

given the best of their lifetime to the services of the State. I beg to move that the following words be added to the Address-in-reply:—

But this House desires to inform your Excellency that it is not in accord with the action of the Government in committing the country to heavy expenditure in connection with new industrial State enterprises without first having obtained the consent of Parliament.

Mr. ALLEN (West Perth): I rise to second that amendment.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan): I beg to move—

That the debate be now adjourned.

I wish to state that the Government propose to accept the amendment to the Address-in-reply moved by the leader of the Opposition, as one of no-confidence in the Government. If the motion to postpone the debate is carried, I propose to move the adjournment of the House till 4.30 to-morrow.

Motion passed; the debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 8.20 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 4th July, 1912.

	PAGE
Question: Land transactions, details	88
Leave of absence	88
Committees for the Session	88
Personal explanation, Hon. M. L. Moss and the Fremantle Dock	89
Address-in-reply, third day, amendment	89

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

QUESTION—LAND TRANSACTIONS, DETAILS.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS (for Hon. C. Sommers) asked the Colonial Secretary: (a.) What area of land has been surveyed in the South-West Division under

Clauses 55, 56, and 68, from the 1st October, 1911, to the 1st July, 1912? (b.) What area has been applied for under Sections 55, 56, and 68 since 1st October, 1911, to 1st July, 1912? (c.) How many sales of country township lands have been made since 1st October, 1911, to 1st July, 1912 (a.) under freehold conditions, (b.) under leasehold conditions, and the total amount realised? (d.) How many sales of country township lands have been made since 1st October, 1910, to 1st July, 1911. (a.) under freehold conditions, (b.) under leasehold conditions and the total amount realised? (e.) How many sales of country township lands have been made since 1st July, 1911, to 1st October, 1911, (a.) under freehold conditions, (b.) under leasehold conditions, and the total amount realised. (f.) How many licensed surveyors are now engaged in surveying lands intended to be thrown open for selection.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: To get this information will entail considerable trouble and take up much time. I shall be glad to have the question postponed until next Thursday.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, leave of absence for six sittings was granted to Hon. R. W. Pennefather on the ground of ill-health.

COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION.

On motions by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, Sessional Committees were appointed as follows:—

Standing Orders Committee—The Hon. the President, the Chairman of Committees, Hon. M. L. Moss, Hon. R. W. Pennefather, and the mover.

Printing Committee—The Hon. the President, Hon. W. Patrick, and the mover.

Library Committee—The Hon. the President, Hon. W. Kingsmill, Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett.

House Committee—The Hon. the President, Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom, Hon. J. E. Dodd, Hon. A. G. Jenkins, and Hon. B. C. O'Brien.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—HON. M. L. MOSS AND THE FREMANTLE DOCK.

Hon. M. L. MOSS (West) : I wish to make a brief statement with regard to the Fremantle Dock. It has been suggested to me that my observations of yesterday are likely to put Mr. Ramsbotham, the engineer for that work, in a false position. I want to say at once that in anything I said I had no intention of reflecting on Mr. Ramsbotham. He was brought out to construct that dock, and I fully understand from a perusal of the minutes and so forth communicated to the public through the Press, that he is able to complete the dock at a cost of three quarters of a million. I make no reflection on him at all.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Third Day—Amendment.

Order of the Day read for the resumption of the debate from the previous day on the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply and on the amendment by the Hon. M. L. Moss—"That all the words after 'sovereign' be struck out with a view of inserting the following words: 'and to protest against the expenditure incurred by your Excellency's Ministers without an Act of appropriation, such procedure being derogatory to the privileges of Parliament and subversive of the Constitution, while in addition thereto the proposal contained in your Excellency's Speech, implying that a ratification by the Legislative Assembly of such unauthorised expenditure is sufficient in law, ignores the constitutional rights of the Legislative Council.'"

Several Members: Let us hear the Minister.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: It is a matter of courtesy that we should.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew): I have been forced to do this afternoon what no other member in this Chamber representing the Government has been obliged to do—

Hon. J. D. Connolly: You are not forced to.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is, to reply immediately after an attack has been made on the Government. Some member has interjected that I am not forced to do so, but I am aware that there has been a concerted arrangement between certain members of the House. I was told last night that I would be forced to speak to-day.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: You did not give opportunity to others to speak. I understand there are several to speak.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: They will speak later on, and make charges, no doubt, and I shall not be in a position to reply before this debate on the amendment is brought to a close. It is very unfair indeed, and it has not been the custom in the past. The custom has been for every member to speak before the Colonial Secretary.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: That is on an ordinary motion.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That has been the custom in order to give the Colonial Secretary opportunity to reply to any charges, or make any explanations that may be thought necessary. Mr. Moss, in his opening remarks, said that at the last general election a great effort was made to turn the Legislative Council into a party House. Truer words were never spoken. I had ample experience of it during the course of my election. Sir John Forrest, the father of the Liberal party, went to Geraldton and strongly urged the electors to vote against me on purely party grounds. The leader of the Opposition also travelled to Geraldton and counselled electors to vote against me, also on purely party lines. Mr. James Mitchell, Minister for Lands in the late Government, said, "You must vote on party lines; do not consider Drew at all; consider simply the party to which he is attached." That was contrary to the attitude adopted in the past by the Labour party when it was a question of the election of the leader of this House. Mr. Connolly and Mr. Kingsmill between them occupied the position of leader of the House for something like twelve years—I think about six years each—and on no occasion, so far as my knowledge ex-

tends, was either of these gentlemen opposed by the Labour party.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: That is not true in my case. I was opposed by a Labour candidate, and he was helped by sitting Labour members.

Hon. M. L. Moss: It was not my experience.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I have followed politics pretty closely, and I cannot remember one instance where the Labour party opposed any leader of this House seeking re-election.

Hon. M. L. Moss: They did it in my case.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Labour party were not in existence at that time.

Hon. B. C. O'Brien: There was no Labour nominee at the election when Mr. Moss was defeated.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Mr. Moss should be the last to cast a stone at those who did attempt to convert this to a party House. He has done more in that direction than any member of Parliament I know. During the last seven years he has repeatedly indulged in vituperative criticism of the Labour party. He has stated only quite recently—I think it was during last session—that the Labour Government were the mere puppets of the trades unions.

Hon. M. L. Moss: So they are.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. member admits it now again. Last night he said, "I am not surprised. The Government had their instructions. They are the nominees of the Trades Hall; they are obliged to obey instructions." Then again, "If the Government introduced a confiscation Bill, it was more than the position of a Labour member was worth not to support it." No one knows better than Mr. Moss that it is nothing of the kind. He knows perfectly well that it is not the case, and that no Labour member is bound outside the Labour platform. Every Labour member has a perfect free will to exercise his judgment in connection with any Bill that comes before the Chamber, if it does not deal with the Labour platform.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: You might get a confiscation Bill inside the platform.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The platform is well enough known, and if a candidate comes forward and says he agrees to the platform, and if he has signed it and is returned pledged to carry out that platform, I cannot see that he is guilty of any wrong when he is acting consistently with the declared intention of that platform. Mr. Moss indulged in some caustic criticism in regard to Socialistic enterprises. He referred to ferries and to the purchase of steamers, but somehow or other he made no mention at all about another socialistic enterprise, the nationalisation of the trams. I would point out that none of these matters were sprung on the country; the policy of the party was proclaimed from the house-tops prior to the last general elections. The people were clearly informed as to what the Labour party would do if their representatives were returned to power, and the result was that in another place no less than 34 supporters of that party were returned. The Labour Government came into power, and they intend to carry out their pledges to the fullest extent possible. As regards the ferries, so far they have been run at a profit. It is not intended that they shall be so run as to produce a large profit, but still they will be so run as to avoid anything in the nature of a loss. The purchase of the steamers seems to be a very sore point with Mr. Moss. No doubt the move is very unpopular in certain quarters; it affects the interests of the meat ring and also of the shipping combine.

Hon. F. Connor: I object to those phrases from the leader of the House. There is no meat ring.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Of course all those interested will naturally resent the action of the Government. I have studied carefully the report of the Royal Commission on meat supply, and from the evidence contained in its pages I am fully convinced of the existence of a meat ring in Western Australia.

Hon. F. Connor: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member is referring to what he deems an institution with which

my name is connected. I give him my word of honour that it does not exist, and I ask him to withdraw the offensive phrase, "meat ring."

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I meant no reflection whatever on the hon. member.

The PRESIDENT: There is no point of order.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It has been said that a reduction of freight will not affect the price of meat. I do not say that it will; I do not say that the Government intend to reduce the freight on the carriage of stock. The freights have no bearing, or but very little, on the price of meat. I cannot say that the freights now imposed are unreasonable, and certainly the freight charges have no very great effect on the price of meat. At the present time the position is that the meat ring and the shipping combine appear to be working in concert, with the result that the small holders of stock are unable to get their stock to market. I know what the meat merchants have been able to do with regard to these matters, I know what it costs to land cattle at Fremantle, and I know the sums offered per head for cattle at Wyndham. Some time ago the Government had cattle for sale at Wyndham, and were offered £3 5s. per head for those cattle. The cost of landing them at Fremantle amounted to something like £4. These bullocks would average at Fremantle approximately 650 pounds per head, and the value of the cattle at Fremantle was £7 5s. Deducting abattoir charges from the value of the fifth quarter, the meat could be sold off the hooks at 2½d. per pound. What is it sold for in Perth at the present day? I pay 1s. 2d. per pound for the best pieces, and 10d. per pound for ordinary steak. There is something radically wrong here, and it is the intention of the Government to do all in their power to effect a reduction in the price of meat. Mr. Moss stated that it was their intention to start butchers' shops.

Hon. M. L. Moss: Nothing of the sort.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Well if necessary, we will do so as a last resort. If we find that all our exertions in the direction of bringing down the price fail, we propose to distribute the meat to the consumer. Even if we have to start a butcher's shop we have a precedent for it. The previous Government established a butcher's shop, a baker's shop, and a grocery store, and sold the goods on credit; they also purchased a cattle station in the North-West, a most commendable piece of enterprise, at a cost of £18,000, for the purpose of supplying free meat to the blacks. It is our intention to enter also into the meat trade if necessary, in order to provide white people, not with free meat, but with cheap meat. Now we are told that the expenditure on the steamers is unconstitutional and illegal. I hope I am not misquoting Mr. Moss when I say "unconstitutional and illegal if without an Act assented to by both branches of the Legislature." Quite so; so far I agree with the hon. gentleman. But he goes on to say "and it has been done without the authority of an Act of Parliament." Here I join issue with Mr. Moss.

Hon. M. L. Moss: The Governor's Speech says so.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It says nothing of the kind. It has not been done without the authority of Parliament; it has been done with the sanction of an Act of Parliament, with the sanction of the Appropriation Act of last year.

Hon. M. L. Moss: You are referring now to the contingency vote.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Appropriation Act, Clause 1 reads—

There shall and may be issued and applied for or towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty for the services of the year ending 30th day of June, 1911, the following sums, that is to say: from the Consolidated Revenue Fund the sum of £1,673,377 on account of the Estimates passed by Parliament, and £250,000 for advances to the Treasurer.

Hon. M. L. Moss : That is a mere subterfuge.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY : It is no subterfuge at all; it is an open cheque to the Treasurer of the State.

Hon. M. L. Moss : This is too thin.

The PRESIDENT : I cannot allow so much interruption.

Hon. M. L. Moss : I want merely to tell the Minister—

The PRESIDENT : I cannot allow it; there is too much interruption.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY : It is an open cheque for a quarter of a million, and so long as the Government restrict their expenditure to that quarter of a million, they are on legal constitutional grounds.

Hon. M. L. Moss : That only applies to excesses on the various votes.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY : It is specified in Schedule B that the advance to the Treasury is to enable the Treasurer to make advances to public officers and on account of other Governments, etc., and to pay expenses of an unforeseen nature. At any rate, you may criticise the manner in which we spend the money, but you cannot go farther without placing yourself in a very awkward position. Here you have given us authority to spend up to a quarter of a million. It is not a specific authorisation, it does not go into detail; so long as the expenditure is unforeseen it is all right, and this was unforeseen. The cost of meat to the consumer had risen considerably, the opportunity occurred of purchasing these steamers, and we spent this money.

Hon. M. L. Moss : But if this is so, why the reference in the Speech to a necessity for ratification?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY : It does not refer to this. There is no ratification needed in respect to this. We propose to come down to ask for further authorisation, for we want other money for the purpose of carrying out our enterprises.

Hon. M. L. Moss : The explanation is too childish.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY : The Governor's Speech reads—

My Ministers have devoted much attention to the provision of means for the reduction of the cost of living, and at an early date you will be asked to ratify the necessary appropriations.

We have purchased the steamers and paid for them, but we will require other money to meet the salaries of the crew and other incidental expenditure, and we will then ask the House to give the necessary sanction. But this does not refer to expenditure in connection with the steamers.

