

between employers and employees, but if employers intend to stand off and dictate their own terms to men who have fought for many years to gain the conditions they are now enjoying, no progress will be made. It is of no use the employers standing off and saying, "We will give you a job, but your wages to-day are too high." The men of Australia have fought for many years to gain a decent standard of living, and they will stick together and fight hard against any reduction. The workers do not mind how soon a start is made to bring down the prices of commodities. When that has been done, the employers may talk about bringing down wages. What we are determined to do is not to bring down the workers' standard, the right of the workers and their wives and families to live in decent comfort. Our men have been working honestly and hard for years past and now that the warehouses are full, their work is done for the time being and they have to walk the streets. One wishes there was some other system so that the workers should not have to put up with this state of affairs.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: The other system ends in Russia.

Hon. T. MOORE: That is exactly what was told the people at the last elections, and what the elections were fought on. I know nothing about Russia, notwithstanding that I have read all the available literature about it. Interjections such as that either in this Chamber or among the workers, will not get us any further. Let us find a commonsense way out of the difficulty and let Russia look after herself. Those who opposed us at the general elections were talking of us as if we were Bolsheviks.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: My interjection meant the other system.

Hon. T. MOORE: There are many other systems, and if I had time I would touch on some of them. I hope that during the session we shall be able to devise means to bring the expenditure of the State into closer accord with the revenue, so that we shall be able to make things better and brighter for the community.

On motion by Hon. A. Sanderson, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 6.15 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 25th August, 1921.

	Page
Questions: Police Department, complaints ...	423
Rottnest Island, accommodation ...	423
Fremantle Meat Works ...	424
Timber Leases and Concessions ...	424
Address-in-reply, Eleventh day ...	424

### QUESTION—POLICE DEPARTMENT, COMPLAINTS.

Mr. RICHARDSON asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Is he aware that it is alleged that serious friction exists in the detective force consequent on the high-handed treatment of members of that force by a senior officer? 2, Is he also aware that privileges, relative to the hours of working, conceded by the Commissioner to members of the force, have been nullified by the action of Detective Inspector Condon? 3, Is he further aware that members of the detective force have, during the past two months, been compelled by circumstances to report the conduct of this officer to the Commissioner? 4, If so, has any inquiry, departmental or otherwise, been made into these complaints, and what action, if any, has been taken by the Commissioner?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, No. 2, No; the Commissioner's instructions are being carried out. 3 and 4, Two members of the branch saw the Commissioner with an alleged grievance, which he personally investigated and satisfactorily settled.

### QUESTION—ROTTNEST ISLAND, ACCOMMODATION.

Mrs. COWAN asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, How many bungalows and flats were allotted to applicants for accommodation for the Rottnest season 1921-22 before the applications closed on the 3rd August? 2, How many personal friends and relations of the officers in charge were allotted bungalows or flats? 3, To whom were the bungalows and flats allotted? 4, How many of the successful applicants for this year were also extended the same privilege last year, and in the years 1918-1919? 5, In view of the policy of the Board of Control to give preference to country and goldfields applicants, what is the proportion of successful town and country applicants? 6, Is a date stamp placed on application when received? 7, If too many applications are received, by what method are the allotments made?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, None. 2, None. 3, Bungalows—Locke, Lappin, Richards, Couper, Campbell, Chand-

ler, Smith, Ranford, Millington, Owston, Toms, Rae, France, Ashby, McDonald, Moun-  
tain, Moore, Glew, Norman, Moore, Powell,  
Nossiter, Vincent, Smith, Connaughton, Mem-  
bery, Nicholls, Young, Cowden, Lutz, Black,  
Polan, Simpson, Hale, Thiel, Brodribb. Flats  
—Parker, Broom, Sloss, Canning, Hum-  
phries, Ford, Nankivell, Chidlow, Royce, Har-  
rison, Cullen, Blythe, Herbert, Bennett,  
Bailey, Rhodes. 4, With the exception of  
seven all these persons have been tenants of  
the Board at one period or another during  
the tourist seasons of 1918-19 and 1919-20.  
5, Seventeen applications were received from  
the country and goldfields, and all were  
allotted the dates applied for. 6, No. 7, The  
allotment is made by the Board.

#### QUESTION—FREMANTLE MEAT WORKS.

Mr. ANGELO asked the Premier: 1, Did  
he see a notification in the local paper re-  
cently that it was doubtful whether the Fre-  
mantle meat works would operate this year,  
the reason given being that the prices offered  
for export were too low? 2, In view of the  
fact that there are hundreds of thousands of  
prime sheep in the Gascoyne and Murchison  
districts for which no market can be found,  
and that the stock routes will remain open  
for some months, will the Government try  
and induce the Fremantle company to open  
and operate for so long a time at least as  
will enable their own and all other cool stor-  
age space in the metropolitan area to be  
filled, such produce to be placed upon the  
market early next year when meat again rises  
to prohibitive prices?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, The  
statements made by the hon. member will be  
brought under the notice of the company for  
its consideration.

#### QUESTION—TIMBER LEASES AND CONCESSIONS.

Mr. PICKERING (without notice) asked  
the Premier: Will he say when he proposes  
to place on the Table of the House the  
papers he promised in connection with the  
Forests Department and the concessions to  
Millars?

The Minister for Mines: He did not  
promise them.

The PREMIER replied: I told the hon.  
member I would be willing to lay the  
papers on the Table of the House so far as  
they concerned the first part of his motion,  
but that I would not agree to lay on the  
Table the personal file of Mr. Lane-Poole.  
If he accepts that—

Mr. Pickering: I do accept that.

The PREMIER: If the hon. member is  
willing to accept that he should withdraw  
his motion.

Mr. Pickering: I am willing to withdraw  
the motion on the promise of the Premier.

#### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

##### Eleventh Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Mr. MULLANY (Menzies) [4.37]: Hav-  
ing listened with a considerable amount of  
interest to the speeches which have been  
delivered during this debate I have been  
struck by the fact that members, both new  
and old, have taken full advantage of the  
ruling given some time ago by the Presi-  
dent of the Legislative Council, that the  
subjects which could be discussed upon the  
Address-in-reply could be any items con-  
tained in the Speech, and any which in the  
opinion of the member should have been  
included in the Speech, thereby creating a  
range of subjects to be dealt with of ex-  
treme width. That is undoubtedly right.  
I wish to congratulate all the new members  
of this Assembly upon their election, also  
to congratulate my old colleagues who have  
been re-elected. We, the old members, feel  
that we have lost some good debaters, some  
good comrades, and some good men amongst  
the defeated candidates at the last general  
elections. Notwithstanding that some ex-  
tremely capable men and able debaters were  
defeated at the last elections, and that  
there were some who did not seek re-  
election, I believe that the debating  
strength of the Assembly has not in any  
degree suffered as a result of the elections.

Mr. Pickering: We have had pretty good  
evidence of that.

Mr. MULLANY: A good deal has been  
said during this debate upon the constitu-  
tion of the various parties in Parliament,  
and as to whether they are open to outside  
influences or outside organisations. As I  
said years ago when I first came to this  
Chamber, I am absolutely free to vote just  
as I please upon any subject that comes  
before the House. I am not much concerned  
as to the situation in which other members  
find themselves. I would say this to new  
members both of the Country Party and  
of the Labour Party, seeing that I have  
had some experience of the work of politi-  
cal organisations, that if they follow out  
the constitution of their various organisa-  
tions in its entirety and submit their will  
to be influenced by discussions anywhere  
else but in this Chamber, they will before  
their term expires find themselves in a false  
position. I heard the member for Leonora  
in his speech complain that, at the end of  
last session when he was here, there were  
matters affecting the mining industry under  
discussion and that members did not stay  
to listen to the debate, but went out into  
the corridors and merely dropped in when a  
division occurred and voted with the Gov-  
ernment. That sort of thing may occur at  
times. I ask any member whether he is  
bound by the decisions of some outside or-  
ganisation or otherwise, what is the use of  
continuing a debate on any subject when  
members come into the Chamber with their

minds already made up regarding that particular subject. I noticed in the "Westralian Worker" last week that my friend and colleague the Opposition Whip had indulged in his usual practice of writing up the personnel of the Assembly.

Hon. P. Collier: How do you know he did?

Mr. MULLANY: I will put it to the hon. member. If he denies it I will accept his denial.

Hon. P. Collier: You are not justified in making that assertion.

Mr. MULLANY: That is my impression, and I do not think the hon. member will deny it.

Hon. P. Collier: He did deny it.

Mr. MULLANY: He makes a statement there suggesting that I regret the action I took some three or four years ago when I parted company with the Labour Party. I do not know how that impression got abroad.

Hon. P. Collier: He was very generous to you in saying that.

Mr. MULLANY: That may be so. I am not worrying about that. The impression may have got about in this way, that I have on many occasions expressed regret, and I express it again now, not that I took the action I did, but that the necessity for taking such action ever arose. After the lapse of over three years should similar circumstances again arise I see no other course of action for me to take than that one. We all regret the continued decline of our gold production. It is indeed sad to see in such a bad way the old deep mines, each of which kept employed from 100 to 300 men for the last 20 years to 25 years. Many of these old gold producers are just now going out of existence. I do not blame, and never have blamed, the Arbitration Court award which was given last year for the fact that these mines are closing down. I am of opinion that the award of these comparatively high wages on the fields did not represent one fraction of a penny per day more than the men engaged in the mines were entitled to, considering their working conditions and the cost of living. I do not altogether agree with the member for Roebourne (Mr. Teesdale) in his criticism of the Lancefield miners in turning down the proposition for the co-operative working of the mine, failing which the mine was to be closed down. I consider that negotiations were broken off too quickly by both sides, that very little patience was shown either by the mine owners or by the leaders of the men. A little more persuasion might have brought the proposal to fruition. Not the least of the causes contributing to the existing depression on the goldfields is that the Chamber of Mines, namely those in control of the mines of this State to-day, are deliberately slowing down this year. They are not satisfied with the terms of the arbitration award, and they are deliberately seeking to do just as little as they possibly can while continuing to hold their leases under present conditions. That policy may be

right as a business policy from their point of view; they consider only the interests of their particular business. But the matter has another aspect. A little further effort might have been made by the mine owners to prevent the closing down of the mines, because this, in its turn, meant the breaking up of the homes of many men, a large proportion of these homes being of 20 and 25 years standing. I shall not deal further with the mining industry on this occasion, since, when the Estimates come down, as they will shortly, there will be opportunity for giving the matter practical consideration, and for making practical suggestions as to the future of the industry. I wish to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition upon the absolute fairness of the attitude he has adopted on this occasion, and indeed on all occasions, towards the Premier and Treasurer. The attitude of the Leader of the Opposition was such as to draw from the member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum) the comment that it was, if anything, too fair. In my opinion, however, no man can be too fair. No man in the history of the world has ever done an injury either to himself or to any other person by being fair. On the other hand, the man who holds a responsible position but lacks the element of fairness and fails to do justice to his opponents, is, and in the history of mankind frequently has been, responsible for much suffering. At the outset of the Parliamentary career of the member for South Fremantle, though by no means at the outset of his public career, I desire to say that, useful as his work has been to this State, it would have been of still greater benefit to Western Australia, and also to the organisation of which he has been the executive head for a considerable number of years, if he himself were possessed of a larger measure of that spirit of fairness which the Leader of the Opposition has always displayed in this Chamber. Industrial unrest seems to come up like a hardy annual for discussion; we always have had it, and probably we always will have it. Practically every member who has applied himself to this debate has stated that he is in favour of arbitration for the settlement of industrial disputes. I believe all of us are.

Mr. Munsie: One of your colleagues is not. I refer to the member for Roebourne (Mr. Teesdale).

Mr. MULLANY: That hon. member can speak for himself. I have not, however, heard him express himself to the effect alleged. The opinion I refer to means that one is opposed to strikes if they can possibly be avoided. I believe that in this State we have had some strikes which could have been avoided. The member for South Fremantle was no doubt quite correct in saying that the disputes committee of the Trades Hall have no part in declaring a strike on. The organisation simply says, "We go out on strike," and then the control of the matter is handed over to the disputes committee.

I ask the member for Hannans (Mr. Munsie) in the absence of the member for South Fremantle, whether it is not a fact that some years ago the State executive of the Australian Labour Federation here in Perth passed a resolution that no organisation should receive any support from the affiliated organisations if it took such a matter into its own hands, and declared a strike without prior consultation with the other unions in the affiliation.

Mr. Corboy: But you know how hard it is to enforce such a ruling.

Mr. MULLANY: Yes, I do. I know that some years ago, when the then horse-drivers' union came out on strike, it did not consult the affiliated organisations before doing so, and consequently the horse-drivers were absolutely turned down by the affiliated organisations.

Mr. Munsie: I may correct the hon. member. The matter is decided not by the State executive, but by the metropolitan and other district councils.

Mr. MULLANY: The State executive, I think. I believe I was present when the resolution was passed.

Mr. Munsie: No. They could not carry that.

