

House for the cost of works done by Government day labour. I do not blame this Government at all, and I am not blaming any particular Government, but I say that this expensive Government day-labour system has grown up. As a member stated to-night, it was a Tory, Sir John Forrest, who started it. I believe that the reason he started it—though I do not know whether it was so or not—was to get political influence, and not to cheapen work, because there is no State in Australia, or almost in the world, where the railway work has been done cheaper than it has here. With regard to redistribution of seats, I am merely a new chum, and I do not know enough about government to give much of an opinion; but from what I saw in my election, I assert that certainly from three to four hundred electors in my constituency are not represented. I do not know whether you will say they are disfranchised—you can use any word you like—but what I mean is that they did not want me. I think that such a position of affairs is not right, and if it could be improved it would be a very good thing. I would ask the legislators if they cannot make some arrangement in regard to more class representation, so that men who want my sort can have one representative, and other people can have somebody who may suit them. Probably it would be a difficult problem, but, in my opinion, it would simplify matters and satisfy people very much better than the system of cutting the country up into certain districts, under which, whether a person wanted a Labour member, a Tory, a Liberal, or whatever it might be, he had to put up with whatever man came along. I do not know that I need refer to other subjects, for I suppose they will come up in course of time; and with these observations I will conclude.

On motion by Hon. F. H. PIESSE, debate adjourned until the next sitting.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 10:44 o'clock, until the next day.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 7th August, 1902.

Question: Stock Export to South Africa—Question: Hospital Grievance, Kalgoorlie—Question: Experimental Farm, Narrogin—Lands Department, Questions—Address-in-Reply, ninth day, conclusion—Administration (probate) Amendment Bill, second reading—First readings: Public Notaries Bill, Indecent Publications Suppression Bill, Justices Bill, Public Works Bill, Roads Act Amendment Bill, Explosives Act Amendment Bill, Elementary Education (District Boards) Bill, Railways Act Amendment Bill, Legal Practitioners Act Amendment Bill, Droving Bill—Returns Ordered: 1, Victoria Quay, Fremantle; 2, Criminal Label Prosecutions; 3, Land Purchases (railway); 4, Railway Stores (value)—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

QUESTION—STOCK EXPORT TO SOUTH AFRICA.

MR. F. WALLACE: By leave without notice, I beg to ask the Premier whether his attention has been drawn to a paragraph appearing in the *Morning Herald* newspaper of to-day, having reference to an expressed intention by the Minister for Lands to levy an export tax or heavy inspection fees on cattle leaving the State of Western Australia.

THE PREMIER: My attention has been drawn to the paragraph, which has occasioned me some surprise. I have seen Dr. Jameson on the matter, and he states that he has not been correctly reported. The subject has not even been considered by Ministers. There is no occasion for taking any action which would affect or interfere with existing arrangements.

QUESTION—HOSPITAL GRIEVANCE, KALGOORLIE.

MR. J. RESIDE asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Whether his attention had been called to a Press report which stated that at Kalgoorlie Government Hospital a lad with a broken arm was refused medical attention, and told to seek it elsewhere. 2, Whether he will make inquiries into this statement, and, if true, issue instructions to prevent such actions in the future.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, My attention has not been called to the Press report referred to. 2, Yes. Inquiries have been instituted, and

the result will be communicated to the hon. member.

**QUESTION—EXPERIMENTAL FARM,
NARROGIN.**

HON. G. THROSSELL asked the Premier: 1, What amount has been expended to date on the Narrogin experimental farm. 2, What is to be the total expenditure. 3, What is the number of men employed. 4, What is the area of the land enclosed and the nature of the improvements to date. 5, What stock is now kept or intended to be kept. 6, Whether it is intended to make provision for the instruction of pupils.

THE PREMIER replied: 1, £520 10s. 1d. 2, Total expenditure authorised to date, £1,680. 3, One foreman. Work is being done by contract, on which 12 men are employed. 4, 1,700 acres. Improvements partially carried out: 10 miles boundary fencing, 1,400 acres of ring-barking, 100 acres cleared, house for foreman, well, etc. 5, At present two Ayrshire cows and three pens poultry. Stud cattle, sheep, and pigs will be kept later. 6, Provision will be made for the instruction of youths in practical farming.

LANDS DEPARTMENT, QUESTIONS.

THE PREMIER (addressing members generally) requested that questions relating to the Lands Department should be addressed, in this House, to the Treasurer.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

NINTH DAY OF DEBATE.

Resumed from the previous sitting.

POINT OF ORDER.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: I understand, Mr. Speaker, that I should be out of order in continuing this debate. Perhaps you will state the reason.

THE SPEAKER: Yes. I should have mentioned it last night to the hon. member, but I thought he moved the adjournment of the debate for the purpose of allowing another member to speak. It is out of order for a member to speak again after having seconded an amendment. This is the rule laid down in *May*, page 306:—

As a member who moves an amendment cannot speak again, so a member who seconds

an amendment is equally unable to speak again upon the original question, after the amendment has been withdrawn or otherwise disposed of.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: I should like to say that, although an old member of the House, I was quite in ignorance of my intended speech to-night being out of order. I have looked up our own Standing Orders, and have not noticed any rule to the effect reported in *May*; though as *May* is undoubtedly an authority on parliamentary practice, your ruling must be accepted.

THE SPEAKER: The fact is not specifically mentioned in our Standing Orders; but Standing Order No. 1 is very wide indeed, and in my opinion properly so. It reads:—

In all cases not provided for hereafter, or by sessional or other orders, resort shall be had to the rules, forms, and practice of the Commons House of the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland, which shall be followed as far as they can be applied to the proceedings of this House.

DEBATE RESUMED.

MR. M. H. JACOBY (Swan): I must congratulate the Government on their wise roads boards policy. If there be one thing now required in this State, it is that full opportunity be given to new settlers to get their produce to market at a reasonable cost. In all directions we have been opening agricultural areas; settlers have been going out considerable distances from the railway; but, unfortunately, the progress of road-making has not followed so rapidly as is desired, and I therefore congratulate the Government, and perhaps more particularly the Minister for Works (Hon. C. H. Rason), on their wise and progressive policy. I trust the suggestion made at the last roads boards conference—that inspectors or supervisors should be appointed—will be carried out at an early date by the Minister. I have had opportunities of seeing the exceedingly loose manner in which many roads boards draw up specifications, and the incompleteness with which some contracts are carried out. Unfortunately, the position of many boards does not warrant their paying large sums to supervisors; and some general system of appointing supervisors, each of whom would take charge of three or four districts, might be inaugurated

with advantage to our State roads. I hope the matter of the Width of Tires Act will be looked into with a view to having the Act applied throughout the State. Wherever put in force by the roads boards, the Act has resulted in a saving of maintenance; and I feel sure road expenditure would be considerably reduced, or the money spent to better purpose, were this Act in operation. I should like to congratulate the Treasurer on his intention to try to borrow money locally, and I trust that when he looks into the matter he will not be too mean in the terms offered to local investors. We offer our stock to the British public at terms exceedingly liberal compared with those mentioned last night by the Treasurer. [THE TREASURER: No.] If any advantage is to be given, it should surely be given to the local investor; and though I am not too sanguine that the experiment will be highly successful, I am certainly pleased that it is to be made. Farther, I wish to say the Government should not rely too much upon the work likely to be done by the Civil Service Commission, but might with considerable advantage themselves start to reorganise the service throughout. Civil service reform is a burning question; it is badly needed; and I am somewhat afraid the three civil servants who have been appointed to reform the service are likely to look at the question from the civil servants' point of view. I have no doubt the rules they will lay down, and the system of classification they will recommend, will be good; but I consider the best possible commission would be one composed of Ministers themselves. There are glaring abuses now existing; and if there be nothing standing in the way of these being remedied by means of an adequate Act of Parliament to control the service, I trust the Premier will bring down a measure giving the Government power immediately to start reorganisation. I believe practically every member is pledged to insist on such reform; and I hope we shall not have to wait another year before it is brought about. Referring to the Midland Railway, it is not so much the manner of running this line which causes dissatisfaction to the country: the land policy of the company is at fault. If the Government could insist on a more liberal land policy being carried out by

the company, 95 per cent. of the grievances of the people living adjacent to the line would be removed. From inquiries I have made, there is not much dissatisfaction with the railway itself; and I believe in several respects the system of running that line might advantageously be copied by our own Railway Department. I hope the year will not be allowed to close without the Midland Railway question being settled one way or other. If it be impossible for us to purchase the line at a satisfactory figure, I trust it will not be impossible to force the company to utilise the lands as they should be utilised. I regret that in taking over many obligations of the old Government, which in my opinion might have been safely ignored, the present Ministry did not include the obligation of their predecessors to purchase the Canning railway. The unfortunate position in which the people residing on the Canning line are placed is this, that whilst the Government have power under the agreement to purchase that line at £1,000 a mile, the company are not at all prepared to do anything to place that line in a proper condition. Only a short time ago Mr. James Morrison, who will not be accused of being an imaginative sort of person as far as dealing with financial transactions is concerned, and who is not a man likely to make a mistake if he starts out to do anything in connection with a railway, started out to purchase this line, satisfied that he would secure good interest on the money, and he would have bought it had it not been for the clause in the agreement which allows the Government to purchase it at £1,000 a mile. The position must be faced in one of two ways. The Government should take the line over, or they should relieve the company of the obligation to sell the line and force them to carry on a proper service. They would be quite prepared to carry on a satisfactory service on that line if they were released from the obligation to sell the line at £1,000 per mile. I understand the Government have a report from one of their responsible officers that the line would pay four per cent. on the amount it would take to purchase it and put it in proper order. If that be the case, I fail to see why there is such timidity on the part of the present Government to purchase that line. It involves a total

expenditure of less than £30,000 altogether. The settlement is increasing at a very rapid rate up there. Without knowing accurately whether the line will actually pay, there certainly seems from outside evidence to be full justification for the belief held by the people up there that it will pay. If, in addition to that, we have a report from a Government officer that the line will pay interest on the outlay, I fail to see why the Government cannot carry out the promise of the late Premier in connection with this line. I would ask the Government also to remember the exceedingly unfortunate position in which these people have been placed. After an active agitation carried on for years they succeeded in causing Mr. Leake to make the purchase of this line part of his policy; and after that to find this thing dropped like a hot potato is, I think, an exceedingly cruel thing to these people. I say again the company should be relieved of the obligation to sell that line at a low price to the Government, and forced in return for the concession to run a satisfactory service, or the Government should take the line over. There are the two alternatives, and I trust that now the opportunity presents itself, and the Government are dealing with this matter, they will do so in the direction of making the line Government property, and doing away as far as possible with the private lines of this State. I also wish to say three or four words upon the matter of education. It appears to me that the time has arrived in this State when we should strictly define what are the limits to which the State should go in the matter of State education. The schools are growing in number, and there are technical and advanced schools. The standard of the State schools is being raised to such a high pitch, and such progress is being made in other directions, that it appears to me we shall have to take the whole burden of responsibility of education upon our shoulders, or define a limit. I think an opportunity will occur later on for me to speak a little bit farther about this matter, but I would like to suggest to the Government that a time has arrived when we should decide whether the State should provide more than a primary education. I intend during the session to exercise what power of criticism I have,

and I would point out to the hon. gentlemen opposite that it is rather out of place to be continually complaining of the criticism to which they are subjected, and for anyone who has at all followed the debates in the House of Commons to complain of the opposition offered in this House as being unjustifiable obstruction is, I think, somewhat childish. Anyone who has followed those debates will find that the criticism very frequently goes beyond pure criticism, and degenerates into obstruction, yet never do I remember any complaint being made by the leader of that House or by those members on the Treasury benches at the criticism levelled at them. I take the position that every act should be scrutinised and criticised as closely as possible. Criticism may be futile or foolish, but certainly before anything is done in the House of Parliament it should be examined as closely as possible from every point of view. Criticism may often be wrong or futile, yet from the debate and clash of opinion we ultimately get down to the bedrock of common sense, and find out exactly the right thing to do.

MR. H. DAGLISH (Subiaco): I do not intend speaking at length on the Address-in-reply. In fact, I should probably not have troubled the House at all but for the remarks made by the member for Mt. Margaret (Mr. Taylor) last night, in criticism of some of the members with whom I am associated and in criticism of myself. I want here to distinctly deny the statement of the hon. member, that any seats have been lost to the Labour party by the attitude of the Labour party in this House. The hon. member made that distinct assertion, and my reply is that the only thing which can injure this party in the estimation of the public is any disloyalty by individual members of the party; but if there be disloyalty amongst the members in this House, as a matter of fact that disloyalty is liable to spread outside the House. I speak in this matter without any personal feeling whatever, and solely in the interests of pure administration. On the part of those with whom I am associated, I say we have had the hon. member for the second time denouncing those whom he was returned to Parliament to work with and to assist. We have had him denouncing them and holding them up as

far as he could to the ridicule of members who are sitting on the Opposition side of the House. I have seen the hon. member winning the applause of those who are anxious to see disorganisation in this party. Of course, it is a known fact that many members do not approve of the Labour party, and they are naturally anxious to see it disorganised, because disorganisation means weakness. I do not blame those hon. members for that, but I say it is a bad sign when any member of this party stands up and wins the enthusiastic applause and delighted smiles of those who deliberately and publicly denounce the proposals of the Labour party. It is not necessary for me to name them. Surely the member for East Kimberley (Mr. Connor) has not been so long in the House without knowing them. The hon. member knows perfectly well there are members in this House who announce themselves as distinctly opposed to the Labour party, and I do not blame those members for it.

MR. CONNOR: It is an unfair charge to make generally.

MR. DAGLISH: I am not making a charge, and I only say that a member of the Labour party won the applause of those distinctly opposed to the Labour party.

MR. TAYLOR: It must have been from the cross-benches of the Ministerial side, then.

MR. DAGLISH: From both sides, no doubt.

MR. TAYLOR: Mostly on the Government side.

