

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 9th July, 1914.

	PAGE
Question: Goldfields Water Supply, Kalgoorlie reservoir	272
Leave of absence	272
Bill: Registration of Births, Deaths, and Marriages Amendment, 1B. .. .	272
Address-in-reply, sixth day	272

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

QUESTION—GOLDFIELDS WATER SUPPLY, KALGOORLIE RESERVOIR.

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH asked the Colonial Secretary: What was the cost of the water service reservoir recently constructed at Kalgoorlie?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: £24,000.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. V. HAMERSLEY, leave of absence granted to the Honourable R. D. McKenzie for 24 consecutive sittings of the House on the ground of urgent private business.

On motion by Hon. J. F. CULLEN, leave of absence granted to the Honourable C. A. Piesse for 24 consecutive sittings of the House on the ground of ill-health.

On motion by Hon. W. KINGSMILL (for Hon. E. McLarty), leave of absence granted to the Honourable Sir J. W. Hackett for 12 consecutive sittings of the House on the ground of urgent private business.

BILL—FIRST READING.

Registration of Births, Deaths, and Marriages Act Amendment (introduced by the Colonial Secretary).

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Sixth Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): In company with those members who have spoken, I desire to express

my regret at the death of the late Hon. R. W. Pennefather. In doing so I would just like to say that I came in fairly close contact with that hon. gentleman, as he was suffering from a complaint similar, unfortunately, to that which I have been suffering from myself, and I very sincerely regret that the hon. gentleman was not able to get over the disease to which he has fallen a victim. Further than that, I also wish to express my sincere sympathy to the Hon. C. A. Piesse. I am sure that every one of us no matter upon which side of the House we are sitting, or to which party we belong, sincerely regrets the serious illness of that hon. member. I regret also the absence from the House of the late hon. member, Mr. Moss, and of the late hon. member Mr. Davis. I suppose that Mr. Moss and myself came into conflict more than any other members of the House, owing to the fact that I was introducing industrial legislation and that he usually opposed it. I think, however, I can say this, and say it sincerely, that Mr. Moss was one, even though he was on the opposite side from me, from whom a great deal could be learned. This House is made very much the poorer by the absence of that hon. gentleman. I cannot do otherwise also than regret the absence of my late colleague, Mr. Davis. I reciprocate the statements which have been expressed about that gentleman. A good deal has been said about the recent elections. It seems to me that some members from an opposite point of view regard the late elections as a victory for the Liberal party. I, for one, am intensely proud of the increased Labour vote that we got in connection with the restricted franchise of the Legislative Council. There is no doubt that the Labour party has succeeded, and succeeded wonderfully well, in face of the restricted franchise for this House. When did we ever come so near to winning the West Province election as we did on this occasion? When was there ever any possibility of winning so many votes against such an old and tried member as Mr. Clarke? All through, whenever we have contested seats, we have secured a very much increased Labour vote. In addition to that increased vote

there have been returned to this House two Country members who by no means have declared themselves as being supporters of the Liberal party. It seems to me that the recent elections have been more of a defeat of the Liberal party than a defeat of the Labour party. There are a few matters to which I desire to refer before the Colonial Secretary replies to all the criticism which has been levelled against the Government. There are a few matters which have come more immediately under my notice. I wish to refer particularly to the speech of Mr. Colebatch, and his reference to the workers' homes. The hon. member has drawn attention to the differentiation in the applications under the leasehold principle and those under the freehold principle. Of course he has drawn pictures very detrimental to the leasehold principle. There is one mistake, however, which he made at the very outset. He said that we were giving one per cent. better terms to the leaseholders than we were giving to the freeholders. That is wrong. Whatever instalments are paid within one week, there is only a half per cent. difference. It is not one per cent. Further than that, it might be pointed out that in connection with the leasehold system there was a considerable amount of preliminary work to be done before that system could be brought into operation. It was first of all necessary to secure the land and when that was secured it was necessary that it should be dedicated. Then surveys had to be effected, the land subdivided and the necessary values appraised, which makes all the difference in the world in starting such a scheme, as compared with what the Workers' Homes Board had to do in connection with the freehold system. If we could only get sufficient land in a suitable locality, we would have no fear of the leasehold system. There is not one solitary block which is available under the leasehold system.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: In every town there are blocks.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I am referring just now to the metropolitan area. There is a good deal of evidence that the leasehold applicants

were unable to be supplied with blocks. Many were waiting to take up land under the leasehold system but were obliged to wait longer, in order that fresh land might be dedicated. It is all very well to say that there may be in many towns leasehold blocks which have not been put up, but it may be as well to know where those blocks really are. I am now referring particularly to the metropolitan area. The hon. Mr. Cullen stated that there was a quantity of land in Western Australia. It is true there is a great deal of land in Western Australia but there are quantities of land in the metropolitan area which are not available under the leasehold system. What land is available is not in a suitable locality and is not near to the centres of activity of the workmen. We do not want to send a man out into the country who is working on manual labour, where it will take him some three hours longer every day to get through his work. In regard to the freehold system, however, there are many blocks in the metropolitan area which have been held for a long time. It is very easy to get hold of some of the blocks, for there are numerous freehold blocks, and that is where the difference comes in between the settlement on the leasehold system and settlement on the freehold system. I have had a little information compiled upon this matter. It is a mistake to assume that Part III. of the Act is leasehold and Part IV. of the Act applies to the freehold system. Almost every speaker in dilating upon this matter assumes this, but it is altogether an erroneous assumption. The Minister may recommend an advance under Part IV. under the freehold system, not only to a person who holds land in fee, but from the Crown, and no distinction is made between the freeholder and the Crown lessee. Then again, Mr. Colebatch has referred to the difference in the value of the houses under the leasehold system and those under the freehold system. In ascertaining the average he has simply divided the number of dwellings by the total amount of loans which have been approved. This, however, is not giving the true facts of the

case. There are numerous cases where, for various reasons, the board does not advance the full amount required for building under freehold, under Part IV. of the Act. I think hon. members will appreciate that fact, that the board does not always advance the full amount under Part IV. It only advances part of the amount; consequently it may appear that under freehold it is lower than under leasehold. Under Part III. the board have determined that substantial buildings, such as those of brick or stone, are better than wooden buildings, and consequently there are no wooden buildings being erected; they are nearly all of durable material. That is the difference between these particular buildings. The Workers' Homes Board was asked to arrive at a true estimate of the cost, but it was explained that this would entail a considerable amount of work, and but for that I should have had pleasure in producing the average cost of the dwellings under these two particular sections of the Act. Reference has been made to persons not being workers securing loans under these Acts. If a person does secure a loan and is not a worker, he is making a false declaration. A person has to declare that he is a worker within the meaning of the Act when he is applying for a loan.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: What is the definition of a worker?

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I have not it here. It has been stated that those who are not workers are getting loans.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: You would not refer to his calling, only his income.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I think the return which will be presented will show what the occupations of these people are. What we say is that no worker can possibly get a loan under the Act unless he makes a declaration that he is a worker within the meaning of the Act. A further statement was made that the board would not advance sums of money to enable workers to purchase homes. That is correct. The board did at the outset advance money to purchase homes, but they closed down on it because their funds were limited,

and because the Act was not brought in to pay off mortgages or loans to contractors and money lenders. The Act was brought in to enable homes to be built, not to purchase them, and although a considerable number of homes were purchased in the early stages of the operations of the Act, the Treasurer closed down upon the principle of buying these homes, believing that we should build them and not buy them. Mr. Carson, I think, drew attention to the fact that streets were not being made in some of the places which had been dedicated for workers' homes, but I would like to know what private company or private individual who subdivides an estate ever thinks of making streets.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Many of them.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I would like to know who they are in Western Australia.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: I think the owners of the Mount Lawley estate made streets.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I am pretty doubtful whether that is the case. I live close to Mount Lawley, and I have been making inquiries to find out whether or not any private individuals have constructed streets there. It must be borne in mind that the municipalities get rates from workers' homes just as they do from other homes, and consequently it is to their advantage to make roads where the workers' homes are, just as they would in any other part of the municipality. Mr. Allen, I think it was, in referring to the freehold as against the leasehold principle, drew a pretty picture from a sentimental point of view of an Englishman's home. This is not the first occasion here that I have endeavoured to refute such statements as that. Mr. Allen has told us of the pride that the Englishman takes in his own home. I would like to ask what is the percentage of people in England or Scotland at the present time who own homes, and when an hon. member refers to an Englishman owning his home we can point to the fact that it is the freehold system which is dispossessing the Englishmen, the Irishmen, and Scotchmen of their homes. That is one of the serious

matters which the British Parliament is considering, whether it can provide for the Englishman having something like a decent home. If the hon. member will only give us an idea of what is the percentage of these people who own their own homes we should be able to judge which is the better, the leasehold or the freehold principle. I am not particularly struck whether it is the leasehold or the freehold principle which is adopted, provided the community secures the values which they create. It may seem an old statement to make, and it may appear like a platitude, but whether it is or not, it is true, and whichever it is, so long as we can get the values the community creates by the expenditure of the money, that is what we want. If we can only do something here to avoid the condition of things which exists in England we should be doing something which would be for the benefit of the people. It may be that the freehold system is a little more popular than the leasehold. Personally I doubt it, but I believe that if we could place before the people here the same number of lots available under leasehold as under freehold, and under the same conditions, and in the same localities where the workmen could get easily to and from their work, they would be split up equally under leasehold as under freehold.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: Why are they all applying for freehold under the Act?

