

Legislative Assembly,*Wednesday, 6th November, 1901.*

Personal Explanation as to Alleged Interest: Kurrawang Company and National Bank—Question: Kalgoorlie Tramway Company, Subsidy for Bridge over Railway—Question: Police Benefit Fund, to Report Annually—Question: Police Force, Railway Passes—Question: Police Uniforms, how Supplied—Question: Boulder School, overcrowding—Question: Ivanhoe Suburban School—Question: Railway Boiler, Kalgoorlie—Question: Rabbit Incursion, Particulars—Question: Goldfields Firewood Supply, State Royalty—Question: Police on Gold Escort Duty—Paper presented—Motion: No Confidence in the Government; Debate, third day—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 4.30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.**PERSONAL EXPLANATION AS TO ALLEGED INTEREST.****KURRAWANG COMPANY AND NATIONAL BANK.**

HON. F. H. PIESSE (Williams): Before the business of the day is proceeded with, I wish to make a personal explanation in reference to a statement made by the Premier, in the House last evening. In the course of his remarks, the Premier stated that he challenged the member for the Williams to authorise him to make certain inquiries at the National Bank in Perth, as to who were the members of the Kurrawang syndicate. I may say I am ready to accept that challenge. As a personal explanation, I will now read to the House certain correspondence which has passed to-day between myself and the manager of the National Bank. I wrote to the manager this letter:

Dear Sir,—During the course of the debate in the Legislative Assembly last night, the Premier (Mr. Leake), in commenting upon the transactions of the Kurrawang syndicate, made use of the following words:—

It is just as well for us at once to consider who was in it, who represented the Kurrawang syndicate. I only wish we knew who was in it. I challenge the member for the Williams to authorise me to make inquiries at the National Bank in Perth, who were the members or who have been members during the last seven months?

As by this statement Mr. Leake endeavours to implicate me, I will accept the challenge. I will be glad if you will afford the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly the opportunity of making such inquiry as may be necessary to

obtain such information; and I have much pleasure, with your permission, in authorising him to do so.

I remain yours faithfully,
F. H. PIESSE.

In reply to that letter, I have received the following:—

The National Bank of Australasia Limited,
Perth, W.A., 6th Nov. 1901.
F. H. Piesse, Esq., Perth.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge your letter of 6th inst., and shall be happy to afford the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly any information he may require, as to the Premier's allegation that you or your firm are or have been in any way connected with the Kurrawang syndicate. I may state that we have no information that would lead us to believe or suspect that you or your firm have had any interest, direct or indirect, as a member of the Kurrawang syndicate.

Yours faithfully,
H. R. ENGLAND, Manager.

[Applause by members of Opposition.]

I may add that I have challenged the hon. the Premier to ask the Speaker of this House to obtain the information; and if the Premier does not take that course, I call upon him to apologise.

THE PREMIER: You have not yet made the statement that you are not yet mixed up with it.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: I deny that I have had anything to do with it. I do not know who the company are, nor was I ever offered any position in it, nor have I ever had one jot of interest whatever in regard to the Kurrawang Company.

[Applause by members of Opposition.]

THE PREMIER: Or with Mr. Timms?
[Laughter by Ministers.]

QUESTION — KALGOORLIE TRAMWAY COMPANY, SUBSIDY FOR BRIDGE OVER RAILWAY.

MR. HOPKINS asked the Minister for Works: 1, Whether the representative of the Kalgoorlie Tramway Company had made application to the Works Department for a cash subsidy of £5,000 towards the erection of a tramway bridge over the railway on Boulder road. 2, If so, whether the application was supported by any local governing body. 3, If so, which. 4, Whether the Minister had acceded to the request. 5, Whether any further subsidies had been asked for by the same person or company. 6, Whether the Minister approved of subsidising

tramway companies to run in opposition to the railways of the State.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, No. 2, No. 3, Answered by No. 2. 4, Answered by No. 2. 5, No. 6, No, the Minister does not approve of subsidising tramway companies to run in opposition to the railways of the State.—

NOTE: To elucidate the matter, I may say that the Kalgoorlie Road Board District Tramways Act, 1900, gives the Government the option of either requiring the company to contribute £3,000 towards a bridge capable of providing for ordinary vehicular and foot traffic (as well as for tramways) or requiring the company to build a bridge entirely at their own expense for their own purposes only.

QUESTION—POLICE BENEFIT FUND, TO REPORT ANNUALLY.

MR. HOPKINS asked the Premier: 1, Why the annual statement of receipts and disbursements in connection with the Police Benefit Fund was not published in the *Government and Police Gazettes*. 2, Whether he approved of withholding this information from those persons whose subscriptions were used to maintain and augment the fund.

THE PREMIER replied: It had not been the practice hitherto to publish the annual statement in connection with the Police Benefit Fund, but there was no reason why it should not be done.

QUESTION—POLICE FORCE, SUNDAY LABOUR, TO REDUCE.

MR. HOPKINS asked the Premier: Whether it was the intention of the Government to so amend existing regulations as to permit of constables enjoying at least every alternate Sunday off duty.

THE PREMIER replied: Constables were exempted from Sunday duty as often as it was practicable to do so.

QUESTION—POLICE FORCE, RAILWAY PASSES.

MR. HOPKINS asked the Premier: 1, Why railway passes are not granted to members of the police force on annual leave. 2, Whether such privileges are enjoyed by the other branches of the Government service.

THE PREMIER replied: 1, The only privileges allowed under the existing

regulations to members of the police force are three weeks' annual leave, with full pay. 2, No; except in the Railway Department, where special arrangements are made for railway employees on leave, and in the case of Public Works officials engaged in railway construction.

QUESTION—POLICE UNIFORMS, HOW SUPPLIED.

MR. HOPKINS asked the Premier: 1, Whether the contractors supplying police uniforms are able to cope with the demands of the department? 2, If not, for what number of months are such uniforms overdue? 3, What effort is being made to bring the supply up to date?

THE PREMIER replied: The present contractors are giving every satisfaction in the supply of police uniforms.

QUESTION—BOULDER SCHOOL. OVERCROWDING.

MR. HOPKINS asked the Premier: 1, If the Boulder school is overcrowded, who is responsible for such overcrowding? 2, What efforts are being made with a view to providing adequate accommodation?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, Including the main hall, the Boulder Senior School will accommodate 565 children. The average attendance last quarter was 465. The main hall accounts for 130 places, but it is desired to leave this free for assembly, drilling, etc. The Infants' School will accommodate 330, the main hall accounting for 125. The average attendance last quarter was 280. There is, therefore, no overcrowding while the main halls are used for classes. That the halls have to be used in this way is due to the very rapid growth of the town. 2, The new Kamballie School will relieve the pressure.

QUESTION—IVANHOE SUBURBAN SCHOOL.

MR. HOPKINS asked the Colonial Secretary: When it is intended to commence the erection of the Ivanhoe Suburban School.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: Tenders for the Kamballie School would be called immediately when an answer was received from the Lands

Department on the subject of the site. It was hoped that building would begin in December.

**QUESTION—RAILWAY BOILER,
KALGOORLIE.**

Mr. THOMAS asked the Commissioner of Railways: Whether he has made inquiries relative to the boiler in the station yard at Kalgoorlie; and, if so, with what result.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS replied: The Locomotive Branch has a small vertical boiler at work in the Kalgoorlie Station yard. This boiler was inspected by the Boiler Inspector of the Railway Department on the 8th July, 1901. The Steam Boiler Act, 1897, does not apply to the Railway Department.

**QUESTION—RABBIT INCURSION,
PARTICULARS.**

Mr. THOMAS asked the Premier at what distance from Burracoppin and Ravensthorpe have rabbits been found?

THE PREMIER replied: Rabbits have been found 63 miles east of Burracoppin, and about 130 miles north-east of Ravensthorpe.

**QUESTION—GOLD FIELDS FIREWOOD
SUPPLY, STATE ROYALTY.**

Mr. THOMAS asked the Premier:
1, Whether it is the intention of the Government to impose a royalty on the cutting of firewood upon the goldfields.
2, If so, whether the consumer will have to pay this increased taxation.

THE PREMIER replied: No decision has been come to.

**QUESTION—POLICE ON GOLD
ESCORT DUTY.**

Mr. THOMAS asked the Premier:
1, Whether it is a fact that the police on gold escort duty get a less allowance than is sufficient to pay for their hotel accommodation on their journey.
2, Whether, if this is found to be correct, he will increase the allowance.

THE PREMIER replied: Police employed on the regular gold escort from Lawlers, and in the North-East Coolgardie Police District, receive 6s. 3d. per day travelling allowance, and in other districts 5s. The allowance can only be increased by augmenting the amount on

the Estimates for travelling allowance vote.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the PREMIER: Return showing Importation of Stud Stock (as ordered).
Ordered to lie on the table.

**MOTION—NO CONFIDENCE IN THE
GOVERNMENT.**

DEBATE, THIRD DAY.

Resumed from the previous day, on the motion by Hon. F. H. Piesse: "That the Government does not command the confidence of this House."

Hon. G. THROSELLE (Northam): I rise to support the motion of the member for the Williams, and I desire it to be understood that I do not do so on mere party lines. I am not here to play the game of the "ins" and the "outs." I rise in support of the motion with a deep sense of duty to this country. No Government that ever assumed power in this or any other State have had so great opportunities opening out before them; yet I regret, from my standpoint and from the standpoint of members on this side of the House, that the Government have utterly failed to grasp these opportunities, or realise the responsibilities resting on them. I cannot help saying that it is a most deplorable thing that the Premier of any State should have devoted the greater portion of his speech to the defaming of the characters of members on this (Opposition) side. Especially was it deplorable when the Premier referred to the member for the Williams (Hon. F. H. Piesse). I have known that hon. member from boyhood, and I say it is a deplorable thing, and it is playing politics very low down when the Premier, with all his responsibilities, should spend so much time in defaming the character of the hon. member as he has done. And if the Premier is the man I once took him to be, having found out his error, he will do the right thing, by apologising to the member for the Williams. Reference was made, not in a complimentary tone, to the "remnants of the old Forrest party." I thank the Premier for making reference to that party; and I ask myself, whence comes the reason for the jibing tones of the hon. gentleman? The hon. member has sat here always opposing measures brought

in by the Forrest Government for the good of the State, and if the State did not possess them to-day, we should be in a very different position. Go to Fremantle to-day, and see the harbour studded with ships of all dimensions. We can now take a ride in a railway train to the east, to the south, to the north, and to the west: all undertakings by this despised Forrest remnant which the Premier speaks of. The Forrest Government started on a revenue of £400,000, and lifted that revenue to three millions, and have raised this country to one of the most prosperous States of the Commonwealth. I say, all this has been brought about by the Forrest Government, who are so disparagingly spoken of. The Premier is altogether out of touch with the people if he says the name of the Forrest party is not a name with which to conjure. If the Premier appeals to the country he will find that the despised Forrest Government is still a name to conjure with; and I question if the hon. member, after an appeal to the country, would occupy a seat in this House. I do not desire, in my remarks which I make this afternoon, to traverse the lines of previous speakers. I desire to give my reasons to the House and the country for rising to support this motion. I charge the Premier with having treated us to political gymnastics that no other State can aspire to. Let us go back to the Governor's Speech. That Speech outlined a policy which was stated to be all that the country desired, and the pages of *Hansard* disclose the fact that members all round the House recognised that it was a fair policy and such a one as we could give adhesion to.

MEMBER: Why did you block it, then?

HON. G. THROSSELL: In the Governor's Speech the following words occur, and I knew at the time when I read them that they would rise in judgment against the Government—the words were: "My present Ministers will faithfully observe the obligations entered into by my late Ministers." How has the promise been kept? Let the history of the House tell us, let the pages of *Hansard* tell us, what regard the Premier has had for that solemn promise. Coming from the Premier, it was a promise that should have satisfied us all. What was the first notable thing that occurred? I will deal

with the sliding scale. The sliding scale was approved by the Federal Parliament, and the Government should have brought down a Bill and had the sliding scale confirmed by the House. The Premier has failed in his promise to that effect. What do we find? A few days ago the Premier, speaking at York, endeavoured to find an excuse for breaking his binding promise; and in the city of Perth he said that he would offer no opposition to the abolition of the sliding scale. I ask, is this a proper action on the part of the Premier? I consider this action is flouting the Treasurer, it is flouting the members of the House and the country. At the same time it shows how lightly the responsibility sits on his shoulders. After the Treasurer has given his Budget speech, showing that he estimates the income of the State at £3,417,000, the Premier is willing to reduce the amount possibly by £250,000; and after what the Premier has recently stated as to his willingness to abandon the sliding scale of State duties, I may be told that he has only given us another illustration of his readiness to "climb down" by announcing that he and his Government will not defend the sliding scale. I can only say that I could have endured very much, but that statement was the last straw which broke the camel's back. By actions of this kind, made in this House and before the country, the Premier has been wasting the time of the House and has been disappointing the expectations of the country, while he has also been dealing with the finances of the State in such a way that he is actually willing to make a sacrifice equal to a quarter of a million of money. We know right well too that no such sacrifice can be afforded by this or any other Government which has to carry on the affairs of this State. The Treasurer has told us that he will have to provide in the present year for the payment of £175,000 on account of interest and sinking fund for the Coolgardie water scheme, and that so far as he knows at present there are no means by which an immediate return can be earned on the money expended in this great scheme. The Premier has also committed the country to other great measures, notably the commencement of the building of halls of Parliament at an estimated cost of £100,000 [some laughter]; and though

I do not say he is going to spend that amount at once, yet the country is committed to that expenditure as well as to other great works. If the Premier had occupied the dual position of Premier and Treasurer, he would not have made use of those words which he uttered so lightly, about abandoning the revenue from the sliding scale; but we know it is only another instance of a little toadying to electors on the part of the Premier. We have had an experience of his posing as a seeker after popularity during the strike, when he went down to meetings of the railway men, and mixing with them said, "Give us a pipe of 'bacca, man!" That sort of thing might do very well for a king of burlesque, but it will not do for one in whom the destinies of this State are placed. So far as we know the Premier, he was not in earnest when he went about the country preaching cheap living under federation, and promising a great increase of population and great times under the Commonwealth; for surely no one can be more convinced than he should be now that in making promises and predictions of that kind to the people of this country, he was literally preaching a lie. What do we find? Instead of cheap living, does not the wage-earner find that he is in a worse position now, under federation, than he has been in for a very long time? And has not the Premier said lately something to this effect: "I am still the Premier of this country, who has been preaching to you cheap living under federation; and now that I find the living is not so cheap, I am willing to sacrifice two or three hundred thousand pounds of the revenue of this State, if you will only force my hand sufficiently to do away with the sliding scale." The hon. gentleman has had the support of many members on this side of the House in bringing about federation under those promises which he made to the people of this State; and although he has had the help of these members, he is now ready to turn round on them and say: "It is the old Forrest party again who are opposing me, and preventing me from doing away with the sliding scale. I would sacrifice the finances of this country, I would give to the people cheap food; but there are members on the Opposition side of the House, members of the old Forrest party,

who will not permit me to do it!" The Premier reminds me very much of the tactics of the ostrich which, when it buries its head in the sand leaving its body exposed to the hunter, fancies it is secure and hidden safely from view. We know in connection with the sliding scale and the five years' grace given to us under the Commonwealth, that there is something more than finance connected with it. What was the object of this sliding scale? The Premier may laugh at it, but I say he has utterly failed to grasp his responsibilities. Why was the sliding scale given to us as one of the States entering into federation? It was given to us as a period of grace, during which time we might so develop our resources and so strengthen our industries that we should be more fully fitted to enter into competition in free-trade with the other States of the Commonwealth. But the Premier, with all his abilities, has utterly failed to grasp that aspect of the sliding scale. The Premier made reference also to the loan which has recently been raised in the London market, and he charged it on members sitting upon this side of the House that they had blocked the Loan Bill because the Government came down for authority to borrow $3\frac{1}{2}$ millions, and the House gave them authority to borrow only £2,600,000. Even then, the authority which was given by the House was absolutely a million too much. We find also that the loan which has actually been raised by the Government will entail a loss of £30,000 on the country; and the fault is that of the Premier and those connected with him. We know the Premier has never lost an opportunity of defaming this country and its financial position, and has never lost an opportunity of exaggerating figures so as to make the position appear less favourable than it is. He has said repeatedly, from his place in this House and in the country, that he believes the Coolgardie Water Scheme will yet be the curse of this country. Such are the utterances of a Premier to whom has now been entrusted the finishing of that great scheme; so that when he placed on the market a loan for carrying out that scheme and completing a work to which the country is committed, he stood before the world as one seeking to borrow money for carrying

out a work which he had himself said would be the curse of this country! By placing the loan on the market considerably under price, a rush was created for the stock; and the position of this loan, as a consequence of the Premier's actions, is that it will entail a great loss on the country. I charge him, and those associated with him, that by his action during the five months they have occupied those benches he has entailed on the country a clear loss of £30,000 in connection with the Coolgardie Water Scheme! We come next to another charge referred to by the Premier, in regard to the negotiations for the purchase of the Midland Railway Company's property. I charge on the Government, in connection with this matter, that we have lost the opportunity of acquiring that railway property at a fair price. No one knows better than the Premier, since he has had opportunity of becoming acquainted with the papers, that the late Government had taken certain action by which we were at liberty to open negotiations for the purchase of that property for £1,100,000. [Interjection by the PREMIER, and some laughter.] It is absolutely true, and I can prove it. We know that the hon. gentleman was not too happily placed in regard to the Treasurer; and we know that when the Treasurer went to Geraldton, instead of his being informed of the latest facts in regard to the Midland Railway negotiation, as he ought to have been informed through the Premier who was then acquainted with them, we find the Treasurer travelling about in ignorance of that negotiation, and announcing to the country that in his opinion we should not get that railway for less than £1,500,000. The Treasurer, one of the most conscientious of men, could not have been aware of the negotiation which had been opened when he made that statement; and I say the Treasurer was not treated fairly by the Premier in the matter, for he went to Geraldton utterly ignorant of the fact that we had resumed negotiation for the purchase of that property for £1,100,000. We have been treated just lately to some of the most lamentable exhibitions in this House that ever a Parliament witnessed. If I were inclined to descend so low, I could have said, with reference to the Colonial Treas-

urer and his announcement that we would have to pay £1,500,000 for the Midland Railway, that in making this statement he was speaking not so much as a representative of this State as an agent for the Midland Company. I might say that, but I will not say it. (General laughter.) Now a few words with regard to the reorganisation of the Railway Department. In the previous session we passed a resolution in this House that a Royal Commission should be appointed to take into consideration the whole of the railway system of the State, and make recommendations to this House. There was not a member all round this House who did not agree with that resolution; for we recognised that this great spending department which had grown up during 10 years might require reorganisation; that at the end of our loan policy for a time, the railway system might be over-manned, and there might be abuses which required correction; therefore we agreed that a Royal Commission should deal with the whole question. If that course had been taken, we should have had none of this turmoil in this House and in the country; but what do we find? The present Commissioner of Railways, who is a law unto himself, and who promised that a Royal Commission should begin the inquiry at once, has never moved in that direction, but has taken on himself the whole work of reorganisation; and in doing so he has done a grievous wrong to individuals and to the State. Every business man and every politician knows that when reforms are necessary, there are two ways of bringing them about: one by constitutional means, and the other by revolution. The constitutional means were placed at the disposal of the Government, by the resolution affirming that a Royal Commission should be appointed to investigate the working of the railway system; but this constitutional course was not taken, and, instead of it, we have had reform simply by revolution, and this revolution has been attended with loss and disaster and turmoil. I do not wish farther to deal with this railway matter, as there are other members of the House better acquainted with railway details who will speak on it. I only wish to express my strong conviction that the Government have set about necessary

reform by wrong measures; therefore, they stand condemned for that. With regard to federation, I said at the beginning of my remarks that no Government were ever called upon to take power under such favourable conditions as the present Government.

THE PREMIER: You made it so easy!

HON. G. THROSSELL: No Government ever had such an opportunity of showing the stuff they were made of and the statesmanship they possessed for developing the State; but I look around and I find that the Government have acted like a needy tradesman. They have deluged us with Bills, and in the future, when the history of the Leake Government comes to be written, they will be recognised as the kite-flying Ministry, a Ministry that dealt in Bills but very few practical measures. With regard to the legislation they have introduced, they have shown that they did not grasp the position. They should have followed up the labour legislation by making provision on the Estimates for the appointment of a labour secretary to deal with matters in connection with labour organisations. What is the use of labour legislation with men who do not understand it? There should have been a labour department pure and simple to advise the Government as to the best mode of dealing with strikes or other troubles. This is one of the opportunities they have missed. What are we getting from entering this great federation? We are told, and we know it to be true, that compensation has been made to us in the shape of this five years' breathing time. What for? To establish industries, to place people on our land, to attract population, and to take every mode to fit ourselves for a higher national life at the expiration of these five years. But I search in vain all the acts of the present Government. I fail to realise one act which shows they have grasped their possibilities and have been able to live up to them. The Premier has referred to other Bills. He has referred to the Land Bill that was tabled in this House. That will serve me by way of illustration to show whether the Government are capable of conducting the affairs of this country, whether they have that foresight and that grasp of the country's affairs which we so require at this juncture in our history. That Land Bill, not by what it

contains but by what it does not contain, is one of the most dangerous measures ever introduced to the House, and it will be easy to prove this at the proper time.

THE PREMIER: The same omissions, I suppose, in your Bill.

HON. G. THROSSELL: We placed at the disposal of the Government a certain sum for drainage, and it was my intention this session to have introduced an amending Bill. What do we find in this Bill? Consider the question of close settlement for thrifty men. We are going to convert land worth 10s. an acre into land worth £5 or £10 an acre, and there is no forecast in the Bill before us that the Government intend to drop the selection of free farms of 160 acres, or that they intend to stop the selection of a thousand acres of conditional purchase land. We should take care—and we will take care, while the present Government are in power or any other Government—that we do not wake up from a fool's paradise and find we have been playing into the hands of speculators, and creating a great curse to this country. There are members on this side of the House who are conversant with the subject, who will bear me out that there must be special legislation in dealing with this great matter. Five hundred acres are little enough for farming proper, but one man should not have more than 20 acres of this drained land. We must take care we are not imposed upon by those who have already selected. Before we move in that drainage question and convert the 10s. land into £5 or £10 land, the House should be furnished with a return showing those who hold conditional purchases and how much they hold. A person who holds 1,000 acres should prove his *bona fides* and show what he has done with the land, before we commit ourselves to this drainage scheme; and we should guard against converting a man who has not spent a shilling on his land into a little millionaire. We have abuses with regard to land on our goldfields, but I venture to say that if we do not take care we shall have greater abuses in connection with the drainage in the South-West. I thank the Premier for making an allusion to the subject. Although I compliment the Government on what useful legislation they have introduced, this

Land Bill shows the incapacity of the Government, and they have proved they possess no foresight and no grasp of the great responsibilities cast upon them. Where are we going to attract population? Here is a question for the Labour members. Let us see whether they understand the question or not. At the present moment we give away 160 acres to every man landing on our shores, and what would be more simple than to make proper provision to continue such a system in this Land Bill? The simplest amendment could have been made in the Bill, that not more than 160 acres should be given away, and not less than 10 acres as a free farm, and we should have made absolute provision for the toiler. Reflection will clearly show that the working men in these days are as necessary to the State as the farmer proper. There is nothing more simple than to provide a hundred acres here and there which would make twenty homes for twenty men, with all their conveniences and their associations. The men would fall back upon their little homes at the proper time when out of work, and so be self-supporting, and we should thus do away with the cry of the unemployed. I say the Ministry do not understand this question. They give us Bills, but they do not introduce practical legislation. My reading goes to show that the statesmen of Europe fully recognise the importance of this question. We have all read of a peasant proprietary building up France; but the new Ministry have lost the most glorious opportunity that ever Ministers had. I appeal to my friends the Labour members whether this is not utterly lost sight of by the present so-called progressive Ministry. I feel justified in saying that so far as I am concerned, after giving the Government a fair trial, I have come to the conclusion that they have forfeited my confidence. Although I am not an office-seeker, but an independent, I feel justified as a colonist of fifty years' standing, in following up the old traditions of the Forrest Government, in protecting the State and seeing it has justice done to it. I do not intend to take up the time of the House farther with this matter, which those who are following me will deal with more in detail. I only reiterate that whilst the present Ministry

are the best of men, they are the worst of statesmen. I think it was said of the Duke of Marlborough and Lord Bacon, that they were the wisest and meanest of their kind. I will not apply that to my friends—far is that from me; but I do say they are the poorest statesmen this State or any other State has ever seen. Much as I respect the Premier, and friendly as I feel towards him, I never felt so sorry or grieved in my life as when I read his speech in detail, and found page after page devoted to defaming the character of members on this side of the House.