Hon. J. D. Connolly : Out of what vote did you pay for the steamers?

Hon. J. F. Cullen : You did not complete the quotation.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY : The Speech continued—

You will be asked to ratify the necessary appropriations for the trading enterprises which have been undertaken for this purpose.

Hon. J. F. Cullen : Yes, go on.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY : Well, it further continues—

The purchase of steamers for the conveyance of stock from the North-West to the markets of the State, the establishment of abattoirs at North Fremantle and Midland Junction and other matters with a like end in view, you will be asked in proper form to authorise and approve.

Parliamentary sanction has already been given to the expenditure; but it will be submitted to you just in a purely formal way.

Hon. J. F. Cullen : That is utterly childish.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY : The hon. member will have an opportunity to deal with my speech later, when no doubt he will introduce a lot of fresh matter to which I will not be able to reply. It is very unfair.

Hon. W. Kingsmill : The situation is very humorous.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY : Mr. Moss made a veiled attack on the Governor. He stated that the Governor was treading on tender ground. It seemed

to me his observations were highly disorderly, and probably if I had performed my duty I should have had him called to order.

Point of order.

Hon. M. L. Moss: I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has no right to accuse me of being disorderly, for I distinctly stated that the Governor was not to be personally blamed, because he acted on the advice of his Ministers. I know my position too well in the House to make an attack on His Excellency. It is most unpardonable of the hon. member, and he must withdraw his accusation.

The President: You must specify the words objected to.

Hon. M. L. Moss: He stated he should have had me called to order for my remarks on the Governor.

The Colonial Secretary: You had no right to refer to the Governor at all.

Hon. M. L. Moss: I had a right to refer to the advice given to the Governor. I stated that extraordinary advice must have been given—

The President: The hon. member must not make a speech.

Hon. M. L. Moss: You asked me to state the point of order; and the Minister interrupts me, and now you call me to order. I am not going to be gagged.

The President: I did not hear the words complained of. It is not a point of order; it is a personal explanation.

The Colonial Secretary: Mr. Moss made an attack on the Governor. He stated that the Governor was treading on tender ground, and that he could not understand how the Governor—

Hon. M. L. Moss: I said nothing of the sort; the hon. member is again out of order in making that assertion. I ask you, Sir, to call him to order.

The President: The Minister must take the hon. member's assertion.

The Colonial Secretary: But Mr. Moss stated—

The President: Do you withdraw that remark about Mr. Moss, who has now made a personal explanation?

The Colonial Secretary: I would like to know what Mr. Moss did say.

The President: Will you repeat it please.

Hon. M. L. Moss: Will you allow me to say I am making no personal explanation at all. I ask that the hon. member be called to order for making an accusation which is groundless, that I made an attack on the Governor. I made it on the Governor's Ministers.

The Colonial Secretary: If we were guilty of unconstitutional—

The President: I think you had better settle that point first. Do you take Mr. Moss's assurance?

Debate resumed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I take his assurance. Indirectly it is a reflection on the Governor, to my way of thinking. If we were guilty of an illegal and unconstitutional act, if the Governor permitted that, he could not have a thorough knowledge of his position. Mr. Moss also said there was never a Governor's Speech framed in the same way as this, because we asked the Legislative Assembly to authorise and approve of expenditure, and made no reference at all to the Legislative Council. That, I understand, is the position Mr. Moss took up. He also added that it was a studied insult to the Legislative Council. I wish to clearly explain that no insult was intended. It might be a mistake. I am not prepared to admit that the attitude adopted by Mr. Moss is sound constitutionally. It was not intended as an insult; it is a mistake, if anything. *May* states, at page 545—

The Sovereign being the Executive power, is charged with the management of all the revenue of the State, and with all payments for the public service. The Crown, therefore, acting with the advice of its responsible Ministers, makes known to the Commons, the pecuniary necessities of the Government; the Commons, in return, grant such aids or supplies as are required to satisfy these demands; and they provide by taxes, and by the appropriation of other sources of the public income, the ways and means to meet the supplies which they have granted. Thus the Crown demands money, the Commons

grant it, and the Lords assent to the grant; but the Commons do not vote money unless it be required by the Crown; nor do they impose or augment taxes, unless such taxation be necessary for the public service, as declared by the Crown through its constitutional advisers. The demand by the Crown for grants of aids and supply for the service of each financial year is made in the speech from the throne at the opening of Parliament. The Sovereign addresses the Commons, demands the annual supply for the public service, and acquaints them that estimates will be laid before them of the amount that will be required.

The portion of the Speech to which objection was made was based upon that ruling of *May*.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: That is not actual Supply.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Certainly there was no intention to insult this House. I have had a conference with the Premier, and other Ministers, and they very much regret that that view was taken.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: It is most unsatisfactory.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It seems to me that there are other authorities than *May*; perhaps not such sound authorities, but, still, worthy of consideration. For instance, in the Governor's speech of the 28th July, 1910, we find—

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Legislative Assembly: Additional expenditure from Loan Funds is necessary upon railways already authorised, and new railways, for which sanction will be sought during the present session; on harbour and river improvements; freezing works; shipping facilities; the sewerage and waterworks in the metropolitan area; assisting the establishment of secondary industries; and other important works for which your approval is required.

That is, the approval of the Legislative Assembly alone. Now No. 2. In the

speech of the 10th November, 1908, it is stated—

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Legislative Assembly: Expenditure from Loan Funds will be necessary upon the railways already authorised, and upon those railways for which sanction will be sought in the present session; on harbour improvements; on the construction of sewerage and waterworks in the metropolitan area, and on various important works for which your approval is required.

Now we go back to 1905, when the Hon. Mr. Moss occupied a position in the Cabinet—I think it was in the Rason Government. The paragraph I will quote is taken from the Governor's speech of the 23rd November, 1905—

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Legislative Assembly: Expenditure from Loan Funds will be necessary upon the railways previously referred to; on harbour improvements, increased water supplies to the goldfields, improvements of existing and creating new stock routes, boring for artesian water in the North and North-West, and in other important directions. Improving the water supply and the initiation of a comprehensive scheme of sewerage for the metropolitan area will be shortly commenced. You will be asked to grant a farther loan authorisation.

Hon. M. L. Moss: You evidently do not understand now the objection I take.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Mr. Moss was Honorary Minister in that Cabinet. If I have sinned, I have sinned in very good company. If I am to be put in the stocks, or sent to the Tower, I think it only fair and just that Mr. Moss should accompany me. Perhaps he is purged of his sin by virtue of the Statute of Limitations. If we desire to make an attack on the Legislative Council, at any time, we will go into the open and make it; we will not make it in an insidious or surreptitious way. Members will have an ample opportunity to thoroughly defend themselves, when we decide to attack them. Mr. Moss stated that the way

to cheapen meat is to erect freezing works at Wyndham. I have gone into this matter pretty deeply of late, and I have found that 80 per cent. of the cattle in the Kimberley district are owned by about four or five different persons, and no more. If the Government were to erect freezing works there, they would be at the mercy of these four or five owners. That is not a desirable position to be in. There is another matter for consideration, and it is this: will the people purchase chilled meat? It will be something in the nature of an experiment.

Hon. M. L. Moss: You are equally at their mercy whether they will give you their stock.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: We can get their stock; there is no doubt about that, but we shall have to consider seriously, before we embark in freezing works at Wyndham under existing circumstances. With regard to trading concerns, the hon. gentleman wanted to know if accounts will be kept on strict business lines. It is our intention that all accounts will be kept on strict business lines. Interest will be debited, deterioration will be provided for, and, in fact, the Accountants' branch will be called upon to keep their books on similar lines to those kept by public companies. With that object in view, it is our intention, during the present session of Parliament, to introduce a Bill which will give us authority to carry out our desires in this direction. Mr. Moss also raised a point in regard to the Sea Carriage of Goods Act. We have discovered that position already. The Crown is relieved from certain obligations, under that Act, but it is not our intention to take up that position. We propose also to amend the law so that we shall occupy no better position than a private carrier.

Hon. M. L. Moss: That is fair.

Hon. C. Sommers: On the railways also?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I have not heard anything against the administration of the railways, in that respect. The Health Act does not bind the Crown, but I do not think there has been any complaint in regard to the Govern-

ment in matters of sanitation, in connection with State hotels, railway carriages, or public buildings generally.

Hon. C. Sommers: We cannot complain against the railways.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Government will see that nothing in the way of sanitation will be neglected. The Inspection of Machinery Act does not apply to locomotives on the Government railways, but there has never been an explosion of a boiler, so far.

Hon. F. Connor: Will you have the same restrictions as others with regard to tick regulations?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is a matter we will go into later on. Mr. Moss also said there is such distrust of the Government that people will not bring capital into the country. In reply to that I would like to say that a foreign whaling company are coming with a capital of £240,000 to develop an industry with many ramifications, and, during the last six months, we have raised, in the Eastern States and London, £2,000,000.

Hon. M. L. Moss: At what rate of interest?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The rate of interest at which we have secured the money is better than that for loans raised by Canada or France or Germany. With regard to the proposed grant to the Trades Hall, Mr. Moss said that was a scandalous abuse of power. We only propose to do what has been done in Western Australia, and elsewhere, before.

Hon. M. L. Moss: Will you give us a similar grant for the Liberal League?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: We have strong precedent for any action we have taken in this direction. To the Trades Hall in Melbourne the Victorian Government made a grant of land worth £33,000.

Hon. M. L. Moss: How long ago?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Some years ago; it was not made by a Labour Government either. In New South Wales there was a land grant of £6,000 and a money grant of £2,000.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: They were all trade unionists in New South Wales.

The President: Order. There is too much interruption.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: A land grant of £8,000 was also made in Queensland, and a previous Government in Western Australia made to the Fremantle Trades Hall a land grant of £2,000, and a money grant of £2,000. The Kalgoorlie Trades Hall also received a substantial grant from a previous Government, which was not a Labour Ministry. There is not an instance in which a grant has been made by a Labour Government up to date. The only grant previously received by the Perth Trades Hall was one of land which was not suitable, and the municipal valuation of which is £750. What we propose to do, and can only do with Parliamentary approval, is to purchase land in Beaufort-street belonging to the Trades Hall for £2,600; to purchase the land in Hay-street on valuation; to make a grant of £1,000 towards the building of a hall. Members will have an opportunity to express their opinion on that later, and I am sure little objection will be raised later on, when they have had time to consider it. It is also proposed to make an advance of 5 per cent. from the Government Savings Bank fund to enable the Trades Hall to convert the land from freehold to leasehold, and to grant a lease of the land thus repurchased in Beaufort-street, not at a peppercorn rental, as Mr. Moss said, but at 4 per cent. on the unimproved value of the land, and subject to re-appraisal at the end of every twenty years. I hope, when the proposition comes before Parliament hon. members will carefully consider it, and I think they will come to the conclusion that the Government have made a very fair deal, and that the Trades Hall people have made a sacrifice—a sacrifice, no doubt, for principle.

Hon. M. L. Moss: Do you think they will do the same for the Liberal League?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I do not see why they should not. There are many minor points which were raised by Mr. Moss, but I think he will admit they have no bearing on this amendment. I do not propose to deal with them now, in fact I have not had time to investigate them. I do hope the hon. member will see fit to withdraw his amendment.

I think it has been clearly shown that the money has been spent with Parliamentary authority. I have stated the case for the Government and I trust that before hon. members decide to support such a drastic amendment to the Address-in-reply, they will weigh the whole position very carefully. It would be a very extreme course to take and I hope therefore the amendment will not be carried.

Hon. A. SANDERSON (Metropolitan-Suburban): Custom demands that any new comer to this Council should crave the indulgence of hon. members when first he takes part in a debate. I gladly conform now, and I hope always, not only to the rules but also to the customs of this House, and in addition to that I feel that before I have finished I may require that indulgence in order to make my position clear to hon. members. I think it will be admitted that in some respects at any rate newly elected members have an advantage over those already sitting here, in that they may be considered to be more closely in touch with the existing position of public affairs of the country, and I hope it is not taking too much upon myself to remind hon. members that the Metropolitan-Suburban Province which I represent with others, embraces 12,000 electors, whereas the next province numerically speaking only take in 8,000. I only regret that I feel myself not altogether equal this afternoon on my first taking part in this debate really to represent that large and important constituency. The Speech of the Governor to Parliament is generally a sort of platitudinous document and the remarks made are equally so. I am referring of course to past speeches here and elsewhere and not to the Speech to which we listened the other day, which I think will be regarded as one of very considerable importance. I would venture to say that it is an honest attempt to put into legislative enactment the amazing policy of that amazing political machine known as the Labour party. I would like to dismiss with a few words the question of the constitutional procedure and of the insult to the Council. Speaking for myself even if I were unable to verify what had been

put forward, I would readily accept the position of affairs as moved by Mr. Moss. On the purely constitutional aspect of affairs it seems to be admitted by the Government themselves that there has been a breach, a technical breach, at any rate, of constitutional procedure.