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): They are not. There are many applicants waiting for a chance of securing leasehold blocks. I would like to read a couple of extracts from two letters written by people who have built under the leasehold system. The first is from a resident in Hay-street, Perth, and it is dated 18th June, 1914. This person writes to the secretary of the Workers' Homes Board—

You will have doubtless heard from Mr. Dreghorn that I took possession of my house in Hensman-street last Saturday, June 13. I should be glad if you would express to the Board my entire satisfaction with all that has been done. In fact, I might truly say

I am very proud of my new home. I should also like to express my sincere thanks to Mr. Dreghorn for his kind attention to all details that I brought under his notice. I shall be glad if any members of the Board happen to be in South Perth at any time for them to come along and make a personal inspection.

That is under the leasehold system which is said to be so very unpopular. The next letter is as follows:—

I have moved into my new home to-day, and take this opportune time to tender my thanks to your Board for the great consideration and courtesy shown to me from the day of my application to date. I have never had dealings with a Government department that has been so free from the restrictions and annoying delays caused through—very often necessary—departmental forms and red tape.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: It is a back-handed testimonial.

The home is pretty and good to the smallest detail, from the foundations to the topmost ridge capping, and has evoked great praise from the public generally and from local builders, and reflects the greatest credit upon all concerned from your officers who drew up the plans to the supervisor and workmen who carried them out.

He goes on in that strain and I am glad to have the opportunity of placing these two letters before members of this House. Mr. Colebatch also had a good deal to say on the gold mining industry. He declared that this industry was not getting a fair show owing to industrial embarrassments. I do not know that a worse statement than that could possibly be made. I think a statement even from the bitterest party opponent could not be worse from any point of view than that particular one. I will just read what Mr. Colebatch said:—

I think that it is largely due to the fact that our goldfields are not getting a chance. I am not going to blame the Government in particular for this, but I do feel that industrial conditions have

been imposed upon those who are endeavouring to develop our goldfields, which are not making for the interests of the State or even for the interests of the men employed.

What are the facts in connection with those embarrassments to which Mr. Colebatch has referred? The only industrial trouble that I know of in my long experience that could be said to have been of a serious nature is the industrial trouble supposed to have taken place at the Youanmi mine. Right throughout the last 13 or 14 years the leaders of the unions throughout the goldfields, not only in Kalgoorlie and the Murchison, but elsewhere, have been complimented by the mine managers upon the freedom from industrial trouble, and I know of no time in the history of gold mining in this State where such a statement as that by Mr. Colebatch could apply. It is just as well when these statements are made that they should be made with some regard to accuracy. What was the particular embarrassment in this case? It was in regard to the abolition of the contract system, and I would like the House to understand what is meant by mining contract. I have drawn attention to it here more than once, and although it is freely stated that under contract men earn higher wages from the statement made by the secretary of the union at Youanmi they are there evidently looking further ahead than the mere immediate present. They are looking to the effect of the contract system, and I know what that is. I have known what it is everywhere, in every centre with which I have had anything to do. Although mine managers will say that men can earn 27s. or 30s. a day under contract, the effect of that system is simply to bring contract wages to a shilling a day more than the arbitration rate, and there is no system on earth that is so fruitful in disease than this particular contract system. I have stated here that there are two sides to this question. There are a number of men who believe in it and many who do not. If the employer wants to get better work, if he wants to give credit to the man who

is doing better work, he has the means of getting over the difficulty without letting out contracts. He can pay higher wages to better men without having this competitive system of contract by which men are simply eating their hearts out underground.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: Why should not a man be allowed to do so if he desires?

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): There are hundreds of things which men are not allowed to do. In hundreds of instances we have to protect men against themselves. In connection with the contract system, I appreciate the fact of men endeavouring to protect themselves and their fellows from its evils. There is no country in the world where such a large number of men are employed, and which is freer from industrial disturbances than the goldfields of Western Australia have been, and I say emphatically that it was a cruel slander to say that the goldfields are not getting a fair chance by reason of industrial embarrassments. The hon. Mr. Colebatch, among others, should go down on his knees and thank God that there have been, and that there still are men on the goldfields who have done all they could to prevent industrial embarrassments and to give the mines a fair chance, as they have done sometimes in the face of severe criticism from their fellows in every part of the State. The hon. member had something to say in reference to the proposal of the Government regarding miners' phthisis, and the attitude he adopted when the Workers' Compensation Bill was being discussed in this Chamber. I want to say for the edification of the hon. Mr. Duffell that the Commission which sat in 1904, and which was appointed by the Government of which Mr. Gregory was Minister for Mines, recommended certain things. The Commission were composed of the most practical men, scientific men and men skilled in technical matters which it was possible to secure in Australia, and were appointed by Mr. Gregory. The Commission spent 11 months in going about the country learning what they could regarding the ventilation and sanitation of mines. They

were not a partisan Commission; some of them were Government officials and they made certain recommendations as to regulations which should be gazetted in regard to mining. The most important recommendation made by the Commission was ignored by the gentleman who appointed them. Had those recommendations been carried out in 1904, the present Government would not have had to step into the breach to-day and find some thousands of pounds to relieve the effects of this terrible disease. With regard to check inspectors, I want to say that the present State Mining Engineer has been and is still in favour of them, and for anyone to state that we propose to give unlimited powers to these inspectors is beside the mark. Their power was defined in the Bill and the Government were quite prepared to accept very much less than was asked for, in order to get some relief. Amendment after amendment was submitted to induce this House to give us some relief in regard to mines regulations. Let me point out also in regard to the Commission that a mines regulation board was recommended, and I maintain that if a board had been appointed, even in each centre, there would have been infinitely better results than we find to-day. The Minister for Mines cannot possibly know all that is going on, but if a local board, consisting of a representative of the employers and one of the employees, together with a Government official were appointed to inquire into the working of the mines, the best means for combating disease, and for providing better methods of drilling, we should have had very much better results. I feel very strongly on this point. I know that the Mines Regulation Bill was defeated, not by reason of what it contained, but owing to the distrust generated against members on the Government side of the House. The Government did not ask that the whole of the Bill should be passed. We would have been pleased if the whole measure had been passed, but we were prepared to accept a number of amendments. However, after we had made out a case in favour of the Bill, hon. members passed

the second reading and then, at the instigation of Mr. Connolly, shored the Bill of everything of any possible benefit. In this connection the House took a stand which it cannot and never will be able to justify. After the discussion on the clause dealing with check inspectors, two members walked out of the Chamber rather than vote on it. They did not desire to vote for the clause and they were conscientious enough not to vote against it. This is the position in regard to the Commission which sat in 1904. Instead of Mr. Gregory carrying out the recommendations of the Commission, he then appointed another Commission to ascertain the extent and prevalence of miners' lung disease. Dr. Cumpston constituted that Commission. How many many times have those fighting for the Bill been accused of over-stating the extent of the disease, and the number of accidents? Time after time hon. members have charged us with being led away by sentiment and over-stating the case in every possible way, but Dr. Cumpston stated that 33 per cent of the men on the mines were suffering from this disease. Then Mr. Gregory, in order to escape from his responsibility in regard to this particular Commission, appointed a third Commission, which cannot by any means be said to have been a satisfactory one. I have said before, and I say again, that I will not utter a word against the personnel of the third Commission. Despite all the criticisms, I have not spoken slightly of the Commission, except to say that it was not a satisfactory one. The Commission was appointed simply to get over the responsibility of Mr. Gregory ignoring the recommendations of the Commission of 1904. But when the Workers' Compensation Bill came before us, in which industrial diseases were classed as accidents, the report of the Commission was hurled at us again and again, and this report was responsible for industrial diseases being deleted from the Workers' Compensation Bill. We hold that an industry should bear the burden of those who are injured or maimed by reason of working in it, particularly the mining in-