MINISTERIAL MEMBER: You cannot refute it.

HON. G. THROSELLE: He has told the country we are all rascals and rogues. He said he was going to clean out the pigeon-holes, and how, in the name of God and common sense, has he cleaned them out? When he found a mare's nest, he moved for that jacket and this jacket. Clearing the pigeon-holes! Where are the gigantic frauds he led his audience to suppose he would reveal? I challenged him when we were debating the Address-in-reply, that if there were any such abuses it was his duty to bring them out. He has kept what he had up his sleeve until the time of moving this no-confidence motion, and he has not done himself justice. My experience of life justifies me in saying he has never before done such a fatal thing for his own reputation as he has by the exhibition he treated us to last night, and any man of my experience knows that such conduct will defeat its own object. It creates a sympathy for the assailed.

THE PREMIER: Are you not going to take it out of me?

HON. G. THROSELLE: The hon. gentleman will find he has created an active sympathy for the member for the Williams, an active sympathy not only throughout this House, but throughout the State. In conclusion, I say that if you send us to the poll, as I hope you will, you will find that you never made a greater mistake in your life. People who have forgotten their debt of gratitude to the Forrest Ministry, who were their friends, will realise that in the Forrest party they had men who knew the State and its requirements, and who could initiate great

measures. When we ride through the country we ask ourselves whether the Forrest party had not the gift of second sight. When you consider our railways, which were always hotly opposed by members opposite, when you see that £200,000 a year is spent on the coal fields for wages, and you know the Government themselves spend £100,000 a year for coal, and when you remember that the present Government opposed every measure put forward for the progress of the State, I appeal to hon. members whether those men who displayed such opposition are the men to whom we can faithfully entrust our affairs. I appeal to members of this House, I appeal to fair-minded members on the other (Government) side, and I appeal to the country for a verdict upon this question, whether the present Government have proved themselves worthy of the trust reposed in them; and I for one, and those associated with me, are willing to go to the polls on the question, and I challenge the Premier to dissolve this House and send us to the country. Then we will prove "up to the hilt" —

MR. GEORGE: "Up to the hilt!" a very good phrase.

HON. G. THROSELL: Prove up to the hilt whether the old Forrest party can best retain the confidence of the people of this great State.

THE PREMIER: Would you not like to say something about the destroyed Executive Council records, and the Dalgaty case?

[Interjections by Opposition members.]

MR. F. CONNOR: We will soon give you something which will affect you.

MR. H. DAGLISH (Subiaco): I think it is to be regretted that in important debates in this House it seems absolutely impossible to keep out of sight the element of personal hostility.

[OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear.] These debates are to a large extent disfigured by this personal element. I take it from the approval I receive from some of the hon. members opposite who have done their little share towards introducing the personal element, that they will translate their sympathy into actual practice.

MR. GEORGE: Speak to your own side.

MR. DAGLISH: I was not referring to one side alone; but I do say that as

regards this particular bench (Labour), we can at all events claim to have kept clear of these personalities. (OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear.) I think it would be far better for the House and for the country if the debates could be entirely freed from such disfigurements. As regards the present debate, I do not intend to deal in any shape or form with personalities. It may be necessary—it frequently is needful—for us to discuss political happenings as they affect individual members; but in doing that, we can do it without casting an unnecessary personal stigma upon the members to whom we refer; and we can do it in such a fashion that there shall be no sting that may affect our private intercourse outside this House. It seems to me the personal feeling here is largely engendered by the fact that in this State parties are at present unfortunately divided not by principle but largely by personal considerations; and many hon. members in Opposition are opposing the Government of the day simply because the Government are constituted as they are, and those members desire to see them constituted differently; not because the Government have introduced any bad legislation; not because they have done any deeds which require condemnation; but simply on personal grounds and on personal grounds only. And this has the effect of introducing the personal element into the debates of the House. In regard to the present motion of no-confidence, I may say I intend to cast a vote against it; and I intend to cast a vote against it because it seems to me there have, up to the present, been no sufficient grounds adduced for bringing it forward, except the one ground that there is a majority of members of this House sitting on the Opposition side.

MR. HARPER: A good ground.

MR. DAGLISH: In regard to argument, this expedition to catch the Treasury benches seems to have been badly equipped; or at all events, if arguments are available, they have not so far been brought forward. I was very much interested on hearing the allusions made by the member for Northam (Hon. G. Throssell) to the Forrest party as a name to conjure with. So far as I am able to judge, the country may well say, "A plague on both your parties!" I cannot

recognise the advantage of keeping alive either the one party or the other; and so far as I can see, it is purely on personal grounds that this old division is now kept alive. The head of the old party is gone, and the tail wags very weakly; but I must object to the contention that we are to support the remnant of that party simply because of the enormous increase in the revenue of this State during the past ten years. That revenue, it seems to me, is not to be credited to the members of the late Forrest party, but to the people of this State, and to them alone. They are the source from which the revenue has been drawn; and the people have come to this State largely because of the golden magnet by which they have been attracted. If gold had not been discovered, certainly there would not have been the accession of population and the consequent increase of revenue that has followed. Now I do not think anyone seriously claims that the Forrest party is responsible for the discovery of gold in Western Australia; but I think my friends sitting on my right (other Labour members) will contend, as representatives of the goldfields, that the Forrest party did all that could be done to discourage the influx of people desiring to prospect for gold, to discourage the influx of persons desirous of following mining occupations in this State. And if the magnet has been strong enough to draw population in spite of the unfair, the unjust treatment very often extended to the settlers who came here to follow that particular calling, then surely we are not entitled to give to the Forrest party any credit in the matter. A great deal has been said by the last speaker regarding the sliding scale. That seems to be the real ground of the attack upon the Government, as far as I am able to judge of this debate. The sliding scale was only inferentially alluded to by the member for the Williams, in opening the discussion; but at the same time, there is no doubt more feeling has been displayed in regard to the sliding scale than on any other point of the attack upon the Government. This sliding scale seems to be regarded as one of those monuments of the late Forrest party before which we are to bow the knee and worship, altogether irrespective of its effect. The sliding scale,

we are told, was intended to give us five years' breathing-space for the purpose of establishing our industries. But we find that about nine-tenths of the State tariff consist of purely revenue duties which can in no way assist to build up industries; and therefore, for the purpose of building up our industries, the sliding scale is not only not useful, but it is absolutely destructive, increasing as it does the cost of living to those who are engaged in those various industries, and increasing in some cases the cost of their raw material also. But the objection in connection with the sliding scale seems after all a purely sentimental objection. The Government have not so far attacked the sliding scale. That is one of my complaints against the Government, that they have not assailed the sliding scale; and it seems to be purely the fear of members of the Opposition that the Government may in future do something in that direction that has caused them to be so severe in their attack on this point. And again, the Government have been made responsible for the comparative failure of the last loan; but in my opinion the real difficulty lies in the fact that this State is, as regards its London loans, in the hands of a bank; and so long as the State remains in the hands of a bank or banks, it does not matter who may be the bank or who the Agent General, so long shall we find that a large share of the money which ought to come to this State is absolutely swallowed up in expenses and in commissions before it leaves London. And I say it is unfair to charge the Government with that, and to bring it forward as justification for a motion of want of confidence. Then again we have heard this evening something about the Midland Railway negotiations, and about certain remarks made some time ago by the Colonial Treasurer (Hon. F. Illingworth). But those remarks, if my recollection serves me, were made absolutely before the Address-in-reply was passed; and if there was ground for challenging the Government because of those remarks, then the challenge should have been made three months ago. As it was not given three months ago, we must take it that in reference to that matter there is no ground for impeaching the Government. It seems to me very significant that the

opportunity for reopening the negotiations with the Midland Company should arise immediately the Leake Administration took office, and should not have arisen before; that the past Government can escape all responsibility in connection with the failure to effect a purchase of the railway, while the present Government, immediately they take office, are blamed for not at once entering into negotiations and carrying them to a successful issue. When the member for Northam referred to the present Ministry as a kite-flying Ministry, I was struck with the idea that he must for a minute or two have been confusing dates, and was thinking of some of the deeds of his own party which undoubtedly fully deserved that appellation. I really am not aware of any instance of kite-flying by the present Administration, or of anything which would justify that retort from the member for Northam. I do not intend to go right through the whole of the remarks made in this debate by the leader of the Opposition; but one thing which particularly puzzled me was the change of front that he exhibited in regard to his charge against the present Commissioner of Railways. One of the principal points he made against the present Commissioner was that the Commissioner had shown a great deal of backbone; in fact, to quote somewhat closely the words of the leader of the Opposition—

With his determination to carry things with a high hand, in the same way as he did in the cases I have previously mentioned, where he brought these matters before the House and showed what he could do, he wished to make out that he had a "stiff back."

The leader of the Opposition seems to conclude that the Commissioner of Railways has a stiff back.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: I did not complain of his "stiff back," but of his lack of discretion.

MR. DAGLISH: I have a recollection of the leader of the Opposition posturing before the country some 12 months ago as the gentleman with the "stiff back," and actually leaving his Government and giving himself sundry public testimonials because he had left the Government on account of the firmness of his backbone.

MR. HOPKINS: He has never been the same man since.

MR. DAGLISH: It strikes me as strange that what in him was a virtue should in the present Commissioner be a crime. But another remarkable change has come over the hon. member within the last month. A month ago I had the pleasure of introducing to this House a proposal to bring in the eight-hours system on the railways. I brought forward that motion because it seemed to me that a resolution passed last session was escaping the attention it was entitled to receive. I did not, on that occasion, obtain the support of the member for the Williams; but now apparently he has become a convert to the eight-hours principle. He said the other day, in attacking the Commissioner of Railways:—

We find that when these men asked for a uniform eight-hours day, a proposal is made to reduce wages. I repeat, when the motion was passed by the House, no conditions were imposed in regard to it. The condition as to the reduction of wages was not made, or even mentioned. I maintain that in this instance the Government have caused trouble. They have broken faith with the men as regards the resolution.

Now this indicates a most remarkable change of front in the hon. member, because not only has he previously not been an advocate of short hours, but neither has he been an advocate of high wages.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: I join issue with you. I was the first man to raise the wages.

MR. DAGLISH: I am glad the hon. member has raised the wages at some time; but I have no recollection of hearing him on the floor of this House speaking on the subject without advocating economy.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: True economy.

MR. DAGLISH: And economy in wages, as apart from economy in general administration. But the change of front in the hon. member reminds me of the motto of the Little Peddington newspaper, which I can slightly paraphrase for the occasion:—

All parties to please, and all difference to smother,

What I say one day I retract on another.

On the 2nd of this month, the hon. member told us, speaking on the eight-hours question, that the resolution passed

last year was adopted without due consideration. He said :—

The principle has now been revived, although it is not quite the same principle as was affirmed by the House last session. I do not disagree with the application of the eight-hours system to laborious work. I think eight hours is sufficiently long for laborious work of any kind; but for work of the character which many railway employees are engaged in, the hours can certainly be lengthened beyond eight, without harm to the individual concerned and without detriment to the safe working of the railways.

That is only a month ago. A little later in the same speech the hon. member said :

Many railway employees have light occupation, and do work of such a character that 9 or 10, or even 11 hours, is not too much.

Yet the hon. member, after this, attacks the Government on the ground that they have not introduced eight hours as a day's work in the Railway Department. Later on, speaking on the same motion, the hon. member said :—

I cannot see that any good will result from the adoption of this principle, excepting of course so far as it would affect the men, whose pay would be increased.

That is on the 2nd October, when the hon. member preferred to stand up to oppose the motion, and preferred political annihilation to pandering to any class of the people.

HON. F. H. PIESSE : That was manly.

MR. DAGLISH : That was very manly. Now the hon. member is pandering to the people, and is attacking the Government for failing to do what he has always opposed, and what he failed to do when in office, and what he objected to the Government doing, so lately as last month. The hon. member might take a little more time to allow his utterances to be forgotten. The lightning-change artist is a very desirable person on some stages, but not on the political stage, and the hon. member's capacity in that direction does not prove his capacity necessarily for political leadership. We find the whole basis of attack, so far as the member for the Williams is concerned, was in regard to railway administration; and we find not only was the General Manager condemned, but the Commissioner of Railways was distinctly charged with having caused the recent strike. I find, when this strike was going on, there were two debates in this House,

and in the course of one the member for the Williams said :—

There is no one sympathises more than I do with the Government in the difficulty in which they find themselves. . . . It seems to me that the Commissioner's attitude is one which must commend itself to the country; and therefore it having been once determined that the course which he has set before the men is the right one, I consider that no farther suggestion should be made by the House at this stage beyond indorsing the action of the Commissioner. . . . I take it the Government have done everything they can. . . . It is my earnest desire to do all that may be in my power to help the Government.

That was on the railway strike—the night before it occurred, and when it was threatened. But a little later on, in the following week, a motion was introduced by the Premier, to justify the action of the Government in the strike, on which an amendment was subsequently moved by the member for South Fremantle (Mr. Diamond). In that discussion the member for the Williams again spoke, and said :—

I am well aware of the difficulties with which the hon. gentleman has been faced; and I may say, knowing as I do of these difficulties, and also the results which might follow a hasty determination in this direction in regard to the expenditure, there is no one who can commend him more than I do for the action he has taken.

I ask is it political honesty for the hon. member to speak in that tone?

HON. F. H. PIESSE : You are taking extracts: why not give the whole?

MR. DAGLISH : It is necessary to go through such a large amount of chaff to get so few grains of wheat, and I have no time, and the House has not the patience, if I had the time, to listen to me. There is nothing in these extracts which I have quoted which is inconsistent with the rest of the speech, and as far as I am capable of judging, I have done the hon. member full justice in the extracts. I have not selected them for any purpose except to show that the hon. member took up a position two or three months ago entirely different from that which he is taking up to-day; and if he is pleased to say that he did not do so, I am quite prepared to give him other instances on other subjects, in which he has made the right-about-face.

MR. GEORGE : That shows he is not fossilised.

MR. DAGLISH: That shows that the hon. member has found that there is a certain Labour party in this House, and I am very glad the fact has dawned on the hon. member, and I hope he will bear it in mind in future. At the same time I think it is hardly reasonable to condemn the Government to-day for what the hon. member commended them for two or three months ago. I think the hon. member has hardly been fair to the Government in that respect, in accusing the Commissioner of having caused the railway strike. He has forgotten, I think, some of the past history of railway government. The hon. member traced back the beginning of the strike to a speech delivered by the member for East Fremantle (Hon. J. J. Holmes) two years ago, when the member for the Williams was Commissioner of Railways. I can trace back to about the same date the origin of the railway strike, to the time when the member for the Williams was Commissioner of Railways; but I do not think the speech of the member for East Fremantle had any effect whatever in creating dissatisfaction in the Railway Department. Dissatisfaction existed before he spoke; dissatisfaction was caused by the fact that the lower grade of the public servants in the Railway Department were paid unduly low wages, and were required to work unduly long hours, while the hon. member was in power, and at the same time higher officers were fattened by heavy annual increases of pay. The country could not afford then to pay fair wages to the lower class of officers, but it could afford to give heavy annual increments to the big officers. At the same time men were continually promoted because they were departmental pets, while others who were not favourites, were dismissed, not only without inquiry or without a word of explanation, but without either rhyme or reason, in the unjust administration that characterised the railways before the present Commissioner came into power. In that unjust administration lay the secret of the present railway strike. But I do not want to labour this point. There is another charge against the Commissioner of Railways, the suspension of Mr. John Davies, and I am prepared to support the Government, and say that the Government were

justified in suspending Mr. John Davies on the evidence taken before the inquiry board. The evidence given by Mr. Davies himself fully justified the suspension by the Commissioner of Railways; and so far as I am concerned, the finding of the board justified the suspension, but against what appeared to be serious charges, the General Manager has sheltered himself under Ministerial authority. I happen to differ from the board in regard to what are the duties of a permanent head of a Government department. I think any permanent officer of the Government service should be held responsible for the recommendations made to the Minister, and should not be sheltered from attack because he has obtained Ministerial approval. I am inclined to believe in the position the Premier took up when he seemed to attach more blame to the member for the Williams than to the Railway Manager, but the Railway Manager must be blamed for wrong recommendations, and whether the evidence or the finding of the board may be held to justify his farther punishment or not, I am not prepared to say. But there was ample ground for inquiry by an independent board; far better than any inquiry by the House, or by a Royal Commission.

MR. GEORGE: Provided it was independent.

MR. DAGLISH: As far as I am able to judge, it was an independent board. Although a few questions were asked by one hon. member in this House for reasons why one gentleman was appointed on that board, there was nothing in the shape of a statement against any member of the board brought forward, and until the member for the Murray (Mr. George) brings forward a statement that the members of the board were not independent, I must be satisfied that they were.

MR. GEORGE: I did not say they were not.

MR. DAGLISH: The hon. member queried my statement.

MR. GEORGE: I said they were independent.

MR. DAGLISH: There was an insinuation against the independence of the board, and if the hon. member did not mean that, perhaps he will explain to the House, if he did not mean anything, that he was interjecting for the sake of

interjecting only. In regard to the condemnation of the appointment of G. W. Davies, I am inclined to take a stand against the Commissioner of Railways. I think this Government, or any Government, should be very slow to make appointments outside the Government service, without searching to ascertain whether or not there are capable men in the service. At the same time, my knowledge of the Government service enables me to say that the Government merely followed on a practice which had been in vogue for years past in this State. When a vacancy worth having in the Government service occurred, someone from outside the service was appointed for the purpose of filling the vacancy. Apart from that question, the appointment of one man outside a department to a position inside is not justification for a motion of want of confidence; and the hon. member should recognise that, or he would have brought forward a motion when the appointment was made, and not a month afterwards. When the slightest charge was made against the appointee, the Commissioner at once suspended him, and had an inquiry held: and if the Government deserve censure for the appointment, they deserve credit for having an early inquiry made as to the man they had appointed. We heard something more, indicating farther conversion of the member for the Williams in his remarks about the railways and the Arbitration Bill. He said:—

If we slightly altered the clause now in the Bill, and had a properly-constituted court of arbitration, our position might be made thoroughly safe in regard to this association.

But what I want to point out to him is that he is, by his own motion, preventing this Arbitration Bill, with the clause as he desires it, from being passed.

HON. F. H. PRIESSE: We will do that afterwards.

MR. DAGLISH: And that he is causing a delay of some months in getting on with the passing of the Bill.

MR. GEORGE: On constitutional lines.

MR. DAGLISH: I am willing to admit that the hon. member's course is quite constitutional; but I think that if he believed, as he professes to believe, in the necessity for getting the measure passed with the clause as he says he desires it, he would have delayed his

want of confidence motion until after the Bill had been passed. I think that would have been a reasonable proceeding; but I regard his utterance on the subject as very contradictory of his other utterances in regard to domestic legislation. The hon. member said:—

We find that we can get any amount of legislation brought down here, legislation dealing with domestic matters, no doubt; and this is legislation to which I do not take exception; but, as I pointed out the other evening, the Government have flooded this House with a volume of such legislation when we have important matters to deal with. Let us deal with these important matters which are before the country.

The hon. member is objecting to this Arbitration Bill and to other Bills before the House because he wants to get on with important business. What could be more important, on his own showing even, than this Arbitration Bill, and this social legislation which he does not oppose? Why, he has opposed it; and a number of his associates on the Opposition benches have opposed it. They and he have opposed this legislation at every opportunity; and the member for the Murray (Mr. George) on one occasion even went so far as to stonewall one measure of this class.

MR. GEORGE: Why?

MR. DAGLISH: I presume, because he did not want it to pass: I presume, because he was opposed to the measure. There may have been some other reason working in the mind of the member for the Murray; but I cannot conceive any other. The very utterance gives ground for suspicion that the object of the leader of the Opposition is to prevent domestic legislation being passed; for there will not be any opportunity of passing this domestic legislation during the present session if the want of confidence motion be successful. After the new Ministry have been elected, a month hence, it will be necessary for us to pass the Estimates; and after the Estimates have been passed, there will not be any time left; neither will hon. members be willing to devote themselves in mid-summer to attendance at this House. But we have heard of farther grounds of objection to the present Ministry from the Opposition. One ground was introduced to our notice by the member for Guildford (Mr. Rason), who stated that the Government

have decided to run the quartz batteries on our mining centres on commercial principles, and that if there be no stone for a battery to crush, then the battery is to be shut down. We are told that if this policy be adopted, the mining industry will be injured, that the mining industry will not succeed if we do not have batteries available for use where there is no stone to keep them going. I contend that the Minister for Mines has taken the only proper course, and deserves credit from this House for the manner in which he has dealt with the public batteries question. Then we heard from the member for Guildford, too, that the postponement of the Aborigines question was a matter justifying attack on the Government. I find, however, that the question was postponed at the instance of an Opposition member; and not only that, but the only opponents to the postponement were a few members from this side who crossed over in order to try to prevent consideration of the matter being adjourned, as the consideration of so many other questions has been adjourned, at the instance of the Opposition. Those of us who crossed over were supplemented by one member on the Opposition benches, the member for Roebourne (Dr. Hicks). All the other members of the Opposition then in the House voted in favour of postponing the farther consideration of the Aborigines question until a later date. And then the Government are blamed for the action of Opposition members! I contend that if the Government are to be thrown out of office, they should be thrown out on a fair, and reasonable, and truthful attack—[OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear]—and that good grounds should be given for their dismissal. Hon. members opposite should not attack unless they have some good weapons, some clean weapons, to use against the Government. I am quite prepared to admit that the Government have made mistakes. I am not here as a thick-and-thin supporter of the present Government, or of any other Government which may chance to be in office. I am here as an independent member; but not like some of the independent members on the other side of the House, prepared to vote with a party at all costs and at all seasons. I am here as an independent member, to

cast a vote which I believe will be in the best interests of the State, apart from any personal considerations or any considerations whatsoever as between the Government on the one side and the Opposition on the other. I am willing to admit that the Government made a mistake in allowing the Early Closing Amendment Bill to be adjourned, or to be delayed, in the Legislative Council; but that is a mistake which will be continued for a much longer period if a change of Government now take place, than if the motion of want of confidence be defeated. If the motion be defeated, the mistake can be remedied in a few days: if the motion of want of confidence be successful, the mistake will continue to exist for months, and it will be months before we can have the Bill re-enacted. I am quite willing, too, to admit that the Colonial Treasurer has followed too closely in the footsteps of the old Forrest party in the framing of his Estimates; but what are we to expect if we have a Treasurer from the old Forrest party in office instead? We can only anticipate that he will do far worse than the present Treasurer has done. Then there has been a certain complaint of delay in legislation; but the delay has been caused by the strong numbers on the Opposition side. [OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No.] It has been caused purely by the strong numbers on the Opposition side. Almost every matter which has been before the House has had to be adjourned time after time. We would have got much farther forward with the social legislation to which the leader of the Opposition objects, if it were not possibly for the fact that he does object to it, that he is strongly opposed to it, and that therefore, as he has the number in his party who are of the same way of thinking, the legislation has been delayed from time to time. However, we cannot blame the Government, with only a minority supporting them, for that. I contend that the country at the present time demands sound administration, and demands social legislation. The member for the Williams says the country does not want social legislation; but if the last general election meant anything, it meant a determination on the part of the country to get social legislation. There are but few members in the House who are not pledged to social legislation.