The Colonial Secretary: It is not admitted.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Very well, if it is a question for me to decide between the interpretation of the constitutional procedure put forward by the Government, personally speaking, I should prefer to take the opinion of Mr. Moss, not having had time or feeling competent to give an opinion. With regard to the studied insult to this House, I feel in public as I feel in private life, that since the days of duelling have passed I would treat with contempt privately or publicly any insult studied or unintentional. We have the assurance of the Minister that it was not a studied insult and so far as I am concerned I will readily accept that and it will doubtless be accepted by other members. I do not wish to labour the question of constitutional procedure with regard to the insult to this House. I prefer rather to come to what I consider to be the central and important question contained in the Governor's Speech. If I could bring myself to believe that socialism was the best policy for the State and was the political ideal to be set up and to be attained, I would gladly join the Labour party because, as I say, they are openly and honestly attempting to carry out this policy. The criticism that I often hear is that this is a fine ideal but that it will not work. The attitude of those I am attempting to represent here is that while the system of State socialism might quite possibly be brought about, and indeed we are making rapid strides towards it, the closer we approach to State socialism, the worse it will be for the country as a whole and the individuals in it. I am aware that one is not permitted even as a new-comer to read one's speech, but in order that there may not be any doubt about any remarks of mine, perhaps I may be permitted to read two lines so that my position may be made

quite clear. I say this system of State socialism would destroy, in my opinion, justice and liberty, the two things that I hold most dear in political life. The essential doctrine of the Labour party is the substitution of public property for private property and the abolition of private property. I hold very strongly that without private property you will destroy family life, you will destroy the progress of the State and you will injure everyone in it. I hope I have made my position clear with regard, not to what you might call one or two items, but with regard to the whole trend and position of the Labour party. There are people who accept State socialism, and I regret to think there are a great many people in this country who will do so, either as practical men, judging each question on its merits, or else they believe in Socialism as the ideal at which to aim. For my own part, I have stood and always stood against State socialism, and the longer I go on in political affairs, the stronger I find myself in fighting for the position that this ideal of State socialism is radically bad from start to finish, and I believe the people in this country will have to alter their opinion with regard to it and decide once and for all whether they are going to advance on this road of State socialism or whether they are going to advance on the road of private enterprise. For my own part I am not very closely concerned as to whether it will pay or whether it will not pay. In many respects the fact that it will pay is an additional argument against it because it seems to carry on those who are in favour of State socialism as a whole and also those who look at it from a practical point of view. It encourages them to continue on this road which I believe has already brought a great injury to this country and prevented its development, and if it is continued it will lead to a most serious disaster. I think that scarcely any apology is necessary, I do not say for dealing with it, but for referring to it, Federal as well as State. I listened with the closest attention and great approval to what Mr. Moss said yesterday with regard to the Federal De-

partment. The Labour party is one and indivisible. They aim, and I for my part cannot blame them, at centralisation, the greatest centralisation they can bring about. They wish to see the Legislative Council abolished, they wish to see, a great many of them wish to see, local Parliaments abolished and a highly centralised form of Government set up. The reference to America by Mr. Moss evoked my applause. It has been said that everyone living under federation is either a Hamiltonian or Jeffersonian, that is to say, you are a follower of the principles of Alexander Hamilton, strongly in favour of a highly centralised form of Government, or else you are a follower of Jefferson, giving to the States as much liberty as you can. I am in favour, not so much of encouraging private enterprise, because that to me is also objectionable. I find people in this country who wish the Government to stimulate private enterprise. From my point of view, in many respects that is just as objectionable as socialism. I would say leave them alone and let them work out their own salvation, and in that way it will be best for the State and best for the individual.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Give a square deal to everybody.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Certainly, but there is a large section of the people in this country who, in the past at any rate, have had considerable power, who have encouraged export business to stimulate private enterprise. Now, on the other hand, we have the Labour party in power, and they, so far from wishing to stimulate an export market want to put a tax on imports in order that the people in this country may have cheap meat, cheap sugar, and cheap everything. And it is certainly somewhat amusing that if we want cheap Australian sugar, or if we want the best and cheapest Australian wheat or fruit, we have to go outside the country to get it. So that I would say it would be to the best interests of this country if we ceased these State enterprises and returned to private enterprise to satisfy the requirement, whether it is wheat or sugar or anything else, of this country. And one reason for saying that

is that, while it seems to me that it is possible, and always will be possible, for the Government of the country to control private enterprise in a very large measure, it seems quite impossible to control these Government enterprises. The latest illustration we have had is with regard to fixing the responsibility of the Government in connection with this disastrous Fremantle fiasco, a Government enterprise—justifiable, if hon. members like—but how difficult we find it to-day to definitely fix the responsibility on the persons who undertook that work. Moreover, to my astonishment, I found, when walking up to this House yesterday, a notice put up that the Minister for Works is so overwhelmed with attending to business that he is unable to see his masters, the electors and people of this country, except on one day in the week. Ministers are working themselves to death. They are continually rushing all over the country and at the same time trying to attend to their office routine, and—I say it with great seriousness—the recent example we have had of one of our most eminent public men being carried off, was in a measure due to his attention, at a most strenuous time, to his public duties. It is deplorable to look through the ranks of Australian Ministers and see what “a bad life” they lead, as the insurance companies would call it. And instead, therefore, of having experienced men in our Legislature, they work themselves so hard that when in other countries they would be considered, at 60 or 65 years of age, matured and able men they have retired or are in the grave. Now, we are asked in this Speech by the Ministers themselves to indulge in about a dozen important business enterprises, to place it on a moderate estimate. How, in the name of fortune, do they expect, either from what the practical man calls the paying point of view, or from the point of view of making a success of the thing irrespective of payment—how can they expect that to be done when we find the Minister for Works, at a time which, compared at any rate with the times of Sir John Forrest and the late Mr. Piesse, is not a pressing time, considers it necessary to put up a notice say-

ing that he is so busy that he cannot see anybody except on one day in the week? I hope it is not labouring the point too much, and I will promise not to repeat this in any other form later on, if I refer to this municipalisation and this nationalisation of industries. What does it mean and where is it leading us? What do we find at the present moment? a fight in progress between the Municipal Council of Perth and the Government as to who shall control the trams. What has been the result from a public point of view and from a capitalist's point of view? They have sent up the price of the commodity they are seeking to purchase; and do not let us imagine that it will stop when we have nationalised trams. Supposing the Federal Government take a hand in this affair—and it is uncommonly likely that they will—and take over the railway system, it must mean the taking over of the trams as well. It is very seldom that I find myself quoting Mr. de Largie with approval, but even he was able to see, when this question of iron-works in New South Wales was in question, that it would be a serious matter, so far as Western Australia is concerned. We are told now that agricultural implements are to be manufactured in this country, and they are saying exactly the same thing in New South Wales and in South Australia; indeed, I believe attempts are being made in New South Wales by the Labour people to do that same thing. What will be the position then in regard to our State agricultural factory? We need not expect much consideration in the business line from our friends and brothers in New South Wales. On a business deal they will be looking after the interests of New South Wales, and we will find ourselves in competition with a country with which, practically speaking, I should imagine we would find it almost impossible to compete on satisfactory terms, and that will be another loss to the State Treasury. I hope hon. members, and not only hon. members but also the people of this country, will think over and remember this Federal system of Government that we have set up, a most difficult and complicated machine to work,

even when the people understand it, and are taking the closest interest in it. But in this State, at any rate, one finds—and this will be confirmed by many of those who have travelled in the country and on the goldfields—the apathy in this country in regard to both Federal and State politics is very great indeed. We have before us this question of municipalisation, then of State control, and then Federal control, and doubtless, before we have finished, we shall have Imperial control, as indeed is already threatened and being carried out in some respects. I leave members of the Labour party to try to reconcile these State enterprises in Western Australia with competitors in the Eastern States, to say nothing of the competition of the Federal Government itself. Now, perhaps, I may be permitted to say a few words on a subject which, whether we are practical men or members of the Labour party, or members of the Liberal party, must be recognised as most important, and that is the financial position of Western Australia at the present moment. I am not an alarmist in any degree. When people talk to me about the serious position of public affairs I regret to think that it is not to the Lower House in the present position of affairs that we must look for the financial salvation of the country. I am not at present quite intimately acquainted with how far this Council can control the financial position, but listening to eminent authorities on the subject, I find that the control this Council can exercise is comparatively small. Where then are we to look for some control over the financial position of this country, which, without being an alarmist, one must surely recognise as being not altogether satisfactory? We have borrowed up to the hilt, and with regard to our revenue, we are £180,000 to the bad, what I suppose would be termed in business language, an overdraft of £180,000. That is not a very serious matter, having regard to what we may reasonably expect in the future, but Ministers are experienced men, many of them—I should certainly wish to say nothing that would reflect on their ability or honesty—and they must be giving serious thought to the problem

of how they are going to square the finances. But, instead of taking a reasonable line, we find they are plunging further into reckless expenditure, and it is to the much maligned private institutions that the business people, and the farmers, as well as the workers, must look to see that nothing serious occurs. I suppose there never was a time in the history of Australia when the private institutions, the insurance offices and the banks, were in a stronger position than they are to-day, and we in Western Australia have very good reason at the present moment to be thankful for that. As to the statement on many Labour platforms, that they, as a party, are opposed to borrowing, why frenzied finance is the proper term to apply to the statements of the Premier in regard to the finances of the country—openly boasting that he is going to borrow as much as he possibly can, and at the same time another member of the Government is attacking in the most violent manner the capital to which the Premier must look. He talks about “the capitalist” bleeding the country, when everybody knows that it is not the fat man, and not any individual, but these great financial institutions, the banks and the insurance companies, that are concerned in these operations of capital. This socialism is not going to destroy the capitalist. In many respects State socialism is all in favour of the big man. I think it is unquestionable that never in the history of Australia, I say that advisedly, have the big men and the big institutions had so much phenomenal success, and such large profits, as they have had during the last seven or eight years, and this socialistic legislation is only playing into the hands of the big man, whether it is in the shape of a tariff or in the shape of industrial arbitration, or—

Hon. J. E. Dodd (Honorary Minister): Or the land tax.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I hope the hon. member will not start me on the subject of the Federal land tax, because I feel it would be most unseemly in me if, the first time I rise to address hon. members, I should be called to order; and it is certainly difficult to measure

one's words when one thinks of the iniquitous land tax put on the statute-book by the Labour party—one of the most iniquitous taxes, I suppose, ever put on. Does the hon. member imagine that the Federal land tax has injured the big man? Who is the big man? Not the nominal owner of the property, who is taxed. The mortgagee escapes without paying a penny of taxation. If it is to be a fight between capitalists—not the manufacturer, who is probably trading on borrowed money, not the land holder, who is probably mortgaged up to the hilt; I look on the capitalist as the man who is controlling a large amount of liquid capital—if it is to be a trial of strength or of wits between the Labour party and the capitalists, the Labour party will go down. The capitalists of this country hold the Labour party in the hollow of their hand. Many of the capitalists would gladly see the Labour party continue in power. You do not hear the banks and the financial institutions criticise, to any extent, the Labour party.

Hon. J. E. Dodd (Honorary Minister): What about the Federal bank?

Hon. A. SANDERSON: It is only this afternoon I was reading the report of the chairman of directors of the Bank of Australasia, welcoming the Federal bank, and going on to say that he hoped they would make profits because he did not want to see the bank in competition with themselves, undercutting their business, but if the Federal bank came into competition the Bank of Australasia was in a fine position to hold its own. I must apologise for being drawn off the trail a little now. But I would even go so far as to warn the hon. member not to open up these avenues of discussion—the Federal land tax and the State bank.

Hon. J. E. Dodd (Honorary Minister): That does not justify the statement you made.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: What is the statement?

Hon. J. E. Dodd (Honorary Minister): The statement you made was that the legislation was all in favour of the capitalist.

Hon. A. SANDERSON : It is not intended to be in favour of the capitalist. I say the Federal land tax is a most iniquitous tax, because it places the burden of taxation on a section of the community instead of generally, and not on the rich people in Australia, but on a section of those who are considered to be—but very often are not, well-to-do. I say the Labour legislation is not intended certainly to be in favour of the capitalist, but owing to the circumstances you will find that the capitalist is in a point of vantage, because the Labour legislation prevents the small man going into competition with the capitalist. That is the point I wish to make.

Hon. J. E. Dodd (Honorary Minister) : The Federal land tax is doing the very opposite.

