

the Labour organisations and the employers will meet together and bring about such a state of affairs that Western Australia will become one of the most wealthy countries on the face of the earth.

On motion by Hon. G. J. G. W. Miles debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.40 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 31st August, 1920.

	PAGE
Questions: Soldier settlers, clearing	363
Ministers' travelling expenses	363
Child immigration	363
Loyal citizens' meeting	363
Wheat, Australian consumption	363
Traffic Act	364
Railway extension, Booralaming	364
Address-in-Reply, tenth day, conclusion	364
Bills: Public Service Appeal Board, 1R.	394
Architects, 1R.	394
Dentists, 1R.	394
Parliament (Qualification of Women), 1R.	394
Building Societies, 1R.	394
Coroners, 1R.	394
Factories and Shops, 1R.	394

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

QUESTION—SOLDIER SETTLERS, CLEARING OPERATIONS.

Mr. STUBBS asked the Premier: 1, Is he aware that many returned soldiers settled east of the Great Southern Railway, in the Lake Grace-Kulin area, are experiencing great difficulty in their clearing operations owing to the absence of suitable machinery? 2, If so, would it not be possible for the Government to procure traction engines and rolling plant, to be hired to these settlers at a reasonable rental, in order to assist them in their operations?

The PREMIER replied: 1, No, except for difficulty in securing labour. 2, No. The Department's policy is to encourage the clearing of forest land in preference to scrub country.

QUESTION—MINISTERS' TRAVELLING EXPENSES.

Mr. GREEN asked the Premier: What have been the travelling expenses for each Minister and each Honorary Minister for the

year ended the 30th of June, 1920—(a) Amount of expenditure incurred by each Minister named? (b) Details of expenditure incurred?

The PREMIER replied: This information will take some time to compile, but a return will be prepared and laid upon the Table of the House.

QUESTION—CHILD IMMIGRATION.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN (for Mr. Munsie) asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, How many children is Mr. Fairbridge preparing to bring from England? 2, What is their average age? 3, What assistance, if any, are the Government granting in fares and maintenance?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, 260. 2, From eight to nine years. 3, Fare, £6 per child for 150 children and maintenance at the rate of 4s. per day.

QUESTION—LOYAL CITIZENS' MEETING.

Mr. VERYARD asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Is it the intention of the Police Department to proceed with the prosecution of those persons whose names were taken by the police for their disgraceful conduct at a meeting of loyal citizens, held in the Queen's Hall on the afternoon of Sunday, 22nd August? 2, If not, why not?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, The matter has been referred to the Crown Law Department. 2, Answered by No. 1.

QUESTION—WHEAT, AUSTRALIAN CONSUMPTION.

Mr. FOLEY asked the Premier: 1, Has his attention been drawn to the following extract from the Commonwealth Debates of the 4th August, 1920?—

Wheat Pool.—Allotment for Australian Consumption. Senator Wilson asked the Vice-President of the Executive Council, upon notice: 1, Was a contract entered into with the wheat pools for wheat for home consumption? 2, How was the purchased wheat allotted to the States? 3, What date was the contract entered into? 4, Who signed the agreement, and on whose behalf? Senator Russell: The answers are: 1, 2, and 3, On and prior to 21st November, 1919, certain mills in Queensland, and also the Governments of the States of Tasmania and New South Wales, made application to the Australian Wheat Board for supplies of wheat for flour for local consumption; and, in the case of New South Wales, for certain limited export. The Board decided that the application should, on certain conditions, be acceded to, and that the Government constituents of the Board should be invited to reserve the necessary supplies at the price for the time being determined as the price for

local consumption. Later, on the 20th January, 1920, the Government constituents agreed that the Board effect the sales proposed at the rate of 7s. 8d. per bushel on rails at port of shipment. This applies to those States which are this season importing wheat, viz., New South Wales, Queensland, and Tasmania, as well as to those States with an exportable surplus, viz., Victoria, South Australia, and Western Australia. It has been agreed to supply New South Wales with its local consumption requirements, not exceeding 10,000,000 bushels, and similarly Tasmania with 1,250,000 bushels. The mills of Queensland will be supplied similarly with 2,329,000 bushels. As North Queensland flour is supplied this year by Victorian and South Australian millers, it is not practicable to allot a definite quantity to the whole of the State. 4, The formal contracts have been, or are to be, signed, on behalf of the purchasers, as follows:—New South Wales—the Minister for Agriculture of the State; Tasmania—the Premier of the State; Queensland—the millers concerned. On behalf of the vendors, the contracts are signed by the manager of the Australian Wheat Board.

2, Were the Western Australian Government represented at the wheat pool conference on 21st November, 1919, and the 29th January, 1920? 3, If so, by whom? 4, Did that representative vote on the question of New South Wales supply as printed in this statement? 5, If so, was his vote cast in the negative or affirmative?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, On the 21st November, 1919, the Western Australian Government was not represented on the wheat pool conference, but the representative of the Western Australian farmers (Mr. Sinclair McGibbon) was present. On the 29th January the Western Australian Government was represented. 3, By the Minister for Education on the 29th January, 1920. 4, No, that question was not before the Board at that conference. 5, Answered by No. 4

QUESTION—TRAFFIC ACT.

Mr. HICKMOTT (for Mr. Griffiths) asked the Minister for Works: 1, Has he received a protest from the York Council against the paying into consolidated revenue of the fines paid for infringements against the Traffic Act? 2, Is he aware that if local governing authorities are forced to bear the expense of instituting prosecutions against offenders, which in some cases may turn out unsuccessful, this will have a tendency to make local authorities refuse to undertake the responsibility of enforcing the Act? 3, Does he intend to amend the Act to remove this disability?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, Yes: 2, Should local authorities neglect to enforce the provisions of the Traffic Act,

as indicated, they will gain nothing thereby. As, however, they receive all fees for the licensing of vehicles and drivers, and these, if regularly collected from all vehicle owners, must help considerably in making and maintaining roads, it is considered not unreasonable for them to carry out the other provisions of the Act. The matter of fines and penalties recovered under this Act was well considered when framing the Traffic Bill, and it was arranged that the money should go to the general revenue, because the State has to provide police to take up offenders, and prepare the necessary evidence to prosecute, also courts, judges, and magistrates, with the necessary staff to adjudicate; therefore, it was thought that the fines and penalties recovered under this Act should go towards maintaining the administration which is necessary for the enforcing of the Act. 3, No.

QUESTION—RAILWAY EXTENSION, BOORALAMING.

Mr. THOMSON (for Mr. Piesse) asked the Premier: 1, Have the Railway Advisory Board reported on a proposed railway to serve the country between the Cowcowing Lakes and the Wongan-Mullewa railway, more especially the Booralaming district? 2, If so, is it his intention to lay the report upon the table of the House?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, Yes.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Tenth Day—Conclusion.

Debate resumed from the 26th August.

Mr. VERYARD (Leederville) [4.40]: Many of the members who have spoken on the Address-in-reply have dealt exhaustively with the position of our State finances. No doubt this is one of the most serious questions which can be raised and, with other members, I must express disappointment that, after the Treasurer had received a large revenue over and above his anticipations, the position is no better than was forecast last year. The experience of the Government largely resembles that of the householder. The householder has received increased revenue in the shape of salary or wages, but has found that the additional income has been swallowed up by the higher prices which he has had to pay for the necessities of life, so that he is in no better position than he was before he received the increase. The Government have found themselves in a similar position during the last year because costs have kept pace with the increased revenue. During the present session the Government might find it necessary to introduce proposals for additional taxation, but I trust any such proposals will not be of a drastic kind, because we cannot hope to square the ledger by increasing taxation to any great extent. If any reasonable

attempt in this direction is made, it will receive my support because I recognise the need for making the revenue balance the expenditure. If a super tax were imposed upon the unimproved land along and adjacent to our railway system, it would have a good effect. If it did not assist the revenue directly, it would result in the development of much land which at present is lying idle.

Mr. Gardiner: What about suburban land?

Mr. VERYARD: We do not want increased settlement around the city. Where we need increased settlement is in the country and, if a super tax were imposed, it would possibly obviate the necessity for adding more mileage to our already lengthy railway system. We have heard reference to a proposal to amalgamate the State and Federal Taxation Departments. If satisfactory arrangements in this direction could be made, a considerable sum of money would be saved to the State. If such an arrangement provided for State officers to collect all the moneys, well and good, but if not, I should not be quite so enamoured of the scheme. Personally I am not prepared to support a proposal that the Federal Government should collect our State revenue, because we have had sufficient experience in the past to convince us that we should receive very little sympathy from that quarter and, in all probability, the staff would consist of wise men from the East instead of our own people. A good deal of economy might be effected by a re-organisation of the State public service. I have heard it stated on several occasions that, in this respect, the sub-heads of departments are not very helpful to Ministers.

Mr. Gardiner: Nor are the heads.

Mr. VERYARD: In one instance the sub-head of a department asked that his staff be increased by about 20, but the Minister replied that so far from having any additions to his staff, he would be required to reduce the existing numbers. The reply of the sub-head of the department was that it could not be done, which remark the Minister followed up with the statement that if the present head could not do it, he would have to find someone who could. The result was that this sub-head of the department was transferred to another department—I presume to carry on business on the same lines—but the new sub-head effected a reduction of 76 out of a total of 208, or more than one third.

Mr. Gardiner: That was the Minister for Works.

Mr. VERYARD: If that can be done in one department, should not a similar reduction be possible throughout the whole of the service?

Hon. W. C. Angwin interjected.

Mr. VERYARD: It may save hon. members some trouble as regards interjecting if I state that since my last illness I have become a little deaf, and in consequence cannot hear interjections. If we could get our Ministers to operate on similar lines to those which I have described, a large amount could be saved.

Mr. Gardiner: Why Ministers? Why not the heads?

Mr. VERYARD: It is the responsibility of Ministers. The public servants are supposed to be the servants of the public, and if the public will not pay them properly, we can hardly expect them to be too pleased in dealing with the public.

Mr. Gardiner: Then courtesy depends on salary?

Mr. Underwood: Largely.

Mr. VERYARD: The great increase in the number of public servants has been due largely to the fact that the members of the service have felt that whereas they are getting, say, £4 per week, they ought to be getting £5 or £6, and the public servant on a salary of £10 per week has regarded himself as deserving £15. Naturally, people so placed are not inclined to do too much work. The result has been that a large amount of work has accrued, and the heads of departments, in place of looking around to see the cause of the arrears, have simply observed the arrears and asked for further assistance.

Mr. Pickering: That is the fault of the heads of departments.

Mr. VERYARD: Undoubtedly. In my opinion, if we are to have a satisfied public service—and that is the only kind of service that will give satisfaction to the public—the salaries of public servants must be adequate. In my opinion, the public servants have suffered in this respect for a long time past. If they were adequately paid, they would have more fear of losing their positions, which would be well worth keeping. Next I wish to say a few words regarding State enterprise. In this matter I am greatly disappointed because, while the majority of Ministers were returned to Parliament to oppose State enterprises, no effort has been made to dispense with them. Personally, I am not concerned as to whether these State enterprises are payable or unpayable propositions. If they are unpayable, then the net result will be that the public will make good the loss; but if they are profitable, then the business people of the State, who should be running these concerns, will be prevented from earning incomes that would be taxable. As regards the timber mills and the brickworks which are being run by the State, the products of these enterprises are required for the use of the State, and I have no objection to State enterprises which are conducted solely for the State's use. But when State enterprise comes into competition with trade, I think it is unnecessary and, more than that, an evil.

Mr. Munsie: What about State steamers?

Mr. VERYARD: The time has come when I can support the Government as regards State steamships trading along our north coast, which requires all the means of communication we can give it, and which private shipowners are apparently unable to look after. I think everyone will acknowledge that private enterprise has made the British Empire what it is, and in my opinion private enterprise should have full freedom to develop,

though possibly it would be for the Legislature to prevent the making of undue profits. State enterprise, however, should be carried on only in one direction; and in that direction there is ample scope for it. I refer to the development of our great State and its abundant resources by the building of railways, roads, and bridges, and by the construction of drainage works, and also, when necessary, by financial aid to foster industries such as freezing works at our ports, mining, and secondary industries. I believe that such activities will absorb all the cash that our State can find, and that thus there will be no occasion for the Government to interfere with private enterprise. I wish now to refer to some questions I asked last week regarding an event that occurred in the Queen's Hall on Sunday week last.

Hon. P. Collier: You will warm up now a bit.

Mr. VERYARD: In the first place I wish hon. members to understand that I have no axe to grind in bringing the matter forward. In fact, it is with deep regret that I do so, seeing that Mr. O'Dea and myself have been well acquainted for many years past.

The Minister for Mines: I may tell you that your information is altogether wrong.

Mr. Jones: Do not you know that Mr. O'Dea took no part whatever in the disturbance?

Mr. VERYARD: I wish to lay my points before the House, because I asked certain questions.

Mr. O'Loughlen: I think you ought to put yourself right with regard to Mr. O'Dea, anyhow.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. VERYARD: I had the pleasure of knowing the gentleman in question for many years, and he is not one against whom I would willingly say a word. I have always looked upon him as a worthy citizen of our State.

Mr. Green: Well, why make misstatements about him now?

Mr. VERYARD: I have heard that Mr. O'Dea has denied any knowledge of the organisation or taking any part in it.

Hon. T. Walker: How do you know there was an organisation at all?

Mr. VERYARD: I wish I could believe the denial myself; but if the old saying is still true, that birds of a feather flock together, then I think that Mr. O'Dea stands in an unenviable position.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Do you think you are justified in trying to cripple the man's business, when you know it is a mistake?

The Minister for Mines: It is a case of mistaken identity.

Mr. VERYARD: There is ample evidence to show that he was at the meeting. One of the witnesses has informed me that he happened to be at the hall and—

Hon. T. Walker: Who is it?

Mr. Green: Give us the name.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. VERYARD: This witness was at the hall some time before the meeting, and he

waited outside. He first noticed a small group, which grew into a large group, and then he heard someone say, in a voice loud enough to be heard by the whole group, "We must agitate, we must agitate, we must smash up this meeting."

Mr. O'Loughlen: Who said that?

Mr. VERYARD: A man named Nolan, a contractor. After the group had increased to about 30 persons, Mr. O'Dea arrived on the scene. Now, if he was not associated with them, he would have walked by; instead of which he walked into the middle of the group and stood there for about half a minute, and then walked into the hall, among the crowd. Not only did he do this, but he saw his friends distributed in the hall.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Would not the Minister know if Mr. O'Dea offended in that way?

Mr. VERYARD: Speaking of Mr. O'Dea's loyalty, I fail to appreciate the loyalty of any man who remains sitting down right through the singing of the National Anthem.

Mr. Lutey: The member for North-East Fremantle tells us that in the old country they do not bother about it.

Mr. VERYARD: I must admit that I never saw such a scene in my life before. There was a wild tumult, and the organisation maintained its uproar right through. Among others who distinguished themselves were J. Monaghan, a publican of Fremantle, and J. O'Neill, who is known as "the East Perth Digger." At one time during the proceedings there were not half a dozen people remaining in their seats, and many were running over to some of the interjectors. Many blows were struck, but fortunately the presence of ladies—I presume this was the cause—prevented any blood from flowing. The police were not in sufficient numbers to keep order, and, what was worse, one of the police was noticed several times urging the disturbers on.

Mr. Jones: That is over the odds.

Hon. T. Walker: That is a very serious charge.

The Minister for Mines: That is not correct.

Mr. VERYARD: I am sorry; but I have felt it my duty to refer to this matter. I think the facts show that a loyal meeting in this city requires to be protected. It is a great pity that such a state of affairs should exist. In one case a gentleman who was asked to form one of the disturbers said, "No, I believe in fair play. No one disturbed our meeting, and I am not going to be a party in disturbing other people's meetings."

Mr. Jones: Who asked him?

Mr. O'Loughlen: I think you ought to clear up the matter about Mr. O'Dea.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. VERYARD: I think I have said all I need to say.

Mr. O'Loughlen: It is a case of mistaken identity.

Mr. VERYARD: Next I wish to say a few words on the public service strike. It is not often that I refer to a speech delivered

in this House, but I desire to make a reference to the speech of the member for Perth (Mr. Pilkington) on this subject. I have read the speech with interest, but am not quite able to grasp its meaning. Possibly the hon. member has veiled his meaning in some mystical form of professional knowledge which puts it beyond my powers to grasp what he intends to convey. With some of his remarks on the public service I am not in accord, but I can agree that their action in ceasing work was disloyal and rebellious. I could not quite understand why those people at their gatherings should invariably wind up by singing the National Anthem.

The Minister for Works: It was just camouflage.