MR. DAGLISH: The member for Mount Margaret said the Labour party were tied to the Ministerial side, which is an absolutely untrue statement. He knows perfectly well, and I am revealing no caucus secret in saying this, that a caucus was held of the members of the Labour party when the amendment to the Address-in-reply was moved; and at that caucus it was decided to vote with the Government. How the party will vote when the next no-confidence motion is brought forward, I do not know. I have never heard of any pledge being given, or of any tie existing between the Government and the Labour party; and the peculiar thing about it is that: the member for Mount Margaret, a few months ago in this Chamber, stood up

and, just as roundly as he did last night, denounced the present Government, and announced his intention to support the Opposition. The hon. member had stood up and denounced the Opposition, and intimated that he intended to support the Leake administration; and he denounced the Opposition, not only for that, but on account of the acts which they had done while in power, or the acts they allowed to be done while Sir John Forrest and Mr. Throssell were holding the reins of Government. The hon. member contends that what in him was a virtue a few months ago, on the part of other members is now a crime. Of course the hon. member is quite justified in criticising the Government.

MR. TAYLOR: I criticised them at the time they went wrong, after the formation of the Morgans Ministry.

MR. DAGLISH: I am aware that the hon. member, after a given time, was a stern opponent of the Leake Administration, of which he was formerly a supporter; but what I object to is that the hon. member should come to the House and say, in effect, that while I support a Ministry it is right to support it, but when I oppose it, it is a crime on the part of other members to support that Government. If they differ from me, it is not right. I differ from the hon. member when he says, in effect, "I am Sir Oracle: let no dogs bark." The hon. member has not yet achieved that reputation for ability, for keenness of political knowledge, or for keenness of perception which enables him to stand up in the House and say he is capable of casting an intelligent vote while the rest of the Labour party are open to be hoodwinked and led by the Government. The hon. member simply says, in effect, there is on one side of the House a Labour member sitting in Opposition who has intelligence, who has discretion, and who has judgment, and that there are six fools belonging to the Labour party sitting on the Government side of the House. (Laughter.) It may be true or it may not be true; in my opinion it is not true; but I say this, that I would rather be a fool and be loyal to my fellows and my party, than be ever so clever a man and at the same time show disloyalty as the hon. member has

on this occasion. The hon. members sitting in Opposition who applauded the member for Mt. Margaret would be the first to denounce members of their party who attended a caucus, and then took up an attitude similar to that which the member for Mt. Margaret took up last night. What they praise in the member for Mt. Margaret, they denounce in those other members who have left their party and have forfeited the respect of members on that side; they denounce those other members as "rats," and yet applaud the member for Mt. Margaret for pursuing the same line of conduct. I am unable to distinguish between such conduct on the part of the member for Mt. Margaret and on the part of other members. I will go a little back, into ancient history perhaps, by referring to the fact that some months ago when the member for Mt. Margaret first took his departure from the rest of the Labour party and announced his intended departure at a caucus of the then Ministerial party just after the second Leake Ministry was formed, he denounced the second Leake Ministry in earnest terms, and he said he would not, on any account, sit behind that Ministry or in the Ministerial corner, and he added, if the members of the Labour party decided to sit on the Government side of the House he would resign his seat.

MR. TAYLOR: No; it is not in *Hansard*.

MR. DAGLISH: This was a statement made in the presence of about 20 members of the Legislative Assembly, and therefore it is a statement that can easily be proved or disproved by the evidence of those 20 members. The hon. member having made that deliberate announcement, the Labour party met and decided that they would sit on the Government side of the House. The hon. member then did not retain the position he had taken up. However, he had this satisfaction: he made an attack immediately afterwards in the House on members of the Labour party. He denounced them as he did last night, and subsequently took the opportunity of going to his constituents and denounced every member of the Labour party, showing how little they had done and how much they would have done if they had followed him. In other words, the hon. member pointed

out what a fine fellow he was himself, and what bad representatives the other Labour members were. Inside and outside of this House, the hon. member has ridiculed those whom he was sent here to strengthen and support, and he has inside and outside done the Labour party and the cause all the harm he possibly can; and I, as one member, have kept silence on the subject until now, but when the hon. member insists in continuing to attack the Labour party in public, then it is absolutely necessary that some member of the party should rise and object to it and point out the unfairness, and also point out that the hon. member, by his disloyalty, is injuring the cause which he was returned to Parliament to assist. The Labour people who sent the hon. member to Parliament have had the disadvantage of an *ex parte* case being presented to them. They have not yet heard both sides of the case, and until the hon. member's constituents have had both sides of the case presented to them they are not in a fair position to judge of the merits. It is a very easy thing for one member to get right away from the rest, and by presenting his side, win the approval of all to whom he presents it; but I am satisfied if that disloyalty be popular in the hon. member's constituency, it is not popular in the constituencies represented by other members of the party. I can assure the hon. member in the constituencies I have been in so far, that disloyalty is censured on all hands. However, I have said all I intend to say on that matter. I regret the necessity which has led to it, but I am not going to sit and listen to this sort of thing; and if the conduct of the hon. member is repeated, I deliberately announce my intention of not attending a Labour caucus at which he is present, because if there is to be no loyalty in that party, I shall cease to attend its meetings at all. The hon. member is already quoted in to-night's newspaper as one who has attacked the principle of the caucus. That is the effect of his remarks last night. We know that all over the British Empire where there is Parliamentary Government, the caucus principle is adopted; it is not only adopted by the Labour party, but by parties on both sides of the House; and it is invariably recognised

as the duty of a man, when he attends a caucus and takes part in its deliberations, that he shall be loyal to the decision whatever it may be. If the hon. member does not do that, even if he gives his vote with them—if he blesses the party with his vote and curses them with his voice, he is rendering only nominal and spurious loyalty, and if it is spurious loyalty then it is as injurious as the utmost disloyalty can be. Coming to a more pleasant subject, the general terms of the Address-in-reply, I wish to take exception to the remarks which have been frequently made in the Press and in this House as to the extent of taxation under which this country is governed. I admit the country is too heavily taxed, but when an hon. member stands up like the member for Dundas did and speaks of the country being taxed to the extent of three and three-quarter millions, it is misleading the country. The revenue of the State is not made up by means of taxation alone. If the hon. member were to adopt the same principle in dealing with the British Empire, he would have to include in the taxation of Great Britain, the revenues of all the private railways that dot the country. A great deal of revenue is made up by commercial departments like the Railway Department and the Post Office Department, and it is misleading to quote the revenues of these departments as being any portion of the State taxation. I would not have alluded to this matter only for the fact that, not only in the House but in the newspapers, we see the same misleading statements used as a basis for submitting arguments as to what our taxation is and the necessity for an adjustment of it. I am very glad to see by the result of the want-of-confidence motion the other night, that we now have stable Government, for I am satisfied that what the country is crying out for is stable Government. We all admit the necessity for good administration in the various departments, and every member of the House is aware that if the Government were not sound and stable, and the Ministry were only in existence for a few months at all events, they could not give due attention to the various departments; they cannot re-organise and administer in a proper fashion. For that reason the country, as well as the House, is entitled to recognise

that the Government have the elements of stability. The country at the present time does not demand a dissolution; the country in fact is opposed to political strife being introduced just now. I am glad the attempt of the Opposition to unseat the Government has been unsuccessful, for if the Government had been unseated, it would mean one of two alternatives, either an appeal to the people or a hand-to-mouth Administration, living on the principle that "sufficient for the day is the evil thereof," and refusing to look any distance ahead. As to the amendment of the Constitution Act, we are met undoubtedly with difficulties. There have been about a dozen different opinions expressed in the House as to the lines on which this amendment should go. Now I am prepared to utter my belief that there must be a reduction of the cost of Government; but I am not prepared in any way to support a reduction of members of this House. I am perfectly ready to vote for establishing one House of Legislature in this State; but that one House must be a substantially large House—a House, at all events, of not less than 50 members. I do think it is time for members of this branch of the Legislature to educate the public in regard to the uselessness of expenditure on a second Chamber, now that so many functions have been taken away from the State Parliament and handed over to the control of the Federal Houses. I should greatly like to see the Government give the public of this State a practical lesson on the subject by introducing a measure designed to establish the unicameral system. I should be glad to see another place entirely abolished, because I feel that the additional responsibility which would under such circumstances be cast on members of this House would be so thoroughly appreciated by them that there would be no danger of hasty legislation. As a matter of fact, hasty legislation is more commonly caused by the feeling of irresponsibility on the part of an individual Chamber. We feel that there is elsewhere a Chamber whose duty it is to check us if we go wrong. We have not that sense of responsibility which we should have if we were members of the sole House of Legislature. In regard to important measures, say measures embodying constitutional changes, there

might be a provision that the one House of Legislature should allow a period of at least a month to elapse between the second and the third reading. This delay will enable the country to consider measures well, and to express its objections if it be opposed to any new departure contemplated. By such means we should, likewise, throw on the people throughout the State their share of responsibility, and we should ensure that this House was fully seised of the merits of proposals brought before it. I refer particularly to proposals of a constitutional nature. I am quite prepared, not only in this House but outside it, to state my political position on this subject. I hold that we have no need of a second Chamber in this State at the present time. If the object of the reduction of members be the reduction of the cost of Government, then the only effective way of achieving such a reduction is to abolish one of the Chambers. Farther, this principle also is involved: I am prepared to object altogether to any small section of the community having a preponderating influence in the Legislature. I object to a man who happens to have a little property being given a greater degree of control than the man who has only intelligence. I know that intelligence and property can co-exist; but, at the same time, I am not aware that the possession of property is in itself an indication of any other than commercial intelligence; and commercial intelligence of itself is not a qualification for legislation. As for the electoral law, I hope that the amendment to be introduced by the Government will entirely abolish the use of municipal rolls; because until municipal rolls are abolished as a factor in our parliamentary elections, we cannot have satisfactory parliamentary rolls. The municipal rolls as municipal rolls are utterly imperfect. They are disfigured by many serious omissions which should not be allowed to occur, and, on the other hand, they include many names which should not be on the rolls. Such is the case when the rolls are first printed; but, as a matter of fact, many changes occur between the time when the rolls are printed to be used for municipal elections and the time when they are printed to be used for the purpose of parliamentary elections. The only satisfactory method

of getting a reliable roll is to institute a system of issuing electoral rights, and to make the issue of electoral rights the only means of placing names on the electoral roll. It is common knowledge, I may add, that hundreds of cases of impersonation occur in connection with State elections, and that there are many instances of men voting more than once; and so long as the rolls remain in their present state, things of this kind are bound to continue. I know that very frequently electors who are out of the State manage, by some means or other, to record their votes. I do not know how it is done; but there are within my own knowledge cases of men who have been absent from the State for a year or two, and have not only remained on the roll, but have managed, through themselves or through some person acting on their behalf though possibly without their sanction, to record votes at parliamentary elections. [MEMBER: Name some cases.] I have not yet been appointed public prosecutor, and before I take on myself the onerous duties of that official I shall require some of the emoluments attaching to the position. There can be no doubt that necessity existed for the appointment of the Civil Service Commission now at work. The mode of appointment adopted in the case of that Commission, and likewise its constitution, however, leave an opening for difference of opinion. It seems to me that the Government in establishing a Commission designed to promote measures of economy acted in a very uneconomical fashion. The Government appointed a gentleman from our public service, Dr. Black; and apparently after that gentleman had been appointed, they recognised that it was necessary for the local member of the Commission to know something about the public services of the other States. Therefore, they sent that local member to the other States to learn something about public service matters. Now, there are in Western Australia at the present time a number of officials who have had public service experience in the other States; some of them officials high up in the service of this State, and others high up in the service of the Federal Government. If Eastern civil service experience was required, it would, I think, have been far

cheaper and far better for the Government to appoint a man already possessed of such experience than to go to the expense of sending away a gentleman on full pay with heavy travelling allowances in order that he may acquire it in the course of a month or two. For, apart from the cost of gaining experience in that fashion, the knowledge acquired in the course of a short trip can be of very little value. No man, however intelligent or capable he may be, can in the course of a couple of months master the intricacies of public service administration in other States. The Government, therefore, in their effort to secure economy have proceeded in what seems to me, at any rate, a very peculiar fashion. Another peculiar proceeding of the Government occurred in connection with the abolition of the Premier's Department. All hon. members wanted to see the Premier's Department abolished, since all recognised that it was not required. We find, however, that in its abolition the Government adopted a most peculiar plan in dispensing with the services of I don't know precisely how many men; but I know of one, at any rate, who was dispensed with on the terms of receiving a year's leave of absence with full pay to begin with and an annual pension thereafter. The man in question is comparatively young, between 35 and 40 years of age, I should say; and he enjoys the pension for the rest of his natural life. A suggestion which seemed to me wise was made by a writer in the newspapers a few months ago. The suggestion was that the Government, if they wanted to reduce the public service, might offer facilities for retirement such as the Victorian Government offered a few years ago to those members of their civil service staff who might be anxious to leave. The Victorian Government offered such officials six months' pay, and in that way dispensed at a comparatively cheap rate with those willing to retire. Now, I was in Victoria and in the Victorian civil service at the time that plan was adopted. Indeed, I may mention that I myself accepted the offer of six months' pay and retired from the Victorian service. I know that service was considerably reduced in number by that very system.

THE PREMIER: But reduced also in power and efficiency.

MR. DAGLISH: In respect of one or two individual cases which need not be particularised, of course that is true. However, the loss of Victoria was the gain of Western Australia. (Laughter.) A method like that adopted in Victoria affords a far cheaper means of reducing the civil service than that adopted here, of pensioning off officials. In a big service there must always be a certain proportion of officials anxious to get out and undertake private business; and doubtless many of these would leave if offered some such terms as I have stated, though they might not leave without that inducement. If the Government adopted the plan even now, they might still derive considerable advantage from it. Such a course would lead to a considerable reduction during the current financial year in the cost of administration of some of our State departments. Turning now to the Coolgardie Water Scheme, I must say I cannot altogether concur in the congratulations of the Government on the fact that the scheme has reached its present stage, and that the water has got as far as it has; for I feel that if there had been only moderate mismanagement in the construction of the work, long before this the water would have been on the goldfields. However, it is satisfactory to know that a far better rate of progress is being made under the new administration. The Government, however, have a nasty nettle to grasp in the constitution of boards to deal with the question of reticulation, and also in the fixing of the price to be charged for the water. One cannot help feeling a certain degree of doubt as to the eventual success of the scheme, when he hears a goldfields representative speak as the member for Dundas (Mr. Thomas) spoke last night. The stand which, in my opinion, the House should take on the subject of the Coolgardie Water Scheme is this, that the goldfields must be made to pay the cost of their water supply, whatever that cost may be; that the country cannot afford to take on its shoulders a permanent burden in respect of the goldfields water supply, and that the goldfields must be placed on precisely the same footing as the people of the metropolis have already been placed on; that is to say, the goldfields should be required to make

the scheme at all events self-supporting. With these ends in view, the Government will have to be exceedingly careful in the constitution of the proposed boards. To my mind, the best arrangement which the Government can make is to deliver the water into the reservoirs on the various centres at the price which it costs them to provide and deliver it; to require the boards to take over the water at that price, whether it be 3s. 6d. per thousand gallons or a lesser or a greater sum; and then to require the boards in their own local charges to make provision for the cost of reticulation; that is to say, for the cost of the money actually borrowed in order to carry out a system of reticulation.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: It is a question of the quantity taken.