dustry which has paid 24 million pounds in dividends and has not given one cent. for the alleviation of the men working in it. This industry should have paid for the loss of the health of the men consequent upon them working in it. The Government are endeavouring to do something for those who are suffering from this disease and have offered to subsidise a grant by the mining companies and to give a subsidy each year, based on one third of the contributions each from the mines and the employees in order to overcome the difficulty. In this connection no scheme will be submitted to Parliament. We shall probably submit a Bill to provide for the creation of a board. What we propose is more in the nature of an experiment than anything else. To come to Parliament with a scheme based on actuarial figures would mean no relief for the men, because neither the mining companies, nor the men, nor the Government, at present are prepared to pay what an actuary would demand to be paid to meet the obligations to be incurred. The hon. Mr. Colebatch referred very slightly to the fines inflicted on the men who have broken the Arbitration Act. He said that, even when fines were inflicted, they were either remitted altogether or were largely reduced. Only on two or three occasions have any fines been inflicted. In the very first case brought before the police court under this Act, the magistrate inflicted the maximum penalty. The particular trouble involved lasted only some nine or ten days, and surely no harm is done to the community when a fine is remitted for a first offence under the Act. May I point out a few other aspects of the matter? It seems a remarkable thing to me that hon. members can see only one side; they never see the other side. We have an Early Closing Act and I say that the fines inflicted under this law are an absolute scandal to our administration. It is remarkable that hon. members know nothing about this. They see the issue where men are fined simply for breaking some clause in the Arbitration Act, but they see nothing of the other cases. Only one day last week there were 14 cases under the

Early Closing Act, and the aggregate amount of the fines was 6s. 6d. Can one imagine a more ridiculous state of affairs? Ever since the Early Closing Act has been in existence the inspectors have experienced trouble, because decent fines are not imposed.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: Industrial trouble is not likely to be caused through not closing at the proper hour.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): There is just as much detriment to the employee who is compelled to work against his will in violation of the Early Closing Act, as in the other direction. If it is wrong to inflict a small fine in connection with one Act, surely it is just as wrong to impose the maximum fine under another Act provided the effects of the breaches of the law are the same. In one instance the effect of the breach is felt by the employer; in the other it is felt only by the employee. I might be permitted to say a few words concerning the carpenters' trouble. In doing so I would like to state, as I did from the beginning of that trouble, that it was utterly unwarranted. For about a fortnight I endeavoured to bring about a settlement. I have no hesitation in saying that the men who brought about that trouble in the way they did, not only did something in the nature of a breach of the law, but even from the view point of tactics did something utterly unwarranted in every shape and form.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Who were the men who brought it about?

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I am speaking now of the unionists who commenced the trouble. For a number of unionists to commence a trouble of this description, likely to have such far-reaching effects, because a number of men would not join their union, was from the view point of tactics ridiculous and suicidal. Is it to be believed that I am going out on strike to make my wife and children suffer, and to cause the wives and children of perhaps hundreds of others to suffer simply because certain men will not join the union? I prefer to make the other fellow suffer.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: The carpenters were only obeying a resolution.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): They were obeying it to the extreme letter and they tried to bring about a movement by revolutionary instead of by evolutionary methods. That was the distinction. I say those men brought about the trouble in opposition to the wishes of the responsible Labour bodies of the metropolitan area. Let me say this also, that as far as the non-unionists are concerned I cannot understand a man refusing to join a union and causing all the trouble that was caused in this instance, more especially when these non-unionists had no need to contribute to the political side of the movement. I approached those men myself, and gave them the assurance that they would not have to contribute one penny towards the political side.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: They are bound to contribute if a levy is made.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): No. In this particular union the members are all free.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: But then they would be called "scabs."

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I do not think there is anything in a statement of that kind. When I was on the Kalgoorlie fields, I prided myself on being a member of the biggest union there, and we never had any occasion to seek to force anyone against his will. I quite believe that even now, at this present time, the men would not in such circumstances be compelled to pay the levy.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: They would be marked men, though.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I do not think so.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Their life would be made a misery to them.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I do not think there is any question of these men being marked in any way. I may say that this is especially so in connection with the carpenters' society, because the headquarters of that society are in England, the same as are the headquarters of the engineers' and other craft societies, and the rules to a large extent are taken from the

English rules, and must be in conformity with the English trade union rules. The society decided that these men would not be required to pay any levy in any shape whatsoever. Therefore I cannot understand the men standing out of the union and bringing about all this trouble, seeing that they were not asked to contribute to the political side of unionism. Having said that, I am not going to exonerate the other fellow in any shape or form. I told those men right through the piece, when attending their meetings, and told them in the face of pretty severe opposition too, what I thought of their action from every point of view. I said that the action of the men who brought about that strike, the action of the particular unionists concerned, was absolutely suicidal. Let me say this also, that having done all we possibly could to settle the strike, and having restricted the area of that strike, having prevented the extension of it to the wharves and elsewhere, we consider that the attitude of the employers in locking out the men was not an attitude in respect of which they can be exonerated in any way whatsoever.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: They did not lock out the men.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): It is useless for anyone to say that was not a lock-out. If that particular action of the employers was not a lock-out, then there is no lock-out under the Arbitration Act, and there is no strike under the Arbitration Act.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: There was no lock-out.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. member will have an opportunity of speaking without interrupting.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I think the action of the employers in this trouble is worthy of all the condemnation that we can give it. I, for one, felt somewhat keenly the action taken by the employers. I admit that the employers have the right to manage their own business as they think fit, but the attitude adopted by some who were in the van of the Labour movement in trying to restrict the trouble and to

end it—by which action they were incurring all sorts of opposition—might have met with some response from the employers. The action of certain firms in closing down without the slightest possible cause when they had heaps of orders and heaps of men to fulfil them, to my mind is just as much to be condemned as the action of the men who came out on strike. If the Arbitration Act is to break down by reason of the attitude which has been adopted, the blame will not be altogether on the side of those who have been ready to strike. So far as the arbitration laws are concerned, I think we are at present at a very critical stage. For many years I have advocated compulsory arbitration. I suppose I have been in the van of the Labour movement in connection with this particular matter, believing that it was a suicidal policy for all concerned, employers and employees, to have these disastrous strikes and lock-outs; but I am gradually coming round to the view that a man should have the right to strike if he wants to strike; and if the employer is going to take the opposite view, then he will have to take it. I believe that in order to get reforms, we require to have more sacrifices. I am sure that if we threw aside our Arbitration Act to-morrow, then in three months we should have both parties clamouring for some law to settle their industrial disputes. Up to the present the employer has been opposed to arbitration, tooth and nail; and yesterday we read that in Victoria the employers have asked for some legislation to settle industrial disputes. But if reform in this direction can only be brought about by sacrifices, well, let us have them. If both parties are going to conspire in order to damn the Arbitration Act and to return to what I call the barbarous method of strikes and lock-outs, then I think we should not stand in the way. That is my personal view. If it must come to that, then let it come, and the sooner it comes the better. I wish to say just a few further words in reference to the mining industry. The hon. Mr. Colebatch has told us that the mining industry is declining, that it is going down, that the re-

turns for the six months of this year are less than the returns have ever been for any previous six months. By reason of that, he infers, the mining industry is going to ruin, and that has been brought about by bad industrial conditions and by the attitude of the Government towards the industry. I wish to quote a few figures this afternoon, in order to show where the hon. Mr. Colebatch slipped. I am rather inclined to think that the hon. gentleman had less the welfare of the country at heart than he had a desire to injure the Government. The annual decrease in the mining industry for the six years prior to the Labour Government coming has been £437,662. The decrease for the two years during which the Labour party have been in office is £120,687; that is the annual decrease. It has been almost three times less during the three years we have been in office than it was during the six years of the previous Administration; and last year we had a surplus of £133,000 odd in the mining industry. The previous year, however, before the policy of the present Minister of Mines could really be brought into effect, we had a decrease of something like £300,000, which means that the average decrease for the two years was £120,687. Now when we come to look at the dividends paid, we find the same thing. The average annual decrease in dividends during the term of the Liberal Government was £223,922. The average decrease for the two years under the Labour Government is only £42,000; and, indeed, last year we had an increase in dividends of £96,000 odd on the previous year. And yet the hon. member has the temerity to get up here and bewail the fact that the mining industry is on the decline. I have no hesitation in stating that the fact of better returns in the mining industry has been due to the policy of the present Minister for Mines. The present Minister has distributed his batteries throughout all the electorates; he has not placed them in one particular electorate. Under the Liberal Government, in one electorate one-third of the State batteries were erected. And then people talk of spoils to the victors,