Hon. A. SANDERSON : I hope it will not be imagined that I am frightened to discuss the Federal land tax at length. Perhaps an opportunity will be afforded another time to deal with the subject. In a State Legislature this is hardly the time nor is it the place to deal with the iniquities—it is not too strong a term—of the Federal land tax. In order to make my position clear and so as not to retreat from what I said, I will say that the system of legislation such as we have had in this country since the Labour people have taken control, has benefited the big man in this country, because it has crushed out the small man and prevented competition. Whether we take the land tax or the industrial legislation or the Early Closing Act, it is hitting very hard indeed the small man and to that extent is benefiting the big man by preventing competition. I do not wish to labour the point: it is somewhat off the track, I admit, so I will content myself by saying that as far as the financial position of the affairs in this country are concerned, if viewed from a public standpoint, they must be viewed with some anxiety. It is to the financial institutions—those much-maligned financial institutions—that Western Australia no doubt as a whole is able to look forward with a moderate degree of confidence in the immediate future. A few moments to get rid

of the financial question and socialistic legislation. The trouble is that to develop this country the amount of capital required is very large indeed, and the Government are quite unable, at the present time, and probably will be in the future, to raise sufficient capital to carry out the development of this country. If private enterprise is encouraged, and if population is encouraged to come here, that seems to me the only solution of the proper development of Western Australia. We all know the potentialities, as they are called, of this great country, and I, quite as much as most people, having travelled throughout the length and breadth of the country—that enables men to realise what this country could be under a sound system of Government—I say the Government are not able to develop the country under a socialistic system. We have not the men or the money to enter into these enterprises.

Hon. J. Cornell : What about the Glasgow trams?

Hon. A. SANDERSON : I am taken away to Glasgow. I know something of Glasgow. I am unwilling to be drawn on a by-path, but I say if we had in Perth the population and the capital, and the grit, and the intelligence characteristic of the Scotch doubtless we might undertake enterprises which at the present time we cannot do. The municipalisation in Glasgow has been a success. How it supports the Labour view I am unable to ascertain, because it is to be knocked out in this country. I pass from the financial position and would like to say a word or two on industrial arbitration. Here, again, it is just as well to make one's position clear. I am altogether opposed to compulsory arbitration from start to finish, and would not have anything to do with it. I greatly regret the principle of compulsory arbitration and to that extent my views differ from many members of this House. The only support, I find, or the principal support I find, against compulsory arbitration, curiously enough, is on the Labour side. They tell us, and this is the *Sidney Worker*, which is recognised, I believe, as the lead-

ing authority in the Labour party and the ablest paper published in the Labour interests, and we do not need to go further than the interjection made the other day—"Would you compel men to work?" I think it came from the hon. member opposite to me. No, I certainly would not, but, under the present system of compulsory arbitration, if it was carried out, you must and you should compel men to work. That is why it is so one-sided and unfair. You compel the employer to abide by an award, but not the men. I think, myself, it would be, if it was possible, a monstrous thing to compel a man to work, and send him to gaol if he will not work. Men are quite ready to go elsewhere and get work for themselves. Mr. Premier Ver-ran dealt with that question, and he said he was going to introduce a Bill to deal severely with strikers, and this brought a protest from the *Worker*—

However much the barbarism of strikes may be deplored the fact remains that to pass a law to prevent men from resorting to them as a last resource is to bring back into our industrial life one of the elements of slavery.

I quite subscribe to that, and it is endorsed by the interjection the other day—"Would you compel men to work?" My answer is, "I would not." Therefore I am totally opposed to the system of compulsory arbitration. What we shall have brought forward in the course of the session remains to be seen. It is not necessary to go at any length into the question at present. We shall have an opportunity no doubt of dealing with the matter later on. But once you accept the principle of compulsory industrial arbitration the constitution of the court is, comparatively speaking, a somewhat minor part. It was astonishing to me to hear a criticism of the Bill which was rejected last session on the ground of a layman being put in the chair as president, and shortly afterwards to hear criticism—to use the mildest words—of a judicial person in the chair in the Federal Arbitration Court. I do not quite reconcile it myself. I am totally opposed to the thing from start to finish. If you have any system of the kind probably

the wages board system is the better one. I am not wildly enthusiastic on that, but it seems to be more businesslike in adjusting industrial disputes than industrial arbitration is, which has become a farce and it is hardly exaggeration to say, worthless, because the men openly flouted it, while the employers have to obey the awards. The reference to the new Constitution, to the proposed convention, is of interest to me. We have not had any explanation as yet as to exactly what it means, or as to how it is to be brought about, but it will certainly be interesting to me to have a clear and definite statement put forward as to what is to be this new Constitution for Western Australia. I can certainly promise the Minister that I do not propose to commit hari kari and abolish myself. I was not sent here for that purpose. It is quite true that my opponent, the Labour candidate, came forward and said that if he was returned he would do his best to bring about the abolition of the Upper House; but the electors evidently did not approve of that in the constituency I represent, or in the neighbouring one. I shall certainly deal as fairly as I can with any proposition for a new Constitution. I am always interested to see what proposals can be put forward for making things better, so far as Western Australia is concerned, but I think it will be a mistake if the people of the State are induced at the present moment to play any pranks with the Constitution of the country. We have not yet learned, it seems to me, how to deal with that curiously complicated and difficult machine, the Federal Constitution; in a big thing like that we must give a reasonable time to see how things work, as to whether the ultimate destination of this country is towards centralisation, or towards splitting up this vast area into smaller sections. I am quite prepared to listen to any proposal with a more or less open mind, but at present to throw our Constitution into the melting pot is a somewhat foolish procedure. As to the duty of a member of the Upper House, this is a question I have been asking myself, after listening to the speeches of hon. members here, and

taking part in informal discussions. It is somewhat difficult for one who all through has prided himself on being a party man—I am for the Liberal party—to cast aside one's, let us call them, prejudices, to say nothing of one's principles, off hand. I will endeavour to do so. I recognise that coming into this House puts one in a somewhat different position from that of a member of the Lower House; just as in the same way a member of the Senate is supposed—although our representatives do not think it incumbent on them to do so—to be there to look after the interests of the States rather than the interests of the Federation as a whole. I put down and published what I considered to be the attitude of a member of this honourable Council; that is "To criticise, to discuss, to suggest, to prevent manifest injustice and absurdities, is the business of anyone who holds a seat in the Legislative Council, but not to offer narrow, party opposition to the proposals of the Legislative Assembly." I can promise, to the best of my ability, while I am here, to carry on my duties like that. In conclusion I can only say that I have to thank hon. members for the kind, indulgent hearing they have given me. It is to be regretted that this by-path into which I was drawn for the moment on the Federal land tax and Federal taxation drew me aside from what one might consider the proper business of the discussion. I can only repeat that I am certainly quite prepared at a more suitable opportunity to maintain the attitude I then outlined, before I gladly came back to the business before the House. It is with special reason I have to thank members, and thank you, Mr. President, for permitting that. It is, of course, rather tempting, with interjections and criticisms, to be drawn off from the track. I have attempted to put before the House my views, not so much with regard to detail, as to whether they are going to start butchers' shops, as the Minister informs us—if the ships are not going to pay, they are going to have butchers' shops; or if they do pay, they are going to have butchers' shops, it seems to me—not so

much with regard to detail as with regard to the whole system of this State socialism that I believe I was sent here to oppose. Let me repeat, I owe my thanks to you, Mr. President, and hon. members, for the kindly indulgent manner in which I have been listened to on my first attempt to address hon. members.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH (East): I am delighted to have the privilege of following my old friend, Mr. Sanderson. I ask you, Mr. President, to take as said in regard to myself the remarks he made at the outset, craving the indulgence of hon. members in the interests of a new member. And from another point of view it may perhaps be fitting that I should follow Mr. Sanderson, because he found it necessary in the course of his remarks to disagree from some of the essential features of the address delivered by Mr. Moss, as in the course of my remarks I shall find it necessary to disagree from some of the essential features in the address delivered by Mr. Sanderson. Those who are pleased to place upon the three of us the same party brand may wonder at this. They may find the solution in the fact that each of us is speaking his own individual feelings; and in that fact they will probably find one of the chief differences between the political party to which we belong and the political party to which we are opposed. I trust that I shall not over-strain the courtesy extended to new members, but there are a number of matters to which I desire to draw the attention of the House. At the outset it appeared to me that if I were expected to confine myself to the amendment now before us I should have to speak on but few of the matters I intended to refer to; but on considering the question further, it seems to me that the amendment is a very comprehensive one, because it undoubtedly touches upon the Constitution of this House, its constitutional privileges, and also upon the financial question. Notwithstanding what Mr. Sanderson has said, I take it that the House cannot consider the proposals now under discussion without paying some regard to them from the taxpayer's point of view, as to whether they will pay or not. I hope, so long as I am a member

of this House, that I shall be anxious to uphold its proper privileges and its constitutional rights. It occurs to me at the outset that if the constitutional rights of this Chamber are important, the constitutional rights of the people who elect this Chamber are of equal, if not of greater, importance; and this may be a fitting time for me to redeem a promise I made to my constituents during the recent election in regard to this matter of the Constitution and the privileges of the electors of the Legislative Council. I am not a lawyer, and I merely desire to raise the question, and state it as it appears to me, leaving it to those who are better qualified to express a final and definite opinion. Section 15 of the Constitution Act enumerates the qualifications of electors of the Legislative Council, and the qualifications of those people who are entitled to be on the Legislative Council rolls. One portion reads—

Or if the name of such person is on the electoral list of any municipality in respect of property within the province of the rateable value of not less than £17, or the electoral list of any road board district in respect of property within the province of the annual rateable value of not less than £17, provided that the names of all persons who have been struck off any municipal or road board electoral list on the ground merely of non-payment of rates shall be deemed for the purposes of this Act to be on such lists respectively.

Now, under the Municipal Corporations Act and under the Roads Act the obligation is cast on the municipal town clerk or roads board secretary to forward to the Electoral Department complete lists setting forth the persons qualified in accordance with this section of the Constitution Act. Until recently it was the custom to compile the Legislative Council rolls partly from the lists so sent in; but now the Electoral Act passed in 1907, under Division 3, apparently contemplates that names shall be added to the Legislative Council rolls in response to claims, and in response to claims only. The municipal and roads board lists are still sent

in, but are disregarded by the Electoral authorities, unless merely for the purpose of checking the claims that are sent forward. This is the point I wish to raise. Can the Electoral Act take away the Constitutional rights of the people? Can it even cast upon them obligations that the Constitution itself does not contemplate? I know of instances in which people have applied to be placed upon the electoral roll for the Legislative Council, stating as their qualification the fact that they were enrolled on the roads board list in respect to property within the province of the annual rateable value of not less than £17; but their claims were rejected because they did not disclose these people's qualifications, the fact of being on the roads board list no longer being regarded as a qualification, and because they were not in conformity with the claim cards provided under the Electoral Act. There have been instances where leaseholders from the Crown have had applications rejected on the ground that they did not pay so much as £10 per annum in rent to the Crown, the other qualifications being entirely ignored, the fact that they had spent so much on the property, though small in area, as to give it an annual rateable value of more than £17 as provided in the Act, and the fact that they were paying their rates to a roads board or municipality, as the case may be, on property rated at over £17. I do not expect that the appeal I am making now will be regarded as of any importance to those who consider that our Constitution is merely a piece of parchment which we can ignore or regard as we see fit; but I hope it will be regarded as worthy of consideration by the mover of the amendment. I do not expect him to agree with me; I expect him to bring his better-trained mind to the consideration of this question.