Mr. MULLANY: I may be wrong. During the time of the Scaddan Government the horse-drivers, coming out on strike, received no support from the affiliated organisations; and individual members of the horse-drivers' union, and also the union itself, were fined for infringement of the Arbitration Act. I cannot say whether the fines were ever paid. I regret that the ruling in question is not now being enforced. The failure to do so puts the disputes committee in a false position. We all admit that the working of the Arbitration Court is not as smooth as it should be, the principal cause of complaint being the extraordinarily long delays which so frequently occur before people involved in an industrial dispute or having an industrial grievance can obtain access to the court. I hold that something could now be done to relieve that situation. Hon. members will be aware that during the last week or two the Arbitration Court, consisting as it does of a Judge of the Supreme Court and two other members, has been putting in its time in the metropolitan area and at Collie hearing what, after all, are trivial charges of breaches of arbitration awards. In my opinion to call upon the Arbitration Court to go around the country deciding such trivial cases is not giving the Court a fair chance to do its proper work. Just as we here in Parliament have been given power to make laws for the State, but are not called upon to fine people for breaking the laws—this work being done by the ordinary law courts—so technical breaches of arbitration awards could be dealt with quite effectively by police magistrates throughout the State. The Arbitration Court should confine itself entirely to the settlement of industrial disputes.

Hon. T. Walker: The Act provides that such charges can be heard in ordinary courts.

Mr. MULLANY: Notwithstanding that, however, we are told that the Arbitration Court is congested, and we see the members of that court devoting week after week to deciding trivial charges of breaches of awards.

Mr. Heron: That is due to the mine managers.

Mr. MULLANY: In my opinion, another cause contributing towards the delays in the Arbitration Court is this: As we are aware, no lawyer is allowed to appear in that court as an advocate except with the consent of the opposing side. This may or may not be right; but from my own observation I know, and I believe every member will bear me out in this, that a system has grown up of having what may be termed amateur advocates who put in no inconsiderable part of their time conducting cases before the Arbitration Court. The term "amateur" is applied by me not in a sporting sense, as meaning that the man gets his bare expenses, or very little over, for what he does; but in the sense that these advocates have no professional status. I consider there is too much of that amateur advocacy. I fail to see the necessity for the bringing in of an outsider in the person of Mr. James Gardiner as advocate for the Railway Department in the recent engine-drivers' case. I consider that just as the union is represented by a member of its organisation, usually the secretary, so there should be in the Railway Department an officer fully qualified to go into the Arbitration Court and put up the department's case. When an outsider like Mr. Gardiner is brought in, the first thing he has to do is to go to the railway officers to have a brief prepared for him, to absorb some sort of railway knowledge. Further, the Arbitration Court should not, I think, be continually seeking for technical flaws. The proceedings in that court should be more in the nature of a heart to heart talk between the parties to the dispute, and the members of the court should have sufficient experience to get through the cases much quicker than they do. There is too much semi-professional advocacy in our Arbitration Court to-day, and the sooner some of it is cut out the better it will be for the interests of the unions and for those of the workers generally. With regard to technicalities, I observed in yesterday's newspaper that the President of the court has said that if certain cases were put before him again in the same form he would simply adjourn them until they were put forward properly. From a layman's standpoint I ask, why should it be necessary for the President of the Arbitration Court to adjourn cases in this manner, involving additional expense and delay, simply on the ground that the people who should have replied to the demands of the union did not state reasons for combating certain demands, but contented themselves with merely saying,

"We object to this." If those employers who are being cited are lackadaisical enough to allow their cases to go before the court in this form, what is there to prevent the President of the court dealing with a case as it is presented to him and on its merits? It appears to me that too many legal technicalities are allowed to creep in and surround the work of the Arbitration Court. Hon. members will, no doubt, have noticed a paragraph in the "West Australian" a few days ago regarding an appeal made by Mr. Theodore, the Premier of Queensland, to the labourites and unionists of that State. His appeal was that he should be assisted to pass out that undesirable element termed the I.W.W. organisation. Mr. Theodore only said, publicly exactly what the members of the National Labour Party have been saying continually for the past four years.

Hon. P. Collier: Our movement has always repudiated the I.W.W.

Mr. MULLANY: Just so. I would like to read an extract from the speech the Premier of Queensland made. He said—

During the last two years the I.W.W. has been causing a great deal of trouble in the Innisfail (sugar) district. Their activities have created strikes and disturbances at Babinda, South Johnstone, and Mourilyan, and led to interruption of crushing at the South Johnstone sugar mills.

Further on he says—

Recent happenings at Innisfail are the direct result of the threatened outbreak. The time has arrived for the labour movement and the affiliated unions to take a hand. If the Labour movement is to survive, the unions, the A.L.P. and the Government must co-operate to rid the community of this ruinous organisation. The task is simple. The adherents of the Labour movement out-number the I.W.W.-ites by 20 to one.

What sort of an indictment is this appeal from the Premier of Queensland? If those labourites and unionists have been influenced, as the Premier says, by this small handful of I.W.W. advocates, and if the latter have been able to do so much damage in Queensland, it is really a serious indictment. What must the position be when we have the Leader of the Labour Party in Queensland, who is the Premier of that State, making the announcement that these few I.W.W. agitators have been able to sway in some of the districts the people there to the extent that he quoted, sound unionists upon whom the Premier of that State depends to enable him to carry on the work of the State. I want to say, more particularly to members on the opposite side of the House, that if they are sincere in their professions, and I believe they are, they should be prepared to do all they can to help the Premier of Western Australia to carry on under the extremely difficult conditions which exist by responding to the call of the Labour Premier in Queens-

land to do all they can to kill this damnable organisation.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: There is no such organisation in Western Australia.

Hon. T. Walker: They are all dead.

Mr. MULLANY: The member for East Perth (Mr. Simons) asked whether there had been any accredited Labour leader in Australia who had advocated I.W.W. principles. Do we call an elected member of Parliament in this State an accredited Labour leader? If not, whom do we call an accredited Labour leader? I wish to quote just now a statement made by W. L. Jones, who, throughout last Parliament, represented the electorate of Fremantle as an accredited Labour leader. This is what he said—

It will be a sorry day for the friends of the Government when the workers of the country no longer go on strike. It will mean that members of labour organisations will be so strongly and scientifically organised that when they wish to redress a grievance against their employers, they will no longer need to withdraw the whole of their labour power, but will withdraw a little of it whilst continuing to take their wages as before. In other words they will go slow and sabotage their employers. They are not yet sufficiently organised to do that, but I am endeavouring to do my part to that end.

That was a definite enough announcement in this Chamber from an accredited Labour leader in Western Australia.

Mr. Marshall: And he lost his seat.

Mr. MULLANY: Yes, but do not forget, even after he made that announcement in this Chamber, he was again duly selected as a Labour candidate.

Mr. Marshall: And he is just as much entitled to his opinion as you are to yours.

Mr. MULLANY: Perhaps so, and I hope my young friend who has just interjected will also not hesitate to express his opinion in this House. I give credit to those sound labourites in the Fremantle electorate for the defeat of W. L. Jones. Fremantle is, and always should be, a Labour electorate, and Labour would have held that seat but for the candidate that they chose. The defeat of the late member was, to a large extent, due to the attitude of the genuine Labourites at Fremantle. They declared that they would not have Jones and that they would try someone else. It is interesting at times to try to find out exactly what is going on in the industrial arena, and I am going to ask members on the Opposition benches if they can explain a quotation which I am about to make from the "Westralian Worker" of the 20th December last. It says—

On Tuesday last a visit was paid by Organiser Butler to the Burswood Cement Co.'s works. A dinner hour meeting was held on the necessity for the men becoming thoroughly organised and educated in order to be able to take control and operate the works should the necessity arise.

A dinner hour meeting to deal with the necessity for the men becoming organised with a view of taking control of the works should the necessity arise!

Hon. T. Walker: What is wrong with that?

Mr. MULLANY: I want to know what it means.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: What is the interpretation that you are putting on it?

Mr. MULLANY: I am asking what it means.

Mr. Marshall: Give us your version of it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Hon. members have had their opportunity.

Mr. MULLANY: I do not know what construction to put upon it.

Hon. T. Walker: I cannot see anything very wrong with it.

Mr. MULLANY: The paragraph says "To take control of the works should the necessity arise." What I would like to know is whether this is a little organising on the part of T. C. Butler on his own initiative, or whether there is propaganda work going on to endeavour to educate the workers in the various industries to get them to combine with the view of taking control of those industries. It appears somewhat significant to me that this kind of propaganda work should have been going on in December last, more particularly in view of the resolutions passed at the Labour conference held in Melbourne. I confess I do not know the meaning of the paragraph, and I would like to know whether anyone on the Opposition benches can tell me what it means.

Mr. Simons: It means that they are studying for promotion to managing positions should vacancies occur.

Mr. Walker: Co-operative Commonwealth.

Mr. O'Loughlen: If it were not for the education imparted by the Labour movement, your side would not exist.

Mr. Marshall: Why should they not take control?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Hon. members must keep order.

Mr. MULLANY: We had a most interesting address from the member for East Perth the other night, and he, I think it was, disclaimed any connection between the Labour organisation and the I.W.W. organisation, in this State. I quite agree with him there. He went on to say, as proof of this, and as proof also that Australians were not concerned with the I.W.W. movement to any great extent, that he had the pleasure and privilege a few weeks before of listening to no fewer than 14 different speakers in the Sydney Domain, not one of whom was an Australian. He said that the speakers, by their accent, showed that they were either Irishmen, Scotchmen, Americans, or Whitechapel Cockneys. I would like to point out, however, that in these days, when facilities for travel are afforded to all, and when the people of different countries meet so much, they perhaps unconsciously absorb the dialects of those with whom they

come into contact. It is quite possible that the hon. member himself, had he made the fifteenth speaker, would have spoken in a dialect quite different from those he heard. It is therefore extremely misleading to judge people by their dialect or accent.

Mr. Munsie: Not one of those speakers belonged to the Labour party.

Mr. MULLANY: The member for East Perth said that it was quite the right thing that the Agent General in London should be elaborately housed, and that the furniture should be of the most elaborate description. I am not going to argue the point with the hon. member. I believe it is right that the representative of this State in London should be decently housed, but the hon. member was perturbed about the name over the door of the residence being "Westralia," an abbreviation of the name of the State, and as the hon. member described it, a vulgarisation of the term. This offended the hon. member and perhaps rightly so. I can point out a wonderful field in Perth where the hon. member might institute reform. If he will get a copy of the official organ of the party he represents, he will find that the name printed every week on something like 15,000 copies of the paper is the "Westralian Worker."

Mr. Simons: That was adopted when men like you were controlling the movement. It is one of the heritages you left us.

Mr. MULLANY: What a field that presents for reform! Why go to the Agent-General's house in London when so much more effective work could be done here! Why not prevent these 15,000 copies being distributed every week containing the same vulgarisation of Western Australia?

Mr. Simons: The State is not paying for that, anyhow.

Mr. MULLANY: The consideration as to who pays for it does not enter into the question. I understood that this vulgarisation offended the artistic sense of the hon. member.

Mr. Simons: We do not like paying for such vulgarisation.

Mr. MULLANY: The member for East Perth also said that this State should do something to secure a great monument to the memory of Lord Forrest. He asked whether we were mere clods of wood or what were we that we allowed time to go on without fittingly recognising the great services Lord Forrest had rendered to this State. In almost the same breath, the hon. member said it was all nonsense to talk about the injustice Western Australia had suffered under the Federal compact. He said the one and only reason for this was the character of our representatives in the Federal Parliament; that these representatives had not done their duty by the State. I want to point out that Lord Forrest and the members of the organisation to which the hon. member now belongs had until last year, almost a monopoly of the representation of Western Australia in the Fed-

eral Parliament. His eulogism of Lord Forrester would have been much more sincere if he had omitted the other references.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That only came out by way of interjection.

Mr. MULLANY: Of all the members of this House who were associated when the unfortunate split occurred in the Labour Party three or four years ago, the member for Mt. Magnet (Mr. Troy) has harboured and nursed a bitter and unreasonable hatred, which he is apparently unable to control, towards members of the National Labour Party. I regret that hon. member is not in his seat at present. When a member of this House adopts the practice which he has done for some years past of coming here only intermittently and taking every opportunity when he is here of insulting—

Mr. Marshall: Address the Chair, not me.

Mr. MULLANY: I would be very sorry to address the hon. member. When you, Mr. Speaker, call me to order, I shall obey your instructions, but from the member for Murchison I do not take instructions. The member for Mt. Magnet has taken every possible opportunity of insulting members of the National Labour Party. So far does he go that, on almost every occasion when he is in the House, we hear uttered in an undertone, which you, Sir, cannot possibly hear, insulting epithets which this man has not the courage to utter aloud.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Yes he has.

Mr. MULLANY: If the member for Mt. Magnet wishes to continue that light recreation he should have the manliness to take a seat on the other side of the Chamber so that, when he does indulge in these remarks, the Speaker or Chairman will have an opportunity to hear him and he will be made amenable to the discipline of the House.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Why not draw the Speaker's attention to it?

Mr. MULLANY: It is impossible to do that, because the remarks are always made in an undertone which the Speaker cannot hear. I make this complaint, and ask if the member for Mt. Magnet has any spark of the manliness which he claims—

Mr. O'Loughlen: He has.

Mr. MULLANY: Then I ask him at least to utter his comments sufficiently loud for the Speaker to hear them.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Which he would do.

Mr. Chesson: He would not deny a statement if he had made it.

Mr. MULLANY: I have my opinion as to why this gentleman is so bitter towards us. It is a fact that when the great question of military service overseas was put before the people of Australia, the hon. member, until he found that influential constituents of Mt. Magnet were against it, was an advocate of conscription. At a Kalgoorlie conference he advocated conscription and at the Timber Workers' Conference in Perth he spoke strongly in favour of conscription and was instrumental in getting a motion carried.