and of what we are doing for our own supporters. We may immediately return the compliment in a hundred and one ways. During the reign of the late Minister for Mines one-third of the State batteries were erected in his own electorate. I say it is by reason of the fact that the present Minister for Mines has distributed his batteries in all parts of the State where they are needed—without fear or favour—that the returns are so gratifying. Further than that, the present Minister has given better battery facilities, and a considerable amount of money has been spent in repairing old batteries which were erected under obsolete methods. I think the hon. Mr. Colebatch would have done well to try and find out a few facts in connection with the mining industry before making his statement. Again, let us consider the returns for the six months of the present year, to which that hon. member particularly drew attention. I find that there has been nothing like the decrease for the six months when compared with the yearly decrease under the Liberal Government; nothing like it. I have here a statement compiled which shows that the decrease for the first five months of the present year has been largely caused by the fact that a fire broke out at the Ivanhoe mine in February last, which caused a suspension of work at this large producer for some time, and to the fact that the Victorious mine at Ora Banda ceased operations to allow of the erection of a sulphide plant. I think it was the hon. Mr. Allen who said that we might establish a department to take credit for the decrees of the Almighty. There is one thing certain, that wherever any bad luck or misfortune occurs, we shall certainly always be twitted with it while we have members like the hon. Mr. Colebatch and the hon. Mr. Cullen in this House. We find that one of the biggest gold producers suspended operations in February last for three weeks, which accounts for almost all the decrease of the particular five months. Further than that, the mine at Ora Banda closed down for the erection of a sulphide plant. Again, amongst other things which the hon. member bewailed was the les-

sened coal production. I have a statement here showing that the output of coal for the year 1913 was 313,818 tons, valued at £153,614—a record production for the Collie field. That was for 1913, and for the first five months of 1914 the coal output was to the value of £63,118. For the first five months of this year the coal output was valued at £64,000 odd—£1,000 more than for the same period last year; the exact increase is £977. I also find that the increase for the five months of the present year in the dividends paid by the gold mining companies has been £464. And yet we are told by the hon. gentleman that owing to industrial embarrassments and so forth the mining industry has declined. I have also noted that in 1913 Western Australia was alone in the increase of the output of gold. All the other States, including Papua and the Northern Territory, show a decrease; New Zealand had an increase in yield; the output from Western Australia was 51.22 per cent. of the total of Australasia. The previous year, if I remember rightly, when discussing the Mines Regulation Bill I showed that our output was 48 per cent. of the then total. During last year it has increased to over 51 per cent. I think I have shown that so far as regards the goldfields not getting a chance under our administration, and as far as industrial embarrassments causing the goldfields any trouble is concerned, the very reverse is the fact. The statement which Mr. Colebatch made is very similar to a statement which has been made by Mr. Doolette. Mr. Doolette is the chairman of the Great Boulder company. He has made a statement, not only in the annual report of his company, but also at the West Australian dinner in London, to the effect that the Government were not doing all that they ought to do in order to encourage prospectors, and that we were leaving it to private individuals to encourage the gold mining industry. He pointed out—

When we remember that the mines during the last 20 years have yielded nearly £112,000,000 to the products of this State, I am sure you will agree with me that no opportunity should be lost, both by private individuals and

the Government, of fostering and developing the industry.

I do not know a man connected with the gold mining industry from whom this particular statement would have come with worse grace than from the chairman of the Great Boulder Company. By that I do not mean to imply Mr. Doolette in his private capacity, because, as far as I know, he may have done much to encourage prospecting in this country; but in regard to his capacity as chairman of the Great Boulder I know of no man from whom such a statement could come with worse grace. His company have paid dividends of over £4,000,000 on a paid-up capital of £175,000, and I ask anyone who knows anything about the mining industry what has the Great Boulder done to encourage prospectors? They certainly have a mine in Alaska, to which they are going to send Mr. Hamilton next year, and they have another mine in Victoria. That is all the encouragement they give to the prospectors, after having paid dividends amounting to almost 4½ millions. It is, as the paper which reported this, says—"Let the other fellow do it; we are content to take the dividends." I would like to read a short extract from a letter recently sent to the Minister for Mines regarding mining and the fields generally. The writer addressed the Minister for Mines in this strain—

After much discussion my friends and I think that Western Australia is a place where a fellow can get a square deal, especially with regard to mining.

That is written to the Labour Government which are doing so much, according to our friends, to injure the mining industry. The writer continued—

and as we are all British bred and born, and therefore free, we have decided to make Western Australia our future home, and hope to arrive in Perth early in January, 1915. Since we have been in Canada we have spent nearly £16,000, equal to £1,000 a man a year, and with that amount in Western Australia we think that it is possible to make something better than we have done here.

Then he goes on to say—

We fully expect hardships, but I notice that Western Australia promises nothing in the way of luxuriant ease and comfort to its miners and prospectors, as Canada does. Thank goodness for that, for it is far better to go into a new country prepared for the worst than to go unprepared, with the assurance of a Government official that "it will be all right." It is only right that you should know something about our party, so that we shall not be turned back at Fremantle as undesirables. We are all of good English parentage, and there is not one remittance man among us, of which we are rather proud. We are fairly well educated, clean-living, and healthy-minded, and are not afraid of hard work. We have between us, when all is totalled up, a sum of well over £100,000, in cash and securities.

Hon. J. Cornell: Yet they say we are chasing capital out of the country.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): Yes, and that this is the place where the industrial embarrassments are so great that mining does not get a fair chance. Yet this is the very place in which those men think they can get a fair deal. There are one or two other points made by the hon. member to which I will refer. I refer to that hon. member in particular, because I take it that at the present time he is the leader of the Opposition in this Chamber, as evidenced by a number of members who have spoken since he did. The hon. member said that the initiative and referendum were not suitable instruments of government in other than a free country. And in addition to libelling the country regarding the gold mining industry, he goes out of his way to libel the people of the community, and he insinuates that in this country we are not free, by reason of the terrible trades union rule which has such a hold upon the country that it compels men when they go to the ballot box to vote according to dictation, and consequently he thinks that the initiative and referendum should not be used in this country. I will leave that to those who have been told that they are not free. Perhaps they are a little bit too free, and when the hon. gentleman comes to face his constituents

again he may realise that the intelligence of the electors in his particular district prefers a member of the Country party. Again we are told that the initiative and referendum means mob rule. That statement has been frequently made. We have been told by Mr. Duffell that he has yet to learn that the 50,000 electors to this House would be prepared to hand over the destinies of the State to the flotsam and jetsam of the community. That is a nice statement to make! The hon. gentleman would not give the vote to these men because they were the flotsam and jetsam of humanity. Several members, in addition to those I have named, have had a good deal to say upon the need of keeping the qualification for this House as it is at present, and each and every one has got up and stated that he is representing all parties, that he is going to give justice to all parties. Mr. Holmes stated—

I am almost inclined to think that I have taken the wrong turning, or turned up at the wrong place. When I decided to nominate for a seat in this Council, on the hustings I declared that I was seeking to be elected to a non-party House, a House where each and every section of the community would receive equity and justice, and the whole of the community be thoroughly represented.

That sentence has been repeated throughout the debate by every member who has spoken. They believe that every section of the community should receive equity and justice. Mr. Allen, I think, made the same statement. Yet none of those members are prepared to give to that section of the community representation here. They are prepared to represent that section, but are not willing to give it a vote to send them here. Could we conceive a more ridiculous position to take up? Mr. Kingsmill I think, said he was sick and tired of this party and non-party business. As far as I am concerned, I am absolutely sick of the political humbug circulated in regard to this House.