However, we want also sound administration; and I am quite satisfied that we have more hope of getting sound administration from the present Government than we are likely to have from any Government coming from the other side of the House. For the present Government have given us an earnest of their good intentions; they have shown a desire to introduce reforms. Their reforms may not have come as quickly as we could have wished; but, at all events, there has been a beginning made, and the other party, while in office, never made a start at all in reform. The other party passed a Public Service Act during the last session they were in power, after having had all the advantage of public service patronage for 10 years. When they were likely to go out of office, when the handwriting had begun to appear on the wall, the late Government passed a Public Service Act for the purpose of preventing their successors from enjoying the sweets of political patronage, and for the purpose of protecting the pets whom they have already got into the public service. [MINISTERIAL MEMBERS: Hear, hear.] The present Government have been the first to show a desire to reform; they have shown the first desire of the kind that has been exhibited in this State. There would not be a need for reform if the past administration had been pure and honest. [MINISTERIAL MEMBERS: Hear, hear.] As a matter of fact, because the former Government were not pure, were not honest in the administration of the departments, because appointments were made for reasons of favouritism, because the best men were not appointed to the public service, there is to-day an absolute need for reform. And I, as one member of the House, am quite satisfied, seeing the start the present Government have made, that if we give them the opportunity they will carry their reforms farther in the future. I like the fact that the Government have not been afraid to begin at the top instead of the bottom of the tree. I believe the steps they have taken in this respect have been dictated by a desire to serve the country; and I believe the country as a whole is satisfied with those steps. So far as I am concerned, I have not met outside the House any opponents whatever of the Leake Minis-

try: I do not remember to have met a single opponent of the Leake Ministry outside the House. [OPPOSITION MEMBER: You are likely to meet some soon.] I am quite satisfied that the will of the country is that the present Ministry should have a farther trial, and that the opinion of the country is that the Ministry have done good service so far—[MINISTERIAL MEMBERS: Hear, hear]—and that we are not warranted at the present day in making a change. If we are warranted in making a change, then we should have to pause long and think deeply before we decide on what that change should be. At the last general election the country spoke very strongly against the Administration headed by the member for Northam (Hon. G. Throssell). I personally was returned as a distinct opponent of that Administration. The member for the Williams was not then leading any party, but was rather in the back-ground. As far as I am able to judge, however, if the member for the Williams instead of the member for Northam had been the leader of the Government then, the majority against the late Government would have been even bigger than it was. [MINISTERIAL MEMBERS: Hear, hear.] Personally, I would far sooner support a vote of no-confidence moved by the member for Northam than one moved by the member for the Williams; because I know that social legislation and social reform have far more sympathy from the member for Northam than from the member for the Williams; and I believe that what the country wants at the present time is social legislation and social reform. I trust hon. members, when casting their votes on this question, will not be influenced by the personal considerations which seem to have weighed in this House so frequently in the past. I trust they will rise above party considerations and cast a vote solely in the interests of the State. I am quite satisfied that if they do that at the present day, they will decide that the Government do possess the confidence of the House.

MINISTERIAL MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. T. F. QUINLAN (Toodyay): I rise, as the House will know I suppose—[applause from Opposition members]—to support the motion of the member for the Williams.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HOPKINS: No, no; don't!

MR. QUINLAN: In doing so, I desire to say that whatever reference I may have to make to the present occupants of the Treasury benches, I shall apply to them in their Ministerial capacity alone. I deprecate, as the member for Northam (Hon. G. Throssell) has done, and likewise the member for Subiaco (Mr. Daglish), the introduction of personalities; and although I shall have occasion to make some strong references indeed to a couple of members of the present Ministry, I shall by all means avail myself of the opportunity when reply is made of accepting any explanations that may be forthcoming. In regard to one reference which I shall make to-day, however, I am not prepared to accept an explanation; for the reason that I have here in my hands the material of an accusation against the Colonial Treasurer, which accusation is quite beyond question. Before coming to that, however, I desire to remark that the Premier in the speech which he made in the Queen's Hall some months ago, if he did not use the words "corruption of the former Government" in their strictest sense, at any rate implied that there had been corruption; and it is on that ground, on the strength of statements then made, I take it, that he occupies the position of Premier to-day; for naturally his remarks caused throughout the State a feeling that there was something materially wrong with the administration of the Right Hon. Sir John Forrest, who was so much esteemed, all over the world I may say, at any rate esteemed wherever his name is known. [SEVERAL MEMBERS: Hear, hear.] For my part, I see no reason whatever for withdrawing my particular esteem from that gentleman. I think it is to be deplored that an implication of that kind should be cast against one who has done so much for this State.

THE PREMIER: I never said anything of the kind in the Queen's hall.

MR. QUINLAN: It was distinctly implied.

THE PREMIER: Will you quote it?

MR. QUINLAN: It was distinctly implied.

THE PREMIER: Will you quote it?

MR. QUINLAN: It was distinctly implied that there was corruption, and that if we began to unfold the files and

rake out the pigeon-holes we would find it so. The present Government have now had five months to carry that unfolding and raking out into effect, and what has been the result? Last evening we had, as my friend on my left termed it, one of the discoveries known as "a mare's nest." I refer to that transaction at any rate which has been refuted absolutely here to-day by the leader of the Opposition—I allude to his connection with the Kurrawang syndicate; and I was pleased indeed to hear the letter he read to-day from the manager of the National Bank. I never doubted the hon. member; and I have to-day, what I have always had, the very highest regard for the member for the Williams. Indeed it would be well if my friend the Premier were at any rate able to claim the same respect and esteem throughout the State which the member for the Williams possesses.

MR. GARDINER (to the Premier): Consider yourself crushed.

MR. HOPKINS (to the Premier): Send in your resignation.

MR. QUINLAN: I admit at once that outside this House there is no more genial or affable person to meet than the present Premier; but inside the House he seems to become embittered, at any rate against those who differ from him in opinion, and there can be no question whatever that he is able to assume the rôle of comedian to perfection. He has had a very good training as an amateur at that game in this State, and he has at all times commanded admiration in that particular line; but as to his sincerity or the respect he commands as a politician, I venture to say he is certainly in the eyes and voice of the people by all means in a minority. The Government have been sitting in a minority, as we know, and I venture to assert if I had been in the position they occupy to-day, I would have had more self-respect than to hang on to the twelve hundred golden reasons in the case of the Premier, and the thousand golden reasons in the case of the other Ministers. That is what they are hanging on to. They give up their own respect to retain those seats, knowing they are not representing the views and sentiments of the people. We are in a majority on this side, as will be proved at the conclusion of this motion. We go farther and say we have the

country behind us. (Laughter on the Government benches.) [MEMBER: That will not do.] I will challenge the Premier, if the Governor is likely to grant a dissolution, which he is not. (Laughter on the Government benches.) I do not pose here as a constitutional authority like the Treasurer, but I have authorities quoted by past Parliamentary Governments which are sufficient in themselves. As, however, there has been no argument used in that regard, I am not going to waste the time of the House by reading them. Anyone else can have them, if he requires them.

THE PREMIER: Give us the pages of "Todd."

MR. QUINLAN: I will give you the whole, if you like. As I said, I have not posed here as a constitutional authority, but I have friends who are acquainted with this subject, and I avail myself of their services. I say that if we had a general election, by all means the Leake party would be in a minority.

MR. GEORGE: They would disappear.

MR. QUINLAN: They contend they represent numbers, because of the gold-fields constituencies. I admit that in numbers there they probably do, but they do not represent the general interests of the country; and it must be recollected, too, that the people who have made this country, who have put up with the hardships in the pioneer days, have the right to be represented here. And although the population may not be in these particular constituencies, the interests are there, and indeed I go farther and say the stuff is there that produces the revenue for the country, namely the land and the minerals. Honestly and fairly on this side we have given every possible consideration to the occupants of the Ministerial benches to do something, since the time they have occupied their present positions. They came in on the distinct understanding that they were going to make disclosures, but they have signally failed in everything.

MR. HOPKINS: They have made them.

MR. QUINLAN: Inquiry into the cases of G. W. Davies and J. Davies certainly is, I suppose, in their eyes a move in that direction; but they have failed in both instances. They have failed is so far as G. W. Davies is concerned, that they made the appointment

knowing full well he had been dismissed from the service, and they must have known he was not going to take his dismissal and sit quietly by; nor would I or any other person who had any spirit in him. I would have at once appealed, and have sought the remedies of the Court with regard to the dismissal. What did he do? He made no move whatever. What does the Commissioner of Railways do? I have always had a good opinion of the hon. gentleman — I have always had an opinion that he had some backbone; but when he asked for the files, why did he not, when he discovered there was nothing in the papers about him, go farther? Because he must have known a man would not be discharged without some reason, although the papers obtained in the first place did not reveal sufficient reason. It is all very well for the Commissioner to tell us it was bidden from him. He has common sense, and I am sure he will honestly admit he knew there were other reasons than those on the first papers before him. The subsequent papers prove that the former Government were justified in their action as to the mode of treatment. Possibly in giving the officer three months' salary they thought it the more kindly way of dealing with the matter, and for my part I believe in treating people kindly. The Government would have my support if that was their motive in paying him three months' salary. In regard to Mr. John Davies, I am glad indeed to congratulate that gentleman upon his success. (Laughter on the Government benches.) I am glad indeed.

MR. RESIDE: You cannot have read the report.

MR. T. F. QUINLAN: I have read the report, and I am glad, because I treat him as I treat every other man. I never consider a man guilty until I am satisfied he has lost his innocence; and I adopted that course especially in this instance, where a man had served the country for 10 years; and he would never have served this country or any other place and passed through so long a period without committing some error, great or small. I admit he has made errors, and who would not have done so under the circumstances, with the large concern he had to control? There was

an immense leap made at the time of the boom here, and Mr. John Davies was abused from every quarter because he could not find trucks for every member who was pulling the Government strings. That was the reason the man was abused. He was made the buffer between the Ministry and the public, and, as generally follows, give a dog a bad name and it sticks to him. He was called a tyrant. That name was given to him by everybody. But what is the result to-day? He has undergone a trying ordeal, and although he has not come out perfectly pure, he has come out pure enough, in my mind at any rate, to satisfy me he was only guilty of errors which all human nature is liable to be guilty of.

MR. GEORGE: They want an angel.

MR. OATS: Black or white?

MR. GEORGE: We are not taking black.

MR. QUINLAN: The proper course in my opinion is either to at once make compensation to that gentleman or else reinstate him. Probably it may be urged by the talkative member for Mt. Margaret (Mr. Taylor) that it would not be popular. Dispose of the popular idea. Do the man justice. He has been injured, then make it good by all means. I trust my friend will do right and justice to that man whom he has injured, perhaps not intentionally, because I have no doubt he has been filled up with these charges. There has been a report by a competent chairman of a board, which board was as a matter of fact of the Government's own constitution. One member was a friend of the member for East Fremantle (Hon. J. J. Holmes), and he was, I believe, supposed to have been prejudiced; whilst another member was a friend of the Treasurer, and was supposed to have been prejudiced; the other member of the board being an independent person, Mr. Pendleton. What has been the result? Mr. Davies has come out of the ordeal. I do not see any traces of prejudice which I was given to understand existed in regard to the honour of these men who have tried him. It is an honest report.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: A damning report.

MR. JACOBY: You are damned by it.

MR. QUINLAN: It is an honest report, and one which was not approved

of by the Premier. I regret that after seeking the aid of a man in his (Mr. Pendleton's) position from another State, the Premier, as he did last evening—though he may not have used the word—made accusations indicating that he did not agree with that report. That is in depreciation of a man who came here competent, as he was, to give an honest report, and I say it was unfair of the Premier to make that reference.

THE PREMIER: I said I was satisfied with the report.

MR. QUINLAN: Pardon me; the newspapers do not say so, and I heard you. With regard to the reorganisation of the civil service, we know full well the Government have done one little bit in that direction. They have extended the hours by half an hour. They know full well that this House approved of a little longer time; and I see no reason whatever why they should not have gone farther and have extended the time to five o'clock. It was never intended by the House to apply the eight-hours principle to the clerical staff. The words were particularly described in the motion of the member for Subiaco (Mr. Daglish) "where practicable." It is not practicable to adopt the system in regard to the clerical staff.

LABOUR MEMBER: Yes; it is.

MR. QUINLAN: My friend the Minister for Works (Hon. W. Kingsmill) laughs, as he generally does: he is so happy, I am glad to say. I am not always laughing, because I feel serious about matters.

THE PREMIER: You look it.

MR. QUINLAN: I am. We know too that while they dealt with the reorganisation of the civil service, they gave us to understand no requitals would be made. I will quote one instance at any rate; not that of a very high official, but one instance with regard to an appointment in the police court. There is an officer named Robinson, who was recently gazetted in that department. He was formerly clerk to the Minister for Lands, who had a hotel in Coolgardie. That is going outside what we understood they would do, and that is by this pure and conscientious Ministry!

MEMBER (referring to Hon. C. Sommers, hearing the debate): The Minister for Lands is blushing.

At 6-28, the SPEAKER left the Chair.

At 7-30, Chair resumed.

MR. QUINLAN (continuing): When we adjourned, I was referring to an appointment recently made in the civil service. My object in so doing was to draw hon. members' attention to the fact that the civil service reform, promised so frequently during this session by the present occupants of the Ministerial benches, has not been effected. They emphasised the necessity for this reform, especially in regard to appointments in the civil service; yet on so recent an occasion this appointment has been made. I admit it is provided in the Act that if there be no person in the service of the State capable of filling a vacancy, the Government are entitled to go outside and to make the appointment; but in this case that claim cannot be upheld; for the reason that the appointee is performing the duties of an ordinary clerk. There are no special qualifications required; and therefore I contend that, the appointment not requiring a professional man, the Government went out of their way to appoint the person to whom I have referred. He may be ever so competent for the position, and indeed I am led to understand he is a good clerk; but suffice it to say we can judge of the influence brought to bear by one of the Ministry themselves in regard to that special appointment. There may be other cases with which I am not acquainted; but with respect to Mr. Robinson, the late clerk of the Minister for Lands (Hon. C. Sommers) when the Minister was in business, his appointment to the service does not smell too sweetly.

MR. DAGLISH: What salary is he getting?

MR. QUINLAN: The salary does not concern me. I am talking of the principle, and of the motives which prompted the appointment. We now come to the question of the raising of the loan. Some weeks ago the Colonial Treasurer (Hon. F. Illingworth) twitted members with the fact that the Opposition had delayed the passing of the Loan Bill, that, if it had passed sooner the Government could have raised to better advantage one and a half millions of money. Now, the Treasurer knows full

well that when he made that statement he had already the authority of Parliament to raise that amount, months ago; and therefore he was not justified in laying against the Opposition a charge of having delayed the Bill, and of unnecessarily causing a higher price to be paid for the loan. It may be argued—and I believe the Minister has already used the argument—that the appointment of the Agent General was made by the former Government. That is so; but the Treasurer knows full well that the gentleman appointed was not by any means a financier, though he is in my opinion a very honest man—[THE COLONIAL TREASURER: Hear, hear!—and is no doubt guided by his advisers. If the London and Westminster Bank erred in giving advice on this occasion, why did not the Government transfer the business to some other quarter? We know that Queensland and Tasmania are able to raise their loans at better prices; and yet here, with the credit we have, with our comparatively small indebtedness, and with the fact that we are now part of the Commonwealth—surely these are sufficient security to warrant our obtaining a loan at a rate not higher than that paid by Queensland or Tasmania, to say the least.

MR. GEORGE: We should, if we knew how to do it.

MR. QUINLAN: What is the result? We lose a very large sum of money in that connection alone. I charge that against the present Ministry. They have not shown their competence to deal specially with finance; and I think there are some members on this side who have had financial experience, and who would make a better bargain for the country than the present Colonial Treasurer.

MR. TAYLOR: Whom have you?

MR. QUINLAN: I need only refer to a very recent interview with Sir Edward Wittenoom, the late Agent General, who distinctly told his interviewer that he had never been consulted in the matter. Surely that is an instance which shows something radically wrong with our financial advisers in London, when a man who had for three years held the office of Agent General, and with whom they had had considerable dealings, was in no way consulted; and Mr. Wittenoom there implies as distinctly as he could that the

loan was not floated to the best advantage.

THE PREMIER: It was floated by Mr. Lefroy, who was your man.

MR. QUINLAN: I have already stated Mr. Lefroy's qualifications. He is an honest man, but not a financier.

THE PREMIER: But you appointed him.

MR. QUINLAN: Mr. Lefroy is one of the financial advisers of the Government; the Colonial Treasurer here knew by the negotiations which were proceeding, the position of affairs; and the Treasurer was the person to direct our agents in London to stay their hands for the moment, or at any rate to put the loan in the market at a price at least one pound higher than that at which it was floated. And I am confident, judging by the gross amount of the tenders received, that we should have had the loan at a price similar to the prices realised by the other States.

THE PREMIER: You would not have us dismiss Mr. Lefroy, would you?

MR. QUINLAN: It is no use the hon. member's asking about Mr. Lefroy. Mr. Lefroy is an honest man. That is all you can say for him, apart from his experience—

MR. MOORHEAD: A very good character at the present stage.

MR. QUINLAN: I should like very much if the Premier would learn a little manners from the lesson he was taught last night by the silence of those on the Opposition side of the House during his speech.

THE PREMIER: I wish I had known it was a conspiracy of silence. I should have "drawn" some of you.

MR. QUINLAN: Possibly. You are cunning enough for anything. I have already pointed out that this appointment was made by a former Ministry. Mr. Lefroy is the right man in the right place, because we want an honest man, for we know what can be done in regard to transactions that go through the Agent General's office, where there are large commissions to be dealt with. I think the appointment was an admirable one. As to the Estimates, the Government emphatically stated in the Governor's Speech that they would carry out all the promises of the former Administration. I am not going to stick to the letter of

the law and say that the Government should carry out every promise, but the Government have broken faith with the country and the House. Numbers of promises were made, and are in black and white, promises made by the former Administration, yet no provision has been made on the Estimates for carrying out the works. There are some new items on the Estimates which we have not heard of before, and I shall have occasion to refer to one or two before the conclusion of my remarks. As to the Midland Railway Company and the negotiations pending when the Government came into office, I may say that the advice of the Agent General was that the railway could be purchased for a sum of money not much over a million pounds. The Government knew that, yet the Colonial Treasurer, on that notable trip, made some strange remarks. I do not know what he had taken previous to his utterances, but it was sufficient to carry away his tongue, and to add on about £400,000 to the estimated value of the line. We know full well the position the company are in now, and the treatment we are receiving; and had it not been for the select committee which has been appointed to inquire into the company's affairs, we could have terminated the contract because it has been broken times out of number. Terminate the contract by all means, but I do not want to take any unfair advantage of the company. I would terminate the agreement, and give the company what is the full value of the line. I will go a little farther, and give them something extra to extinguish them altogether.

THE PREMIER: Not a one-sided arrangement!

MR. QUINLAN: I now come to another matter, and I shall quote the substance of a communication which was sent to the Treasurer. I wish to refer to the Mount Lawley Estate. The Treasurer has the power, under the Municipalities Act, to create a new municipality. The petitioners in the case under notice complied with the Municipalities Act, so far as a roads board was concerned, and presented a petition to the Treasurer asking for a municipality; and included in the proposed municipality was the Mount Lawley Estate. The Mount Lawley Estate is pretty well known,

because there are some peculiar transactions in regard to the matter, before it became part and parcel of the proposed municipality. The petitioners asked for the inclusion of that estate in the municipality. On 1st October a deputation waited upon the Colonial Treasurer, and a short account of that deputation appeared in the newspapers. The object was to ask that the Mount Lawley Estate might be excluded from this proposed municipality. Now the Municipal Act distinctly provides that in the case of a proposed new municipality, a counter-petition can be received provided it is signed by an equal number of persons to those who have signed the petition in favour of the municipality. I ask the House to believe or disbelieve: is it possible, where there are only two owners of an estate, that a sufficient number of names can be provided to counteract a petition? The Minister excluded that estate, which will be a direct loss to the proposed municipality in regard to rates and taxes. But the Minister went beyond his power, and this was brought to his notice. I will read to the House the substance of the communication the Treasurer received:—

The deputation (October 1st), as far as Perth Roads Board were concerned, was not by authority of the board; and as to the residents on Location Z forming part of the deputation, there were no such residents on the location. A visit the day after the deputation to Location Z revealed no signs of water being laid on, no trace of residents or roads being made. There were two or three roads being cleared only. The only buildings were about four specimens of the kerosene tin and calico architecture. Thus representations of deputation as to this is false in the extreme. The contention that the North Perth Roads Board had not done anything for Location Z was absurd, as the location not being previously under the board's control it was, and must have been, evident to the dullest capacity that the board could not improve properly not under its control. The additional argument that the board would not in the future was altogether beyond the deputation. That considerable expense had been incurred in connection with the proposed municipality as petitioned for. That the proposed exclusion would necessitate re-arrangement of wards, and it was urged that the municipality as prayed for should be granted.

I will quote the section of the Act, and I cannot see how it is possible for any explanation to be given why this estate was excluded. The only reason I can

conclude is that the estate was going to be rated. The Minister asked the deputation to put their request in writing: but I contend it was not within the power of the Minister to receive the deputation, and he was taking an extreme step. The result will be a large loss annually to this new municipality, because they will lose so much for water rates, and so much for the ordinary rates and taxes. There the fact remains, and I say the case is unanswerable. I give as my authority the section of the Act which says:—

If within one month after the publication of any petition praying for the constitution of a municipality, or the division or redivision or the alteration or abolition of the divisions in any municipality, a counter petition, in accordance with the provisions of this Act, signed by an equal or larger number of persons qualified to sign a like petition than have signed the petition be presented, no proclamation shall be made on such petition.

Every petition and counter petition shall be addressed to the Governor and shall be left with the Minister which shall be deemed the presentation thereof.

The signatures to any petition or counter petition shall be verified by solemn declaration made before any justice of the peace of some person signing the petition; that such declaration shall be in the form or to the effect in the second schedule hereto, and no petition or counter petition shall be received by the minister unless the same be accompanied by a declaration in accordance with the provisions of this section.

I appeal to the House to say whether it was within the province of the Colonial Treasurer to have gone so far; and even if he possessed the prerogative which he assumed, he ought not to have caused this great loss to the proposed municipality, by excluding the Mount Lawley Estate: the reason for doing so cannot be explained. My friend (Mr. George) asks who is interested in the Mount Lawley Estate? I know that Mr. Robinson, of Messrs. Sholl and Robinson, and Mr. Copley are interested. I did not wish to mention the names, but I have been asked for them. [MR. GARDINER interjected.] I was just coming to the hon. member. He may be able to give the House some explanation on the point, because he is agent for the proprietor, and he is the seventh Minister. The hon. member will be able to tell us to-night, for what reason the Mount Lawley Estate was excluded. I challenge the Minister to give reasons to the House

for the action he has taken. Now I come to another matter, and I will put it as a question for the reason that where there is smoke there is generally fire. I hope the Treasurer will be able to contradict the statement which I make. I ask the Treasurer here, is it a fact that he is the owner of the Kalorama Park, and that he has made or at the present time is making application, or through his instrumentality negotiations are being made, for a loan of £5,000 on the Kalorama property, from the Savings Bank? If that be the case, then I say the Government have no authority to advance £5,000 on that bare land. Go to any financial institution and ask them to lend you £5,000 on land which is not producing anything, and you will not get the money. I shall be glad if the hon. member will deny that statement, and I will accept his denial.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: I am not the owner.

