

# Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 16th July, 1912.

	PAGE
Obituary: Hon. F. H. Piesse, Letter in reply ...	405
Papers presented	405
Motion: Railway deviation, Wongan Hills-Mullewa, to enquire ...	405
Bill: Inter-State Destitute Persons Relief, &c. ...	406
Address-in-reply, 8 venth day, amendment ...	406

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

## OBITUARY—HON. F. H. PIESSE, C.M.G., LETTER IN REPLY.

The PRESIDENT: I have received the following reply to the letter of condolence which I sent to Mrs. Piesse:—

Kobeelya, Katanning, July 13th, 1912.

The Hon. the President, Legislative Council, Perth.

Dear Sir,—I gratefully acknowledge your kind letter conveying the resolution of condolence in our recent sorrow, as passed by your Honourable House. May I ask you, dear sir, to express to the honourable members of the Legislative Council the deep appreciation and thanks of myself and family for the generous sympathy they have shown. Their mark of respect for a good husband and kind father will always be cherished by us all. With sincere thanks to yourself also, I remain, yours sincerely, Mary J. Piesse.

## PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: 1, Amendment of by-laws of the Goldfields Water Supply Administration; 2, Papers relating to claim by Mr. Ernest Mead for compensation for damage caused by fire at Brunswick Junction (ordered on motion by Hon. M. L. Moss).

## MOTION—RAILWAY DEVIATION, WONGAN HILLS-MULLEWA, TO INQUIRE.

*Standing Orders Suspension.*

Hon. C. SOMMERS (Metropolitan): I desire to move without notice—

*That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended to enable me to move*

*the following motion:—"That a Select Committee of five hon. members of this House be appointed to inquire into the reasons for the deviation of the Wongan Hills-Mullewa Railway authorised to be constructed by Act No. 16, 1911, with power to send for persons, papers, and records, and to report thereon, and on the line generally, to this honourable House on Tuesday, 6th August, 1912."*

Is it necessary to give reasons at this stage?

The PRESIDENT: I have heard the reasons for urgency, and I am satisfied, but I think the hon. member might state the reasons briefly.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: The reason for bringing the motion forward at this stage as a matter of urgency is that I understand from the leader of the House that there is a possibility of the House at its rising to-night adjourning for a fortnight. If the committee are appointed to-day they will have an opportunity of taking evidence and viewing the deviation in the interval. I think it is a matter of urgency, because a quantity of material is on the ground and a number of men are ready to commence work, and if the deviation is not to take place it is desirable in the interests of the settlers that no loss of time should occur on account of this inquiry.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY (East): I second the motion.

Question put and passed.

The PRESIDENT: I declare that the motion has been passed by an absolute majority of the Council.

*Select Committee appointed.*

Hon. C. SOMMERS: I now move—

*That a select committee consisting of the Hons. T. H. Wilding, J. E. Dodd, R. J. Lynn, H. P. Colebatch, and E. M. Clarke be appointed to enquire into the reasons for the deviation of the Wongan Hills-Mullewa Railway, with power to send for persons, papers, and records, and to report thereon and on the line generally to this honourable House on Tuesday, 6th August, 1912.*

Some eighteen months ago the line was surveyed to hug the eastern slope of the Wongan Hills. Originally there was a battle of route as to whether the line should go east or west of the Wongan Hills range, and as there were believed to be difficulties in connection with carrying the line to the west, a compromise was arrived at that the line should hug the hills on the eastern side. Mr. Daglish, the then Minister for Works, stated in another place that the line would hug the eastern slope of the hills as closely as practicable in order to enable settlers to the west to be as near as possible to the line. I may explain that the Wongan Hills are a steep and rugged range that can only be crossed at two places; one place is called the Gap, which is six or seven miles south of the northern end of the hills, and the other means is by going round the hills at the north end.

The PRESIDENT: I do not want to check the hon. member, but I think all this information might be given in the report of the select committee.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: I only wish to satisfy the House as to the necessity for this committee, but if the House is satisfied, I have no desire to go further into the matter at this stage.

Question put and passed.

#### BILL—INTER-STATE DESTITUTE PERSONS RELIEF.

Introduced by the Colonial Secretary and read a first time.

#### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

##### *Seventh Day—Amendment.*

Debate resumed from the 11th July 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 Minister's without an Act of appropriation, such procedure being derogatory to the privileges of Parliament and subver-

sive 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.' "

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE (North-East): As one of the representatives of the gold-fields in this House, may I be allowed to preface my remarks on the question before us by congratulating the State generally and the residents of the agricultural districts more particularly on the beneficent rains that we have had during the past two or three weeks. Things from an agricultural point of view were beginning to look very gloomy and we know that when agricultural interests are affected it is going to affect the interests of the State as a whole. One cannot help thinking what a lot Nature can do by distributing a copious rainfall over the State and what a little Parliament can do in comparison with what Nature can do for an industry such as agriculture. May I also express the wish that, considering the bounteous rains we have had, we will have a plentiful harvest, and that all those people who have gone on the land and taken to the agricultural industry will reap that reward they so richly deserve. I also offer my congratulations to those members of the Chamber who have been re-elected or have been returned unopposed to this House again. I regret the absence of many old friends from the Chamber. Some of them have left the State; some have decided to go out of politics; some unfortunately have also left this earthly abode. I think I may safely say that during the whole of the time I have been a member of this Chamber, some eight years now, there has been the utmost good feeling among the members of the House. Looking over the names of those members who were in the Chamber when I first joined, I find that there are at present only some twelve or thirteen left. As I was saying, during the whole time I have been in the House there has been the utmost good feeling among members, and in welcoming new members to the House may I express the

wish that the same good feeling that has pervaded the Chamber in the past will be followed up now we have so many new members amongst us. In addressing myself to the question before the House, may I say that it is a most unusual thing—I do not think it has happened before since I have been in the Chamber—that an amendment to the Address-in-reply should be moved. Therefore it is a serious matter and one to which members must give serious consideration before they vote. I regret that there is a necessity for an amendment to be moved on this occasion, but I think from the tenor of the debate so far it will be agreed by members that there is a necessity for it, and I fully expect to see the amendment carried. The franchise for this Chamber is probably the most liberal franchise in connection with an Upper House in Australia—we are well in touch with the householders of the State, as the £17 franchise practically allows every householder in the State to be entitled to be on the roll—and the legislation passed by this Chamber and put on the statute-book has been fairly liberal, I think as liberal as has been put on the various statute-books of other parts of Australia, showing that the House has assisted in putting liberal legislation on the statute-book. The recent elections also would show that the Chamber possesses the confidence of the electors for the Upper House, as most members who were seeking the confidence of their constituents again were returned, and in some instances by very large majorities indeed. It was only on the goldfields where there was any want of confidence shown in the Upper House during the last election. Now, one asks one's self the question—why should the present Government seek to ignore this Chamber? The Constitution of Western Australia provides for the bi-cameral system of legislation. One Chamber is meant to be a House of review, its functions being rather of a judicial than of an initiatory character. The fact of this Chamber being in existence to act as a House of review has had a very wholesome effect on the legislation of the State. I do not care what party is in power, or what

party is dominant in another place, this Chamber has a very wholesome effect on the legislation brought forward. It has on many occasions been able to check what may be termed hasty legislation, and in many instances it has been useful in revising the legislation sent to us from another place. It has been said that to the President and the Chairman of Committees and also the leader of the House members generally look to have the rights and privileges of the House conserved and the Constitution upheld, but there are times when even the President and the Chairman of Committees cannot look after the interests of the Chamber. In such circumstances we look more particularly to the leader of the House who sits in Cabinet and has powers no other member of the House possesses; but if he fails to look after our rights and privileges, then, in that extremity, members themselves must look after their own interests; and I can assure you, Mr. President, that members of the House will jealously guard their rights and privileges. It has been said during the course of this debate that this is a party House. I deny this entirely. With the exception that we have six members who call themselves Laborites or Socialists, all the members of the House are pledged to do the best they can for the State as a whole. They come here free and untrammelled; they do not come here to vote at the dictates of any caucus. Caucus has decided on the abolition of this Chamber. Whether it be a right or a wrong policy, the six members I have referred to have come here pledged to obey that caucus and pledged to abolish this House at the first opportunity. In fact they have but one object in coming here. How can these six members honestly engage in the duties of revising legislation propounded by the dominant party in another Chamber? They come here bound hand and foot to vote according to the dictates of caucus. Mr. Cornell in his speech admitted that it was an impossibility for a member of the Labour party to come to this House and vote against any legislation that is put through by the dominant party in another place.

Hon. B. C. O'Brien: They simply follow their platform.

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE: They come here bound hand and foot.

Hon. B. C. O'Brien: You know their platform.

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE: They come here bound hand and foot to vote according to the dictates of caucus.

Hon. F. Connor: Their tongues are not bound.

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE: No; but when it comes to voting we find they are always on the one side. I believe Mr. Cornell honestly believes in the opinions he expressed. Therefore I claim that there are only six members of the House who can be termed to belong to a party; and if the House is to be termed a party House, the responsibility must lie with the six members returned by the Socialistic party.