The member for Mt. Magnet prates about his principles, and yet exhibits bitterness towards those members who had the courage to go on in support of conscription, and take the risk whether they held their seats. This is the underlying reason for the bitterness of this individual to-day.

Mr. Munsie: When there was a majority of 39,000 for conscription, you needed a lot of courage to support it. The man who opposed it had more.

Mr. MULLANY: I am not speaking about the majority but merely what I believe is the real reason for the bitterness shown by this individual. The hon. member flourished before this House a circular which he said had been circulated in the Murchison electorate and which condemned the members of the National Labour Party for having introduced the question of sectarianism.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Nothing of the kind.

Mr. MULLANY: He did.

Mr. O'Loughlen: He did not; he accused an organisation.

Mr. Marshall: Here it is.

Mr. O'Loughlen: The member for Hannans will read the circular.

Mr. MULLANY: I have a few words to say on the question of sectarianism. I regret that it has been introduced because it would be well in the interests of this country that this thing, which is brought up particularly at election time, should be freely discussed among members with a view to showing the absurdity of such an issue. I am not casting a reflection on any religion. I believe this world would be a poor place if there were no such thing as religion, but when we talk of sects we are dealing with a totally different proposition. What is the meaning of sectarianism? Simply that in a country where 95 per cent. of the people are professed Christians, there is a difference of opinion as to which particular road they should travel in order to get to a particular place. It would be just as logical for people to quarrel among themselves regarding the wisdom of travelling to Melbourne by train or boat, as to quarrel over sectarian differences. I believe that the man or woman who attempts to introduce into this sunny land of Australia the unfortunate religious differences which existed in Europe in the dark ages is not a good citizen. Such a person has reason to be ashamed of himself. The sectarian issue should not be introduced, and we should do all in our power to keep clear of it. We have in Australia a free sunny land as a heritage for our children, and it is damnable that any individual, whether a supporter of yellow, green, or any other colour, should attempt to introduce such a controversy into Australia.

Mr. Marshall: There is no attempt about it; they have done it.

Mr. MULLANY: I believe it is extremely inadvisable for Churchmen occupying high positions—I care not what their denomination may be—to take an active part in

political affairs. I consider that the functions of the Church are entirely apart from political functions and that the two should be kept distinct. I have made these few remarks with the idea of repudiating any suggestions that I have ever been contemptible enough to use sectarian influences in political matters. The member for Leonora (Mr. Heron) mildly and in a most kindly manner, expressed wonder as to how it ever became possible for a man with a record in labour organisations like that of the member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Boyland) should have come here practically as a nominee of the Chamber of Mines, because he was returned as a member for the Nationalist Party. I would ask the member for Leonora is it or is it not a fact that in the 1917 election he was a member of Mr. George Foley's committee and was largely instrumental in securing the return of that gentleman?

Mr. Heron: I say it is not correct; I was never on his committee.

Mr. MULLANY: I have been informed—

Mr. Heron: I do not care. I say your statement is not correct.

Mr. MULLANY: I accept the hon. member's denial, of course.

Mr. Heron: I was a conscriptionist, but not a Nationalist.

Mr. MULLANY: I accept the denial but Mr. Foley stated on his return here that the present member for Leonora would under no circumstances oppose him for the seat.

Mr. Heron: Not while he was available.

Hon. T. Walker: You know what Foley is.

Mr. MULLANY: I took some little part in that election and I know that although the present member for Leonora says he was never a Nationalist—

Mr. Munsie: He did not say even that.

Mr. MULLANY: He did. He said he was a conscriptionist, but not a Nationalist.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I say I am a Nationalist and always have been one.

Mr. MULLANY: I have been informed that the present member for Leonora owes his return to this House to the fact that he was considered to be a Nationalist. This has been stated to me repeatedly. I have been told that Heron is as good a Nationalist as Foley or any of them.

Mr. Boyland: He distinctly said at a Kalgoorlie conference that he supported the Nationalist ticket.

Mr. MULLANY: I do not intend to deal with the deficit. I admit that we must leave that to the responsible Ministers, but we can assist them in every way to get through the present hard times. Still, I am getting tired of hearing members of successive Ministries say with regard to the Civil Service that they have not the power that they should have to control the departments, that the service is really controlled by the Public Service Commissioner and the various heads of the departments. The Minister for Works made that statement only two even-

ings ago; I have a distinct recollection of having heard a former Treasurer, Mr. James Gardiner, make a similar statement; I believe the Leader of the Opposition has made a similar statement, and I am sure that the present Minister for Mines has done likewise. I want to ask Ministers, seeing that there is a consensus of opinion that it is almost impossible to administer the departments to their satisfaction under the present Public Service Act, whether they intend to bring in a Bill to remedy this state of affairs. The statement was made the other night that we cannot carry on satisfactorily under the present conditions, but that we want more Ministerial control as against departmental control or control by the heads of departments. In view of this position, I ask the Government whether they intend to do anything to relieve the position. I am sure they will get sufficient support on both sides of the House to carry any legislation in this direction. In conclusion, I want to have a few words to say upon a most important matter in which members of the Country Party know I have taken a keen interest. I refer to the question whether we shall establish a State wheat pool in Western Australia this year. With the Leader of the Opposition and many other members in this Chamber, I would be extremely sorry if the wheat growers of Western Australia were to be forced back to the old system under which they depended upon the private merchants to dispose of their wheat. I believe the great majority of wheat growers desire a wheat pool. While I am prepared to support legislation with that end in view, I think that before we do that, there should be some definite understanding as to what the price of wheat for local consumption should be.

Mr. Mann: And also of bran and pollard.

Mr. MULLANY: Hon. members who were here during the last Parliament will remember that I tabled a motion in this Chamber dealing with this question. The motion was carried. It was worded to the following effect—

That in the opinion of this House the practice of making world's parity a basis for fixing prices of commodities produced and consumed in Australia is unsound, and that cost of production and forwarding to market should be the factors considered in fixing such prices.

Such a proposal may not meet with the views of all members of this Chamber, but I endeavoured to make it comprehensive and to get down to the point that I do not believe wheat growers or any other section of producers in Western Australia are entitled to make our own people pay an abnormally high price for the commodities they are producing.

Mr. A. Thomson: There is no desire to do so.

Mr. MULLANY: Although I believe that a majority of the Country Party were opposed to any such motion as that, they did not discuss the motion in the House.



The Minister for Agriculture: You know why.

Mr. MULLANY: I know, and I was sorry it was not discussed. My primary object in bringing forward the motion was to get a discussion on the subject. We did not get that discussion, but at the same time that motion stands as a resolution carried by this House. I think I would be quite within my rights in asking the Premier to say, on behalf of the Government, if they intend to give effect to that resolution. No attempt has been made so far and I do not desire at this juncture to force it. I ask members representing the wheat growers to consider the position. The member for York (Mr. Latham), in seconding the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply, which motion was so ably moved by our lady member, the member for West Perth (Mrs. Cowan), suggested that owing to the declining state of the gold-mining industry the men engaged in that industry should forego something to keep the industry going. The Deputy Leader of the Country Party (Mr. A. Thomson) also made a remark in the same strain. I do not know exactly what those members meant by their suggestion but the only construction I could place upon their remarks was that they thought the mine workers should be willing to accept lower wages.

Mr. Latham: You dissect my arguments badly.

Mr. MULLANY: That was my idea of what the hon. member meant.

Mr. Corboy: And that was his intention too.

Mr. Latham: You should mention taxation first.

Mr. MULLANY: The Arbitration Court award in connection with the mining industry was only given after an exhaustive inquiry into the cost of living in that part of the State.

Mr. A. Thomson: We have no objection.

Mr. MULLANY: If it is right that the miners should forego portion of their wages as suggested—and it must be remembered that the profits from the mines in Western Australia, except from a very few of the richer propositions, have almost reached the vanishing point—

Mr. A. Thomson: Unfortunately so.

Mr. MULLANY: I ask the representatives of the wheat growers, while we all admire what they have done to bring wheat production to its present status—and we must admit that when mining was proceeding satisfactorily and the State was prosperous generally, it was through the gold production that the State was able to assist men to go on the land and thus helped them to their present position—I ask the wheat growers whether, in their days of prosperity, it is not a fair thing to ask them to forego some little proportion of their returns to help other producers to keep going. What is London parity? How comes it about? No wheat grower will say that under the present con-

ditions in Western Australia he cannot make a profit on an average farm in the wheat belt, at 6s. a bushel. When the Premier some two years ago took a party of Parliamentarians and others through the wheat belt, along the Dowerin-Merredin line and through the Bruce Rock and other districts, he was able to announce that, for the price of wheat at the siding for that year, he was able to guarantee 5s. at the siding. The announcement was the success of the trip, as the reports in the "West Australian" will show. I remember meeting after meeting when that announcement was made and it was pleasing to see the looks of pleasure on the faces of the farmers who listened to the announcement. Many of them told me that they were all right as they could get through on 5s. per bushel, and meet their immediate troubles comfortably. That shows that at that figure they were able to make a reasonable profit. I want the representatives of the wheat growers to seriously consider this position. When they come to the question of appointing a wheat board again, is it reasonable to ask the State to guarantee their price and practically eliminate the middleman and handle the harvest and yet charge only the exact cost of handling? We should get rid of the middleman. I ask the Country Party representatives, however, if it is right and reasonable to ask the Government to come to this Parliament, consisting of representatives of various industries, with a request to agree to eliminate the middleman simply in the interests of the producers, while the interests of the consumers are not to be considered at all?

Mr. Latham: Who pays the taxes?

Mr. MULLANY: There can be no getting away from the fact that that is the position. The State is asked to form a wheat pool and the farmers are to get the world's parity; we are to eliminate the middleman and soon, yet the consumers' interests are not taken into consideration. What is the main reason for the high price of wheat to-day? It is not easy to follow. From what I can gather, however, the principal reason for the excessive price to-day is due to the fact that Russia, which in pre-war times was a large exporter of wheat, and of other foodstuffs, has practically ceased to produce. In any case, Russia has ceased to export. Members of the Country Party have referred to Bolshevism which is popularly understood to mean that the Bolsheviks are breaking down everything and producing nothing. They express horror at that sort of thing, yet they have no compunction in asking for world's parity for themselves and, by so doing, they are taking advantage of the Bolshevik revolution in Russia.

Mr. A. Thomson: You do not hold us responsible for that, surely.

Mr. MULLANY: No, but I ask members of the Country Party to consider this position: no people did more than the residents of Western Australia during the war period. Is it a fair thing for the wheat growers to

penalise our people who are carrying on other industries, because Russia has not settled down? That is what it amounts to. I have no desire to unduly harass the wheat-grower, but in the interests of the whole State, it is not the matter of the few pennies which represent the difference in the price of wheat that makes the whole difference. It goes further than that. The member for East Perth (Mr. Simons) mentioned last night that the price of bread, wheat and flour is the basis of the price of a good many different commodities. It goes further than that in these dire times which we are facing in the State. Nothing we can do as a Government, or as members of this Chamber to endeavour to show consideration for all sections of the people throughout the State should be omitted, and we should endeavour to give a fair deal to all concerned. I believe and trust that the members of the Country Party if they discuss this matter dispassionately will see that if they give up the matter of the few pence in respect of the world's parity, it is possible, and I hope it will come to pass, that a working agreement will be arrived at in regard to the wheat pool and that it will be formed. I trust too that the price for local consumption will be fixed at a reasonable rate in the interests of those engaged in other industries throughout the State and that the rate will be fixed for the term of the Parliament which is now beginning its work.

Mr. CLYDESDALE (Canuing) [5.43]: Allow me to congratulate the member for West Perth (Mrs. Cowan) on being the first lady to be elected in Parliament in Australia. I am perfectly satisfied that with her public record she will be a decided acquisition to this Chamber. Seeing that we have the mother of the House on the Ministerial side of the House and the baby of the House on the Opposition side, I believe that the member for West Perth would be more comfortable than she is at present if she were sitting alongside the baby.

The Minister for Mines: No, the baby is more comfortable away from the mother.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: I congratulate the leaders of both sides of the House on the fine feeling and example they have shown to other members. If we as new members follow the example set us by our leaders I feel sure that our relations, when this Parliament is terminated, will be very amicable indeed. As a new member I have listened to the debate with great interest, more particularly to the remarks concerning the deficit. Although many suggestions have been put forward as to how we can overcome the deficit, I do not think we have yet been shown how we can wipe it out and place Western Australia in that position where we all desire to see her. The main point that seems to have been missed is the huge interest bill we have to meet every year. Many members, more particularly those on the Government side, seem to make a target of the public servants. I protest against this.

Mrs. Cowan: Hear, hear!

Mr. CLYDESDALE: It is not right that the public servants should be blamed almost entirely for the deficit. The member for Roebourne (Mr. Teesdale) yesterday made the most doleful speech I have heard in my 20 years of public life.