MR. QUINLAN: You may not be the owner, but what about the £5,000? I come to another point, with regard to the Minister for Lands; and I am aware this afternoon the member for Dundas (Mr. Thomas) has given notice of a series of questions in regard to the Londonderry Dam scandal. That is the best way to put it. I know that sounds peculiar, but the Speaker is aware that I am quite right in the English I am using. The Speaker knows I am referring to the Londonderry Dam. I am given to understand that the concessionaire for the concern, out of which large sums of money have been made, is a brother-in-law of the Minister for Lands. That may or may not be so. If it is the case, then the utterances of the Minister for Lands in Coolgardie, on 31st May of this year, are strange; because he distinctly said, "They (speaking of the Government) had no sisters, cousins and aunts to look after, and as Mr. Jenkins had said, there would be no backstairs influence." We have been told that the Ministry were placed in office to clean out and disgorge, and tell us what has happened. I ask them to clean out their own homes before they attack other people's.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am the person responsible for the Londonderry Dam.

MR. QUINLAN: Then perhaps the hon. member knows all about it, and will be able to explain. The same Minister in his speech stated that he would prefer—and mark you, I direct the attention of the House to the statement made by the Minister for Lands, whose duty it is to protect the lands of the country and what we produce—"to give us more moth and cheap fruit in preference to no moth and prohibitive prices." Here is a gentleman who ought to look after the lands of the country, endangering the interests of the country by making a statement of that kind. These are cases that should be brought home to Ministers. In regard to the Colonial Treasurer, he said he believed in his purity and conscientiousness.

THE PREMIER: He said so.

MR. QUINLAN: Yes; he said so.

THE PREMIER: That is all.

MR. QUINLAN: Then it cannot be true, I suppose? Now, in respect to a question which has to do with the Southern Districts, known as the South-West drainage scheme—

MR. GEORGE: A very good scheme, too.

MR. QUINLAN: I believe the Minister for Lands has a block of about 2,500 acres in that locality; and I am informed on very good authority—otherwise I would not make the statement here—that he sent a surveyor to the South-West to survey a route for the purpose of draining that area. That surveyor returned with a report and a suggested route for the proposed drain. The Minister asked him: was it not possible to go from another direction—which would, no doubt, have served the Minister's land: that is how it was given to me, at any rate. The surveyor replied, "If you will put it in writing that I am to go and make another survey, I will do it." He was taken off that work, and another surveyor was sent to the same locality; with what result I do not know. Suffice it to say, however, that the first surveyor reported to the Minister that the route being through hilly land, he was unable to design a channel to run in the direction desired by the Minister. I leave it for some of the hon. gentlemen who represent the Minister for Lands in this House to answer the charge. I have been given the information by one who is competent to give it.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Has the Minister for Lands spent any money at all down there?

MR. QUINLAN: I never answer interjections.

THE PREMIER: Was the information given you by a disloyal public servant? [Laughter.]

MR. QUINLAN: With regard to the Kurrawang syndicate, which has already been mentioned so frequently, and in the references to which my friend the leader of the Opposition has been concerned, I believe the Kurrawang syndicate had from the former Government a concession to carry their line to a certain distance. For that concession or permission the previous Government have been much condemned.

MR. TAYLOR: Quite right, too.

MR. QUINLAN: The syndicate have had that permission extended since the present Ministry took office. In this connection, I need only quote the words of the Minister for Lands, who said "he understood that the company had put down 76 chains of railway beyond the 42-Mile, and had cleared another mile." This is the concession which received so much condemnation at the hands of the present Government! From the circumstance that the syndicate have been permitted to extend their line, and from the complimentary references to them by the Minister for Lands, it is evident that the present Administration have learned to appreciate the efforts of the syndicate. I quote for the purpose of asking, if the permission or concession to the syndicate was such a bad thing, and if the previous Government were to be condemned for granting that permission or concession, why did the present Ministry agree to a proposal in any way to extend the evil? One other matter I desire to bring to the attention of the House is an item on the Estimates, namely the item for the Melville Park road. The residents of South Perth have agitated for a long time for the building of a channel towards the Cooke Street jetty; and I believe certain promises have been made in respect of that work. At any rate, this road, which according to the Estimates is to cost about £1,000, passes through a district with scarcely any residents, and leads to Melville Park. I contend that the money should have been spent

where it would serve the most people, where it would do the most good, namely on the Cooke Street jetty channel. However, I have no doubt the matter is capable of explanation. Possibly the member for Albany (Mr. Gardiner) will answer me on this point also. He, being the seventh Minister, I feel sure will be able to give us the information.

MR. GARDINER: Do not ask me for information. Ask the member for Cockburn Sound (Mr. McDonald), who introduced the deputation.

MR. QUINLAN: Generally, so far as this motion is concerned, I contend that the country is in sympathy with it. We know it has been argued by the Ministry times out of number that they represent population. [MINISTERIAL MEMBERS: Hear, hear.] The population has not increased to such an extent on the gold-fields that other parts of the State are not to be considered; and although various constituencies represented by certain members may not have much population, nevertheless they have the interests which, as I said before, provide the revenue of the State.

MR. RESIDE: What are the interests?

MR. HASTIE: What interests?

MR. QUINLAN: It has been frequently urged in the course of this debate that we on this (Opposition) side are the remnants of the old Forrest Ministry.

THE PREMIER: Old Forrest party.

MINISTERIAL MEMBERS: Party.

MR. QUINLAN: I contend we are nothing of the kind. There are on this side of the House two hon. members who have been in the Forrest Ministry for a term; but we here, generally, are a new party, newly elected. [Ministerial laughter.] Although there is nothing to be ashamed of, by any means, in being connected with the old Forrest party—indeed, it is rather something to be proud of, in view of the long years of service of that party, and the ordeal it went through, seeing the opportunity which the present Premier has had for making disclosures without being able to make any—I contend, nevertheless, we are not here as remnants of the old Forrest Ministry, but as the chosen representatives of the people. As regards the threat of a dissolution, let the Premier, if he can, get a dissolution, and let him find what will

be the result in regard to the return of members.

MR. GEORGE : He would not get back himself !

MR. QUINLAN : Would he not find the election disastrous in his own particular case ? [OPPOSITION MEMBERS : Hear, hear.] The poser for eight-hours ! The labouring man's friend ! I appeal to anyone who knows the hon. member as I have known him, all my lifetime, to say whether the Premier ever had any sympathy with or any leaning towards labour in his whole life. It is impossible to maintain it : he has never had any leaning whatever towards the workers. He has been provided for all his life ; and here he is now, supported by the so-called Labour party.

MR. RESIDE : So-called ? [Laughter.]

MR. QUINLAN : My friends on that (Labour) bench laugh.

MR. TAYLOR : I should think so.

MR. QUINLAN : Let me ask them, do they consider the member for Plan-tagetnet (Mr. Russell) a Labour member, and do they consider the member for Subiaco (Mr. Daglish) a Labour member ?

MR. DAGLISH : Certainly !

MR. GEORGE : Certainly not !

MR. RESIDE : Most decidedly we do. The member for Subiaco says so himself.

[Several interjections.]

MR. QUINLAN : If the hon. members on that (Labour) bench were so fond of Labour, they would not be here to-night. [Laughter.]

LABOUR MEMBER : That is the hardest knock we have had yet.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER : Labour is fond of them, you know.

MR. QUINLAN : I say emphatically, we here are not the remnants of any party ; or, if I may so express it, I will say we are one whole piece (looking towards Mr. Piesse).

MR. J. GARDINER (Albany) : Before I start with the serious business of speaking on the important motion now before the House, I should just like to refer to the beautifully delivered attack of the hon. member for Toodyay (Mr. Quinlan). The matters referred to in that attack were introduced in a very nice manner indeed to the notice of the House by the hon. member. First of all, he referred to an estate called the Mount Lawley Estate, for which, in my business capacity, I am

agent. I believe the North Perth Roads Board and the proprietors of the Mount Lawley Estate protested against inclusion in the North Perth municipality from the beginning to the end of the transaction. The inference to be drawn from the hon. member's remark is that because I sit behind the Government, £1,000 has been put on the Estimates for Melville Park.

MR. QUINLAN : True ! Quite true !

MR. GARDINER : My friend the member for South Perth (Mr. Gordon), my friend the member for Cockburn Sound (Mr. McDonald), the chairman of the East Fremantle Roads Board, the chairman of the Melville Park Roads Board, the mayor of Victoria Park, the president and a member of the Canning Roads Board, certainly formed part of the deputation which waited on the Minister for Works in connection with the matter. The member for South Perth was present and expressed himself as in favour of the construction of that particular road, provided that the revenue of the South Perth municipality were not depleted in order to build the road. I believe I am perfectly right in that assertion, and I think the member for South Perth will bear me out in it. I am sorry the member for Cockburn Sound is not here, because it was at his suggestion that I formed a member of that deputation, representing the Melville Park Roads Board. I live at Melville Park, and have been intimately associated with bringing the Melville Park Roads Board into existence. That is the explanation of the transaction. A thousand pounds was put on the Estimates for that reason—to continue the Fremantle road so that it should join the other road which branches out from Victoria Park, thus making a complete circle of the road from Victoria Park into Fremantle, and providing practically two roads from Fremantle to Perth. That is the explanation. Having disposed of the serious charge levelled against me, and feeling myself lightened—as I am sure the member for Toodyay (Mr. Quinlan) must have felt lightened when he had delivered himself of it—I shall endeavour to get on with the serious business of the country. And I say, in common with every other member of the House, that I welcome this want of confidence motion. [MR. TAYLOR : Hear, hear.] The posi-

tion of those of us who have sat behind the Government has been discreditable from a constitutional standpoint. [MR. QUINLAN: Hear, hear.] We are accused by the member for Toodyay, or rather the Ministry are accused, of sitting here because they want to keep their salaries of a thousand pounds a year. Another Opposition member, however, has accused Ministers of continually taunting hon. members opposite by asking to be turned out. What consistency is there in the attacks of the Opposition? I was much amused by the speech of the member for Northam (Hon. G. Throssell). The member for Northam is a man whom we all respect, whom we all love. We love him so much that we allow him to believe that he is constantly fooling us. He might, however, remember Lincoln's adage, "You can fool some of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time." Possibly the message which the member for Northam left on his desk when he gave up office may be within the recollection of hon. members. He left this message for the present Premier to read: "To thine own self be true." The hon. gentleman took every possible precaution that all the pressmen should see that magnificent sentiment. Then, in order to show that he was quite capable of practising what he preached, he instantly sat down and wrote to the railway employees, "You have proved your case up to the hilt." That sentiment, however, was not for the pressmen: it was for his successors. Next, what do we find? We find this gentleman who leaves such magnificent phrases behind for the edification of his successors, going about with the resignation of Sir Alexander Onslow in his pocket, and yet refusing to appoint Mr. Pennefather to the position of Judge. [MINISTERIAL MEMBERS: Hear, hear.] Not only that, but the hon. member—the country may just as well know this, and certain members of this House may just as well know it—the day after the receipt of a telegram notifying to the people of this State that several gentlemen who were lately Ministers of the Crown here had been allowed to retain the title of "honourable," button-holed me and said, "Look: here are several members of the old Government, who have served this country, allowed to retain the title of

'honourable,' and Pennefather is not amongst them. Now, I did not think that of George Leake: I did not, indeed. I did not think he would be so mean as this. It gives some colour to the things that were said in the House the other night, about his letting his little personal feelings interfere in regard to the appointment of Mr. Pennefather." I felt a little indignant at this. I will say this for the Premier. I know his faults possibly just as well as most men know them; but I do not think littleness is one of them. On meeting the Premier I said to him, "Look: I do not like what Mr. Throssell has been telling me about your omitting to recommend Mr. Pennefather for the retention of the title of 'honourable.'" The Premier said, "Why, what nonsense are you talking? Come along and look through the file." I went and looked at the file, and I discovered that this man who left behind him the message, "To thine own self be true," did what? Almost the last thing he did before quitting office was to recommend the appointment of Mr. Lefroy and Mr. Randell, and to leave Mr. Pennefather out. As soon as the Premier entered, what did he do? He recommended that Mr. Throssell should be allowed to retain the title of "honourable." On another reference to the file he found Mr. Pennefather had not been recommended, and like the man he is he instantly wired or wrote, some time in July—that was before ever this discussion took place—recommending Mr. Pennefather, as all the rest of the members of the Ministry had been appointed. That is the gentleman (Hon. G. Throssell) who stands up in his place to-night and accuses the Premier of passing Mr. Pennefather.

MR. GEORGE: What was the appointment of Mr. Randell for?

MR. GARDINER: I am only speaking of what was brought directly under my notice by Mr. Throssell himself. I had every right to feel indignant with the member for Northam when I ascertained what were the facts. It must appear to this country that we are certainly not worthy of the trust of the country. It is said that Nero committed a crime when he fiddled while Rome was burning; and I say unhesitatingly that such crime, if it were a crime, sinks into insignificance beside the action of this Parliament, if

we are willing to permit private ambition or personal pique to outweigh the desire that there is in this country for wise and just measures, good administration, and a thorough purging and clearing of the civil service of the State. We know we have a country second to none in the world, and all that it is crying out for is wise and just administration; more for administration than anything else, for we are told:

For forms of Government let fools contest :
Whate'er is best administered is best.

I feel sure this country will honestly indorse that desire on the part of those of us who want to see good and just administration. We have a session partly wasted; we have devoted a large amount of time here to the consideration of abstract questions, and probably in no Assembly have abstract questions been more frequently debated than in this House during the present session. But that has gone past to a certain degree, and we are now down to the standard of wanting to do business. Members of this House, some of them, have been earnest to do business ever since they came here; other members have not been so earnest in that desire; but whether we are for or against the doing of business, what is facing us now is this, that now we are down to business, now we have the Estimates to consider, now we have the Conciliation and Arbitration Bill in Committee, now we have the Public Service Bill in Committee, and other and lesser measures of importance in an advanced stage, we are practically asked to throw the whole of the result of this session into the waste-paper basket, in order to gratify the ambitions of the Opposition side of the House. What else have we to do? We, the legislators, are practically to go to the country and say we are unfit to carry on the business of the country, and consequently another party in exactly the same circumstances will be trying to carry on what we have been unable to do. And why? If there were the slightest tinge of patriotism in this House, I venture to say the House would be a huge committee trying with its intelligence—I believe we all possess some degree of intelligence—to do its level best not to block the business of the country, but to assist in giving to the country wise, just, and good measures.

That is as much the province of His Majesty's Opposition as of His Majesty's Government; and every man who fails in that is a traitor to his country every time. We are asked to throw these measures practically under the table, in order that ambitions may be gratified; in order that a mere force of circumstances, nothing more and nothing less, should be allowed to alter the destiny either of the Ministry or the country. I ask the sensible men of the Opposition whether these are reasons that they feel would justify us in going to the country, for changing this Government? You have just as much right to answer the country as we have in that particular respect. We have been taunted with trying the long-suffering patience of the Opposition. Just let us analyse this particular statement and put it under the magnifying glass of fact, if you like. Take *Hansard*, and look up the abstract motions that have been proposed in this House, and you can easily ascertain where the opposition to the Government carrying on the business of the country has come from. In the first instance, we had the Address-in-reply occupying some six days, then we had the railway strike, then we had the Royal Visit, and all these count for a certain amount of wasted time. Then we come to the abstract motions. Probably some members remember that the first abstract motion we had was on the question of Parliamentary trips, which was introduced by the member for the Murchison (Mr. Nanson). You all remember the eloquence, you all remember the taunts thrown out by the member for the Murchison against the iniquity of Parliamentary trips, and if you peruse the daily papers you may also find that on these Parliamentary trips ever since, the name of Mr. J. L. Nanson is really absent. Then we had the Newspaper Libel and Registration Bill introduced here and discussed with much warmth and much innuendo. We have also had an inquiry into the treatment of the aborigines, introduced by the member for Roebourne (Dr. Hicks)—a perfectly legitimate introduction of a motion of very great interest indeed in this country; and there was every justification for it. Then we have the Police Amendment Bill, introduced by the member for York (Mr. Monger). Then we

have the Collie Coalfields railway to construct, introduced by the member for the South-West Mining district (Mr. Ewing). Then we have a motion introduced by the member for Tooday (Mr. Quinlan) regarding the proceeds of land sales, on which there was another very necessary discussion. Then we have the appointment of the Judges introduced with a fair amount of warmth by my hon. friend who is absent, the member for North Fremantle (Mr. Doherty). Then we have the motion to inquire into the duties on cattle or something like that, on which a select committee was afterwards elected. Then we have advertising in the *Sunday Times*, brought forward by Mr. Monger; then we have the blackmailing of a Judge, introduced by the member for the Murray (Mr. George). Then we have the discussion of the Federal Tariff, introduced by my hon. friend the member for Coolgardie (Mr. Morgans)—a discussion that was prolonged to a great extent by my friend the member for the Murchison (Mr. Nanson). Then, in addition to that, if that be not sufficient apology to the country for this Government not being allowed to proceed with the business of the country, I may mention that the member for the Murray occupies, I think, a 23rd portion of the whole of the *Hansard* of this country, embodying the proceedings of both Houses. We have heard the member for the Murray, and every man who hears him gives him credit for a certain amount of sound solid sense. Outside this House he is recognised as a shrewd business man. Before I came here a man said, "He is inside a different man from what he is outside the House." We have heard him talk on every subject. I have never heard a subject on which he has not spoken, and he generally speaks 15 or 20 minutes: the first 14 or 15 minutes may be applied to the Tires Act, the Police Amendment Bill, or the Conciliation measure, and in the last two minutes he generally gives a certain amount of sense, but by that time the House has become wearied of him. We on this side have protested in every way possible against waste of time by the member for the Murray; we have interjected; we have got up, and we have been absolutely rude enough to him and to you, sir,

when he has got up in his chair, to go out of this House in a body.

MR. JACOBY: A very small body.

MR. GARDINER: I was very amused to notice the hush which was introduced so happily the other night by the Opposition. It was a great pity that they did not introduce the policy of hush so far as the member for the Murray is concerned.

MR. GEORGE: Perhaps the policy of "hush money" may be more convenient for you.

MR. GARDINER: I think that is rather an imputation.

THE SPEAKER: I did not hear what the hon. member said.

MR. GARDINER: Very well, sir.

MR. GEORGE: I will repeat it if you wish me. I said that perhaps the principle of "hush money" may be more convenient for the hon. member. I do not know if it is out of order: if it be, I withdraw.

MR. GARDINER: The interjection of the member for the Murray carries as much sense to the country as very frequently his speeches do. We will let it go at that. It is a policy of hush, that is the mainspring of this motion against the Government; a policy of hush. They say, "No; we do not want the people to know how the government of this country has hitherto been carried on." That is the position, and they want to turn this Government out at a very critical time, so that this policy of hush may be more effectually carried out. We have a right to ask ourselves what the country has to gain by the change. I take the Ministry, and I will let any member of the House take the Ministry, and I say they are fairly representative of the intelligence of the House. I think the Ministry fairly representative of the ability of the House, and I certainly say they are fairly representative of the honesty of the House. [Laughter on Opposition benches.] I admit I should have qualified that only by comparison with the transcendent ability in that particular possessed by the Opposition. The present Ministry are to be replaced by what? First of all they are to be replaced by a Ministry composed I expect of the ability of that side of the House. We have been told that it is of a very much higher standard than what

we have here. We will accept that on trust, but probably we will try it, and will just see whether that is sufficient. The speculative ability of that side of the House is sufficient to justify this House in the eyes of the country in turning out this Ministry? We have the leader of the Opposition (Hon. F. H. Piesse). Other members have deplored the introduction of the personal element into this debate, and have apparently introduced that element. I am not going to do that. I am only going to attack the member for the Williams in his Parliamentary capacity.

MR. CONNOR: What about the general policy?

MR. GARDINER: I beg to remind the hon. member, as I reminded the House a little while ago, of the course I intend taking with regard to the member for East Kimberley (Mr. Connor). When I come up through Katanning, I am proud to think that this State owns citizens like the Piesse Brothers. I have not one word to say of the private character of the member for the Williams; in fact, I respect his energy, and I respect his enterprise. I say he is a marvellously good farmer, and that is paying him a very great compliment; but when it comes to a question of his political ability, I much regret that I cannot give him that praise. I say it is with questionable taste, in view of the decision of the Davies board of inquiry, that the member for the Williams dares to move a vote of want of confidence in the present Government. Whatever that report does for John Davies, there is not the slightest doubt that it casts a grave suspicion on the administration of the member for the Williams in his former capacity as Commissioner of Railways. I said, and so did the member for North Fremantle (Mr. Doherty) when this case of John Davies first cropped up in this House, that so far as the member for the Williams was concerned, he was equally culpable with the General Manager in the maladministration of the railways. We shall see if we can follow him in his defence of the railway management. I have taken the statements of the member for the Williams for the last three years, and have honestly tried to understand what was his railway policy. On one day he told this House we had the best-equipped and best-managed railways in

Australia. On the next day he told the House that he took great credit for having ordered rolling-stock in advance without the authority of Parliament. The next day, he told us that all rolling-stock was being properly repaired. If ever the hon. member can keep his ideas long enough in one position to have them photographed, I should like to have a photograph of them. Then, possibly, I shall be able to understand what he means. There is never any cohesion in his ideas; and I have tried in vain to follow him right away through. And I say, too, that I do not blame the hon. member so strongly as that report blames him. I say the General Manager was to a large extent more culpable than the ex-Commissioner of Railways, behind whom the General Manager shelters himself. But I cannot forget that at this particular time, during the last two years of the management of the member for the Williams, the hon. member was suffering from a form of psychic disease which I believe is vulgarly known as "swelled head;" and the consequence was that whenever the General Manager wanted to carry out any of his ideas to fruition, he merely pressed the vanity button of the member for the Williams, and the figure worked. I venture to say that very materially accounts for the blame now being thrust upon the shoulders of the ex-Commissioner of Railways, which blame properly belonged to the General Manager. [MINISTERIAL MEMBERS: Hear, hear.] Regarding the accusations now before the House, let any reader turn up *Hansard*, and he will find the accusations are just a repetition of what cropped up two or three years ago. It is strange, too, that while we do not meet with the Kurrawang syndicate, we do meet with Millar Bros. and W. N. Hedges with wonderful regularity. We meet them there, and many members—and I think I may include the member for the Murray (Mr. George)—were very particular, and wanted to know why Millar Bros. and W. N. Hedges were at that time getting concessions. But there they are; and the member for the Murray and others will remember that when those charges were brought up, there was a little thing known as the Seabrook Battery. There was an instance where the Seabrook Battery (or water)

Company, whatever it is called, was allowed to get into the debt of the Government to the extent of £3,000 or £4,000 for freight; and what happened? First of all, I should like to know how it is some people can get into debt with the Railway Department, while other people of equal reputation have to pay spot cash.

MR. GEORGE: The man who could explain that is dead.

MR. GARDINER: Well, I do not want to attack a dead man, seeing that I am dealing with the testimony of a living management, or what is supposed to be such testimony. But what happened? When the department found they were in a hole, they said: "These people have some trucks;" and they, the department, sent up their engineer, and he valued those trucks at £40 each: the General Manager and the then Commissioner promptly purchased them at £90.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: They did not.

MR. GARDINER: Well, there is the record in *Hansard*. Look it up and see if that is not so.

MR. GEORGE: You are hardly correct in your facts.

MR. GARDINER: That is what *Hansard* says. Then we come to the Ice Company frauds. Does any hon. member say there was not justification, after the revelation of those ice frauds, for some very stringent measures being taken with regard to the management of the railways? [LABOUR MEMBER: Of course there was.] Would any member of this House—and there are some of them with big interests—have stood in his private business such a revelation without calling somebody to account? Why, I say if nothing else justified the suspension of the General Manager, it was undoubtedly justified by these ice frauds.

MR. JACOBY: You did not make that charge against him.

MR. GARDINER: I am not saying what the Government should have done; and I am not speaking with the bias of an advocate.

MR. MOORHEAD: It looks very like it.