Hon. J. F. Allen: We represent the children, but they do not vote.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): The children have not the intelli-

gence to vote; but if the hon. member insinuates that the adult electors are like children, I invite him to go and tell the free and independent electors of Fremantle so. In this flotsam and jetsam of humanity we have the very men who have made it possible for most of us to be here to-day; the very men who have made it possible for Mr. Duffell, Mr. Allen, and Mr. Holmes to be conducting the businesses they are to-day are a part of that flotsam and jetsam of humanity, and are not entitled to have a vote. There is hardly a prospector in the State who has the qualifications enabling him to exercise the vote, and it is the prospector who, of all others in the State, has made us what we are; and not only the prospector but the surveyor and the surveyor's assistant, and many other men working in outback parts of the country, doing all they can, under most uncomfortable conditions, to make the country worth living in. These are the flotsam and jetsam of humanity so slightly referred to by the hon. member. I was sorry to hear Mr. Kingsmill speak in the way he did last night regarding Mr. Bath. I think his remarks on that occasion certainly lowered the dignity of the House, and brought into our discussions an element which should never have been introduced. When a member of this Chamber makes a statement about a member in another Chamber, drawing attention to his personal appearance and making the references which the hon. member did to Mr. Bath's personal failings, if he has any, I certainly think the remarks were in exceedingly bad taste, and I, for one, am very sorry that Mr. Kingsmill should have gone out of his way to give expression to them. None of us owe our election, or the fact of our being here, to any personal graces which we have. I do not owe my own to anything of the sort. If I had to rely on personal graces I should be left in the cold. We cannot all possess those personal qualifications and that personal charm which Mr. Kingsmill has, and consequently I think it was very bad taste indeed for him to refer to Mr. Bath in the way he did. Reference has been made to the deficit, and I suppose the

deficit always will be used as a stalking horse with which to harry the Government. To a very large extent it has been brought about by means over which we had no control. One was the increased pay necessary to bring a large number of State servants up to the ordinary current rate of wages. Yet the increased taxation necessary to provide the means to pay those increases was refused in this Chamber, and when a body of men withhold the means to pay an increase I take it they are opposed to the increase, and are simply using that method to prevent the increase being paid. I think this Chamber has something to answer for in this respect. Many members have stated that they regard the increased taxation as necessary, but they are not prepared to give any measure of increased taxation in order to bring a large number of State servants up to the current rate of wage. I may just say that Mr. Cullen drew attention to the fact that we sought to increase exemptions in regard to those who had to pay income tax, but that we decreased the exemption in regard to land. I am prepared to say that I am a party to that. It is a particularly just system of taxation, and there is nothing wrong in doing that. So far as the exemptions in the income tax are concerned, a tax on incomes is a tax on personal exertion and a tax on thrift, but a tax on land values is a tax on the value created by the expenditure of public money, and the erection of buildings. I do not intend to say much regarding this speech of Mr. Cullen's. So many parts of it were devoted to vituperation and abuse that there is no need to say anything in reply. I will say this, however, that when he referred to the question of "spoils to the victors" he might have mentioned some of the appointments to which he referred. I suppose "spoils to the victors" is the appointment of Mr. Northmore to a judgeship; "spoils to the victors" in the appointment of Mr. Davies as manager of the State Implementation Works, and Mr. Davies has always been an advanced Liberal; "spoils to the victors" in the re-appointment of Sir Newton Moore to the Agent Generalship.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: No, that was tactics.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): That is the cry used. When we ask our opponents to show us where has been the "spoils to the victors," we are met with the retort that it was tactics. We had other applications for many of those positions, and some perhaps were not members of the Labour party. Some perhaps were more favourable to the Labour party's platform than those who were appointed. I was very much amused with a statement made by Sir Edward Wittenoom in regard to the freezing works. I have drawn attention before in the House to the socialistic ideas of the various members, and I am glad to notice that the socialistic principle is gradually gaining ground here. It is beginning to permeate every member, and when we find Sir Edward Wittenoom of all others rising and supporting a socialistic venture or advocating it, we are beginning to make our presence felt in this Chamber. I have only been here something like four years, and during those four years I have heard members who are out and out individualists in every way get up and advocate socialistic measures when it affects something with which they are connected, or when it affects their part of the State. I heard one member supporting State hotels, I heard another member supporting State implement works, and I even heard Mr. Moss strongly advocating the principle of State insurance. I have heard other members advocating the nationalising of roads, the roads leading to Perth; the road leading from Fremantle to Perth, the Kalamunda to Welshpool road. I was particularly struck by Mr. Sanderson supporting this, because that hon. member chided Mr. Davis and others for socialistic principles. I believe Mr. Connor is with Sir Edward Wittenoom in supporting the erection of freezing works at Wyndham.

Hon. F. Connor: He knows he has no chance.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I thoroughly agree with the hon. member, and I hope we will extend his

ideas so as to support many other socialistic ventures of the Government.

Hon. F. Connor: I shall support the freezing works at Wyndham, whether they are socialistic, republican, or anything else.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I do not quite hear the hon. member, but the most remarkable aspect of it is this, the freezing works will be situated in Sir Edward Wittenoom's constituency, and he supports them, but the hon. gentleman in the same breath condemns the erection of State sawmills. The fact of Sir Edward Wittenoom being chairman of Millars' Company has nothing whatever to do with his opposition to State sawmills, and because he represents the North Province, has I suppose nothing to do with his advocacy of the erection of freezing works at Wyndham.

Hon. F. Connor: I will elaborate that later on, and try to educate you.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): It is a remarkable aspect that when a matter affects any other individual we always hold to our opinions, but when it affects ourselves or our constituency we will sink every principle which we previously advocated. The hon. member (Mr. Hamersley) who is an extreme individualist when on the question of bulk handling of wheat which affects the farmers, says that if we cannot buy ships we should build them.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Why do you not quote the whole of the remarks I made?

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I would just like to say a word or two in regard to the speech of Mr. Baxter, and I think the House is to be congratulated on receiving the hon. member into the Chamber. I think that the speech he made was something out of the ordinary line of speeches. The hon. gentleman showed that he can take a broad and comprehensive view of matters which we do not usually discuss here. Unfortunately, some of the principal matters the hon. gentleman touched upon were more fitted for the Federal Parliament than for the State Parliament, but the hon. member stated that his party were prepared to give a fair deal; were in favour of high wages; believed in high

wages, and always were prepared to pay high wages, and the hon. member struck against the key-note of the remarks made at the first conference of the Country party. The principal speaker at that conference was Mr. Moran, whose speech consisted of "more work and less wages." That was a statement made by Mr. Moran at the first conference of the Country party. He was the chief speaker, and he said that we should have "more work and less wages." I am glad Mr. Baxter is seeing the folly and fallacy of going to the country with such a principle as this. He has referred to the question of free trade and the revenue tariff, and also the question of protection and new protection. I want to say here that if the Country party were advocating a system of free trade combined with land value taxation they would be on good ground and hold a strong position, but the Country party have to abolish one form of protection, and substitute a revenue tariff. Whether we shall have to pay more for the necessities of life I cannot say, but this we do know, it will be a substitution of protection for a tax on tea, kerosene, and other articles. That is the object of the revenue tariff advocated by the Country party. I may just be permitted—although it does not come within the scope of ordinary State matters, but Mr. Baxter referred to it—to say this in regard to the question of protection against new protection. The Labour party are right every time. If the new protection will give protection to the employee as well as to the employer then they are on safe ground. The employer in the agricultural industry or the mining industry should take to heart the statement of Mr. Gregory in this morning's paper, where he stated that he was in favour of the old protection and not the new protection. I just want to say a word as to the Esperance railway. We shall have the Bill before us very shortly, and then we can have a free debate on the matter, but I would like hon. members to try and look at the question of the Esperance railway apart from any parochialism whatsoever. I can assure members here that this railway will be one of the best

that can be entered on in the interest of a large number of people on the goldfields. We find that one of the worst problems on the goldfields that can possibly be faced is finding suitable employment for many who are stricken down with miner's phthisis. I have previously directed attention to measures for relief but if to-day something more than that can be done in finding other employment for those men, men who find that they have got to the stage when they cannot continue work in the mines any more, possibly that by placing them somewhere else they can continue work for some years and be good and useful citizens in the State. On the Esperance lands we could place quite a number of people with the chance of their getting a decent living. Perhaps we could place many of them in other parts of the State, but there is no great area where we could bring about a settlement like there is along the Esperance railway. I hope members will sink any personal feelings or parochial sentiments, and at this late hour give some assistance to those battling for this particular railway. I do not know that I need say more. I wish before sitting down to congratulate Mr. Allen on the speech he made last night. Although I am not going to say I agree with all his views, that is only natural, for I think he is going on erroneous lines in many matters, but the clearness with which the hon. gentleman placed his speech before the House may be the envy of many of us, and despite what he stated about having to follow in the footsteps of Mr. Moss, I can assure him that he will be no mean successor to that hon. gentleman. There is one other matter before I conclude to which I wish to direct attention. Mr. Cullen, the night before last, gave us a very fine parable. It was one which I am sure will go down on the records of the House as affording a considerable amount of amusement. It is one which will also qualify us still further for being appraised as a house of fossils. In the course of a couple of minutes during his speech Mr. Cullen drew attention to what he called the cock-sureness of the hon. Minister for Works, his belief in himself, and his cock-sure-

ness in everything that he did, and then made use of this statement, "The Fremantle harbour must in future come right into Perth; there is no question about that." That is one statement which shows the cock-sureness of the hon. gentleman. Further on he goes on to say, "Perth is going to be the second city of Australia; there is no doubt about that." Here is another statement. He is quite correct, I dare say. I am only referring to that statement as showing another instance of the cock-sureness of the hon. gentleman. He goes on to say there is no doubt about the harbour coming up here, about Perth being the second city in Australia, and "in this connection there is no need to speak of Bunbury. Bunbury always comes out all right." Here are three statements made by the hon. member in the course of a couple of minutes. He talks about the cock-sureness of the hon. Minister for Works, but it exactly applies in the same degree to Mr. Cullen. I have nothing further to add except to say that I am sure, so far as the Government is concerned, they have done the very best they could do, have done better than any government could have done, and that they are going to continue doing so for a good many years to come.