Hon. M. L. Moss: I do agree with you.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: Have the constitutional rights of electors of this Chamber been taken away, and if so, what is the proper procedure to take in order to restore them? I am aware objection has been raised on the ground that

these municipal and roads board lists often contain the names of those who unhappily have passed away. I am told that on one occasion the department had the painful necessity of removing one man's name for three years running, not because he had died thrice, but because, having died once, after being removed once, his name was restored, then removed again, and then restored again. I admit that it is important that our rolls should be kept clean, but I think it better that one guilty man should escape than that one hundred innocent should be punished. Now, I am aware that this is not the old phrasing of the maxim, but I hesitate to use the old familiar phrase lest I be mistaken to advocate the wholesale gaol-clearing that we have experienced in the last few months. I think it is better that one dead man, who, during his lifetime, was qualified to be an elector of the Legislative Council, should remain on the rolls, than that one hundred duly qualified living men should be deprived of the franchise. The effect of the altered method is more severely felt in the country than in the town. Mr. Sanderson told us he represented a constituency of 12,000 people. Because most of those people live near the town and they have the matter brought constantly under their notice, it is an easy matter for them to get on the roll. The constituency I represent is chiefly a country constituency, and I venture to think it is of equal importance and of equal population to the one Mr. Sanderson referred to; but largely because of the difficulty I have outlined, largely because of the great number of people who are disfranchised, there are only about 4,000 names on the roll. I may be told that it is a simple matter for people to send in their names, and that people who do not send in their names should not be considered as entitled to vote. I had rather a curious experience on this matter; because when at the last moment I decided to nominate, I looked through the roll for the names of personal friends and political supporters, and was somewhat surprised to find how many were missing. I have no enemies, but I looked for my political opponents,

and was rejoiced to find that many whom I knew were qualified had neglected to send in claims. Among these were such prominent men as the Minister for Lands and the Minister for Works, both of whom I knew to be qualified as electors in the East Province, but neither of whom had carried out the requirements of the Electoral Act.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: Before tea I was speaking in regard to the constitutional privileges that affect the Legislative Council, and I took it for granted that the Electoral Act passed in 1907 did not possibly override or amend the provisions of the Constitution. To my mind, apart from this constitutional aspect, it would seem to be highly desirable that we should preserve the old method of securing enrolment for the Legislative Council, because it seems to me that the municipal rolls and the roads board rolls would cover practically the whole of the country, and give in themselves a reasonably complete enrolment, apart from the claims that might be sent in to supplement it. It is hardly necessary for me to say in this connection that I do not blame the present Administration. I do not wish to blame anybody, but in any case the Electoral Act to which I refer was passed under another Administration. I intended to make some reference to the remarks of the leader of the House in regard to members who, being of the opposite political party to himself, had forced him to take up the debate at an unusually early stage. So far as I am concerned, it seems to me that by replying to the amendment moved by Mr. Moss the leader of the House did not forfeit his right to speak to the general question at the end of the debate. Moreover, it would be rather absurd for member after member to get up and discuss this constitutional question without first having something from the Government as a lead to go upon. Sitting here we should know both the charge put up and the defence made against it. I hope that in

following another member who may be said to be on the opposite side, so far as party politics are concerned, I shall be considered to be doing a fair thing in view of the fact that there are in this Chamber a comparatively limited number of members representing one political party. I have no doubt that if in another place there was a similar set of circumstances, but with the balance of power reversed, the same courtesy would be extended by the stronger to the weaker party. I should like to refer to the remark made by the Hon. Mr. Davis in seconding the motion for the Address-in-reply. To my mind it has a direct bearing on the amendment before the House. The hon. gentleman was advocating an extension of that popular, and, to some, admirable instrument of Government, the referendum. He told us the referendum was necessary in order to give people an opportunity of definitely expressing their will. He told us, too, that a Parliamentary election, and even a general election, did not have this effect, because so many conflicting issues were involved, and because personal and local considerations entered into the conflict. I do not propose either to endorse or dispute what he said; all I ask is that he shall be consistent, and that if, in advocating a referendum, he tells us the people cannot without it express their will, he will not afterwards come here and say that at the last election his party received a mandate from the people, particularly that he will not tell us his party received from the people a mandate to ignore or override the Constitution where it seemed to conflict with their own desires. One reason why I intend to support the amendment is because, rightly or wrongly—I am open to conviction—I regard it as a cardinal fault in the present Administration that they do not observe the Constitution, that their desire is to set the Executive above both Parliament and the people. As an instance I wish to make reference to one of the earliest actions of the present Administration, namely, the minute issued by the Minister for Lands in regard to transfers. Most of you probably will remember the leading features of that minute.

It provided that no holder of conditional purchase land should transfer that land unless he had held it for five years, or unless he had effected five years' improvement upon it; and if he happened to be a non-residential holder he should not transfer the land, or sub-let it, unless he had effected 10 years' improvements in respect of it. There was a proviso that the Minister might allow special latitude in special circumstances. He had at that time the law of the country, the Land Act, by which I maintain the Minister was bound. The object of this amendment, I take it, is to set up the position that the Executive is bound by the law of the land. Section 142a of the Land Act reads as follows:—

Except in special cases to be approved by the Minister no holding. . . shall be transferred or sublet until after the expiration of two years from the commencement of the lease or occupation certificate, unless the holder has expended on the land in prescribed improvements the full amount required to be expended during such period.

The minute issued by the Minister followed the wording of the Land Act itself, except in regard to the period, and then the Minister altered it from two years to five years. I say it was an unconstitutional act, a repudiation of the contract entered into between the Crown and the individual. It was another instance of the Executive overriding Parliament and making themselves supreme as against the people of the State. Equally unjust and unconstitutional was the action of the Minister in discriminating between the resident holder and the non-resident holder. The Act itself makes a discrimination; it requires of the one a larger amount of improvements than it demands of the other, and I am prepared to say that any action the Minister might have taken to enforce the carrying out of the improvement conditions would have been endorsed by the great bulk of the settlers themselves. Why was the non-resident holder discriminated against? Is he a worse settler than the resident holder? Surely, provided he carries out his obligations in respect to his contract,

he is a citizen in all respects worthy of encouragement. As a matter of fact we know that certain members of this Administration themselves held land and did not live on it. It is true that some of them held it under residential conditions, but that was rather an aggravation of their offence; and we are aware that the Minister for Lands told one of his colleagues that he must bring his land under the non-residential clauses. That was a proper thing to do; but in this same minute the Minister also gave instructions that in future all rural lands should be thrown open for selection under residence conditions only. Therefore, whilst this Administration were prepared to set themselves up as being above Parliament, they were prepared also to extend all the latitude the law allowed to their own members and political supporters. There are one or two matters to which I intended to refer, but which have no particular bearing upon the amendment, and these I will pass over, at least for the present. I come now to another socialistic proposal more or less intimately connected with the principle we are discussing, namely, the Workers' Homes Act. and although I am afraid I shall not in this matter receive the endorsement of Mr. Sanderson, yet I wish to say I regard this as a most excellent departure. It is to my mind a splendid thing to encourage working men to own their homes. And, since the collective credit, the credit of the State, should be greater than the individual credit, it seems to me a sound proposition that a State, able to borrow money on something less than four per cent., should lend it to the people at five per cent. to the end that they may acquire their own homes, instead of forcing them to borrow from the private money lender at seven per cent. or eight per cent. By doing this we shall be doing a good thing indeed. We are told that this workers' homes scheme will become more popular when it is better understood. The misunderstanding that prevents people taking more liberal advantage of it is that they have looked upon it as being a purely leasehold system. And, by the way, this

is one instance in respect of which the Labour party did not receive any mandate at the last election. It is, in fact, a question upon which they took fright. The newspaper they were publishing at that time in support of their policy stated over and over again that this principle of non-alienation of Crown lands was not the final word, that it might be amended. That was proclaimed to allay the fears of the people, and therefore it cannot now be said that the party received a mandate from the people in regard to this particular matter. I know full well that the working men do not want leasehold homes. They want freehold homes, and I could quote hundred of cases in my own district of working men who in the past have been loyal supporters of the Labour party, but who will tell you that the leasehold is of no use to them when it comes to the matter of their own homes. Another curious feature in connection with this workers' homes scheme has to do with the announcement, a week or so ago, of the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth that he was going to give a sum of £5 to every mother in the Commonwealth at the birth of her child. I am not going to say whether that is a good or a bad proposal. But I have here a pamphlet issued by the workers' homes board, which comprises a plan and a diagram of the workers' homes which they intend to build and sell to the worker, and of the land they propose to lease to him. According to the plan it is a very beautiful home indeed; but there is no place in it for a child. It is not contemplated that the people who take advantage of this workers' home scheme should have children. It seems to me to be a sort of pleasant Saturday to Monday arrangement which, no doubt, will fit in nicely with some of the socialistic ideas of the Labour party. There is no child's bedroom whatever provided for in the plan. In order to get the house as comfortable as possible with a minimum of expenditure, we have presented for our consideration a dwelling which is only big enough for two people. It is not intended that the people who inhabit these homes should have children. I suppose

the intention is that the State should look after the children for them. There is another striking difference in regard to the people who are going to inhabit these Saturday to Monday homes on leasehold tenure, and those who want homes for themselves. Although the land the Government is going to buy will be paid for by money borrowed at four per cent. it is only proposed to charge leaseholders three per cent. on the value of that land, while the money which it costs to build the houses will be lent to them at five per cent. But when a bona-fide landholder comes along to the Government and says "I have a little bit of freehold land on which I have partly erected a house. I want assistance with which to complete it, in return for which I can give you ample security," they demand of that man six per cent., with a rebate of one half per cent. provided he pays promptly. In the one case no security at all is given, not even that of people with children in the home, yet here the money is lent at three per cent., and five per cent., while in the other case, notwithstanding the existence of all the security that a private money lender would desire, the borrower is to be charged six per cent. with one half per cent. rebate. I know a specific instance in which a working man, qualified in every respect under this Act, earning, I believe £3 15s. per week—at any rate less than £200 a year—who had acquired a home, and who very prudently and properly had placed it in his wife's name, was paying 8 per cent. on the remainder of the purchase money. This home was worth at least £550. He applied to the Workers' Homes board for a loan of £400 to enable him to purchase this home from his wife, because she was not a worker within the meaning of the Act, whereas he was. This amount was considerably less than the value of the property. It was required to pay off a first mortgage of £300 still remaining on the home, and a second mortgage of £70 or £80 that had been since incurred. He received a reply asking for 2s. for a search fee, and he forwarded the amount, but it was refunded and a curt note sent, stating that the board could not recom-

mend his application. They gave no reason for this attitude. We can only assume that he wished to borrow money for a home for himself and his children, and probably for his children after he was gone. Now, I come to the purchase of the steamers—the matter on which the amendment is based. I have no choice but to support the amendment. I remember not long ago I had the privilege of presiding at a lecture delivered by Professor Mills, a most interesting, instructive, and entertaining lecture on "Socialism," and he congratulated the people on the progress they had made. He made use of words like these:—"You have already gone a considerable distance in the matter of public ownership and public monopolies. Keep on as you are going, but for your own sake and for the sake of a watching world, make a success of everything you take in hand; and then, so fast and no faster than you can convince the people of the wisdom of what you are doing, extend the scope of your activities." Under Professor Mills' system the first thing would be inquiry and investigation for the preparation of a complete scheme; the second thing would be the submission to the people or to the people's Parliament for the ratification of this scheme, and the third step would be the definite action. Now the Government have reversed that order. They have bought the boats first. There may have been preliminary inquiry, but from what I have been able to ascertain, it appears to me that there has not been. If there had been, surely we should have known something about it. Now we know nothing of the details in this matter, and we can only assume that the Government acted in exactly the opposite direction to that which would be adopted by a trained socialist. They are going to get Parliamentary sanction as a second step, and after that I suppose they will consider whether it will pay and achieve the object at which they are aiming. This is not a matter of constitutional technicality, but a disorderly, unbusinesslike, and unconstitutional thing which might or might not be wrong, but which, if right, must be done in an orderly, business-like and constitutional manner. I believe that

in the public Press and from public platforms reference has been made to the action of the late Government in regard to the Bullfinch railway, and it has been quoted as furnishing a satisfactory precedent for what the Government is doing in this instance. I do not wish to say anything in regard to that railway except that those same critics declare that the work was undertaken in undue haste, and is likely to become a burden on the country. If that is so, that it was unconstitutional and done in undue haste, how can they plead that as a precedent? Should not they record it as an example of a line of action which they ought to avoid. And so far as all these demonstrations on the Esplanade are concerned, it is a fact that only when the Government do something wrong we have these demonstrations. I was reading the other day a great writer on the relationship of England and her Colonies, and he laid it down as a principle that England must support the Colonies whether right or wrong, "more," he said, "when wrong than right." The Government have to be congratulated on having followers who are prepared to go to any extreme to show the extent of their support when the Government are wrong. I am one of those who believe that the public ownership of public monopolies in a community of this kind is necessary to allow free scope to private enterprise generally. I am not going to say that the privately-owned railways of England are not better than the publicly-owned railways of France; but in a young country like this if we have privately-owned railways, great disabilities would be thrown in the way of those people who desire to develop the industry of the country by private enterprise. There is a great difference not in name, but in principle, and in application, between a public monopoly and a competitive enterprise. Under a public monopoly like railways, the Government can fix the freights and conditions and make the thing pay; the taxpayer need never lose. Under a competitive enterprise like the one in connection with the purchase of these steamers, the freights and conditions will be largely dictated by the competitors, and I for one, in the interests of

the taxpayers, would like to know, apart from every consideration of the general wisdom of the Government entering into concerns of this kind, whether the steamers are such as are able to compete with those they have to compete with on decently favourable lines. My own opinion, from what I have heard, is that when it comes to competition, the privately-owned steamers will be able to do the work at a cheaper rate and still make money, where the Government steamers will lose it. I must be excused if I am wrong, but I am forced to that conclusion from a lack of information. I cannot help drawing attention to the delicate humour of one clause of the Speech delivered by the Governor—

With a view to conducting the business of the State in a constitutional manner, you will be asked, without delay, to grant temporary supplies to meet the requirements of the Public Service.