Mr. Teesdale: You have a lot to learn.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: I should not have been surprised if he had wound up by declaring that the deficit was due to the public servants having gone to the football match. The annual interest bill which has to be met by the State and all public bodies in it is almost killing progress. The only way in which to reduce the deficit is by increasing population and production. Before we start to increase our population we should see to it that our own people are properly employed. I do not think the remedy lies in the dismissal of public servants, or anybody else. Surely there are sufficient brains in the House to evolve some scheme under which, instead of sacking people, we shall create fresh employment. No State ever progressed by sacking its own people. During the last 12 months 2,700 immigrants arrived in this State; yet every day we are sacking men wherever possible, while placing new arrivals in positions. Is it fair to sack our own men and bring in others to fill the positions which may be offering? I am not opposed to immigration. I have done as much for immigration as any other man in this State. But I want to protest against the manner in which public servants are treated after being dismissed. I am not going to say that those men should be kept on although there is no work for them to do. But before the Government dismiss public servants they should give them reasonable notice, and should call them together and give them an opportunity to secure any other positions which may be offering. Under the existing system, men who have occupied positions of trust in the State for a number of years are being dismissed at almost a moment's notice. In my own electorate one man, after five years service in the Crown Law Department, has been dismissed. He has a large family, he has incurred liabilities and built a home, and now he cannot get work anywhere. Such men are entitled to just as much protection as is the farmer who is guaranteed 9s. a bushel for his wheat. I am a strong advocate for increasing our population by immigration, and I am a strong advocate of land settlement. Still it is not of much use bringing immigrants to Western Australia unless we have land ready for them on arrival. If we have not the land ready for them, the next best thing is to make the owners of land adjoining the railways utilise it, or alternatively, release it. I cannot understand why the men tilling the soil are in many cases opposed to the idea that the land owner not tilling the soil should be taxed. Why did the railways have to impose extra charges to the tune of £400,000 last year? I will answer it this way: The man who is tilling the soil produced, say,

100 tons of commodities, and used the railways for their transport; whereas the man alongside of him allowed his land to lie idle, and produced nothing. The man who, through the railway charges, had to pay for that idle land, was the man who worked his own land. The sooner the farmer realises that, the better. I hope the Premier will be able to announce ere long that land lying idle must be used or forfeited.

Mr. Mann: He said that the other night.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: But it was not a definite pronouncement. I had something to do with the opening up of the Peel estate. We were told that the land there was not fit for settlement. To-day 40 or 50 farmers are settled on that estate. We were told also that adjoining the Peel estate there is another 60,000 acres of land of higher quality, all lying idle. The sooner that 60,000 acres is utilised, the better for Western Australia. I am connected with an organisation that has had something to do with the placing of a number of immigrants on the land. Since 1st July of last year we have dealt with 2,795 persons. We placed 1,995 oversea immigrants, and 471 of local unemployed. In second positions we placed 315. That means that of those men who went to positions and, for some reason or another, could not hold them, but returned to us, we placed 315 again. In third positions we placed 96. We kept a record of those 2,795. The records show that the total failures numbered only 113. That is very creditable. I have been informed that there are 227 immigrants to arrive this week, and that the whole of them, except married couples, have been placed. I shall have something to say about married couples later. Before these ex-service men are sent on to farms it would be wise to put the majority of them through some sort of instructional school. At the close of the war, when our soldiers returned, a number of them applied to the Lands Department for land. Although they had served their country well, they were told that they did not possess the necessary qualifications as applicants for land. We formed a committee and educated those men up to the standard at which they were able to secure the qualification certificates, and 400 of them were placed on the land. Consider the position of an immigrant leaving the Old Country in the middle of winter and arriving here in the middle of summer. Take the altered conditions he has to withstand. More especially is it so with the women. In this connection, the women of Western Australia have not taken the interest in the women folk arriving here which might reasonably have been expected of them.

Mrs. Cowan: Every effort they have made has been frustrated.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: They have not done what they should have done. Before these men are placed on the land they should be given instruction. Even our own farmers, the returned soldiers on the land, have told me that it has taken them two years in which to determine the quality of the soil and how

to treat it. That being so, how long will it take the oversea immigrant to determine these questions? When we put our men through the school we taught them horse-shoeing, ploughing, shearing, plumbing, baking, milking, almost everything necessary on a farm. I saw men who could not read a two-foot rule come into that school, and within three months they were making tables. I saw two men make a 200-gallon tank. Only last month, in the wheat area I visited a blacksmith's shop. There were there five men and 12 horses. The whole day was occupied in getting those horses shod. It meant the loss of a day for five men and 12 horses. If those men had had instruction in shoeing they could have been occupied on the farms for by far the greater part of that day. Having placed men on the land, the Government require to go further and guarantee them some sort of market for their products. The time must come when there will be a large number of unemployed who will have to be protected just as much as is the farmer. If De Garis can guarantee his settlers a market for 10 years, why cannot the Government do the same?

Mr. Angelo: Because the Government are not De Garis.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: Then the sooner they become De Garis the better for the State.

The Minister for Agriculture: The Government guarantee the settlers assistance over an extensive period.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: They must go further than that. When the harvesting is over there will be a large number of unemployed. Some sort of protection in the way of insurance should be given these men also. The man who is out of work through no fault of his own is just as much entitled to protection as is the farmer who wants 9s. a bushel for his wheat. There is one matter which very considerably affects my electorate. I represent the largest number of electors in any one constituency in the State. I mention this fact because in that electorate four tramway extensions are required. Each and every one of these is necessary, and I, personally, am going to fight until they are all completed, notwithstanding that the member for Leederville (Capt. Carter) developed a brain wave when he saw that the "West Australian" was opposed to the tramway extension to South Perth. That hon. member said, "Here is a chance for me now; I will make a name for myself; my name will go down to posterity because I tell the people that we have spent altogether too much money in Perth." One of the four tramway extensions required is the Beaufort-street-Mount Lawley, a total of 70 chains, which will cost approximately £7,000. Most hon. members are under the impression that tramway construction or extensions will cost from £10,000 to £15,000 a mile, whereas under present conditions the outside cost is in the region of £7,000 per mile. Belmont only requires an extension of two miles, which will cost approximately £15,000.

Capt. Carter: What about the subway?

Mr. CLYDESDALE: We can get over the subway.

Capt. Carter: On the basis of £7,000 a mile?

Mr. CLYDESDALE: Yes, and they can go to Leederville for that.

Capt. Carter: There is no subway there.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: Queen's Park requires three miles of extension, which will cost approximately £20,000. The extensions to South Perth of five miles will cost approximately £41,000. Included in that amount is provision for a sub-station for the extension to Canning Bridge and later on to Fremantle.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: What about the railway south of the river?

Mr. CLYDESDALE: The people can have the railway if they like. In all these cases my electors are prepared to guarantee the interest and sinking fund upon the outlay, and in some instances the working expenses.

Mr. Latham: The whole of the working costs?

Mr. CLYDESDALE: Yes, in many cases. If we are prepared to ask for tramway extensions under these conditions how can they possibly affect the deficit?

Mr. Angelo: What guarantees do you suggest?

Mr. CLYDESDALE: I will state what they are directly.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The metropolitan area has always to pay for everything it gets.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: If Leederville wants a tramway extension it should pay for it just as we are prepared to do.

Capt. Carter: Everybody cannot afford to do that.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: We are prepared to pay, at any rate. I was led to believe by the speech of the member for Leederville that the people of his electorate did not want a tramway extension until the deficit had been paid off. As we are going to the bad to the tune of £800 a day, I was going to ask the school children to work out a sum showing when Leederville was likely to have its tramway extension.

Capt. Carter: You had better read "Hansard" again.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: With regard to the Beaufort-street extension, I am instructed on behalf of the road board to say that they will guarantee the interest and the working expenses for five years.

Mr. Latham: And sinking fund, too.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: The Belmont people are satisfied that the two miles extension into their district will prove profitable. I have a letter from the Belmont Road Board stating they are prepared to strike a rate of  $1\frac{1}{4}$ d. in the pound for five years, which will give a return of £1,000 a year. This represents a gift of £5,000 towards the tramway extension, without any reservation. It also means a deduction of that amount from the

estimated cost of the extension, namely, £15,000. We are prepared to talk business along these lines.

The Minister for Mines: I knew that long ago or I would never have gone ahead.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: The Queen's Park Road Board is prepared to strike a rate guaranteeing to make up any loss in interest and sinking fund, and working expenses, for five years.

Mr. Richardson: The Claremont Road Board gave the same guarantee.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: Under these conditions these portions of my electorate are under no obligation to the Government for tramway extension.

Mr. Latham: The Government have to find the money all the same.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: We are prepared to find interest and sinking fund, and I am satisfied that the hon. member's people will be prepared to do the same.

Capt. Carter: Yes, and we will pay for it straight away.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: The hon. member threw in his towel on the first round. He thought he was being backed by the "West Australian." He, therefore, threw in his towel and will not go any further.

Capt. Carter: I am still going and will win on points.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: The hon. member will be down and out.

Mr. Pickering: What about the South Perth extension?

Mr. CLYDESDALE: A restricted tramway service only means increased rents. There are many people at present looking for houses. We shall be obliged to extend our tramway system. We are only working into the hands of the land agents by increasing land values in the immediate areas where the tramways are already running. I will lay before the House a scheme which was placed before the Government for the extension to South Perth some three years ago. A betterment tax to operate for a period of five years was suggested. The estimated cost of the tramway extension is £41,000, and interest at six per cent. on this amount is £2,460. We propose to raise revenue on the zone system. On the first zone system 10s. per quarter acre within 30 chains of the tramway route would produce a revenue of £2,500. We had an alternative of three zones. One was in the case of a quarter of an acre within five chains of the tramway route, at 20s., which would produce £1,154. The second zone was on quarter-acre blocks between five chains and 10 chains from the route at 15s., which would produce £569. The third zone was on quarter-acre blocks between 10 chains and 20 chains of the route at 10s., which would produce £856. We could, therefore, tax the land owners on the betterment principle and bring in a revenue of £2,579, which would be £119 in excess of the amount necessary to pay six per cent. interest on the outlay.

The Minister for Works: It would surely represent more than £2,000.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: That is the revenue we can raise.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: At that rate the interest would amount to nearly seven per cent.

Capt. Carter: What will you do with the balance?

Mr. CLYDESDALE: We will present it to Leederville in order to give them a chance to get their tramway extension.

Capt. Carter: At that rate the original capital amount would be well over £46,000.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: I am informed that the figure would be £41,000. I would sooner take that assurance from the Government officers than the figure of the hon. member. This betterment tax is not altogether a new principle. The Minister for Works lays down a water main in some part of the metropolitan area, and charges the various blocks affected a certain water rate.

The Minister for Works: Because the law allows me to do so.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: Everybody has to pay the rate whether he uses the water or not. I consider this is the most equitable system of effecting tramway extensions. Immediately the line of route to South Perth was announced the price of land advanced from 25 per cent. up to 100 per cent.

Mrs. Cowan: And sold at that increase?

Mr. CLYDESDALE: Any amount of land was sold. In many cases the land agents received instructions to withdraw blocks from sale. I do not object to a man making a profit out of land because it happens to be on a tramway route, but if a person is to receive an unearned increment amounting to from 25 to 100 per cent. because the tramways are going to pass his door, the State should receive a fair proportion of the money, even if it is diverted into paying for a tramway extension to Leederville or anywhere else. If a man coming under the first zone system pays 20s. a year for five years, his land will increase in value by far more than that amount. If we take the increase in land values which has already accrued, and compare it with the sum of £2,579 I have already referred to, I guarantee that the land will have increased more in value, even before the tramways have been constructed, than this amount. It is the fairest and most equitable system of charging those people who will derive a direct benefit from tramway extensions. I hope the Government will see their way to carry this out. It would be wise if metropolitan members had a conference and formulated some scheme whereby the whole of the people in the metropolitan area could be given tramway extensions. I will ask the Minister for Railways—

The Minister for Mines: Ask him in a nice way and you will get a nice answer.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: If tramway extension to Como is to be stopped, what will be the position of any metropolitan member who introduces a deputation to the Minister for Railways asking for this extension?

The Minister for Mines: It could not happen: I would not receive the deputation.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: The Minister would either receive it or refuse to receive it. Does he refuse any tramway extension in any direction in the metropolitan area?

The Minister for Mines: Of course: I would take it as a direction that no tramway extension should be made. Will you support a Bill providing that we should—

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not the time for asking questions.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: I will support a Bill along the lines I have indicated, that is for the raising of revenue on the betterment tax principle. If it had been brought into vogue in connection with our railway system, the State would have been a great deal better off. I am an advocate of this principle. Those people who derive the benefit are the people who should pay.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Mr. CLYDESDALE: In speaking on immigration I was, like most new members, carried away a little. I intended to refer to certain drawbacks involved in immigration. In this connection I am not criticising the Government, but am merely offering a few observations which may prove of some benefit to hon. members opposite. My experience is that there are four disadvantages connected with our system of immigration. Firstly, too many immigrants arrive without sufficient capital. Secondly, we get too many single men in proportion to the number of men with families. Thirdly, our farmers will not employ married couples with children. Fourthly, there is not sufficient housing accommodation in our rural districts to enable immigrant families to live together. On the first point, all the literature that I have read leads me to believe that the first effort of a State should be to induce people with capital to come to it. Next, the farmers of Western Australia somehow do not feel at all favourable towards the employment of married couples. All the immigrants who have arrived in this State latterly have been placed, excepting the married couples. The exception is not a good thing for Western Australia. If some housing scheme in the rural districts were adopted to enable the wives to accompany their husbands working there, we should be able to place more married couples than we are able to do now. During the last two days I myself have had applications from 16 married men wanting to go to the country and wanting to take their wives with them, and the wages offering in the country do not allow a married man to keep himself there while keeping his family in the city.