MR. DAGLISH: I am aware of that. My opinion of the chances of the scheme succeeding is very much that of the member for Dundas (Mr. Thomas). I believe that the people of the goldfields are anxious to get the water, and that the quantity required for domestic purposes will be sufficient to assure, with reasonable management, the success of the scheme. As for the Metropolitan Waterworks Board, I suppose no Governor's Speech would be complete without some reference to the necessity for providing the metropolis with a good and wholesome water supply. That is a recognised item in the Governor's Speech; indeed, I believe the type is kept standing from year to year in the Government Printing Office, in order that the paragraph may be duly inserted. I hope the present Government are really in earnest with this measure, because the position of affairs is becoming more critical year by year. We know that the supply from bores in Perth and its suburbs is very much less than it has been in the past. As regards the metropolitan water supply, I have to point out that during most of the winter the bore at Subiaco has had to be used; this for the first time since it existed. The fact indicates the necessity for taking immediate measures for the provision of a new supply. I should like to see the board to be appointed under the new scheme an elective board, because I do not think the system of management by a nominee board can be continued much

longer. The nominee board has given great dissatisfaction, not only by its treatment of the individual ratepayer, but particularly by the varying nature of the treatment which it accords various districts. If the new board cannot be constituted at once, then I hope that the Government will, at all events, introduce a short amending Bill making uniform the charge for water in all districts supplied by the Metropolitan Waterworks Board. It is a most unreasonable thing that one district should be paying a much higher price for its water than another district. The charge for water should be uniform throughout. I think it most unreasonable, too, that the board should be allowed to charge the consumer with the cost of extension. If a man desires to build in a street through which the water main has not yet been carried, he is called on to pay the cost of extension past, in many cases, a number of other building blocks. Immediately the water main has been extended past those building blocks at the expense of the individual consumer, the board steps in, very properly of course, and charges the holders of the blocks past which the main has been carried, with a water rate. That is to say, the board makes the extension at the expense of the individual consumer, and then takes the interest on the capital in that extension for its own benefit. That, I say, is unreasonable. Individual contributors should not be required to pay for extension of the mains. Even if they are required so to pay, it is still unreasonable that, as is done in many cases at the present time, a three-quarter inch main alone should be provided. The member for the Moore (Dr. O'Connor) spoke on a recent evening in support of a union of the various metropolitan municipalities. But the time has not come, and will not come for another ten years at least, for such a union. At present we have been obliged continually to separate different districts from their various centres for the purpose of getting the wants of the outlying quarters attended to; and for the same reason, there will in future have to be created new municipalities in the metropolitan district. For instance, if the municipal districts of Subiaco and Leederville were included in the municipality of Perth, we know that the centre

would have all the attention, and would very likely have spent on it a great deal of the rate money provided by the out-skirts. For that reason, in a new district the municipalities have to be split up into very small areas; but when streets have been formed by the various councils, lighting provided, and other necessities of the places met, then will come a time in which the municipalities will recognise the wisdom, for the sake of administrative cheapness, of again uniting. But until a fairly large population has been gathered in the various suburbs, there will be no hope for such a proposal being regarded as practicable. [MR. ILLINGWORTH: We require a metropolitan board of works.] Quite so; we need not only a water supply board, but a metropolitan works board. In the suburbs we need provision for drainage. In my opinion deep drainage is needed in the city of Perth itself; but in the suburbs we need some provision for surface drainage, which we cannot provide for ourselves without spending much money, a great proportion of which would be absolutely lost unless the expenditure were part of some common scheme. I therefore hope the provision of drainage as well as of water will be intrusted to the new board, and I am quite satisfied a great saving will be effected. Regarding old-age pensions, I am sorry the Government have not introduced a proposal; because I think one of the most urgent necessities is to make due provision for the wants of the aged. We know the Federal Parliament will be unable to do so for many years, because the requirements of Federal legislation are so great that the time taken in practically constituting the Federal Government must for the next few years exclude the consideration of other questions, and there will be no hope of this matter receiving attention. The Treasurer, speaking on this point, mentioned the difficulty of providing funds; but it seems to me that if we exercised great economy in administration we could materially reduce our expenditure; and farther, we have a means of raising revenue which the country has not yet adopted, that is by leasing instead of selling our lands. At present we are raising a certain annual revenue from the sale of Crown lands, which means that we get each year a certain small sum--a sum far in excess of what

we should get from rents at the outset; but it means also that we hand over to private speculators the full advantage of the increased land values caused by settlement. For instance, if the Government had retained the land in the various goldfield centres, with which they parted a few years ago--[MR. THOMAS: They are selling blocks now]--I know, and if we had retained possession of the Crown lands at Kalgoorlie, Coolgardie, Leonora, and other places where there are now big towns, the Government would be receiving an enormous rent far in excess of the total received in any one year from the actual sales of land. As a fact, the rental would be increasing year after year; but so far, the Government have preferred to hand over the land for a mere song to private speculators. I contend that in parting with this valuable asset the Government made a mistake. The asset will ultimately be all got rid of; ultimately the public lands, especially in towns, will all be alienated; and I say Ministers would earn the gratitude of the country if they would take steps to stop farther alienation of Crown lands, and I hope they will give this subject earnest consideration. I know that in the future we shall have many new goldfields towns, and townships in the agricultural districts also; and the Government should seriously consider at an early date the advisableness of stopping the sale of Crown lands. I am speaking particularly of town lands, though my remarks would apply to agricultural as well as to pastoral areas. But at present the pastoral leases are not in any way alienated, so far as I am aware; and I do not see why the principle adopted in regard to these leases should not be applied to agricultural lands, and likewise to lands within townsites areas. Last session I drew attention to the need for greater facilities being given to savings bank depositors wishing to draw their money without notice. I know the ex-Treasurer (Mr. Illingworth) made a certain provision as regards Perth, which, however, does not apply to the suburbs. And I cannot see any reason why it should be necessary for a person requiring to draw £2 or £3 to give two days' notice before he gets the money. [MR. ILLINGWORTH: Not two days' notice.] Well, what virtually amounts to two days. Where I am living, if one gives

notice early this morning, one may get the money to-morrow afternoon. We should as far as possible encourage thrift by providing facilities for people to bank every penny they do not need. If a man adopts that system, he must occasionally draw on his reserve fund in sickness or in other emergencies; and I cannot see why it should not be possible in the suburbs to keep available a floating balance sufficient to enable a man to draw say £5 or £10 at a moment's notice. Regarding a Shops and Factories Act, I should like to say in reply to the member for East Fremantle (Mr. Holmes), who argues that the present Early Closing Act is sufficient, that, as far as I can judge, the Act does not altogether meet the requirements which led to its being placed on the statute book. I do not think that, as at present constituted, it is of advantage to any district, because as far as I can judge, at a maximum of public inconvenience it gives a minimum benefit to the shop assistant. I supported the Early Closing Act solely for the purpose of limiting the hours of shop-workers; and if early closing does not meet that end, it is ineffective. In many big shops, though the doors are shut promptly at the time appointed, the employees are required to come back or to remain behind some considerable time, to replace stock and so forth. I should much prefer some amendment of the Act in the direction of limiting strictly by law the hours of employment; and if those hours be limited, I confess I do not care much whether the shop be open or shut; because if the shops be shut and public inconvenience caused, and the employees' hours not shortened, then the main object of such legislation has been lost; and that I know to be at present the fact in many shops. As to technical education, I think the proposal of the Government is to be welcomed; but differing from the last speaker, I should like to see the State make provision for the higher education of the people. I should like every facility offered those capable of receiving it, of attaining to the very highest limits of culture. I should like to see boys and girls, no matter how poor they or their parents may be, afforded a chance of acquiring all the knowledge they are able to absorb; and for that reason, some

scheme for a secondary school altogether independent of any religious denomination should be drafted. I do not like the system of subsidising any church whatsoever in respect of education; and I think if the State were to provide secondary education, this should be provided in a college of its own, and not as at present by voting a grant which is administered by one particular denomination. I hope the Government will consider the advisableness of making some provision for the higher education of children, regulating admission to the State college by competitive examinations held in various centres. I welcome the proposal to provide a new lunatic asylum, because our present asylum is an absolute disgrace to the country. It is positive cruelty to imprison in it the unfortunate persons sent there under existing conditions; and I hope this will be one of the earliest works pushed on. I should like to see some provision made to improve the accommodation for those persons forced to take advantage of our charitable institutions, the Old Men's Depôt and the Old Women's Home. Those refuges are most unsatisfactory, and I hope it will be found possible to give them some attention. While maintaining that expenditure should be kept as low as possible, these are matters in which we cannot afford to be parsimonious; and I think the very best provision should be made for those who have almost come to the close of their life history, those who in their latter days have fallen on evil times. For them we should make every provision, so that if they are forced to rely on State aid, they shall have such comfort as the State can well afford to give them. Let us economise in any other direction we please; but do not economise at the expense of the unfortunate, whether the insane, the sick, or the aged.

MR. F. REID (Mount Burges): My remarks this evening will be brief, for I and other Labour members are of opinion that these discussions drag out too long. I desire to pay a slight tribute of respect to the memory of our late Premier (Mr. Leake). Like many others, when I first came to this House about 15 months ago, I was absolutely unused to the customs of Parliament and the mode of procedure, and on many occasions

I had to go to Mr. Leake for advice. I am pleased to be able to say here that on every occasion when I was compelled to ask his opinion or advice, such opinion or advice was always given with the greatest freedom. Undoubtedly, his loss to this House is deeply felt, and his withdrawal from public life must be keenly regretted by the people of this State. There is another melancholy event regarding which I am not sure whether the Government have done anything. I hope they have. I refer to the disastrous explosion at Mt. Kembla, New South Wales, where nearly 100 coal miners were hurled into eternity almost at a moment's notice. In connection with this matter I think it should be the duty of the House to send a message of sympathy to the New South Wales Ministry. [MR. MORAN: A sum of money would be better.] I agree with the hon. member that practical sympathy is always better than mere messages of condolence. At the same time, I remember that when an explosion occurred at the Bulli Colliery, in New South Wales, many years ago, messages of sympathy came to the bereaved persons and to the Parliament of that country from all parts of the world, and included one from Her late Majesty Queen Victoria. Now that the various Australian States are federated, we should demonstrate as far as possible that feeling of sympathy and friendship to those who have been so unfortunate in New South Wales. In endeavouring to deal lightly with matters before the House, I shall not touch on any questions, so far as I know, that have already been grappled with by members. In connection with the railways in this country, I must deprecate the attack which was made upon Mr. Rotheram, the Chief Mechanical Engineer, by one of my comrades a night or two ago. I think it is hardly fair for members in this House to get up in their places and attack a man who is in such a very high position. That gentleman may have made many mistakes whilst occupying that position, and if a man occupying a similar position does not make any mistakes, such man is to my mind absolutely doing nothing at all. Various individuals in this House have spoken to me about Mr. Rotheram, some being for him and others against him, and so far

as I know opinions are pretty evenly divided even by those people who are employed under him. I think the judgment of the House should be suspended as far as that gentleman is concerned. It reminds me of the story of a painter who invited some of his friends into his study to look at his pictures. The friends went into the study and examined the pictures he had exhibited there, but there was one picture placed upon an easel with a canvas covering. The friends made a request that this particular picture should be shown to them. He said, "No; I am sorry I must refuse to show you that picture, for the reason that it is not finished yet, and, if I were to show it to you, you would only see a number of blotches and daubs. You would not understand the work done upon that picture; therefore, I will not show it to you until it is finished." Mr. Rotheram may be in exactly the same position. There is no doubt he has to make many experiments. Some of them very likely have been exhibited to the eyes of unpractical persons, who have formed their judgments before the experiments have been concluded. I desire, in connection with the railway system of this country, to point out what I consider at the present time to be a grievance so far as the goldfields people are concerned. I have already brought this matter under the notice of the Minister, but I bring it forward again so as to emphasise the request made to him by the people on the goldfields in connection with the carriage of wood upon the railways. I understand that jarrah and rough-hewn timber is being carried from Perth to the goldfields for about 18s. per ton, whilst at the same time sandalwood, the production of which has, upon the goldfields, engaged about 500 men, is charged for by the Railway Department at the rate of over £2 a ton for carriage from the goldfields down to Fremantle. I think a great injustice is being perpetrated upon sandalwood cutters on the goldfields by reason of the charge made for the carriage of sandalwood from the goldfields to Fremantle. Trucks have to be provided to carry jarrah from the coast up to the goldfields, and these trucks very often are returned from the goldfields empty. In connection with sandalwood, the sandalwood cutters