Hon. B. C. O'Brien: The House has recently shown it is very much a party House.

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE: The existence of this House is probably responsible for the present Administration having an opportunity to carry out the many promises made on the hustings during the elections that took place towards the end of last year. The Government in existence at that time, that is the Wilson Government, were accused, among other sins of omission and commission, of having increased the cost of living and the cost of the necessities of life. On the other hand the Socialistic party went round and said not only that if they got into power they would be pledged to reduce the cost of living, but also that they would do it; and the electors of Western Australia, secure in the knowledge that there was an Upper House, elected to give the Socialistic party the opportunity for carrying their platform promises into effect; the electors, secure in the knowledge that any legislation of a reactionary nature, or likely to do any great amount of damage to the State and its interests, would be checked or revised by this House, gave the present party the opportunity to get on the Treasury bench and show the people of the State whether they were able to

carry out the promises that they made on the hustings. One of the first things I thought the Labour party would do when they got on to the Treasury bench, and when they gained power, was to use their influence with the Federal Government and point out the necessity for a revision of the tariff. We all know, from statistics recently issued, that during the past year fourteen millions of money was collected by the Customs from the four million odd people in Australia. This is an enormous amount to extract from the pockets of the people, and nobody knows better than those who in this Chamber represent the worker that the tariff which we have built around us in Australia is responsible, to a large extent indeed, for the high cost of living. Take such items as necessarily enter into the calculations of every working man, namely, jams, tinned fruits, tinned milk, boots and shoes, clothing of all descriptions, building material, and many other items; all these carry a tremendously high tariff. The duty collected on them is put on the invoiced cost of the goods by the merchant, and by the time they are retailed to the consumer this makes a very considerable difference indeed in their cost. But we do not find that the dominating party in Western Australia have approached their friends on the Commonwealth Treasury benches with a view to trying to secure a reduction in the cost of living, per medium of the tariff; on the other hand, we find them prepared to rush, in an unconstitutional way, into an industry of which they have no experience. They have rushed into this, and it means the expenditure of enormous sums, while at the very best it can only be an experiment. Anyone who listened to the remarks of Mr. Connor in his able address two or three evenings ago could not but be convinced that the Government have entered into a project that will spell disaster. It was clearly pointed out to us that the high cost of meat cannot be ascribed to the price the cattle bring in the North-West, or to the charges incurred in bringing them down in the steamers; because the average wholesale price of meat in Perth was shown to be 2½d. per lb. Clearly the reason for the

high cost of this item of living must be looked for elsewhere than in either the price charged by the grower or for the bringing of the stock down to the port. Right here I want to say very distinctly that I am going to support this Government or any other Government who may be trying honestly to effect a reduction in the cost of living, that is to say, honestly and constitutionally. I want to see the purchasing power of the sovereign increased. It is not so much the question of seeing wages raised as of seeing the purchasing power of the sovereign increased. So far, we have not been taken into the confidence of the Government, for they have not laid before us their complete scheme. We see by the newspapers that the Government have taken an option over the Swan Meat Company's butchering establishment. Whether or not this be true I cannot say, but it would have been more honest in the Government had they told us their intentions, even though it were that they proposed to start at A and keep on to Z in their efforts to reduce the price of meat. If there be rings and monopolies—of which I am a strong opponent—in Western Australia, every member of the House will readily assist the Government to break down those monopolies and rings. My friend Mr. Sanderson said that State socialism was a bad policy from start to end, and he also declared that he would not assist private enterprise. I cannot agree with Mr. Sanderson in those views; because, apart from the State-ownership of the railways, tramways, water supplies, post office, telephones, telegraphs, and last but not least, State batteries, there are many instances in which the State is justified in launching out into an industry. I believe the Government would have been on far safer grounds if they had gone into the timber industry before they went into the meat industry. Last year, I think it was, in this Chamber Mr. Moss made an admirable speech in which he pointed out the way in which timber concessions were being abused. He told us, I think, that 300,000 acres of timber were held by one corporation, and that most of the concessions were dummed, to evade the conditions attached to

the licenses. He said that each area held by this corporation should have a substantial and fully-equipped mill and plant, and that in respect to other Crown leases, such as gold mining and mineral, labour conditions are provided, and, in default of these conditions being complied with, summary forfeiture follows. I say the Government would have been much safer in going into this timber industry first. I understand they intend to do so later on, but they should have done it straight away, for in this instance they own the raw material, and a special asset it is. The previous Administration decided, some time ago, because of the high price of scantling and railway timber, to start a mill in the interest of the Railway Department. That mill was duly started by the Wilson Government, and has been a pronounced success, the timber being supplied to the department at an infinitely less cost than it would have been through private individuals. If the Government go into this industry they will certainly have my support, and, so long as they can get Parliamentary authority for the necessary expenditure, I am sure it will be a good thing for the State. Again referring to the remarks made by Mr. Sanderson, I contend the State is sometimes justified in assisting private enterprise. We have had an instance of this in respect to the Collie coal industry. I am told that had it not been for the support given to that industry by the Railway Department the industry must have died. Again, I believe we would be justified in assisting private enterprise in the export of the various agricultural products, such as flour. There are certainly times when it does not do to stick to hard and fast lines. No business has been successfully built up, the proprietor of which started in a small way and laid down certain rules from which he was determined not to deviate; rather have all successful businesses been built up on a system of allowing a little latitude one way and another, and I say the same principle will be found to apply to the State. In the Speech very little mention is made of the mining industry; it was passed over with the good old platitudes that the Government were

imbued with the necessity of encouraging the industry. Only a few days ago the report of the Mines Department was laid on the Table, and I may say it is not pleasant reading to a man who has the whole of his interests on the goldfields. It shows that the gold production has dropped away, year by year, and that the number of men employed in the industry is falling away also. One has only to travel about the mining districts to find towns almost deserted, and to see that the industry is in a bad way indeed. Although, perhaps, the gold mining industry did not altogether build up Western Australia, yet it helped to do this, to a very great extent. The industry in Western Australia produced to the end of 1911 no less a sum than £103,850,487 and paid £22,177,659 in dividends, while it employs, at the present time, no fewer than 16,596 men. If you refer to statistics you will find that one man employed in the gold mining industry will carry at least five others of the population on his back. This means that at least one-third of the population of Western Australia owes its existence even at the present time to the great gold mining industry. The Minister for Mines, the Hon. P. Collier, speaking at Coolgardie some time since, admitted that fact, namely, that one-third of the population were being supported by the gold mining industry. An industry of this nature, to which the State undoubtedly owes a great measure of its prosperity, and to which all the members of the present Government owe their political existence—for this industry to be passed over in the Speech with the statement that Ministers are imbued with the necessity of giving it further assistance is, in my opinion, a very sorry way of treating it. The Government have been nine months in office.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh: The last Government were six years in office, and did nothing.

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE: I will come to that presently. The Government have been nine months in office. They went up and down the length and breadth of the State, before the elections, declaring what they were going to do. Among other

things, they asserted they were going to galvanise life in the mining industry. I cannot learn that they have done anything new at all to assist the industry. Mr. Ardagh says the previous Administration was in power for six years. They were, and they did a lot for the industry during those six years. They built the following mining railways:—Mount Magnet to Sandstone, Coolgardie to Norseman, Marble Bar, Meekatharra, Ravensthorpe, and Bullfinch. They constructed water supplies all over the State; they cut tracks through unexplored country, and put dams and tanks at short stages along those tracks, in order that the prospector might get out into the back country. They kept an equipment of camels, tools, carts, and drays, which they were always ready to lend out to prospectors; they made advances for deep-sinking; advances against machinery: they increased the geological staff to its present strength of 13 or 14; they appointed a petrologist, and they put down bores by diamond drills and by manual plants. They were largely responsible for the existence of the State batteries: we have, at present, 33 of these batteries in operation, and from the inception of the system to the end of 1911 these batteries recovered by amalgamation £3,146,990, and by cyanidation £429,000, or a total of £3,576,264. These batteries have cost £290,732, of which £198,751 was provided from loan funds and £91,981 was provided from revenue. The previous Administration were not afraid to take money out of loan funds to help this great industry along. They did not insist on these batteries paying working expenses, because I think that up to December, 1911, the expenditure exceeded receipts to the extent of £28,870. There has been an average for some years of £50,000 yearly spent by the Government in assisting and developing the mining industry. I can only say I hope the present Administration will follow in the footsteps of their predecessors with regard to the way they have treated the mining industry. So far as I can see, nothing new has been done. They have followed to a certain extent timidly along the lines laid down by their predecessors. I give them credit that they have reduced the cost of