I wish to impress upon the Government the urgent need for formulating some housing schemes whereby married couples may remain together, for their own benefit and for the benefit of this country. On the subject of tramway extension I do not wish to weary the House, but somehow or other an impression has got abroad that the Como extension will not prove payable. Probably very few members know the route of the proposed Como extension. The five miles to be constructed at a cost of £41,000 will start from the Causeway, whence it will run almost in a direct line to the Como jetty, to link up with the Mends-street jetty, from which a boat crosses to Barrack-street. That is an entirely different proposition from the bush route suggested, to go from the Causeway to a dead end at the Preston-street jetty, Como. After having considered all the schemes in the metropolitan area, Mr. Taylor picks this out as the most payable. I am prepared to show that it will be a remunerative proposition from the first day it is opened. In some newspapers it has been hinted that the construction of a tramway to Como will mean a reduction of the ferry revenue. But in no part of the world can an instance be shown of such a result from the connecting of a tramway with a ferry service.

The Minister for Mines: I agree with you there.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: The ferry traffic is bound to show a considerable increase. When I read in the newspapers that the Government were likely to dispose of the ferries on account of the probable decrease in traffic, I immediately instructed the Town Clerk of South Perth to write to the Colonial Secretary expressing the municipality's willingness to purchase the ferries. Needless to say the Minister, being perfectly satisfied that there will be no decrease, refused to sell the ferries. Last year some 104,000 people visited the Zoological Gardens, and some 14,000 people patronised the baths connected with those gardens.

Mr. Johnston: Double the number would do so if they were given the opportunity.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: Yes. The Zoological Gardens management has for years been desirous of shifting the main entrance to Labouchere-road. The gardens could then be worked more economically. Probably 80,000 visitors annually would come by the ferry, and there would be a penny section from the Mends-street jetty to the Zoological Gardens entrance and return. Who can show me any tramway section in the metropolitan area which, to start with, has 80,000 people travelling each way on a penny section? Then let me draw attention to the Como beach. I venture to say that in the whole of the metropolitan area there is not a beach to compare with Como.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You mean, not a river beach.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: I have seen the South Beach, and I say that beach comes second to Como as a beach for people with children taking a day's outing. Even under present conditions I have repeatedly seen over 6,000 people on Como beach during holiday time. And people from Victoria Park have to walk miles to get to that beach.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They have a good beach at Point Walter.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: I am not running down other beaches; I am merely saying that Como is better than other beaches in the metropolitan area. Although the hon. member interjecting is of opinion that too much money is being spent in and around Perth, I say that we cannot, in reason, spend too much money on our beaches, firstly with a view to attracting people from the other side, and secondly with a view to inducing our own people to spend their holidays here on our beaches instead of going to the Eastern States and spending their money there. Further, the construction of this proposed tramway will reduce the length of time occupied by the journey from Applecross and Canning to Perth to the extent of half-an-hour. That will mean the opening up of the sort of district, we want to develop as a health resort. Again, consider the building sites available at Como—two miles of the most magnificent sites to be found in Australia. The beach there is unlike many other beaches in that it has no water holes for mosquitoes to breed in. Como beach would easily accommodate 2,000 or 3,000 people with residences. With all due respect to certain hon. members, I say there is no beach to compare with that at Como. The Government cannot expend money to better purpose than in opening up a health resort. If we devote thousands of pounds to bringing immigrants here, in what better way can we spend a few thousands additional than in keeping them healthy when we get them here?

Mr. Pickering: But the immigrants are not going to settle at Como Beach.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: I know all about that argument. When I left Victoria, the people on the land there were crying out for decentralisation. Now they have let their farms at comfortable rentals of a couple of thousand or so a year and are living on the fat of the land in Melbourne, and still talking about decentralisation. When they speak of decentralisation, it means that they want the other fellow to go into the bush. If the people concerned in this tramway extension are prepared to pay for it, they should not be denied it. Without desiring to be in any way impertinent to hon. members opposite, I say that if the Government cannot give us a tramway extension when we are prepared to pay for it, they have a right to make way for some other Administration that can.

The Minister for Works: What is the value of the guarantee that is offered?

Mr. CLYDESDALE: We are prepared to strike a rate. Belmont alone is prepared to

make a gift of £5,000 in this connection, without any restriction whatsoever. The Belmont people have been promised tramway facilities for about 20 years. Railway extension ought to be on the same principle, the betterment principle.

The Minister for Works: I inquire what is the value of the guarantee that is offered, because we have had guarantees that have proved of no value.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: If the road boards and municipalities strike a rate on the betterment principle, there is a complete guarantee. I still advocate that metropolitan members should meet.

Mr. Pickering: That will be the end of it.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: I do not wish to adopt a parochial attitude and declare that South Perth should be the only place to have tramway extension. I am perfectly satisfied that the tramways will pay throughout the metropolitan area. It is said they are not paying, but, according to my perusal of the figures, it is easy to make a loss, and it is very easy to turn that loss into a profit. I desire to congratulate the Minister for Works on his system of disbursements under the Traffic Act. I know there are people who think otherwise, but in a very few years the result of the Minister's efforts will be to bring about in outside roads a condition which will be a great improvement on what has obtained during the past few years. I think the Minister can go further.

Mr. Pickering: We do too.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: The trouble in connection with road construction in this State is that we have been continually patching. There has been nothing but patchwork done. I have heard people comparing the conditions in Western Australia with those in the other States. I have heard them ask why the roads here are not to be compared with those elsewhere. The explanation is that we have more miles of road to maintain and fewer people to pay for them. At various meetings and elsewhere I have heard people condemning the engineers, the municipal councils, and the road boards, and have heard them say that they do not know how to make roads in this State. We have as good engineers here as they have in any other part of the world.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They expect the work to be done without any money.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: That is true. We can apply the same argument to the deficit or anything else we like in this State, and it comes back to the same position that we have not the people in this State to adequately pay for the utilities provided. Unless we have more population or assistance from the Government, the roads will become as bad as formerly. I suggest to the Minister for Works that the amounts he collects under the Traffic Act should be distributed on a different basis. He gives the South Perth Council, for instance, £500. If he were to give us £1,500 in advance we could make good roads. It could be provided that the £1,500 would be spent

under Government supervision and that the work should be done properly. If that were done, the work would stand for many years.

The Minister for Works: You show me how to finance it and you can have it.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: I do not know how the Minister would finance it but if he could do so it would improve the position. There is another way. If we could capitalise the amount necessary and pay the interest thereon, the same object could be achieved. At the present time, £1,000 is given to the Belmont Road Board. If we capitalised the amount required and paid the £1,000 away as interest, we could get good roads made under such a system. I ask the Minister to give serious consideration to this matter. If it cannot be financed then it cannot be done, but I hope he will be able to see his way clear to do something in this direction.

The Minister for Works: Do you believe I am supplying cheap material?

Mr. CLYDESDALE: No doubt it is cheap, but we cannot get any of it. We have money in the bank at South Perth to carry out works, but we cannot get the material. If the Minister were at South Perth from time to time he would hear nice things said about him and he would probably hurry up with the material.

Mr. Pickering: You have money in the bank and yet you ask for the advance.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: The money in the bank is from loans which we raised, and the residents are prepared to spend the money. We are not getting any consideration however. In conclusion, I wish to appeal to the Country Party not to be parochial.

Hon. P. Collier: Hear, hear.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: I have been impressed during the course of this debate by the fact that, whenever the tramway question was mentioned and anyone spoke in opposition to the proposals, there was a general chorus of "hear, hears" from members of the Country Party. We on our part are prepared to do everything possible to assist the Country Party members in the work of developing the country. I am satisfied that we must have development in the country and more population. At the same time those who live in the cities and are employed here, are entitled to consideration.

Mr. Latham: They are getting more consideration now.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: They are not, but they are entitled to some consideration. The members of the Country Party should not be parochial. We are prepared to assist the Country Party and we are also prepared to assist the Government if they show ability and an inclination to work, so as to bring this country out of the chaos it is in to-day. If, however, the Government intend to sack a few civil servants and a few men from the railways and try to clear up the deficit in that way, there will be trouble from the Opposition side of the House and from myself in particular. I want the Government

to show us that they can create employment and if they do that, they will lift the country out of its present position. We have no time in Western Australia for pessimists and there are too many on the Ministerial side of the House. One hon. member said that this was the time when we should go slow. This is not the time to go slow. They have referred to the deficit of five millions. Even if we owe 25 millions, the country will stand it. All it requires is development and the future of this country rests in our hands. We can make it or mar it. If we put our shoulders to the wheel we will make this country what it should be. I thank hon. members for the attention they have given me during the course of my first speech in this Chamber.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. F. T. Broun—Beverley) [7.51]: With others who have spoken I desire to congratulate both the new and the old members who have been returned to this Chamber. I want to extend my hearty congratulations to the member for West Perth (Mrs. Cowan) on being the first woman to be returned to Parliament in the Commonwealth. I have known the hon. lady for some time and I know she is a woman of good character and that the interests of the women of this State will be quite safe in her hands. I feel sure she will be able to deal with their interests quite adequately when she deems it desirable or necessary. I did not intend to prolong the debate on the Address-in-reply, because as a rule so many members speak and there is so much repetition. I cannot refrain from speaking, however, after the statements that were made by the member for Kanowna (Hon. T. Walker) last evening. I do not know why it is that that hon. member is always attacking me. I am sorry he is not here to-night, but I will not reflect upon his character or upon the character of any other member in this Chamber. If I cannot speak well of a man, I will keep my tongue tied. On nearly every occasion since I have been in this Chamber, the member for Kanowna has attacked me in one way or another. If it gives him satisfaction and pleasure to do so, I will not interrupt him or prevent him from indulging in this pleasure.

Hon. P. Collier: He has attacked your administration, but not yourself personally.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I think it is mostly an attack on myself.

Hon. P. Collier: Oh, no.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I think a lot of it is personal.

Hon. P. Collier: He has attacked your administration and justly so.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: He has attacked me personally.

Hon. P. Collier: No, he has not. If you think so you will get more later on.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I do not know about that.

Hon. P. Collier: You will get more unless you cease to be a rubber stamp.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: If the hon. member thinks fit to criticise me he may do so, and I hope that I will be able to reply to him.

Hon. P. Collier: Don't continue to be a rubber stamp, then.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There is no more rubber stamp there now than there has been under the administration of other Ministers who have held the position. The member for Kanowna mentioned the Hospital for the Insane at Claremont. Unfortunately this question has been brought before the House during several past sessions and I hope, now that the Government have agreed to appoint a Royal Commission, that once the Commission is sitting, if there is anything to be cleared up in connection with the institution, it will be cleared up once and for all. No one will welcome it more than I shall. If any member knows that things are not right in connection with my department or any institution under my control I shall be only too willing to receive information from him and I shall take steps to have the position rectified. The Hospital for the Insane is a very large and important institution, and one that is not easy to administer by the officials who have control there. It was my intention, seeing that we had taken steps to provide for further accommodation for the inmates of the institution, to invite an expert from the Eastern States, particularly after we had sent the Inspector General for the Insane and the Chief Architect to the Eastern States to go through the institutions there.

Mrs. Cowan: The institutions there are not superior to our own.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Some are superior in regard to buildings and so on.

Mr. Underwood: It will be like the Education Commission.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I considered it advisable to invite either Doctor Sinclair, who is a man of wide experience in New South Wales, or some other expert officer—

Hon. P. Collier: If you are well advised you will not get him. You will not get the head of a department to sit in judgment upon the head of another department. We do not want a white washing commission.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I do not want a white washing commission, by any means.

Hon. P. Collier: That is what it will be.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. member has no right to say that; he does not know what individuals will be appointed on the commission.

Hon. P. Collier: We know that if a head of a department is sitting in judgment upon another head of a department it is always a white washing commission.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The expert will not be the only member of the Commission. The hon. member should remember



that fact. It had been my intention to appoint this expert, not as a Royal Commission, but so that I could interview him and discuss hospital matters generally, to consult with the other officers who will be responsible for the construction of these buildings, and to make recommendations or suggestions which might be of benefit to the Government.

Hon. P. Collier: That was your intention before you got your instructions from the Primary Producers' Association's conference.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I have had no instructions from the conference, and so far as the motion which was carried at the conference is concerned, it would not have swayed me one iota in connection with the Royal Commission. These buildings will cost a large amount of money. The fault, as pointed out by the Select Committee appointed by Parliament some time ago, is chiefly on account of the overcrowding of the institution. It is absolutely essential that we should build as quickly as possible so as to provide further accommodation for the inmates and thus relieve the present congestion in the institution. We should have blocks of buildings erected there so that a patient on entering the institution may go into the first block where he may be given adequate treatment and every opportunity to recover. If it is found that the patient cannot recover without further attention, he should be passed on to the next block. And if it is determined that he cannot recover, he should be passed on to still another block. The patients should be given every consideration and help in the hope that they may recover. More particularly should women be given the most careful attention, for then very often they will recover and be as well as ever. My reason in the first place for being against the Royal Commission was because only recently we had a select committee considering the question, and still more recently was the board of control appointed. Coming into operation last March, that board has done good work already. Dr. Birmingham, a member of the board, has his heart in the work and is doing all that he can for the inmates. In Dr. McWhae also we have a most excellent worker. Then there is Mrs. Casson, one of finest women to be met with. She has put her soul into that work. We have also on the board a solicitor in Mr. Darbyshire, and we have Mr. Weir to look after the commercial side of the working of the institution. During the short period of its control the board has discharged 11 patients.