load the sandalwood themselves, the people to whom sandalwood is consigned empty the trucks, and the Government are put to no expense whatever in the carriage of that commodity. Nevertheless we find that sawn jarrah can be carried from the coast to the goldfields for 18s. a ton, whilst £2 4s. is charged for sandalwood, which is absolutely costing the Government nothing and is only occupying a space in wagons that would otherwise be empty on their return from the goldfields districts. I ask the Government to very earnestly consider this matter, because whereas six months ago we had from 400 to 500 people on the goldfields-cutting sandalwood, there are to-day, I dare say, not 50 persons employed in that particular industry, and it means a good deal to those persons there. The member for Hannaus (Mr. Reside) a few nights ago referred to the number of unemployed people in Kalgoorlie and districts, and I think that if the Government grappled with this matter, four or five hundred would immediately find employment in the sandalwood industry on the goldfields. Another matter to which I have endeavoured to give a little of my attention during the last few months is the question of refreshment rooms on our railways. I have had to take upon myself the responsible duty of inquiring as to the charges made at the various refreshment rooms, and I found that at those refreshment rooms they invariably charged 100 per cent. more than they were entitled to according to the schedules and time-table rates. I have communicated with the Minister and the Commissioner, and I believe that at the present time the keepers of these refreshment rooms have reduced their charges to the proper level. At the same time, I should like to bring this matter to the attention of the Minister again, so that he will see that these persons are not permitted to impose upon the people who have to travel between the goldfields and the coast. Many of those people are miners' wives and children, and while they are travelling a cup of tea or some light refreshment is very grateful indeed. Where there are five or six persons all travelling together, they might possibly be able to spend 2s. 6d. where it would be utterly impossible to spend 5s. In

that way these people in the past have been deprived of their refreshments while travelling to and from the goldfields. I trust the Government will see that the licensees of the various refreshment rooms take care that the public are not imposed upon in future. Another subject to which I wish to draw the attention of the Government is this, that in future, to allow the public to travel with any sense of comfort at all, it will be necessary to erect more refreshment rooms on the line from Perth to Kalgoorlie. In my opinion at all events it is absolutely necessary for a refreshment room to be erected at Northam. I saw just a short time ago that an application had been made for permission to erect a hotel right opposite the Northam railway station. The application was refused. Why, I do not know; doubtless in favour of some other hotel in Northam. I repeat that in my opinion the time has arrived when a refreshment room should be erected upon the railway-station at Northam. People coming from the goldfields get down to the Northam railway-station about half-past five in the morning, and you can just imagine what it is for a woman with four or five children travelling with her to arrive at that time in the morning and find they are absolutely unable to obtain any refreshment at all. I also think a refreshment room should be erected at Coolgardie railway-station, and one at Kalgoorlie railway-station. Another matter that I would like to point out to the Minister is the fact that the administration of the railways, more especially on the goldfields, has in the past, in my opinion, been very bad indeed. On one occasion when I intended to leave Kalgoorlie and travel to Coolgardie by the midnight train or the train leaving Kalgoorlie at 10.30, I got into a carriage with many others. The train was kept waiting there for three-quarters of an hour, and then I endeavoured to obtain some information or reason why it was delayed to such a great extent. I was informed that there was no coal there. The fact was pointed out to me that, notwithstanding we were then three-quarters of an hour beyond our time for starting, the locomotive was not attached to the train. I asked where it was, and the party who informed me

said, "The driver has just gone round now endeavouring to get a little coal off the various locomotives in the yard. We have no coal here. There is no coal in stock which would carry this train from Kalgoorlie to Southern Cross." If a supply of coal is not kept at Kalgoorlie to send a train away in time, someone is in fault; there is a person who has not been doing his duty. There is plenty of coal in the country, there is plenty of coal down here, and if there be not a supply in stock at Kalgoorlie I have no doubt the people at Collie could find as much as is wanted. I come now to another matter which has been referred to by the member for Dundas (Mr. Thomas), I mean the question of members travelling by train. I myself on a Monday was unable to come down by the express. I asked the station-master if he would provide accommodation for the member for Dundas and myself. He said he would do so. It may seem a piece of impertinence to members and possibly to the outside public for members of Parliament to demand a little extra accommodation, but I have to travel to Coolgardie almost once a week, and I think I am entitled to travel that journey under fairly comfortable conditions. On this occasion I had to travel on Monday morning about 7 or 8 o'clock, and I was going about all day attending to one thing and another until nearly 12 o'clock at night, when it was time for this train to start. I had then been on my feet nearly 16 hours, at all events. When Mr. Thomas and myself got to the railway station we found that no accommodation had been provided for us, and we had to get into what was practically a second-class carriage and travel down to Fremantle from Coolgardie. In that carriage there was no sleeping accommodation provided. There was no accommodation other than what is very often provided for second-class passengers. After I had been on my feet 16 hours in Coolgardie, we had to sit up for another 18 hours, from 12 o'clock at night till 6 o'clock the following night. Then the time had arrived for us to come here, and we had to come here and wait till about 11 o'clock at night. Do you think that a man is fit to come here and attend to his duties in this House after being on his feet for

practically 34 hours? I say it is unreasonable to expect him to do it, and I trust that something will be done in connection with the matter. I remember that during the last session the member for Dundas took this question up very strongly. He sent a petition round to the members of this House and the members of the other House, and I believe on that petition he had 80 per cent. of the names of members of both Houses in favour of granting farther facilities to members when they had to travel. I think some attention should have been paid to that petition, and that the required accommodation should have been provided. There is a matter the member for the Murchison mentioned last night, which may seem trivial to some members who have never been in the position of having to draw their pay fortnightly. I agree with the hon. member when he asked that something should be done to compel mining companies on the Eastern Goldfields to pay their employees fortnightly and in cash.

MR. THOMAS: Not fortnightly; twice a month.

MR. REID: Twice a month? It is a distinction without a difference.

MR. THOMAS: No. There are more than four weeks in a month.

MR. REID: I am sorry I am physically unable to speak much longer, but I have little more to say. I hope the Minister for Mines will endeavour to have something introduced into the Mines Regulation Bill to compel mine-owners to pay their employees twice a month. There is one other matter which I wish to deal with to-night, and it is in reply to the remarks the member for Mt. Margaret made yesterday evening. I, as one of the Labour party, have had to accept, as others have had to do, the position. I have attended caucus meetings and I have been overruled, but, at the same time, I have always obeyed the vote carried at these meetings. I am sorry indeed to think that a man who was sent here to represent labour, and who attended the caucus meetings of his party, had, notwithstanding that fact, defied the party, and told them that unless they agreed with him he would resign his seat. [MR. TAYLOR: That is not so.] On one occasion the Labour members were placed under this awful threat by

the member for Mt. Margaret; but I am happy indeed to say, notwithstanding that threat, the Labour members adhered to their decision. The member for Mt. Margaret is the only member who came to this House to represent labour who has spoken of what has taken place in caucus. He has not only disclosed caucus secrets, but he has given colour to the rumours which have been spread throughout the country that a split has taken place amongst the Labour Party. [MR. RESIDE: Only a chip taken off.] The hon. member delivered us a worthy lecture on the ethics of labourism, and I think if he had applied the advice given to the Labour party yesterday evening to himself, and had obeyed the dictates of his own conscience, he would not now be sitting on the Opposition side, nor would he have made the exposure which he did.

MR. TAYLOR: You do not like the exposure. That breaks you up.

MR. REID: The hon. member reminds me of an insect which no doubt members have seen. In walking along the sea beach you come to places where there are numerous rocks, and you will find numbers of little molluscs going in and out of these rocks. They never walk straight forward. The hon. member is like a mollusc, which can neither go straight forward nor backward, but can only slide away in an awkward manner to one side. The hon. member interjected when I was speaking just now that I would find how I was placed at the next election. The hon. member has made this accusation in the past, not only with respect to myself, but with respect to every other member of the Labour party, that we are afraid to face a general election. I am not afraid to face a general election, and whether I am again returned as a Labour member or not I can say that I have been a honest and conscientious Labour man for years before the hon. member knew anything about labour, and I intend to uphold the banner of labour as long as I can, and I should not be sorry if I were defeated in an election to-morrow. If a general election were to come to-morrow, I do not know that I should trouble to ask the electors to return me again; for, with the family I have, it is absolutely impossible for me to maintain them on the amount of

money I receive here. I shall not allow the member for Mount Margaret to say I am afraid to go to the electors, or that I am bound to the Ministry. I have given the Ministry honest and generous support up to the present, but if the time comes when the Ministry do anything that I disapprove of I shall not be afraid to vote against them. I am not here because I want any particular favour from the Ministry. I am here to-day to do my duty honestly and fearlessly between those who sent me here and the Parliament, without fear, favour, or prejudice to any man.

[A pause ensued.]

MR. R. HASTIE (Kanowna): I have waited to see if someone would rise to speak, and solely for the reason that two other members had spoken from this (Labour) bench. Seeing on the other side of the House there were gentlemen who appeared to take such a great interest in the debate to-night, I thought someone would say something. [MR. JACOBY: They have all spoken.] There are such orators, who are yet dumb, as the member for Sussex and the member sitting in front of him (Mr. Butcher), whom we should have been delighted to have heard to-night before tea, as no doubt it would have assisted our appetite. Another reason for not rising to speak at once was that we have just heard two members of the Labour party defend the position we are in from the aspersions of the member for Mount Margaret.

MR. TAYLOR: You cannot do it outside the House.

MR. HASTIE: The hon. member is always declaring, like a school bully, that he, and he alone, has power over the people outside. It is nothing of the sort. He has never addressed a public meeting outside, and I have addressed a great number. I spoke of the hon. member as a school bully very flatteringly for the position which he has taken up to-night. It must have been noticed by every member of the House that the hon. member is a perfect nuisance to every one of us. Even when he sat on the Labour bench and I rose or anyone else rose, he would sit laughing and sniggering and jeering at the person speaking. That occurred when any member of the House was speaking, and it is astonishing that the hon. member has not learnt better manners.

I do not wish to advertise the hon. member any more than I can help, but there comes a time when we must take steps, and not take the hon. member's leers and jeers in quietness. The member for Subiaco to-night mentioned that the member for Mt. Margaret, at a meeting of which the majority of the members of the House were present, declared that because Mr. Leake dared to differ from him in opinion as to the composition of his Cabinet, if the Labour party did not follow the course taken by him (Mr. Taylor), he would resign his seat.

MR. TAYLOR: Am I in order, Mr. Speaker, in contradicting that? Is it right for a member to make such a statement when it is untrue and I contradict it? I made my statement here, and I defy the member for Kanowna to say I threatened to resign.

MR. HASTIE: I am not referring to what took place in the House, but to what took place at a semi-public meeting within the precincts of the House. A large number of members who are now present on the Government side are aware of it, yet the hon. member contradicts it, and is trying to bring forward a quibble that it was not said in this House. I wish the hon. member would curb his own tongue in that way. He spends most of his time inside the House laughing and jeering at members and misrepresenting.

MR. TAYLOR: It is not so.

MR. HASTIE: The hon. member last night, in referring to some remarks made by me in a previous debate, said that I had declared, when I first heard of the appointment of Mr. George to the Commissionership of Railways, that my particular thought was that I was quite sure Mr. George would not take the appointment. That is perfectly correct, but the hon. member went on; he not only reads but he interprets; and he has said my meaning was that Mr. George was too honourable a man to take part in political jobbery. Is there any fair-minded man in the House who has heard me speak who could take such an idea into his head? Is it possible for anyone to speak of that unless he knows that he himself is subject to political jobbery? I have never for a moment suggested political jobbery in connection with this matter. We have heard in this debate and in pre-

vious debates that this is a political appointment. I have not yet heard what is the meaning of a political appointment, except that the appointment is made for the express purpose of stopping opposition. That implies that if Mr. George is taken away from the House, the Opposition members are not game enough or are not brave enough to hold their own against the Government—that I have never heard anyone seriously bring forward—or else Mr. George is in possession of some secret that no other member of the House knows anything of. I have made it my business to ask every member of the House if he thinks that is so. Every man whom I have consulted has declared that there is absolutely nothing in it. It comes to this, therefore, that people who use such high-flown language seek merely to entrap the ignorant, strive merely to gain the applause of those who are themselves subject to political jobbery, and to political jobbery alone. I am not surprised that the member for Mt. Margaret continues to sit giggling and sneering at what I am endeavouring to place before the House, because giggling and sneering seem to constitute his principal weapon. I do not wish to speak farther on this subject, except to say that if the member for Mount Margaret continues in the style which he has been in the habit of adopting in this House so far, he will suffer. Also, like the member for Mt. Burges (Mr. Reid), I wish to declare that it is a terribly mean thing for members like the representative of Mt. Margaret to come forward and declare to us the opinions of our constituents. The hon. member does not know the opinion of his own constituents; and yet he is always standing forth to declare that he knows all about our constituencies and that we are not "game" to face our electors. How in the mischief does the hon. member know that? He, at any rate, is not "game" to carry out a promise he made in the presence of a number of members of this House, by facing his electors.

MR. TAYLOR: I shall face them.

MR. HASTIE: Yes; the hon. member will face them when he cannot help it; but not before.

MR. TAYLOR: I faced them long ago.

MR. HASTIE: I say the hon. member is not "game" to face his constituents.

I do not wish to drive him out of the House. I have not done anything—

MR. TAYLOR: You can hang on to the Government as much as you like.

MR. HASTIE: It would not take much to get the member for Mt. Margaret to hang on to any Government. Any Ministry, so long as it would patiently listen to the long-winded stories of the hon. member, in which he himself always figures as the mighty hero, can have his support. So long as Ministers will applaud him as one of the grandest men in the world, his adherence is assured. The Premier who can tender suitable assurances of the nature indicated will always receive the support of the member for Mt. Margaret. I shall give an instance in point. It is within the recollection of the House that the late Premier, Mr. Leake, when in a minority here, wished to keep good friends with all the members constituting that minority. He wished to secure to himself the support of every member of the minority sitting on this side of the House, and therefore he made it a great point on every possible occasion to tell the member for Mt. Margaret what a grand man he is.

MR. TAYLOR: Don't revile the late Premier.

MR. HASTIE: Hon. members generally know that during the period I refer to, the member for Mt. Margaret was the most servile follower Mr. Leake had in this House.

MR. TAYLOR: Read the debates. I am the only Labour member who opposed Mr. Leake.