MR. GARDINER: No. I am speaking as I have every justification for speaking, as a member desirous of

criticising the actions of the present Government in their suspension of the General Manager. Then we take the railway administration as a whole. We have been told by the ex-Commissioner that by the action of the present Commissioner in suspending one important officer, the whole of the working of the railways has become disorganised. In my speech on the Address-in-reply, I pointed out that at one time there were absent from the State the General Manager, the Chief Traffic Manager, the Engineer for Existing Lines, and two other important officers. The whole of these men were out of the State at once. Now I say, would any man in this House having a turnover of one and a quarter millions, permit everyone in the managerial department of his business to be out of the State at once? The fact in itself brings into the minds of hon. members this thought: "Well, if all those officers could be out of the State at once and the railways still go on, why should we not get rid of some of them?" [LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear.] Again I would put it to the House: we can clearly show that so far as the leader of the Opposition is concerned, we can gain nothing in administration by making him the head of the Government; and now let us see if we can gain anything in legislation. And first of all, we know that the tendency of Australia especially is towards democracy. Now let us ask, what chance has this country of democratic rule under the member for the Williams? [THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Buckley's.] Is there any? Some members, notably the member for the Swan (Mr. Jacoby), are adherents of the member for the Williams because the latter is a democrat. The member for the Swan—in a speech to which he has frequently referred members of this House, a speech, I say, that has in it the elements of a statesman, a speech that is no discredit to the member for the Swan—says this:—

To make the country an up-to-date, democratic one, it would be necessary to institute the principle of one-man-one-vote; and he hoped within the next twelve months to see such a provision on the statute book of Western Australia.

MR. JACOBY: It will be there, too.

MR. HOPKINS: Hold on a bit.

MR. GARDINER: This is his apology for the democratic view of one-man-one-vote:—

Under existing circumstances, if a man had an acre of ground in 50 different electorates, he would be entitled to 50 votes; and yet the man who had 500 acres in one electorate had only one vote.

Remarkable, is it not? Here is what the hon. member finally says:—

He felt strongly on the question of alien labour, because he held that white labour could do all the work that was required in Australia. It was necessary for a candidate to look around and judge who would make the best Premier for the next Parliament. He would wait until Mr. Piesse had announced his platform at Katanning; and if his platform was sufficiently democratic, he would support him.

Now I will give the House an idea of the democratic member for the Williams. Here is one month's record:—

MR. JACOBY: Not a bad prophecy, was it?

MR. GARDINER: Here is one month's record of the votes of the democratic member for the Williams. He was against the abolition of plural voting: the member for the Swan was in favour of it. He was against the appointment of working men as justices of the peace; he was in favour of the amending Bill for the restriction of immigration—practically a Bill in favour of the importation of coloured labour; he was also in favour of coloured labour. That is the leader whom the member for the Swan selects as being a leader of democracy.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: Can you prove these statements?

MR. GARDINER: If you turn up *Hansard*, you will find them there.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: Turn them up.

MR. GARDINER: I will give you the pages of the volume of *Hansard*. Next we come to the West Australian Government Railways Association, and the Conciliation and Arbitration Bill as it affects the railway service. Now that is a very nice political cry; for political reasons, it is all very well to use it; but what was the feeling of the House at the time of the late strike. Were there not two predominant feelings in this House: one, that it was necessary to have peace on these railways —

MR. JACOBY: You want Piesse on the railways.

MINISTERIAL MEMBERS: No, no!

MR. GARDINER: And was it not another of the undercurrents in the House, to say the W.A.G.R. Association were not to be allowed to rule the Government? Was it not? Let members who recorded their votes on that question be honest to themselves, and say that I am speaking what is exactly true.

MR. JACOBY: We voted against the strike; not against the Railway Association.

MR. GARDINER: I am saying what was the undercurrent. The member for East Perth (Hon. W. H. James) has been assailed because of the action he has taken with regard to the Conciliation and Arbitration Bill. I say from what I know of the workers of this State, they would rather accept injustice from the member for East Perth than expect justice from the member for the Williams. [OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Oh, oh!] But why have not hon. members the courage of the opinions they then expressed? I say the member for the Williams can never be taken as an authority on the feeling of the W.A.G.R. Association, seeing that he went out of power because he would not recognise them. Now he accuses the Government side of the House on this very point, and poses as an authority on the wishes of the association.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: I have always been fair.

MR. GARDINER: I hope that I have been fair, and I shall read this to show that I have been fair.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: If I make a promise I fulfil it. If I promise justice, I fulfil that.

MR. GARDINER: You are too good for this world, evidently; you are too good to lead a Government. In order to show that he is not the authority on this question that he poses to be, let us see what the secretary *pro tem.* of the Boilermakers' Association says. This letter was published in the *West Australian* or the *Morning Herald* of October 31st:—

Seeing a classification in your paper emanating from the W.A.G.R. Association, in which boilermakers are included, I am directed by the executive of that society to inform you that we are not represented in that body, and

that none of our members belong to it. Consequently, we deny their ability to classify us, or, if having the ability, we deny their right to interfere in matters affecting our members and our trade. In conclusion, I may state that our members are unanimously of opinion that they will be able to manage any matters that affect their trade and interests without the intervention of any outside body. Thanking you in anticipation for the insertion of the above—Yours, etc., G. LUNT, secretary *pro tem*.

Fremantle, October 17.

That simply means that there are a lot of members who want to belong, not to the W.A.G.R. Association, but to the Boiler-makers' Association.

MR. GEORGE: This Bill does not do this.

MR. GARDINER: I beg the hon. member's pardon. We now have two associations: the Engine-drivers' Association, which was registered and saved the country from a very great calamity, and according to what I stated here equal fairness should be given to these people's contention. They want to remain a separate society. Therefore, what is there in this political red-herring which is being drawn across the Conciliation and Arbitration Bill? I went down and consulted the members of the Railway Association: I got 60 of them together. I did not hesitate to read to them the amendment I proposed to introduce into the Bill. I told them if there was a man amongst them who broke the law he would be liable to imprisonment for 12 months. I told them this to their faces. You know the amendment which is standing in my name to Clause 108: it is as follows:—

Provided that any union of railway servants, in the event of a dispute with the Commissioner, failing to avail itself of the Arbitration Court to settle such dispute, it shall be unlawful for any railway employee, either directly or indirectly, to do or advise the doing of anything of the nature of a strike, or lockout, or of a suspension, or discontinuance of employment or work.

- (a.) No person shall urge, assist, or advise, or incite any railway employee affected to do any act, manner, or thing forbidden by the last preceding clause. Any person so doing shall be guilty of an offence against this Act, and shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding £100 or 12 months' imprisonment with hard labour.

I had the courage of my opinion on this. I do not think that these people for a

moment appreciate this eleventh-hour sympathy from the member for the Williams, so far as his conduct in regard to the association is concerned. Let us see if we cannot face this railway question. Here is the position of the railways. The cost of working is increasing abnormally; everybody will admit that. If we take into consideration the different systems of the States we find ourselves now rapidly overhauling, in the cost of working, that of Tasmania. Tasmania previously was the highest; now we are making Western Australia the highest, and we find as the result, according to the Colonial Treasurer, last year, after providing for sinking fund and interest, there was an absolute loss of £1,593 on the working of the railways for the year. The Loan Bill provides for an extra expenditure of something like £95,000 on the railways, much of which will not be productive, and the hon. member for North Fremantle (Mr. Doherty) in my estimation made the speech of the House when dealing with the railway question, and clearly showed that as soon we begin to add this on to the already large cost of our railways, instead of having a profit every year we shall have a very large loss indeed. We have also to consider that unless we are very careful, this the greatest earning power of this State will return us a very great loss. We, for some five or six years, are supposed to have made a nominal profit of £678,000 on the working of the railways; but that has been made at the expense of our rolling stock, and now to-day we find we have to replace the rolling stock; consequently we never had a profit. That profit was a fictitious one, and very careful management would have made provision for the reinstatement of the rolling-stock, keeping it in thorough repair. It must be forced on the House that we must give up the control of the railways so far as Parliament is concerned. They must be removed entirely from political influence. The railways are too large an asset for us to have messed about by Ministers, who may be wise and just. (Opposition laughter.) I am not wishing to make the slightest accusation against the member for East Fremantle. We are only trying to reform the bad management of a previous Commissioner: do

not make any mistake about that. There is very grave cause for the House to tackle this difficulty and see that we have appointed a commissioner—never mind what we pay him: I do not care if we pay him £1,000, £2,000, or £5,000 a year so long as we get a good man. We cannot afford to have the railway question a bone of contention between parties in the House. There is too much depending on the railways in this country for them to be made a mere political machine. Therefore get the best possible man we can, and give him a fair show; put him outside the influence and control of Parliament; pay him well, see that he does his work well; and if we have a really good commissioner, there will be no loss of 8,500 sleepers on one account, there will be no Seabrook battery business, no Ice Company frauds or 40-mile shunts, there will be no zone system or Kurrawang water system, and consequently we should expect management instead of mismanagement. We should then expect that this great asset of the State would be managed in every possible way for the benefit of the State and in order that it may be used to its fullest benefit for the people. And now, what is going to be the result of this motion, if carried against us? Well, I presume the leader of the Government will have to recommend who will be his successor. Of course when one does this, one puts himself in the position of His Excellency the Governor, and says: "Send for Mr. Piessé." I think I have just got a paper called the Davies Inquiry Board, here sent to me; the ink is hardly dry on it; that document says when this gentleman was previously Minister of the Crown, he did not discharge his trust as an independent board thought he should have done. Consequently, if I were the Governor, or any other man was Governor, one would suggest: "Well, is that the standard of the legislators of this country? Are they prepared to ask me to appoint a man who this report says was disloyal to his trust? Ask me to appoint that man a leader of the Government of this country, giving to him every possible power, giving the destinies of the country into his hands?" I think if I were the Governor, I would say: "No. Let us send for the member for Coolgardie, and then the House will

be represented on this side, carrying with it the support of the people of the country." We can just imagine, if there was a change, we should see the present Opposition in the same difficulty the Government are in to-day. There are bound to be ten applicants for the five portfolios; therefore, the five disappointed men will then be seated with us as independents. Is there anything in this motion to 'justify the political turmoil, to justify the stoppage of the measures before the House, to justify going to the country, to justify anything? Take the lowest, or the highest, possible ground: has there been anything in the conduct of this Ministry, so far as honest intentions are concerned, to justify that side of the House sending us out? I appeal to members whom I know to be thoughtful members, I appeal to members who promised us a fair show; if they are men of their word they have a right to give us every show. You gave another Government a ten-years show, and you expect this Government, hampered as it has been with a minority, hampered by the fact that on the other side the numerical numbers are against us, and hampered by the cramped ideas and animosities of a number of members. You have tried in every possible way to block the business of the country. You have not given us that manly support you promised us. I am saying what is true, and I am saying it right up to you. You have not given to us that support; and when you do, you have the right to say this Ministry does not enjoy the confidence of either the country or the House.

MR. J. EWING (South-Western Mining District): I regret very much I cannot congratulate the hon. member (Mr. Gardiner) on his speech. I must congratulate him on the excellent manner in which he delivered his speech, but I cannot congratulate him on his remarks and the manner in which he referred to His Excellency the Governor and the prerogative which is placed in the Governor's hands. I think this House governs the country, and the vote taken in the House, whenever it comes, will decide whether or not the Government retain the confidence of the House. Then the constitutional law will decide the Governor as to whether he will grant a

dissolution or not, or whether the leader of the Opposition will be sent for. I disclaim the remarks of the member for Albany, who was very bitter in his references to the member for the Williams. As the first member sitting on the Opposition cross-benches who has risen to speak, I say emphatically that I do not regret to-night the position I occupy; I am fully satisfied with it; and if a dissolution be granted, I shall be very pleased if a member on the Government side will contest my constituency, to prove that I have not forfeited the confidence of the people I represent. I can assure hon. members that I do not desire to remain a member of the House if I am to represent constituents who have no confidence in me. [THE PREMIER: Oh!] If it be said that by my actions I have betrayed their confidence, I shall be delighted if the Premier, should he get a dissolution, will send a Government candidate to test the question with me in my electorate. [THE PREMIER: Oh!] In the early part of the session I, in common with a great number of members of this (Opposition) side of the House, was subjected to violent attacks from hon. members on the other (Government) side, and more especially from the member for East Perth (Hon. W. H. James), who is not here now. In the course of the attacks those who thought fit to criticise our actions went so far as to say that we had violated our election pledges, our pledges on the hustings. [THE PREMIER: Hear, hear.] The Premier says "hear, hear"; but I have risen here to-night to say deliberately that I have not violated my pledges; and I challenge the Premier, when the next election comes along, to send a man to contest my constituency with me. I challenge the member for Albany (Mr. Gardiner) to contest it with me.

MR. TAYLOR: We will send a Labour candidate.

MR. EWING: As for that, I have beaten the Labour candidate before, and I will beat him again. [OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear.] If members on that (Labour) bench say they represent the working-man, and that they alone represent him, I say that before I sit down to-night I will prove they do not represent the working-man. Standing here, I say deliberately that I represent

the working men of as democratic a constituency as is represented by any member of the House. The political Labour party may come down and prove to my electors that I have violated my pledges, and then they can turn me out of my seat; but not before.

MR. TAYLOR: *Hansard* will prove it.

MR. RESIDE: You have proved it yourself.

MR. EWING: I hope hon. members on the Labour bench will interject as much as possible, because it does me a lot of good.

MR. TAYLOR: I know you like it.

MR. EWING: It is said that he who excuses himself, accuses himself; and when hon. members on the other side of the House chose to accuse me of violating my pledges, I did not endeavour on those occasions to excuse myself. I do not intend to do so to-night, because I am perfectly satisfied to take the responsibility of my actions. [OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear.] I maintain, notwithstanding the remarks of the member for Albany (Mr. Gardiner), that the present Government have received fair and reasonable treatment at the hands of the Opposition. [Interjections and laughter.] I maintain that there has been no undue interference on the part of this (Opposition) side of the House, so far as the passing of legislation is concerned. I maintain that no advantage has been taken of our apparent numerical strength to harass or impede the Government in any way whatever. I say, farther, that our sincerity in this respect is shown—and I speak now more especially of those who sit beside me on the cross-benches—

MR. TAYLOR: Are you the leader?

MR. EWING: I am not the leader.

MR. TAYLOR: No; we know you are not.

MR. EWING: I say our sincerity is evidenced by the fact that when Parliament met, the members sitting in direct Opposition with those on the cross Opposition benches formed a majority of the House, for whom it was quite possible and quite competent to turn the Government out of power immediately. But I, with others—I think with the whole of the members of the direct Opposition, and those on the Opposition cross-benches—decided that

the Government should have a fair and reasonable chance; and I say we have given them a fair and reasonable chance. In my humble opinion, the Government have neglected their opportunities, have not administered the affairs of the country in a manner which is satisfactory; and that is the reason why I take my stand to-night and say I shall support the motion of no-confidence. I am prepared to give my reasons for voting for the motion tabled by the member for the Williams.

THE PREMIER: Hear, hear.

MR. HASTIE: The Government would not build the Collie railway.

MR. EWING: The hon. member says, "The Government would not build the Collie railway." I can assure the House that in the notes which I propose to use here to-night, I have not a single reference to the Collie railway.

MR. TAYLOR: We do not doubt that. [Interjections and laughter.]

MR. EWING: If any hon. member wants to hear my views on the Collie railway, I am quite willing to give him an hour, or a couple of hours, or even three hours; and I undertake to say at the end of the time he will be with me on this point, that the Collie railway—

MR. TAYLOR: Oh, save that for the elections!

MR. EWING: The matter has been introduced into the debate; it is not of my seeking that I refer to it; but I say now that it matters not one jot what gentlemen may occupy the Treasury bench, it matters not one jot whether the Premier of this State be the member for West Perth or the member for the Williams, that railway has got to be built in the very near future, in spite of them all. [Interjections and laughter.] It is a very anomalous position to see the Government endeavouring to carry on the affairs of the country with apparently only a minority supporting them. [THE PREMIER: Hear, hear.] It has been said that when a motion of this kind was tabled, it would soon be seen that the Government were not in a minority, but had a majority at their back. When the debate is over we shall see whether that prognostication is right or wrong. If it be right, then the business of the country can go forward in an undisturbed manner, and without interruption; and

there will be no harm done. All the cobwebs will have been cleared away, and we shall at least see who are supporters and who are opponents of the present Government. I take it the Ministry must desire that consummation; because they cannot — [THE PREMIER: Hear, hear]—as men with any self-respect, wish to occupy so anomalous a position for any greater period of time. It is a very significant fact, however, and one which appeals to me strongly, which especially appeals to me because I took my seat on these Opposition cross-benches fully prepared to cross over to the Ministerial side of the House and support the Government if I was satisfied with their policy —

MR. JOHNSON: The trouble with you is too much Labour legislation.

MR. EWING: Too much Labour legislation, the member for Kalgoorlie says. I venture to affirm that there is more capacity for Labour legislation in my little finger than in the whole body of the hon. member.

MR. JOHNSON: I would like to see your Labour legislation.

MR. EWING: The result of the session so far has been that Ministers have not been able to induce any member to cross over from the Opposition benches to the Ministerial side of the House. Ministers must give members sitting on these Opposition cross-benches credit for acting in accordance with their convictions, and with a view to what they consider to be the best interests of the State. I say, therefore, that if Ministers have not been able to induce one or two of us to cross to their side of the House, it is because their conduct of affairs has not been in the best interests of the State, in the opinion of myself and of hon. members sitting beside me.

MR. RESIDE: That is it: in the best interests of the State.

MR. EWING: Had the case been otherwise, some of us would have been only too pleased to walk across the floor. We find, on the other hand, that one member, the member for the Murchison (Mr. Nanson), whose ability cannot be disputed, whose sincerity cannot be impugned, and whom the Government delighted to honour, would not remain on the Government side of the House. I say the Government, by their bad

management, by their want of tact, and certainly I can say by their want of ability in the administration of the affairs of the State, forced that hon. member to cross over, he being a democrat.

MR. TAYLOR: He is a democrat?

MR. EWING: I venture to say that the member for the Murchison is a democrat. I venture to say the day is not far distant when he will have proved to the people of the State that he is a democrat, and a very able one at that.

THE PREMIER: And that is why he follows the member for the Williams?

OPPOSITION MEMBER: Yes.

MR. EWING: I am about to deal with that matter now. The statement of the Premier amounts to an assertion that the member for the Williams is not a democrat.

THE PREMIER: That is what I mean.

MR. EWING: It has been suggested from time to time that the member for the Williams is not a democrat; but it is given to all men to repent.

MR. TAYLOR: You will repent yet.

MR. EWING: Why should the right to change his opinions be denied to the member for the Williams?

MINISTERIAL MEMBER: He says he has not changed them.

MR. EWING: I rejoice to think the speech delivered by the member for the Williams the other night was quite as democratic as anything which has come, or is likely to come, from the Government side of the House. I venture to say that if the member for the Williams gets into power, and surrounds himself with the best men he can find on this side of the House, he with them will be prepared to carry through the democratic legislation which is now before the House; and then nothing will stop the passing of that legislation. In all probability members on this side are prepared to go to a greater length in democratic legislation than even the gentlemen occupying the Ministerial benches at the present time.

MR. TAYLOR: Nonsense! Go on.

MR. EWING: I believe it; and if the member for Mt. Margaret (Mr. Taylor) live long enough, he will yet find that it is his duty to himself, and his duty to his constituents as well, to follow the democrats on this (Opposition) side of the House.

MR. HOPKINS: He will have to live a long time, I'm afraid.

MR. EWING: For my part, I maintain—

MR. TAYLOR: Mt. Margaret knows you people too well.

MR. EWING: There is one thing about the member for Mt. Margaret: it is always pleasant to hear him interject, or rather to see him interject, because there is a perpetual smile on his face, and we know "it will be all right" as soon as we get outside the Chamber. For my part, I rejoice that the member for the Williams has tabled this motion, and I hope to be able, before I resume my seat, to give full and sufficient reasons for supporting it.

MR. TAYLOR: I wish you would begin with your reasons.

MR. EWING: I have not started yet. There is one thing I desire to refer to before beginning to give my reasons for supporting the motion, which reasons may or may not commend themselves to my friends on the Labour bench. I think possibly before I finish, my reasons will strike those members as satisfactory. Before proceeding farther with that part of my speech, however, I shall refer to what has been said about the old Forrest party. I notice the Premier nudging the Minister for Works, as I say this. The hon. gentleman evidently thinks he is going to hear something amusing.

THE PREMIER: Not a bad phrase, is it?

MR. EWING: A few members like myself, sitting on the Opposition cross-benches, have been twitted times out of number on the score of our sitting in company with gentlemen who in times past followed Sir John Forrest.

THE PREMIER: Hear, hear; quite right!

MR. EWING: I notice the Premier never looks pleasant when that right hon. gentleman is mentioned. I trust there is no offence in what I am about to say, I hope the Premier will not take offence at it, for anything I say inside the House I say out of regard for my duty as a member of Parliament. Accordingly, I state now that in my opinion the Premier is quite incapable of filling his high and honourable position with the wisdom and dignity which characterised Sir John Forrest's tenure of the office. [OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear.] I mean

that, when I say it: I assure hon. members I never say a thing I do not mean.

THE PREMIER: You see, I am a "traitor and a croaker."

MR. EWING: I do not think you are a traitor; but I do think you are a croaker to a certain extent.

MR. HOPKINS: A croaker do, you say?

MR. EWING: The bold and progressive policy of the Forrest Administration, I maintain, has done much—indeed, I may say all—for the advancement of this great country. I may remark here that the goldfields especially, to which the Premier so frequently refers, would perhaps have fared very badly if the present Administration had been in office at the time of the boom. The Right Hon. Sir John Forrest took time by the forelock. I venture to say—and I believe I cannot be contradicted—that in such works as the Coolgardie Water Scheme—

MR. TAYLOR: Oh, goodness!

MR. EWING: I say, such great works as the Coolgardie Water Scheme.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: That will come out all right!

MR. EWING: I venture to say that the constituents of some of the gentlemen on the Labour bench will be delighted to have the Coolgardie Water Scheme in operation. There is no mistake about its utility. I have been on the goldfields, and I know what want of water means. I now call attention to the fact that the Premier and the Colonial Treasurer were the strongest opponents in this House of the advancement of the railway system, and of the construction of the Coolgardie Water Scheme.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

THE PREMIER: I opposed the Coolgardie Water Scheme, but not the extension of railways: there you are wrong.

MR. EWING: I say the Premier and the Colonial Treasurer were the strongest opponents of the general advancement of the State. I am not conversant with all the earlier debates of this Assembly, not having had time to look them up; but I make this statement advisedly, and it is within the power of the Colonial Treasurer, who is going to reply to me, or not particularly to myself, but to myself and anyone else who speaks—

MR. TAYLOR: We shall want two or three to reply to you.

MR. EWING: It is quite competent for the Colonial Treasurer, when speaking, to deny the statement. I maintain that the Premier and the Colonial Treasurer were against the progress of the State when they sat on the Opposition benches.

THE PREMIER: That's right! Hear, hear.

MR. EWING: I say those two hon. members endeavoured to block the Forrest Administration.

THE PREMIER: Quite right!

MR. EWING: They tried to block the progress of the State. Had the hon. gentleman who occupies the position of Premier at this day been in the position of the Right Hon. Sir John Forrest, in all probability we would be carrying merchandise to the goldfields on the backs of camels to-day.

THE PREMIER: You are quite right. I did oppose the Greenhills railway.

MR. EWING: Possibly. I regret exceedingly that the Premier should bring up such a small matter as the Greenhills railway in this connection. When I think of the great things accomplished by the Right Hon. Sir John Forrest, I say we should be just, and render honour where honour is due.

MR. TAYLOR: The goldfields did not think so, judging by the members they returned.

THE SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. EWING: Those who were loudest in condemnation of the administration of Sir John Forrest's régime are those who, in my opinion, have received the greatest benefit from the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues. They have railways, and post offices, and every facility for the transport of goods that they could expect, and more than they had a right to expect, and more than any other State, in similar circumstances, has given to people in times past. I am satisfied on that point. Therefore I say, be fair; do not be unjust.

MEMBER: What did we give in return?