Mr. VERYARD: When they were in rebellion against the King's Government the singing of the National Anthem seemed out of place. I think some of them would have preferred to sing "God save Ireland." The hon. member censured the Government, but I offer them my congratulations on the manner in which they handled the strike. The hon. member said the Government had acted in an entirely unconstitutional manner, and that there was in fact no Government while the public servants were out on strike. To me this is difficult to understand. The hon. member might be inferring that the public servants, when not on strike, were actually the Government.

Mr. Pickering: And he would not be far wrong.

Mr. VERYARD: Later on the hon. member, after having asserted that there was no Government, declared that Parliament should have been called together. I wonder who he thought should call Parliament together if there were no Government? Did he mean that the public servants should have called Parliament together, or that the leader of the Opposition, or the Trades Hall Council should have done so? I think the hon. member should have been a little more explicit at that stage of his speech. Instead of calling Parliament together, which would have meant at least two weeks' notice and another week to get through the business, it was, I think, much better to go ahead with the task of settling the strike, which was done. In my opinion, the Government did the right thing in calling a meeting of their supporters. At that meeting they took their supporters into their confidence, and, in consequence, those supporters expressed confidence in the ability of the Government to manage this trouble. I congratulate the Government on the way in which they did handle it. I take this opportunity to warn the Government that there is a Sinn Fein movement in the State. There is a sprinkling of Sinn Feiners in the public service, as, for instance, in the Education Department, the Railways, the Police and in the Government workshops. If trouble is to be avoided in the future, those people require to be kept in check.

Mr. Pickering: How are you going to do it?

Mr. VERYARD: That is not for me to decide. On behalf of a number of my electors, I wish to express thanks for the proposal to extend the drainage system at West Perth and beyond.

Hon. T. Walker: It requires something to carry off their miasma.

Mr. VERYARD: The proposed drainage scheme is rather a large one, but is not so extensive as that outlined in a previous proposal under which a quarter of a million would have been spent between West Perth and Claremont. The Government propose to drain about 1,200 or 1,300 acres for repatriation purposes. It is fortunate for some of my electors that the scheme cannot be carried out without benefit to their individual properties. I am glad that the Minister for Repatriation should have seen the need for this work on its being explained to him. Members scarcely realise the quantity of water lying north and west of Perth where, a few years ago, the country was practically dry. At Shenton Park, west of Subiaco, we have a lake where some years ago I with others used to play cricket. That area is now carrying 15 or 16 feet of water. In my own electorate some hundreds of acres of good land which has been under cultivation for many years has been consistently flooded during the past four years. In view of this, one can easily understand the enormous rise in the price of vegetables. For instance, cabbages are bringing 5d. per lb. retail whereas their cultivation used to be profitable at 1d. per lb. retail. All other lines of vegetable produce have increased in similar proportion.

Mr. Robinson: Is the reason for that the lack of drainage?

Mr. VERYARD: Yes. Many of those swamp lands are now three or four feet under water. I had a letter from the secretary of the drainage board recently in which he says that the water out there is higher than ever before and is still rising, many people having had to leave their homes. What land is not under water is waterlogged. Therefore, it would be in the interests of cheap living if this drainage scheme were put in hand at the earliest possible moment. We are not only losing the cultivation of the submerged land, but other lands previously used for such crops have had to be utilised for other purposes, and in consequence the available land is rapidly becoming scarcer. Therefore it seems probable that the larger scheme of drainage will have to be put in hand. I am not given to boasting, but I state as a fact that with proper facilities, such as drainage and the construction of a railway through my electorate to Wanneroo, we could supply half the people of the State with vegetables, butter, milk, pork, poultry, and eggs. I have never offered any objection to anything being done in the South-West, but the cost of improvements in the South-West as compared with the improvements I indicate, is as about 10 to 1. Wanneroo has been wholly neglected by successive Governments,

and by past members who have represented the district. If the district had been represented in the House by a live member the railway would have been built long ago. Personally, I have no interest in Wanneroo except that the proposed railway would run partly through my own electorate. Many of the returned soldiers who have been induced to go in for poultry farming are having a bad time in consequence of the high cost of poultry feed. The Government should assist those men, for the poultry industry has become of great importance to the State, resulting in the virtual abolition of importation. Yet that industry may be ruined by the high cost of poultry wheat. The Government should certainly render some help to those men. The Minister for Repatriation should advance sufficient money on loan to the poultry farmer to enable him to store his eggs in freezing chambers until the annual scarcity comes round, when he could sell his produce to advantage, pay interest to the Government on the loan, and recoup himself also. The reason for urgency in this matter is that we are just approaching that time of the year at which the price of eggs is down to a minimum. I urge the Government to give this question favourable consideration. The wheat-growers might reasonably come to the assistance of the poultry farmers, seeing that their own immediate past has been very satisfactory and that they are to be congratulated on the prospects of the future. I would remind the wheat-growers of their sacrifices in past lean years, and of the ready help extended to them by past Governments and all classes of the community. The Government might also arrange to see that more flour is gristed in the State and a larger quantity of wheat retained. That would be a great help, not only to the poultry farmers, but to the dairy-men also.

Mr. NAIRN (Swan) [5.14]: It is pretty obvious that much of the interest in this debate has vanished. Without intending any reflection on members as a whole, I must say that in my opinion we have listened to about the most depressing debate that has ever been heard in the House.

Mr. Maley: Why not brighten it up?

Mr. NAIRN: I do not know that I can do that, because the debate appears to have reached a stage of decay at which it is impossible to brighten it up. If only one half of what has been stated about Western Australia were true, this would be the best State in the Commonwealth to get out of. If anyone believed only a fraction of what the member for Perth (Mr. Pilkington) has declared, then he would come to the conclusion that this was a deplorable community in which to find himself. From one end to the other the hon. member's speech was nothing but a series of lamentations. The lamentations of Jeremiah were only a trifle to the horrible visions placed before us by the member for Perth. He even went so far

as to say we were nearer a revolution than at any time in our history. It may be that we are so much nearer a revolution, but we are also so much nearer to our end. For anyone to seriously suggest that the people in Australia were tending to any appreciable extent towards a revolution is moonshine and utter nonsense. The great heart of Australia is true and loyal, in my opinion. We have our difficulties and they are often in an acute form, but compared with other parts of the world Australia is a paradise. The great majority of the people in the Commonwealth realise that now in the light of events elsewhere. In other parts of the world many organisations have come into being, and have done a great deal of harm. In Australia there are very few of these "isms," such as Syndicalism, I.W.W.-ism, and others of that kind, and they are not being taken into the minds of the people to any serious degree. The heart of the worker is not with these things. He has too much at stake. We would all desire to see his conditions improve. He has too much to think of. He has his home and his family, but notwithstanding his responsibilities, by comparison with the rest of the world, we are under better conditions than any people elsewhere.

The Minister for Mines: This is the finest inheritance on earth.

Mr. NAIRN: It is the finest inheritance on earth. I am positive that such an idea as a revolution is not seriously entertained by five per cent. of the people of Australia. There is another "ism," which I regret to see has given some indication of showing its head, and that is sectarianism. My opinion is that the only attitude to adopt towards sectarianism is one of positive and absolute contempt. Just as I feel regarding the other extremists I have mentioned, I think the people of Australia do not want sectarianism. If this is treated with the contempt it deserves, it will not come to maturity, nor will it have anything but a short and contemptuous existence. My attitude toward it and the whole question is one of utter and unlimited contempt. I feel sure that people do not want it. Those who endeavour to force it upon us are doing an injury instead of a good to the community. The member for Kanowna (Hon. T. Walker) made a speech which I was delighted to hear, but which I do not think was up to his usual standard. The hon. member regretted the attitude of the public towards Parliament. There is, after all, some reason for the attitude of the public towards Parliament. They are, perhaps, not as keen on it as they used to be, but I am not prepared to say that is altogether the fault of Parliament. During the last six or seven years we have gone through the most strenuous time that we have ever had in our history. The greatest defect in Parliament is that it has not been able to keep pace with the ever-changing circumstances. It has not been sufficiently elastic to meet the altered conditions which so rapidly rose.

Hon. T. Walker. It cannot adjust itself rapidly to the needs of the people.

Mr. NAIRN: That is my opinion. It cannot do so. We have an instance of that before us in regard to the Arbitration Act. In the ordinary course of affairs the Arbitration Court could with safety be left to get through all those problems which come before it. But since the war, and since the days of peace, there have been greater difficulties surrounding us in the industrial world. The problems placed before the Arbitration Court have been immense and also greater in number than they were before, and it was for the most part impossible to deal with them with the machinery that was available. In that way Parliament has itself to blame for some of the expressions of opinion directed against it. Another reason for the trouble is that amongst hon. members there has been a good deal of hypercriticism directed towards the Government from either one side of the House or the other. Generally speaking, the criticism has been calculated to lay the foundations and prepare the country for the election which is shortly coming. I now come to the question of finance. None of us can truthfully declare that we are satisfied with the financial conditions of the State. Even the Treasurer, I feel sure, is dissatisfied, and feels that it is not all that could be desired. In my opinion, however, the man is not born who can adjust a financial business of this sort in the short space of a year or two. We forget that we have been through five years of war and, so far as Australia is concerned two years of complete peace, but so far as the rest of the world is concerned two years of only a partial peace. During this time there have been many disturbing elements which, in many cases, have destroyed society itself. There has also been the disarrangement of commerce and trade throughout the world. To suppose that any one party or Government could put back into a condition of success the financial affairs of the country, as the Premier found them when he took office, would have been an unreasonable thing. It would be humanly impossible for a man to do. We should congratulate ourselves not on having a good Treasurer particularly, but that the Treasurer has been supplied with funds sufficient to meet the ever-increasing demands upon him.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: He has not.

Mr. NAIRN: The Premier has been criticised freely, and particularly by the member for Perth, owing to the fact that he did not show a smaller deficit in the following year of his administration than he did in the previous year. I gather from the facts, as we have them, that the extra commitments of the Premier were those that were impossible to avoid. I have not yet heard any hon. member declare that the Premier was wrong in committing the State to any portion of the expenditure. If the Premier had done all that was due to the State we would have had more expenditure still. There is no charge

against the Premier that he could reasonably have escaped any of that expenditure. When I say that the Government should perhaps have made an even greater expenditure if they had met the whole of their obligations, I refer particularly to the civil service. I do not wish to justify the civil service strike, because that was unjustifiable, but the claims of the civil service have been recognised by various Governments and attempts have been made by previous Governments to do something for them. The Premier has, at least, done something for them, but not sufficient to give full justice to the requirements of the civil service. With that exception I do not know in what way the Premier could have saved the expenditure that was forced upon him. He has also had an amount of unforeseen expenditure to meet. We had one of the greatest maritime strikes during the Premier's term of office that Australia has ever seen. It is impossible to calculate the immense loss that this strike has meant to the Government and the State. We have also had other serious industrial disputes during the time the Premier has been in office. If we look at all these facts and take all the circumstances into consideration, I venture to say that we have reason to congratulate ourselves that the State is not in a worse financial position than it actually is. I have no appreciation for or anything in common with the attitude of the member for Perth towards the financial position of this State. The remedy he suggests would be a most destructive one and one which, if put into operation, would do an infinite amount of harm to the State.

Mr. O'Loughlen: You think it would start a revolution?

Mr. NAIRN: No, but I think it would start a financial crisis, and where that would lead to it would be difficult to say. If we retain confidence in our own State and hold the feeling that this State is a good one, and that things will go right if only people will give it an opportunity, we shall be in a better position to face the future than we would be by having this dull and dismal outlook upon things in general. Notwithstanding our deficit, which is an immense deficit, if it were calculated on the assets of the State it would be found that we were in an infinitely better position than we have been in any period of our history. There is no industry, whether rural or secondary, that is not in a better position to-day than it was five years ago. The assets of the State are more valuable to-day than ever before. New industries are springing up in all directions, and many old industries are taking a new lease of life.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Where are the new industries springing up?

Mr. NAIRN: They are there quite plainly for the hon. member to see.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You said they were springing up in all directions.

Mr. NAIRN: I repeat that new industries are springing up in all directions. If the hon. member is so dull that he cannot see

them, and will spare me half an hour, I will convince him that this is a fact. Probably, however, there are not many in his electorate, and he does not see anything outside of that electorate. There are industries coming into being in Western Australia that are bringing confidence to the people. There are old industries, such as the primary industries, that have assumed a stability and profitability that a few years ago we did not dream of as being possible. Generally speaking, the outlook for the State is good. We certainly do not want any more of these lamentations, and I hope when the member for Perth goes to the Old-Country he will not repeat the speeches we have heard here as to the fearful outlook upon things. We are not so badly off in Western Australia. There are many indications by which the coming prosperity can be seen. There never was a time in the history of our State when the insolvency courts were less used, or when the business of the State generally was more flourishing than it is to-day. The marvellous thing is that we have reached this stage of prosperity in the face of all the circumstances and the experience we have gone through.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The member for Perth told you all about that.

Mr. NAIRN: My impression of the speech of the member for Perth was that it presented a dismal outlook upon things. Nothing was any good, and particularly were the Government not any good. I think that sort of thing is entirely wrong. It has almost become a habit of the member for Perth. I have never heard him express any other sort of opinion either in the House or out of it.

Mr. Underwood: It was merely a suggestion.

Mr. NAIRN: It was, at all events, bad for the State. These opprobrious statements do a great deal of injury to Western Australia. Assuming that men who were about to start enterprises here had listened to that speech and paid heed to it, and went so far as to believe half of the statements that were made, they would think twice about putting their money into Western Australia. I do not desire to mention any particular matter connected with the financial outlook except to say that, in common with every other member, I urge the Premier to make an effort to overtake the deficit. We know that if we can get a run of prosperity, a period of the continuous development of our industries and a reasonable influx of population, the financial position will adjust itself. We have passed through seven years of depression and it cannot be overcome in the short space of a year or 18 months or even perhaps five years, but given reasonable time and reasonable government—I do not care which party may be in possession of the Treasury benches—I believe our industries will expand and our population will increase and our financial burden will be overcome. A matter to which I desire to make some reference is the erection of a recreation hall at the Wooroloo Sanatorium. Criticism has been offered be-

cause the Government has not assisted in the erection of this hall before the present time. This is a legacy of past Governments. It was originally part of the Wooroloo Sanatorium scheme.

Mr. Underwood: The sanatorium is a legacy of past Governments.

Mr. NAIRN: That is so, but I see no reason why the sanatorium should not accept assistance from the charitably disposed amongst the people just the same as any other institution in the State does. There is no reason why we should differentiate between the Children's Hospital for instance, and the sanatorium, if the people are prepared to render assistance. If a sum of £2,000 can be raised for the erection of the recreation hall, the Government should be prepared to assist with a similar amount, and I see no objection whatever to asking people to assist to that end.

Mr. O'Loughlin: They do not contribute too much to the Perth hospital.

Mr. NAIRN: They do not. I desire to refer to a matter touched on by the member for Forrest (Mr. O'Loughlin), who said that it was not right in his opinion that, while so much money was being expended in entertaining the Royal visitor recently, some should have been set aside for the erection of the recreation hall at Wooroloo. I do not think there is any connection between these two matters and I do not see any force in the hon. member's argument. The sanatorium requires a hall in common with many other requirements through the State, and I fail to see why, on that score, we should have limited the expenditure on entertaining the Prince. It is an illogical attitude to adopt. The right time to consider an argument of that kind was when hon. members were increasing their own salaries. I did not like the hon. member's remark. It was out of place and quite unnecessary. If I had had any scruple about that matter I should have considered it when I was voting for the increased payment to members. Some complaints have been made with regard to the manner in which returned soldiers are being settled on the land and it has been said that 50 per cent. of them at least have been placed on improved properties. I cannot say that other arrangements could have been made so far as placing these men on the land is concerned. I do not approve of the principle of making a returned soldier settler a pioneer. If there is a suitable property available and a returned soldier is there competent to take it up the Government cannot do anything but give that returned soldier the first opportunity of taking it up.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That does not increase settlement.

Mr. NAIRN: No, but we surely do not intend to force returned soldiers to take up new land in order to increase settlement. We give the soldier an improved holding because of what he has done for his country and our desire is to give him the fullest and best opportunity to make good. In most cases the individuals who have sold their properties have taken up others.

Mr. Thomson: And some of them are sorry that they sold.

Mr. Munsie: Not too many of them.

Mr. NAIRN: The question is whether we give the soldier the land that he desires to take up or whether we should use him as an instrument of pioneering. The only course to adopt is to put him where he can make good. I think they are in their right place on improved or semi-improved properties. The member for Forrest also made a remark about the business men in this House and he made a more or less vicious attack on those business men because they happen to find their way into this House. According to the hon. member those business men who are here are as poor a lot as ever entered the Chamber. I thought that remark was very hard on the member for Coolgardie (Mr. Lambert) who sits behind the member for Forrest, and particularly hard on the Minister for Works whom I look upon as the most characteristically business man on the Treasury bench. I do not say he is the most admired but he is certainly the most practical. I have had the pleasure of having business transactions with him and I make these remarks because of his knowledge of business and the manner in which he has placed the departments under his control on business lines. The hon. member's utterance was one of those cheap sort of statements that one might expect from unthinking people. I certainly would not like to see the Chamber composed of blacksmiths or philosophers or any other class of people.