MR. HASTIE: The hon. member declares himself to be the only man fit to have an opinion of his own about everything; and he finds great fault with us because we do not always go in the direction he wishes us to take. But I think it is about time we had a change, and tried to consider other members besides the member for Mount Margaret. I hope that hon. member will excuse me for having introduced his name so freely. Last night we heard the maiden speech of the member for the Murray (Mr. Atkins), and I for one was strongly interested in what he said, although the hon. member appeared to think that I did not act in a particularly appreciative fashion. The hon. member told us that he did not know much about politics, or

much about government, but that he had a good deal of practical experience in the construction of large works. Let me tell the hon. member—and I believe I express the opinion of the majority of the House in telling him this—that he is the class of man we want. Any person, almost any fool, can rise here to declare in high, glowing, sounding terms what ought to be done. Any body of intelligent men can draft Bills the provisions of which, on paper, look beautiful. It is a different matter, however, to put those beautiful provisions into practice. What we need in this House is a number of men of sufficiently realistic imagination to be able to inform us beforehand what effect certain provisions will have. We welcome the hon. member to this House, and I have no doubt that the country will greatly benefit by his experience. Twice I interjected when the hon. member was speaking, the first interjection occurring when the hon. member stated that the great defect of the Public Works Department was that the department was so greatly subject to political influence. The hon. member continuing in that strain, I interjected, "What about Mr. Hodgson?" My meaning is apparent. I wished to know whether the cause of the tremendous failure of works carried out under Mr. Hodgson's supervision sprang from the prevalence of political influence. Having merely glanced at the report of the Royal Commission which inquired into the conduct and management of the Coolgardie Water Scheme, and not having carefully perused the document, I wished to know whether, if the Commission had found Mr. Hodgson's failure to be due to political influence, the Commission had done its duty by pointing out specific instances of the exercise of political influence. So far as I understand the position, the facts from the hon. member's own point of view lead to exactly the opposite conclusion. The hon. member infers that Mr. Hodgson took advantage of his public position to line his private pocket. If, however, the Coolgardie Water Scheme works had not been carried out by departmental day labour, but had been executed by a private contractor, Mr. Hodgson, who would presumably have held the appointment of Government engineer in connection with the scheme, would then have been

in ten times a stronger position to secure to himself a large amount of money belonging to the State. Mr. Hodgson's activities were limited, his mistakes were limited, by the circumstance that the work was carried out by departmental day labour instead of by contract. My desire in interjecting was to bring this point to the notice of the hon. member, so that he might have explained it. My second interjection arose in the following connection. The hon. member, referring to our railways, said that the great difference between our railways and other railways—private railways, the hon. member apparently meant—was that our lines were not subject to competition. But that argument has really no bearing on the position in Western Australia. Any private railways which might be constructed in Western Australia would necessarily be in the nature of monopolies. Were it possible for us to have two private lines running, say, five miles apart between Perth and Kalgoorlie, and were it possible to guarantee that the companies owning those railways would always remain rivals, so that it would pay both companies to meet the requirements of everyone as fully and as speedily as possible, then, so far as the general convenience of the people is concerned, private railways would be a good thing; but such a system of competition is unthinkable in this country. Whether a railway in Western Australia be built and owned by the Government, or built and owned by a private company, the railway must be a monopoly. The solution of our railway difficulties is therefore not to be found in the direction indicated by the member for the Murray. No doubt we shall have many opportunities of discussing this and other subjects as the session proceeds. I should like now to refer to a number of suggestions thrown out by various speakers in this House and in another place. The first suggestion which occurs to my memory is that most valuable one made by the member for Beverley (Mr. Harper), who referred to the fact that the timber in our South-Western districts is being rapidly depleted, and that it is being sold to people outside the State at an unpayable price, or at all events at a very low price, whilst, simultaneously, our own citizens who require

to use the timber are charged very high prices. The hon. member, in his mild manner, hinted that it might be wise for us to declare that West Australian purchasers of West Australian timber shall not be placed in a worse position than the purchasers of it abroad. I should be prepared to go much farther than the hon. member, and I believe the view, indeed the complaint, of most members will be that his statement is not strong enough. The position really is this. In justice to our industries we ought to see that they can buy timber at least as cheaply as anyone outside the State can. We have the control of the whole matter in our own hands. We can easily equalise matters of price by imposing an export tax on timber. I have not the slightest doubt that if the game described is carried on, an export tax on timber will be a matter receiving the close and early attention of Parliament.

MR. DOHERTY: Put an export tax on gold too. Don't forget that.

MR. HASTIE: An export tax on gold is a matter which will receive consideration when it is raised. If the member for North Fremantle (Mr. Doherty), the other gentleman who knows all about the feeling of the country, will bring forward a proposal of the nature indicated, the House will be prepared to discuss it. If the proposal be fairly debated and then agreed to, I do not suppose any hon. member will seriously object to an export duty on gold. However, my personal view is that such a duty is not required. One other matter I have to refer to is of great importance. It was raised, not here, but in another place. I call attention to it largely by reason of the fact that so many members of Parliament are in the habit of making wide, loose statements, without having looked into the subjects they pronounce on. Such statements are liable to do harm; at any rate, they lead a lot of unthinking people astray. I do not know whether I am exactly in order in referring to this, but a statement was made by one of the most honoured, one of the leading men of this country, that the railway truck difficulty had disappeared, and that so far as the timber districts were concerned the reason of the disappearance of the difficulty was that the high rates of freights recently imposed had so greatly reduced the trade in timber

that the supply of trucks was ample for the transport of the limited output. When I read those remarks I wondered, and I asked the Minister for Railways for the exact figures bearing on the point. I have been furnished by the Minister with this statement. For the months of March and April, the two months preceding the rise in rates, the total quantity of timber conveyed from the South-Western district was 50,008 tons 18 cwt. For the two succeeding months, May and June, during which the higher freights obtained, the total quantity was 53,796 tons 18 cwt.

MR. TEESDALE SMITH : The increased freights did not obtain during those months.

MR. HASTIE : There was actually an increase during the last two months.

MR. HARPER : The timber companies were working off old contracts, at the old rates.

MR. HASTIE : There was an increase in rates, except in cases where the timber companies had sworn that certain quantities of timber had been contracted for prior to the imposition of the higher rates. But far the larger portion of the timber, I believe, was carried at the increased rates. At all events, my figures are such as show conclusively that there is absolutely nothing in the contention advanced.

THE PREMIER : They show there was an increase in the volume of traffic, and not a decrease, as stated.

MR. MORAN : I rise to a point of order, since the leader of the House will not do his duty. I wish to know where we shall end if we begin replying to the debates of another place. Is the hon. member in order in discussing what occurred in another place?

THE SPEAKER : No; he is not in order.

MR. HASTIE : I have done with that matter. I thank the member for West Perth (Mr. Moran) for not rising to order sooner. Next, I wish to refer to certain views advanced by my good friend the member for Dundas (Mr. Thomas), a gentleman whom I am particularly glad to hear on many subjects. At the same time, however, I shall try to show that in certain directions the hon. member, no doubt unconsciously, leads himself and possibly other people astray. The member for Subiaco (Mr. Daglish) to-night pointed out that the revenue figures

of this country are apt to convey a wrong impression, and that the member for Dundas in referring to them had omitted to deduct one and a half millions which the people pay in the shape of railway taxation, or (as a member interjects) railway revenue. A peculiar thing about the member for Dundas is, that he is rapidly becoming a lightning-change artist. Only ten days ago he told us that the duty of the Government was to borrow as much money as ever they could, until their credit was exhausted.

MR. THOMAS : For reproductive public works.

MR. HASTIE : The hon. member next rose in this House and told us in so many words that £800,000 was the maximum amount of taxation that should be levied here. According to the figures he gave, we should raise a revenue of only two and a quarter millions, and not three and three quarter millions. Deducting £1,450,000 from £2,250,000, leaves us about £800,000. The hon. member has travelled so great a distance within ten days!

MR. THOMAS : I added that the Government should borrow only for reproductive public works.

MR. HASTIE : The hon. member will have changed back again by the time the session closes.

At 6:30, the **SPEAKER** left the Chair.

At 7:30, Chair resumed.

MR. HASTIE (continuing) : I was referring to some remarkable figures quoted by the member for Dundas (Mr. Thomas), and had arrived at the conclusion that the hon. member was seriously advising the House that £850,000 was sufficient to run the country; that is, after the railway income had been deducted. Then to that we must add about £250,000 as the gross profit from the railways; that is the amount of money which would otherwise be devoted by the Railway Department to paying its share of loans. The total would reach £1,050,000. [**MR. THOMAS :** To be correct, £1,100,000.] Something like that. From that we must deduct £650,000 for interest and sinking fund, leaving about £400,000. But out of that the hon. member is willing to pay £800,000 in wages to civil servants, besides a great number of other expenses

essential to all government, such as the expenses of Parliament, of the courts, etc. Those figures bewilder me. I should not have taken particular note of them had not the hon. member been in such deadly earnest in advising the House to adopt his policy. I should strongly urge the Treasurer to try to induce the hon. member to manage the Treasury for him. The figures are no more remarkable than some others the hon. member brought before the House. They have already been dealt with by the member for Hannans (Mr. Reside). This is a very serious matter to both sides of the House. The hon. member has practically told us to-night that profits on gold-mining have wonderfully decreased. [MR. THOMAS: I never said anything of the sort. The value per ton has decreased.] Then what meaning does the hon. member intend to convey by that? Is he not trying to assure the House mining is now less profitable than it used to be? That is the impression conveyed. The hon. member tells us no one is such an optimist as he; but how can he be an optimist in the face of those figures? If members bring forward figures, they should do so honestly, and not for the purpose of scoring a point. The figures do not prove what the hon. member says. They lead people to believe, on the other hand, that mining is more profitable. The member for Hannans told us that in 1900 each man engaged in the gold-mining industry produced 88ozs. of gold, while in 1901 each man produced 108ozs. [MR. THOMAS: You had more machinery, I suppose?] That is a difference of 20ozs., and means about £75 per man, or 30s. per week per man engaged. And it stands to reason that there must have been a gross profit much greater than in the previous year. The hon. member interjects "machinery." I admit there is machinery, and a good deal of machinery; but the hon. member is not willing to allege that the machinery can be reckoned as more than 30s. per week per man. And the reason for the discrepancy is one which members of the House who are not intimately acquainted with mining may not understand; so they will excuse me for a moment if I explain it. If we enter a new or even an old claim, we shall find there is a

certain comparatively narrow vein that is richer than the surrounding stuff. If we have not good crushing machinery, or any crushing machinery, on the claim, we shall probably find it does not pay us to take the indifferent ore. It will sometimes pay us to take ore which will run one, two, or three ounces; but ore that is worth only eight, nine, or ten dwts. will not pay to handle. Consequently, we may be able to treat, by picking our ore, say 200 tons per year; and if out of that we get 20zs. per ton, then, on the face of it, we have a highly payable claim, or one which may be highly payable, because the amount of gold per ton treated is large, averaging two ounces. But in these circumstances, our entire net profit would not, in all probability, exceed £200. If, however, we expended £1,000 or £2,000 to erect a suitable battery, to improve our plant, then we should find the claim paid us much better; for instead of, at great expense, digging out this narrow belt of gold-bearing ore, we should have wide stopes of five, six, seven, or 10 feet in breadth, while the gold would go, not two ounces to the ton, but perhaps 15dwts. Then we should perhaps have an average return of between 15 dwts. and one ounce per ton. That would bring down the average of the yield; but instead of having a small profit of only £200, the chances are we should have a profit of £1,000 or £2,000. That mine is then more profitable; that mine the member for Dundas himself would a thousand times rather manage than he would the mine I first indicated. That is the principle of the thing. [MR. THOMAS: It is all a question of machinery.] I need not argue out this question. I have stated the principle; and the only new features during the past year or two are cyanide plants or other plants to farther reduce the ore. But that is the principle; and I maintain that until the hon. member can show us by reliable figures—not figures good enough for Parliament, but good enough for men acquainted with the mining industry—that the mines on the goldfields are now less payable than they were before, I am perfectly justified in calling attention to his tall statements.

MR. THOMAS: I gave the figures prepared by the Minister for Mines.

MR. HASTIE: There is no mention in the Governor's Speech of any considerable retrenchment. At that I am not surprised. Several times I have already stated in this House, and I think most members will agree with me, that so long as we have an overflowing Treasury, so long as we get money very easily, it will be absolutely impossible for us to economise. By all my reading of parliamentary proceedings, I have never yet learnt of any people who voluntarily went in for retrenchment until they could not help it. We have here plenty of money; and the main effort of any Government in power will be to spend that money. Various speakers have referred to the many deputations to the Treasurer and other members of the Ministry, asking that money be spent in different districts; and I agree it is very difficult for the Treasurer to refuse. He can stop these grants in one way only; that is, if he be able to swear that the Treasury is empty, and that he has no money to spare; and I hope we shall, in the future, when considering the financial policy of the country, bear that in mind, to see whether it be advisable not to increase the general income as it has increased, but to lessen the amount of money available to the Treasurer. Still referring to the Speech, I come to an item all other members have begun with—the departure of the Governor; and I wish to say, in general terms, that I thoroughly agree with every remark made by preceding speakers. This also strikes me. It may appear to the Governor, and to many others who watch these debates, rather queer that at the time we are declaring him a good Governor, we are all competing for an opportunity, either to clip the Governor's wings, or to do without any Governor. But on the other hand, it must be borne in mind that during the whole of his term of office he has done so particularly well and been so popular, that no one thought we should reconsider the position of the Governor during his term of office. Although many members of the House were pledged to do their best to economise in that direction, they delayed taking any steps until it was seen that the Governor was leaving our shores. This is not the first time that many of us have bidden farewell to people leaving Australia for South Africa. For the last

two years, at any rate, many of us have done so; but it was in time of war. The war is over now, and men of a different calibre are asked to go there. "Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war." South Africa does not require soldiers, but men of peace, and men who have the faculty of satisfying contending interests. I, like others, hope the Governor will be particularly successful in that direction. I was speaking just now about this surplus which we are all taught to believe is hardly in existence. After all we have heard about it, it amounts to £211. The hon. gentleman was not in office more than two or three weeks when he seemed to have "blued" the greater portion of a quarter of a million. I, like the member for West Perth (Mr. Moran), wish to find out where all this money has gone. I should also like to ascertain—I do not know whether I could get it from returns, but I think not—exactly where all this money has come from. No doubt a lot of it has been obtained illegitimately. Here is one instance. A long time ago we started the construction of the railway from Menzies to Leonora. The general understanding then was that it would be run through long before the present time; and in order to get the line hurried on as quickly as possible the people who wanted to use the line were required to pay double or treble freights and fares. If the construction of that railway had proceeded on ordinary lines, it would have been handed over to the Railway Department and have been treated like any other line long before now; but, owing to the manner in which that work was conducted, these dear freights and fares were charged for a much longer time than was anticipated; so I am justified in saying that this surplus must comprise at any rate a large amount of illegitimate income. I should like the Minister for Works to tell us as nearly as possible the amount of money obtained over what should have been received in that respect. No doubt much has been lost, but my point is that many of the people living there have been charged money that should not have been charged, and would not have been charged had the Works Department been in such a condition that the work could be finished in a reasonable time.