Hon. E. M. CLARKE (South-West): I have reached a term in my sojourn in this House, where I have occupied a seat for twelve years, and I feel that in being returned by those I represent the actions which I have taken hitherto are endorsed; therefore I want to deal with a few of the questions in this connection. I am almost in the position of a new member. There has been a lot of talk about this being a party House. It appears that to disagree with other persons in this Chamber constitutes a party House. If that is so, it will always be a party House; but I disagree that it is a party House. The mover of the Address-in-reply set out at the outset to abuse this House, and the seconder to the Address-in-reply adopted the same tactics. Persons setting out to abuse this House should give specific instances in which this House has done wrong. It does appear to me that this is not done in order to help the communi-

ity but to show that they were not the right men here. I object to abuse of that kind. I only call attention to this, to let my views with regard to that be known. We have a perfect right, and we are here for that purpose, to criticise measures in a fearless manner. It appears to me that this House is regarded by those who hold an opposite view as a party House. So far as I am concerned, I deal with measures absolutely upon their merits. It is idle to say that because this, that, or the other government, is in power we are a party House because we reject certain measures, for if they take the trouble to look up *Hansard*, they will find that dozens of the measures have been thrown out. Even measures introduced by my fellow townsman were thrown out, the taxation measure was thrown out, and quite a number of measures in addition. It would appear that it is only since the advent of the Labour party to power that we have exercised these rights, and done things which we ought not to have done. I do not wish to take up more time of the House on the question. I now want to go into something which I consider is of far more weight. First and foremost let me deal with the Governor's Speech. It seems to me as if there were quite a number of things for which the Government have taken the credit, and in some instances they have rightly done so. There are, however, a number of other things which are never mentioned and which certainly the Government ought to take the responsibility for. The Honorary Minister, who has just sat down, pointed to the increase of pay which, I take it, he means had been given to the railway employees; that is a loss, but he ignores the fact. And within the last few hours the Auditor General has issued audited accounts of the loss on the steamers. I think that amounts to £22,000. These things are absolutely ignored. While taking credit for one thing, the Government should certainly take the blame for the other. With regard to those on the wheat belt, I admit that the Government have rightly assisted them; they have rightly allowed the rents to

stand over. I, however, go one further and say that they have been charged too much for their land. So far as I am concerned, I would all but give them the land in small areas on condition that they improve the land. I know too well the hardships that these people have to put up with. I would certainly recommend, on behalf of those people, that there should be a re-valuation of all of the lands on fair lines. I say emphatically that they have been charged too much. It is practically, in many instances, bearing in mind the bad seasons that are likely to occur, impossible for them to make a living on the land. The one question that I take note of is that certain ports are mentioned by the Government for improvement, and that Bunbury is mentioned amongst them, and rightly so, too. I consider that inasmuch as Western Australia in the near future is going to be one of the greatest wheat producing countries in the world, every port where wheat is being shipped from, or is likely to be shipped from, should be provided with harbour facilities. I would go in more for decentralisation. I am not going to say much about Bunbury further than that, as has been remarked by one hon. gentleman, Bunbury can look after itself. The fact is evidently forgotten that the greatest tonnage of shipping that is sent away from Western Australia goes from Bunbury—and why not? It stood a year or two ago fourth on the list of export tonnage in the Commonwealth. The positions were Sydney first, Melbourne second, Newcastle third, and Bunbury fourth. Bearing these things in mind, why should not Bunbury get something? I know this, that so far as Bunbury is concerned, we look for the time when there is fruit to be exported from that place. I say this, without fear of contradiction, and knowing what I am talking about, that three-fourths of the fruit in Western Australia is coming from south of Perth. I know this to be a fact. I may tell you that the marginal profit on the fruit industry is becoming very small; that it is almost, in fact, disappearing. The time is coming when we shall have to turn our at-

tention not only to the export of our very best apples but we must go on in for canning works and things like that. Dealing with the fruit, which comes principally, I say, from the Blackwood district, what is the position? That because we have not the facilities to ship it from Bunbury growers are compelled to rail their fruit 115 miles further than they would otherwise have to do, namely to Fremantle. I hope these things will be taken into consideration. While I advocate the interests of Bunbury and the south-west, I want to see all the ports in the south-west, where wheat is being exported from or other stuff of the kind, paid proper attention to. With regard to the people on the wheat belt, of course there is a party lately sprung into power. Now I really do hold this opinion, that in Parliament there is no room for a third party. Whilst I absolutely endorse the aims and objects of the farmers' and settlers' party, I must say I do not approve of their methods in every case; my sympathies, however, go out to them. The Government say that there have been substantial increases shown in the export of wheat and fruit, and that the expansion in these activities furnishes a guarantee of the progress that we are making in these industries. It would appear from this that everything in the garden is lovely. I would say this: I am certain that the margin of profit on wheat is almost doing a disappearing trick. While we sympathise with these people, we want some tangible, some practical sympathy given to them. One of the things I say I should certainly support would be the reclassification of the land. There is one other thing that I think the Government can take credit for. This has been mentioned in one or two instances. I want to emphasise the fact that there are increases on the transit charges of fertilisers. They do not take credit for that; nevertheless it is a fact. It is a fact that there was an increase of the freights on Collie coal, but a noise was made by the coal people, and very rightly so, and they were told that certain revisions would be made, and these were made. But what about the people who

want fertilisers? I am in this position, if you can understand, having recently been returned—and it is not an election cry with me—of having to say that these freights on fertilisers should be reduced, and that at once. When we bear in mind the amount of money which has been advanced by the Agricultural Bank to these men, and all the difficulties they have to put up with, through bad seasons, I say it is cruel to inflict these extra costs for the carriage of fertilisers on those who have to use them.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. E. M. CLARKE: In the Governor's Speech there is a paragraph, "The future of the meat trade in Australia, and particularly in this State, has engaged the careful attention of my advisers." What I want to say is that, looking on while things are going to ruin, while others snap up the business, so to speak, is of no use to us. Some years ago I advocated the establishment of chilling works in the North-West. It is obvious to any one who has gone into the business that you cannot advantageously carry cattle on the hoof. According to a Royal Commission which was appointed to go into that question some years ago, the loss per head amounts to something like \$0 to 100 lbs. on each and every head to say nothing of the manner in which the meat deteriorates in quality. There is also loss by mortality and accidents, and all this clearly shows us that it is the dearest way of dealing with the meat supply. I am given to understand that the State Parliament has now taken the matter out of our hands, and in that connection I made some inquiries from one gentleman in particular, who has been engaged to erect some huge freezing works in the Argentine. I pointed out to him that our first attempt at freezing meat was not a success. His idea was that we made a mistake, in that the meat was chilled down too quickly, and frozen too hard. He was a man who had made an almost life study of the question, and he said it was necessary, after killing the beast, to allow it to gradually cool down

to a certain temperature and keep it in that state. However, we find that the cost of transporting a beast to our southern ports is something like £3 10s. and it was said that when the Government started the steamers, the small owner would be materially assisted, and the statement was made on one occasion that the small owners were sending down their stock only to find that there was no room for them at the port of landing. I do not mind informing the House that I asked my son-in-law, who is a man of experience in these matters, what he thought of the whole thing, and he replied that no one in the Kimberley district would be foolish enough to send stock down unless he was sure of a place that he could put that stock in on arrival. It was said that when the stock got down here the beef buccaneers bought them at whatever price they pleased. I scarcely believed that until I got from an important Labour gentleman the statement to the effect that what I had heard was true.

The Colonial Secretary: It occurred on only one occasion.