water to the low-grade propositions in Kalgoorlie. That will probably mean the employment of a number of men, and I would not be doing my duty if I did not give the Government credit for that. I further admit it is difficult to know what to do in the shape of assistance which may be termed new for the mining industry. The Federal Government are certainly not assisting us. The Labour party are the dominant party there, and they are increasing the cost of living. I am told they intend to increase taxation through the Customs House. If the cost of living increases, then of necessity the wages of workers must increase in proportion, and if this is so, the mining industry has arrived now at about almost the breaking point. If we raise the cost of gold production, then in the near future I fear that many more of the mines will be closing down, and that will not be in the best interests of the State. The present administration, as well as all other legislators in Australia, should be anxious to find some method by which they can encourage the industry. I admit it is a most difficult matter. It is a problem which was up against the past administration, and I have no doubt it is against the present administration. In the first place, as I have stated in this House before, and I state it again, the prospector is the backbone of the mining industry in its last resort. The prospector must therefore be assisted, and assisted by every possible legitimate means in our power. If he does not go out in the wilds and into the auriferous country, we shall have no mines to take the place of those which are gradually being depleted now. After we have taken steps to get the prospector out, we want capital to develop the industry. The other night Mr. Moss said sovereigns were capital. We cannot develop the mining industry without sovereigns. It takes a good many sovereigns to equip a mine, and until we have equipped a mine we cannot expect to get gold out of it. In addition to assisting the prospector, and this is one of the principle things to be done, we must encourage capital to come here. We certainly must show that ~~we ourselves~~ we have faith

in the industry. The present administration should follow in the footsteps of their predecessors. They should not be afraid to build more mining railways. I would suggest the extension of the line to Marvel Loch, Parker's Range, Lawlers, Mt. Sir Samuel, and Wiluna, Mt. Jackson, and in the immediate future to Ora Banda. I think no Government can do wrong by connecting these districts with the present railway system of Western Australia. It would cheapen the cost of working the mines, and it would give them cheaper supplies of firewood. It would show that this State at least has faith in the gold mining industry, and that would be an encouragement for those who have money to invest it in the mining industry. We should encourage immigration in the interests of mining. We should not adopt a "dog in the manger" policy and say that we are going to keep Western Australia for the Western Australians, or that we do not want suitable population to come in and work our agricultural and mining industries. We must encourage immigration if we expect the mining industry to go ahead. Another thing which is militating against capital coming into the State is the uncertainty of the renewal of mining leases. It is something like twenty years since the first batch of leases were taken up on the Eastern Goldfields. The term of these leases is about to expire and no provision has yet been made for their renewal. This is a question which ought to be fixed up at the earliest possible moment. It is not fair to the companies that they should have to go on working their mines without knowing how they will be treated when the last day of their lease comes. Whether in renewing these leases we are going to extract a royalty or some other equitable means I do not know, and I do not say for a moment that they should get their leases on the same terms as before, but I do say that these leases should be fixed up, and where companies require renewals they should be granted on equitable terms with as little delay as possible. Another question which the Labour party seem to regard with suspicion is the question of

security of tenure. I say some equitable security of tenure should be given to induce capital to come here. The industry at its best is a most speculative one. It probably costs more sovereigns to get an ounce of gold than an ounce of gold is worth; consequently many people who put money into the industry do so without getting any adequate return. Again we should look to our company law, and see that the shareholders in the different mining companies are fairly treated. I think it was Mr. Connolly who gave us an instance of one mine at least, the shareholders of which had been treated very unfairly by directors sitting in London. We should have simultaneous reports, that is reports should be available to shareholders in Australia at the same time as they are made available to shareholders living in London or on the Continent. We should insist on legislation to give us one responsible director at least in every mining company who would reside here, and be responsible to the law for any mis-statements made in connection with his particular mine. We should have the right of official entry, examination and report with regard to every mine. These are some of the recommendations which were made by the Royal Commission, which sat some years ago, in connection with the Boulder Deep Levels scandal and the Perseverance scandal. Not even the worst enemies of Mr. Gregory or of the previous administration could say that that gentleman was not anxious to conserve the interests of miners working in our deep mines. I say, and Mr. Gregory agreed with me, that the lives of the men should be the first consideration of any administration. A Royal Commission on Miners' Diseases sat and presented their report and recommendations. Noxious fumes have been dealt with in an able manner by the Government Analyst; sanitary arrangements are being looked after; the explosives used are strictly supervised, and anything which will not pass is not allowed to go into consumption. I think from the few remarks I have made on this question that it will be obvious to the Minister

for Mines and the Government generally that the mining industry requires very careful consideration. If we are not going to allow it to go down lower than it is at present, some steps must be taken to ensure that the present out-put is maintained. Only yesterday word was received in Kalgoorlie that from an old abandoned goldfield at Kurnalpi, between 400 and 500 ounces were brought in, and a few days prior to that two prospectors came in with about 200 ounces. This shows the possibilities even of the old fields, which by some people are regarded as being worked out. Ora Banda is a very old goldfield. I think the Governor mentioned that it is one of our new goldfields. That only goes to show the ignorance of the Minister for Mines. Ora Banda is practically as old as Kalgoorlie. Mr. Gregory was giving special attention to it for years. Eight or perhaps more years ago, he lent money to the proprietors of the Ora Banda mine to enable them to sink a water shaft and put a pipe line down to convey water to the battery. During the past two or three years every effort has been made to assist the men who have been on the field to remain there. A subsidy was given to the people there to erect a condenser, so that the men would not have to go away, and during the drought of last year it was arranged that water should be supplied at 8s. per 100 gallons. There is a splendid cement concrete dam covered over for the benefit of the people living there. Again, there are large tanks which were built 16 or 18 years ago, one at Waverley and one at the 45-Mile. An interjection was made some days ago about Ora Banda to the effect that this field had been neglected. I emphatically deny that statement. Mr. Gregory was anxious to give people at Ora Banda a fair chance to prove what the field was worth and I am glad to say today that a company have taken on some of the leases and are proposing to work them on a large scale. I hope it will not be long before Ora Banda is connected by railway with Broad Arrow. There are one or two other remarks that I would like to make. One is with regard to education. I compliment the present administration on their desire to give increased



facilities for educating the young people of Western Australia. Although this is going to cost a great deal more money and although the education vote is increasing year by year, it is one of those bills which the taxpayer foots with a smile. He is quite prepared to pay it because he knows that we will reap the benefit of the instruction that the children will receive. The Governor's Speech states that secondary schools are to be established in Kalgoorlie and Boulder. I think this is an admirable scheme. Some time ago we established continuation schools, and I am very glad to see the proposal to establish secondary schools. These, working in conjunction with the School of Mines, will go a great way towards supplying students for the University when it is established, and while I am speaking of the University, I want to say I hope arrangements will be made whereby the School of Mines at Kalgoorlie will be affiliated with that institution. I understand the Technical School in Perth has been affiliated with the University of Adelaide for some years and the School of Mines is not. It is within the knowledge of members of this House also that the School of Mines is controlled by the Mines Department, and the Technical School is controlled by the Education Department. I am not going to say whether it is a good or bad thing that this dual control should exist. The head of the Technical School in Perth also controls the School of Mines in Kalgoorlie. I think the Government might take steps while they have such an able man as Mr. Gunn in the State to have a complete overhaul of the School of Mines. Such a thing would not do any harm. The School of Mines is not inspected as the State and Technical Schools are, and I think it would probably do some good if such an inspection were made by a man of Mr. Gunn's ability. With regard to the water supply, the Speech mentions that the whole of the supplies of the State have been amalgamated, that is, the supplies in the Metropolitan area and the Goldfields as well as those which were previously controlled by the Mines Department. I think it is to the credit of the present Administration that this has been done, and

I trust now the department will see the necessity for constructing a storage reservoir in Kalgoorlie. This was under the consideration of the previous Administration, who realised that the capacity of the pipe line to Kalgoorlie has been seriously decreasing year by year, owing to chemical and other action. In winter when there is not such a great demand for water this storage reservoir could be filled and then there would be no danger of a shortage in the succeeding summer. As the position is at the present time there is always the danger of a shortage during the summer months. The service reservoir could only carry one day's supply and there is the possibility of the goldfields being left without any water. I commend this to the attention of the Government. Mr. Patrick in his speech stated that those who were along the pipe track had been harshly treated. I have no desire to see the farmers harshly treated, but at the same time I have recollections of Mr. Patrick more than once in this Chamber stating that the goldfields water scheme should be made to pay, and I think he is the last member who should say that the Government are not treating the farmers on the pipe track fairly and squarely. With regard to the question of immigration, I think it is a good thing for the State that the previous Administration entered into contracts with two of the shipping companies to bring out a certain number of immigrants, otherwise, owing to the policy of the present Government, there would have been very few immigrants indeed coming to this State. On reading the report of the Mines Department, which was laid on the table of the House lately, I notice it stated that there has been an undoubted shortage of labour. If that is the case, what possible objection could the present Administration have to bringing in suitable immigrants for both the mining and the agricultural industries. With regard to the finances of the State, I am one of those who is not alarmed in the least at the existing position of affairs. The deficit is fairly large, but I do not think it is anything we need worry about. Our trouble, however, must be to see that it does not go on increasing. I think the

Government made a very great mistake when they issued debentures locally at 4 per cent. That had the effect of mopping up a lot of the available spare cash of the people. Many who had their money in the banks on current account took it out and put it into the Government debentures, with the result that there was a shortage of money in the banks, and the banks immediately raised their rates of interest to such an extent, that I am told it is possible to-day to get  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. for a fixed deposit of two years. This action has had the effect of making money very dear. As it is, the rates have gone up to such an extent that they are almost prohibitive to traders and others. The Federal bank are giving 3 per cent. on current account and this will have the effect of keeping the money market very tight. Then we hear that the Federal bank will take the Savings Bank from us. I do not feel greatly alarmed at that, because I believe that the money we borrow from the Savings Bank is very dear money to the State. I am pretty sure in stating that the money that we get from the Savings Bank costs us  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., and we can go on the London market and borrow for much less than that. I am inclined to think that it will not be a bad scheme for the Federal people to take over our Savings Bank, because I am told they are going to allow us to retain three-fourths of the amount on deposit, and we shall thus have to find for them only one quarter.