MR. DOHERTY : Do you believe in high rates ?

MR. HASTIE : Not when I have to be charged the high rate myself. I wish to refer to a matter which has been often spoken about, and that is the Coolgardie Water Scheme. I am one of those in this House who have always been very sceptical about the scheme. Long ago I, like other sceptics, took up the position that if the water was to go there we ought to see that they had it at the earliest possible moment. The member for Dundas (Mr. Thomas) has declared that the people on the goldfields have always been in favour of this scheme. I interjected that such was not the case. In my own way as far as I could I opposed the scheme, as did many others ; but after it was seen that, whatever we might do, the scheme would be brought on, we did not oppose it any farther. We did not act as obstructionists, and we said that we would help to bring the water to the goldfields at the earliest possible moment. Amongst the men responsible for that scheme more than any others I know of is the member for West Perth (Mr. Moran) himself. He told us that he was a sceptic, and that he criticised the scheme very severely, but he said whatever objections there were to this scheme, we could always depend upon this, that there would be a sale, not only for the five million gallons a day, but for nearly double that quantity. That to my mind was the most important point. The doubt as to the demand was to me and to many others who had anything to do with the scheme the greatest possible objection. I do not wish severely to criticise the initiation of that scheme, but I desire to say that within the last month or two I have been reading the debates relating to that initiation, and I am bound to say I have never come across anything more extraordinary. I am sure that even if my friend the member for Dundas would consider some of these figures, he would find that he was out-Heroded. That scheme was started in the wildcat days. Any man who knows anything about these mines, and who considers these figures, will be absolutely astonished that any sensible man could believe in it ; but it has progressed, and it was taken up very largely on account of its being pro-

posed by the strongest man in this country, a man who absolutely, solemnly, and seriously believed that it was the only thing for Western Australia, a man whose officers told him it was absolutely impossible to conserve water locally and that they could get the water there within three years, and also satisfied him that it could be supplied on the goldfields for 3s. 6d. per thousand gallons. Some members have declared here that Sir John Forrest never stated it would be delivered for 3s. 6d. per thousand gallons. I refer to the time when the scheme was first introduced. Sir John said not only once but several times, that the meaning of the scheme was to supply water at this price.

MR. ILLINGWORTH : He says so still.

MR. HASTIE : He said, "This scheme will supply abundance of water to the Coolgardie goldfields, and at the cheap rate of 3s. 6d. per thousand gallons."

MR. ILLINGWORTH : The Engineer-in-Chief never said that.

MR. HASTIE : Sir John Forrest said that, and he read many extracts from the Engineer-in-Chief. The Engineer-in-Chief committed himself as closely and concisely to this plan as to any he was ever connected with. I have also tried over and over again to get absolute information from the Engineer-in-Chief in regard to this. He would speak in general terms, but rarely did I ever get him to come to specific terms. If the Engineer-in-Chief believed that it would cost more, he should have been man enough to say so, and not have led us astray. During the meeting of Parliament last session, in criticising this scheme I was the last to speak, and I finished by strongly urging the Government to try and make this water available on the fields for the summer after next, as at that time I believed it absolutely impossible to make it available before then. Something very extraordinary has since occurred. Partly through the exertions of the Minister for Works, and partly through the sitting of the Royal Commission, a revolution has taken place amongst those on the pipe track. Then they travelled along at the rate of one mile per week, whereas now they travel at six miles per week, the rate of progress being nearly six times greater than it was before. So it is not surprising I was a

bit out in that respect. I hope the water will be available by next Christmas, and, if not, as soon after as possible. To-night when the member for Subiaco (Mr. Daglish) was speaking, he asked—and I admit fairly asked—whether the goldfields ought not to pay for all this scheme. I should be glad if they could pay for it, but I do not know how it is to be managed. By this scheme it is intended to supply on the goldfields 5,800,000 gallons per day. If half of that can be used on the goldfields, those who use it will consider themselves very lucky. Many people have made a calculation. In that respect I am probably the most optimistic, yet I estimate that the Government will be particularly lucky if they can obtain a sale for two and a quarter million gallons a day. That will be possible if the water is sold at an unpayable price. If you charge for that water a very much higher price, a price that will pay not only for pumping it up, but also interest and sinking fund, I am very doubtful if it is possible to sell over a million gallons; so the matter is one of very great gravity. I hope the Government will consider this and try to get as much water used as they can. Although I have to-night, and very often before, criticised those who initiated this scheme, I quite admit that it was impossible for them at that time to make a proper estimate of the consumption, because the Coolgardie Water Scheme was based substantially on this. On the west coast we have a large rainfall, which generally speaking is gradually decreasing until we get to Southern Cross. At Southern Cross the rainfall is five inches per year, and experience has shown that in Australia the nearer you get to the interior the less rainfall there is. Although nominally the rainfall is five inches, they calculate that upon the goldfields they can only depend upon a four-inch rainfall. Those of us who criticised had exactly the same figures and the same experience to go upon, but we were absolutely certain we could depend upon a higher rainfall than that. I think we estimated it at six inches, and experience has shown that it has been between seven and eight inches on the fields.

MR. MORAN: In how many years?

MR. HASTIE: Since 1896. The insinuation the hon. member will make,

and a fair one, is that we can only expect the centre of this country, like the centre of other countries in the East, to be subject to drought, and we may have a very severe drought; but I would say we may have a drought at Mundaring, where the dam is. At any rate, I feel satisfied that if, instead of saddling such an enormous expenditure upon the country at the time the scheme was inaugurated, a third of the money had been spent in collecting the water on the fields, we would in a third of the time have got a supply of water at as low a price as you will be able to charge here. I do not expect the water will all be used at first. We shall make use of it after a bit, and shall also be able to make it pay expenses; but my greatest regret is that so tremendous an amount of money has been added to the debt of the country, and my fear is that for a considerable time we shall not be able to do anything to substantially clear it off. But like the member for Dundas, I am an optimist in regard to the gold-mining industry. I have never done anything directly or indirectly to cause people to think that I believed the fields have only the prospect of a few years' existence. I am one of those who look on the goldfields all over Australia, and say that the mines may not last for ever, but as far as goldfields go we have not yet worked out any. We have goldfields in existence five times or six times as big as those in any country in the world; and it is possible to believe that, so far as the fields are concerned, they are in their infancy, and in 10, 20, 50, or even 100 years after this the gold industry will be a bigger institution than it is to-day. In connection with the Coolgardie Water Scheme, on looking over what was expected of it I find it was calculated that the laying down of this scheme would, when completed, save the Railway Department £120,000 per annum. I wonder how that pans out. These are figures seriously given in the House, but I dare say that probably they are as reliable as many other figures. It was stated that by the starting of the Coolgardie Water Scheme and the spending of two and a half millions between the middle of 1896 and three years from that time, that was the middle of 1899, we would be sure to have a population of a quarter of a million in

this country. These figures have not panned out exactly. Let us not spend too much time in dwelling on this subject, but do the best we can to try and make the scheme as efficient as we possibly can. We have received a large amount of good advice from many members of the House. We have been told that if taxation be reduced wages will be lowered. We have been told this by half a dozen members. Then another half a dozen members have told us, "If you increase freights you lower wages." I have been puzzled in thinking over the matter to see where the truth lies. Are both statements true? I do not know. I know that wages do not entirely depend on the price of commodities; like everything else it has its effect, but after all it is not the deciding point. I wish to impress on members that it is possible to change to a large extent the price of things in this country without in any way affecting the average income either in wages or profits of business.

MR. TAYLOR: Wages do depend on the price of goods.

MR. HASTIE: The member for Mt. Margaret, I know, is a complete authority; but is not the only authority. The hon. member knows that this is not the experience on the Western Australian gold-fields, and the wages have not decreased there; while I hope and believe that, as the result of making eatables somewhat cheaper there, wages will not decrease in the immediate future. It is too late to dwell on this at length, at this time of the evening, for I know a number of other members are anxious to speak; therefore I will not enter farther into that particular question. I will touch briefly on some other matters which have been spoken to, and the first is that of the civil service. I would like to ask the Premier to pay particular attention to this, that in this country we have a civil service and too many holidays, I think 12 or 14 or 15, and it is about time to settle the question whether we should not wisely reduce them. Efforts have been made to increase wages in some of the departments to the same standard as that which obtains outside, and the Government very fairly said, "If we give you the same wages as those paid outside, then the conditions should be the same as obtain outside." That seems fair; but on the other hand the

employees reply, "That means we would not be paid for the days we do not work, and the days we are not allowed to work." They may point out that if they accept the conditions put forward by the Government they are practically debarred from gaining wages for a period of perhaps 14 or 15 days in the entire year. It will be admitted that this is unfair, and it seems to me that no harm can be done if the Government seriously considered whether they could not stop a good number of the unnecessary holidays. I do not think the same number of holidays obtain in the other parts of the world; but if they do it is surely our time to take the initiative in this direction. Several remarks have been made in the House about the rabbits, and I am wondering very seriously if there is anything in them. The hon. member for Dundas is certainly becoming their champion, but many members of the House have assured us that soon they will eat us out if we do not keep them out. They have not eaten us out yet. Members told us last year that if we imported apples we should be eaten out with the codlin moth; members also told us that if we brought cattle down from East Kimberley all the cattle down South would die with the tick. They have told us of all these things, but not one has happened. I am very much inclined to place the three on the same footing—the rabbits, the codlin moth, and the tick. The evident object of making such statements is to frighten us, but I, for one, am not satisfied that we are likely to suffer anything from the danger of these things. Rabbits have been found all over the country. Rabbits were found in Gippsland years ago; but they have not spread. Rabbits were found here 30 or 40 years ago, but they will not spread, and there is nothing to make us believe they are likely to spread.

MR. THOMAS: What does the rabbit inspector tell us?

MR. HASTIE: He certainly will do everything he can to emphasise the importance of his position, and he will join with the hon. member in frightening us if he can. At the same time I admit it is possible in some parts of the country for rabbits to do harm.

MR. THOMAS: There is very good country in my district, you see.

MR. HASTIE: If the land in the hon. member's constituency is one-fifth as good as he is over and over again assuring the House it is, then I am surprised that the rabbits have not been there long ago. I spoke just now about the codlin moth. Up to this time last year, from all directions we heard that it was impossible to let in the apple and keep out the codlin moth. But experience has shown that no codlin moth has come here, and the number of fruit pests have not been increased to any extent by the importation of fruit. I notice, like the member for Dundas, that there is no mention made in the Governor's Speech of the Esperance railway. Upon the whole, I am particularly glad that no reference is made to it, because it is one of those things that it is unwise for us to make anything like a party question of. It is one of those matters on which opinions very widely differ. I am satisfied and believe, and most fair-minded people are satisfied, that the Esperance railway is one of those lines we should get a large amount of information about. We should get that line placed in the hands, as nearly as possible, of an impartial committee, who will be able to give to the House a fair and true estimate of what that railway will cost. They, and they alone, will be able to tell what the line will cost and what the harbour will cost, and they will be able to recommend if it is wise to double our railway system. Before sitting down—I believe I have heard that expression somewhere before—I may say that in the Governor's Speech there are some legislative proposals. With reference to the Lower House, enough has been spoken; but with reference to the Upper House, I would like to say a word. Like others, I wish it were possible to abolish that House; if not, I am bound to admit that I do not think the proposals of the Premier in that respect are the wisest. I wonder if it is not possible for us to adopt the Tasmanian idea, which is that the two Houses should sit together. I do not know if it would be an improvement on this House if we always had the pleasure of members of the Upper House with us; but I am sure it would have a tendency to greatly improve the Upper House. That is an unusual idea, but I wish the Premier would think of it. If

the Premier is not going in for that, or for abolishing the Upper House, I wish he would seriously take into consideration whether it would not be wiser to make an alteration in the franchise of the Upper House. So far as the goldfields are concerned the great bulk of the people who live there regularly have no vote whatever, and I wish some means would be adopted by which practically every man who lives regularly in one place at any rate should have one vote for the Upper House. It would be well if he inserted in that Bill a provision similar to that existing at the present day in South Australia, by which a man can vote for the Upper House only in the province in which he resides. We wish here that the people in each part of the country should have their fair share in the government of the country; but that wish is unattainable if a few people in Perth, Fremantle, or any other place are allowed a preponderating voting influence in provinces all over the country. The law in South Australia has been as I state for some time past. I am told that the adoption of such a law here will not make much difference; but I believe it will. At any rate, it will have the effect of taking away from many people the cry, the complaint, that they are being unfairly treated. As regards the franchise for the Lower House, I am particularly glad to see that we are now coming to what is practically a residential qualification only. The same qualification can apply to the Upper House. Some people tell us that it will be ridiculous to have an Upper House and a Lower House elected on the same franchise; but why should it be ridiculous? People simply make the statement, and there they stop. If any ordinary man is good enough to vote for a member of this House, why should a special class of men be necessary to vote for the Upper House? When the Bill comes before us we shall discuss that point; and I hope that if the proposals of the Government are not as liberal as I have indicated, the majority of members here will assist in trying to improve those proposals as I have suggested. I am pleased to learn from the Governor's Speech that Ministers are considering the question of private railways. That pronouncement, I take it, refers to the Midland Railway. I was a member

of the Joint Select Committee which inquired into the Midland Railway Company's affairs last year. Although I am glad to join with every member who has spoken in urging the Government to try to hold the Midland Company to their agreement, yet I know the job to be a very strong one indeed. I am convinced that the Government can act successfully in the direction desired only so long as they have the knowledge that they are backed up by a unanimous Parliament; so that the future of the Midland Company will depend not on the good will of the Government, but on the good will of Parliament as a whole.