Hon. P. Collier: Which is the strongest possible condemnation of the superintendent of the institution, who said those patients were incurable.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The board has the release of 20 other patients under consideration, and four others out on trial. Some of the patients down there have reached an age when they could well be

passed out and handed over to friends. Unfortunately it has not been possible to get anybody to undertake the care of them, and so they have to remain in the institution. They are not sane, but because of their impaired physical condition they are quite harmless. However, it seems that their friends do not care to undertake the responsibility of looking after them. During the last six months the superintendent has released 51 inmates, and he has six others out on trial. I asked the chairman of the board whether those discharged by the board were completely cured. He said that none of them were normal, but that they were sufficiently recovered to justify their release, and that in time they would become normal. With the recommendation of the superintendent of the hospital they left the institution.

Hon. P. Collier: It was against his opinion that some of them got out.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is so. In respect of the 11 released by the board, both the superintendent and the Inspector General of the Insane considered that they should not be released. Under the Act, the responsibility for the release of a patient is cast practically on one man, whereas since the appointment of the board the responsibility for release ordered by the board is cast on a number, and they are prepared to take a risk which one man would not take. That is one advantage derived from the appointment of the board.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: So you must admit that we did some good work.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I do. I admit it is a good thing for that purpose. When introducing the Bill, I said it would improve the chances of release of a certain class of patients because the board would take the responsibility for their discharge.

Hon. P. Collier: And it was done in the face of strong opposition from the Inspector General.

The Minister for Works: Why did these busybodies butt in?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There are 1,077 inmates of the hospital to-day. We have at Whitby 30, which is as many as we can take. We have 14 others at Green Place. With the assistance of my colleagues, I will see to it that a Royal Commission is appointed to go into the whole of the working of the Hospital for the Insane. If there be anything wrong about the place, the Commission will dig into it; and whatever their finding may be, it will be adhered to and their recommendations acted on. So the public will have no cause for further complaint.

Hon. P. Collier: But it is all entirely unnecessary!

Mrs. Cowan: I hope you mean to put a woman on that Commission.

Mr. J. Thomson: I hope not.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I am not going to say who will be on the board. It will shortly be known to all. We want a

proper inquiry, and I will do my best to see that a proper inquiry is made.

Hon. P. Collier: It is quite unnecessary!

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I do not want any white-washing commission.

Mr. Underwood: Bring your proposed Commissioner from New South Wales, and you will get one.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The member for Kanowna (Hon. T. Walker) referred to the inebriates' home at Green Place. When I came into office there was an inebriates' home for women at Green Place. For three months prior to my advent there was only one woman in that institution. At big expense to the State she had a staff to look after her. The Hospital for the Insane was overcrowded, and so I cancelled Green Place as an inebriates' home and had it gazetted as an institution for the insane. We now have that home set apart for a mild type of women's cases. There are 14 inmates there at present, which is as many as can be accommodated.

Mr. O'Loughlen: If there were 28 such cases, would the other 14 have to go to gaol?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The place is not likely to be over-full. It was a more humane act to set that place apart for women from the Hospital for the Insane than to keep it open at big cost for one inebriate. Medical men say that not 10 per cent. of inebriate women who go into an institution of that kind will make any attempt to recover. It appears to be almost hopeless to try to cure a woman of addiction to intoxicating liquors.

Hon. P. Collier: That's a policy of despair, that is.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: You may leave them there as long as you like, but only a very small percentage of them will ever be cured.

Mrs. Cowan: Would it not be better if you could take them right away into the country?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It depends on how long we could keep them there.

Mr. J. Thomson: You will never cure them.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: We should require a very large amount of money to erect proper accommodation for inebriates and to establish a reformatory. During the war practically everything was at a standstill, and since the war the position has been just as bad, with the result that the Government are not in a position to provide large sums of money for such accommodation.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Whatever else goes short, this should be provided for.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: We are spending money on the maintenance of other institutions, such as charities and hospitals, in preference to an inebriates' home.

Mr. O'Loughlen: And on Connolly's home too.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: In respect to an inebriates' home for men, we made arrangements with the Salvation Army, who have been most successful all over the Commonwealth in caring for this class of

patient. An arrangement was made with the Salvation Army through Major McClure to set apart a home for inebriates. We have that home to-day, but from an interview with Major McClure I learn that there are only five men in it. With such a small number it will not pay the Salvation Army to keep the home open. If the home is closed down by the Salvation Army, then the responsibility of providing accommodation for inebriates will be thrown on the Government. Nearly all the convictions for drunkenness carry short sentences ranging from one to four months, most of them for a period of three months. This is a very short period. Men go into the institution and it is not long before they are discharged and they return to the drink. Of course, in many cases they are re-committed to the institution. As regards the reformatory, this legislation was passed by a previous Government. This reformatory should be situated in some country district and not in the city, so that the men might be taught the various trades and the methods of production. I feel sure that many of these men in a reformatory in the country would become so accustomed to the climatic conditions and environs that they would probably go on the land or remain in the country instead of returning to the city. We have a small reformatory at Rottneest, and on an average there are 14 or 15 men in that institution. It was intended to set this aside permanently as a reformatory, but shortly after I took office I realised that it would be inadvisable to continue the reformatory there. I therefore took steps to prevent money from being expended on buildings as was intended. It is my belief, and the belief of other Ministers that if we are to have a suitable reformatory, it should be located in the country. As soon as money can be made available for this purpose, a reformatory will be established in some country district so that the particular cases for which it is designed to cater might be taken in hand. When I stated that I had had no intention of speaking on the Address-in-reply, I did so because a Minister has an opportunity to deal with all his departments when the Estimates are before the House. I intend to deal at length with the different departments under my control when the Estimates are being considered, and I shall therefore refrain from mentioning them to-night. In connection with the Primary Producers' Association we have heard a lot of criticism directed against country members. I want to tell members that the Primary Producers' Association was founded purely because the producers considered they were not getting a fair deal.

Hon. P. Collier: Mainly in opposition to your present Premier.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Before the association was started, we had no direct representation in Parliament, and no one to look after our interests.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You were here.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Only for a very short period.

Hon. P. Collier: You were a Liberal then.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: My voice was as one crying in the wilderness.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The present Premier was in the House at that time.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: At that time a large amount of money was expended in the city instead of in the country.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Where?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: We considered that there was only one way to obtain our just rights and that was by starting an association and becoming one union.

Hon. P. Collier: You did not help to start the association. You came in three years afterwards.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I was one of the first members. I was a member of the first conference held in the old Technical School in Perth.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: But you would not come out as a Country Party candidate. Wansborough took your place.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is so.

Hon. P. Collier: You stood out for three years.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: We considered that it was only by banding together as a union and having direct representation to look after our interests that we could get our just dues for the country. Members on the Opposition side of the House have done the same thing. They found they were not getting all they were entitled to, and they started their unions and elected their members to represent them in Parliament. We have done practically the same, and we are here representing the primary producers. It has been said, and I have read the statement in print, that the member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum) controlled the Labour Government when they were in power.

Mr. McCallum: I wish it had been true.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Now we hear the same cry from the Opposition, namely, that the head of the Country Party organisation is running the Government.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We have the letters here in the House. We do not want any letters from outside.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Nothing of the kind. The hon. member, however, can place what interpretation he likes upon them.

Hon. P. Collier: Be careful!

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No matter what criticism comes from the Opposition side of the House or from the public of Western Australia, the Country Party have come to stay. There is not the slightest doubt about that. Only since they have occupied seats on this side of the House, have the people of Western Australia realised that the primary producers are of some importance to the State.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They got greater benefits from us than they have ever got since.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Prior to the formation of the Country Party, a man from the country was regarded as one who grew hair on his teeth.

Hon. P. Collier: And straw in his whiskers and corks on his hat.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: He was regarded as a miserable, puerile sort of a being, an animal almost, was treated with disrespect, and was considered to be of no importance to the country. Some of the finest men who ever came into Western Australia are to be found among the pioneers.

Hon. P. Collier: No one is disputing that.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: And many of their sons are on the soil following in their fathers' footsteps. In spite of all the criticism, we are going to continue along the path we have taken. It is the correct path; our policy is a national one. Our policy will lead to the saving of this country. Only by primary production can this country be saved.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Every worker assists in primary production no matter what his calling might be.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I do not disagree with the hon. member in that. So far as we are concerned, there has been no dictation whatever by the executive or the conference.

Hon. P. Collier: What about the Royal Commission on lunacy?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: We have a platform just as Labour members have a platform.

Mr. McCallum: Then the Minister for Works did not tell the facts the other night.

Hon. P. Collier: The Minister for Works must have been misleading us.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: In our platform we have set down our policy and our ideals. We have set down our constitution. Members elected on our platform are only asked to adhere to that policy.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: But you alter it every 12 months. Ours lasts for three years.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. member is wrong in that statement.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Take the land tax to start with.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Whatever the policy is, we are expected to adhere to it for the three years.

Mr. Corboy: You altered the land tax in 12 months.

Hon. P. Collier: Is the Minister for Works listening?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It does not matter what resolution is passed by the primary producers' conference, no member of the Country Party is bound to abide by it until the next general election, when a new platform is signed. Then candidates undertake to adhere to the platform, and on that they are elected.

Mr. Wilson: Nonsense!

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is only right for members who are returned to this

Chamber to adhere to their platform. Otherwise, they have no right to be here. The President of the Primary Producers' Association has never once attempted to force my hand in any direction.

Hon. P. Collier: You have pleaded with him, you know.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I have never pleaded with him at all.

Hon. P. Collier: Fancy a Minister pleading with him.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I did not.

Hon. P. Collier: Your letter said so. You pleaded with him to use his influence.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I have never been dictated to by him, and I do not think that he has ever dictated to any other member of the Country Party in this Chamber, or held a pistol to anyone's head or asked any member of the Country Party to take certain action.

Hon. P. Collier: Is the Minister for Works listening?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The President has not done so, and I am sure he will not do so. I shall always endeavour to carry out any request which he or the association makes if I consider it to be a reasonable one.

Hon. P. Collier: You are now carrying out something which you consider to be unreasonable.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: If I consider any request to be unreasonable, I will stand up against it.

Hon. P. Collier: You are now carrying out an instruction which you consider to be unreasonable.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Primary Producers' Association is growing. A certain amount of bitterness has been displayed by members on the Opposition side of the House towards the Country Party simply because it has become a strong body not only in this Parliament, but in the Federal Parliament.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It is not as strong as this side of the House.

Hon. P. Collier: But you are a Minister doing under instructions something which you consider to be unjustifiable.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The bitterness against the Country Party by members of the Labour Party arises from the strength of our party.

Mr. McCallum: Everything the farmer has to-day was given him by the Labour Party.

Hon. P. Collier: And you as Minister do under instructions things that you believe to be unjustifiable.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I wish to assure the member for South Fremantle that I am not saying anything against the Labour Government as regards what they did for the farmer.

Mr. McCallum: Then where does the bitterness come in?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That bitterness towards the party is due to its having become a power in the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! If the Minister will address the Chair we shall get on better.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: As long as we remain a strong party and hold the seats we do hold, and are likely to hold, the Labour Party have little hope of obtaining a sufficiently strong majority for some time to come to enable them to get back into power.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That does not create any bitterness.

Hon. P. Collier: The Minister does an unjustifiable thing under instructions from the conference.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. P. Collier: That is responsible and constitutional government.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Leader of the Opposition should not make remarks of that description, more especially in view of the position he holds in the House.

Hon. P. Collier: That is so; responsible government.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. P. Collier: Let us have responsible government.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: A good deal has been said for and against the establishment of a compulsory wheat pool. A good deal of criticism has been levelled against the establishment of a further pool for the coming harvest. I am strongly in favour of the establishment of a wheat pool.

Capt. Carter: Under better conditions, I hope.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: And a higher price for wheat.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Unless we have a wheat pool many farmers will in a short time be unable to carry on. We hear enough in the streets and in other places to know that every effort is being made by merchants and others, who are operating in wheat, to prevent the establishment of the pool.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: In Western Australia?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is the first I have heard of it.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is also heard in the Eastern States. Only a short time ago I received a letter from a big firm which has been operating in wheat for a number of years. I received that on the way to the conference in New South Wales. I was asked in that letter to oppose the continuation of the pool, but the firm which wrote that letter wrote to the wrong man.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They ought to have known you.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The letter said, "You need have no fear about getting a good price for your wheat, because we will

pay you immediately it is harvested, on the world's parity." Who is to say what the world's parity will be throughout the year, though we may be able to get close to it when the harvest first begins to come in? The merchants have buyers throughout the country purchasing wheat. They go to many of the small farmers, who are really compelled to sell their wheat because of the liabilities they have to meet. Many of them are under the Industries Assistance Board and receiving help through the Agricultural Bank. These agents go to the farmers in the early part of the season and offer them a fair price, but only buy a limited quantity at that price, with the object of filling up a ship or completing a parcel which has been sold.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Is that the system which used to be adopted?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Is that the reason why your party opposed the wheat pool when it was first started?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I do not know that the party did oppose it.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Did not the party tell the farmers to get out their guns and fight those people over it?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was not the party.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Your leaders did.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Under this arrangement a certain quantity of wheat is purchased. Shortly after, however, prices come down and in many instances the small men are compelled to sell at a price below that to which they are entitled, because they are forced by circumstances to do so. The pool is a wise provision, because the small farmer is placed on an equal footing with the big farmer so far as the price per bushel is concerned.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Thanks to the Labour Party.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The big farmer or the man with capital can always store his wheat if he is not satisfied with the price offered. He can wait until the price enables him to get the full value for his product. It is in the interests of the small man that the pool should be established. I would not agree to the establishment of a pool for the future unless the price of wheat for local consumption was fixed, subject to revision every month or two. The price should only be fixed for a short period at a time.