Hon. M. L. Moss: What guarantee have we that they will give us that three-fourths for longer than a month or two.

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE: I have no knowledge of a guarantee at all. I am only speaking of what I have heard, but I do not think that the fact that they are going to take over the Savings Bank need worry us.

Hon. M. L. Moss: I wish I could think so too.

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE: I think we shall get a pretty fair deal out of it; we shall be allowed to retain three-fourths of the deposits.

Hon. M. L. Moss: We were going to get 25s. per head of the population for

twenty-five years and we are only getting that amount for ten years.

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE: One hon. member speaking a few days ago made some remarks derogatory to the previous Government. He said that when the present Government came into power the Treasurer had discovered a minute which showed that there would be a deficit at the end of the financial year, that was in June last, of £116,000. There was such a minute left behind in the Treasury, but the hon. member who spoke about this, I refer to Mr. Kirwan—I am the hon. members know the reputation that Mr. Kirwan holds for fairness—and I will only say that the remarks he made are on a par with other actions of his, not only in this House, but in other ways, that is with regard to fairness. This minute was in existence; it was an estimate and I think hon. members should have a knowledge of what it says, and with the permission of the House I propose to read it. It was a minute that was called for by the Colonial Treasurer and it reads—

In accordance with your instructions I have obtained from Departments an estimate of revenue and expenditure for four months ending 31st December next. 2. The total estimated receipts, including Commonwealth, amounts to £1,357,657 and the estimated expenditure amounts to £1,263,040. The estimated surplus on the four months' transactions is £94,617. There was, however, a deficit of £78,230 on 31st August, and therefore the estimated surplus on 31st December next is £16,387. 3. The expenditure for July and August was £573,057, and the estimated expenditure for the four months ending 31st December is £1,263,040, making a total of £1,863,097. The expenditure for the last six months of last year was £2,067,540, and therefore we may estimate the expenditure for current financial year at £3,903,637. 4. The revenue for July and August was £481,527, and the estimated revenue for four months ending 31st December is £1,357,657, making a total of £1,839,184. The revenue for the last six months of last

year was £1,934,458, and therefore we may estimate the revenue for current financial year at £3,773,642. Therefore there would be a shortage of £129,995 on the year's transactions, or a net deficit of £116,697 after deducting surplus of £13,298 at commencement of year."

This is signed by L. S. Eliot, Under Treasurer, and is dated 15th September, 1911. Hon. members will notice that this minute deals with three periods, the first from July to August and the results of that period were known, then from September to December, which were estimates, and the Department were able to estimate very fairly for two or three months ahead, and the third period was from January to June of the present year. The estimated revenue according to this minute was £3,773,642 and the actual revenue collected was £3,966,673, so that there was £193,031 more collected by the Treasurer than was estimated. If therefore we take the £116,000, which they estimated as a deficiency, from the £193,000 actually received in excess of what was estimated, it will be found that there will be a handsome balance at the end of the year of £76,334. The Railway Department last year cost £117,000 more than the year before to earn £38,000 less, and there was a lesser profit in the Railway Department last year than the year before of £155,000. I think that does away with any wrong impression that honourable members may have with regard to what was said. We have now a copy of the minute as it came from the department and hon. members will be able to estimate for themselves the value of it. There is just one other question I want to deal with, and that is with reference to the workers' homes. Honourable members will remember that a few days ago I asked some questions in the House as to whether the Government were making provision for purchasing land on the goldfields for the purpose of building homes there, and we were told that they were not doing so. It is quite evident that the Government do not intend to give the goldfields people the same facilities for getting these homes as they are giving to people on the coast, and it will be a great shame to the workers on the goldfields,

who have to live, in many instances, in hessian or tin houses. Those on the coast who are more fortunately situated will be able to go to the Government and arrange for the building of brick or stone houses. It looks as if the Government had not confidence in the goldfields. There has not been any publicity given to the fact that the Act is in operation. I had to go to the Lands Department the other day to get a pamphlet, which I heard had been issued, and I understood none had been sent to the goldfields, and neither had there been any publicity given to the matter by way of advertisement in the local papers. Rather an amusing incident occurred in connection with the workers' homes. There is a union or association of architects in Perth. Evidently the Public Works Department have too much work to do, or they have not suitable men in the department to draw up plans and supervise the erection of workers' homes, consequently a circular letter was sent to every architect in Perth asking what they would charge to draw up plans, and prepare specifications and supervise the erection of workers' homes, and when the replies came in it was found that there was the same figure mentioned in all of them. The Government thought that they would like to get the work done cheaper so they called in one of the architects and asked him if he would reduce his price, in fact, they wanted him to be a blackleg and to undercut those people who were in the union with him. I merely state this to show that what is good for the goose should be good for the gander, that the Government should be as consistent in their works policy as in their unions. In regard to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, I want to say that I am prepared, when this measure comes before the House, to debate it with an open mind. I am prepared to give it every consideration. I am more than anxious that industrial troubles shall not be brought about on the goldfields, and I believe in a give and take policy, and if such is put on the statute-book it might ensure industrial peace in the State for a long time. Mr. Cornell, in his remarks, said that a member of the Labour party coming into this

Chamber could only look on any measure coming before members from a party point of view. I am not going to do that, I am going to look at measures from a commonsense and broad point of view, and from a view which will be for the benefit of the whole of the people of the State, and I hope our friends who have been returned by the Labour party to this Chamber will take a similar view and look on the measures from an impartial standpoint, I, of course, realise that the present Administration have come into power with a mandate from the country to reduce the cost of living and to reduce the cost of the necessities of life. I want to say from my place in the House, and outside of it as well, that I shall do everything that can be fairly done to assist the Government to bring about this desirable result. I look on it as of the utmost importance that the purchasing power of the sovereign should be largely increased. I intend to support the amendment before the House.

Hon. C. McKENZIE (South-East): I wish to say a few words on the business before the House, but before doing so I, like other members, desire to offer a welcome to the old members who have been returned and also to the new members. I am sorry that some of the old members have left, but such is the fortune of elections. I see no reason why one and all should not work together in harmony and peace for the benefit of the State. I hope members will leave party behind them when they come here—I refer to members on both sides—there is nothing in it. I am glad that the Government have foreshadowed in the Governor's Speech some very good legislation, more particularly do I refer to the improvement of the various harbours and rivers of the State. There is no doubt that to enable us to compete with our neighbours we must have every facility and means of despatch at the various ports for the purpose of getting away the produce of the State with the least possible expense. It is little use for the farmers to labour year in and year out to get their produce to a market and when it is sold there is nothing left because of the enormous ex-

pense in removing the produce from the port of shipment. The Government are to be commended for improving the harbours of the State. I think in improving the harbours the Government will be doing good work for the benefit of the whole of the State, for the accommodation at some of the ports is scandalous; there is no means of getting the produce away except at great expense, and we shall have to be in a position to get the produce away with despatch and in a very reasonable manner if we are to compete with our neighbours. On the question of railways, I am sure the Government will carry out a policy for the benefit of the whole of the State. We passed a number of railways last year, but they have not all been constructed, and I urge on the Government to put the works in hand and make provision for the future, for without railways in the State I do not know how we are to develop it. It is much cheaper to build railways than to make roads, and in some of the heavily timbered country, more particularly that in the South-West, which is very bad country for roads, I should like to see railways carried through, as well as through the wheat belt. It would open up the country there, and we are always certain of water in that country. Unfortunately this year the country was visited by a dry season, but down in the South-West there is always water and crops can be grown all the year round. I wish to endorse the remarks of Mr. R. D. McKenzie. I come from the southern portion of the State where we have any quantity of rain; we had more than was good for us the other day, which prevented the railway train getting through. Still, the Government worked with despatch and the train got through as speedily as possible. The dams in the south-western portion are all full, and I am sure everyone is pleased to hear it. The rain has been a great boon to the farmers in general. As to monopolies, I shall assist the Government to put them down if they exist. I have heard a great deal about monopolies, but I have not found one yet. I have heard of them, but if there are any to be dug up I shall do all I can to assist the