In order to observe the letter of this constitution, this House without discussion and without consideration passed appropriations to the extent of over one million of money. "With a view to conducting the business of the State in a constitutional manner," it reads, and the party that lay such stress on this are asking us to go to this extreme without any consideration beyond this that the wording of the constitution should be observed one moment apparently only to break the whole spirit of the constitution when it suits them to do so. The leader of the House, in the course of the few remarks he made, said it was significant that nothing had been said by Mr. Moss with regard to the purchase of the Perth trams. I intend to say a word or two in regard to the matter from the three or four points of view from which it may be considered. There is municipalisation as against nationalisation. I feel it my duty to express regret that leaders of public opinion in many instances should have chosen to discuss this phase of the question in the manner they have. I have read all that has been written about it, and although now and again the merits of the question have been touched, there has been held up before

the public eye what, in the minds of those writers and speakers seems to have been the one salient fact that the Mayor of the city, charged with the administration of this under municipalisation is blundering and incompetent. I do not know whether he is or is not, and it is as ridiculous to condemn the system of municipalisation on the assumption that the ratepayers of the city of Perth will always return a blundering and incompetent person as Mayor, as it is to fool with the system of nationalisation on the assumption that the people of Western Australia generally would always send in to the highest executive offices heaven-born geniuses like those who fill them at present. I hope the time will come before this matter is finally settled when the merits of municipalisation against nationalisation will be fully discussed. If we are going in for public control we should make it as direct and close as possible. That is why we have so many difficulties in connection with departments controlled from Melbourne, departments which we would like to see controlled more directly in our own State. It seems that a tramway run by the municipality would have advantages over a national tramway, and there might be competition, but a municipal tramway owned by a Greater Perth and a national railway owned by the State would stimulate both of them to give the best service to the public, who, after all, are the people entitled to consideration. In this matter we shall have to consider the rights of the ratepayers of Perth. I fail to see how the Government can take away those rights. We have been told that the greater includes the less, and because the Government are greater than the municipality, they can take over these rights whether the municipality wish it or not. That is a principle I refuse to subscribe to. The least among us has his rights and they are entitled to respect, even as against those of the greatest, whether that principle is applied to local governing bodies or to individuals. Then we have to consider the rights of the shareholders. We have heard these people abused year in and year out as long as I can remember—this howelless company that did not care at all for the people of

Perth so long as they got their dividends. We have heard it said that they must be dealt with severely, and so this Government has seen fit to deal with them severely. In what way? Simply by giving them about 100 per cent. more than their asset was worth. About nine or ten months ago the shares of the Perth Tramway Company, Ltd.—there are 200,000 of them, 100,000 preference and 100,000 ordinary—were worth about 13s. or 14s.

Hon. M. L. Moss: There are debentures also.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: I am aware there are other obligations. This is not a matter in which I am blaming the present Administration. The question of the purchase of the tramways by the State or municipality arose, I think, while the present Mayor and leader of the Opposition were in England. While there was a prospect of the company selling, the prices of the shares went steadily upwards to about 17s., and the other day when the amount which the Government were prepared to give was announced, and in anticipation that it would be endorsed by Parliament, the shares took another bound, and you could not buy them for 23s. each. When the purchase is finally approved and there is no longer any risk. I do not know to what extent the shares will go, but it is evident this proposal contemplates making a handsome present to the shareholders, who have been treating the citizens of Perth so scurvily. How is the Government able to do this? Because they are going to buy from the company the rights which the company have, and steal from the ratepayers the rights they have.

Hon. W. Patrick: They cannot do that.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: Then they are going to make a bad bargain from the point of view of the State. Shareholders are pretty shrewd judges of the value of this concession. If the shares are worth only 13s. or 14s., and this contemplated purchase induces buyers to pay 23s. each for them, and if besides the company is discharged of its obligations, the only way the Government can get round is to steal the rights of the ratepayers. If the Government are merely sitting in the position of the Company, and still hand the system

over to the people at the expiration of the company's concession in the terms set out in the original agreement, then they are making a bad bargain from the point of view of the people. I am aware that in connection with such things as the purchase of the Midland Railway, whenever that purchase is made, the people will say that the Government have given too much for it, and whenever the proposal for that purchase is rejected we shall find out that the enterprise has, year after year, appreciated in value. Exactly the opposite applies to the trams. The company is operating an enterprise that must of necessity depreciate in value, because the period of the concession which was granted to them is drawing to a close, and at the end of that concession they will be obliged to hand over the system to the municipal council, complete and in working order. The mere fact that the enterprise of the trams is depreciating steadily in value seems to me to be an argument against any hurry in this matter. I have every sympathy with the citizens of Perth, who may be obliged to wait at street corners longer than they think is necessary, but, in view of the enormous amount of money required for the opening up of the country, and in view of the limited financial resources, not only of this Government but any Government of this State, for some time to come, it seems to me it would be far better for the citizens of Perth, to say nothing of the people in the country, if the £450,000, which it is proposed to pay for the trams, were spent in adding another 100 or 150 miles per annum to the railway construction policy of the Government, in the agricultural districts. Now I come to a question on which I may commend the Government. It is, I know, to some extent, a socialistic enterprise. There are people who think that the principle of secondary education should be left to private enterprise. I believe, in this matter, as in other matters, State interference is necessary. It is necessary to protect the child against parental neglect; it is necessary to give the child that equal opportunity that all adults clamour for. Mr. Moss, in moving his amendment, made some reference to a race that would be

conducted by the political Labour party, in which everyone would start off scratch, and in regard to which it would be the aspiration of the promoters that they should all finish in line. I remember that there was another method of running a race; a method in which the people did not even get a fair start, and in which some were supposed to wear hobnailed boots, and, if a man were so badly equipped he was liable to be jostled. I have no more sympathy with that kind of race than I have with any other. In this matter of education we should aspire to give everyone a fair start; we must prevent jostling, and we must not try to deter the speedy. For that reason, I applaud the intention of the Government to establish secondary schools in the Kalgoorlie and Boulder districts, also the proposal to establish agricultural schools, as the Speech goes on to say, on one or more of the State farms. I hope also that closer consideration will be given to the proposal in regard to the State farms, which were started merely as experimental farms. We have these State farms at Narrogin, at Nangeenan, and at Chapman, and, if we are to regard the agricultural industry as a wheat industry, we must recognise that these three farms were established in extreme parts of the State; Narrogin from the point of view of wet districts as almost the limit; Nangeenan from the point of view of a dry area as almost the limit, and Chapman as in the middle, and while these places were suited for experimental farms, they did not offer the best opportunities to make a real success of agricultural schools. They are not sufficiently centrally situated. I understand it is proposed to establish the first of these schools at Narrogin, and I think it is an excellent idea, although I do not think it is the place which would give the best results. I hope there will be no delay in getting it going. I understand that the reason for establishing the first there is that there are certain buildings which may be adapted, but that should not be a dominating circumstance. These schools should be central as from the metropolis, and central as from agricultural districts, and as near even to the goldfields community as possible, to encourage the

people there to send their children to them and, if it is intended to work these schools with the University, again, they should be within easy reach. So keen am I a supporter of this matter of secondary education, that I would be sorry to say anything that would be regarded as critical to the proposal of the Government. I said just now that the financial resources of this Government, as indeed the financial resources of future Governments must necessarily be limited for some time to come. It will be remembered that, some time ago, the Premier of this State made application to the Federal Treasurer for a loan, but, unfortunately, there was no money available at the time. A month ago, the Treasurer of Queensland was twitted with having accepted a loan from the Federal Treasurer that he had some little time previously refused. The Premier of Queensland defended himself, and said, "Quite true; some time ago the Federal Treasurer offered me a loan at 3¾ per cent.; I made inquiries and I found that I could do better elsewhere, and so I refused it, but, quite recently, the Federal Treasurer came again, and made a great point of the fact that he had a million of money, and said I could have it at 3¾ per cent.; it suited me, and I took it." A few months before this, the Federal Treasurer had loaned a million at 3¾ per cent. to the Treasurer of Victoria. Both the Treasurers of Victoria and Queensland, at this time, were members of Liberal administrations, and it has struck me as curious that a previous request for a loan, from the Labour Treasurer of Western Australia, was refused by the Commonwealth Treasurer, on the ground that he had not the money, but it was strange afterwards, when he did have the money, that he should offer it to the Liberal Treasurers of Queensland and Victoria, instead of offering it to his comrade here. Surely the security of Western Australia is as good as the security of any of the other States. But it looks as if the Federal Treasurer went on the principle of the people who button up their pockets when they see their poor relations coming along. With regard to

all these enterprises which are referred to in the Governor's Speech, I take it that they are intended to be reproductive, and, therefore, the tendency will be to reduce taxation, and, on that ground, I shall welcome the proposed amendment to the Land and Income Tax Act, which will be in the direction of lightening a burden on the people. It cannot possibly be in an opposite direction, because if the Government were to go to the country and say we want more money, the effect would be to condemn their enterprises, which they claim are to pay their way. It is claimed that only small profits will result from these enterprises, but the accumulation of small profits will surely amount to something; at all events it will be sufficient to give relief from taxation. Now I come to the last matter. It has been suggested, in the amendment, that the Government has treated the Legislative Council discourteously. I remember during the last general elections that the first plank of the fighting platform of the political Labour party was the reduction of the franchise of the Legislative Council with the view of its ultimate abolition, but, as in regard to the matter of the non-alienation of Crown lands, members of the Labour party took fright and said, "No, no, we do not intend that; we intend to hold a convention to frame a new Constitution, in which the bicameral system may or may not be preserved." Now, instead of being the first plank of their platform, we find, in the very last line of the Governor's Speech, that a Bill will also be submitted to enable a convention of representatives to be chosen by the electors to frame proposals for the amendment of the Constitution Act, for submission to Parliament. This idea of calling it a convention is a confession of their inability to interpret the wishes of the people. Surely a constitutional amendment will resolve itself into merely a matter of election, merely a matter of how is the Parliament of Western Australia to be elected, and, if the framers of this Bill can give us a perfectly satisfactory method of electing the convention, a method which will give better representation to all sections, then the

work of the convention will be completed before it is elected. If the framers of the Bill are not able to provide a satisfactory method of electing the convention itself then its work must necessarily be similarly deficient. Personally, I have not much faith in convention-made Constitutions. I rather believe in the Parliament of the country amending the Constitution from time to time as may be necessary. We have had some experience of convention-made Constitutions. I believe the French people called their convention a number of undesirable things. We do not want to cut off the people's heads; we feel that we can do what we want in an orderly manner; we have no need to resort to revolutionary methods. There was a convention held to frame the Constitution of Australia, and now every writer on the matter of parliamentary elections holds up the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia as a horrible example of what is absolutely the worst in the matter of electoral principles; every writer on this subject has done this, and when Mr. Gawler, who has given notice of his motion regarding proportional representation enters upon his discussion he will, I have no doubt, tell us that the different nations who have experienced the bad systems all come to the conclusion that the worst of all the bad systems is the system framed by the convention that sat to draft our Federal Constitution. I am not one of those who believe in restricted majority rule, but what do we find in Tasmania? We find there that 30,000 Labour electors have returned three members to the Senate, and, if they are successful in this coming election, they will have six representatives in the Senate of Australia, and 250,000 Liberal electors in New South Wales will have none. Now, as I have said, I am not wedded to the principle of majority rule, but I would like those who are wedded to that principle to try to reconcile it with these two facts. I would like them to go a step further. At the last senatorial elections the Labour party in Victoria polled 648,000 votes, and all other parties received 692,000 votes; that is to say, 50,000 votes more than was cast for the Labour

party, but with the result that the Labour party obtained three seats and every other section in the community was disfranchised. In Australia as a whole, 4,018,000 votes were cast, each electorate receiving three votes, and of these 2,021,000—just over two million—were recorded for the Labour party, and 1,997,000, or just under two million, for the Liberal party, a difference so slight as not to justify one party having a single member more than the other party, but in the result the Labour party gained 18 members, and all other sections of the Commonwealth were entirely omitted.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): Why not quote the last South Australian elections?

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: I am not aware that the late South Australian elections were held under a convention-made Constitution. I am confining my remarks entirely to the matters raised in that connection. There are many matters that I would like to refer to but they have no reference to the amendment, and therefore I shall not touch on them. I shall support the amendment because I do not support any breach of the Constitution. We may be right, or we may be wrong, in our approval or disapproval of the Constitution, but we must be wrong if we disregard it. We may not believe in the terms of the Constitution, but we must abide by it, because it is the only means we have of insuring that the Executive and Parliament shall be the servants and not the masters of the people.

Hon. J. CORNELL (South): I will not preface my remarks like the two previous speakers, this being my first speech in the Chamber, by craving the indulgence of hon. members. A few hon. members are aware that I was not too generous in my indulgence when other members were speaking, but I feel quite confident that hon. members will be just if they are not generous. Now, I would like to say that Mr. Moss in his able, lengthy, and clever address—it obscured many points—charged the Labour party with making this a party chamber. I hold that in the evolution of Governments as we know them to-day and as we follow

them down through their various stages, any hon. member of this Chamber who thought that the time would never arrive when parties would not exist in the Legislative Council, has been mistaken. Responsible Government, as we know it to-day, and I do not hold with it in all its ramifications, or its mode of election in many instances, is Government by party right throughout the world.

Hon. F. Connor : Government by caucus.