Hon. E. M. CLARKE: I am simply dealing with the matter from my standpoint. There is a reference in the Governor's Speech, and a lot has also been said in regard to this and the previous Governments, about assisting the dairying industry, but with the exception of the loan of a certain amount of money, for the purpose of establishing a butter factory in the South-West, for which the company that received the money had to pay interest, there has been absolutely nothing done. I am sorry to say that not only have the Government not assisted us, but they did not do what they could, in the way of sending cream to that butter factory. The factory has been struggling for a long time. The directors get nothing for their trouble and they do not ask it. Their one aim is to make a success of the dairying industry. I am proud to say that though we started it, and in the first year we showed a loss of £230, we gradually wiped that out and our balance sheet shows that last season we made a profit of something over £200. Our difficulty is that we cannot get the cream. If we could,

we would make an absolute success of the factory and we would be in the position to pay the producers, those who supply cream, a greater price than we are doing now, for the reason that it costs us no more to make 10-lbs. of butter than it does to make 5-lbs. We get along well during the spring months when cream is plentiful, but it falls off considerably in the summer. Practically what we make during the fat season we lose in the other. We want to know that something will be done in the South-West in the direction of getting the dairying industry going. It is no use talking, because while talking is proceeding, the industry is starving. I am not going to remind this House of the vast sums of money which are sent out of the State, simply because dairying is not established here. In the south-west corner of the State there are thousands of acres of land eminently suited for the dairying industry, but the prices put upon that land are absolutely prohibitive. When one goes down there and sees the huge trees and bears in mind the cost that would be involved in clearing, one cannot help but come to the conclusion that it would be a fair thing for the Government to give away the land in small areas, conditionally that those who took it up improved it. There has been a lot of talk about exhausting the timber down there, but my idea is that the timber has been maturing for thousands of years and I am absolutely certain that the correct thing would be that on all the choice spots the timber should be cut and the land should be thrown open for selection, conditionally, as I have stated, on certain improvements being effected, and the sizes should be sufficient to enable those taking it up to make a decent livelihood. With regard to the State enterprises, I desire to be fair. The present Government were returned to power pledged to start and carry on a number of these enterprises, brickworks, saw-mills, butcher shops, steamers, etc. The electors knew well that the Government were pledged to establish these enterprises and that in doing so the Government were within their rights. I am convinced that enterprises such as these should only be

taken in hand by men who have had lifelong experience in them, and I say it advisedly that the administration of the ordinary affairs of this State is good enough for a Cabinet of the very best men, without going in for the management of these industries. I contend that the Government have had a fair chance, notwithstanding that it may be said by them that this House has blocked them. I say it has done nothing of the kind. They have had a free hand in that respect, and I contend that the time is ripe when, if they are perfectly honest in their intentions and not stubborn, they should say to the people who are paying the piper, "We have tried to conduct these enterprises, acting under your instructions, but we find that we cannot carry them on except at a loss." I say that these enterprises have been given a fair trial, and it is now for the Government to place the position fully and clearly before the people, and say such and such is the effect of their endeavours to cheapen the price of meat, to supply cheap timber, and so on, and allow the people to determine whether or not the Government in power shall continue to conduct these industries, these mad industries I call them, at a loss. I do not blame the Government for going on with them, but it is time for the people to pause and say "Shall we allow them to continue carrying on these foolish fads." We cannot afford to carry on this farce any longer. There is another matter that interests me very much—I refer to the Irrigation Bill—and I see it is again coming before us notwithstanding that it was said that we threw it out. I want it clearly understood that I am in favour of irrigation, but not at any price. I have been over a considerable number of irrigation plots and I find that irrigation is not all that it is cracked up to be by a long chalk. Even the State farm is not what it was, that is the irrigation plot there. I find there are such things as sorrel and couch that take the place of lucerne, and I can point to plots which have been total failures, but these failures do not damp my ardour one scrap. It is only an object lesson and it shows how careful we must be in that sort of thing. I say, without boasting, that I have gone

into the matter, not only in this State but in other States, and I have made it a study, and I am more than satisfied that this matter should be gone into very carefully.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: The Minister for Works knows all about it.

Hon. E. M. CLARKE: Yes, and the Minister for Works almost challenged the people at the Harvey during election time that if they did not return his man he did not know what would happen to them, and that if they did they would get their irrigation works. I want to point out that I was returned by a majority on the first count. I say it advisedly, when that Bill was dropped in the first year, the Harvey people were prepared to swear at me if I went there, and instead of that at the present time they are swearing by me. The Government, I believe, have decided on a gravitation scheme there, and I say that that is fraught with danger in more ways than one. I shall deal with it, of course, when the Bill comes before us. But I want it to be clearly understood that I am more than ever satisfied that irrigation is one of those things we must not rush into, and I will give my reasons for saying that later on, when the measure is being considered by this House. One of the conditions which this House tried to obtain from the Government was the right of veto in that Bill. The people who are to pay the piper ought to call the tune. The Harvey people want to know what the scheme is to be—they want a pipe scheme—they want to know the cost of it, and they want to be able to say whether they will have it. I desire the Minister for Works to understand this. I am anxious to see what the Government can do in this direction. If they introduce a Bill giving the people this right of veto and submit the scheme to the Harvey people, I will assist, as far as I can, to give them the power to construct the works. The Government, however, should not seek to extend irrigation over the whole of the State and thus prevent those who are doing good work under irrigation from utilising the water. Irrigation will spell disaster if the Government rush into it. I do not want to be nasty, but one is tempted to ask the reason why the Govern-

ment desire to control the whole of the waters in the State. I have a strong suspicion as to what their reason is. Until the streams are required for the public good, I would not surrender them to any Government and thus give the right to rate the owners of abutting properties for the water. The people must be given the right of veto, and when the Bill is introduced, I hope this provision will be embodied in it.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Local option.

Hon. E. M. CLARKE: Certainly. I am glad that I was opposed at the recent election because I had a good excuse to pry into every nook and corner in the South-West Province. I believe that on the Serpentine River there are 15 or 16 pumps doing good work. They are demonstrating what ought to be done and what must not be done. These people should be allowed to continue until the river is required for public purposes, and then the public ought to pay for it. Some little time ago I read an account of an action for damages against the Water Commission of Victoria, and a verdict was given in favour of the Commission. An appeal to the Full Court confirmed the verdict, but the plaintiff then appealed to the Privy Council and that body decided that if the Commission in the execution of their duties did anything to the injury of an individual for the good of the public, the public should pay for it. Their decision was plain and straightforward and in as few words as I have given it. Another matter which has been dear to my heart for a long time is that of the conservation of our forests. We have talked about it for many years. Mr. Ednie Brown and Sir Newton Moore made an estimate of the timber forests and ascertained within a trifle how much timber was available. They considered that all of it would be cut out in a certain period which expired, I think, some six or seven years ago, but timber is still available. I have heard people say that they can tell the age of a tree by the number of rings in the trunk. About 1862 or 1863 a gentleman who took a racehorse to Tasmania brought back some Tasmanian blue gum seed. From that seed there are now in Dardanup Park two trees, one of which

is 18 feet in circumference. At a place belonging to Mr. Marriott, about a mile from the State farm, there is a red gum tree about two feet through, with a cart tyre around the trunk. The owner, who is now about 50 years of age, informed me that as a boy he dropped the tyre around a stick of a tree and there it is to-day. The point I wish to make is that the forests have been maturing and rotting for thousands of years. Let us conserve the timber, but by all means let us cut the mature stuff and leave the younger stuff to take its place. On the Blackwood line there are tens of thousands of young trees of anything from six to 18 inches through, which have grown within the last 25 years. In my opinion all that is required to conserve the forests is to assist Nature to a certain extent by ringbarking the useless red gum trees and the old jarrah trees and giving the young stuff a chance, and then inside of 15 years I am satisfied that it will be possible to cut through these forests again. We should throw our lands open to a greater extent wherever possible, and encourage people to go on them and engage in the dairying industry. I am not out to complain, but unless these things are mentioned they will not be remedied. A former Government imported a lot of first-class cattle in order to breed good stock to sell to the settlers. What has been done? The business was carried on to a certain extent by that Government, but at the present time there are quite a number of bovine stomachs walking about on very little legs and having very big heads. These are the progeny of first-class stock. It is possible to judge a stock breeder of any repute by his young stock. At the State farm the progeny of these first-class cattle is being offered at 10s. to 50s. per head, which is absolutely ridiculous. As one who knows something about stock, I have yet to learn that it is possible to keep good stock unless the young are looked after. The young stock should be offered for sale to the public and should be an object lesson to the settlers as to how to rear their stock. But such is not the case. I believe the milk is supplied to a person in Perth under contract, and that they are starving the young stock. Is

it consistent to sell the milk to a firm who have a considerable monopoly of the trade in Perth? I say more power to the Government for supplying a little to the Children's Hospital, but it is being done at an enormous cost, when, with proper safeguards, they could call for tenders for the supply of milk to this institution and be sure of its purity. Some of the stock belonging to the Government are by no means perfect; in fact I believe there is something the matter with many of them. I am not finding fault, but I desire that these things should be remedied, and I am pointing out the direction in which the remedies lie. Western Australia should be able to supply its requirements of butter and our factories should not be struggling for existence, but should receive the little support which the Government could easily give.