Member: What about Pressmen?

Mr. NAIRN: Or even a party of Pressmen. Some of the finest politicians in Australia did not know anything at all about business. They were taken out of mines, factories, and foundries because they had the ability to understand human affairs. Business training does not detract from a man in any way provided he has that natural ability which enables him to understand his fellow men. But whether we have business men in Parliament or not, if we do not employ business principles the State will suffer. If we look back and trace the cause of the errors that have been made and which we would not make again, we will find that they were caused by the discarding of business principles. That, in my opinion, is the cause of the whole of the trouble in this State.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You cannot adopt straight-out business principles in connection with every branch of government.

Mr. NAIRN: I admit it is difficult and that in some cases it is impossible. I have always stated that there are some departments of government to which business principles cannot be applied, for instance, the police, charities, and others. On the other hand, business principles should be applied to such undertakings as the railways, and public services such as the Lands Department. To say that the railways shall not be run on business lines is to say what is absurd.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: There would be a howl if you ran them on business lines.

Mr. NAIRN: There will always be a howl, but before the railways can right themselves, and before they will do justice to the State they must be placed on a more or less business basis. I do not think the hon. member understands my meaning. In many respects the attitude of Parliament towards the railways is not fair, in this way, that it does not give them the opportunity of being worked on business lines. I have seen in connection with the running of the railways a handsome surplus, and I hope to see it again. But during the whole of the time the surplus was earned it was lost to the railway department by being paid into Consolidated Revenue and spread over other departments which were not so fortunately situated. That is not fair to the public and to the people who use the railways. So long as the railways are not permitted to create a reserve fund so as to make provision for lean years, we shall never have a satisfactory result. I have pleaded for that before and I shall plead for it again. Under reasonable control the railways should again show a profit. It has been stated more than once that the railways should not be made to pay their way. In my opinion it is imperative that the railways should be made to pay their way just as any other institution in the State which is used for providing conveniences for the public should pay its way. The time has passed when the State could by indirect means square its ledger. At one time we could get revenue by means of indirect taxation, the customs, and by other means. In other words, the people were taxed without being aware of the fact, and it was then possible to provide relief in one way and make it up in another. That time has past. I know of no avenue by which the Government can by indirect means increase the revenue. Therefore it is imperative that the big business departments should be made to pay for services rendered.

Mr. Underwood: Suppose when you build a railway you sell a million acres of land?

Mr. NAIRN: I am not speaking of building railways. Last year we were compelled to increase the wages and salaries of the railway employees, and I am sure those employees deserved what was given them. In my opinion the Railway Department have not yet reached the limit of wages they will have to pay, even if they concede the award which is under consideration to-day. Would it have been fair or equitable to ask the Railway Department to carry that extra burden without passing it on to those who use the railways, whether passengers or producers? The producers must bear their share of the increased burden just the same as other sections of the community.

Mr. Thomson: So long as it is a fair share.

Mr. NAIRN: Quite so. The manner in which that increase was distributed over the railways was eminently fair. I do not be-

lieve in a percentage increase beyond a certain point, and that point was reached many years ago. I hope that in future the surcharge system recently adopted will be again availed of, so that the burden will be distributed all over the State, and every section in the State will bear its fair and equitable share. It should be laid down as an established fact that these big business undertakings must be paid for the services they render.

The Minister for Mines: A certain section of our railways should be considered departmental railways.

Mr. Pickering: We must have that arrangement.

Mr. NAIRN: That might be so. It is suggested that new railways should be set aside and should not be expected to pay until such time as development has taken place. I do not know how the Minister could work out a scheme of that kind.

The Minister for Mines: Quite easily.

Mr. NAIRN: If it is so easy to work out, surely the Minister should have introduced it before this.

The Minister for Mines: We are doing it now.

Mr. NAIRN: I am not aware that it is being done. However, that is quite a different aspect. I am speaking of the railways as a whole, and am emphasising my belief that the railways should not be asked to give service at a lower figure than it costs. I hope that the House will not acquiesce in anything of that kind, but will compel the railways to extract from the people a fair return for the services they render. I do not want to delay the House longer except to say that, in my opinion, Western Australia, with reasonable luck and reasonably good management and the inculcation into the minds of the people of faith and confidence in the country, will yet become what it promised to be a few years ago, one of the most favourable and inviting States in the whole of the Commonwealth of Australia.

Mr. FOLEY (Leonora) [5.48]: A paragraph in the Governor's Speech expresses pleasure that this State in common with the other States had shown its homage and loyalty to the British Empire by the reception tendered to His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales during his recent visit. With perhaps one exception, no member has referred to the expenditure incurred, and I am sure the member for Forrest (Mr. O'Loghlen) meant nothing derogatory when he referred to the expenditure. In my opinion the money that was spent in connection with the welcome to His Royal Highness was equally well spent as the money expended in connection with the welcome to the American Fleet which visited our shores a few years ago. Notwithstanding the present troublous times, fortunately not so pronounced here as in other countries, it is refreshing to find efforts being exerted for

the betterment of the people, even by one who is doubtless a future king. Anyone who took part or interest in the welcome to His Royal Highness could not fail to be struck with the fact that in the great line of British monarchs history fails to record one who has proved to be so near to the hearts of the people as the Prince of Wales.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: He could not beat his grandfather by much, you know.

Mr. FOLEY: No, but evidently His Royal Highness has copied anything worthy of imitation in his grandfather. And Australians, by showing their loyalty in such a magnificent way, are doing much to spread contentment and strengthen the feeling of loyalty which, in the event of misfortune, might some day stand us in good stead. I believe a vast majority of the people are firmly convinced that they could not be better served under the government of any other country than they are served as members of the British Empire. The visit of His Royal Highness led to the manifestation of a greater spirit of loyalty than has ever been evoked before, and in my opinion the expenditure involved by the Royal visit was money well spent.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Do you think there is any necessity to prove the loyalty of Australia.

Mr. FOLEY: It will have the effect of improving the loyalty of this country.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That has always been recognised.

Mr. FOLEY: Australia has manifested her loyalty in no unmistakable manner, and I believe it was a sincere and honest expression.

Mr. Harrison: More manifest than it ever has been.

Mr. FOLEY: Yes; and I trust the same whole-hearted enthusiasm will always prevail. Almost every member who has spoken on the Address-in-reply has dealt with the State's finances. Some of them have painted very doleful pictures of the position of the State, and ins and outs have told us what they did when they were in office, and what others failed to do when they were in office. I consider that, irrespective of party, we should do the best we can to help those in office at the present time. How can we best help them? Rather by just and honest criticism than by scratching their backs and telling them they have done so well. We know that the State is going back financially. During the past year the Treasurer had a greater revenue than had been received for many years. Yet during the same period there was not a business in this State which had a greater turnover last year than in the previous seven years.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Because things cost more money.

Mr. FOLEY: This is not to say that they made a greater profit or that there has been greater wealth, or that the people have received a better deal. I remember when considerable criticism was levelled at a certain

Government because they were characterised as a spendthrift Government, but with the experience of some years behind us, I am of the opinion that the many millions of money spent by the Scaddan Government had the effect of laying the foundations for as much useful developmental work in this State as did the millions spent in earlier years to open up the land on which many of our farmers have proved so successful. If money were available to-day at a fair rate of interest, the spending of five or six millions now would accomplish more for the uplifting of this State than double the amount in a few years hence.

Mr. Harrison: Where would you spend it?

Mr. FOLEY: The very first work to undertake is to endeavour to fill some of our empty spaces, and lovable as some members seem to think the yellow races are, I do not want them here, nor do I believe that any right-thinking Australian would welcome them here.

Mr. Lambert: He never suggested they should come here.

Mr. FOLEY: If they are so lovable I would prefer them to remain lovable people in their own country. I am quite as capable of loving them in their own country as if they were here. What we want in Australia and particularly in this State, are as many Britishers as we can get to settle on our lands. The member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) has recently been to England, and has seen something of the people who are likely to emigrate. During the past 3½ years I have had ample opportunity to see the class of people we are likely to get in Australia if the greatest care is not exercised in the matter of the immigration policy. With the member for North-East Fremantle I am of opinion that we do not want men of the type who have come out here during the last few years. We do not want the very old men and women who will soon become a burden on the State. We want the most virile and forceful people we can get. I have visited every immigrant boat which has passed through Fremantle, and in conversation with the immigrants I have learned that there are thousands of people in Great Britain who, notwithstanding the high rates of wages and the greatly improved conditions prevailing there, have been carried away by the glowing sentiments expressed by those good Australians who fought with them in the war. I believe we can and will get many thousands of such immigrants. If in England they do receive high wages, they have to pay higher prices proportionately for the necessities of life than people who are living here. The immigrants who have landed here impressed me as being not so well clothed as Australians. They did not look to be so well fed as Australians; neither did they look so healthy as Australians are. During the four years from 1914 to 1918 they have been able to recognise that the men who represented Australia in the great

war had led lives which had qualified them to put up with any conditions obtaining. Trying conditions applied equally to all men in the world, pretty well; and the men from Australia showed that they were able to take their part and come out with as good a record as the men of any other country, and to do these things more cheerfully. Let me adduce the difference between the Australian regiments and the British regiments as it presented itself to the mind of one of the foremost generals in the British Army. I asked him what was the difference between Australian soldiers and British soldiers. His reply was that the Australians and the Britishers were both good fighters, but that every Australian soldier was an individual and every British soldier a unit. He meant to convey that there was in the Australian an initiative which was lacking in the other man. The Australian initiative has been Australia's best advertisement both as regards those with whom the Australian soldier fought and as regards those against whom he fought. It means that thousands of those with whom he fought will come out here and bring their wives and children with them. I agree with the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) that the greatest care should be exercised in selecting assisted immigrants. The cost will be great, and therefore the best man for the purpose should be sent to Great Britain—not a man who has passed his life in an office or in a department, or at the head of some little institution, but a man well versed in Australian conditions and with a good knowledge of human nature and, above all, a knowledge of what is necessary for the development of Australia. If we bring immigrants here, some people consider, they should be put on virgin soil, to open up new country. I do not agree with that view. Some of that money to which I have referred would be wisely spent in clearing tracts of country and putting up houses sufficiently good for immigrants to bring their families to. The immigrants should be placed in a position to commence producing almost immediately upon arrival. If they fail then, it would not be the fault of the Government. But, even if some of them did eventually fail on prepared areas, there would still be the asset for the State, and other men could be settled on it. In most of the Australian States the man who pioneered the country, the man who blazed the track, did not make money; it was the man who came after him that made money. In one sense, we in Western Australia are in a better position than the people in the Eastern States. True, there are more manufactures in the other States; but I believe the chickens are coming home to roost as regards the big war expenditure. Some people in Western Australia growled during the war period because this State was not getting more of the war expenditure; but now that Australia has to pay back the war

loans, this State has not to pay back so much, in proportion, as the Eastern States. Moreover, during the war period some of our assets such as timber, remained untouched, and these assets will, when shipping becomes normal again, enable us to pay back our borrowings more readily than the Eastern States, which are bound to suffer a reaction. We are now getting a few secondary industries in this State. On the other side of the Swan River, around Belmont, factories are going up, and elsewhere too.

Hon. T. Walker: What are they?

Mr. FOLEY: Cement works, pipe making works, an asbestos factory, and pottery works. If one only goes around the metropolitan area one finds industries springing up. These industries, if they are fostered, will help to pull Western Australia through. No member, I am sure, wishes to cripple them; nor do I think that the legitimate demands to be made on those industries from a wages point of view will cripple them either. But if overhead charges are put on them that are not put on such industries in the other States, they will be crippled. For a time at least we shall not have many secondary industries here, but shall have to rely principally, or almost entirely, on our primary industries. That being so, how will the State be treated by those engaged in the primary industries now, and how will the State treat them? In the past the treatment meted out to the primary industries has not been too bad on the part of any Government. There has been a great deal of talk regarding what the farmers could get for their wheat now if they were allowed to secure the London parity or the world's parity. But at one period of the war there was no parity at all for wheat, and then the Parliament of Western Australia stood by the wheat grower and granted him a parity of 4s. 9d. per bushel; this while there was wheat rotting on our wharves. Now, when there is an opportunity of doing something with the wheat the growers who in times of stress were assisted by the Government ought to think a little of the community and give to any Government in power every assistance with a view to securing the best conditions for the State as a whole. After a look round a good many districts I have come to the conclusion that the best means of assisting the wheat growers is to afford them facilities for getting sheep. My own view is that not many wheat farmers can do much good without sheep along with the wheat. The State has many thousands of acres of land suitable for the production of wool. If a case were put up for the Federal Government in this regard, we could accomplish a great deal more than we have done so far. We have one-third of the space of Australia, and only one-fifteenth of its population; and in our biggest areas we do not grow the best class of wool. I believe that with expert advice to the farmers, and with financial assistance from the Government in the direction of wool growing, much better results could be ob-

tained. Since we have a third of the area of Australia with only one-fifteenth of its people, the Commonwealth Government must come to our assistance if only for the sake of defence. An enemy landing here will not want to take only the sparsely populated West; he will want to take Australia as a whole. In view of the millions of Commonwealth money which have been lavished on the Northern Territory and on the Murray irrigation schemes, the Federal Government are bound to help this State. We do not want the Federal Government to take over the northern portion of this State, but we do ask that some of the millions of money which are to be spent in the development of Australia should be spent on our North-West. Next I come to the question of mining. There are people who say that mining is a dead letter in this State. I take the very contrary view. However, I may say that investors in Western Australian mining are not getting the results they ought to get. There are various causes for this unsatisfactory position. I have here a list of mining requisites, of things that are absolutely essential in the working of a big plant on any mine in this State. The rise in prices as far back as October 1918 was, in many cases, over 150 per cent.; and at the present time it is nearly 200 per cent. From these figures it will be appreciated what mining has had to put up with in this State.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. FOLEY: Before tea I was expressing the opinion that mining was not giving to the State all that we might expect of it. I have here a list of every requisite used on any mine with a treatment plant of its own. It is a long list and I am sorry it cannot be taken as read. In order to have it placed on the records I must read it. Mining in the early days of Western Australia was distinctly prosperous. We have had mining booms in recent months and I believe that out of the new discoveries we shall get at least two or three rich permanent mines. Unfortunately this State is not getting at the present time a great deal out of mining. The list we have here has been prepared by the accountants of a certain well-known mine in this State. These are the figures:—Sulphuric acid, pre-war price £20 4s. 7d.; in October 1918, £23; present price over £23. The pre-war railway freight was £10 4s. 7d., which has since risen to £12 11s. 8d. Retort's plumbago—pre-war price £10 10s. 4d., in October 1918 £21 5s. 6d., present price £21 5s. 8d.; pre-war railway freight 17s. 3d., present railway freight £1 5s. 1d. Bolts—pre-war price £1 18s. 6d., in October 1918 £4 5s., present price £4 5s.; pre-war railway freight 7s. 7d., present freight 8s. Candles—pre-war price 6.5d. per lb., in October 1918 10d., present price 10½d.; pre-war railway freight a fraction of a penny, present freight one penny. House canvas, pre-war price 1s. 6d. per yard, in October 1918 3s. 8d., present price 4s.; pre-war freight 2d. per yard, present freight 2¼d. per yard. Filter