Government to put them down, for monopolies are not good for a State. As to reduction in the price of meat, that is a very good action on the part of the Government, for we are paying more for meat than we should do. I know we have plenty of cattle. As to the purchase of the steamers, I do not quite agree with that action on the part of the Government. I would like to see the Government endeavour to reduce the price of meat by chartering a steamer for the season of the year when cattle can be brought down. The Government could then see what ground they are actually treading upon. At the present time they do not know how the venture will turn out. I object to the way in which the purchase of the steamers was made. I think the matter ought to have been brought before Parliament in a proper manner. No doubt the Government who have the best of intentions thought it advisable to proceed in another way. As to the vessels being scrap iron, I do not believe that at all. I believe the gentleman who has passed the steamers has done so honestly and the Government have got a fairly good deal in the steamers they have bought. I hope the Government will look towards the mines. From what Mr. R. D. McKenzie has told us, the mining industry seems to be in a bad way and there is a large number of people depending on the mines. I hope the Government will give all the assistance they possibly can to the mining industry, also to the farmers, for there are many who require assistance to tide them over their present trouble. There are many amending Bills promised and I hope they will all receive due consideration. We pass many Acts and year after year they must be improved upon. We pass roads Acts and Municipal Acts and they should be improved upon as time goes by. No doubt when Bills come before us later on we shall give them due consideration. A great deal of alteration has been made in the administration of the Lands Department. At present people are very frightened to go in for land, they are very careful what they do. It is all very well to say that the land agents are making all the money, but land agents

cannot make a profit unless the Government also make a profit. I hope to deal with the matters separately when they come before the House.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY (East): I had not intended to take up the time of the House on this amendment, because I believe that I have never listened to any question in this House that has received more attention from hon. members, or has been dealt with more fully in every way. The question has been so ably dealt with by hon. members, that it is only because of the fact that perhaps when this amendment goes to the vote the Address-in-reply will be completed, I have decided that it is just as well to make a few remarks at this stage, and not discuss the Address-in-reply at any great length. With other hon. members, I wish to congratulate the House upon the entry into it of the new members we have amongst us this season; and also to congratulate them on their election. I feel that the debating power of the House has been strengthened, and that the old members have received an endorsement of their past actions, which has been very gratifying. I noticed in the remarks made by Mr. Cornell that it was his intention to vote at all times in this House according to his reading of the wishes of the people as expressed at the general elections, and I am with the hon. member to this extent that I will vote at all times according to my reading of the wishes of those who have elected me to this Chamber, because, after all, it is to those who have elected us we are responsible. We must recognise the drift, from time to time, of the public mind, and whilst we are governed to a great extent by the wishes of the whole of the people of the State, it frequently happens that a majority at a general election absolutely reverse the verdict given by them only a few months previously. We might say where we have the confidence of the whole of the people on some important question, they are swayed more easily perhaps than those who are the electors of this Chamber—those who have a definite stake in this country, those who cannot get out of it if some legislation put on the Statute book seems likely to be detrimental to

the best interests of the country; whilst I feel sure a great many of those who vote on party politics are able, if things go wrong, to depart from the country for good, leaving behind them many liabilities in the form of taxation for those who remain in the State to carry on their shoulders. We have been going into various legislation which has been the subject of this debate, and whether it has been constitutional or not has been clearly set forth by the members who have spoken. It is well to bear in mind that we have been for a very long time drifting on from one matter to another, and it is just a question as to whether we are wise to interfere with private enterprise in the manner that the Governments of these States have been doing in the last few years. It is all very well for Governments to come along from time to time and say that it is their wish to interfere with monopolies, and then to create one themselves by borrowing money, and thereby preventing the people from exercising that money in the best possible way. They also seem to be at every turn very much against the person they call "the fat man," or the capitalist, and it seems to me that they are making it much easier for the capitalist, because although they want to interfere with his trade they are prepared to go on the market from time to time to borrow his money, paying him, I believe, a fairly high rate of interest, fully four per cent now. I do not think we are getting, on every occasion, the full value of the sovereign we borrow from him when the Government spend it. I believe that a great deal of the money borrowed by this Government would not show 10s. in the £ by way of return for the outlay, and, when we bear in mind that the people will be taxed for all time to find interest on the money, I doubt if it would not be better if a lot of these enterprises were left to the individuals themselves. Personally, if I happened to be a capitalist—and I understood from Mr. Sanderson that he would account the sovereign as the main thing in capital—I should prefer to lend money to the Government at four per cent. rather than exercise it myself, because when the community undertake to pay a private indi-

vidual a certain percentage for his capital it does not matter to that person whether the Government waste the money or whether they throw it into the sea, as they have done at Fremantle. There is absolutely no risk to the capitalist in that case; he is certain, for all time, of his four per cent.; whereas if these individuals are left to bring that money into this country and use it themselves, and are not interfered with, they will be quite prepared to come here and expend it in various ways, so that the wage-earning community will get a very big share of it, and if it is injudiciously spent, whilst the owner will lose, the community will benefit by it, and they will not be taxed for all time to find four per cent on it. I was very much struck the other day at noticing that whilst on June 30th, 1910, the population of Australia was 4,600,000 and the public debt £257,627,000, the Argentine has a population of 6,000,000, and a public debt of only £75,782,000. Of course, there is the difference between a State trying to run everything itself and a country where private enterprise is allowed all possible freedom. In the latter country they are not taxed for all time to the extent they are in Australia upon a public debt bearing a high rate of interest. We find that taxation is creeping along; the Land taxation is something like 30 per cent. of the revenue, and it is becoming so unbearable, and some of these enterprises are so unsettling to the community, that I am quite satisfied we are not altogether in the right in still further interfering with the avenues of private trade, whether it be in the hands of rings or of combines; in fact, I doubt very much, especially after listening to this debate, whether these rings or combines, particularly with regard to the meat trade, do exist. Therefore, I regret that the Government have embarked upon this enterprise of buying steamers to put upon the coast, and I also regret that they intend, according to the Speech, although in this case not so unconstitutionally, to embark upon brickmaking and timber milling. This carries us back to the introduction of sheep by the late Government and also the introduction of horses, and interference in the cattle trade by the importa-

tion of dairy cows; all of these things have taken place under the so-called Liberal Governments, and on every occasion these have interfered with private enterprise. They have unsettled the community, and so far I do not think any good result has accrued to the State in connection with them.

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

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: It seems to me that while the Government have been ardent-hearted in embarking on so many of these new enterprises, they have overlooked some of those that have always had ready help from the community in days gone by, even in the Crown Colony days and in the early days of Responsible Government in this State. I refer to inroads that are likely to obtain upon the welfare of the community in the direction of helping farming in it by way of subsidies for roads and subsidies to agricultural societies to encourage the breeding of stock and a better class of work. There are new industries that perhaps are attracting attention, or new departures that are more speculative, though practically they are not, in keeping with the suggestion of the Government, "natural industries of the State." The natural industries are undoubtedly the ones to build up; but this suggested embarking upon the purchase of steamers, and the further suggestion of reducing the cost of machinery to the farmers and the agricultural community by the manufacture of machinery by the State, I consider to be extremely risky. The Liberal Government had ideas of embarking in this direction, but I have always been opposed to it. I cannot realise that we are likely to get any good results from the Government embarking upon the manufacture of machinery for the farming community. It is another interference with private traders, another interference with the trade of people who have been established for some time, and who, I am perfectly satisfied, will cater for the community very much better than the average Government official. It is this interference with men who have already embarked upon these industries, this threatened interference with

them, which in so many instances debars people from bringing capital into the country. If they have a fair field and, I might also say, no favour—because under the Federal tariff it strikes me they are getting too much favour in many instances—I feel that, as time goes on, these industries will establish themselves. All we require to do now is to foster them. The Governor's Speech says that the Government intend to foster the "natural industries of the country." I think in doing that they will be doing an immense amount of good, and quite sufficient, but to foster these other industries which are not natural industries, and not only to foster them, but to embark upon them through the State itself, is entering into competition with those already established; and it seems to me a very great mistake. I do not wish to go into any particulars with regard to these subsidies I have referred to, but I do know that in the past agricultural societies throughout the State have been the means of encouraging private breeders of stock and various manufacturers. The Government have carried out quite sufficient when they have encouraged work in that direction. Subsidies to societies for the purpose of encouraging ploughing rather than manufacturing machinery or manufacturing ploughs, I am perfectly satisfied, will do a lot more good by helping men to improve themselves in that class of work; and encouraging them to take a greater interest in their work will be quite sufficient to help the manufacturers of machinery. At the same time it will be the means of our producing a greater quantity of wheat off the areas now under the plough, and by that means it will encourage a far greater revenue for our railways. I am convinced the State will be doing a greater amount of good in that direction for the natural industries than by embarking upon the State manufacture of the machines to do the work. I hold the opinion that if the Federal Parliament were to do away with the major portion of the duty upon machinery and encourage men to work the machines rather than to manufacture them, Australia would be better off in her production. Now, with regard to another matter mentioned in the Speech, and in