Hon. C. McKENZIE (South-East): Although I understood that it was hoped to make this the last day for the debate on the Address-in-reply, I did not expect to be called upon to speak this evening. With other hon. members I am pleased to welcome the new members, as well as the old ones who have been re-elected. I am sorry that we have lost our old friend, Mr. Davis, and other hon. members. We miss those gentlemen, who last session helped to form our circle and are no longer with us, but doubtless we have good men to replace them, and I trust we shall work together in the same happy manner as heretofore. With regard to the Esperance railway, I visited this port before there was a house on the beach. I have worked for a long time on that coast, and I think an attempt has been made to spoil the harbour. The harbour is a good one, and I wish I possessed all the wheat and produce which I could ship from it during the next 50 years. The reports regarding the Esperance land by men who are settled there, and others who have been to the district, are conflicting. I have been up and down the track during the last few months, and I say that the land is as good as that on which I have seen good crops growing nearer to the metropolis. The people of Esperance have experienced a very hard

time. I remember Esperance when it had a population of 1,500, in the days when Norseman was in full swing. Since then it has dwindled and its population at the present time is very scanty. I would like to see the railway linked up with Norseman, but this session we are to be asked to sanction the construction of only 60 miles of it. I have been up cart tracks on different occasions, but I do not know what route the railway is to take. I hope that something will be done on this occasion. The Esperance railway has been a burning question for two or three sessions. I look at the proposal from a different point of view from most members and one which I think ought to appeal to every hon. member, that is, the point of view of the health of the unfortunate miners. The miners are on the fields and the fields have to be worked. It is useless for anyone to say that he would not engage in the mining industry; someone has to do it. Perhaps the mine owners do all they can for the welfare of the men, but there is something wrong. When human beings are suffering as the miners are, something ought to be done to enable these unfortunate folk and their families to get to the coast, and Esperance is the natural port of the goldfields, being the nearest to them. It is to be hoped something will be done in that direction. At the port itself things are very dull. I would like hon. members to visit the district and have a look at the land for themselves, and see whether it is right or wrong. The place is 220 miles, if I remember rightly, from Albany, which is the nearest port, and the goldfields are a somewhat similar distance off. It is a very expensive matter to cart over such a distance, however it may be done. I myself have paid £35 a ton for cartage. It does not take much of that to make a man feel ill. Something ought to be done to help the people living at Esperance, and also those who are settled on the land in that district. There is no doubt that with conveniences for getting produce away, and for getting to and fro, people will settle there more readily. I travelled along that track when there were only thirteen men on

the Norseman goldfield, and I have been over it since on various occasions. Leaving that subject, I will now come to some remarks Mr. Lynn made yesterday in connection with the Esperance harbour. That hon. member's observations were fairly correct. The harbour is not up to what we might wish, for anything large, though it is safe for small boats. However, it will do for the time being. There is no doubt that if Ravensthorpe goes ahead as we all hope it will—and the Government are now making a strenuous effort to advance it, which we trust will be successful—there will be need for railway communication connecting Ravensthorpe with the Great Southern railway. The route of that connecting railway should be such as to open the best land. If it means going a little further round, that will make no difference, so long as the best country is made available. I may mention that Doubtful Island Bay is a good harbour, though a little rough at times in heavy weather. There is also Starvation Roat Harbour, which is very well named. I have gone in there in the afternoon, when it was beautifully calm and smooth, and at eleven o'clock the vessel was standing on her head practically, and we had to get away to save our bacon. A terrible roll comes from the South, and the port is also open to the East. So really the only port available is Doubtful Island Bay, 110 miles east of Albany. At Albany we hear that there are bright prospects of Ravensthorpe turning out right. Under those conditions, no doubt, things will be a bit livelier in that district. Independently of the owners of mines, people have invested a lot of money there, and are living there, hanging on, and waiting, and hoping. I trust that all will turn out well for them, and that they will be able to get their money back and live comfortably. Now I will go a little further to the West. In Albany we have been in a bad way for a considerable number of years owing to the want of proper harbour accommodation. I am pleased that the Government have now taken steps to supply that want. I have seen ships berth, one in 22 feet of water

at the town jetty, and the other at the deep-water jetty. The large boats, such as the "Neslor," lie on the one side, and on the other side there is water enough to take one large boat, but the berth is too short, and a long vessel has to let its stern hang outside the end of the wharf. Further, if there is a vessel loading wheat, she has to go away. I saw one barque go away five times. Of course, vessels have to pay for going away and being brought back; and this expense comes out of the producers' profits some way. If the Government want to make Albany the success which we hope to see it, they must give the people every facility to get their wheat and their fruit and their produce generally away as cheaply as possible. Until that comes about, things will be hard. In this respect the requests for harbour improvements appeal to me. The harbours from one end of the State to the other, wherever required, ought to be placed in a condition to deal with the produce of their districts in as cheap a manner as possible. Similarly with the railways. There is a deputation to wait on the Premier to-morrow respecting a railway survey of 19 miles out from Mount Barker into the great South-West. It has been talked about for years, and now the settlers are asking for the survey. We know that it is an apple-growing district, and the orchards are increasing every year. I may say that large stocks of apples are being held both in that district and in Albany at present, waiting for the price to rise. There is one railway which has been advocated. I think, ever since the introduction of Responsible Government, and which was always a great idea of the Rt. Hon. Sir John Forrest. That is a railway to connect Albany with Bridgetown or Big Brook, or one of those centres. There is a railway now to Denmark of forty odd miles, but the people are stuck there and having a very hard time. Of course, that railway carries a good deal of traffic, although I cannot supply the figures. The country there is heavily timbered, and it is something for the new settler to deal with. Lately the Government have

come to the assistance of the settlers in a very fair way; they have supplied the settlers with cows imported from the East, and some of those settlers are doing very well. I am told by the manager of the State farm. Still, some of those settlers do not understand the management of their holdings as they ought to do. It is a very rough place for people coming out from England, and they have a trying time. The Government have some idea of fixing up matters so as to connect that country to the Great Southern railway by a spur line. That will be a boon to all out there. We know that the south-western district is very wet, more particularly in winter; and it is hard to get over the land except with a strong team, and that means a sum of money. Therefore, railway communication is necessary in that district. The settlers are all planting fruit trees. Only the other evening at one small spot, Cranbrook, I saw 19,000 trees arrive, all ordered, and all to go into the ground this year. The people are not idle in that direction, and are still endeavouring to get along. So far as Albany is concerned, I wish to say that the Government have come to our rescue after long years of talk, and have given us a really first-class water supply. The cost has been pretty heavy, as the water comes a long way; but I suppose the supply is worth the money. I am glad to say that the water comes from a place where there is not likely to be any pollution. The Water Supply Department, I understand, are well satisfied. Further, the Government have actually made a start with one worker's home at Albany; and they have made no mistake about that. They will lose nothing by that job—it is a good house, in a good position, and well built. I understand that applications are in for many more workers' homes, and I hope they will all receive favourable consideration, so long as everything is correct. Of course, I do not wish to see the Government advance money on anything; and I do not suppose anyone else wishes that. It will be a good thing for the workers, and I

consider the Government are to be congratulated in connection with the workers' homes scheme. It is well that the workers should make homes for themselves, whether on the system of leasehold for a number of years, or fee simple. I myself prefer fee simple, although I may be a bit old-fashioned in that. As I told you, I am not prepared to deal with anything at very great length to-night. I thought my turn would have come on Tuesday, and I had hoped to say a great deal more, but I have not yet the information I require in regard to shipping, and so forth, and in consequence I am not able to go on.

On motion by Hon. W. Patrick, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 8.17 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 2nd July, 1914.

	PAGE
Questions: Agricultural College, Avondale estate	294
Railway Construction, Wickiepin-Merredin	295
Railway Route, Armadale-Great Southern	295
Magistrates' Retirement	295
Bill: Esperance Northwards railway, 1A.	295
Papers presented	295
Personal Explanation, Hon. W. D. Johnson and the Geraldton Harbour	295
Address-in-reply, fifth day	298

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

QUESTION—AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE, AVONDALE ESTATE.

Mr. BROWN asked the Minister for Lands: 1, Is the area reserved in the Avondale estate to be used for the purpose of establishing an agricultural college? 2, If so, when do the Government anticipate opening same for the purposes intended?