duck—pre-war price 3s. 1½d., in October 1918 12s. 8d., present price 12s. 8d.; pre-war freight 2d., present freight 2½d. Coal—pre-war price 5s. 1d., in October 1918 6s. 6d., present price 6s. 10d.; pre-war railway freight 2s. 7d., present freight 3s. 6d. Coke—pre-war price 5s. 8d., in October 1918 6s. 10d., present price 7s.; pre-war railway freight 2s. 4d., present freight 2s. 7d. Borax—pre-war price £55 19s., in October 1918 £127 19s., present price £130 19s. 3d.; pre-war railway freight £8 5s. 3d., present freight £10 2s. 8d. Litharge—pre-war price £50 19s. 2d., in October 1918 £90 11s. 8d., present price £90 11s. 8d.; pre-war railway freight £6 18s. 2d., present freight £8 9s. 8d. Mabor—pre-war price £41 9s. 4d., in October 1918 £97 8s. 2d., present price £97 8s. 2d.; pre-war railway freight £7 8s. 2d., present freight £8 3s. 4d. Cyanide—pre-war price £9 16s. 9d., in October 1918 £15, present price £14; pre-war railway freight 17s. 6d., present freight 19s. 4d. Gelignite—pre-war price £1 18s. 4d., in October 1918 £2 4s. 4d., present price £2 16s. 10d.; pre-war railway freight 4s. 3d., present freight 5s. 5d. Gelatine—pre-war price £2 10s. 6d., in October 1918 £2 14s. 10d., present price £3 10s.; pre-war railway freight 4s. 6d., present freight 5s. 6d. Bar iron—pre-war price £15 13s., in October 1918 £38, present price £39 15s. 9d.; pre-war railway freight £2 19s. 6d., present freight £3 5s. 9d. Battery shoes—pre-war price £2 7s. 7d., in October 1918 £5 3s. 2d., present price £5 13s. 2d.; pre-war railway freight 14s. 3d., present freight 15s. 1d. Cam shafts—pre-war price £9 8s. 11d., in October 1918, £18 6s., present price £18 6s.; pre-war railway freight £1 18s., present freight £2 1s. 8d. Pig iron—pre-war price £7 19s. 5d., in October 1918 £16 10s., present price £18; pre-war railway freight £1 6s., present freight £1 9s. Engine oil—pre-war price 3s. 7d., in October 1918 6s. 4d., present price 7s. 2d.; pre-war railway freight 8d., present freight 10d. Wired insertion—pre-war price 2s. 3d., in October 1918 4s. 7d., present price 4s. 9d.; pre-war railway freight 1d., present freight 1½d. Quicksilver—pre-war price £8 7s. 7d., in October 1918 £31 10s. 8d., present price £27 0s. 8d.; pre-war railway freight 10s. 8d., present freight 13s. 5d. Rock-drill cylinders—pre-war price £6 7s. 2d., in October 1918 £11 5s. 6d., present price £11 10s.; pre-war railway freight 4s. 6d., present freight 5s. 6d. Piston rods—pre-war price £6 15s. 6d., in October 1918 £9, present price £9 10s.; pre-war railway freight 4s. 1d., present freight 5s. 1d. Manila rope—pre-war price £3 3s. 4d., in October 1918 £8 14s. 9d., present price £8 14s. 9d.; pre-war railway freight 9s. 7d., present freight 11s. 8d. Drill steel—pre-war price £2 1s. 3d., in October 1918 £5 13s. 3d., present price £6 9s. 9d.; pre-war railway freight 3s. 7d., present freight 4s. 5d. Zinc—pre-war price £44 11s. 2d., in October 1918 £75 7s. 8d., present price £75 7s. 8d.; pre-war railway freight £6 4s. 2d., present freight £6 17s. Fuse—pre-war price 6d., in October 1918 9½d., present price 10d.; pre-war railway freight ½d., present freight ¾d. Detonators—pre-war price 4s. 3d., in October 1918 6s. 9d., present price 7s. 7d.; pre-war

freight 1d., present freight 1½d. Those figures speak for themselves. A lot has been said in this Chamber about the interests of the employer and the employee being as far apart as the poles. As one who has worked for wages, I contend that the interests of all mining men in the State, whether wage-earners or employers, are identical when we have to consider a means of redressing those prices before mining can make any showing. The sooner we get down to bed-rock and leave out the question of which Government are in power, the sooner shall we reach some practical remedy. On every one of these items I have quoted the railway freight has been increased. I listened with interest to the member for Swan (Mr. Nairn) speaking of railway freights. It brings up the question of whether we are to make our railways pay. What we must do is to tell the Commissioner of Railways on what principles we require our railways to be run—whether they are to be run at a profit or in the interests of the State generally. If that were done we could get many anomalies in our existing rate-book adjusted, anomalies which are retarding the development of our industries.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Is it not a recognised principle in this State that the railways shall be run for the development of the State?

Mr. FOLEY: It may be so, but I have never yet been able to learn precisely on what system our railways are expected to be run. The sooner the Government get down to bedrock, even if they have to do it by resolution of Parliament, and tell the Commissioner the conditions under which we want the railways run, and hold him blamable for anything that is wrong, the better it will be for Western Australia. We want to see mining prosper and there are many ways in which it can be made to go ahead. There is one company on the goldfields, that which owns the Sons of Gwalia Mine, which has spent out of profits £5,000 a year in prospecting. I have worked there but have nothing for which to thank the mines outback. Certainly I got employment, but when I did not suit them they ceased to employ me and when it did not suit me I left them. We want to see how we can help these mines. The Sons of Gwalia has spent this money in practical prospecting, in sending men out to do it in an up-to-date manner, instead of, as in some other cases, prospecting from motor cars. If money is spent in legitimate prospecting by any company or any body of men, this money should be free from taxation. Another point is that we have assessing the taxes to be paid by the mines in this State, a man who sits in his office in Perth, and who has never seen a mine in his life nor had anything to do with mining. This is the man who says to a mining company, or party of miners who send in their returns, how much shall be allowed for development purposes from the point of view of income tax. I know of one case in which he said that 4s. per foot was all that should be allowed for

development. An officer who says that, does not know how best the interests of the State can be served. By altering anomalies such as this we can assist our mines and those who employ labour. During the past four years mining has been hampered through the best of our men having gone to the war. In Western Australia most of our men who went from the goldfields were either in the 11th, 16th or 28th Battalions. And we also know that these battalions suffered more than any others that left Western Australia. The result is that many of our men who left mining to go to the war have not returned. Whilst those men were away fighting it would appear at a casual glance that the development of our mines had shown better results with those who were left behind in the matter of costs. There was never a greater fallacy. Scarcely any development work has been allowed for, with the result that many of the mines are working with too little development ahead of them. We now have many of our men back again and a large number have gone back to mining, with the result that mining companies are now getting better results from labour than heretofore. The cost to the mines has been very great indeed. Western Australia can help these men in a practical way by giving them something for the long period they have put into mining. Most of us who have been engaged in mining for a number of years know that our health has been impaired. Men end up either in the Sanatorium or in the various cemeteries on the fields, if they stay in the industry very long. When men came back from the war vocational training classes were started for soldiers who could not follow the same avocations as they followed before the war. As the result of this vocational training men are now able to earn a living as artisans and tradesmen who previously were not qualified in those particular directions. Knowing that it is the inevitable destiny of many of those engaged in mining, either to die through ill-health at an early age or at an early age to go to the sanatorium, it is the duty of the State to say to them, "We will not see your wives and families on the verge of starvation, and we will not see them suffer if it is possible for us to help them." The State can help them by forming vocational training classes. Even if these are started at the Wooroloo Sanatorium, by this means men whose health is impaired can be enabled to learn useful trades. We all know that scarcely a man will leave the goldfields unless he is forced to do so, with the result that in 99 cases out of 100 he goes to the Sanatorium to die, too late to be cured.

Mr. Harrison: He does not go early enough.

Mr. FOLEY: That is so. Were inducements offered for a man to go to the sanatorium before the germs of the disease got a firm hold, and before he reached the tubercular stage, and he was then given the opportunity to learn some trade which would

enable him to make a living for his family, it would be of great help to him and he would become a direct asset to the State.

Mr. Harrison: It would also give the institution a better chance.

Mr. FOLEY: We were sorry, when the leases were renewed on the goldfields, that something was not done in the direction of getting this project supported by the companies. I believe that both the wage earner and the proprietor would in conference formulate a scheme which could be backed up by the Government with assistance. This would mean that instead of providing, as we do now under the Mines' Workers Relief Fund, for these men and their families or, if they die, their widows and children, money would be forthcoming to enable men to learn new trades and produce something which would be a valuable asset to the State. It would also be the means of prolonging their lives. In the past most of our efforts in mining have been directed towards gold. There are, however, other minerals found in Western Australia. I contend that the duplication of our departments has meant that as much assistance has not been given to these miners as the Government might wish to give. There was, for instance, alunite found in the constituency represented by the member for Kanowna. This was proved to be successful by the best chemist in the State, Dr. Simpson, of the Mines Department. It was said that this alunite could be used as a fertiliser, and it was being used for that purpose. Later on another officer in the civil service, paid for by the same Government and out of the pockets of the same taxpayers, a chemist in the Agricultural Department, brought in a contrary verdict. After Dr. Simpson said that this was a good fertiliser and after it had been proved by the farmers to be good and the farmers had said that they had proved it in this way, the agricultural chemist, Mr. Mann, stepped in and said, "You must not sell it because it is not a registered fertiliser." Dr. Simpson says it is good, and Mr. Mann says it is not good. So far as whisky was concerned, Mr. Mann pitted his opinion against that of the world, and I think the world won in a canter. We will have to get rid of this duplication of departments. If a chemist, with the undoubted qualifications of Dr. Simpson, says that this is a good fertiliser, and there are men willing to put money into it and to work it, because it is not so dangerous or harmful to health as other classes of mining, the Government should not have the position that one chemist in one department can say it is good, and another in another department say it is bad.

Mr. Harrison: What does it contain?

Mr. FOLEY: It contains potash. One cannot but see that this over-lapping and duplication of departments is a bad thing, and the sooner we have a Government which will have the temerity to say that one man can do this job, and that there is no room for two men to do it, the better it will be for all

concerned and especially for the mining industry.

The Minister for Works: Then we should be accused of victimisation.

Mr. FOLEY: I should like to say a few words in regard to the hospital accommodation in this State. Hundreds of thousands of pounds were subscribed during the war by the Red Cross Society for the assistance of soldiers. Unlike the State there was a big surplus. The surplus amounts to £30,000, which could be made available to this State for the building of a hospital for returned soldiers and other patients.

Mr. Harrison: Why not divide it up amongst country centres?

Mr. FOLEY: I will tell the hon. member why. Many of those who returned from the war are either going to be a burden on the State, or must have access to a hospital to be treated quickly for their ailments. Quick treatment in the case of many men who have war complaints, or injuries due to the war, usually results in quick recoveries. Our Perth hospital is 30 years behind the times in size. It is proposed to build a new wing and to put 96 beds in it. I have it on the best authority that this is the place that it is intended to use for returned soldiers when the base hospital is closed. If we take the patients from the Base hospital, accommodation will be needed for 200 men, leaving out altogether the out-patients who must be treated.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: When are they going to move?

Mr. FOLEY: I do not want to say anything about that. It is a Federal matter. I understand they are considering the question of closing it up.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Is it because the State wants to build there?

Mr. FOLEY: I do not intend to go into that matter. If we could get hold of that £30,000 we could spend the money in the direction in which it is needed. I desire to touch on the subject of the civil service strike. Unlike many hon. members, and perhaps like some, I contend that the strike was a blow aimed at constitutional authority and rule by Government. I have not waited to come to the House to say that; I told the members of the service so at their meeting.

Mr. Green: And so did the member for Guildford on the same day.

Mr. FOLEY: A great deal has been said about the trouble which arose at Fremantle, and those who went on strike were declared to be revolutionists and Bolsheviks. Everything that was bad was said of them. If those men were guilty of all that was then declared then the civil servants were equally revolutionary. We should have a way of settling our differences and that way should be through the Arbitration Court. It can be done and it should be done and every hon. member can assist in that direction. Having an Arbitration Act we should also have a Conciliation Act with it. When the conciliation sections were taken out of the Ar-

bitration Act the best portion of the Act was removed. Now we want to see whether we cannot put something in the place of those sections. We all are aware that there are ever changing conditions which render the Acts of 1908 and 1914 useless. But the principle of arbitration remains, and it is only a matter of bringing the Act up to date. The reason why the Act has not been a success is because in many instances the workers have been forced by stress of circumstances to strike before they could go to the court at all. We thought that arbitration was going to end all our troubles. What we should have is not an arbitration court, but arbitration courts that could be made accessible within the space of a week and if necessary one day, so as to prevent trouble. We have not enough courts at the present time. Moreover, it is a fallacy to have one man representing the workers and another representing the employers, sitting with a chairman, and then having an advocate for either side. If we had six or seven men and clothed them with the same power as that possessed by a judge, and made those men available at short notice to sit as an arbitration court, we would get better results and bring about speedier settlements of troubles. I trust that when anything is done in connection with the civil service, something in the direction I have outlined will be followed. There is not one man who can classify the civil service and the individual. There should be a man thoroughly conversant with each department and his sole duty should be to classify the officers.

The Honorary Minister: Should not that be the Under Secretary's job?

Mr. FOLEY: I would not have an under secretary do it. We know that an under secretary has risen from the ranks, and so with the person under him and the officer under him again, but if we secure the services of a man with qualifications consisting of a good sense of proportion to do the work, I am convinced he would be successful in classifying the various positions. In that way only shall we get greater efficiency, which is what we are after. Even if it is found necessary to utilise the services of officers in other directions, as the result of this classification, or even to put them out of the service altogether, a great amount of good must follow. Arbitration has failed for the reasons I have given. We all desire to make this country what we want it to be—one of the best to live in. The question of education might be touched upon. I am entirely opposed to the views held by the member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood). I contend that if a man goes out back we want to provide facilities for the education of his children. The hon. member used the argument that if parents do not educate their children those parents are to be blamed.

Mr. Underwood: I said that fifty years ago parents educated their children.

Mr. FOLEY: We have no desire to blame the parents, but we want to see that the

children are educated. I want to see that every child in the State receives the education he is entitled to receive. The system of education can be improved. I quoted figures last session to show that many were employed, not in teaching children, but over-looking those who were actually teaching. If the question of the cost of education were gone into thoroughly I believe it would be found that we were not getting the best results for the money we were spending. No hon. member cavils at the amount spent on education, but we should have better results and those better results can be obtained by closer application, by bringing the teachers into closer touch with the children, and paying all the staff to teach instead of paying a section of them to watch those who were actually engaged in the work of teaching. The debate on the Address-in-reply is just about to conclude, and in all probability before there is another there will be a new Parliament, but no matter what Parliament we have I trust that any criticism that is levelled at any Government will not be in the direction of destroying the proposals that may be suggested by those in occupation of the Ministerial bench, and I hope that those gentlemen on that bench will regard it as their duty to listen to members who have arguments to advance.

Mr. O'Loughlin: It is awful to ask them to listen to some of us.

Mr. FOLEY: There is good in everybody. I want to see the system of Government altered in this direction: We come to this Parliament as members; we debate questions. The questions that we debate are governed by six men or the number who happen to constitute the Ministry. Those six men decide to submit a Bill and they declare what that Bill shall contain. Not sufficient advantage is taken of the knowledge possessed by members generally. If that general knowledge were sought better results would follow.

Mr. Underwood: Have you not the power now to discuss any Bill that comes forward?

Mr. FOLEY: Yes.

Mr. Underwood: Do you not read every Bill that comes forward?

Mr. FOLEY: Yes, but there are six men who say what the programme shall be. And perhaps one man in that Ministry has the right to drop a particular Bill, or to say whether it is to come before us.

Mr. Underwood: Not likely.

Mr. FOLEY: My greatest objection to the present system is that there are too many months of the year in which Parliament does not sit. When Parliament is not sitting members carry out their duties in connection with their respective constituencies, but it cannot be denied that during the recess members are not giving to the Government the best of which they are capable because there are few opportunities to express an opinion. I am not speaking of the opportunities of waiting upon Ministers to get them to consider different questions. I mean that there are few

opportunities to get into touch with Ministers in connection with the questions that occupy our attention in this House. I hope that ere many years pass, every member of this Parliament will be given greater opportunities to place the best that is in him at the service of the Government during the whole of the year.

Mr. Smith: Do you intend to make them all Honorary Ministers?

Mr. TROY (Mt. Magnet) [8.16]: I propose to contribute a few remarks to this debate because I do not think any member ought to let the opportunity pass without expressing his opinion on matters mentioned in the Governor's Speech. The Speech put into the mouth of the Governor might be taken as mere window dressing. The Government of the day put in the most conspicuous place all the things which in their opinion would put their administration in a favourable light and they pretend that behind all those good things in the window are all the things which will make for the prosperity and satisfaction of the people of this State.

Mr. Smith: Very poor window dressing.