connection with a question before the House, the likelihood of embarking upon this steamer enterprise and purchase, which I feel has undoubtedly been proved by all the speeches to have been an unconstitutional proceeding, we are likely to give still further opportunities for industrial trouble; and in anything we can do to avoid the State running on the rocks any further in regard to industrial troubles, I shall be pleased to help the Government. There is no doubt there has been more trouble within the last twelve months or two years than ever before, and I think it is that most of the people must be having too good a time. They really seem to strike with the slightest provocation. I realise that at our ports only last season the farming community were made to suffer a severe loss through a few hands at Fremantle refusing to unload several of the vessels. They found their bags cost them infinitely more than they should have. Again, the same thing occurred through the strike at Midland Junction. If these troubles had been grappled with by the Government by making the men face their obligations under the agreements under which they were working, I think it would have had a much greater effect, and helped the community much better than embarking on these enterprises which will only encourage still further trouble. In the case of the Midland Junction strike, we realise it was a State-controlled concern, and if these concerns controlled by the State can not be freed from industrial troubles, it is just as well for the State not to embark on too many of them. I certainly think the solution of this will be to continue the system of immigration. We want more people on our shores. We find that in all directions the community wish to keep Australia for white men. It is freely acknowledged it is impossible for us to hold the country unless we fill it up more with white people; yet the attitude that some of the people would have us adopt seems to me is that, while they want to encourage the white men, they are not doing it in the right way by not getting more people in Australia. By our not encouraging a sufficient number of people to come in we are only helping

to drive trade to the people of the East; and in driving our trade into their hands, we are helping to build up those nations at our expense. If by certain strikes a lot of our coal contracts are driven off to Japan, and if by other delays in the carrying through of various classes of trade here the trade is driven away from our shores and goes to the Eastern ports, it stands to reason that that these people will be thriving while we are losing trade and losing money that should be coming to our shores. I think at every turn we want to do our utmost to encourage people to come here; and the day will not then be very far distant when we will not need to look to America or England to defend us. I think we will be on fairly safe lines if we encourage thrift. I do not think Mr. Bath could have realised, when he gave forth his minute with regard to land transfers, what an enormous amount of damage would be done to the credit of a great many people settled within our borders. I should like to see Mr. Bath acknowledge that he made a mistake. I do not suppose there is any possibility of getting him to do so, but I feel convinced that there was no necessity for him to issue the instructions in the way he did. There is no doubt it has done an immense amount of harm to the credit of men who are settled or wishing to settle on the land. I say again, it has meant that a great many men have had to rely on the State for them to carry on operations. Many of them could have obtained the money from the private banks, and would have preferred to do so. I think it would have been very much better if they had been able to obtain that money in that way rather than having to run to the Government for it. If there was any loss to be sustained it was better that the private individual and not the State should bear it. The State has had to find a very much larger amount of money for financing the people on the land than it would have done if these instructions had not been issued. If we can only revert to the old state of affairs, under which a tight hand was kept on the conditions of improvement and of land settlement generally, it would be quite sufficient. I do



not like to sit down without referring again to a further feeling of insecurity created by disposing of certain hands who have been retrenched. I regret extremely that it should have been found necessary to retrench such men as Mr. Despeissis and Captain Hare. It must have unsettled the whole of the Civil Service from end to end. They were men with years of service before them, and I can speak feelingly, particularly in respect to Mr. Despeissis, whom I looked upon as one of the ablest officers in the Agricultural Department. In regard to his work in the North-West, I suppose he spoke his mind a little too freely and so fell into disfavour. For my part I like to see a civil servant have an independence of view; and if he has certain views it is just as well for him to give a straightforward expression to them.

Hon. E. McLarty: That officer always did his duty well.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Certainly he was one of the most able officers in the State and I regret that it was found advisable to get rid of him. I am satisfied the work he did will stand as a record in his favour. He was at all times a very good official in the department. I do not wish to detain members at any great length, because I know Ministers have several speeches to make in reply to the debate, but I wish to tender one or two remarks in regard to the question of whether or not this is a party House. Some members have come into the House with the avowed object of doing away with it, and others have announced as their mission the making of it a party House, while still others go so far as to say it is, and always has been, a party House. Personally I have ever acted most independently, and I believe I can say the same for every other member of the House. It is of frequent occurrence to be sitting side by side with an hon. member in one division, and then find oneself opposite to that same member in the next succeeding division taken on a later clause in the same Bill. The one idea uppermost in the minds of every member of the Chamber in the past has been to view whatever subject was before the House in the light of what was in the best in-

terests of the State, without any idea of benefiting one or the other party. No matter what parties may have existed in the country, they have not been allowed to affect the members of this House. Mr. Cornell stated that he would ever uphold any man who, in his own opinion, thought he was doing good to the community. I hardly agree with that sentiment, because it seems to me the nihilist is convinced that he is doing good to the community. I do not know that even Mr. Cornell would uphold anyone whose desire is wholesale destruction. I am quite satisfied that members who have given expression to these views will before long be counted among our best friends, and will realise that there are two sides to every question, and that we can still be good friends without necessarily holding the views put forward by either the Labour or the Liberal party. So far as those who desire to do away with the Upper House are concerned, I agree with Mr. Connor, who remarked that it was not the price of meat, or the cost of living, that was so detrimental to the State, but that it was the want of thrift, and the tendency so many people have to run to the picture shows or the racecourse, and spend their earnings and gamble away their future. I feel that this is particularly applicable to the proposition to do away with the Upper House. Those men and women who are prepared to send here a representative with the idea of doing away with the Upper House are quite prepared to gamble away their future and throw everything into the melting pot.

Hon. J. Connell: Do you deny them the right to amuse themselves?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: No, I do not; I only feel that a great many of them seem to think that life is created for nothing but amusement. They will spend all their time in amusement, and wonder why they have not made a greater success of life. They are quite prepared to gamble on the chances, and when they lose come round and share with the other fellow. So with regard to the Bill under the proposal of the Government. I am perfectly satisfied it will have a very fair consideration at the hands of members of this Chamber, but of course it is one that, on the face

of it, is directly against the Constitution under which we live, and therefore will probably meet the fate which I feel sure the Government anticipate for it. I do not wish to take up any further time, except to say I sincerely hope that when several of the new members have been amongst us a little longer they will not retain their extreme party feelings, but will agree to fall in with us and work in the best interests of the State.

The PRESIDENT: I would remind the House that the question is the amendment to the Address-in-reply.

Hon. B. C. O'BRIEN (Central): I realise that this debate on the amendment moved by Mr. Moss has been somewhat drawn out. I did not intend to address the House on this particular amendment, but I really find it necessary to speak now in case I may not have another opportunity. Like those who have spoken before me, I desire to tender congratulations to the new members elected, with all due respect to the old members who have passed out. In some cases it was defeat, and in one or two cases former hon. members have retired. As Mr. McKenzie said, at election time some must pass out and others come in. We may congratulate ourselves on the introduction to the House of Mr. Sanderson, Mr. Lynn, and Mr. Colebatch; I mention these three first because of their able debating powers. I would also beg to tender my most hearty welcome to the other two gentlemen returned from the Eastern Goldfields, namely, Mr. Ardagh and Mr. Cornell. I think those two gentlemen will, to a great extent, be able to assist the House in the consideration of questions affecting the workers. It is necessary that we should have all shades of opinion represented here, just the same as anywhere else. I still nurture the hope that Mr. Moss may think fit to withdraw the amendment, for it ill-becomes this Chamber to dissent from the Address-in-reply to His Excellency per medium of an amendment such as that moved by Mr. Moss, and I therefore fervently hope that Mr. Moss will withdraw without forcing on a division. One of the first matters the hon. gentleman referred to in bringing forward the amend-

ment was the fact that this House has been made a party House. From my knowledge of this Chamber it has been very much a party House all the time. I was first returned eleven years ago last January, and on looking round I find there are just nine members in the present House who were here eleven years ago. On that occasion I was elected to Parliament as a Labour candidate pledged to the abolition of this Chamber. In those days we fought our elections on party lines, and in every election each candidate always took sides. Of course Labour was not in the forefront then as it is to-day, but nevertheless each election to this Council was fought on party lines.

Hon. F. Connor: No.

Hon. B. C. O'BRIEN: My election was, and so was every other election.

Hon. F. Connor: No.

Hon. B. C. O'BRIEN: If hon. members will cast their minds back for the last ten or eleven years and recollect the different Governments that have had their day, they will find that every election for this Council was always fought on party lines.

Hon. F. Connor: Mine was not.