Hon. P. Collier: You have reformed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I have never reformed—

Hon. P. Collier: Oh!

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: In that direction.

Hon. P. Collier: I tried to do that last year but you were against me.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: My opinion to-day is the same as it was, namely, that the price for wheat for local consumption should be revised at periods

not longer than three months. That was my opinion last year when it was decided to continue the pool.

Mr. McCallum: Are you asking for the world's parity?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Undoubtedly. The farmer is entitled to that, that is the world's parity minus the transport charges and other expenses in connection with the handling of the wheat. The value of wheat placed f.o.b. should be its price for local consumption.

Mr. McCallum: No matter whether it paid to produce wheat at world's parity price or not?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: You cannot do anything else. It must be sold at the world's parity.

Mr. McCallum: To the local consumer?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes.

Mr. McCallum: You must take it or leave it. When the world's parity is high you are content with that, but you want something else when the price is low.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum) states that the price should be fixed for the farmer, and that this price should be paid to him year in and year out.

Mr. McCallum: No!

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: He also said that that price should be the actual cost of production to the farmer, plus a certain percentage.

Mr. McCallum: That is for local consumption.

Mr. Pickering: That is a generous margin.

Hon. P. Collier: A very "generous" margin.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is impossible to fix the price of wheat so that it may be fair to every farmer. The farmers in Beverley, for instance, five miles west of that town, cannot produce wheat at anything like the same price as farmers on the eastern side of the railway can do.

Mr. Latham: That would be allowed for.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: How is that going to be done? Every farmer would have to keep a set of books so as to be able to show what it costs him to produce his wheat, and the price would have to be varied accordingly.

Mr. McCallum: One workman cannot live and support his family in the same way and on the same rate of wages fixed by the Arbitration Court as another workman.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: In that case it is possible to fix the rates, but I do not see how it is possible in the case under review. The Government are wise in deciding to continue the pool. It will not only protect the farmer but the Government as well. It will be of great benefit to the State. Most of the merchants who are operating in wheat send the money that they make in this State to some other place and invest it there. Their capital is not in West-

ern Australia. Is it not better for the farmer to get that to which he is entitled, and to have the money kept within our own borders? I do not say that the middle-man is altogether dispensable. There are middlemen who are necessary, but there are many who are not. Very often those who are unnecessary are making the greater profit, as compared with the grower himself. The member for South Fremantle apparently forgets that during the year before last the consumer was getting his wheat for something like 5s. per bushel less than the world's parity.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Not on the average. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: At all events it would be something like 4s. 9d. less.

Mr. McCallum: I am satisfied that the farmer will be the loser under your proposal, and that he would do better under ours.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I disagree with the hon. member.

Mr. McCallum: I am convinced of it.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: At the time the price for local consumption was fixed it was not known whether wheat would be 6s. a bushel or 14s. or 15s. a bushel. At the time it was more than 9s., and it was anticipated that it would average a figure of 9s. or over. No one knew what it would be.

Hon. P. Collier: They knew very well.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Had it been fixed at 9s. and had it risen to 14s. or 15s., no more than 9s. would have been charged to the local consumer.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Everyone knew they could not get a "bob" for it because it could not be got away.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: If it had not been for the pool—

Hon. W. C. Angwin: And the Labour Party.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The farmer would have been getting a mere pittance for his wheat.

Hon. P. Collier: The pool, which we started.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: What would the effect have been upon our finances and upon the raising of loans by the Federal Government during the war?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That shows the interest in the country on the part of the Labour Party.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Had it not been for the money received from our wool and wheat the Commonwealth would not have been able to raise the huge loans that it did.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is due to the Labour Party.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: When the price of 9s. was fixed by the Australian Wheat Board it was anticipated that this would be the highest price it would reach. Up to date that figure has been realised. The price has been fixed and there it remains. The price for local consumption

should, in my opinion, be fixed on the world's parity, subject to revision from month to month.

Mr. McCallum: You will be crying to us for something else soon.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is London parity. You do not believe in what your colleagues—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The member for North-East Fremantle must keep order. I will not speak again, but will enforce the Standing Orders.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I do not wish to detain the House. I have already pointed out that there will be opportunity for replying on many of the points raised by hon. members when I introduce my Estimates. With reference to immigration more particularly, I have here figures which I could give to-night, showing what is the policy of the Government. However, the Estimates will be before the House ere long, and I wish to avoid repetition. I do hope that not only the Parliament but also the people of Western Australia will realise the imperative necessity for exercising economy in every direction. For the development of the State it is necessary that every man able to do something should give the best that is in him to help production forward, with a view to tiding the State over its financial difficulties. I feel that if the people of Western Australia do not expect too much from the Government—

Hon. P. Collier: They will not be disappointed.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: —and will help the Government to economise, we shall be able, though with difficulty, to stem the present drift. I feel sure that under such conditions we shall be in a position, before very long, to produce to the people of this State a balance sheet showing the huge deficits of recent years reduced by a very large proportion. I may express the hope, too, that before many years pass the occupants of the Treasury bench—whenever they may be—will have the pleasure of announcing that the ledger discloses, instead of a deficit, a small credit balance.

[The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.]

Mr. MUNSIE (Hannans) [8.50]: There has been a great flow of congratulations in this Chamber recently.

Hon. P. Collier: It has got to stop.

Mr. MUNSIE: Yes. Speeches such as those delivered by the member for Roebourne (Mr. Teesdale) and the member for Menzies (Mr. Mullany)—

Hon. P. Collier: The Government whip.

Mr. MUNSIE: —are bound to draw some retaliation from this side. Many of the congratulations which have been uttered I am prepared to endorse. However, in view of the two exceptions which I have indicated, let me express the hope that the fairly good feeling displayed by hon. members on either side in this Chamber will be carried a little

further, carried outside the House as well. It is remarkable how members of the various parties supporting the Government, as well as members of the Government party themselves, are always asking for, and I believe expecting, support from this side of the House. For myself personally, I am prepared to support any measure introduced by the present Government which, in my opinion, will operate in the interests of the majority of the people of Western Australia.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We have saved the present Government from defeat on several occasions.

Mr. MUNSIE: As to members carrying good feeling outside the House, let me remind certain hon. members sitting in this House at the present moment that during the general election there was no word in the English language bad enough to express what they felt in regard to any candidate labelled "Labour." They called us everything they could think of. No term was too bad for them to apply to us. I heard one gentleman speaking for an hour and twenty minutes, and of that time he devoted at least one hour and fifteen minutes to abusing the members of the Perth Trades Hall. I am rather surprised to find that gentleman coming along here—

Hon. P. Collier: Was he elected?

Mr. MUNSIE: Yes. Seeing that there are 17 of us Labour members in this Chamber, I am rather surprised, in view of what the hon. member said regarding the Trades Hall and the great Labour movement of Australia, to find him coming here unarmed. Really, after hearing him talk as he did on the platform, one would expect him to come here with a revolver in each pocket and a sword on each hip to protect himself from the Labour Party. However, a little experience of the Labour movement as represented in this House will enable certain hon. members to realise that we are not actually quite so bad as they painted us outside.

Hon. P. Collier: We are not bad fellows when you know us.

Mr. MUNSIE: Next, I wish to deal briefly with one or two items of the Governor's Speech. The deficit has, I think, been discussed quite sufficiently. I agree that the best time to deal with matters affecting finance is when the Estimates are being considered. I may just remark that during the general election assurances were given by the Treasurer, who is also Premier, that the financial year would end very close to his forecast. Many candidates standing in the Labour interest criticised that statement and predicted, on the basis of the figures then available, that the Treasurer would be likely to finish about £300,000 out. We were called despots for having the temerity to suggest that the Premier's estimate would prove wrong. We forecasted that he would be £300,000 out; he did actually get £285,000 above his prediction. I fancy the hon. gentleman did fairly well to keep within that amount. The Governor's Speech mentions

that the credit of this State is good, and I am very pleased to know it. But I also notice that the Premier, being desirous of raising a loan of two millions, had to postpone that move for six months, and, instead, issue Treasury bills, the market not being too good. Just a little while ago, two other Australian Premiers had gone to England for the purpose of interviewing financial authorities there with a view to financial aid. What attitude did the Press of Australia adopt towards those two gentlemen? If a Labour Premier of Western Australia had been obliged to issue Treasury bills with a six-months currency, what would have been said? "There is a Labour Government; it cannot get money; the London financiers will not lend money to a Labour Government."

The Premier: Who said that?

Mr. MUNSIE: The "West Australian," in particular, said it as regards Mr. Theodore. It was proclaimed in large headlines that Mr. Theodore, the Labour Premier, could not get money in London. At the same time the Press glossed over the fact that our Premier himself could not get money, and had been compelled to issue Treasury bills instead of floating a loan. In New South Wales there happens to be a Labour Premier; and from the information at present available to us it seems that Mr. Storey, while in England, succeeded in arranging with some financial institutions to get 19½ millions of money over a period of three years. What has happened since Mr. Storey made that statement?

The Premier: He has not got the money yet.

Mr. MUNSIE: There is our Premier coming at it again; right down in his heart he hopes that Mr. Storey will not get the money, just because he happens to be a Labour Premier. Even the Commonwealth Treasurer, Sir Joseph Cook, has had it published throughout the Press, under big headlines, that he doubts Mr. Storey's statement.

The Premier: Mr. Storey did not say he had raised the money.

Mr. MUNSIE: Why are these tactics being adopted by the Press? For the sole purpose of preventing a Labour Government from getting the money, if possible—simply because it is a Labour Government that is concerned, and for no other reason.

The Premier: Oh, no!

Mr. MUNSIE: That is my candid opinion, and I am always prepared to express my opinion.

The Premier: You should withdraw that.

Mr. MUNSIE: I am not going to withdraw it, because I believe it to be absolutely true. As regards the premium on gold, the Governor's Speech says that Ministers are pleased the premium continues at a satisfactory rate. The Speech also mentions that Parliament last year passed a measure dealing with the tributing system in gold mining, and that a Royal Commission has been appointed to consider certain aspects of that measure. I regret very much that in this connection my mouth is closed, since I happen to be one of

the Commissioners and the Commission's report is not yet completed. However, I shall have something to say on the subject at a later stage. Another paragraph of the Speech states that with a view to further assisting the mining industry the Government propose to introduce a Bill altering the Land and Income Tax Act as it applies to the sale of gold mining leases. I applaud the Government for adopting that attitude. I realise that for the sake of the gold mining industry of this State the Government ought not only to introduce such a Bill, but as a Ministry should make serious overtures to the Federal Government with a view to securing relief from Federal taxation also in that respect.

The Minister for Mines: The Royal Commission that is sitting represents both the Federal and State Governments.

Mr. MUNSIE: As a matter of fact, however, the relief that can be given to the mining industry by the State under this heading is not very considerable. I appreciate the efforts the Government are putting forth in an endeavour to foster the mining industry, but I urge the Minister for Mines to make overtures to the Federal Government to co-operate in this matter. There are one or two other directions in which the Government can assist the mining industry. In the evidence given before the Royal Commission on Tributing, I heard a good deal about the premium on gold and the cost of explosives and other materials generally. On nearly every occasion we have been assured that the cost of mining requisites has gone up from 100 to 150 per cent. In some cases the increases represented more than 150 per cent. I want to urge upon the Government the necessity for stepping in in regard to the supply of these requisites, so as to keep the mining industry going. What is wrong with the Government being the sole importer of all explosives coming into this State? We heard it said by men in authority three years ago that if the Government cared they could have imported the whole of the explosives necessary for the mining industry in Western Australia at a very cheap rate indeed. The Government did not step in on that occasion. It is not very often that I give credit to the Chamber of Mines. I am prepared to give that credit, however, when the members of that institution do something to deserve it. In this instance they do deserve credit. Those gentlemen who are associated in the activities of the Chamber of Mines got to work and made it possible for explosives to be imported. Had they not taken that action the whole mining industry of this State would have been hung up for three months at least. Seeing that things have got to such a pitch, it is the duty of the Government to assist the mining industry to the extent I have suggested. I believe that the Government could assist the industry very materially by importing all these explosives and also cyanide, zinc shavings and those other requisites which have

advanced from 100 to 150 per cent. If that were done, it would materially reduce the cost of mining at the present time. If the Government did that, we would hear less of that absolute bogey that increased wages have crippled the mining industry in Western Australia. There is a paragraph in the Governor's Speech reading as follows:—

In obedience to the provisions of the Licensing Act, 1911, a local option poll was held in April of this year. The result of that poll has revealed certain defects in the existing legislation, and a Bill is being prepared to remedy these, and to put our licensing laws generally on a better footing.

With regard to the recent local option poll, I want to ask the Government what attitude they are going to adopt as the result of that vote. The Government were determined in their attitude not to interfere in any way with the Act as it stood on the statute-book until after the vote had been taken. The last two questions submitted to the people require attention. The first question was: "That all future licenses in Western Australia should be controlled by the State." That vote was carried with an absolute majority of 5,777. The last question submitted to the people was: "That all liquor licenses should be controlled by the State, yes or no." That question was carried in the affirmative by an absolute majority of 3,977.