MR. EWING: It was ever thus. We are all apt to kick down the bridge that carried us over. I regret to see some members are sitting in this House who kick down the bridge by which they walked to salvation. I will simply conclude my reference to this by saying—and I say it advisedly, and I believe I have the country at my back—I believe

that if Sir John Forrest could return to power, not only would the goldfields, but the cities and the coastal districts, would have received him with open arms, and would have put him back if only to save them from the maladministration of the present Ministry. Some of us had not the opportunity of being present when the hon. gentleman (the Premier) delivered his maiden speech as Premier in the Queen's Hall. On that occasion he referred more especially, I think, to the reorganisation of the public service than anything else.

THE PREMIER: Hear, hear; quite right.

MR. EWING: There is no question that this is one of the best planks in his platform; and if he had carried out that reorganisation in a way that would have commended itself to me, he would have found no more loyal supporter than myself to-night. I would remark that if that policy had been carried out in a fair and reasonable manner, he would have had the confidence of this House, and not only would he have had the confidence of this House, but the confidence of the country. I say advisedly that if a board had been appointed immediately upon his accession to office, or within a month or six weeks, the work of reorganisation could have been carried out. I know that a board to reorganise the service in New South Wales was appointed, and that board did its work, and there was no trouble. If the hon. gentlemen had had any idea of administration, they would have appointed an outside body altogether, and they would then have elicited public confidence. That would have given to the railway employees an assurance that in the near future they would have a remedy for all the ills they had been suffering under. I think you can attribute to this negligence the strike that occurred. The Government procrastinated; they waited until the evil time was upon them, they waited until all the trouble came, and then, I regret exceedingly to say, the Commissioner of Railways handled the railways in such a tactless, undignified, and unbusinesslike manner that he brought all the trouble upon the State that was experienced then, and is partially here now.

MR. GARDINER: How did you vote?

MR. EWING: The member for Albany is twitting me as to how I voted; but I

do not regret that vote, and if a vote were taken to-morrow I should vote in the same way. Make no mistake about that; I am not going back upon any vote I have given in this House.

MR. GARDINER: Why did you give them?

MR. EWING: I have my reasons, and shall endeavour to give them. If they are not sufficient to satisfy the member for Albany, then of course I shall be sorry. I was going to say that the Government thought fit to appeal to this House at the time. I was pleased at the manner in which the House loyally supported them and lifted them out of the trouble into which they had got themselves. But my especial reason for referring to the strike, which I regret having to refer to, is to point out what, to my mind, is an absolute breach of faith on the part of the Premier in connection with the reinstatement of certain men. I ask the House to believe that in referring to this matter I am doing so in the best interests of the State, not in regard to party politics, but as a part justification, I may almost say a complete justification, if there be any justification required, for the vote which I shall record on this occasion. For the information of the House—I trust I have not wearied them—and to refresh their memories, I would desire to read the remarks of the Premier on that occasion. He said on that occasion, 10th July, in speaking on this railway strike—and there is no doubt he made a magnificent speech on that occasion, and one which did honour to him:—

But we have given a pledge, and we give it now, that a proper board, representing persons on both sides of the dispute, shall be appointed to determine, without any delay whatever, the question which is at issue; and moreover, we have declared that we will reinstate these men in their original positions without any qualifications whatever, if they will return to work at once, every one of them, and we make no reservation; and I also declare, and I declare it upon my honour, that there shall be no "marked" men on account of the recent dispute. [THE PREMIER: Hear, hear.] Also, while I desire to be fair to the men who have gone out on strike, I must be equally fair to those who have come to the assistance of the State in a moment of emergency, and the men who have been temporarily employed will be offered employment at the same rate of wages, and will not be discharged.

I beg the House to take notice of this. These men were going to be kept on, and there was no question of want of work. The Premier farther said:

We shall, no doubt, require more men to assist in the working of the railways. Up to the present moment so few men have been taken on that we shall not be hampered by their presence; that we can not only replace the strikers in their old positions, but I am also happy to state that we shall be able to continue the men who have come to our assistance.

I hold there can be no misunderstanding of these words. They are very clear and distinct, and I say again they admit of no misunderstanding. It was clearly understood that all the men should be put on. What do we find? The member for Bunbury (Mr. Hayward) called for certain papers in connection with what was the alleged non-reinstatement of certain men in Bunbury. Those papers were laid on the table of the House. I have been able to peruse them, and after perusing them I have come to the conclusion that an injustice has been done to one man, or to seven or eight men, if you want to know. I fully understand that a certain time must elapse before these matters can be brought under the notice of the Premier; and I would not have referred to these matters if they had not been brought under his notice. But for a considerable time—I may say a month or six weeks—they have continually been brought under his notice, and he has failed to do his duty and to be what I consider fair and just between man and man. He had a perfect knowledge of this, and he has decided that these particular men, one particular man at any rate, shall not be reinstated until there is work for him. I mark that point. But to put the matter in a few words I may say this, that a certain man called Hehir, a carpenter working at the Collie, building a cabin, and another man called Tucker, at the time of the strike, when the general secretary called them out, of course loyally obeyed and came out. When the mandate went forth that the men should return to work, this man, in the usual course, applied to his superior officer in Bunbury for his reinstatement, but he was told there was no work for him. He says himself—but I cannot vouch for this—that he was farther told that, if he had not gone on strike, he

would not have been retained. I give that for what it is worth, but he was told deliberately that there was no work for him. What do we find? The reason given was that the work on which he was engaged when the strike started would not last sufficiently long to enable him to return to his work and take part in it. I know that to be an absolute untruth. Of course, I am not charging the Premier with an untruth, or anything of that kind, but the officer who gave him that information told a deliberate untruth, for to my own knowledge, speaking as a responsible member of this House, I know it to be untrue, for it took upwards of three weeks to complete that work after the strike; and only one man was employed upon it. Therefore, why was not that man reinstated and sent back upon the work? There is a clear case. And there are seven or eight men in a similar position. This man is receiving strike pay, and is being kept by the association. I want to know why the Premier did not act in accordance with the promise he gave to this House, and carry out faithfully the high trust placed in him, and when all the facts of the case were before him, see that these men were not subjected to any grievance.

THE PREMIER: You will see it all on the file on the table: have you read that?

MR. EWING: I have said advisedly, in speaking of this matter, that I have read that file.

THE PREMIER: That is all right.

MR. EWING: Furthermore, I have no information or knowledge of those men. I would not know them. They have never approached me in any shape or form; but my conclusion has been arrived at entirely from a study of the files, and my own personal knowledge of the case.

THE PREMIER: I see.

MR. EWING: It is only a personal difference of opinion. Certainly, that is my opinion. I give it to the House for what it is worth, and I say it is right. I say this to the members sitting on the Labour benches, they were sent here to look after labour, to look after the interests of the working man.

MR. TAYLOR: That is right.

MR. EWING: But they have got up to-night and told us they are going to support the Government.

MR. TAYLOR: So we are.

MR. EWING: All right; you will have to answer for it some day at the ballot box.

MR. GARDINER: Your own paper said so.

MR. EWING: True. I told the member for Albany (Mr. Gardiner) that I am prepared to go to the ballot box to-morrow morning. I say it is a clear case of injustice, and it is a case which should not be brought before this House by what they call a "Conservative" member of the House. If I were a Conservative, would I worry about these things? No. I am a true democrat. However, I say this in connection with the matter: I have dealt with the matter in all seriousness and all earnestness, because in my heart I think a great injustice has been done. I think the Premier does not retain confidence, in not fulfilling his pledges. I venture to say that had the member for the Williams (Hon. F. H. Piessé) been Premier, he would to the very letter have carried out the instructions of the House, and have seen that no man suffered a wrong.

MR. HASTIE: Is that democracy?

MR. EWING: That is one reason why I, as a responsible member of this House, answering for my constituents, feel justified in voting against the Government.

MR. HASTIE: Give us some democracy.

THE PREMIER: That is because I would not receive your deputation.

MR. TAYLOR: That is right.

MR. EWING: Well, I have been waiting a long time for that. The point also forms no part of the remarks I have to make. If I chose to attack the Premier on the certainly unstatesmanlike attitude he adopted on that occasion, I might safely do so; but I might then be told I was actuated by interested motives, and was not dealing fairly with the question. Therefore I have let it alone until the Premier himself introduced it, and I may now tell him he never committed a greater blunder in his life than when he refused to receive that deputation. That, however, is not the reason for my opposition to the present Ministry.

THE PREMIER: It has a great deal to do with it.

MR. EWING: No, sir; but I say advisedly that if the Premier can ignore

fully half the people with vested interests in this State, can refuse to receive them and to hear their complaints and wishes, then I say he cannot successfully carry out the high rôle which he attempts.

THE PREMIER: Then you are annoyed.

MR. EWING: Not a bit. You could not annoy me. Regarding Clause 107 of the Conciliation and Arbitration Bill that is still before the House, I should like to make a few remarks. A Bill was introduced which embodies the views of the Government, and it certainly has not my support; and if the Government have introduced this clause with any ulterior motive, which, on the face of it, seems apparent, then it has my distinct opposition. And to say the House have passed the second reading is to say nothing except that the House have affirmed the principle, and have not in any way dealt with the details. We have not pledged ourselves to Clause 107, and to it I am absolutely in opposition. I say the Government have no right arbitrarily to break up the Railway Association into different unions; and they cannot do so without destroying the usefulness of unionism. Of course the member for Kanowna (Mr. Hastie) seems to believe in this policy; at any rate, he is supporting the Government which introduces the Bill.

MR. HASTIE: Which?

MR. EWING: I refer particularly to Clause 107.

MR. HASTIE: Wait till it goes into Committee.

MR. EWING: I was waiting for that interjection. What does it mean? That we have to rectify the mistakes of the Government.

MR. HASTIE: Certainly.

MR. EWING: Do you mean to say the member for East Perth (Hon. W. H. James) will allow the House to cut out of his Bill what is one of its most vital clauses? Certainly not. And the Government have to take the responsibility for introducing legislation of such a character, and the members on the Labour bench are supporting the Government against their own convictions.

MR. TAYLOR: I have entered my protest.

MR. EWING: I have had the honour to introduce a Coal Mines Regulation Bill to this House; and you might just as well say I am prepared to sit here and

allow hon. members to cut that Bill to pieces, and deprive it of its most vital portions, and then be satisfied. Why, if that were attempted, I should stand up and object, and do my level best to keep the Bill in its entirety; therefore, the Government are bound to look after their own Bill, and to uphold their own principles in opposition to the members on the Labour bench.

MR. JOHNSON: What sort of Arbitration Bill would you give us? You would wipe out the association altogether.

MR. EWING: I do not think I can give credit to the member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Johnson) for having any brains at all.

MR. TAYLOR: You have not sufficient brains to judge him.

MR. EWING: I have come to the conclusion that he has none.

MR. TAYLOR: How much have you?

MR. EWING: I have certainly sufficient not to make such silly miserable interjections as the member for Kalgoorlie. I should like to deal as shortly as I can with this great reorganisation of the railway service. It is the only reorganisation which has been attempted by the present Administration. Last night the Premier spoke for three hours; he gave us practically all that has to be said from the Ministerial side of the House. Perhaps he is better fitted than any other member on that side to do so, because he happens to be the head of the Government, and everything centres in him. He told us he could not reorganise the civil service in five months; he could not even attempt it, because there are civil servants who will not allow him to do it. If that be really so, it is a pitiable state of things; and any man in his position with a desire to reorganise the service would have done it in a very short time. I wish to refer to the Commissioner of Railways; he has had a lot of heckling, and I do not desire to heckle him, or to be unnecessarily severe in my strictures. [THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: Thank you.] But I must say what I feel. I have not any doubt that he has, to a certain extent, acted in a manner which he thought was in the best interests of the State; but in my opinion he has acted in a very arbitrary and foolish manner. I would refer for one moment only to the appointment of G. W. Davies. I should

not like to be G. W. Davies. He has been dragged about enough. However, it is my duty to give some of my reasons, and this is one of them; and to my mind it is an all-sufficient reason for registering my vote against the present Administration at the present time. I consider the appointment of G. W. Davies to the service of the State, taking into consideration the full knowledge which I believe the Commissioner of Railways had—

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: You are wrong.

MR. EWING: Well, the Commissioner says he had it not. I am bound to take his denial; but I must say that since certain questions were asked in the House, and since he has had ample opportunity of standing up here and denying what has been said about his knowledge of the facts, he has not done so. Therefore I am bound to believe what has been said. It is very unfair to this country that a discredited civil servant should have been placed in such a high position, in such a position of trust. We find that this particular man not only while in the service did give information to certain people, and it has been said in this House, to the Commissioner of Railways; but to enable him to criticise the actions of the member for the Williams, who was the Commissioner then, he kept in a note-book learned and conned by rote all the matters he could collect to cast in the teeth of the political opponents of the present Government. I say that is an unheard of, a scandalous thing; and I farther venture to say that by such an appointment, which has been condemned by the board of inquiry, the present Commissioner has neither secured the approbation of this House nor the confidence of the country. As regards the suspension of Mr. John Davies the Premier has taken a stand, and seems to think the vote of want-of-confidence is centred round John Davies. That is not my opinion.

THE PREMIER: Then you are wrong.

MR. EWING: I have ample grounds apart from that; and the John Davies suspension does not enter into the question at all. But I say that, as a fair-minded man, I at all times would endeavour to give a "fair deal" to my fellow man. I do not think Mr. John Davies

has been given a fair deal; and for that I condemn the Government. I say advisedly they have not justified the position they took up in suspending Mr. Davies, but they have landed this country in enormous expense, and they must now face the situation by reinstating Mr. John Davies at a very early date, or must pay the piper.

THE PREMIER: Do you mean it?

MR. EWING: I say you cannot prove justification by the report of the board of inquiry. Notwithstanding what the Premier explained to us last night, you cannot prove justification to my mind.

MR. HOPKINS: That would be impossible.

MR. EWING: Therefore I say you have landed the country in a pitiable state.

THE PREMIER: I do not understand what you mean about incurring expense or liability.

MR. EWING: I say, you have not proved a case against Mr. John Davies; and I believe, if he be not reinstated in his right position, you must compensate him.

THE PREMIER: What does that mean?

MR. EWING: What does it mean? I am dealing with the case of Mr. John Davies.

THE PREMIER: That has caught you.

MR. EWING: No; it has not. I tell the Premier decidedly that in my opinion, outside the question of cost, there is no justification for the suspension.

THE PREMIER: I thought you were talking about a legal liability.

MR. EWING: Well, I do not profess to have any legal knowledge, and I sometimes thank God for it. Although I have relatives in the legal profession, I have not been led to think legal practitioners are the best people to control the affairs of the State.

THE PREMIER: There are policemen in the family, I should think.

MR. EWING: I do not think so; but I maintain that this attempt at reorganisation—the only attempt made by the Government—has resulted in an utter disorganisation of the service, and in no good to the country. I am satisfied on that point; and I believe we cannot have any assurance that in time to come, were the present Ministry left in the position they occupy to-night, we should have

more reasonable Government, more orthodox methods, or methods that would commend themselves to right-thinking men. We do not want despots here; we do not want Shah-of-Persia rule in this country. We want every man, every civil servant, to get a fair deal; and that can certainly be done without going on in the very high-handed manner adopted by the Commissioner of Railways. Does not the Commissioner know that his railway service—I know it, if he does not—is the most iniquitous service in the whole State? There are men working 12, 14, and 18 hours a day. Why does he not appoint a board? Does he not know the stations are improperly classed?

THE PREMIER: Then the department is disorganised; it requires reorganisation?

MR. EWING: Certainly.

THE PREMIER: That is right.

MR. EWING: The member for the Williams, who aspires to be Premier of this State, is going to reorganise it if he goes in.

THE PREMIER: He ought to understand it, because he disorganised it.

MR. EWING: That is all right. I shall deal with that presently. But I say, for the information of the Premier, his attack last night on the member for the Williams, and the attacks of every direct Ministerial supporter, have been nothing more to my mind than a deliberate attempt to besmirch the character of an honourable man. I say it is wrong to do so. Go for a man's political character as much as you like; tarnish him politically as far as you can; but do not try to take away a man's fair name. I say as to the maladministration of the railways in the past, that has little to do with me. I say that the ex-Commissioner of Railways (Hon. F. H. Piessé) was not administering one department, but two; and I venture to say that in administering those departments, were the right people consulted, you would find he administered them most admirably.

MR. TAYLOR: Who are the right people?

MR. EWING: There is only one more point I should like to touch on—the Government policy. It is a policy of stagnation; and I maintain that whatever Government be in power in the future—the Leake Government or the

Piesse Government—we must have some progress in this State.

MR. GARDINER: We must not neglect the Collie railway.

MR. EWING: I have already explained to the House, it matters not to me who are in power, that railway will be constructed. But in speaking on the Budget the other night, the member for Coolgardie (Mr. Morgans) tried to get an assurance to the House that there would be in the near future an extension of the railway system on the goldfields. With his sentiment I agree; it will be necessary to carry the railway system in that direction. We find the Colonial Treasurer immediately afterwards getting up and saying that he had no hope.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: Not no hope; no money.

MR. EWING: That means no money. The last loan floated in the London market demonstrated to my mind that there are millions of pounds of London money waiting for any good investment here; therefore the hon. member's remarks do not hold good. I will ask him this question as a responsible Minister and one who has the interests, I hope, of the country at heart—and he must get a larger heart—how are the Government going to develop the country and to work the natural resources unless they build railways and other public works. The Government cannot reduce the indebtedness of the State by one pound except they settle people on the land, and this question must very soon be faced. From the remarks of the Premier and other Ministers I see no gleam of hope, but I do express the wish that we may have men with a greater knowledge of the requirements of the State and with perhaps a little more pluck to fill the Ministerial benches, and who will be prepared to do a little more for the advancement of the State. There is one thing I would like to refer to in the Treasurer's Budget speech: it is a very small matter no doubt to him, but it is a pretty large question to me, representing the constituency which I do. The last Budget speech delivered by the late Premier mentioned the coal and the tin industries: the new Colonial Treasurer spoke about every other industry of the State, but forgot the great industry of coal-mining in the State. It may have

been an oversight, but it is an error the Treasurer should not make. The Treasurer should not forget to tell us what has been done in the past in connection with the coal industry, and he should not forget to tell us what hope there is for it in the future, because a very great deal depends on the future development of the coal industry. The Treasurer may not have remembered it if the omission was not done purposely.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: Not purposely.

MR. EWING: Then the hon. member neglected his duty, and he has failed to recognise what is going to be one of the finest industries of the State.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: I have said the strongest thing about the coal industry that has been said in this House.

MR. EWING: I am glad to hear it. I hope the Treasurer will say much stronger things in the future. It has been said by members that there are no liberal advanced ideas on the Opposition side of the House, and that there is no chance of the legislation before us being carried through. Why?

MR. TAYLOR: Because you block it.

MR. EWING: I say that the hon. member has no right to make an assertion of that kind. If the member for the Williams goes into office to-morrow, I know nothing of his intentions, but I have sufficient confidence in him to believe he will respect the wishes of the House and carry out the legislation before it.

MR. HASTIE: We have not.

MR. EWING: The day will come when the hon. member will learn to respect a man, and not judge him before he has a fair and reasonable trial. I say members are too apt to judge: give a man a fair trial, and see whether he has the ability to carry on the affairs of the State. For my part I am going to give the member for the Williams a fair trial, and if he fails then I will judge him.

MR. TAYLOR: Judge a tree by its fruits.

MR. EWING: As far as the member for the Williams is concerned, he can defend himself against the charges which have been made against him. There is not the slightest question but that he will clear them away, he will brush them aside as cobwebs. If the honourable gentleman assumes the reins of the

State, we shall have a man honest in his intentions as head of the Government.

MR. J. RESIDE (Hannans) : I do not rise to reply to the remarks of the member for the South-West Mining District; I do not intend to waste my time on the hon. member. I have risen to tackle a bigger gun than the hon. member for the South-West Mining District. But I would like to make a few remarks in passing as to the attitude of the member for the South-West Mining District. We know the great object for which he was sent to Parliament. He is a man with a mission, and that mission is the construction of the Collie-goldfields line.

MR. EWING : Be fair.

MR. RESIDE : The member for the South-West Mining District says that the Collie line will be constructed no matter who is in power. It is going to be constructed, and I understand that down in Collie the hon. member said that the Government ought to construct it, but that they had no money. Then the hon. member said if the State could not construct the railway, it should be built by private enterprise, and if private enterprise would not construct it, then he would construct it himself.

MR. EWING : Be fair. I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member has in no way vexed me; he has misrepresented me. In my advocacy of the Collie railway I have never mentioned the construction of the line by private enterprise.

MR. RESIDE : I can get one of the leading men in Collie to prove what I have said is true. The hon. member says he is going to prove that he is a better Labour man than any of us here, but he has not convinced me. Again, the hon. member says he voices the views of the independent members. How can a man be an independent member if he belongs to a party? A man who belongs to a party ceases to be independent at once. But immediately after the hon. member starts to wave the flag and justify the old party. Other members on the Opposition side have ventured to give advice to the Labour members, and have said that the workers should be grateful to the old party for, in the construction of public works on the goldfields. Residents on the Eastern goldfields have nothing to thank

the old party for, in the construction of buildings. The buildings which have been erected have been paid for out of the revenue, and not out of loan moneys.

MR. HOPKINS : They got the revenue from the goldfields.

MR. RESIDE : And they have taken some of the revenue from the goldfields and spent it in other parts, as well as spending all the loan money. Then members accuse the Government in reference to the late strike, and the member for the South-West Mining District considers a great injustice was done : he wants to know why the Labour party did not take the question up. The member for the district whose duty it was to take up the question has taken it up, and I believe he is of a different opinion from the member for the South-West Mining District. In regard to what the hon. member said about the Labour party that they would have to answer at the ballot-box, I may tell the hon. member that as far as the Labour party are concerned they court another election. They know that when another election comes round they will come in with stronger numbers, they will then hold the balance of power, and will not allow the old party to block the progress of legislation. We are not afraid of a general election, we are only too glad to have an opportunity, for we reckon we shall get a few seats down Fremantle way then. Then the hon. member for the South-West Mining District accuses the Government in reference to the details of the Arbitration Bill, and he wants to know why the Bill was not rectified on the second reading. We only deal with principles on the second reading, and this matter which the hon. member referred to was only a detail. The hon. member said that people should be careful of a man's fair name. What have he and other members of the Opposition said of G. W. Davies. Under the cowardly privilege of Parliament they have called that man all sorts of names, they have blackened his character, they have robbed him of his livelihood, and they have said things about him which they are not game to say outside. I will say what I have to say about a man to his face. I do not believe in using Parliamentary privilege in order to blacken a man's character.

Why did the leader of the opposition pay off G. W. Davies if he has such a character as has been described? As far as G. W. Davies is concerned there are a number of members on the opposite side who would use information gleaned from a disloyal servant, just as much as members on the Government side. The board of inquiry said there was something in the man's money transactions with the department, but that other civil servants higher in the service than G. W. Davies had also been guilty of a similar practice. But I rose to reply to the would-be Minister for Mines, the member for Guildford.

MR. RASON: I rise to order. Is the hon. member justified in making that statement?

THE SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member was out of order.

MR. RESIDE: I only supposed that as a new Minister would discuss the question which he would be likely to have to attend to when he got to the Treasury benches, so the hon. member for Guildford has taken up the question of mining in the debate. But the hon. member has been unfortunate in attacking mining development. I, as representative of the chief mining centre in the State, say that Mr. Gregory has instituted reforms, he has done good work, and he has done it satisfactorily. The hon. member (Mr. Rason) condemns the idea that public batteries should be made to pay. I should like to know, does that hon. member believe in the old system, which was no system at all, whereby the public batteries of this State were costing thousands of pounds? The present Minister for Mines has taken the matter in hand, he has reorganised the system, and by careful management has made the public batteries pay. The old system which the hon. member for Guildford thinks is fair would have gone on, and I admit that if the present Minister for Mines had not come to the rescue and carried out reforms, the public batteries would have been a failure in the State, which would have been a sad catastrophe. Without increasing the cost of crushing, the present Minister for Mines has made the public batteries pay. During the first six months of this year there was a loss of £3,000 on the public batteries, but during August they were made to pay expenses, and in September there was

a profit of £270. That was satisfactory.