Hon. B. C. O'BRIEN: The hon. gentleman has scarcely ever had opposition. To my knowledge this House has always been a party House, and it is because people are getting better educated to what is necessary in political matters that a few candidates of a more democratic character are now being elected, and it seems to be a dread on the part of some gentlemen that this House is becoming a party House. I do not see why there should not be as much party feeling here as in the other Chamber. I have the distinction of being the first pledged Labour man returned to either House in the Western Australian Parliament. Getting back to the amendment, Mr. Moss laid great stress on the fact that the Council is becoming a party House. If it suits people to elect democratic candidates, I do not think it is right of any gentleman to criticise that fact. The session before last when we reduced the franchise it will be remembered that that Bill was carried after a compromise. We would never have got that

reduction but that a few members, who are now claiming that they are non-party men, compromised. It is well remembered that Mr. Connolly, whom I am sorry is not in his seat at present, went round and told members who were deadly opposed to the reduction, "If we do not compromise a little, our Government will be accused of refusing a reduction." In this amiable way he got certain gentlemen to compromise and by this means the Bill became law. That is well known to members. With regard to the unconstitutional methods of the Government we have heard a great deal. I do not intend to weary the House further; we have had quite enough of that. Of the pros and cons and what should be constitutional or unconstitutional, we have heard sufficient. With regard to the propositions of the Government, the great point raised is that the Government have acted unconstitutionally by appropriating money for certain purposes without the consent of Parliament. The Government on the hustings last year made pledges to the people that if elected they would bring about certain reforms and that they would put into operation certain movements which would assist the people generally. They were elected by a very large majority; therefore the people confirmed the right of the Government to do as they have since done. When the present Administration met Parliament last year, it was then given out that the session would be a short one, and that no very contentious matter would be introduced, and it was accepted on all hands that the Government would just get an opportunity to put little necessary measures through Parliament and then go into recess. It was a well known fact last year that the Government intended to buy steamers; it was well known when we were sitting last session.

Hon. M. L. Moss: They never said a word about it in Parliament.

Hon. B. C. O'BRIEN: It is no use the hon. member trying to tell us that. It was discussed and thrashed out on the hustings and asserted in Parliament. When Parliament went into recess, the Christmas holidays were upon us, and the Government were faced with many difficulties. In the first place they were

faced with industrial troubles, but not because the Labour party were in power, for I can say that if there had not been a Labour Government there would have been serious trouble for the country. It was owing to the diplomacy of the present Administration that many big industrial troubles did not occur last year, and have not occurred yet and I hope are not likely to occur. For having averted this trouble I give credit to Mr. Scaddan and his Administration.

Hon. R. D. McKenzie: I think credit was due to Mr. Dodd.

Hon. B. C. O'BRIEN: I am giving credit to the whole Administration. Had another leader been there—

Hon. C. Sommers interjected.

The PRESIDENT: If the hon. member wants to interject he must sit in his place.

Hon. B. C. O'BRIEN: When the Government had their own friends clamouring about them wanting to tear them down and wanting to get a lot of consideration, it was a big trouble to be up against. The present Administration dealt in the most diplomatic manner with these troubles and have come out with flying colours. We were up against a very serious trouble with regard to the bad season. I dread almost to think what confronted Ministers when they had to protect unfortunate new settlers, find water for them, provide seed wheat and manure, reduce their rents or extend their payments and assist them in various ways to tide over the dry year. I am proud to say, and I know all members will agree with me, that these troubles are over, and I hope they are not likely to recur. The present Administration has dealt with these matters and dealt with them very well, and various speakers, including Mr. Moss, gave a certain amount of praise to them, though there seems to be quite a unanimous feeling among certain members that they should carry this amendment. The Honorary Minister, I venture to say, will, when he replies, defend the Government on the constitutional point. These pledges were made on the hustings, a hurried session was held, and the country was told that no contentious matter

would be entered upon; yet when the Government try to put their policy into effect during the recess they are faced with a certain unanimity among some members to down the Government simply because they are trying to put into operation a policy they promised the people as soon as they got an opportunity. With regard to the enterprises which the Government have entered upon, I do not think there is anything unusual or strange about them. The Government took the bull by the horns, if I may use a vulgar phrase, and took over the ferries on the river. They are running a good service and they are promising a better one. The service was only indifferent prior to the Government taking over the ferries. Speaking the other night Mr. McLarty endeavoured to defend the cattle owners, or the "beef buccaneers" as Mr. Connor called them; and went so far as to say there is a considerable amount of trade in freights and passenger fares on the North-West coast for more steamers, but the only thing he thought was that the Government were not wise in catering for the cattle trade. Mr. Connor in his speech endeavoured to show the cost of cattle in Kimberley, the rates of freight, and the cost of beef on the hoof or hook at Fremantle, which was 2½d. per pound.

Hon. F. Connor: That is not quite correct; 2¾d. to 4d. It is all in *Hansard*.

Hon. B. C. O'BRIEN: Let us say 3½d. as an average. There must be some justification for the Government to step in, because there is a tremendous margin between 3½d. and an average of about 10d. per pound for beef.

Hon. F. Connor: What has that to do with the producer or dealer?

Hon. B. C. O'BRIEN: We are dealing with this question in a broad way. It has everything to do with them. The hon. member is treating the question from his own standpoint; the Government are dealing with it for the country. We cannot consider the "beef buccaneers" or the "pig pirates" as they have been called, when the Government are endeavouring to do something for the community, and we want to know where that difference between 3½d. and 10d. comes in. I am

going to support the Government; I have been returned to support this Government in carrying out a certain policy.

Hon. C. Sommers: By one vote.

Hon. B. C. O'BRIEN: I fought my election fairly and squarely on a straight-out pledge, and I think it all the more to my credit, because in a province like mine—Mr. Drew will bear me out that it is a very conservative province, made up of pastoral and agricultural interests principally, because the mining interests have no votes—members can understand it is difficult for a man to contest on the Labour ticket and win a seat. Mr. Sommers interjected that it was won by one vote; if it was by only one vote I fought a gallant battle, and it difficult to stand on a platform pledged to wipe this Chamber out of existence if I get an opportunity. However, although I was elected by only one vote, I am here to do the best I can for my constituents and the country generally. With regard to the steamers, what we want to find out is something about the margin between 3½d. and 10d.

Hon. E. McLarty: Do you pay 10d.?

Hon. B. C. O'BRIEN: I do not, I pay 6½d., but that is under contract, and I have not changed my butcher for nearly two years. The average price of meat today is 10d.

Hon. E. McLarty: Nothing of the kind.

Member: Nonsense.

Hon. B. C. O'BRIEN: I assert it again; the average price to the ordinary consumer is 10d.

Hon. F. Connor: No.

Hon. B. C. O'BRIEN: The fact remains that it is so. Mr. McLarty's experience was limited to only a certain portion of the Kimberleys, but Mr. Connor spoke with a wider knowledge of the two Kimberleys, and the trade he opened up with Manila. Mr. Connor told us of the trade from Kimberley, and what it cost to bring cattle down, but he did not give us information about the prices he got in Manila; however, we will not worry about that; it is his affair. Mr. McLarty referred to the firm of Emanuel Bros., who he said—and I am sorry that he used the words, as I am sure he did not mean them—were

hounded out of the country. I would like to be hounded out of the State just as the Emanuel Bros. have been hounded out. I worked in Kimberley nearly twenty years ago for the Emanuel Bros. and I know what they have done in the past, and I know the methods they adopted, and I repeat I would like to be hounded out in the manner that Mr. McLarty referred to. I cannot reconcile these statements of hon. members. There is another gentleman in the North-West who is well known to Mr. McLarty, and to Mr. Connor and others; I refer to Mr. Bush, who owns something like four million acres of territory there.

Hon. F. Connor: He does not own an acre.

Hon. B. C. O'BRIEN: I mean it is held under pastoral lease. Mr. Bush has also been hounded out of Western Australia, and he is living in England, in luxury, in a beautiful mansion.

Hon. A. G. Jenkins: What did he do here for fourteen years?

Hon. B. C. O'BRIEN: He made all his money in Western Australia. My point, however, is that if we had two or three Bushes and two or three Emanuels who owned the whole country, of what use would it be to anyone else? The Government are endeavouring to cope with the difficulty and provide meat for the people at a reasonable price. Every member who has spoken has applauded the Government for their efforts, and that I consider is an admission that they believe that the Government are honest in their intention to do something for the people. If they fail, we must not blame them; the least we can say will be that they made an honest effort. This project was a long time on the tapis before the Government entered on it, and they knew what they were doing, and got certain information, and I take it they have been guided in all their actions by the advice of experts, and that the State will be protected against heavy loss.

Hon. R. D. McKenzie: Are they going to retail the meat?