Mr. TROY: I do not deny that it was very poor window dressing indeed, but the Government did their best. I am merely expressing my opinion of the matter because, apparently, it is the practice of the Government to put forward their best in the Governor's Speech. We in this House have been accustomed every year to hear about the various industries and their prosperity; nothing, of course, of adversity. We are told that the prospects of certain industries are exceptionally bright; that land settlement is proceeding apace and every attention is being paid to the advancement of secondary industries. These statements have appeared in every Governor's Speech I can remember during the last 17 years, but we who know the real position of the State are perfectly satisfied in our own hearts, unless we wilfully deceive ourselves, that the position of this State is not at all satisfactory. I think there is too much deception by members who pretend that things are not so bad as they really are. In my opinion it is high time the real state of affairs was brought home to the people of this State, and I commend the speech of the member for Perth (Mr. Pilkington) which I did not hear but which I read in "Hansard," in which he endeavoured to point out to the people the reality of our present position. The member for Perth was censured to-night by the member for Swan (Mr. Nairn), but I am inclined to think that such members are guilty of deception—I do not say wilful deception—because any man who looks at the state of our finances must realise that since Western Australia is in debt to the extent of over four million pounds, things cannot be satisfactory. When we realise that since 1910, when the deficit was £102,000, there has been an ever-recurring

and increasing deficit annually, and that to-day it amounts in the aggregate to over four million pounds, no one can say that this State is in a satisfactory position. Just as it is with the individual, so is it with the community. If an individual is heavily in debt, if he is financially in straitened circumstances, no one can consider that his position is satisfactory, and unquestionably the position of this State is not good because we are in deep water financially. Any hon. member who endeavours to lead the community to believe that things are all right and will be all right is not doing his duty to the country. He ought to place before the people the real position. When we realise the heavy amounts which must be raised for interest both by the Commonwealth and by the State; when we consider the fact that we have falling due loans which cannot be met, but which will have to be renewed at high rates of interest, and when we consider that between the Commonwealth and the States the five millions of people in Australia owe almost a thousand million pounds, the interest bill on which amounts to 50 million pounds a year, we ought to tell the people the gravity of the situation. Ministers will not do it and members behind the Government will not do it either. I may be accused of being a pessimist because I make these remarks, but I am not a pessimist. Just as in my own affairs I endeavour to make provision for what might occur in future, so also with the State, we should let the people know the real position of affairs in order that they also might make provision and help the Government to tide over the difficulties which are sure to arise in the near future. To-day, apart from the State and its financial necessities, the Commonwealth Government have financial necessities. Looming behind the State are the Federal Government with heavy burdens, and in my opinion with little regard for their heavy burdens—

Mr. Pickering: Hear, hear!

Mr. TROY: Trying to raise money in Great Britain and failing, carrying a very heavy burden of interest, owing 48 million pounds to Great Britain and having no money to pay the liability, even proposing to pay in bonds to the wool growers of Australia 30 million pounds due to them by the British Government since they cannot get the money from Great Britain owing to the fact that they owe 48 million pounds to Great Britain. Realising that the Commonwealth has a loan of 25 millions on the local market—which in my opinion will not be subscribed unless compulsion is employed—and that another loan is foreshadowed eight months hence, realising all this I ask how can it be said that the Commonwealth and the State are in a satisfactory position? I say that the position, so far from being satisfactory, is very unsatisfactory. I am not so much concerned about this State particularly. I think that despite our position to-day we might with care and with economy tide over, but what I

am concerned about is that behind the State Government stand the Commonwealth Government, in my opinion the most reckless and unscrupulous Government which Australia has ever had. Apparently the Commonwealth Government do not care a rap how they spend the money they raise, and when I observe how the Federal Government dominate us and can invade every avenue of revenue and will invade it and show no concern whatever for our difficulties, I am alarmed at the position of affairs.

The Minister for Works: That is right; they have no compunction.

Mr. TROY: I realise that the position for us is very grave indeed, and I hold that we should tell the people exactly what the circumstances are. I have endeavoured to let my constituents know from time to time the gravity of the position as I understand it. To-day the Federal Government are raising millions of money and their expenditure is increasing by leaps and bounds. There is no end to the positions they are creating, no end to the boards and commissions they have in existence, no end to their extravagance and no end to the scandals which, in normal times could not have occurred, but which have occurred because the people's minds have been influenced and doped during the war and the Government have been encouraged to wicked waste and extravagance. I make no attack particularly on Federal members representing this State but, in my opinion, members of the Commonwealth Parliament and Government have become so emboldened by the fact that the things they have done have escaped observation that they are pursuing the old course and, unless we tell the people, they will not be brought to their senses. I have not always spoken so strongly of the Commonwealth Parliament, but I am satisfied that, as we have our difficulties and are honestly endeavouring to meet them, we cannot do anything for our ultimate good while behind us is the present Commonwealth Government, reckless and extravagant, and without regard for our needs or necessities.

The Minister for Works: Hear, hear!

Mr. TROY: I am glad that my remarks meet with commendation from the Minister.

The Minister for Works: I agree with you. I have no time for them.

Mr. TROY: I am a Federalist, but I speak as I feel. I feel that the present Federal Government are the most reckless and extravagant body of men that have ever held the reins of office in Australia and I believe they are emboldened to pursue the course of the last five years because so far they have been able to mislead the people by party cries, by sectarianism, by any old thing which will blind the people to the true position. In my opinion, and I ought to be in a position to judge, the condition of the great mass of the people in this State to-day is worse than it has ever been my lot to know. This is due not only to the high cost of living, and to the fact that the purchasing power of the sovereign has been reduced by 50 per cent., but

also to the fact that the people and particularly the producers are burdened by heavily increased taxation. The people in the outback areas of the State are burdened not only by high charges for necessary commodities but, during the last 12 months, have had to meet increased railway freights while the taxation on incomes has also been increased. The position of the people of this State, satisfactory as it might be to the member for Swan, is more oppressed than it ever has been in the history of this country. During the last few years the income tax alone has been increased from £91,000 to £271,000 per year. The exemption too has been reduced with the result that people, particularly those living in the mining areas who have to pay for the carriage of goods over 400 to 600 miles of railway and who have to buy all their commodities since they are able to grow none, have out of their scanty wages to pay income tax, even though the wages they have received are barely sufficient to maintain themselves, their wives and their families. I am not exaggerating; I am speaking from personal experience. I had occasion to act on behalf of the miners in an arbitration case and I can say I was not aware by any means of the real position of these people until I went into their homes and saw their accounts and the conditions under which they were living. I read the other day that a member of the Federal Parliament, Mr. Gregory, said that in the Arbitration Court the awards went to those who swore the hardest and told the most lies. Well, that remark marks Mr. Gregory as not a very creditable representative of the people whom he represents in the Federal Parliament. Surely he must be judging of these matters by his own standards. In the Arbitration Court I have always insisted on my witnesses getting down to bedrock. Even if I were not above trying to put up a bogus case, I know it would be hopeless to try to do so, because men with the fear of the law before them, and not up to the games that some members of the community are up to, would be afraid to tell an untruth. In all my cases I have had my witnesses down to bedrock and they have had their accounts to back up their statements. In Meekatharra recently I saw evidence produced in court showing a condition of affairs which I think few men in this House know exists. I am in a position to say that there are people in that district who cannot do fairly by their children, living as they do 600 miles away from the city, with the cost of living increased 50 per cent., with railway rates increased, and with the income tax exemption reduced necessitating the payment of a tax out of incomes not sufficient for the maintenance of their families. That may be a satisfactory position from some people's point of view. But it is not satisfactory to the people who are doing the hard pioneering work of the country, the people who, in my opinion, should be most considered. Of all the industries which have been affected by present conditions the mining industry has fared worst, and I will give the reasons. Every increase in price, every increase in rail-

way freights, every increase in the cost of living, every increase in the cost of mining requisites has hit the mining industry because, apart from the small amount of gold sold by the Gold Producing Association, the product of the mining industry remains at the same price as 20 years ago. Unlike the farming industry or the pastoral industry, in which the prices of grain and wool have increased, largely—

Mr. Harrison: During the last eight months.

Mr. TROY: In the case of wool, during the last two years. On the other hand, the price of gold remains as it was 20 years ago. And yet the Government, in raising railway rates and in imposing heavier taxation, have had no regard whatever for the people employed in the gold-mining industry.

The Minister for Works: But you know why the railway rates had to be increased.

Mr. TROY: Yes, I know that.

Mr. Lutey: Why?

Mr. TROY: I will come to that later. However, the Government have had no regard whatever for the condition of the people engaged in the gold-mining industry. In the agricultural industry, owing to the high price received for wheat last year, increased railway freights could be paid; and the same thing applies to the wool growers. I think there is little to complain of in that connection. But as for the gold-mining industry, the Government, had they had any regard for the industry, would have realised that, as gold brings no greater price now than it has brought during the last 20 years, the people engaged in the industry should have received consideration as regards both income tax and railway rates.

The Minister for Works: How could you differentiate?

Mr. TROY: The hon. gentleman's Government have differentiated in regard to the transport of superphosphate over the railways. The Government have also differentiated in regard to water supply in agricultural districts. In both cases the differentiation has been in favour of the agriculturists. I want to tell the party opposite, who now call themselves the primary producers' party—

Mr. Harrison: Are you a primary producer?

Mr. TROY: Yes. I have always been an advocate of the primary producer in this House. I have always advocated a policy in his favour. But I have always found my friends opposite, while going part of the road, averse to going the full extent necessary to safeguard the interests of the people whom they represent in this House. The people engaged in the mining industry have had no corresponding advantage such as that secured by the agriculturists and the pastoralists. The Government stand condemned in so far as the mining industry is concerned, because they have never considered it in any respect, either in their legislation or in their administration. The other night the Premier made some comparisons between the farmer and the rest of the community. In

reply to an interjection by the leader of the Opposition he said—

The hon. member knows full well that the landowner is already fairly heavily taxed. His income is taxed. I suppose there is no member of the community who pays more than the farmer. He is taxed on the actual money he makes and on the increase on his stock and on the money he spends in keeping his farms in order and keeping himself up to date, and in every possible way.

But that statement is not correct. The farmer, in my opinion, so far as income tax is concerned, is taxed less than any other producer in the country. Moreover, he is not taxed at all on the improvements he makes to keep his property in order. He is allowed for that.

The Minister for Works: How?

Mr. TROY: If his fences have to be repaired, or if the improvements he has made require keeping in order he is allowed exemption for that expenditure and is not taxed on it. Moreover, the farmer can live more cheaply than any man in the country. Whereas the miner has to pay out of his income for everything he requires for his daily wants, and has to pay income tax on his income, which is already eaten up in providing for his daily wants; the farmer, on the other hand, can produce two-thirds of his requirements.

Mr. Harrison: He has to allow for that when making up his income tax return.

Mr. TROY: The farmer grows his own vegetables. How much does he put in on that account? He has his own milk, butter, poultry, eggs, bacon—

The Minister for Works: He has to put those things in though.

Mr. TROY: How much does he put in? He puts in an approximate sum. For example, he puts in 10s. for a sheep. The miner has to pay 25s. for a sheep.

The Minister for Works: But part of that 25s. is freight.

Mr. TROY: The consumer on the goldfields has to pay a higher freight than the agriculturist because the goldfields consumer is further away. He has to pay a higher cost because of the number of hands through which his commodity passes, every one of them making a profit on it. He has to pay a higher cost for all his personal and household requirements. Even though the farmer does put in to the income tax commissioner the approximate cost of that portion of his product which he has utilised in his household, he does it at a much less cost than the miner, or the person on the goldfields, has to pay for his requirements to the storekeeper, the butcher and the baker. The farmer has a distinct advantage. I speak from experience. He has an advantage over other men in the community engaged in any other occupation that I know of. I have a farm and I live partly on it; and I have lived on the goldfields. Therefore, I know the positions. I have seen

the accounts of the Murchison workers. I know where the advantage lies. The agriculturist to-day has, I say, less to complain of than any other man in the community, except, possibly, the pastoralist and business man. And how is the farmer being treated as regards taxation? As pointed out by the leader of the Opposition, the land tax paid last year was less by £1,000 than that paid in 1910—10 years ago. That is an extraordinary state of affairs. We are told that this country has progressed, that land values have increased owing to the actions of the Government. We are also told that, owing to the prosperity of the country, land values have increased greatly and we find that they have increased to such an extent that last year's land tax yielded £1,000 less than did the land tax of 1910.

Mr. Green: The farmers are getting cleverer at juggling the figures.

Mr. TROY: Has the value of land increased in the cities? Has Perth not grown during the last 10 years? Has the land not become more valuable in St. George's terrace and Perth generally, and in Mount Lawley and South Perth? How comes it, then, that the people who pay land tax now pay less than they paid 10 years ago, whereas the unfortunate people who pay income tax pay ten times as much as they paid 10 years ago? We are told there is going to be more taxation. The Governor's Speech says that Parliament is to be asked to consider measures which will bring the finances into greater accord. We know what that means. Behind that is this, that the Government intend to increase taxation by some means. We hear there is to be another increase in railway freights. I shall oppose that strongly, because I am satisfied that the people in my electorate will not be able to live if railway freights are again increased. Moreover, such an increase would wipe out the gold mining industry utterly and absolutely. There is a rumour that there is to be an increase in the income tax. I shall oppose that also. How on earth can the Government ask people to pay heavier income tax than they are now paying, people who are with difficulty keeping body and soul together in the outback areas of this State? The Government may expect that, so far as I am concerned, both those proposals will receive the most uncompromising opposition. Why do not the Government, if they want money, bring in an amendment of the Land and Income Tax Act, as suggested by the leader of the Opposition, and increase the tax on land? I will reiterate a statement I have made in this House frequently, reiterate it in the hope that it may reach the intellects of some hon. members present who represent the primary producers. I want particularly to address my remarks to the member for Swan (Mr. Nairn). In that hon. member's opinion, to-day everything in the garden is lovely, and there is no State with better prospects than Western Aus-

tralia. He says a striking fact is that there are fewer people in the bankruptcy court to-day than there have been for years. Granted, because the position is that during the last five years the business man of Australia has had the time of his life. He is the one man in the community, apart from the agriculturist and the pastoralist, who has done well during the past few years. In all parts of the Commonwealth, the business man has had the people in his hands. By every pretence and excuse he has raised prices. The business community have made profits they never previously dreamed of. No wonder they are not in the bankruptcy court. But the rest of the community is near it. That is the position. The business man has made the best of his opportunities and the mass of the community is bordering on insolvency. Take all our big business firms. The Minister for Mines told us that Mr. R. P. Vincent's profits were twice as great during the first year of the war than they were before the war. So too with all the big business firms. These are the people who can evade taxation which every other member of the community has to pay.

Mr. Nairn: You show the business community how to evade taxation and you can have a salary of £100,000 a year.

Mr. TROY: They have made profits which they had never previously dreamed of. While the railway freights have been raised and the producer has had to pay the freights, the city business man has escaped. He pays no railway freights. He simply puts his goods on the railway and the people at the other end pay.

Mr. Harrison: How would you get at him?

Mr. TROY: By a good stiff income tax with decent exemptions for the mass of the people.

Mr. Harrison: But he would pass it on.

Mr. TROY: He would pass anything on. He can be got at, but the Government have made no attempt whatever to get at him. The big business man has escaped his obligations to the community. He pays no increased railway freights, yet the Government, representing the community as a whole, and the Country party representing the primary producer, have never attempted to make the business man live up to his obligations with the rest of the community. Probably there are members on the Government side who share my opinion; but the line of cleavage between those members and myself is that while they support vested interests which are exploiting this State unfairly, I cannot be and will not be with them. That is why I say that this party, the Labour party, is more truly representative of the producer than any party sitting on the Ministerial cross benches. The member for Swan (Mr. Nairn) being a commercial man, regards everything in the garden as lovely. I for my part, representing a community which I know is heavily burdened,

cannot think that everything in the garden is lovely, because I know that my constituents are oppressed with such burdens.

Mr. Nairn: They require a new member.

Mr. TROY: What they want is a new Government, and there is a hopeful prospect that they will get one. The excuse given by the Government regarding the parlous condition of the State is that there has been much industrial unrest. There has been a little of it, but less here than in any other part of the world except perhaps Greenland. If there has been industrial unrest what are the causes of it? I have heard Ministers talk of Bolshevism, or Sinn Feinism, and of I.W.W.-ism. It is of no use wasting time on pretences of that character. There must be some cause for the industrial unrest. Every hon. member knows that whatever industrial unrest obtains in Western Australia is due to the ever increasing cost of commodities rendering it difficult for parents to support their families.

Mr. Pickering: Is there not a contributing factor in the decreased output? Be honest about it.

Mr. TROY: Let the hon. member be concerned about his own honesty. I know that the people of the back country work as hard as ever they did and for as long as ever they did, and I know that no employer up there is complaining about their slackness or claiming that there is a decrease in the production.

Mr. Harrison: Then there is no industrial unrest there.