Hon. J. CORNELL : I will come to that later. It is only logical to assume that with the introduction of one party into a popular Chamber, when certain measures are brought forward and dealt with on party lines, that I, who have been all my life a member of that party, and am their representative in this Chamber, must of necessity view legislation through the same glasses as my colleagues in the Lower House, and I think it would be just as feasible, and just as logical to try to draw two kinds of ale out of one bottle, as to sit here and view legislation not from a party point of view. A lot has been said regarding misrepresentation at the last elections. I think hon. members will bear with me when I say that an election contest is really not an indicator of the people's true opinion at all times, and invariably the good goes to the bottom and the froth rises to the top. I will admit that there are things said not only by our party, but by other parties who are politically opposed to us, which would be better left unsaid. Unfortunately, too, the organs which convey the utterances of men on the hustings at election time do not always convey them in the manner in which they were given, and the Press of our country is, to a large extent, the school master and the lead which the people generally follow. I have just emerged from a political campaign and I put my position fairly and squarely to the electors, yet I will say that in that campaign the gentleman whom I defeated is just as good a friend of mine to-day as he was before we entered upon that campaign. He fought from the non-party standpoint, and I fought from the standpoint of the Labour party, with which I

have been connected all my life, and it would be just as well for hon. members to erase out of their minds the wrong impressions created by their opponents as to bear them in mind after the elections. One question hon. members have touched upon which, I take it, is one of paramount importance. We are twitted with desiring the reform of this Legislative Council with a view to its abolition. On the hustings I did not hide my light behind a bushel, and I would vote to-morrow for the abolition of the Legislative Council. I said that on the hustings and I intend when the opportunity offers to keep my word.

Hon. F. Connor : Do not worry.

Hon. J. CORNELL : I will not. It is not out of any animosity to hon. members of the Chamber, or to the framers of the Constitution, that I adopt that attitude. I say that there can be no democratic form of Government truly representative of the people unless legislators are returned by the votes of the whole people. That is the reason why I believe in the abolition of the Legislative Council. Were I to be of the opinion of some who say that the franchise of the Legislative Council should be the same as the franchise of the Legislative Assembly, I would be taking up a ridiculous attitude, for this reason, that immediately we have two Chambers elected on the one basis, it is just like putting a thief to catch a thief, if I may use the expression.

Hon. W. Patrick : Then you must be in favour of abolishing the Commonwealth Senate?

Hon. J. CORNELL : I agree with the hon. member for the Central Province that the present Constitution of the Commonwealth is undemocratic in all its ramifications, for the reason that the majority does not rule. Take the matter of a referendum of the people. It is quite possible for a majority of the people to be of opinion say, for instance, that the Federal Constitution should be amended, and for a minority to prevent them from doing it, because the referendum has to be agreed to by a majority of the people and a majority of the States. But though I agree that the Federal Con-

stitution is not democratic, it has something in it which our present State Constitution has not. It provides for an amendment of the Constitution per medium of the people, and though it is necessary to get a majority of the States and a majority of the electors, yet every adult over the age of 21 has the right to vote. Immediately you try to reform our State Constitution, however, you are in difficulties. To amend the Constitution of Western Australia we have to pass a Bill through both Houses, and that Bill has to have an absolute majority of both Houses. It goes through one House elected on the popular franchise, and it goes to the other elected on a property qualification, and whatever shortcomings may be contained in the Federal Constitution, it has that to recommend it over our State Constitution, that the voting qualification for every man and woman over the age of 21 is alike. That is something we do not possess here. The time is fast coming when this Constitution of ours must of necessity be moulded in the direction of making it workable to the wishes of the people. Before touching on other matters of more general interest, I wish to say that I intend to vote against the amendment. I am perfectly prepared to accept the statement of the honourable the Minister. Mr. Moss, in moving this amendment, said that certain privileges of this Chamber had been flouted, and he desired to move the amendment as a protest against a recurrence of such a procedure. It has been asserted that the Legislative Council ought to preserve its dignity, Mr. Moss having said that it had been assailed; then, to be logical the House ought to vote not only for the amendment, but against the Appropriation Bill when it comes forward, or else all the amendment will amount to will be a pious resolution and nothing else. I have never been a partisan through my walk in life. I have always attempted to be a pious man at any price. If a thing is good enough to bring forward in a pious manner, I consider it is good enough to bring it to a conclusion. A good deal has been said in this Chamber against conciliation and arbitration, and

against trades unionists generally. Mr. Sanderson does not believe in arbitration; Mr. Moss believes in a certain form of it. I have seen a good deal of industrial warfare and have taken part in it. I do not believe that compulsory conciliation and arbitration is going to be the panacea for all economic evils, but I believe it is a great advantage over the old and barbaric method of the strike. I regret that Mr. Moss replied, when I interjected in reference to the appointment of a layman as judge of the Arbitration Court, that we wanted a man free from party bias and party restrictions. He thought a judge of the Supreme Court was the only man fitted for that position. but I agree with Mr. Sanderson, who took Mr. Moss to task; because in the same speech Mr. Moss saw fit to stigmatise Mr. Justice Higgins.

Hon. M. L. Moss (on a point of order): I made no observation with regard to Mr. Justice Higgins. In response to an interjection, I said that Mr. W. H. Irvine, a member of the Federal Parliament, had made a certain statement, and that another gentleman high in politics in New South Wales had described him as a "sentimental humbug." I expressed no opinion.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am prepared to take the hon. member's assurance. But I thought that when the hon. member spoke of such a high and eminent authority as Mr. W. H. Irvine he meant it as part of his own speech. However, I recognise that a layman is equally qualified with a judge in regard to ability and, probably, equity. In regard to the Federal Arbitration Court Mr. Dodd pointed out that there has never been a strike against any Federal award. Mr. Justice Higgins has recognised what I have recognised long ago, that any tribunal sitting in the Arbitration Court cannot for a moment say unto itself—"We are going to extend equity and good conscience to whole parties." It is an economic impossibility.

Hon. M. L. Moss: Then the court is to be one-sided?

Hon. J. CORNELL: It has to recognise which side demands the most equity. That is my candid opinion. There are

many men in Western Australia to-day, unfortunately, who think that the interest of the working man and that of the employer are identical, that there is community of interest between them; but it will not bear searching inquiry. There can be no community of interest between employer and employee.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Not with the agitator between them.

Hon. J. CORNELL: For instance if Mr. Cullen employs me, he has to take a portion of what I earn. It is my duty to endeavour to get as much as possible of what I earn, and it is Mr. Cullen's duty to get as much as he possibly can off me. Mr. Moss said that he did not object to unions because they had been the means of making the lot of the working man easy. I would like to ask Mr. Moss, was it the union that did it or was it the component parts of the union? It is ridiculous for any man to think that unionism, as we know it to-day, is going to be stationary, and that members of unions are going to say, "We have got a fair thing." It is ridiculous.

Hon. M. L. Moss: We are getting some inside knowledge now.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Unionism is just an organism the same as any other business venture. It is only natural—I do not know whether it is natural; it may be acquired—that if a band of men and women unite for their mutual protection and self-advancement, if they get something by doing that they are going to keep on doing it.

Hon. W. Patrick: What will become of the industry?

Hon. J. CORNELL: Some members have taken exception to the working men taking over the industry. That is what trades unionists desire, not only better recognition of hours of labour and rates of pay, but eventually they are after—

Hon. J. F. Cullen: The lot.

Hon. J. CORNELL: They are after the national ownership of the means of production.

Hon. M. L. Moss: You will have a lot of capital coming in for your industries.

Hon. J. CORNELL: What is capital?

Hon. M. L. Moss: Sovereigns.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I would like the hon. member to give a definition of capital. I have heard that sovereigns are capital, but I do not think any political economist says so.

Hon. M. L. Moss: You cannot get on without them.

Hon. J. CORNELL: How did the first man get on without them?

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Do you advocate a return to that stage?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I have been advocating it all my life.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: The simple life?

Hon. J. CORNELL: No; not the simple life. I know hon. members on the other side of the Chamber resent this.

Hon. M. J. Moss: No. The whole thing is amusing.

Hon. J. CORNELL: You have been making a big fuss about the purchase of steamers. I can assure hon. members, as a man who has worked all his life and come into contact with the working man, that working men and women are not endeavouring to bring about this state of affairs for their own self-aggrandisement or for gain. They are of opinion that they are on the track of ushering in a better social system than we have to-day. It is an honest ideal. There is less selfishness and more sacrifice on the part of the rank and file of the followers with whom I am proud to associate, than there is with the rank and file of the followers of members on the other side. Mr. Moss has said there are too many agitators. It is an old platitude. The only practical illustration I can give of an agitator is the mechanical process that I can show hon. members if they come to the Golden Mile. They use agitators on the mines.

Hon. M. L. Moss: They have two kinds now there.

The PRESIDENT: If the hon. member will allow the speaker to go on.

Hon. J. CORNELL: We can search the pages of history. There has never been one man who has come down through all its pages who has not been termed by the ruling class of the day as an agitator.

Hon. A. Sanderson: You are the ruling class.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I wish we were. I believe in individuality of thought. There is more individuality of thought and more encouragement for individuality of thought in our movement than in any other movement which exists in the world to-day. I say that in respect to men or women who through honest research are of opinion that the conditions of their fellow men can be improved, and who have the courage to express these opinions—and many men have suffered for it—we ought to find a little better name for them than the term "agitators." Posterity will recognise their merit, as it has recognised to-day the merit of many men previously denounced as agitators. I know men on the Golden Mile who have suffered, who have gained no kudos, who are not members of the Legislative Council as I am, but who nevertheless have done more to better the material lot and welfare of the working man than I have. These men have done it in their honest convictions, and not in any hope of material gain or advancement, and I will at all times raise my voice in protest against any reflection upon any individual who has endeavoured to do good for the community. During the course of his remarks yesterday Mr. Moss declared that trades unionists should be reasonable, that there should be no attempt on their part to coerce men's political opinion, that there should be no tyranny. I think more tyranny is exercised in one week by the employer class of the world towards the working man than the working man exercises over his fellow men in a lifetime. I am proud to say that I have never been identified with any other party than the one to which I am attached to-day. I have been more or less closely connected with many elections, and I can conscientiously say that never during the whole of my political experience have I asked a man to record his vote in favour of our party. As a party, we recognise that compulsion is no good, that immediately you compel a man or a woman to think your way, by that very act of compulsion you sink their individuality. We recognise that there is only one factor in social evolution, and that that factor is reason.

Hon. M. L. Moss: Did you ever hear a man called a blackleg during a strike?

Hon. J. CORNELL: Well, is he not one? I will get away from the tyranny of trades unions, and get down to the tyranny exercised in other unions. Take the medical profession: is there no tyranny exercised in the medical profession? Take the legal profession. At a trades union function in Kalgoorlie I myself heard an honourable gentleman who once occupied the position of Attorney General in this State say that he was a member of the closest corporation in the world, and that he was proud to be a member of it.

Hon. F. Connor: Two wrongs do not make a right.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I say that if hon. members who subscribe to unions on the other side of the House exercise certain functions in dealing with fellow members who have broken the articles of association, that we as workers have a perfect right to do the same. I pity the man or woman who is branded by the working man as a blackleg, for I recognise that very often they are the victims of circumstances; and a good deal of my sympathy goes out towards them, because that stigma goes with them all their lives. But I say that when in a trades union or any other organisation a decision is come to by the majority rule, and every component part has had an opportunity of expressing his opinion, then, as hon. members have said here to-day, we should abide by the majority rule and constitution.

Hon. F. Connor: Is no member of the Labour party made to vote against his opinions?

Hon. J. CORNELL: He has a right to make up his mind before he gets into the Labour cause. We are accused of many things. We are accused of caucus. What is caucus?

Hon. F. Connor: Minority rule.

Hon. J. CORNELL: What is the derivation of the name?

Hon. F. Connor: I do not know, but I know what the thing itself is.

Hon. J. CORNELL: At one period in the history of the United States of

America, as in Great Britain, it was almost a criminal offence to be a member of a union; because of this a certain number of caucuses met and deliberated, and that is where the word "caucus" is derived from. You will find it in the book written by Professor Mills. I ask hon. members has this amendment before the Chamber to-night emanated from the brain of one hon. member? Was it not deliberated prior to coming here, and a decision arrived at, and is that not caucus equally with the caucus of our own party? To my mind caucus is a chimera; it has been a fetish and a bogey whereby those at one time opposed to caucus used to hush their babies to sleep. It was so good a husher with them that eventually they applied it to themselves, and the Liberal party to-day meet in caucus just as do the Labour party. If you recognise political parties is it right that you should give your tactics to the other side? I say no. The question of caucus has been exploited long ago. It has been good enough for others to adopt, and they have followed in the footsteps of the initiators. There is one other matter I wish to refer to. Mr. Moss spoke yesterday of the large number of strikes all over Australia. He said it was a serious blot on arbitration, and asked what could be expected when the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth subscribed to strike funds, and the strikers themselves were given all kinds of privileges. I ask hon. members, do I by entering this Chamber sink those feelings and those principles for which I have worked for years past?

Hon. W. Kingsmill: No, you do not.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Yet you ask the Prime Minister to do it. I say more power to our Prime Minister.