THE PREMIER: Hear, hear.

MR. MORAN: Land tax and socialism.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: We have tried that before.

MR. THOMAS: "I shall now close."

MR. HASTIE: The hon. member having anticipated what I was about to say, I shall not use those words, but shall state simply that I am about to stop; expressing, by way of conclusion, the hope that as almost every member of the House has now availed himself of the opportunity of expressing his opinion on political matters freely and openly, we shall devote the remainder of the session to doing the hardest legislation work we can do.

MR. F. CONNOR (East Kimberley): As usual, we have had in the course of this debate lessons from members on the Government side of the House on what, according to their lights, is necessary for the proper conduct of business. I have benefited in some measure by those lessons. Although I shall not promise to be brief, I shall do better, and endeavour to achieve brevity. I recommend the same endeavour to hon. members opposite, and particularly to the occupants of the Labour bench. As we all know, there has been a change of Government, and we have at present as leader of the House and Premier of the country one of the most estimable and able gentlemen in the State—a gentleman whom I, in common with members on both sides of the House, am indeed pleased to see in his present position. Although I can conscientiously pay this compliment to the hon. gentleman, still I must admit that, although I consider his ideas good and his intentions

honest, his inexperience and his youth in a measure disqualify him from adorning his high position to that degree which is desirable for the advantage of the State. The member for the South-West Mining District (Mr. Ewing)—I was nearly going to say the member for the Collie railway—who is not here just now, gave us, a night or two back, a lesson on the manner in which we should conduct ourselves when debating in this House. The hon. member instructed us as to the means by which we might guard against the very possibility of anything in the nature of party spirit creeping into the debates. Indeed, he preached us a very nice little sermon. I have to point out, however, that when the hon. member sat on this (Opposition) side of the House he preached pretty well the same sermon. What has he done, however? Has he practised what he preaches? No. The hon. member is now one of the staunchest party men in the House. He is a party man for an object which is undoubtedly a good one; namely, the construction of a railway from Collie towards the Eastern Goldfields. The Premier, when he went before his constituents on attaining his great and honourable position, said—and he has been perfectly consistent in this regard until now—that his object was to make living in this country easier for the people; to make it possible for the people here to live better and more comfortably. To show that he was in earnest, the hon. gentleman said—and he said the same thing in years gone by, when sitting on this side of the House—that he was not in favour of imposing a tax on meat grown in this country. I was and am quite with him on that point. Although I was with him on that point in days gone by, I did not at the time get due credit for it. I may inform hon. members, however, that a reference to the pages of *Hansard* for the past ten years will show that at no time did I advocate the imposition or retention of duties which would have or had the effect of burdening the people and making living dearer for them. I ask members of the Labour party in particular to remember that fact, and to remember it especially before they rise to make wild and silly statements and to cast insinuations which they have not the slightest right to utter against members who have been in this

House longer than the Labour members have been, or will be. I also ask the gentlemen on the Treasury bench to remember the fact. I understood that when the Premier came to the House it would be his duty and his pleasure to endeavour in every way to make living in this country easy for the people. Perhaps the fault is not his. I do not think the hon. gentleman has yet secured complete control of the reins. He is driving a four-in-hand, whereas he has been accustomed to a two-in-hand, or perhaps to single harness. Whoever is pulling the strings in connection with the railway business, whoever is making the mistakes, is responsible for the circumstance that the Premier is now acting in opposition to the policy which he came into the House to expound. The hon. gentleman's original idea, so far as I can gather from his utterances both inside and outside the House, was that when it was possible—I go farther now, and say when it was necessary—the railway rates should be decreased. What, however, do we find has been done in regard to the matters I have mentioned? We find that there has been a big increase in the railway rates, and that those rates are not likely to be decreased, but rather to be raised still higher. Unless radical alterations be effected in our system of railway management, the rates are likely to increase rather than decrease in the future. What has been the Premier's conduct in reference to the railway rates and the food duties? The railway rates I have dealt with, and the only thing I can say for the hon. gentleman, as far as the food duties are concerned, is that the restrictions on the importation of apples have been removed. That is the sum total of what the hon. gentleman has done for the people. Is that enough for the leader of the democratic party in this State, for a man who poses as a friend of the people? Is that enough, I ask, for such a man? I say it is not enough. I say the Premier has failed to maintain the position he took up when he entered the House. What next do we find? The cry of the hon. member, who when on this (Opposition) side of the House consistently posed as a great democratic leader, was constitutionalism, and constitutionalism alone. Nothing could be

done unconstitutionally, unless it were done wrong. Now, however, the hon. gentleman having attained a seat on the Treasury bench, we find him acting by no means in conformity with the opinions he expressed when sitting in Opposition. We find his Government committing unconstitutional acts, and admitting those acts to be unconstitutional. We find them making an appointment from this House without consulting this House. That appointment was the most important any Western Australian Government could possibly make. Such is the hon. gentleman's record so far. I can only hope that he will improve as he goes on. We have read in to-day's newspapers a rather alarming statement. I shall not labour the matter, but I must draw the attention of hon. members to it because it carries me back to old times, reminding me of what happened in this House in earlier days. History, it is said, must and always does repeat itself.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: "Hence these tears."

MR. O'CONNOR: The hon. gentleman interjects "Hence these tears;" but there are no tears as yet. There was a time, perhaps, when my tears might have flowed; but as they did not flow then, they are not likely to flow now. Some few years ago members who then sat on these benches as Her Majesty's Opposition made a regulation prohibiting the bringing of cattle from the East Kimberley district to the Fremantle and Perth market. It was pointed out to that party, of which my friend the present Premier was one—I can quote *Hansard* on the subject, but I said I should endeavour to be brief—that to prohibit the importation of our own stock was wrong. To this it was retorted that the Kimberley cattle were infested with tick, and that therefore it would be dangerous to bring them to Perth and Fremantle. What was the result of the prohibition? The cost of living increased greatly; beef was, for two and a half years, twopence a pound dearer than it would have been in the absence of the prohibition. Well, that was all right; but Sir John Forrest, who was then Premier, said that this state of things did not suit the people; that it was not fair to the consumers; that it could not

possibly be right to exclude from our markets the large quantity of cattle available in the East Kimberley district. After the most acrimonious, the bitterest debates which have ever occurred in this House, after debates of the most unfair character conceivable—these adjectives apply to the speeches of hon. members who then sat here, but who now sit on the Treasury bench—Sir John Forrest said, “I will feed the people and take the chances.” He abrogated the regulations and allowed these cattle to be brought down, with the result that the cost of living has been considerably lowered for the people.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: We did not all oppose the removal of the prohibition.

MR. CONNOR: Oh, I shall come to you later on. A most alarming statement appeared this morning. The *Morning Herald* informed the public that an iniquitous firm, the name of which I cannot recall just now—I believe the name is to be changed shortly—had actually arranged to export from this country some cattle to supply our friends in South Africa. The *Morning Herald* informed the public that these cattle were not allowed, or would not be allowed, under existing regulations to be brought to Fremantle. The Government in their wisdom—I believe they have given an explanation, which, however, I was not present to hear—in their wisdom said, “We shall not allow those cattle to go out of the country: we shall put on them a tax which will prevent their going out.”

MR. MORAN: Only one Minister said that, and the statement has been contradicted.

MR. CONNOR: I did not know that.

THE PREMIER: The announcement by the Minister in question was not given as coming from the Government.

MR. CONNOR: If the Premier repudiates the published statement of his Minister for Lands, I shall accept that repudiation. If not I must go on. What has happened? I am speaking now of what would have occurred assuming the announcement in this morning's newspaper to be correct. I have obtained from the Premier a qualified repudiation. He said that the present shipment would not be taxed. The repudiation is, I repeat, a qualified

one. I want, however, an open, fair repudiation, one that will stand in the light of day, not a lawyer's repudiation; perhaps I had better say, not a politician's repudiation. I would adhere to the “lawyer's repudiation,” but that I am afraid of complimenting the hon. gentleman. Briefly, I ask for an unqualified denial. Supposing that the intentions of the Government as expressed in this morning's newspaper were carried out, what would be the position? The people who have gone to the North, and have spent their lives and their money in opening up the country, who have worked practically night and day, worked in the heat of summer, who have done everything that it is possible for human beings to do, and got very little return so far, would, if the intention of the Government, which has been but partly repudiated, were carried out, be prevented from opening up a trade in cattle with another portion of the British dominions. It is a most serious position; it is only history repeating itself again; and I go so far as to say, and may as well say it right out, that it is a purely political question, and one dealt with in a manner which no Government should be allowed by the people of this country to adopt. I have no hesitation in saying it was the same on the previous occasion. The very people who years ago objected to those cattle coming here are the people who to-day raise the cry of cheap meat; though at that time they would not allow the public to have it cheap, because certain members sat on a certain side of the House. Much has been said on this meat question; and may I say at the beginning, before I offer any suggestion towards a solution of the difficulty, that the meat business is subject to one law which we cannot alter, much as members may talk in this House or to the people outside—the law of supply and demand. Hon. members may as well admit that it is not a question of rings: it is merely the law of supply and demand, because when you can produce more fat cattle than are necessary for this market, down goes the price. If you cannot do that, cattle cannot be bought any cheaper; or if they are, the business of cattle-raisers must be unfairly and unduly interfered with. I wish to suggest that the Government do away with all these hysterical restrictions. [THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:

You said they were historical.] They are now hysterical. Do away with them. Open up the country between here and the Kimberleys, and supply the wants of the people here who require breeding stock and store cattle. That is the nearest solution possible in honestly trying to overcome this difficulty. We have a fancy scheme for building abattoirs. I do not know in whose fertile brain that originated, or where the man came from who had sufficient ability to think out the idea that these abattoirs should be built inland at Claremont. I do not know whether all members are aware that Claremont and district is between the Swan river and the sea. I ask the House, if we build abattoirs there, where is the approach for live stock unless they be brought there by rail? If brought by rail that will not reduce the price of beef; for knocking them about in trucks must take weight off them every time you hurt them; and it is otherwise costly. I am merely giving my opinion, though in my own interest I might remain silent. The best site for abattoirs in this country—and a more ideal site it would be impossible to find in any country—is at Owen's Anchorage. There is an approach by sea, a railway built to the site, the place is comparatively isolated from traffic, there is access to the paddocks; there is natural drainage into the sea—the proper outlet; and the slaughtering is not in any sense a nuisance. Those are only a few reasons why that should be selected rather than Claremont as a site for abattoirs. Let the cattle be run straight into the abattoirs without any knocking about in trucks; take them away from the ships, and put them in paddocks. If we build at Claremont, to get to the abattoirs the cattle must cross a bridge; and hon. members who understand the stock business are aware that comparatively wild cattle cannot be driven across bridges, or at least that must be done in the middle of the night, so as not to stop the traffic. It seems to me to be too absurd that we should even dream of building these abattoirs at Claremont. There is a good suggestion that in connection with the abattoirs we should have cold storage. My opinion is—and I say this deliberately, after having thought the thing out—that building abattoirs

and cold storage works will be the means of increasing the cost to the consumer. I wish that clearly understood; and I know what I am talking about, because this is my business. The fact will undoubtedly be as I said. There is the additional cost of supervision; there is the cost of the fancy abattoirs which will be put up. Somebody must pay the interest on the money expended, for we cannot continue for ever to build works out of consolidated revenue, unless they be reproductive works of some sort. But the people clamour for abattoirs, and I say the Government are right in building them. But I say, do not put them where they will be of no use. Go to the place where they will be most effective, and where the cost will be least to build them, and that is Owen's Anchorage. We have had promises from both the Forrest and the Leake Governments—we have not yet had one from the James Government, but we shall have it shortly—that the explosives magazines, the source of such great danger to South Fremantle, shall be removed to Case Point. We are told, I think in the Speech, that the Government have in hand, of unexpended loan moneys, sufficient to build a graving dock at Fremantle. If that be so, I ask, why do they not start the dock at Fremantle? It is a work of national importance, one of the first that should be constructed. Perhaps I should put before that the necessity for water-supply. The dock will employ labour, and induce workmen to come to the State. I should put before railways or anything else the construction of a graving dock at Fremantle. We have vessels trading there from all parts of the world, vessels passing Fremantle day after day; and if we had a graving dock, they could come in and be cleaned up. We are told the dock will not pay for itself. Well, even so, it will be a splendid advertisement. It will be of such use and benefit to the shipping of the Australian coast, and such an encouragement to foreign vessels to come here, that on these grounds alone, and because of the employment it will give to labour and to the people it will settle about Fremantle, the Government should, not only because it is in their programme, say they will build it, but should at once start to build it. There is another suggestion in connection with our railways. I see my friend the

Whip is present, and I hope this will please him, though I do not often say things which meet with his approval. I am entirely in favour of the extension of the railway from Mount Malcolm towards Leonora. That will also lessen the cost of living; for cattle bred in the North-West—this does not affect Kimberley—can be brought by rail over a very dry and very bad stage; and the line will also connect the Eastern with the Murchison Goldfields. I will touch lightly on a matter which I am told somewhat concerns me. It does concern me a little, but is hardly worth talking about. That is the secret purchase of land. In reference to that matter I said the commission on the purchases would be something like £800, according to the chamber of commerce scale; and I think the Treasurer corrected me in his speech, and said it would be £600.

THE TREASURER: No; I said the valuation.

MR. CONNOR: Then you were wrongly reported.

THE TREASURER: I said "the valuation."

MR. CONNOR: I can go only by the report, that you said it was £600. I was about to let the Minister's remark pass as correct; but I shall not labour that, and should not mention it but that the report certainly made him challenge my figures. While on that question, I would dispassionately ask why it was, when these secret purchases were made, that none were made on the Cottesloe Beach side of the river.

THE TREASURER: There were. The papers will be laid on the table.

MR. CONNOR: Well, I shall not mention names.

THE TREASURER: No; it is all right. You can have the papers.