Mr. TROY: There would have been industrial unrest there but for the advice given by myself and others in accordance with which the miners have been patient and have gone to the Arbitration Court. I hope the difficulty will be fixed up satisfactorily, although I am afraid that even if they get an increase in wages it will be of no benefit to them, because the price of commodities is still rising. I have been a little amused by the discussion here upon industrial unrest and the Arbitration Court. I have heard hon. members say that everything will be fixed up by the Arbitration Court, while others have held that we ought to amend the Act, and still another section have declared that we should first bring the employer and employee together. All those propositions are equally hopeless. At best the Arbitration Court cannot be other than a palliative. Still it has benefited the community on many occasions. Some disputes it cannot settle because unfortunately the gentlemen who preside over the courts are frequently as unprogressive as certain other members of the community and will not realise the true facts. The proposition to bring employer and employee together is in some cases hopeless, the employer not being a free agent. At a sitting of the Arbitration Court at Meekatharra I was struck by this view of the position. I asked Mr. Roberts, a well-known mine manager, did he think the men were receiving a fair wage. His reply was "It is not for

me to say. It is for the Chamber of Mines to decide." Ninety per cent. of our mine managers are not free agents but are employed to get the best possible results for the shareholders, and consequently must resist every demand for increased wages, whether just or not. I do not hold those men responsible; it is the condition of society in which we live. We cannot hope to bring together two bodies of men, one body not free agents, and expect those bodies to come to a satisfactory settlement. I am sure that Mr. Roberts knew what was a fair thing. Another mine manager up there confessed to me that it was not a fair thing, and that he knew it; he added that he was saying that in confidence. We can never get an arbitration court which will give complete satisfaction. Still the court has been a great help and on many occasions has tided the community over a serious difficulty. Those members who say that the Arbitration Court should be abolished should bear in mind that it is better to have a court which will do some good than to have no court at all. Of course in the case of an employer who comes into contact with his employees there is no great difficulty. Take the case of, say, an hon. member who is running a farm and employing half a dozen hands. There should be no difficulty there between the employer and his employees, for he can meet his employees face to face and talk things over with them. But wherever a business is managed by a manager or wherever there are competing businesses one of which gets an advantage by paying a lower wage, it is of no use trying to bring employer and employee together; it is first necessary that the employers should get together and agree as to what they can pay. Personally I have done as much as I could to settle industrial disputes, but I never will subscribe to the proposition that on every occasion disputes should go to the Arbitration Court. If on many occasions the workers had not made a strong protest they would have got nothing in the Arbitration Court; because the courts are just as conservative as are the individuals composing them. Had it not been for the public service strike, the public service would not have got the recently appointed board. Had it not been for some of the strikes in the Eastern States the Arbitration Court judges would not have given the men satisfactory awards. The judges have been constrained to improve their awards, feeling that if they did not do so there would be trouble. It is only human nature and, after all, a judge's knowledge is probably not more profound than that of many other individuals.

The Minister for Works: At all events he has the experience.

Mr. TROY: Not necessarily. Just as with you and I, Mr. Speaker, the opinions of a judge of the Arbitration Court are largely the result of his environment and of the society in which he lives and moves. I have heard it suggested that if a layman were made President of the Arbitration Court, at all events he would be of democratic views and would

entertain humane ideas. It is possible to get such men but it is doubtful if their appointment would meet with the approval of all parties. Recently, when travelling in a railway train, I heard two gentlemen, both station owners, discussing shearers. The one squatter said that he had a fine gang of men who turned out wonderful work. The other referred to all of his shearers as swine. I happen to know that the man who used that epithet has never done a day's work in his life, his father having left him a fine station. Yet he had not a decent word to say for the men who worked for him. Obviously they cannot all be bad. The other squatter, as I say, had the highest praise for the men working for him. We can well understand the relationship between the employer and the employee in the case of the man who calls his men swine. Those who travel about the country cannot help engaging in conversation with other people when travelling in the trains. That is where one hears the true opinions of men. One travels in a first-class carriage and frequently meets people of diverse views who express their opinions quite frankly. In 90 per cent. of these cases where I have heard such men express opinions it is utterly hopeless to expect a fair deal for those employed by them. I travelled down with a man some 12 months ago who had been buying sheep on the Murchison. With him were two other gentlemen. He lived on a station near Moora. We began to talk about mining. It was stated that mining was in a pretty bad way, and this particular man said, "No wonder, the men won't work; they are always asking for increased wages, and they are slackers." This man had been 12 months in the country at that time and yet he professed to know all about it. I said to him, "Do you know that the wages these men now receive on the Murchison are what they received 12 years ago, and that there has been no increase during that period?" He replied that he did not know, and I then asked him why he made such a statement. He was staggered and did not reply. I then said, "How do you know they are slackers?" but he did not answer. Another gentleman who was in the carriage, one of the same persuasion, was frank enough to say, "You are up against it, old man; you have opened your mouth too wide." That is the sample of men who are some of the employers in this country. How can one expect from such men conciliatory methods towards their employees? It is impossible to expect it. I am always struck by the fact that with few exceptions these are men of little tolerance and full of self-interest. They do not care a rap about other men. Even men like myself are apt to get away from a real understanding of the position of people on the bread line. When I went to Meekatharra I did not know that the condition of the people was so bad. I found, as I have stated before, women unable to supply their

children, from compulsion, with the full necessities of life. The husbands are engaged every day in occupations which mean for them an early grave. They do not have the life to look forward to that the farmer has. I have heard the sufferings and struggles of the farmer talked about. They are ridiculous in comparison to those of the miner. I was reared on a farm, and know that in the beginning there is a struggle, but every year that a farmer works he is building up an asset for himself and is becoming better off. In his old age he has a home, and that is all that a man can expect in this world. The man who works for an employer has no such thing to look forward to. The assets he creates are created for someone else. Men who are engaged in the mining industry are living under harsh conditions. Conditions are burdensome owing to the taxation and legislation, and the miner goes to his occupation every day knowing that he is not creating any asset for himself, with the exception possibly of the asset of ill-health resulting in an early grave.

Mr. Harrison: Why do they not transfer their assets to the land?

Mr. TROY: I have always told these men to get out of the industry as soon as they can. Many of the poor fellows have families and no money. If the Government will give them an opportunity I am sure they will get out very quickly. I have seen them with pasty faces and short breath, and I have told them to get out of it. The mothers of children have told me that they will never let their children work in the mining industry, and I do not blame them. For years past in this House we have heard of little else but the struggles and difficulties of the farmers. They have the most happy position of any in the country, because they are laying up for themselves an asset which has not impaired their health and will afford them decent comfort in their old age. We are told that there is a proposition to further increase railway freights because the railways are not paying. We know now that the railway rates were increased this year to such an extent as to bring in a revenue far above that required by the administration to meet the increase in wages. There is no doubt that the next proposition will be the same, and that the rates will be increased out of all proportion to the requirements. The Premier has said that the State trading concerns, for the establishment of which this party came in for much censure, are paying propositions and returning good profits as well as paying interest and sinking fund. The whole of the State difficulty was due to the railways. And yet this Government propose to build more railways, when the country already has too many. They are going to build the Wilgarup-Albany railway, which will cost hundreds of thousands of pounds, and still further add to our difficulties. At the same time they admit that

along our existing railways there are thousands of acres of land not utilised.

Mr. Harrison: Where?

Mr. TROY: On the Wongan Hills line, for instance, and on the Midland line.

Mr. O'Loughlin: On every line.

Mr. TROY: Yes. We have a greater mileage of railway per head of the population than any other country in the world. This constitutes a great burden on the people. We have too much railway for our population, and yet the Government intend to build more.

Mr. Harrison: To stimulate immigration.

Mr. TROY: They propose to raise railway rates again, and still further add to the burden. This Government must be fit subjects for a lunatic asylum; they cannot govern with sanity. The Premier tells us the whole trouble is that we have too many railways, and that lands along our railways are not fully utilised, and that we are carrying more railways per mile to the population of the State than any other country. And yet here we have a programme for still more railways where the people cannot get a decent return from the land to be served, for at least a generation.

Mr. Pickering: Do you not think the people who have been promised a railway for 20 years should get it?

Mr. TROY: Let me ask the hon. member how many people would be served by the Wilgarup-Albany line? It would take a generation at least before any family could make a livelihood on it. It will be no good for the first generation, and until the second and the third generation the land will not give a livelihood. Notwithstanding this the Government propose to lay out huge sums of money on building this railway which can only be a burden on the country for at least a generation. Alongside our existing railways there is plenty of land for settlement.

Mr. Harrison: Freehold land?

Mr. TROY: Yes, Crown lands, with the same rainfall there as where I am farming myself. Much of this country is held by squatters and others, and the Government will not interfere with them. I am going to oppose the imposition of any further burdens upon the people, and oppose it as strongly as I can. I will not be guilty of supporting anything of that nature.

Mr. Pickering: You will not oppose a promised line to assist settlers?

Mr. TROY: I deprecate the huge expenditure in opening up land on which the first generation will certainly make no livelihood. There is plenty of land where quicker and more certain livelihoods could be obtained. In what part of the country is the farming community more prosperous than in the wheat belt, which has been settled during the last ten years or twelve years? In these areas the newer settlers are the most prosperous in the country. The agricultural wealth of the State is coming almost solely from the wheat belt.

Mr. Harrison: They have gone through the pioneering stage.

Mr. TROY: Settlers have been in the South-West for 50 years and have still not passed through the pioneering stage.

Mr. Pickering: I will soon show you evidence contrary to that.

Mr. TROY: The evidence lies in the fact that the agricultural wealth of the State comes from the wheat belt, where settlement occurred 10 or 12 years ago. In these localities hundreds of settlers can be placed on the land if the Government will only take heed of the true position.

Mr. Pickering: What about our butter supplies from the South-West?

Mr. TROY: There is as much butter produced in the wheat belt as there is in the South-West.

Mr. O'Loghlen: More.

Mr. TROY: Yes, I believe so. The wheat belt will produce for the next ten years as much butter as the South-West will produce.

Mr. Green: The Merredin-Dowerin line produces in winter time more than the South-West produces.

Mr. TROY: There is no question about that. The wheat belt where the conditions are easier and where land can be more easily brought under cultivation, and where there is a quicker return, is the place on which to settle people on the land.

Mr. Pickering: The Premier says there is no more land available there.

Mr. TROY: I know of plenty of land east of the Wongan Hills railway where people can farm successfully. Fifty miles east in the pastoral areas people are growing wheat just as successfully as where I am grazing. On the station owned by Mr. P. A. Connolly they have grown fine hay crops and can grow wheat every year except during a drought year. Since 1915 at Warriard a settler has put in 100 acres of wheat annually, and the crops produced have been just as good as those I have produced 70 miles nearer the coast. Thirty miles beyond Mullewa, on the Murchison line, Jones Bros. have had crops every year that there have been crops in the Geraldton district, and yet we are told we must go to the South-West where it is possible only for the second generation to make a living. If I had plenty of money I might go to the South-West.

Mr. Pickering: They all come there with money.

Mr. TROY: If I wanted to make money, however, I would go to the wheat belt and the pastoral areas. All the men who go to the South-West have made their money in the north, out of the pastoral areas. I hope the Government will not proceed with the ridiculous proposition of building a railway from Albany to Bridgetown which will not bring in any return for the next 20 years. A word with regard to the future. I do not deny that some of our industries have hopes of greater prosperity. The agricultural in-

dustry with good seasons and high prices must continue to improve, even though it may be burdened with taxation. The Premier has told us that taxation meant prosperity, but I think the contrary is the case. If too much taxation is levied from the people it will mean that they will not be able to develop their properties. The money which the people should have in their pockets will go into taxation, and too much taxation is not good for any country. The agricultural industry may be able to bear more provided the farmers continue to get the high prices they are now receiving and provided also that they have a continuity of good seasons. The mining industry cannot bear any more taxation. I told a meeting of mine managers the other day when they spoke about increased wages killing the industry that at one time I would consider that to be my responsibility but that it was not my responsibility any longer. He said, "You know well that the miners' demand for increased wages will handicap the industry." But what has the Chamber of Mines done towards reducing the cost of living? Nothing. What has been done by way of legislation to reduce the cost of living? Nothing. The Government have encouraged the profiteer. The Chamber of Mines supports the profiteer. The people who dabble in mining dabble in other things. The people engaged in financial institutions dabble in mining; the men engaged in manufactures dabble in mining. I have no responsibility so far as the mining industry being hampered by higher wages or higher cost of commodities is concerned. The Chamber of Mines must accept the whole responsibility since their representatives in both the Federal and State Parliaments have supported the profiteer on every occasion. The timber industry will progress as it should do because of the opportunities which are now open to the timber trade as the result of the conditions of reconstruction; but so far as the State generally is concerned, I do not think that we are going to do any good for the great mass of the community unless a different policy from that carried on by the Government is adopted. The member for Leonora says he wants to see the system of government altered. So do I, but in an entirely different manner from that which the hon. member suggests. Whilst we have Cabinet government what the hon. member proposes cannot be done. I want to see a Government in power, representing the true interests of the people and I want to see that Government compel the exploiting section of the community, the profiteering section of the community, pay their fair share of taxation towards the upkeep of the State, something they have not done in the past. That is where the Country party is proceeding on wrong lines. That party has attached itself to those interests which they were elected to destroy. Instead of destroying them they are bolstering them up. They have not taken any action to compel the people engaged in those establishments to pay their fair share of taxation or to assist in the country's development.

Mr. Pickering: What about the graduated income tax?

Mr. TROY: Most of them are paying less under the dividend duties tax than they would under the income tax. I have pointed out on many occasions to the Treasurer how those people were evading the taxation, but the Treasurer has not so far taken any action. The member for Guildford (Mr. Davies) said the other night with regard to industrial unrest that it was preventing the State proceeding on sound lines and that the position was not being faced squarely. I will tell him why. I want to see a change of Government and I want to see this House get back to honest party government. I never had any faith in the pretence and humbug that has been foisted on the people. Even the Country party have altered their name now to primary producers, and three years hence it will be something else. We have a Government which contains Country party members, Liberals, Nationalists and supported by Independents, National Labour, bogus Labour, and other Labour. Mr. Asquith in the British House of Commons struck the nail on the head the other day when he said that the country was in favour of the traditional honest party government. That is the position here. The Minister for Works has always been what he is. In my opinion he is a sort of ultra democratic Tory. The hon. member has radical impulses.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Lucid intervals.

Mr. TROY: The Attorney General is conservative and an absolutely honest one and I respect him for it. The Premier pretends an optimism which he cultivates as a political asset.

Mr. Green: Are you going through the whole list?

[The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.]

Mr. TROY: The Minister for Mines was an independent last session. He was National Labour for a time and what he will be next year I do not know. No man will stake his reputation on his convictions. He is an opportunist now. But you cannot have a Government in this House where half the members pretend to represent one principle and the other half another. It cannot be done. Some party must be sinking their prejudices.

Mr. Pickering: Give us a fair trial.

Mr. O'Loughlen: You should have been hanged two years ago.

Mr. TROY: Look at the Country party in the Federal House. They have been keeping the Federal Government in power and while doing that they ran a candidate against Hughes, and the bitterest statements made against him at Ballarat were those made by Country party members. The statements were most malicious and vindictive. They were to the effect that Hughes was utterly unfit to run the country and yet they calmly go back to Parliament and sit behind him.

The Minister for Works: A choice of two evils.

Mr. TROY: How many evils are there here? There must be a dozen. There is too much pretence altogether. The member for Guildford said, "We will not face the issue." We cannot face the issue here because the member for Guildford pretends to represent interests here which he does not act up to in practice. The member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) in the North-West states that he believes in neither Mitchell nor Collier. Why? Because if he follows the Premier he must accept the responsibility for the actions of the Government. He cannot follow the leader of the Opposition because this party will not have him. It is the same old pretence. Until people unmask this hypocrisy we can never make progress. The party on the other side of the House who have always been Liberal I respect though I disagree with the views they hold. With regard to the Country party such as they are, I respect their opinion. I say they are wrong, still I respect the opinions that they hold. At the forthcoming elections we will find them calling themselves primary producers but they will be the same old party. The member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson) was a Liberal. He is now a Country party man.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Only in name.

Mr. TROY: He has not changed his convictions.

Mr. Thomson: You are an authority. You should know.

Mr. TROY: I ought to know. I have been in this House with the hon. member for nearly 10 years.

Mr. Thomson: I have not been here so long. That statement, like the rest you make, is incorrect.

Mr. TROY: The hon. member has not altered his convictions. I have not altered mine. I now hold the same views that I held 17 years ago.

The Minister for Works: You must be a Tory if you do not change.

Mr. TROY: An honest man cannot serve two masters. I could not go into the Arbitration Court and serve the Chamber of Mines and the workers too. I could not advocate State steamships or State insurance and sit behind the Ministers who are opposed to those undertakings. I could not advocate nationalisation and sit with members who are opposed to it. There has always been a distinct line between those members of our thought and those who hold the opposite view. I read a very fine article by Professor Mathews of the Columbia university. In addressing the students on Constitutional Government, he said that since the beginning of British Constitutional Government there has been a distinct line between the two parties, those who believe in legislation for social good and those who believe in legislation for the individual. The Labour party believe in legislation for the social good, that is for the community. The party behind the Government believe in legislation for the individual. How can members there profess to hold our view when their legislation and

actions are all to the contrary? It cannot be done. We shall be going up for election in five or six months' time. The people will never get back to decent straightforward sound legislation unless they thrust out the hypocrites. The member for Moore (Sir H. B. Lefroy) has always stuck to his principles. He might change his name but he will not pretend to be a Labour man. I recollect having chided him about his action in refusing to support the broadening of the Legislative Council franchise to soldiers, but the hon. member said he had always believed in the property qualification and still adhered to that view. I respect the hon. member for that opinion. He is what he is. We have had nothing but hypocrisy and lip loyalty and pretence during the last five years. This sort of thing is bad for the people and bad for Parliament. I hope the Government will be able to get over their difficulties.