Hon. W. Patrick: I thought you said the strike was a barbarous method.

Hon. J. CORNELL: What strike funds did the Prime Minister subscribe to?

Hon. F. Connor: Brisbane.

Hon. J. CORNELL: That was not a strike at all; it was a rebellion. The Brisbane fiasco was no strike. A certain individual said to the workmen that they would not be allowed to wear the trades union badge. They said they would wear it, and he locked them out.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: He would not go to arbitration.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Under the Federal Arbitration Act it is not possible to go to arbitration in one State until the dispute has extended over the boundaries to another State. They got there after all, it is true, but therein comes the tyranny that they exercised. It is deplorable, of course. But the employer can exercise tyranny and can say, "you will wear what I tell you to." It might be a goatee, or it might be that their hair should be parted in the centre, but the employees cannot say "no." The men in Brisbane had a perfect right as citizens of the Commonwealth to wear their badge of office, just as the hon. the President has to wear his.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: It was the Brisbane general strike that Mr. Fisher subscribed to, not the tramway strike.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am leading up to that. It was not a matter of wages or of hours, not a matter of abstract principle. The manager of the company said, "You cannot do a certain thing."

Hon. R. J. Lynn: The case was stated in Victoria.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Could not Mr. Badger have allowed the men to wear the badge and awaited the decision of the court? Whether or not the Brisbane men acted rightly in a general strike was for them to say.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: You admit now that it was a strike.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Not on the part of the tramway men.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: It was a strike that Mr. Fisher subscribed to. You said there was no strike.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am coming to that. The men were asked to cease work by way of protest, and they did so. Now the first thing we have to consider is the object they were endeavouring to achieve. Was it worth fighting for? I am glad to say that the Prime Minister agreed that the principle the men were fighting for was a good one, and he not only had the courage to think so, but he had the courage to say so, and the manliness, when he had the money, to help them.

Hon. M. L. Moss: And he refused to send a force to preserve law and order.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Yes, and the Government authorities of Queensland refused to give the strikers police protection to save them from assaults. There are always two sides to a story. It is the first time in the history of Australian politics or Governments, in which we have had a Prime Minister or a Minister of the Crown who had the courage of his convictions to say there was no necessity for sending out a military force. Now I ask members in their sane and calmer moments whether there was any necessity for calling out the military.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: Why, they prevented the necessities of life being taken to the public hospitals.

Hon. M. L. Moss: Unless they had a pass.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Were the military needed for that? The Constitution of Queensland gives them power to make enough special constables to enforce their laws. Why did not they do that?

Hon. M. L. Moss: They did.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Why did they ask for the troops?

Hon. M. L. Moss: Remember it was the Premier who asked for the troops, to keep his country in law and order.

The PRESIDENT: I must have order. This is not in Committee and it is not fair to a new member.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I wish to defend the Prime Minister in the attitude he took up. I agree with Mr. Colebatch on the question of education. The Government are to be highly commended for the attitude they have adopted in regard to secondary education. The greatness of any nation can only be measured by the intelligence of the units that go to compose it. With regard to taxation, the people of the State should not quibble where public education is concerned. There is another matter I would have liked to refer to, and I am sorry the Hon. Mr. Sanderson has gone. It is the question of immigration. There is a mournful wail throughout the Liberal party of Australia that the Labour party will not carry

out the Liberal party's ideas of immigration. In the course of his remarks yesterday Mr. Moss referred to the prosperity of America as a result of immigration. I hope the same thing will never occur with regard to sunny Australia, and that we shall never reach the stage that America has reached. Statistics show that over 15 millions of people, out of a population of 90 millions, are practically starving, and yet immigrants are flowing into the country every year. Then on the other hand, we turn to Great Britain, with her population of 46 millions, and what do we find? That 20 odd millions of her people are on the verge of starvation.

Hon. W. Patrick: Rubbish!

Hon. J. CORNELL: It is not rubbish. I refer you to Mulhall.

Hon. W. Patrick: That is out of date.

Hon. J. CORNELL: You will find it in any eminent authority.

Hon. W. Patrick: That is absolute rubbish.

Hon. J. CORNELL: It is not. You have one lot of people leaving one country on account of starvation and going to another country to starvation. I venture to say that any Parliament which assists persons to come from abroad with the finances of the State while there are others starving in the country—

Hon. F. Connor: How are we going to fight the Japanese?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I have yet to learn that the Japanese have any intent with regard to Australia.

Hon. F. Connor: You say that people are starving in America and Great Britain.

Hon. J. CORNELL: There is not one country in the world where people are not starving, and before any Government induces needy people to come to a country like this, they should ensure that they will be able to earn a decent livelihood and get enough to eat. Even where I come from—one of the great mining centres—you can find men who are willing to work and who cannot obtain employment. These men have stomachs and they have wives, and they need food, and, while I am in this House, I hope that no vote will be recorded by me which will have the

effect of bringing out needy people at the expense of the State. I favour making this a white man's country, and a country which will be attractive to citizens from other parts of the world to come to. If we make it attractive people will come and settle here without State assistance.

Hon. F. Connor: Are not English people our kith and kin?

Hon. J. CORNELL: Yes. I have no objection to them coming here if they pay their way, but, as a tax-payer, I am not going to bring them here while men in our own State are hungry and on the labour market.

The PRESIDENT: If the hon. member addresses the Chair he will not be drawn into conversation with other members.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Very well. There is a matter of railway construction. Mr. Moss, in speaking to the amendment yesterday, said he agreed with the necessity for the construction of railways for the opening up of the country, and understood that they could be built in Western Australia cheaper than a main road could be built in other parts of Australia. On an interjection he admitted that he was not a convert to the Esperance line. I would like to say, with regard to the proposals contained in the Governor's Speech, I do not know whether a line is necessary or whether the resources of that district justify a railway, but I would be willing to be guided by the opinions of the responsible Minister who introduces the Bill, and I will endeavour to facilitate legislation in the matter of railways. By the time the Esperance Bill comes before the House, I hope the hon. member will have changed his opinion, and will exercise towards that line some of the consideration that is being shown towards other lines in other parts of the State. In concluding, I would like to refer to one or two remarks made by Mr. Colebatch on the subject of workers' homes. When the hon. member started out I admit I misjudged him. He led me to understand that he believed in them, but half-way through his remarks I concluded that he did not. He drew a glorious picture regarding a plan issued

with a pamphlet, and said there was no room for the baby. There are always two sides to a question. If the hon. member likes to go to Kalgoorlie, he will see in some instances that there is no room for the husband let alone the baby. I say the Workers Homes Act is a just one. It is an endeavour to provide men with that which all men and women are entitled to, namely, a home. I believe in the leasehold system. To a great extent it does not concern me much. What concerns me is that once a man gets a home, no fault of his own and no stress of circumstances should compel him to part with it. That is one of the reasons why I believe in leasehold. I believe it is the intention of the Government to make the leasehold such that no creditor can dis-train upon it. I think it is ridiculous to a degree to talk about there being no room for the baby. I have been informed that so far no special plan has been agreed upon.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: It is on this pamphlet.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Yes, but the hon. member might have seen that on a patent medicine bottle.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: People who have children will not apply under leasehold.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I have one child, and I am going to apply. I venture to say that a three or four-roomed house is ample for a man and his wife and two children.

Hon. F. Connor: What! Will you limit them to two children?

Hon. J. CORNELL: Oh, no.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: This is only a three-roomed house.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The hon. member's assumption seems to be that the workers' homes are to remain like the constitution, and never to be improved or added to. I venture to say that if a man wants a house of ten rooms and is willing to pay for it and can put up the necessary security, he will be able to get it. I will now refer to another remark made by Mr. Colebatch—the Prime Minister's proposal to give bonuses to mothers. I think that proposal is to be commended.

I regret to a great extent that Australia is in need of State assistance in the matter of motherhood. It does not say much for our conditions, but there is one pleasing feature of the Federal Government's proposal, and it is that there is nothing in the nature of a stigma attached to it, that the highest lady in the land can apply for the £5, and get it. It is an endowment given as a right, and I hope also, that our own Government will take into consideration this question. In conclusion, I would like to refer briefly to the convention. Mr. Colebatch has made a lengthy reference to conventions and constitutions by conventions. I say that if the convention meets and frames a constitution, and does anything that is not right, will the blame be due to the principle of the convention or the component parts of the convention?

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: How would you elect the convention?

Hon. J. CORNELL: If I had my way, I would elect it on the proportional representation of the State voting as a whole at an election.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: Is that the Government proposal?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I cannot say; they have not let me into the secret. By doing what I have suggested you would get what proportional representation aims at; you get one vote, one value, and you provide the machinery for the representation of minorities. When this Bill comes before the House, I hope that it will meet with the consideration which it deserves. I think the time has arrived when the Constitution of Western Australia must of necessity be remodelled, and to remodel it, I take it every privilege should be given to every individual unit in the State. That is the only way you can have a say in it. In that Convention Bill will be contained two planks in the fighting platform of the Labour party. Effective reform of the Legislative Council, with a view to its ultimate abolition, and initiative, referendum and recall. I think any hon. member who has given consideration to the evolution of Governments in the various countries of the world must, of necessity, arrive at the conclusion that the only

logical stage in the evolution of self-government is the initiative, referendum, and recall.

Hon. R. D. McKenzie: Is the Bill already drafted?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am pre-supposing that it will be; I do not know whether members are aware of it, but I am aware of this, that the people of this State are fully alive to the need for the reform and remodelling of the Constitution, and the last elections in connection with the Legislative Council cannot be taken as an indication of the true feeling of the people.

Hon. F. Connor: That is a poor compliment to yourself.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I say I am not a representative of the people of the South Province; I only represent a certain section of them. My aim and object when this Convention Bill comes along will be to remove that anomaly, and if I am again returned I hope it will be as their representative with a direct mandate from the whole of the people in the province. As it is, the South Province contains five Labour constituencies returning Labour men, and the South Province returned me as a Labour man, but only a section of the South Province. I think the electors of that province run into the vicinity of 16,000 or 17,000 people, and the roll which returned me contains some 3,200 odd names. I may be here by accident, but whether I am here by accident or by design, or by the choice of the majority of the electors, that does not alter my opinion, that I must represent the whole of the people. My aim in this House will be to review legislation in the interests of the whole of the people, and not from the point of view of a few. In conclusion, I thank you, Mr. President, and the members for the hearing which has been given to me. I may be a little raw, but I suppose as time goes on I may become more polished, but I do say that if I become more polished in my utterances, I hope I will never be against the principles I have fought for. I say that members may disagree with me, but I will

at all times hit hard and ask for no quarter, and it will stop in this Chamber and not go outside.

On motion by Hon. F. Connor, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.23 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 4th July, 1912.

	Page
Question: Fruit industry	122
Formal motions	122
Motion: Fremantle Council accounts	122
Papers: Petition of John Maher	122
Paper presented	123
The No-Confidence debate, proposed second amendment abandoned	123
The Mace	123
Address-in-reply, third day, amendment of No-Confidence, point of order, debate	123

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

QUESTION—FRUIT INDUSTRY.

Mr. TURVEY asked the Minister for Lands: 1, Is it the intention of the Government to provide open markets in the metropolitan area for coping with next season's fruit supply? 2, Will ample cold storage accommodation be provided in connection with the open markets? 3, What action, if any, does the Government intend to take to exercise a greater control over the export of fruit during next season? 4, In view of the Agent General's favourable report upon our local timber for fruit cases, will the Minister equip a small plant in connection with the State sawmill, for the manufacture of fruit cases locally?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1 and 2, The Government intends to establish markets, and in connection with these, refrigerating works will be erected to replace the present works

which are included in the railway resumption. 3, This matter is receiving consideration. 4, The Minister concerned will, no doubt, keep in view this outlet for the use of timber.

MOTION — FREMANTLE COUNCIL ACCOUNTS.

On motion by Mr. CARPENTER, ordered: "That all papers in connection with the recent special audit of the accounts of the Fremantle Municipal Council be laid upon the Table."

PAPERS—PETITION OF JOHN MAHER.

On motion by Mr. DWYER ordered: "That all papers in connection with the application and petition of John Maher, contractor, for compensation in reference to the erection by him of public buildings in Cathedral-avenue, be laid upon the Table."

QUESTION—FORMAL MOTIONS.

Mr. MONGER: If I am not trespassing, may I ask whether the motions, notices of which I have just given, will be treated by the Government as formal, and placed in such a position on the Notice Paper that they will be dealt with speedily?

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member obtained the consent of the Ministers concerned to that course?

Mr. MONGER: I submitted these motions the other afternoon in the form of questions and I was asked to present them in the shape of motions. I now desire to know whether they will be treated by the Government as formal.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may have them treated as formal if he obtains the consent of the Ministers concerned.

Mr. MONGER: With all due respect, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot allow a discussion on the matter at this stage: I have given the hon. member my ruling in respect to the matter and I hope he will be satisfied.