Mr. J. Thomson: The member for West Perth does not agree with that.

Mr. MUNSIE: I have taken the figures from those supplied to us and the member for West Perth has the same details in her drawer. These figures are accurate. What are the Government going to do about it? We have not had a word about this subject from any member of the Government.

Mr. Underwood: Not one of them has had a word to say on the matter.

Mr. MUNSIE: We do not know what attitude the Government intend to take. They say they will introduce legislation to remedy defects. I believe that the last local option poll was nothing more than an absolute farce.

Mr. Latham: That is so.

Mr. MUNSIE: If the Act is to be amended in any way, some amendments should be aimed at making the law more reasonable than it is at present. I notice that the Government, according to the Governor's Speech, intend to introduce 19 Bills. I intend to deal with only one of them. I refer to the Land Agents Registration Bill. If recent reports and statements made in the "West Australian" and other leading newspapers throughout the State are correct, there is great urgency for this measure. I have a cutting from the "West Australian" dated 18th March of this year.

Mr. Underwood: It is a very unreliable source.

Mr. MUNSIE: Perhaps it is, but in this instance they backed up their statements with figures, proving they were correct.



Hon. P. Collier: They strike the truth sometimes.

Mr. MUNSIE: Occasionally they do.

Mr. Underwood: There is the law of averages; that accounts for it.

Mr. MUNSIE: The paper pointed out that some of the persons concerned were unfortunate returned soldiers who had gratuity bonds to cash. The report goes on to say—

Some of the land "sharks,"—

That is not my language, but the language of the "West Australian." I am rather surprised at it. The report states—

Some of the land "sharks" it is reported, have made several thousands of pounds. In one notable instance an agent sold one block of land five times over.

That is pretty strong—

His practice was to sell land to a returned soldier, to give him a cash advance on the bond, to secure a receipt for payment of the bond's full value, and to allow only a few days for the production of the full purchase money on the land. In most cases the returned soldier did not pay the balance of the purchase price, whereupon the block was declared forfeited and offered to another bondholder on similar terms, who in turn failed to discharge the short-dated time payment. And so the "system" went on. This particular agent, it is understood, holds £9,000 worth of bonds.

I have four other cuttings from the "West Australian" on the same subject. Three of them comprise motions carried after discussion at meetings of the executive of the Returned Soldiers' League. On two occasions they carried motions demanding the publication of the names of these land sharks who have been swindling their fellow men.

Capt. Carter: So they should.

Mr. MUNSIE: What has happened to the Returned Soldiers' League? They have had nothing to say on the subject for some time. They are I.W.W.-ing on the job; they have been going slow for the last three months. During that period we have heard nothing from the league regarding their demand for the names of the land sharks to be published.

Mr. Latham: They did not get the returned soldiers behind them.

Mr. Wilson: I have the names and I will give them to the House.

Mr. MUNSIE: What happened to the Returned Soldiers' League that caused them to drop their demand for the publication of these names? Perhaps it was, as stated by someone on the Ministerial side of the House last night, because they did not place the matter in the hands of the member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum), for had they done so, they would have been published.

Mr. Marshall: But he is an agitator, they say.

Mr. MUNSIE: Why did not the Returned Soldiers' League continue their demand to have the names published? In the interests

of the public of Western Australia and of commercial decency, the names of these men who robbed and defrauded returned soldiers and others should have been made public.

Mr. Wilson: I have the names; they will be published.

Mr. MUNSIE: They will be published, make no mistake about that! I intended to say something about the water supply, but will content myself by saying that I am absolutely in accord with the member for East Perth (Mr. Simons). It does seem remarkable to think that the capital city of Western Australia has been absolutely starved for want of water during the hot periods of the summer. And yet we have millions of gallons running to waste over the Mundaring Weir. The lowest the water has been below the crest is nine feet. What is wrong with tapping the Mundaring supply for use in the metropolitan area?

Hon. P. Collier: The engineers say it is not an engineering proposition.

Mr. MUNSIE: It is 80 feet higher than Mt. Eliza, so that the water will gravitate.

Hon. P. Collier: Yes, but they think it is not an engineering proposition.

Mr. MUNSIE: I would like to hear the objections they have to raise to the proposition. With reference to statements made by members on the Ministerial side, the member for Roebourne (Mr. Teesdale) had something to say regarding the workers. I do not expect to ever hear that hon. member say anything good about the workers. He is a Conservative; he knows it, and preaches it.

Hon. P. Collier: Never having worked himself.

Mr. MUNSIE: I suppose he has worked himself sometimes.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: He told others to work.

Mr. MUNSIE: He has no time for the workers. I do not expect him to say anything in their favour, but he was concerned the other night about the member for Yilgarn (Mr. Corboy), who happens to be the baby of the House at the present time. He was afraid that there was some germ or virus left in his chair from the late member for Fremantle and that the member for Yilgarn might be affected. While the member for Roebourne is not expected to say anything good about the workers, he should be careful not to be affected by the germ issuing from the chair occupied by the member on his right.

Hon. P. Collier: He is not to blame.

Mr. MUNSIE: Not only has the member for Roebourne nothing good to say—

Mr. Teesdale: You are barking up the wrong tree now.

Mr. MUNSIE: But he has adopted his colleague's attitude and has gone outside Australia to pick up something detrimental to the workers. The member for Guildford (Mr. Davies) never gets up in this Chamber to speak without quoting something detrimental to the workers.

Mr. Teesdale: He knew nothing about what I intended saying.

Mr. MUNSIE: He is affecting the hon. member by his tactics.

Mr. Teesdale: He knew nothing about it.

Mr. MUNSIE: I am not accusing you of getting your information from the member for Guildford, but that hon. member always has quotations to make to the detriment of the worker.

Mr. Teesdale: He had nothing to do with me.

The Minister for Agriculture: The member for Roebourne has his own germ.

The Minister for Mines: The North-West tick.

Mr. MUNSIE: Regarding the closing down of the Lancefield mine, the hon. member again blamed the workers for that occurrence.

Hon. P. Collier: He always blames the worker.

Mr. MUNSIE: He did not tell hon. members the circumstances in which the Lancefield closed down.

Mr. Chesson: He did not know.

Mr. MUNSIE: Then he had no right to make the statement. Had I been at Lancefield, whether as secretary or president, or even plain Sid. Munsie, I would have advised those men not to accept the offer.

Mr. McCallum: They would have been repudiating the finding of the court.

Mr. MUNSIE: That was the first offer. As a matter of fact, the Company in the last seven or eight months of its existence had been showing just under a profit in some months, and in other months had made up to £800 for the month. They offered the miners the right to take over the mine. All they wanted was 1s. per ton royalty. That seemed very good. As a matter of fact, that 1s. per ton royalty represented considerably more than the profit the company had been making under the old conditions. And what proviso did they put in? That they should retain control of the management, as in the past. Could it be expected that the men would accept such a proposition? Having been there for years, many of them knew exactly what the mine was capable of producing. They knew also where improvements could be effected in the management. But the company said, "You can work the mine; we will take the royalty and will control the management." The other alternative was that the men should go back at the 1916 rates, and the company continue to work the mine. I cannot understand the logic of my friend opposite. He condemns us because, as he says, we do not prevent strikes. He declares that we should urge the workers to abide by arbitration. Those men at Lancefield worked for three years after the outbreak of war without any increase in wages, although the cost of living was going up all the time. Eventually they went to court and got an award. Immediately the award was given, the company said, "We cannot pay it. You must take the 1916 rates." And the hon. member asks, "Why

did not the men accept it?" He accuses the men's leaders because the men did not break the award of the court. Suppose the men had accepted the 1916 rates, and carried on. What would have happened? Every mine in Kalgoorlie would have closed down unless the men working in those mines accepted the 1916 rates, flouting the award of the Arbitration Court. So if we stick out for arbitration we are wrong, and if we will not have arbitration we are wrong again. What does the hon. member want us to do? The hon. member read from an English newspaper a paragraph showing that some hero had enlisted in 1921. That man was expelled from his union. Why was he enlisting? There was no war. But there was a coal strike in England at the time, and the Government were calling for volunteers. For what? So that if the coal miners persisted, they would be put in their places at the point of the bayonet. This particular man enlisted, and the hon. member holds him up as a hero, this man who enlisted to shoot down his fellow unionists. I admire the courage of the unionists who said, "Get out, you are not a fit associate for us." I would have said the same. The hon. member found great satisfaction in the fact that two candidates had been defeated in the Roebourne election. He said the electors had given them the blucher boot pretty hard. He derived much satisfaction from the fact that one of them happened to be a Labour candidate. Looking through the returns of the late elections, I find there were six electorates which returned members unopposed. Of those six, three were Labourites, namely, the members for North-East Fremantle, for Forrest, and for Collie. The other three electorates in which no contest was fought were Mt. Margaret, Williams-Narrogin and Beverley. That left 44 electorates to be contested. Out of those there were nine without Labour candidates, namely, Irwin, Moore, Murray-Wellington, West Perth, Pingelly, Sussex, Toodyay, Wagin, and York.

Hon. W. C. Angwia: We returned our man for Murray-Wellington all right.

Mr. MUNSIE: It has been said that it will be many years before the Labour Party get back to power. Yet, save that I am sorry that some of my old colleagues should have been defeated, I am by no means disappointed at the result of the late elections. The total number of effective votes polled throughout the State was 97,338. In the nine electorates in which there were no Labour candidates the total votes polled were 14,147, leaving a balance of 83,191 effective votes polled in the constituencies contested by Labour candidates. Out of those votes the Ministerial party, including all on that side, polled 45,864 for 23 members, while the Labour Party polled 37,324 for 13 members. The Government intend to introduce a Redistribution of Seats Bill. I hope they will provide for proportional representation. Worked out on the basis of proportional representation, the figures I have quoted give

the Labour Party 16 seats, and the remaining parties 19 seats. As I said, the result of the late election is perfectly satisfactory to me. A good deal has been heard of economy. Even the Colonial Secretary just now urged the necessity for supporting the Government in a policy of economy. He said there was no money for the unfortunate inebriates, but that when money was available a home would be built for them. While the Government preach economy in one respect, it behoves them to practise it in others. I have here a file showing the furniture purchased for the Agent General's house in London.

The Minister for Railways: That is not a file. It's a rasp.

Mr. MUNSIE: The Government made a good deal in purchasing that house. I do not believe in paying rent if one can get the freehold.

Mr. Underwood: They are still paying rent for it, ground rent.

Mr. MUNSIE: They bought the house outright and made a good deal.

Mr. Teesdale: Whose word have they for that?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Mine for one.

Mr. Teesdale: Do you know the property?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Yes, and have been through it.

Mr. MUNSIE: The Government made a good deal in purchasing that house.

Mr. Underwood: In purchasing the lease of it.

Mr. MUNSIE: Well, have it your own way. But when it comes to the furnishing of the house, it is quite another question. The Government have in Barrack-street a shop used for the purpose of exhibiting and advertising Western Australian goods, stuff manufactured in Western Australia. Why did not they furnish at least one of the rooms of the Agent General's house with furniture made in Western Australia from Western Australian timber.

Mr. Latham: They have some jarrah there.

Mr. MUNSIE: Yes, but they got it from Savoy House, not from Western Australia. The Government preach economy. Let me run down a few of the items of furniture in the Agent General's house. For a spare room they have a five-foot mahogany bedroom suite costing £95 10s. That is supplied by a stony-broke Government.

Mr. Wilson: You did not want them to put in a Coolgardie stretcher, did you?

Mr. MUNSIE: They have one Wakefield easy chair. I do not know what a Wakefield chair is like, but it must be pretty good, for it cost £24 10s. In the drawing room they have one velvet pile carpet costing £83 17s. 6d. This from a Government always preaching economy. There is one six-foot white enamel bedroom suite costing £105. That is a pretty decent suite.

Mr. Pickering: Who is it for?

Mr. MUNSIE: I do not know, but I am satisfied that she has pretty expensive tastes. Now we come to provision for refreshments after dinner. They purchased one dozen cut glass tumblers at £5 17s. 6d., one dozen champagne glasses at £7 10s., a dozen claret glasses at £5 17s. 6d., a dozen sherry glasses at £4 18s. 6d., and a dozen glasses for port wine at £4 18s. 6d. This comes from the Government who are all the time preaching economy and telling us we should advocate Western Australia first of all. I always do so. I was born in New South Wales and lived there until I was close on 13 years of age, but Western Australia is first to me and always will be, not because I am prejudiced against the other States, but because I believe there are better opportunities here if the people of Western Australia will only stick up for their own State. I am sorry that the Australian has not a little more of that quality of which the Yankee has too much. No matter where one meets an American, if he hails from one of the smallest hamlets, he will always swear that his little home and his little town are the best in America and that his country is the best in the world. But an Australian is almost invariably prepared to say that some other country is better than his own. I hope that Australians will cultivate a little of that Yankee spirit and boost their own country.

Mr. Underwood: You want to take Yankee skite in very small draughts.

Mr. MUNSIE: But a little confidence in our own country will do a considerable amount of good. Unfortunately there are too many members of this House who have no confidence in the country they are living in. All the time they are crying stinking fish. I applaud the Premier for his optimism. It is the right attitude to adopt in any country. We want a little more optimism and a little less pessimism, and then we shall do better for the workers as well as for those who employ them.

On motion by the Minister for Mines, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 9.32 p.m.*