Mr. O'Loughlen: In March next.

Mr. TROY: I wish the Government well so far as their honest endeavours for the welfare of this country are concerned. We are all wrapped up in the interests of Western Australia. All our interests are here. No matter what members may say about people stirring up unrest, we need not pay much attention to such remarks. All our interests are in this country. We want to see it advance and prosper and the Government who will strive to make it prosper will be carrying out the best policy for the country. If the Government can make the country prosperous they will be doing well. So far they have not done much. If they try to do so this session they will have my support, but much of the legislation forecasted in the Governor's speech I shall strenuously oppose, because I consider it will not be in the best interests of this State.

Mr. HARDWICK (East Perth) [9.33]: I must thank members for the compliment they have paid me by applauding me in anticipation, and I shall regret it if my effort does not come up to their expectations in elucidating many of the problems which to-day confront us.

Mr. Lambert: You have the problems on the front benches.

Mr. HARDWICK: I would like to point out that some 37 members have already spoken on the Address-in-reply. Therefore it leaves the path in bad condition for me to tread, seeing that those 37 members who have spoken have exhausted almost every debatable subject that might be presented to this Assembly. However, it is not my intention to-night to invade the regions of finance, realising that we have had a number of members who have endeavoured to explain the financial position and also the details in regard to the deficit. My conclusion about those members who are continually reminding the Government that there exists a deficit of seven figures, and who, after talking upon the subject for probably an hour, again re-

mind the Government that the deficit exists, do not accomplish very much good, but, on the other hand, merely add a further amount to the deficit. I am inclined to agree with the Minister for Mines when he told us the other night that he did not regard the time devoted to the debate on the Address-in-reply as time lost. I am inclined to think that the Governor's Speech is a sort of introduction that practically illuminates the path in which we are supposed to walk and foreshadows impending legislation. It opens wide the gate for free and deliberate discussion which our legislative halls do boast as the sturdy pillars upon which our national progress rests. I am delighted to think the Minister for Works approves of what I have said.

Mr. O'Loughlen: I would give you a rise.

Mr. HARDWICK: The possibility arises of getting the seat in front of me. Glancing through the Governor's Speech, I am pleased to notice that we are to have a Bill to place the State trading concerns under a commissioner. I think that will be an excellent departure.

Mr. Lambert: I thought you were going to stop State trading concerns.

Mr. HARDWICK: After looking at both sides of the paper containing the Governor's Speech, I fail to find any mention of a Bill to control the deficit. Probably it is here somewhere, but I have not discovered it up to the present. In looking at item No. 2 in the Speech, I find reference to a Bill to remove the disqualification against women offering themselves as candidates for Parliament. This is a Bill which will receive my hearty concurrence. I am prepared to argue that the womenfolk in our community should be placed on an equal footing and have equal rights with us men.

Mr. Lambert: Keep your eye off the ladies' gallery.

Mr. HARDWICK: The women have been too long held in subjection, and I claim that this is nothing more or less than a relic of the barbaric age.

The Minister for Works: The barbaric age?

Mr. HARDWICK: Yes. If the member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) were in his seat, he could bear me out that, even in the far distant lands of the North-West, we find this barbarism displayed among the aborigines. Whenever they are shifting camp to cross to other hunting grounds, the aborigine is laden up merely to the extent of a spear, while his better half comes dragging along behind him laden up like a Father Christmas. I hope this Bill will be passed. It will certainly receive my hearty support because I am sure it would not do any very great harm if we had a few more women in Parliament.

Mr. Munsie: We have already got some, then?

Mr. Lambert: We might offer a premium.

Mr. HARDWICK: Should my esteemed friend the member for Subiaco (Mr. Brown) who sits on my right, cease to be one of the members chosen to guide the destinies of this nation, let me hope that a buxom lassie from

the heights of Jolimont will occupy his seat. If that should be so, I can assure members that I shall pay much closer attention to the debates. What do we find on making a comparison between the men and the women? The menfolk of the city have their clubs to go to. I do not know whether you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, belong to a club or not, but the men go to their clubs, they drink from the cup that cheers, they tell their nursery rhymes, and very often do not get home till midnight. But they expect their better half to be at home, probably washing the bairns and putting them to bed, and they expect their partner to be a sort of knight commander over a regiment of pots and kettles. I notice in the Governor's Speech also that we must produce in abundance. That expression is shrouded in ambiguity. I am inclined to think His Excellency really meant that we were to have waving fields of golden corn and wool and sheep to sell and to keep. If so, that is all right, but if the expression meant a bountiful supply of candidates for the next election, well perhaps it is still all right. I must say before passing away that I met a friend—

Mr. O'Loughlen: Before passing away from your better half? Tell us whether you want to sell the State trading concerns.

Mr. HARDWICK: I shall come to that presently. Will members be at all surprised at having a bountiful harvest of candidates next election? They should not be surprised because, by raising the salaries last session, they made the position so much more attractive. By the admission of the womenfolk to Parliament, the position will be made more attractive still, and I know that many members intend to make a very big effort to get returned at the next elections.

Mr. Lambert: You were the most powerful exponent of getting the salaries raised, and you know we are all thankful to you.

Mr. HARDWICK: I met a friend, the Opposition Whip, down the street the other day. He told me he was a candidate for the Labour selection. He impressed upon me how the Government were neglecting their duty. He said, "What you want to do is to get one of those machines that turn out Commonwealth frog skins." I think he meant £1 or £10 notes. These, he said, should be put into circulation to make things boom. The only reason why more had not been sent along here was that in the Eastern States there is a shortage of paper. That was his idea of making things boom. I mention that to show the views of some gentlemen standing for selection in the Labour interests.

Mr. Munsie: You are hard up for material to-night.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Mr. HARDWICK: I must not lose sight of the old teaching that many are called but few are chosen. The member for Mount Magnet (Mr. Troy) dealt exhaustively with the Arbitration Act. I have said in the

past, and I repeat to-night, that that Act has outlived its usefulness. I listened attentively to the leader of the Opposition a few evenings ago when he indicated at last he has fallen in with my views and believes that the Act is now antiquated.

Mr. O'Loughlen: What amendment do you suggest?

Mr. HARDWICK: I will come to that directly. We must not lose sight of the fact that only eight years ago the member for Kanowna (Hon. T. Walker), when Attorney General, impressed upon us all the fact that this was absolutely the best industrial Act in the world. If that is the best industrial Act in the world, I should like someone to trot out some of the others.

Mr. O'Loughlen: How would you amend it?

Mr. HARDWICK: We are short of mechanics. Our boys and girls cannot be taught any trades owing to the rigidity of some of the sections of this Act.

Mr. O'Loughlen: The Great Fingal Mine has had to close down because of the situation.

Mr. HARDWICK: These men are fitters and not tradesmen. I am speaking of general tradesmen. In nearly every calling there is a shortage of mechanics. Under the Act the number of apprentices is restricted to something like one in three. That is quite wrong. When the Trades Hall suggested amendments they did not take into consideration the fact that there are hundreds if not thousands of mechanics who are leaving their callings, often before they reach the age of 40. In the Water Works Department there are plasterers being employed, in the Public Works Department there are bricklayers being employed, and in nearly every department of the Government service there are found men who have been mechanics. They have left their callings and gone to a more congenial one.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Because they were not attractive enough to them.

Mr. HARDWICK: They have been made too attractive. I wish to quote a glaring instance of a widowed mother of seven children, who was hopeful of getting her little boy Willie into some joinery works at East Perth. Willie had shown aptitude for joinery, for he had made dog carts and go-carts and other things. The mother was delighted, and thought Willie would assist her in feeding the balance of the family. She accordingly went to these joinery works in East Perth but the manager said to her, "Missus, we would be delighted to employ your little boy. There is work for him to do and more for others, but we cannot employ him on account of the restrictions of the industrial legislation." That is a shame, because we are told by the good book that we should go forth and multiply and replenish the earth. This boy is sent along to work and the work is there for him, but owing to some of the old jossers who shelter themselves under the ragged plumage of Trades Hall, all these callings are made into close preserves. They

say, "No, we do not want more apprentices in our occupations."

Mr. O'Loghlen: Would you like to see your saddlery shop full of boys, unrestricted in number?

Mr. HARDWICK: That has nothing to do with it.

Mr. O'Loghlen: You know the object of that stipulation.

Mr. HARDWICK: Members opposite have interfered in this matter. They have interfered with the law of supply and demand, and are inflicting great injury upon the young people of the community. In hundreds of cases willing children have been turned away from the workshop, and have been driven to sacrifice themselves in the field of sport looking after trotters and gallopers. They have been left without any fit occupation. Where are there any boys learning trades to-day? A little over 12 months ago a position was advertised in South Perth for a boy to learn engineering. This boy was to be between 16 and 17 years of age. There were 60 or 70 applicants for the position.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Can you see the jobs for the educational trainees as soon as they have completed their course?

Mr. Thomson: There is any amount of work.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HARDWICK: I happen to know something about that. Let me remind members opposite that the day has gone by when they can compel children to work from five to seven years in learning a trade.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Who wants them to work from five to seven years?

Mr. HARDWICK: It is the old theory that is entertained that a boy cannot be useful. The hon. member has mentioned vocational training. There are at present intelligent young men on divisional work who have been less than six months at it, and yet have gone to the factories to earn £4.10s. a week. The tutors in this vocational training are paid to impart the knowledge they possess, and the willing learners of these trades lose no time in picking up the knowledge required. This is not the case with the old jossers who hang about Tammany. These men have no particular incentive for imparting knowledge to the young fellows who go to them. They are most busy in making a close preserve to allow every opportunity for others to slow down as much as they like.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Do you think they are slowing down?

Mr. HARDWICK: Of course they are slowing down. Manufacturers will bear me out in this. In one particular work, that of moulding, one manufacturer told me that before men went away to the war they used to get out 16 moulds at a cost of 10s. Since the war and the slowing down policy he has only turned out 10 moulds for 16s. Is it possible to find fault with the cost of living in such circumstances?

Mr. O'Loghlen: Ask the Minister for Works about this slowing down. He employs thousands of men, but does not find it.

Mr. HARDWICK: Machinery has played an important part in the different trades.

Mr. O'Loghlen: That is a cheap libel.

Mr. Troy: Can you guarantee the statement you are making?

Mr. HARDWICK: I will guarantee all of it.

Mr. Troy: You are making another man's statement.

Mr. HARDWICK: To which particular statement does the hon. member refer?

Mr. O'Loghlen: To your statement about the moulds.

Mr. HARDWICK: Yes, I have the assurance of the person who made it, and I do not think he would tell me an untruth.

Mr. Lambert: Are they moulding doll's eyes?

Mr. HARDWICK: The Arbitration Act is entirely antiquated. If it is not amended, I will make one to send it into the darkest shadows of industrial oblivion. This country is overrun with cliques and combines. I was at one time a strong supporter of unionism, but I am beginning somewhat to waver in my faith in that direction. When we see that 24 shunters can practically block the arteries of distribution on our railways, it is a bad sign.

Mr. Troy: And yet half a dozen firms can put up prices 100 per cent.

Mr. HARDWICK: That is only imaginary. Hon. members opposite glory in the delusion that they are really the protectors of the toilers. They make a proud boast that they are the sons of Martha. I wonder what Martha thinks of them, and that little nest which sits immediately behind the Opposition whip.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not be personal.

Mr. Troy: Martha thinks you are a joke, I am sure.

Mr. HARDWICK: She is sure the hon. member is. The member for Kalgoorlie told us that there are dozens of men walking their boots off looking for employment in the brickmaking trade. I made inquiries the following day from a number of workers, and they have assured me that there are plenty of bricks and that the men were offered £1 a day to lay them.

Mr. Green: The Minister for Works said there were 1½ million bricks on order from the State Brickworks. I think they have been pulling your leg.

Mr. HARDWICK: Nothing of the sort. I noticed in the paper that the freezing works at Wyndham have lost £45,000. These were works established by the Labour Government. I can well understand when the foundation stone was laid that the flag of victory would be flown on the Trades Hall amid the chorus of hallelujahs. We heard

a lot about the mud fat oxen that were depasturing on the fertile fields of Kimberley.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Not one of your party opposed it.

Mr. HARDWICK: Members opposite originated it. That is a work which will stand as a white elephant or a monument to—

Mr. Munsie: To the 'incapacity' of the National Government.

Mr. Troy: We heard you say something about State steamships.

Mr. HARDWICK: To hon. members opposite. We were going to get underent and fillet and sirloin at 5d. per lb. I made inquiries, and so far as I could gather not even a sausage has come to the city.

Mr. O'Loghlen: You bought at the fish shop when it was running.

Mr. HARDWICK: When the Labour Government were running meat shops in the city they bought mutton at 7d. and sold it at 5d.

Mr. O'Loghlen: That was business.

Mr. HARDWICK: Like the woman with the broom, they lost 2d. on each but got through the quantity. The 1912 elections were won practically on the question of cheap fish that was to be supplied to the city. A member of the Government in the Upper House visited my electorate. He promised the people that they would have fillet of schnapper at 5d. a lb. delivered at the door.

Mr. O'Loghlen: You smacked your lips then?

Mr. Troy: What is the price now?

Mr. HARDWICK: This Minister impressed upon the people that his Government had discovered the right bait for coaxing schnapper from the Indian Ocean to the markets of the city. I know there is a desire on the part of the Opposition to get on this side of the House. I do not say this of the leader of the Opposition, because I do not think he is anxious to get here, but the others are anxious to indulge in a further campaign of shadow chasing. A great deal has been said by the Opposition regarding the purchase of a timber mill, and they are rather inclined to blame the Minister because he added some few acres of jarrah lands for the mills to cut. But let us not lose sight of the fact that this particular infant was left by the Opposition on the doorstep of the present Administration. What could the Minister do except take in the infant and give it sustenance? And that is all that has been done. It was impossible to find a buyer to give anything like a price for the State timber mills.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Your party sold them, and would not come to Parliament for authority. You know they were sold for half-a-million.

Mr. HARDWICK: What I know is that the cormorants of commerce are always flying about, anxious to make a deal of this kind. But the Government did not sell the saw mills.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Why not?

Mr. HARDWICK: Because they had good reasons for not selling.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Tell us the reasons.

Mr. Munsie: The Government were afraid to sell them.

Mr. HARDWICK: Perhaps the oratory of the member for Forrest (Mr. O'Loghlen) on the Esplanade had something to do with the blocking of the sale.

Mr. O'Loghlen: I did not speak there.

Mr. HARDWICK: Is the hon. member sure?

Mr. O'Loghlen: Quite sure.

Mr. HARDWICK: Anyway, there were a lot of kerbstone orators on the Esplanade speaking against the sale. Workers' homes represent another matter that the Government should consider very seriously. Owing to the cost of material and of labour these homes are going to run into a great deal of money.

Mr. Munsie: War service homes, not workers' homes, are being built to-day.

Mr. HARDWICK: I have seen Perth more than once with thousands of houses empty. Now, there is nothing that deteriorates more quickly than an empty house, and therefore the State's security in respect of many of the homes may not prove sufficient in the event of a slump. Some of the State trading concerns may be all right, but the others are very far from it. The effect of their operations has been to strangle enterprise, disjoint commerce, and destroy individual effort.

Mr. Lambert: Which of the State enterprises do you object to?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HARDWICK: Has it ever occurred to hon. members opposite that practically at the christening of the State trading concerns came the birth of the deficit? The two things have gone hand in hand ever since. In my opinion there is no doubt that the State trading concerns are very largely the cause of the present financial situation. The Administration of to-day find themselves, as a result of the policy of the Ministry of six years ago, bumping a huge deficit which is growing every day.

Mr. Lambert: Tell me what Australian State has a surplus.