MR. CONNOR: I want to know, not what was bought, but why certain people who own the land there should benefit by the unearned increment by which other people whose land was bought will not benefit. That is what I and what the House want to know. But to overcome that difficulty I would now suggest to Ministers that as they have made this plunge and have said they will construct this railway—I am afraid it will be long before they do it—that the alternative scheme proposed by the late

Engineer-in-Chief should be adopted; the scheme by which private property will not be touched at all, the route by Cottesloe Beach and not by Cottesloe; the route which runs through Government land practically all the way. And we wish to know why that alternative scheme will not be adopted, through Government land, instead of through private land purchased never mind how. The Minister for Mines (Hon. H. Gregory) was rather rough on the member for North Fremantle (Mr. Doherty), who he said had made statements he had no right to make, one of them being that a former Commissioner of Railways, the member for East Fremantle (Mr. J. J. Holmes) had refused the railway fettlers a shilling a day increase. Well, we know that is true; for it is admitted. And this is the great democratic Government and democratic party; this is the people's party! I do not know what we in Opposition are, but we are talking for the people now, at all events, and we are not afraid to talk on their behalf. I tell the Government they perpetrated an injustice on the working man when they refused to give him what they themselves admitted he had a right to. That I should not have referred to, except for the silly reference by the Minister for Mines to what was said by the member for North Fremantle. We should like to know, and I suppose the House will soon get, the particulars of the scheme for reticulating the Coolgardie Water Supply; how the Government are to find the money for that reticulation, and how it will be spent. And while I mention that, may I also recall hon. members' recollection to the sensational statements made on the Address-in-reply during the Leake administration, when I told the House, as I tell them now, that I do not believe that scheme will be a success, nor that the pipe-joints will successfully resist the water pressure. We have a very sensational article in to-day's *Morning Herald*, and we are shown that all along the line in certain cases joints are broken. We are told this, which is startling, that the railway system of the State was actually in danger by the breakage of a pipe, and that it had to be stopped for one joint to be fixed. That statement is there, and it appears to be the statement of a public

servant. It has not been contradicted, and I think that if it is going to be, the Minister should have got up in this House before anyone had an opportunity of again referring to it, and have satisfied the country that it is not so, if what he says now is right. I hope the Minister is right and that this thing is right, but here we have joint after joint for miles leaking, and in some places a river. I hope the man who sent this article is wrong, but he is a Government servant, and the statement has not been contradicted. We have the railway service stopped by that.

MR. MORAN: They will stop the Government servant, too, pretty quickly.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: He was not a public servant at the time.

THE PREMIER: I do not know why we should be blamed for these things, anyhow.

MR. CONNOR: I am sorry the member for Subiaco (Mr. Daglish) is not in his place, because I listened with great interest indeed to his very able speech. I was very pleased to hear it, but I failed to see where he, in attacking the member for Mt. Margaret (Mr. Taylor), justified the position he holds in this House. He was elected as a Labour member, and it is notorious that the Labour members promised to endeavour in every possible and fair way to abolish the sliding-scale in so far as it relates to the food duties. We have the Government standing, and taking their stand definitely, on this point—and I am very pleased to see they have that much backbone anyhow—that they will not abolish the food duties.

MR. RESIDE: Your leader says so too. It is the policy of the Opposition.

MR. CONNOR: Yes. But may I tell the Labour member that my leader is not a political derelict, going from one side of the House to the other. My leader did not go to his constituents pledged to any particular thing. He sat on the Government side of the House as long as he thought they did what was fair and honest to the country. I ask members on that bench to answer me: are they doing what they promised their constituents to do by voting for a Government which will keep on the duties?

MR. RESIDE: We have no choice. Your policy is the same.

MR. CONNOR: It is not worth while to take notice of any interjections like that. The member for Subiaco also tells us, in reply to the member for Mt. Margaret, that we want both sides of this question put to the country. That is what we do want, and I ask members sitting over there as the Labour representatives of this State to say, when they go before their constituents, that they supported a Government which raised the railway freights against the voice of the people, and a Government which said it would not take off the food duties. Which of them, the member for Mt. Margaret or others, will be most justified when they go before their constituents? That is what I want them to realise. I do not want them to vote to put the Government out, and I would not vote to put the Government out now; but I do not like members to get up in the House and say to people like myself who are trying to do what we honestly can for the country, "I believe in the reduction of the railway rates, I believe in the abolition of the food duties, and yet I will vote for their retention." What can we do? Where are we? That is what I want to know. We listen to members on that side of the Chamber (Government cross-benches) talking and dictating in turn to the Parliament and to the Government, telling the Government that they are in favour of the abolition of the Upper House, and that this is their price for sitting on the Government side. I want to know whether the Government are prepared to accept the Labour party at that price. Are they prepared to tell the country that they will, for the Labour party, attempt to abolish the Upper House? That is where you are. You do not seem to realise it. Of all the squirming I ever saw or read of in my life, I never knew of such an unfortunate position as that of those hon. members who have to get up here and try to justify themselves, five or six of them talking about the political brutality of the member for Mt. Margaret, and trying to knock him down politically every time, using unfair means to do it. There is no fair-play in that, and the country knows it. Also we have the Labour party divided against itself, even in small details. We had the member for Hannans (Mr. Reside) telling us the

other night about certain parts of machinery which I myself do not understand, and abusing the man in charge of the locomotive works, who is a very capable man. We have the member for Mt. Burges (Mr. Reid) also in the Labour interest—my very dear friend, I may call him, I hope—getting up and telling the House that Mr. Rotheram is perfect. Where are we in this question? May I quote the old saying, that a house divided against itself must fall. I hope they will not. A reference was made by the member for Kanowna (Mr. Hastie) to the departure of some unfortunate people from Western Australia to South Africa, and as my business necessitates that I should make that voyage soon, and I was sorry for the member for Kanowna, I was going to suggest that, if it suited him, I would take the member for Mt. Margaret with me. I do not want to be too severe on the Labour party. I desire to refer to that very able speech by the member for Subiaco in which he said the Labour party were independent. I hope they are. He went on again and told us that when the members of the party attended caucus they were bound by caucus. That is all right. They as a party are independent, except over what they are bound to by caucus. Then he also told us that he and other Labour members attended the Ministerial caucus. What does all that mean? The hon. member is independent, yet he is not independent, because he is bound by his caucus; and the next time he and his fellow members attend a Ministerial caucus, where are they bound? I like consistency. I am pleased and proud to see working men, labourers, sons of the soil, have the opportunity of being in this House; but when they do come, I like them to be manly and consistent, not to be in such a position as they are at present. Again referring to the railways, we also had the Labour members telling us they are in favour of the building of the line from Esperance to Coolgardie. That must be done, or else the Government will lose their support.

MR. HASTIE: Who said that?

MR. CONNOR: All the Labour members. If necessary I can quote the names to the hon. member. Will he say he is not in favour of it? He must be in favour of it. He is returned to get it.

Why? To reduce the railway rates. There is no other reason: it is simply to reduce the railway rates; and yet we find him voting in favour of the increase in railway rates proposed by the Government. These are solid facts. Members may laugh. When on the Opposition side of the House, my right genial friend the Premier barked at the Forrest party and called them the "brutal majority." I would not say such a thing of a majority sitting on the Government side of the House. I would only call them a bilious majority; a majority which has to swallow legislation that it cannot digest, a majority with no political stomachs—and it would take political gizzards to digest the policy of the Ministry.

Question—that the Address-in-reply be adopted—put and passed.

ADMINISTRATION (PROBATE) AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. Walter James), in moving the second reading, said: This is a Bill which was before the House last session and the previous session also. Members will no doubt remember that last session it went through the Upper House, and came before us here and passed the second reading, but objection was raised to a clause that dealt with the allowance of commission to administrators and executors. As the great bulk of the Bill deals with administration, and simplifies the judicial procedure, and on the whole will make the law prompter and cheaper, it seemed to be desirable that the questionable provision—the clause thought objectionable by those opposing it, but I myself do not think it objectionable—should be eliminated, and that we should get the Bill as it now stands. The measure deals with probate and administration, and is to place in one statute the law which to a large degree now extends over a great number of old English statutes, being contained in our local legislation in one or two sections of the Supreme Court Act of 1861. It deals in the next instance with foreign probate and administration, but there it makes no material change. It effects no change of principle, but is a matter of procedure. Part III. has reference to the Curator of

Intestate Estates, and Part IV. relates to miscellaneous. I think that in dealing with this Bill the only matter which calls for attention is that involved in Clause 14. By its provision is made that when the husband or wife dies and the net value of the property does not exceed £500, the survivor, wife or husband, as the case may be, is entitled to the whole of the £500; but if the estate is in excess of £500, then the surviving person is entitled to £500 in the first instance and the ordinary share of the residue. The law at present is that in case of an intestacy, the surviving husband or wife and children should come in and share; and if there be no children, the wife gets half the value of the estate and the other half goes to the next-of-kin. If there be children, the wife gets a third. It is obviously unfair where there is a small estate of £500—and they are mostly small estates—the wife having her share, that the other part should be tied up for the children, for whose benefit the money should be used as quickly as possible. That is the principle adopted in the old country; but I do not think the law allows as much as £500. There the small estates are set down at £200 or £300, and the whole of that amount goes to the wife or husband. Very much the same principle as that referred to in Clause 14 is adopted in Clause 16. In the case of small estates of £2,000, portion of which is tied up for the benefit of infant children—and there is no right to deal with the amount until the children come to the age of 21 years—it is very often found that the money is kept tied up while the education of the children is being neglected, whereas the money could be usefully spent in the education and clothing of the children. Under the clause the Court can deal with small sums like that for the benefit of the children.

MR. MORAN: Is this law in force in other places?

THE PREMIER: I think it is in Victoria, but I am not certain. The Bill is largely based on an Act passed in New South Wales two or three years ago, and I commend it to the House as being one of the Bills, of which I hope there will be many, to bring the law up to date, and to simplify it as far as possible, by placing the whole of the law in one

statute, which will avoid the difficulty that faces practitioners every day when they are asked to find out what is the state of the law on any particular subject.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

PUBLIC NOTARIES BILL.

Introduced by the PREMIER, and read a first time.

INDECENT PUBLICATIONS BILL.

Introduced by the PREMIER, and read a first time.

JUSTICES BILL.

Introduced by the PREMIER, and read a first time.

PUBLIC WORKS BILL.

Introduced by the MINISTER FOR WORKS, and read a first time.

ROADS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Introduced by the MINISTER FOR WORKS, and read a first time.

EXPLOSIVES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Introduced by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, and read a first time.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (DISTRICT BOARDS) BILL.

Introduced by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, and read a first time.

RAILWAY ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

Introduced by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, and read a first time.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Introduced by MR. PURKISS, and read a first time.

DROVING BILL.

Introduced by MR. BUTCHER, and read a first time.

RETURN—VICTORIA QUAY, FREMANTLE.

On motion by MR. DIAMOND (South Fremantle), ordered: "That a return be

laid on the table of the House, showing—1, The total cost of the mail train station and approaches erected on the Victoria Quay at Fremantle 2, The total cost of running the mail trains in connection therewith during the year ending 30th June last. 3, The total revenue derived from the running of the trains, including payments from the Federal Government for carrying mails."

RETURN—CRIMINAL LIBEL PROSECUTIONS.

On motion by Mr. NANSON (Murchison), ordered: "That there be laid upon the table of the House a list of the cases in which newspapers have been criminally prosecuted for reporting portions of parliamentary debates."

RETURN—LAND PURCHASES (RAILWAY).

On motion by Mr. HIGHAM (Fremantle), ordered: "That a return be laid on the table of the House, giving full details of all lands purchased since 1st January, or about to be purchased by the Government, for Railway and other purposes in the vicinity of Fremantle, Richmond, Preston Point, Bicton, Buckland Hill, and Cottesloe, giving the number and position of each block, the names of the vendors and buying brokers, the prices and commissions paid by the Government, and also commissions paid to the brokers by the vendors, stating whether the same have been refunded to the Government."

RETURN—RAILWAY STORES (VALUE).

On motion by Mr. RESIDE (Hannans), ordered: "That there be laid upon the table of the House a Return showing—1, The value of railway maintenance stores outstanding which were delivered during the financial year 1900-1, but which were not paid for until the year 1901-2. 2, The value of material chargeable to working expenses delivered to the railways—(a.) Prior to January, 1902. (b.) During January, February, March, April, and May, 1902, respectively, accounts for which were paid in June, 1902."

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 14 minutes past 9 o'clock, until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 12th August, 1902.

Member Sworn—Question: Coolgardie Water Scheme, Action on Report—Questions (2), Metropolitan Water Supply: Filtering, Leakage of Reservoir—Question: Jetty at Albany, particulars—Papers ordered: Land Purchases (railway), Fremantle—Motion: Perth Drainage, Money Grants—Children's Convalescent Home Bill, first reading (debate)—Supply Bill, assent—Parks and Reserves Amendment Bill, second reading (moved)—Pharmacy and Poisons Act Amendment Bill, second reading, Committee (progress)—Fremantle Prison Site Bill, second reading, Committee—Transfer of Land Amendment Bill, second reading, Committee (progress)—Friendly Societies Act Amendment Bill, second reading—Public Service Act Amendment Bill, second reading—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

MEMBER SWORN.

Hon. C. A. PRESSE (South-East), who had not attended during the session (through illness), took and subscribed the oath of allegiance as required by law, and signed the members' roll.

QUESTION—COOLGARDIE WATER SCHEME, ACTION ON REPORT.

Hon. G. BELLINGHAM asked the Minister for Lands: 1, If, in view of the report of the Royal Commission on the Coolgardie Water Scheme, the Government intends instituting proceedings against Messrs. Hodgson, Finlayson, and Couston, or any of them. 2, If so, what is the nature of the proceedings proposed to be instituted.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1 and 2, A board having been appointed to inquire into certain charges against Mr. Hodgson, the matter is now *sub judice*; the question, however, has not been overlooked.

QUESTIONS (2)—METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY.

FILTERING.

Hon. J. W. WRIGHT asked the Minister for Lands: What steps, if any, are being taken to filter the water supplied to the inhabitants of the city of Perth and suburbs.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: The Metropolitan Waterworks Board states that it is proposed to construct filter beds.