MEMBER: Were they all at work?

MR. RESIDE: I do not know whether all the batteries were working full time; I am giving a statement of what has been done. There is another matter which the member for Guildford referred to. He condemned the Mining Development Bill. I contend that so far as the Minister for Mines is concerned, this is another attempt to introduce a system where no system has obtained in the past; and I say although the Bill perhaps was not perfect—such a thing as a perfect Bill very seldom comes into the House—it was a good Bill, and might, before it got out of the House, have been licked into a piece of good and useful legislation. The member for Guildford, in condemning the Bill in such scathing terms as he made use of, did not, I think, show that degree of practical experience which we would expect from a man with his aspirations. [Ministerial laughter.] In reference to this matter, I may quote from the leading mining journal of the Commonwealth, which criticised the measure as I shall read now. I may mention that the article approves of the measure generally, and pronounces it better than Tasmanian legislation on similar lines.

MR. RASON: I know where that is got from.

MR. RESIDE: The member for Guildford, I think, said that one of the chief mistakes of the Bill was that it assisted the company rather more than the prospector or the small co-operative party of miners. This article states:—

The assistance the Bill [that is, our Bill] proposes to afford prospectors who, subject to the Government Geologist's report, may obtain advances up to £200, is also a commendable feature, and making all allowance for the differences in mining conditions, it is fully justified by Victoria's experiences under its Mining Development Act. In that State it has been found that, while the advances made in thousands to large companies have in the main proved unfortunate for the State, those made in hundreds to prospecting parties and small co-operative companies have served their purpose most successfully, and have to a very considerable extent been refunded. This has been the conspicuous feature of the Victorian experience. The assistance which the Bill proposes to render for the purpose of encouraging boring operations is another point that will strongly

commend it to the mining community, and as the provisions indicate that it is not to be of a spasmodic, but of a well sustained and comprehensive character, the measure will be the more acceptable. Seeing the extent to which Western Australia must depend for its future prosperity upon its mining development, the proposals submitted to Parliament are in every way to be approved. They stamp Mr. Gregory as a live and energetic Minister for Mines, and they furnish a guarantee that under his régime the industry will receive the attention to which, by its importance, it is fully entitled.

That is an article from the leading mining journal of the Commonwealth; and I say the opinions of that journal may well weigh as against those of the member for Guildford, and may well be taken in contradiction of his opinions.

MR. HIGHAM: What is the name of the journal?

MR. RESIDE: Do you want to see it?

MR. HIGHAM: No; but I want to know the name of it.

MR. RESIDE: Are you particularly interested in it?

MR. HIGHAM: I want to know the name of it.

MR. RESIDE: It is the *Australian Mining Standard and Financial Review*, published in Melbourne. The next matter I desire to refer to is the abolition by the present Minister for Lands of an old system—a system of the old party, which some of you people opposite are so much inclined to skite about—and that is the system of conditional surrender of leases. I draw the attention of the member for Guildford to the circumstance that the old mining officials have given up on conditional surrender valuable blocks of ground. Blocks of ground valued at thousands and thousands of pounds have been given up on conditional surrender. It has been held that these acts are illegal; but perhaps the member for Guildford prefers the old illegal system as against that legal and regular system which we on this side hope to see introduced by the new Administration. As regards these conditional surrenders of leases, I may mention particularly the Scotchman leases—three of them—in the centre of the Kalgoorlie municipality. They were surrendered, and five and a half acres of valuable land was given away. So far as the Land Act is concerned, that gives no power to exchange fee simple except for fee simple, the

Act gives no power to exchange fee simple for lease; consequently those exchanges in the past were illegal, and I certainly consider the present Minister for Mines is to be congratulated on the fact that he is putting a stop to the old illegal system.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: It was abolished by the late Government.

MINISTERS: It was not.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: It was taken in hand by them, then.

THE PREMIER: That's another thing.

MR. RESIDE: There is a farther matter which has been taken in hand by the Minister for Mines, and which I consider deserving of the consideration of the House, and that is the matter of indiscriminate exemptions. We know that in times past it was the man with influence and sometimes backstairs influence, who could get continuous exemption—exemption sometimes running up to as much as two and a half years. We also know of one occasion where a lease was actually protected for a space of seven months—actually protected for that length of time. That was entirely illegal. The present Minister for Mines has taken the matter of indiscriminate exemptions into his particular consideration, and has determined to put a stop to them once for all. Farther, he has decided that if exemption is to be given it shall be given on the merits, and not on the principle of influence, or backstairs influence, which used to obtain in times gone by. So far as the present Administration are concerned, I will mention, moreover, that they are not disposed to discriminate in favour of the wealthy man or the wealthy corporation, as against the poor prospector or the poor miner. This is evidenced by the circumstance that the application of the Merton's Reward Company for exemption, not long ago, was unsuccessful, the company being refused exemption. In his speech on the Mining Development Bill, introduced by the Minister for Mines, the member for Guildford condemned it as not liberal enough to the prospector, the pioneer, and the alluvial miner. The people on the goldfields know too sadly well what the methods of the old Forrest régime in that respect were. That régime sent up armed dragoons to capture the alluvial miners and drag them off to gaol

as common criminals. That was the kind of treatment the alluvial digger and the prospector received from the old Forrest party, of which we have the remnants here now asking for the support of the Labour members. The present Ministry have given evidence of an earnest desire to assist the pioneer, the alluvial digger, and the prospector, who it is only right should be supported. While on this subject I will just ask, what has the member for Guildford accomplished, with all his great experience, gained on the Mining Commission, which cost the country about £5,000? The commission represented some very good outings for a number of people; but was there any practical result from that expenditure of £5,000? The hon. member tells us that the present Government have done nothing for the goldfields. As the member for Kanowna (Mr. Hastie) said last night, one has to go from home to hear news. I will put a pertinent question to the member for Guildford, and will ask him whether, when he represented a mining constituency, South Murchison, he neglected that constituency, or whether he was anxious to look after its interests by visiting it frequently and introducing measures for the advancement of mining generally. He knows too well how he neglected the mining industry of South Murchison.

MR. RASON: Who says so?

MR. RESIDE: Oh, I know.

MR. GEORGE: What do you know?

MR. RESIDE: I know.

MR. GEORGE: You know everything.

MR. RESIDE: So far as the goldfields people are concerned, they clearly support the present Administration.

MR. GEORGE: No.

MR. RESIDE: They do.

MR. GEORGE: No; they do not.

MR. RESIDE: They clearly support the present Administration, as is evidenced by the fact that out of 10 members returned by the Eastern goldfields, only one is to be found on the Opposition side, and he is there as an independent member.

MR. GEORGE: But then you won't be returned at the next election, you know.

MR. RESIDE: Won't we?

MR. GEORGE: No. [Opposition laughter.]

MR. RESIDE: I desire to refer, next, to the trouble which cropped up at Bulong. A claimholder there discovered what I believe to be a lode, and some of the leaseholders wished to grab the whole of the gold-bearing country so discovered. The matter was laid before the Minister for Mines, who decided that the quartz claim must have the preference; that the man with the miner's right must come first and the leaseholder afterwards; that where ground could be worked by small co-operative parties of miners on the miner's right basis, the privilege of working the ground must be granted to holders of miner's rights before the leasing system came into play. I say the Government who will establish the precedent of giving the miner's right a preference over the boddler and the grabber, are entitled to some sympathy from us, who represent not only Labour, but the goldfields as well.

MR. F. CONNOR: What about the general principles of this motion?

MR. RESIDE: I am remarking on the fact that the attack of the member for Guildford was made on the Mines Department; and I am speaking now in the belief that, as a goldfields representative, I have a right to say something in reply. Of course, the Minister can say more when he gets up. So far as the hon. gentleman is concerned, he has taken into consideration many reforms in mining administration, and chiefly in regard to the inspection of mines. Next, I would like to have a say at the member for Claremont (Mr. Sayer). That hon. member last night undertook to give this party some advice. He stated that the present Government were guilty of introducing bad legislation. On being asked what sort of legislation he referred to, he condemned the Industrial and Provident Societies Bill, the aim of which is to legalise co-operative societies. He said the Government should not encourage co-operative societies. That is the liberal sort of man we find on the Opposition side of the House! Such are the people who expect us to follow them and support them! I do not think they have much hope this time.

MR. CONNOR: Later on, perhaps.

MR. RESIDE: So far as the member for Claremont is concerned, we know very well what his actions in the past

have been with respect to domestic legislation; and we also know the attitude taken by the member for the Williams, who, in speaking on the Estimates, said, I think in answer to interjections, that he would take the first opportunity of throwing out the domestic legislation before the House. I say, people who talk like that about labour legislation are not worthy of the support of the Labour party; and the reason why the Labour party are inclined to support the present Government is that the Government have shown some sympathy with our party, and that we look on them accordingly as men of progress and reform. We certainly think that, so far as representation in the House goes, although the Opposition may claim a majority of members, they do not represent a majority of electors. The leader of the Opposition admitted as much in his speech on the Address-in-reply. In the course of his remarks he uttered words to the effect that although the Opposition might represent the lesser number of electors, still—the member for Toodyay (Mr. Quinlan) said the same thing to-night—they represented the interests of the country, the interests of the farmers, and that the interests of the farmers were more important than those of nomadic miners. That is the kind of man the leader of the Opposition is! There is no mistake about the objects of the Opposition members: they want to keep the farming industry in the front rank always. Indeed, one of their chief objections to the present Government is that the Ministry contains too many goldfields representatives. I say the present Administration have attempted to deal fairly by all sections of the community; and that is a kind of treatment we cannot expect from members on the other side of the House. I say we cannot expect the same even-handed treatment from the present occupants of the front Opposition bench.

MR. GEORGE: What is that?

MR. RESIDE: I just remarked that all sections of the community would not receive even-handed justice from the men in your front rank.

MR. GEORGE: That is hardly fair, you know.

MR. RESIDE: Well, so far as the Labour party are concerned, we do not

think so. Has your leader not objected to and opposed every progressive measure in which our party was concerned? Did he not get up here and advocate cheap labour, and the introduction of undesirable immigrants?

HON. F. H. PIESSE: I challenge the hon. member to prove that. I never spoke on the subject in my life. I have never spoken on it. [Several interjections.] I did speak on the second reading of a Bill, which was carried against us, for farther consideration.

MR. RESIDE: What did the leader of the Opposition say on the eight-hours question? He said that if nobody else in the House would get up to protect the interests of the country in that matter, it would be his business to do so; and he farther said that the introduction of the eight-hours system into the railway service would be an injustice to the country.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: No.

MR. RESIDE: You did say so. It is in *Hansard*.

MR. PIESSE: I do not object to that.

MR. RESIDE: So far as the present side of the House is concerned we are not—

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Which is "the present side of the House"?

MR. RESIDE: We represent the country.

MR. GEORGE: Why, man, there would not have been any country if it had not been for the members on this side!

MR. RESIDE: Oh, is that so? At any rate, we have more people behind us. One hon. member has said that he will vote for the motion because the Premier would not receive a certain deputation. I think that hon. member ought to have appreciated the honesty of the Premier, instead of being huffed at the refusal. Then, another member says he will support the motion because the Premier once asked for a pipe of tobacco. [Ministerial laughter.] If I were not a member of the Labour party, and not a goldfields representative, I should still be prepared to vote for the Government on the present occasion—[MR. GEORGE: Oh, no]—simply because I consider that the introduction of the no-confidence motion at the present juncture is not wise. Why did not the Opposition, with their overwhelming numbers, attack the Govern-

ment on the Address-in-reply? If they were not "game" to do it then, why can they not wait until we are in a new session? What is the object of introducing the motion at this stage of the session? The motion, if carried, will have the effect of delaying all the work we have so far done. Indeed, if the motion be carried, the effect will be that all the work of the session so far will practically go for naught.

MR. GEORGE: Oh, no!

MR. RESIDE: I say it will.

MR. GEORGE: Oh, no; it won't!

MR. RESIDE: I defy you to prove the contrary.

MR. CONNOR: It will not be a question of a majority and a minority next time.

MR. RESIDE: I do not wish to speak at any great length on this question, for I suppose it will make no difference if we talk the matter over for a week; because evidently they have made up their minds what to do on the question, and we only hope that the people who have the balance of power on this subject, the independent members, will use their common sense, and vote on the matter from a statesmanlike view of the best interests of the country. If they do that, they will vote against the present motion.

MR. GEORGE: No, they won't.

MR. RESIDE: Yes, they will; and I tell you I shall be quite justified, and I am sure the people I represent will be satisfied, if I support the present Government on this occasion. If I were bound to no party I should do the same. What did the member for the Murray (Mr. George) do with regard to the Workers' Compensation Bill? He stonewalled it. He referred to mothers-in-law, step-daughters and so forth, and tried to deprive a poor little grandchild of its just reward, in compensation. Yet he says he has the interests of the country at heart, and is the friend of labour. Though he does that, he gets up to try to block measures in this House.

MR. GEORGE: I have done more for labour legislation in one month than you have all your life.

MR. RESIDE: Then the member for Claremont says we should wait till some other portion of the Commonwealth leads the way. But I ask, why so far as Western Australia is concerned, with her great possibilities, is she to lag behind in

the race of progress? Why is she to wait for someone else to take action before she does so herself? If Western Australia is the country we suppose her to be, and men are patriotic, they are game enough to take the lead as far as labour legislation and democracy are concerned. It is wrong for the member for Claremont to say we should lag behind in the race. I see no reason at all why the Labour members should support the front Opposition, and I am not going to do it.

MR. W. B. GORDON (South Perth): I bring to my recollection the fact that when I took my seat in this House I was entirely independent, and I retain that independence to this day. I also said I intended in no way to object to the policy of the Government as suggested or promised to the country by the Premier. I have not, according to my own ideas, in any way since I have been in this House blocked any honest, fair, and legitimate legislation. I am sorry the Premier is not here to-night, and also the member for Albany (Mr. Gardiner).

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: I will send for him.

MR. GORDON: Thank you very much. I think what I may tell him may do him good. He is not a very old man yet. The hon. gentleman continually suggested that on this side of the House are the remnants of the old Forrest party. How he can possibly claim that I am a remnant of the old Forrest party, I do not know. I say, too, if I remember rightly, and I have been in the colony for some years, that he is more a remnant of the old Forrest party than I am. I will tell the Labour members something to-night which may perhaps surprise them. I have not had time to look it up, but if I remember rightly, the Premier of to-day contested an election at Roebourne as an Opposition member, and was elected. But in two days he took office as Crown Solicitor, and retired from Parliament. The welfare of the country was at stake; but what did he care about the country as long as there was something to fill his pockets? This man refers to me as one of the remnants of the old Forrest party. There is no disgrace in being a remnant of the old Forrest party if, while being a member of that party, you conducted yourself as a

fair, square, and honest man. Under such circumstances I would have been proud to be a member of that party. I was not a member of that party, but the present Premier was, and I would not be in his place for something. In the Queen's Hall the Premier was not indefinite as regards his policy. He was decided, he was very decided, and one point especially made was in relation to carrying out the promises of the former Government. These were almost his words: "I am not in any way going to interfere with the promises of the former Government. We intend to carry them out, gentlemen; we intend to carry them out." I will show you how he has not carried out all of them, anyhow. There is the sliding scale. The sliding scale is peculiarly adapted to the Premier. He seems to get on it on every possible occasion. Sometimes I think he does not know which way he is sliding, himself. He will slide all right this time, and his direction is very definite—he will slide out of office. He said in the Queen's Hall, "The country have pledged themselves to support the sliding scale."

MEMBER: Not the country.

MR. GORDON: Yes; the country. The country have pledged themselves to support the sliding scale. I say it was held out as a bait to the residents of the coast and to every settler in the country, to induce them to support federation, that the sliding scale would be carried out in its entirety. What do we find now? The Premier absolutely does not care whether the sliding scale is in existence or not; he does not care whether he breaks his word or not; he does not care whether a bare-faced lie is told to the people. He does not care as long as he is in office. This is the gentleman they would follow on the other side of the House. I do not know how to express my contempt—I cannot use any other word for the Premier in regard to his action to-night, when the member for Northam was speaking.

THE PREMIER: What did I say?

MR. GORDON: It was the action you took; not your words. Your actions are worse than your words, at times.

THE PREMIER: Oh!

MR. GORDON: Your actions are, if possible, worse than your words. When the member for Northam was speaking

you knew he could not hear, and how did you attempt to annoy him? He is a man whose shoes you are unworthy to untie, a man who has a reputation, and who has, I maintain, done a lot for the country. You turned your back upon him and you laughed. You did not give him the ordinary courtesy that should be extended to a dog.

THE PREMIER: I was laughing at you.

MR. GORDON: It will be a nice change to laugh. Laugh if you can, because you will not laugh very much longer. I may say that "fools rush in where angels fear to tread."

MR. TAYLOR: That is second-hand.

MR. GORDON: You are acting the giddy goat instead. I am pleased to see the member for Albany in his place, because I intend to throw down the gauntlet to-night. I do not intend to challenge his word, but I ask the House to believe me. In reference to a deputation which waited on the Minister for Works for £1,000 for the Lower Canning road, on the south side of the river, I told Mr. Gardiner when I got his note that it was not possible or feasible for me to support the application or deputation they were making, as I thought the country, being short of funds, could not afford £1,000 for that road without in some way interfering with the moneys that should be allowed to settlers.

MR. GARDINER: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member has been good enough to say he wrote me. I think he is confusing me with Mr. McDonald, the member for Cockburn Sound. I never wrote to the member on the question of the Melville road. I was dragged in by Mr. McDonald, in the corridor.

MR. GORDON: I apologise for having mentioned the member for Albany in this matter. It was really the member for Cockburn Sound; but I maintain that the member for Cockburn Sound was pulling the strings for the member for Albany.

MR. GARDINER: Certainly not.

MR. GORDON: For whom was the member for Albany pulling the strings? We hear of North Perth asking for a municipality, and one of the most valuable blocks of land not built on in this city is absolutely cut out. They grant a municipality to North Perth, and the very land from which the people thought

they had every reasonable chance to derive the rate, is absolutely cut out. This lovely piece of land!—to whom does it belong? It belongs to Mr. Copley.

MEMBER: Who is he?

MR. GORDON: The member for Albany (Mr. Gardiner) is his agent. In relation to this road for which £1,000 is asked, it is a wonder £1,500 was not given. It is very seldom you find a deputation waiting on the Minister for Works for £1,000, and getting £1,000. It is an exception. I maintain it is the only case on record where £1,000 has been asked for and £1,000 given, or where any amount has been asked for and the whole amount given. Of course there are exceptions to every rule. I would like some of the Ministers to tell me where there is another case in which they have granted the full amount asked for. I attended the deputation with regard to this road. I plainly told the Minister for Works the road did not affect my constituency at all. But mark the acuteness of the member for Albany.

MR. GARDINER: I had nothing to do with it.

MR. GORDON: The member for Cockburn Sound. Of course the member for Albany does not live anywhere near where the road is made. Mark the cunningness. They got the chairman of the Canning Roads Board, the chairman, mind you, even of the Belmont Roads Board, the mayor of Victoria Park, and the chairman of the South Perth Roads Board. They thought that was a splendid thing for the member for Cockburn Sound. They thought how good it was for him to ask for £1,000 for the district. It is extraordinary, and it is backed up by the strongest supporters of the Government. It is backed up by their saying, "This is what we want." What for? To cart beer from Victoria Park to Fremantle, in Copley's cart. I will give you some more. I can go on from now till to-morrow. On the face of it, it is absolutely rotten. This £1,000 that was put on that road was robbed by the Government from the Coode Street dredging. On the other side of the river are 500 residents who have to walk two miles to get to one of Copley's boats. Were the Government so flush of money that they wanted to throw £1,000 away on a road that absolutely

only suits the beer cart? "We endeavour to do right"—they endeavour to do right! Why, if they had the brains of a common or garden monkey, they must have known that this £1,000 would have benefited 500 people instead of one beer cart. Those are the facts of the case. Now there is another sequel to this. If, mind you, the Government had spent that £1,000 in dredging that Coode Street jetty, Copley would have had opposition. He might not have had so much land to sell; he would have been selling boats. That is the way in which the funds of the country are scattered. That applies, too, to the member for Albany. He would get £1,000 for his own district—I mean the member for Cockburn Sound. Of course, one hardly expects a lawyer to understand figures; but as a rule, a man who has dealt in land and had other business transactions knows what £1 is worth. Now I maintain that if I have £1, I cannot buy 25s. worth of stuff without being 5s. in debt. I speculate 25s. I spend £1 and owe 5s. But what do we find the Premier saying? He is a man of business and a lawyer, who ought to understand finance; and this is his statement, word for word: "The Kurrawang syndicate started with a capital of £18,000."

THE PREMIER: Nominal capital.

MR. GORDON: And what sort of special acting did he put on then? He said the syndicate spent £19,000, though he let it out that they had only a capital of £18,000; yet they spent £19,000 while they were still £18,000 to the good. That is what he wants to tell the country; that the Kurrawang syndicate with a capital of £18,000 robbed the Government by buying £19,000 worth of stuff.

THE PREMIER: And not paying for it.

MR. GORDON: That is the sort of stuff you attempt to put to the public, Mr. Premier; and that is what you have been doing from the first to the very last. It is only "stuffing," and you do not put in enough seasoning. Of course I came here entirely independent; I am independent still; and I should have followed the Government—

MR. GARDINER: If you had received the £1,000.

MR. GORDON: If they had the sense to lead me. The explanation I would give is that, unfortunately, I have a little

bit of conscience left. I could not follow them ; not only because of the acts which they have done, but for the acts they have not done, and for the most ignoble position the Premier takes in this House. He is a man who will practically stand on his head if the Labour party tell him to do so. I have it here in black and white. If the Labour party were to write him, "We desire you to call at our office to-morrow morning on your head," I will bet he would be there. What does he do ? During the discussion we had here on the 25th September, regarding police uniforms, he got up and said, "I am entirely opposed to this motion." That was early in the evening. He went out ; and of course the Labour party—you know they get roused now and again : they cannot stand too much—did not like this at all. The Premier got the whisper, came in and apologised, and said, "I will support the measure." That was about two hours afterwards ; and it will be found in *Hansard*. There is a pattern for you ! Through what will he lead you ? He will lead you through anything. I might almost take it as a text—"We endeavour to do right." That has been a little phrase of the Premier's. I do not know where he got it. I think he started it at the Town Hall. He got it somewhere, and he has been using it ever since : "We endeavour to do right." That is the way in which he says it, or something like it. I should not like to say it with such emphasis as he uses : I might break my throttle. (Laughter.) As a sort of consolation to the Premier, I may tell him that in the fact that he attempts to do right, he to a certain extent receives some reward. As I was about to remark—

No endeavour is in vain,
Its reward is in the doing ;
And the rapture of pursuing
Is the prize the vanquished gain.

We know he has been pursuing for a good many years, and I do not think he will ever catch the object of his pursuit ; but he has "the rapture of pursuing." I do not begrudge it to him, I begrudge it to him not. That is worth something ; but the net result is absolutely *nil*. Of course I cannot say we are always in the right : I cannot say the former Government have always been right. They may have been wrong at times ; and the disclosures the present Government said

they would give to the country have not all failed. In one instance they struck the nail on the head : I will not say fortunately or unfortunately for the former Government ; I will not say whether for their good or for their injury. But the present Government made one disclosure thoroughly and well, that is as regards their inability to run this country. [THE PREMIER : Hear, hear.] I might be one who would help that innocent, that good, and that "endeavouring" Ministry. They are full of promises ; though where they get their promises from, goodness knows. I reckon they have a large stock of them. But that they are full of promises, there is not the slightest doubt. I should not like to close these remarks of mine without referring to the member for East Perth (Hon. W. H. James). He is not here. He is the outrigger of the Ministry. Of course, I do not want members of the Cabinet to take offence at that statement, if "outrigger" is an unusual word. It means that you generally use an outrigger in connection with a bottle-cart. You will see one poor horse in the shafts, and a little pony running alongside. The member for East Perth runs alongside the Ministry. Why do they put on the outrigger ? I got a headache studying the point. Because they are overloaded with social legislation, and they want an extra pull. That is the reason they put on an outrigger. I am sorry, in a way, to leave such a promising Ministry ; but I have only one stand to take in this matter, and that is to study the interests of the State. I care not whether the public adjudge me wrong in going against the Ministry : but I care whether my own conscience tells me I am right or wrong, and it says I am right. And I will admit to a certain extent that it is not without due consideration that I have taken the determined stand I take now.