Mr. HARDWICK: I shall reply to that when questions are being answered to-morrow. Another matter of great importance, and one on which I have spoken frequently in this House, is the pollution of the Swan River. What is causing the trouble is, in my opinion, the weed or growth called algae. Probably members do not know what that weed or growth is, or perhaps people outside do not know, and therefore I give the information that algae is really a division of thallogoneous chlorophyllus cryptogams. On the coast of Europe—it is just as well we should know these things—the weed is used as a manure. In New England and Iceland, it is used as a food,

just like cabbage. I am sorry the member for greater Perth or the "City Beautiful" is not present, as in the light of this information he might be able to persuade the vegetarians to take on algae as a food. Then, if the vegetarians did not quickly eradicate the algae, the algae would quickly eradicate the vegetarians. The Labour Government have perpetuated this nuisance of the pollution of the river. When Mr. W. D. Johnson sat in this House as member for Guildford and Minister for Works, he perpetuated the evil by building two or three more filter beds on the other side of the river. A deputation waited on the city council the other day in this connection, and an old gentleman by the name of Mr. Traylen, who was taking an active part in the matter, said the cause of the trouble was the filter beds. On the other hand, Mr. Lawson declared it was the mud banks. I am prepared to divide the responsibility, and give the filter beds 50 per cent. and the mud banks 50 per cent. I would like the member for Mt. Magnet (Mr. Troy) and the leader of the Opposition, who live on the salubrious heights of Mt. Lawley, and who have not said a word about this matter for many months—in fact, not for years, but now election time is coming they distend their nostrils and say the stench is something awful—to recognise that the finger of scorn is pointing at men who sit idly in this House instead of taking active steps to remedy the evil.

Mr. Munsie: What have you done? Never moved a motion, never made a protest.

Mr. HARDWICK: Why, on more than one occasion I have been accused of being the member for the septic tanks, on account of my continual advocacy of the removal of the nuisance. His Excellency the Governor recently paid a visit to the North-West, and he has told us of the many wonders he saw there. But I am going to endeavour to induce His Excellency to go up the river on a fishing expedition in the vicinity of the tanks; and if I succeed in that I have no doubt that item No. 1 in the next Governor's Speech will be to the effect that "my advisers have decided to remove the filter beds and to cover up the mud banks." If the Government would alter their policy and offer a bonus for the constituency creating the biggest smell, it is the member for Canning (Mr. Robinson) who would collect the bonus; not I. The nuisance is created in another electorate altogether, but any electorate gets the benefit of it when the wind blows. It is utterly unfair to those people who have bought expensive river frontages and built bungalow houses in the hope of sleeping out at night and enjoying the pure atmosphere thrown off from the river eucalyptus trees and the flood gums. Instead of getting that which they expected, they have this nuisance confronting them from one year's end to the other. In my opinion there will be no remedy unless metropolitan members get busy to compel the Government to remove this parti-

cular nuisance. First of all, the mud banks should be covered up.

Mr. Lambert: Why do you not withdraw your support from the Government?

Mr. HARDWICK: They have promised to attend to this matter after the next election. I now propose to make a quotation from the "Civil Service Journal" for last month—

It is earnestly to be hoped that there will be no delay in bringing this board into being. There is no need to await the passing of the Act, as there is a great deal of work before the board, which can be begun forthwith, in the inquiry into the question whether officers above £324 per annum are entitled to a "cost of loving" allowance . . .

The other day I saw in an Eastern States journal a declaration that our public service had mutinied. The member for Moore (Sir Henry Lefroy), speaking the other evening, did not fail to impress upon the House that never before in the world's history has anything of the kind occurred. I do not believe that the leaders of the civil service had the support of more than 25 per cent., at the very outside, of the men who struck on that occasion—

The Minister for Works: The others were cowards, then!

Mr. HARDWICK: The leaders threw down the gauntlet, which in my opinion was a direct negation of the statute.

Mr. Lambert: Do you suggest dismissing them?

Mr. HARDWICK: No, I do not; but I am inclined to think that had I been a civil servant at the time I would have been out with them too.

Mr. Lambert: You would have been in the mutiny?

Mr. HARDWICK: I am not blaming the service generally; I am more inclined to blame the leaders. The service unfortunately gave the leaders the opportunity, and the leaders took advantage of it.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They took a ballot.

Mr. HARDWICK: They did not take a ballot as to the actual strike. After they had got what they had been promised, they brought about the strike. I do not believe that that action was approved of by 20 per cent. of those who were forced to go out on strike. I trust that before long our law will incorporate a provision that in connection with proposed strikes there should be a ballot of all those who have to suffer, and I would particularly include the wives in the ballot, because they especially have to suffer the inconveniences involved in a strike. However, as the representative of my constituency, I felt that the Government's back had to break before bending in acquiescence to an act which imperilled our national welfare. Still, that is all past and gone, and the public servants have returned to work, like the prodigal son. I applaud them for it, and offer them my congratulations.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Do you think they should be paid for the time they were out?

Mr. HARDWICK: That is a question which we will discuss later. The strike was only another indication of the abnormality of the public mind. I am not going to say that the Government were altogether faultless in the matter. In a question of this kind, involving so many and such serious problems, the Government possibly may not have done all that they could have done. However, out of evil cometh good. The Government have to exercise the functions of administration. The service is the mechanism which directs our ambition, regulates our progress and controls our welfare, and for this country to flourish, the civil service must work harmoniously with whatever Government occupies these benches. The Opposition whip made a most vicious attack upon the Government the other evening and the member for Perth (Mr. Pilkington) did not forget to tell us that we were practically on the verge of a revolution. The Opposition whip was unfair in the attack he made on the Government because he knows as well as any hon. member that the collective administrative mind of the Government has been strained almost to breaking point in an honest endeavour to settle the many problems confronting them. In times of apparent revolution the problems of Government are many, and utterances like those of the hon. member are only calculated to incite the public mind on to revolution.

Mr. O'Loghlen: What do you say of a Government who have not introduced an amending Arbitration Bill for four years?

Mr. HARDWICK: What we want is to see the country progress. The hon. member should broaden his views, expand his vision, and gaze out into the open space of a brighter and better world.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Did you go to King's Park to write that speech?

Mr. HARDWICK: Yes. Where could one have more congenial surroundings? During the strike many of my people were in fear and trembling. The eyes of Eastern Australia were looking towards the West. They were gazing across those barren wastes in expectancy and in fear also that the torch of revolution had been ignited and that anarchy and confusion were prevailing. I would ask the people, however, not to fear. There is no possibility of a revolution in this country. We make the proud boast that we have the freest constitution in the world, that we have the most liberal franchise, that we have no ruling class and neither have we a subject people. In six months' time the people will express their opinion through the ballot box.

Mr. O'Loghlen: About the other Chamber.

Mr. HARDWICK: It is just as well that it exists as a protection against hasty legislation, which the hon. member boasted he tried to run through a few years ago. There is no such thing in this country as the possi-

bility of a revolution. I am not afraid of it at all, but the remarks of the member for Perth and others who talk about revolution show that they are out of touch with the public feeling, and the only effect—if it has any effect—is to add fuel to flames or weapons to the armoury. There may be social eruptions or evidence of disloyalty, but we must not forget the fact that the wrong people in this country are blamed for being disloyal. We must not lose sight of the fact that the blood of the fatherland still circulates warmly through the veins of thousands of our people, and they have not forgotten the rebuffs of two or three years ago.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Who do you say is disloyal?

Mr. HARDWICK: The emotions of a people are a force we cannot diagnose, not even with the most powerful microscope. Those emotions are a force, a power, and we do not know what they are like. We can only compare them to electricity, to the dynamo—it is a power and that is all we know about it. My friend the Opposition Whip wants to know what I think about it. Any words from me that might remove a misunderstanding I am prepared to say, even in regard to that Celtic institution of which the Opposition Whip is a member. I know the constitution of that institution, and I can declare it to be a resort of Irish gentlemen of Irish national sentiments. During the visit of the Prince to this State the exterior of the building belonging to the Celtic Club was credited as being the best illuminated club in the city. Never a word of disloyalty is ever uttered there. Certain references were made during the course of a speech here to-day that any one possessing an Irish name was disloyal. I declare that that is not so. During the visit of the Prince, there floated triumphantly in the breeze from that edifice of Irish national sentiment, the Union Jack in grateful recognition of the freedom and liberty we enjoy here, and to do honour to that popular Prince, the son of a good Sire, and a Noble Grand Sire. I mention this because I do not want any section of the people in this State to be branded as disloyal. The third paragraph in the Governor's Speech expresses the hope that goodwill will prevail amongst us, so that the country may develop and flourish as it should do. We cannot afford to be divided; we must allow for extremists on whichever side they be.

Mr. O'Loghlen: How can you get goodwill amongst the people if you do not lift some of the burdens?

Mr. HARDWICK: Have not the Government done their utmost for the workers?

Mr. O'Loghlen: They have done nothing whatever.

Mr. HARDWICK: The workers were never better off than they are to-day.

Mr. O'Loghlen: I will produce letters which will show you that children are starving.

Mr. HARDWICK. The hon. member can keep those letters for electioneering purposes.

Mr. O'Loghlen: The Government have done nothing in that regard, and you know it. What have you done?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HARDWICK: We should endeavour as a people to be more united. Never mind about those things that are disturbing the public mind to-day. Certain remarks have been made to-day which, in my opinion, are not conducive to the welfare of our people. During the visit of the Prince the people demonstrated their loyalty. Were there any disturbances? No; because the people have the greatest respect and admiration for the country they live in and for the freedom they possess. We are passing through a crisis but we can dismiss the word revolution. In conclusion I implore the people of Western Australia to be true to themselves and to their children as well as to their Government and they will win the gratitude and approbation of thousands yet unborn.

Mr. HICKMOTT (Pingelly) [10.25]: Like other hon. members I do not think there are any definite proposals in the Speech as to what the Government intend to do to make the revenue and expenditure come more in accord. The position is undoubtedly serious but there are some bright spots on the horizon and the Speech touches on one or two of them. It refers to the fact that we have been blest with bountiful rains, that the prospects are of a good season and an abundant harvest. Having travelled through various portions of the wheat belt I can fully concur in this. Everyone states that the prospects were never better. In places where they reaped an excellent harvest last year, the prospects this year are said to be 100 per cent. better. It is gratifying, therefore, for us to find that we are debating the Address-in-reply under such favourable conditions. The Speech also refers to the fact that good progress has been made with the work of settling returned soldiers on the land. This is a pleasing feature, especially in a large portion of the electorate that I have the honour to represent. East of Corrigin and out towards Kondinin I was told a week ago that returned soldiers had 6,000 acres under wheat this year, and that in many cases the crops were looking excellent. In some instances returned soldiers secured good yields last year. One man who took up land out there 12 months before the last harvest put in 200 acres, and off that 200 acres scarified and drilled, he obtained 1,200 bags. This year he has 400 acres under crop. That speaks well for the energy of some of our returned soldiers, and it is gratifying to know that we have such men doing good work. With reference to the high cost of living and industrial unrest, I take it that the high cost of the various commodities that we all use is one of the greatest factors of

the industrial unrest that we are passing through at the present time. There is no doubt about the fact that many of our merchants are absolutely profiteering. I have been told by a man in business for many years that just before the price of jam was increased, and when sugar was expected to rise no jam was available. One firm, however, had 3,000 cases of jam locked up in their store, and as soon as the price was increased that jam was made available, although no fresh supplies had come to hand from overseas. That clearly shows that profiteering does go on, and if such was the case in the one instance I have quoted it must have been the case in many others as well, and in that way fortunes are being made. We have also been told that various firms engaged in the hardware trade are in possession of stocks that they have had for years. Many of them now are selling out at greatly increased prices. It is surprising that something cannot be done to stop that kind of thing. I quite agree with what the member for Menzies (Mr. Mullany) said, that the Prices Regulation Commission is a farce. The only thing that the Prices Regulation Commission have done is to take evidence and then increase the price of a commodity immediately afterwards. It is most extraordinary that something cannot be done, because we know that many of the necessary commodities have been tremendously increased in price. An ordinary plough, manufactured in this State, for which we used to pay £45, now costs £37. I remember when, in Victoria, we could buy a reaper and binder at £25. Since then the price has increased to £45, and to-day it costs £97 and £98, while in the near future the price of that implement, not manufactured in Australia, will be £103. The same thing applies to all our machinery. An eight-foot harvester which used to cost £120 now costs £220, while a six-foot harvester, for which we once paid £110, is now quoted at £187. The member for Menzies also stressed the fact that the price of wheat was very much too high for poultry farmers. I was struck with the remarks of the President of the Arbitration Court a few days ago, when some poultry farmers said they had to get rid of their poultry because of the high price of wheat. One man said he had only five fowls left one of which had since died of starvation. He declared that 12s. 6d. a bushel was far too high a price to pay for poultry feed. His Honour the judge agreed, and remarked that he had once had 400 head of poultry, but that he now kept only 20. Just fancy a gentleman in the position of His Honour, receiving anything up to £2,000 a year, complaining of feeding 20 fowls with wheat at 12s. 6d. a bushel!

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Is not 12s. 6d. a bushel too high?

Mr. HICKMOTT: I think it is, but it must be understood that the farmer is not getting that. We get only 7s. 6d., less freight. It is not the farmer, but the retail man, who is getting 12s. 6d. per bushel. It will be seen that, although the producers are

getting a fairly big price at present, they have to pay enormous prices for everything they use. An ordinary axe, which used to cost 4s. 6d., now costs from 14s. to 16s., the handle costing as much as we used to pay for the axe. Imported handles are retailed at 4s. 3d. each. What the reason for it may be, I cannot say. I cannot understand why implements not made in Australia should have been so largely increased in price. In a measure, of course, it is due to the high tariff. No binders are made in Australia, although some are assembled in the Commonwealth. Mackay can sell his harvesters much cheaper in other parts of the world than he charges for them in Australia, where they are manufactured. Undoubtedly there is a considerable amount of profiteering going on. Fencing wire and galvanised iron and netting have enormously increased in price. A short time ago we could buy fencing wire at the Westralian Farmers at £42 per ton. The Westralian Farmers sold freely, but other merchants held up their stocks and, in consequence, to-day fencing wire is quoted at £80 per ton. It shows conclusively that those people have taken advantage of their position to charge what they like. The same thing applies to all the commodities the producer uses, including food and clothing. It is one of the chief causes of the industrial unrest. As soon as the workers obtain an award increasing their wages, the price of commodities goes up, and the consumers are worse off than before. There is fault on both sides. I do not believe in strikes. They are not good for the strikers, for the employers, or for the country. They hold up the business of the State, and so serve to increase the prices of commodities. While I believe in giving a man the full value of his labour, in many cases I do not think the workers are giving value for the money they receive. There is a tendency on the part of the workers, and of many producers, to lean too much on the Government. In my earlier days we never had any assistance from the Government. To-day we hear too much of shorter hours, less work, and higher wages. I agree that something should be done in respect of the Arbitration Court. The present method of getting a case before the court is altogether too cumbersome. In many instances when a case is cited it takes six and even 12 months to bring it before the court. If one or two judges are not sufficient, some other tribunal should be appointed so that the evidence could be taken promptly and all doubt set at rest as to what the award shall be. Having had conversations with many in the public service, I feel there is need for a re-organisation of that service. The men themselves admit that there are in the service drones who are not earning their wages. That sort of thing should not be allowed to go on. I do not think that a Commissioner appointed from the public service will ever meet the requirements of the service. What we want is an independent man, a business man appointed

from outside, one who knows his business and who will be able to go through the service and ascertain whether the men are doing their duty and earning their salaries. From what I have been told by members of the service, I have come to the conclusion that there is room for a considerable reduction in the numbers of the staff. If there were fewer men in the service and if they were paid better salaries, the work could be carried on much more satisfactorily than is the case at the present time. I have listened with great interest to the many speeches which have been made by my fellow members. It is a great pity that there is not a better feeling existing between employers and the workers. In the early days I admit that the workers were not treated fairly. I can remember times when men were treated more like slaves than men, and no doubt they are now getting a bit of their own back. Revenge, we are told, is sweet, but I believe that unionism, especially as regards the tactics adopted nowadays, has been carried a little too far. I think employers and workers should be able to come together amicably because this is the only way to pull the State out of its present difficulties. Not only members of Parliament and producers, but the whole of the community must take a hand to give a long pull and a strong pull and a pull altogether. If this is done, there is not the slightest doubt in my mind that we shall achieve that success which the State deserves. We have heard from all quarters of the House and from people who have travelled throughout Western Australia of the wonderful resources of this State. We believe Western Australia has magnificent resources, but there is no gainsaying the fact that we need men and money to open up and develop those resources. If we are successful in getting the immigrants to whom reference has been made, immigrants of the right class, and can settle them in the country, this will be one of the most effective ways of reducing our indebtedness. I trust that a better feeling will be brought about between the various sections of the community, and that we shall settle down to so order the affairs of the State that the Government will be able to make the revenue meet the expenditure.

Question put and passed; the Address adopted.

BILLS (7)—FIRST READING.

- 1, Public Service Appeal Board.
- 2, Architects.
- 3, Dentists.
- 4, Parliament (Qualification of Women).
- 5, Building Societies.
- 6, Coroners.
- Introduced by the Attorney General.
- 7, Factories and Shops.

Introduced by the Minister for Mines.

House adjourned at 10.53 p.m.