THE PREMIER : When did you make up your mind ?

MR. GORDON : Do not forget, "fools rush in." [Opposition laughter.] I think it is due to me to advise Mr. Leake that I make my living out of interjections. It is practically my living. Forewarned is forearmed ; therefore let the Premier beware. I made up my mind to take this stand. The Government, as I said before, promised in the Queen's

Hall to fulfil or attempt to fulfil the promises of the former Government. In this one instance alone, my own case, in the case I mentioned of dredging to the Coode Street jetty, where there are 500 people waiting for accommodation, promised for some time, they have never fulfilled their promise; and why they have put that £1,000 on to that road, I leave the public to judge.

MR. T. HAYWARD (Bunbury): It was not my intention to have taken part in the debate, only I wish to correct a statement that I had the papers laid on the table with reference to the non-reinstatement of the railway employees at Bunbury, and that when the papers were produced I was satisfied. I am not satisfied so far, because the Premier has not carried out his promise.

MR. RESIDE: The hon. member is misrepresenting my statement. What I said was that I understood the hon. member's opinion was different from the opinion of the member for the South-West Mining District (Mr. Ewing).

MR. HAYWARD: I did not understand the hon. member in that way. I think that anyone who peruses the papers will be of the same opinion as myself, and it cannot be said that the Premier carried out his promise.

MR. W. D. JOHNSON (Kalgoorlie): Like other members of the Assembly, I did not intend to take part in the debate; but as things have gone, I think it is absolutely necessary that the Labour members should place their views before the House. The Opposition members, those principally aspiring to office, have got up, one after another, and have taken a deep interest in the welfare of the workers, and have stated that we do not represent Labour truthfully, but that they will look after the interests of the workers provided they are successful in carrying this motion. Their speeches remind me very much of electioneering speeches by which men try to gain the Labour vote. During election times we have such speeches made as we have heard to-night. We have had members getting up one after another practically touting for the vote of the Labour party, or they have an election in view and are making speeches to the people in their electorates. The workers are alive to the fact that on the eve of an election numerous candidates come for-

ward and say that they will bring forward legislation to improve the condition of the workers; and they know well that members see that if the motion is carried they may have to go back to their electors. Members get up to speak knowing that they must get the vote of the workers to be returned: they say, "We have the interest of the workers at heart and will push forward the legislation that is on the Notice Paper now." I contend that actions speak louder than words. The workers read *Hansard*; they see that division after division has been taken to block one of the most necessary measures which the workers of the State require, the Workers' Compensation Bill. I say without hesitation that the Opposition have again and again blocked that measure. They allowed the principle to be adopted; they allowed the clauses to go through Committee, although they altered one of the most vital clauses, in my opinion, in the Bill, and when they got to the Schedule the member for the Murray (Mr. George) practically stonewalled the measure. The members of the Opposition voted solidly against the measure. *Hansard* speaks louder than words here, and if this motion is carried and members go to their electorates, the workers will vote according to the records of *Hansard* and not according to the speeches of those members who wish to get the support of the workers on the eve of an election. But when these members are returned after an election, they forget all about the workers. We, as a Labour party, consider that a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush. We know that we have legislation on the Notice Paper, and if it were not for members on the Opposition benches some of the measures would have been through to-day. We consider the Leake Administration are sincere in their desire to bring forward and pass Labour legislation. It is not the desire of Opposition members to see Labour legislation passed; in fact, I go as far as to say I consider this motion has been brought forward to block the Labour legislation which some members say they are anxious to see.

MR. MONGER: Take it at that.

MR. JOHNSON: Much has been said in connection with the Railway Association and the Conciliation and Arbitration Act. I interjected to-night, when a

member who defeated a Labour candidate was speaking, and that member in reply to me said he would defeat that candidate again.

MR. EWING : You come down and see.

MEMBER : That is his business.

MR. JOHNSON : It is his business.

It may be his business when the election comes on. I say that the party who aspire to office, and who bring down this no-confidence motion, are the political party who tried to wipe out the Railway Association altogether. The member for East Perth (Hon. W. H. James), it is true, tries to cut up this association. I agree with the remarks of the member for Albany (Mr. Gardiner). I say the Railway Association should have the right to register as an association as at present constituted ; and I go farther and say that the association should have the right to break up whenever they desire. Take myself as a carpenter : I say the executive of this association cannot represent me as a carpenter. Take the carpenters referred to to-night as being blocked during the late strike and not getting employment afterwards ; what are they doing ? They are working for the Railway Department for 2s. and 3s. a day less than carpenters outside the department are getting. Why ? Because the association worked for the fettlers first. I say it is right the association should have a chance to register as constituted at the present time, but with the right to break up when they desire. I say, as one who has been a unionist all his life, who has taken an interest in unionism all his life, that the time will come when the Railway Association will break up of their own accord, and that you will find the boilermaker, the engineer, the carpenter, the fettler, the guard, and so forth, in their respective associations, and at their head an executive as an industrial combination representing the whole of those organisations ; whilst the various branches of employment under the Commissioner of Railways and the Minister for Works will directly represent their own particular classes of work. Although the Opposition members get up here to state that they take a deep interest in Labour and in the welfare of the Railway Association, and that they will do this, that, and the other, I say, as a representative of Labour—and I think I voice the opinions of the Railway

Association—save us from our friends on the Opposition benches !

MR. GEORGE : What have I done ?

MR. QUINLAN : Save us at two hundred a year.

MR. GEORGE : Well, he is entitled to that.

MR. JOHNSON : This motion of want of confidence, I contend, is an attack, firstly on the Labour legislation to-day on the business paper, secondly on the appointment of G. W. Davies, and thirdly on the suspension of John Davies. In connection with G. W. Davies I may point out that while members on the front Opposition bench have said it is wrong for the Government to condemn John Davies and to drag his name in the mire, they forget altogether that they, at the same time, are dragging the name of G. W. Davies in the mire. They forget that G. W. Davies was paid off, practically dismissed, without being given any reason for his dismissal. The present Commissioner of Railways tells us he was unable to find in the departmental files a record of any cause for G. W. Davies's dismissal from the railway service. Yet Opposition members know that G. W. Davies, as a matter of fact, was dismissed—I was going to say dismissed for nothing, but I believe he was dismissed solely because he gave certain information to the present Commissioner of Railways. [OPPOSITION MEMBERS : Hear, hear.] I do not care whether the statement is correct or not ; but that is what the Opposition infer, that G. W. Davies was dismissed from the railway service because he gave certain information to the present Commissioner of Railways. What, however, was the finding of the board which sat to inquire into the case of G. W. Davies ? Their finding gives a different version of the matter altogether. The fact remains, nevertheless, that G. W. Davies was appointed, that the board of inquiry expressed the opinion that his holding the position of Secretary to the Commissioner of Railways was not justifiable, and that the Commissioner of Railways accordingly dispensed with Mr. G. W. Davies's services. Now let us get on to Mr. John Davies. Before I entered the House, I have always, in season and out of season, condemned the railway management of this State. I have in the past condemned

John Davies in season and out of season; and I condemn him to-night. The charges brought by the Commissioner of Railways, I admit, were not wholly upheld by the board which inquired into them; and therefore I do not base my condemnation of John Davies on those charges. I condemn him by reason of what I have seen with my own eyes in Kalgoorlie. I purpose to refer to-night to matters which came under my observation. I congratulate the Commissioner of Railways on his suspension of John Davies; and I only wish he had gone a step farther, and dismissed John Davies altogether. I consider that John Davies should have been suspended or dismissed long ago; and if the member for the Williams had done his duty he would, long before he went out of office, have suspended John Davies.

MR. GEORGE: The member for the Williams is not in the Chamber at present.

MR. JOHNSON: In passing, I wish to point out that a perusal of the report of the board which sat to inquire into the charges against John Davies shows that he is practically exonerated. But in what position does the member for the Williams stand, then? What is the position of the member for the Williams, who aspires to become the Premier of this State? I leave it to those who read the report to form their own conclusions on that point; but I say without hesitation that if the majority of members in this House do not pronounce the member for the Williams unfit to fill the position of Premier of this country, the majority of the electors of Western Australia will pronounce him unfit. [OPPOSITION MEMBERS: We shall see that.] Going a little into the report of the John Davies board, and reading the evidence, we come to the charge relating to purchase of water. As representative of Kalgoorlie, I say that the purchases of water made by John Davies or by the member for the Williams—I care not which of the two—constitute a very bad deal. I know for a positive fact that when these purchases were made, when water was being obtained by the General Manager of Railways at 60s. per 1,000 gallons from the Kurrawang Company, and at 25s. per 1,000 gallons from Mr. Graham Price, an offer had been made to the General Manager to

supply him with water at 15s. per 1,000 gallons. That offer was refused, and the department continued to buy water from the Kurrawang Company at 60s., and from Mr. Graham Price at 25s. Then the person who made the offer of water at 15s. per 1,000 gallons to the General Manager, finding he could not sell his water to the Railway Department, was compelled to sell that self-same water to Mr. Graham Price at 10s. per 1,000 gallons; and Mr. Graham Price then re-sold it at 25s. to the Railway Department. [OPPOSITION MEMBER: What quantity?] I would like to know whether, during the construction of the Kurrawang line, water was carted from Kalgoorlie and taken up the Kurrawang line, and practically handed over to the Kurrawang Company? I would like to know whether that water, when delivered, was paid for by the Government, or paid for by the Kurrawang Company? A matter which surprises me greatly is that the late Government should have allowed the Kurrawang Company to run into their debt to the tune of £19,000. The Government supplied all this material to open up the 42-Mile Dam, so that they might obtain a supply of water from the dam. If I cannot leave it to this House, I will leave it to the people of the State, to consider why the Government, if they could give the Kurrawang Company credit to the tune of £19,000 for material, could not have used that £19,000 worth of material and opened up the dam for themselves. The Government practically supplied the whole of the material required to open up the 42-Mile Dam, and took payment for the material in their own water. That is exactly how the position stands. I stated before that I intended to refer to the management of the railways and to the—I will say—manipulations of John Davies in connection with railway affairs in Kalgoorlie. Reference was made by the Premier to certain blocks of land, on which is built to-day an hotel known as the Torbay Arms. We find Messrs. Smith, Timms, Davies, Short, and Patterson figuring in this particular deal. Looking a little farther into it, we find that a proposal was made to shift the goods sheds in connection with Kalgoorlie station. Originally these goods sheds were certainly not in the best position, so

far as the railways are concerned; but they were then much nearer the town than they are to-day. We find, however, that those goods-sheds have been shifted some considerable distance farther from Kalgoorlie. Hon. members who have gone by rail to Kalgoorlie know that they see the goods-sheds in connection with the Kalgoorlie station some considerable time before they get to the station itself; that when they have reached the Kalgoorlie railway station they are still at some considerable distance from the town. I leave it to hon. members to judge the distance over which the people of Kalgoorlie, who use the goods shed, have to cart their goods. We find that immediately the proposal to shift the goods sheds was made, these blocks of land in Forrest Street, Nos. 264 and 265, were bought as stated. Immediately after that an hotel was erected. There were other hotels in the same street long before the Torbay Arms was erected. What do we find next? We find that a fence is put down the boundary of the railway line on the opposite side of Forrest Street to where the Torbay Arms would be. Barbed wire is put opposite the whole of the hotels with the exception of the Torbay Arms. [Ministerial laughter.] We find letter on letter of protest written to the Government department; and many letters were written to the newspapers. One Dufrençon, a Frenchman, the proprietor of the Telluride Hotel, communicated with his consul, protesting against the shutting out of the railway men from his hotel by the putting up of barbed wire opposite it. The only opening left for the railway men was opposite the Torbay Arms. That is an absolute fact. At the last general election we had a Minister of the Crown, a member of the Throssell Administration, contesting the Kalgoorlie seat. This is put to him, and he says it is wrong, it is unjust. It has been going on for months, though, and he says "You shift that wire." To use his own words, "Take a tin-opener and cut the wire, and I will take the responsibility." The wire was shifted that night. Let us go farther. We find that water was bought from the Kurrawang Company at 60s. per 1,000 gallons, and taken to the loco. yards tanks at Kalgoorlie. Then what do we find? We find a line of

pipes laid from these tanks in the loco. yards in Kalgoorlie, going over to the Torbay Arms Hotel. This is sufficient in connection with the Torbay Arms Hotel. The Premier has proved that mixed up in the Torbay Arms affair were Smith, Timms, Davies, Short, and Patterson. Let us go farther. There was a determination on the part of the Government to erect stations and to put up barriers at Hannans Street, Golden Gate, and other stations.

MR. TEESDALE SMITH: I would like to rise to a point of order. The member for Kalgoorlie says Mr. Davies, Mr. Short, Mr. Patterson and myself were interested in the Torbay Arms. I wish to give the hon. member a deliberate denial that either Mr. Davies, Mr. Short, or Mr. Patterson was ever, as far as I am concerned, interested in the Torbay Arms; an absolute denial. (Applause by Opposition members.)

MR. JOHNSON: I am not in a position to say who built the Torbay Arms, or to whom the Torbay Arms belongs. Suffice it to say that the men I quoted were interested in blocks 264 and 265 on which the Torbay Arms was built. That is all I quote. I do not say these gentlemen I quoted were interested in the Torbay Arms, but they were interested in these blocks of land.

MR. TEESDALE SMITH: I say it is absolutely wrong.

THE PREMIER: They are the registered proprietors.

MR. TEESDALE SMITH: I say at the time he is talking about they had nothing to do with the Torbay Arms. The arrangement he is talking about was after I had sold to Timms; three or four months after.

THE PREMIER: They are the owners now.

MR. TEESDALE SMITH: Smith is not the owner now. He says Smith.

THE PREMIER: No.

MEMBER: Fair play; one at a time.

MR. JOHNSON: I do not know who is the owner of those blocks now. I say again that in the purchase of those blocks, 264 and 265, those names were mixed up. It is difficult to find out who were the owners.

MEMBER: Why make the accusation, then?

MR. JOHNSON : Let us get down to these facts.

MEMBER : Where did you get the information ?

MR. JOHNSON : I got the information from the Titles Office. The Premier quoted it.

MEMBER : Who gave it to you ?

MR. JOHNSON : I have had it a considerable time. I said when I started speaking in this debate that I made these statements long before I was a member of this House. I stated it publicly in Kalgoorlie during the election, and I will state it again.

MR. GEORGE : Prove it.

MR. CONNOR : Do not make false statements.

MR. JOHNSON : So much for the Torbay Arms. If the member for Wellington (Mr. Teesdale Smith) is going to speak, let him explain the whole affair. I am not going into details and to take up some hours of the time of the House in explaining every matter of detail. I simply make the statement and let him explain it, if he can. Now let us get on to the Hannans Street station. We find there was a determination on the part of the Government to reorganise and to generally reconstruct the Boulder line, to erect buildings and put up barriers. We find that at the corner of Egan Street and Attwood Terrace there is a block which belonged to Laslett. This block is in close proximity to the Hannans Street station. I wish to impress upon the House that previous to the alteration the whole traffic went from Hannans Street station. Hannans Street is the main street of Kalgoorlie. But we find that this block of land is purchased from Mr. Laslett by Henry Teesdale Smith. Then it has been proved—I quote this for what it is worth—that the transfer was first made out in the name of John Davies, and torn up. That is common talk in Kalgoorlie. Whether it is correct or not, I do not know, but it is said that this statement emanated from the original owner of the land, Mr. Laslett.

MR. TEESDALE SMITH : I absolutely deny that statement. The block was transferred direct to me from the man I purchased of.

MR. JOHNSON : That is not a contradiction of my statement. I say it was transferred to Mr. Henry Teesdale Smith,

and I assert rumour has it that the first transfer was torn up. I give you my statement, and you can take it for what it is worth.

OPPOSITION MEMBER : It is worth nothing.

MR. JOHNSON : If it is like many of the statements made against the Government by Opposition members, it is not worth much. They have gone into rumour time after time. We found the member for the Murray taking up hours in this House on the talk of the man in the street some time ago in connection with one of our Judges.

THE PREMIER : Hear, hear.

MR. JOHNSON : And when I make this statement he says it is not worth much, but he says that what he referred to is worth hours of the time of this House. Perhaps he did it to delay legislation. Let us continue. We find that on this particular block; namely 420, at the corner of Egan Street and Attwood Terrace, a fence was put up, and the course was to be continued right up to the front of the hotel. It blocks Hannans Street and it blocks Egan Street as far as the street is concerned. It crosses the street, and there an opening is made for the thousands of people who travel daily on the Boulder line to come out right opposite the door of the Glen Davon Hotel. It is impossible to go through the fence unless you go to the front door of this particular hotel. I will give you the plain facts of this, because I happen to know all about it. The people of Kalgoorlie recognised the injustice that was being done to the main street, namely to Hannans Street, and the other hotels in Attwood Terrace protested against this. Numerous meetings were held, and deputations came down here and protested against it; but for some considerable time they failed. Hundreds and hundreds of pounds were squandered on the Hannans Street station in defiance of the protests of the people; but eventually the protests of the people were recognised by the authorities, and we find that the whole of the work, or practically the whole of the work, done is pulled up. Things are reconstructed, and we find that this particular fence, or this particular gateway I referred to, opening into the hotel, is closed, and an opening is made somewhere between Egan Street and Hannans Street. Let us look farther.

This is from research in the Titles Office. Let us look down farther, and we find this particular hotel is leased for ten years to Mary G. Hickey. The hotel was named the Glen Davon Hotel, and this Mrs. Hickey gets a lease for ten years. She goes into that hotel, and it is opened. But we find that the agitation by the people of Kalgoorlie has been successful. We find that this particular opening is blocked, and that the traffic goes on the old route, namely down Hannans Street. Then we find that although Mrs. Hickey takes this lease for ten years —

MR. MONGER : Sling your mud at men; not at women.

MR. JOHNSON : I have to state facts. We find farther down that it is eventually transferred to Paton, Maher, and Scott, of Perth, owning a brewery in Kalgoorlie. Mrs. Hickey leaves, and then we find, according to a question put in this House, that Mrs. Hickey is travelling on the railways on a free pass. When the question is asked the Commissioner of Railways, the answer is given that Mrs. Hickey was looking for a tin trunk which had been lost. I believe that tin trunk is still lost, and Mrs. Hickey is still looking for it. Then we find Mrs. Hickey comes down to Fremantle and permission is given, or a licence is given her, to open a refreshment room in the Fremantle Station. This permission is given by the old Forrest party, or by the Throssell Ministry. This is one of the legacies left to the present Ministry. But fortunately for the country, the present Commissioner of Railways discovers the little game. He cancels the authorisation and says he will not allow the refreshment room to be established at Fremantle. Then we find Mr. John Davies writes to Mrs. Hickey, and states the Government have cancelled her right to open a refreshment room at Fremantle, but they are prepared to pay compensation. That comes to the ears of the Commissioner of Railways, who calls upon Mr. John Davies to withdraw that statement, and says he does not agree to any form of compensation: if Mrs. Hickey wants compensation, she has her alternative. But we find the letter is withdrawn by the General Manager, and Mrs. Hickey does not come up for her compensation. Now I said I would state why I consider the General Manager of Railways should

have been at least suspended, if not dismissed, long ago; and I say those facts I have mentioned are sufficient to justify me in making these remarks.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS : You have not stated any facts.

MR. JOHNSON : We know the crowd we have to deal with. We know that they will cover up their tracks, and that it is almost impossible to follow them. But we know that the barbed wire was put in front of all hotels except the Torbay Arms Hotel. We know that pipes were laid from the loco. shops to the Torbay Arms, and we know that the opening was made in the Hannans Street station, running immediately into the door of the Glen Davon Hotel.

LABOUR MEMBER : That is right.

MR. JOHNSON : And I go farther, and defy contradiction to the statement that Mrs. Hickey got a ten years' lease of the Glen Davon Hotel. When it was found that the traffic was cut away from her, I defy contradiction to the statement that she travelled with a free pass on the railways, and that she got permission to open a refreshment room at Fremantle station, to my mind illegally. Then we find the General Manager states that if she makes a claim for compensation, she will get it; and afterwards he withdraws that statement, and Mrs. Hickey does not put in a claim for compensation. Those facts are sufficient to condemn the General Manager in my eyes; and I contend that the whole—not a majority—of the people of Kalgoorlie are equally as strong in their condemnation of the General Manager as they are in their approval of the present Ministry; and I have no hesitation in saying that I shall vote against this motion, because the present Ministry are endeavouring to purify things. They are endeavouring to push labour legislation, but the Opposition side are endeavouring to block it. They are endeavouring to push this country forward progressively, so that it may equal the other States of Australia; consequently we, as Labour men, support the present Government because we feel we can trust them, and that we must, in view of the past history of members of the Opposition benches, distrust those members. Therefore we, as Labour men, are supporters of the present Ministry, and if the motion be carried, we shall be

found on the Opposition cross-benches. Then, if the leading members of the Opposition go as Ministers to the country and are elected, which I doubt very much—but if they are successful, and if they do carry out the pledges they have made here to try to secure, if not the votes of members on this Labour bench, the votes of the workers outside—then they will find the Labour members will support them: not support them in the manner in which the Opposition have supported the present Government, but in season and out of season, so long as they go forward to give us as good administration as the present Ministry are endeavouring to give us.

MR. JACOBY: We will give you better.

MR. JOHNSON: The present Ministry might give us better legislation if you would assist them a little more, instead of trying to block them. However, we will support them if they will give us the same industrial legislation which the present Ministry are endeavouring to give us, whose efforts are unfortunately being blocked by members of the Opposition.

MR. TEESDALE SMITH (in explanation): I would ask the Commissioner of Railways to telegraph to Kalgoorlie for information to contradict the statements made by the last speaker. I deny that the opening in the fence is, as stated by him, in front of the hotel. As far as I recollect, the opening is in front of the street that goes past the hotel, and that also at the other end, nearer Kalgoorlie, is the main road out for all the teams. I say the opening as mentioned by the hon. member is not, and never has been, in front of the hotel; and I ask the Commissioner of Railways, in all fairness, to send a telegram to-morrow, and ask exactly where these openings are.

MR. JOHNSON: I also ask the Commissioner to send a wire, not to ascertain where the openings are at the present time, but where they were situated when the Glen Davon Hotel was opened. I made those charges in reference to the time of the opening of the Glen Davon Hotel. I refer to the time when Mrs. Hickey was in charge of that hotel. Since then, things have been altered through the agitation of the people of Kalgoorlie.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: I can promise the hon. member

that I will make inquiries to-morrow, especially with reference to the water pipe from the railway station to the Torbay Hotel.

MR. GEORGE: And the fence, too. Be fair.

MR. H. TEESDALE SMITH: What I said was only a personal explanation. It had nothing to do with a speech on the motion.

MR. F. CONNOR (East Kimberley): Unless any of the Ministers wish to continue this debate, I think it is fair to adjourn.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MINISTERS: No.

MR. CONNOR: If Ministers wish to speak, I will waive my motion. If not, I move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and passed, and the debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 11-20 o'clock, until the next day.

Legislative Council, Thursday, 7th November, 1901.

New Member (East Province)—Adjournment: the No-Confidence Debate.

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

PRAYERS.

NEW MEMBER (EAST PROVINCE).

THE PRESIDENT reported the return of election writ issued by him for the vacancy in the East Province, caused by the death of the Hon. H. Lukin; and that Mr. F. T. Crowder had been duly elected.