Hon. B. C. O'BRIEN: I am not in a position to state what their future intentions are in that direction. I would also

like to refer briefly to the question of the nationalisation of the trams. Exception has been taken here to the Government entering on this project. I would not like to argue as to the merits of municipalisation as against nationalisation, but I do say that some system different from the one which exists at the present time is absolutely necessary. It has also been said that because the Government are going to take over the trams the citizens will be deprived of certain rights. I want to know where they come in? We are told that in 28 years' time the whole concern will be handed over to the city council on behalf of the ratepayers, but what are we going to get in 28 years' time? I venture to say that in 28 years from now this system will be so obsolete that it will not be worth two shillings, lock, stock and barrel. Mr. Colebatch advocated the system of municipalisation, I think, as against nationalisation, and he said that a little inconvenience to the people who were kept waiting on street corners was neither here nor there; but I want to inform Mr. Colebatch that the city of Perth is growing daily, and I venture to say—and I hope I will not be considered too optimistic—that we shall shortly see a building and a general boom such as we have never seen before. The population of Perth is increasing, and it is a half-hourly occurrence to see women and children left standing on street corners whilst crowded trams pass them by. The system at the present time is very bad; I do not know who is to blame, but we certainly want some kind of change. I will not go into the question of which is the better, nationalisation or municipalisation, but I would welcome any scheme, and we should not consider what the rights of the citizens will be 28 years hence. I think the Government deserve great credit for the bold step they have taken in dealing with this question. The services must be extended, and I maintain that the scheme when it is nationalised can be dovetailed into that of the railways. There is another matter to which I desire to make reference, and that is with regard to workers'

homes. We were told that the Government intended to do this, and in order to make the scheme more complete they decided to establish brickyards and State mills. These scheme will all dovetail, and again here I think the Government are deserving of credit instead of the condemnation which has been heaped on them during the past few weeks. With regard to the question of immigration, I do not know what the Government are doing at the present time. Mr. Connolly told us the other evening that the Government had practically stopped immigration, and the few who were coming to the State were those who were being brought out as the result of contracts entered into with shipping companies during his régime. I say that those immigrants who have come to the country have had a very fair crack of the whip. I still maintain that before we bring people here by the thousand we should know what we are going to do with them. It was clearly understood a few years ago when we started the immigration policy, that there would be none brought out here but farm labourers and other country workers that the State was in need of and of whom there was a scarcity. Immigrants have come here by the thousand, but what do we find; that for a couple of years back we have had as immigrants men who are not farm labourers and who have no capital, and these people are at the present time in the city and suburbs driving bakers' carts or running messages and taking up work that really should be done by local people. That is not the class of immigrant we want, and even if the Government have stayed their hand a little in the matter of immigration I believe they have followed a wise course. For my own part, however, I think we can do with thousands and thousands more people in this country, but we should use discretion in their choice. During the past ten or twelve months there has been a decidedly better class of people arriving from the old country, and I hope that may continue, because a good class are always welcome; but if the Government have stayed their hand I think they have done so in time. I do not like

to be rude, but I say that batches of men who have arrived here are nothing but hobbledehoyes and are quite useless, and when one speaks to them it is impossible to get anything out of them. They are people who have come from the big commercial centres of England, and are useless for colonial life. It is pitiable to see them. That class are no good to us, and if the Government have eased up I think it was not before it was time. I will just deviate a little in order to make some reference to the Fremantle dock. I do not know what would have happened if the Labour Government had been in power when the construction of the dock was authorised; I think they would have been annihilated.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: They would have had no peace.

Hon. B. C. O'BRIEN: I will not say it is a scandal, but it seems dreadful to think that £200,000 has been sunk in that work without result. We want a dock, and a big sum of money has been spent, and there is no one to take the responsibility. When the Labour Government make an honest effort to do something, hon. members should give them encouragement and the opportunity of doing it. The Government have been in office only eight or nine months, and the moment they make an effort to put their policy into effect there is a tremendous howl. It is just about seven years since the Daglish Government were in power—the first Labour Administration in this country. Those gentlemen on that occasion made a noble and honest effort to buy out one of the biggest monopolies and one of the greatest stumbling blocks to progress in this country. I refer to the Midland railway. Hon. members know the attitude I adopted towards that company when I was first elected to this House eleven years ago. I was the means of having a Select Committee appointed, of which the present leader of the House was a member, and we improved that service out of all knowledge within a few months. Then, when the Labour Government came into power they made a noble effort to acquire for the State that great hindrance to development, and there was a howl from one end of the country to the other.

Hon. C. A. Piesse: I do not think so.

Hon. B. C. O'BRIEN: It is a well-known fact there was a howl from one end of the country to the other, and because of their efforts to buy out that company they were treated as a lot of thieves wanting to make money out of the deal.

Hon. C. Sommers: They quarrelled amongst themselves.

Hon. B. C. O'BRIEN: They did not quarrel amongst themselves; they worked amicably together, but when the matter came before Parliament it was decided against them. The trouble is that as soon as a Labour Government make an endeavour to do a patriotic service for the country they are denied the opportunity. We have heard a great deal during this debate about the Trades Hall influence and about caucus. Now, I was elected eleven years ago to this Chamber and I signed the Labour platform on that occasion. There was a definite platform put before me, and all I have ever tried to do was to stick to that platform: and if this Mr. McCallum, whom hon. members are advertising so much, came to me and put a proposition before me, I would say—"There is my platform and I am going to stick to that, and so long as I do that I am doing my duty to the people who sent me here." A lot is said about the Labour caucus, but in all parties there must be a means of coming to finality and arranging something definite. If a proposition is coming before the House or the country, naturally the party will hold a meeting, and in order to arrive at finality the proposal is discussed and a decision arrived at by vote, and it is generally expected that the minority will fall in with the views of the majority. Therefore, there is a caucus of the Liberal party in the same way as there is one in the Labour party. Naturally, Ministers will not go before Parliament without consulting their party: they put their views before the party, and at the meeting their proposals are either modified or strengthened. The consequence is that this dreaded caucus, which comes in for so much abuse, arrives at an arrangement which is then put into effect by the Government. Hon. members have accused the Labour members of being dominated by the Trades Hall. The

Trades Hall has its own little organisation, but one of the latest movements emanating from that body shows that it is doing some good for the country.

Hon. M. L. Moss: Do not give away any secrets.

Hon. B. C. O'BRIEN: There are no secrets. I know that Mr. Moss will be always fair, but he is in the habit of blurring out interjections out of his turn. In the past he was always in the habit of referring to "politicians of a certain brand," and yet members say this is not a party House! Some hon. members will remember the time when Mr. Kingsmill was leader of the House, and he and I sat together with the whole of the House arrayed against us. Perhaps these little remarks which Mr. Moss makes are not sarcasm but only pleasantry, but he does frequently refer to a "certain brand of politician," and just now by interjection he alluded to secrets. I assure him I can give away no secrets, because there are none. As I was saying, the Trades Hall is trying to bring about a more amicable arrangement between the unions themselves and between the unions of employers as well as of employees. One would think that there were only unions on one side, but there are powerful and autocratic unions on the other side. Members talk about the Labour party caucus—if only we knew some of the secrets of the other caucus! In order to bring about more amicable working amongst the unions themselves the Trades Hall is promoting a movement which will tend to band together the various trades in a particular industry. In every industry there are a number of different trades, each having its own union. In the printing trade, for instance, there are the bookbinders, the typographical society, and others. In the iron trade also there are many branches of work, the workers in each of which have their own unions. Those unions may be regarded as sections of the industry. Let us say that in the iron trade there are iron workers who have a union of 200 members, and in another section of the industry there may be a union with only 30 members; these 30 might have a grievance against their masters, and at a little meeting of their own

they decide that they are not getting a fair deal and they will go on strike. They do so, and perhaps paralyse a whole industry, and cause distress to hundreds of men connected with that industry, because all the other unions in the industry are loyal and stand by the men who are on strike. Now the Trades Hall is making these various unions combine, and before any strike can be brought about they will have to send their delegates, with their grievance, to the executive; the executive, after dealing with the case, will send back a recommendation to each of the sections in that particular industry, and these sections will have to consider the matter again before they can go out on strike.

Hon. M. L. Moss: But strikes are not lawful.

Hon. B. C. O'BRIEN: We know that they are not lawful, nevertheless these troubles do occur. At any rate this is what the Trades Hall people are doing at the present time for the good of their fellow men and also, I maintain, for the good of the country. I hope I have not wearied the House too much, but I have just tried to make the best of the few points I had noted.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I, like other members, extend a hearty welcome to those new members who were returned at the last elections, and I may say I also regret very much the defeat of Mr. Doland, who, I am satisfied, would have become a very useful member of this Council, and one who would have been of great use in the debates. I am also exceedingly sorry that Mr. Pennefather is not able to take his place during the debate on the Address-in-reply. Mr. Pennefather and I were comrades in misfortune some 18 months ago when we were both in ill-health, and I sincerely hope that during the course of the session he will be able to take his seat again and give us the benefit of his experience. A good deal has been said during the debate, and also in the Press, in reference to the recent elections and the defeat sustained by the Labour party. At least, we have not heard a great deal about the defeat of the Labour party, but rather of the success of the other

party. So far as the last elections go the Labour party won magnificently; we won three seats which had never previously been won by Labour candidates. We lost one certainly, but we put up a great fight in two other constituencies. That is the record of the Labour party at the last election; we won three seats which had never previously been won, we lost one, and we put up a magnificent fight for two others. I do not think we have much to complain of in regard to that election, and I do not know that with the narrow and restricted franchise on which we had to fight, we have not a good deal to congratulate ourselves upon. I am always prepared to give credit where credit is due, and to give Mr. Sommers credit for his victory. But what did it mean? Did it mean the defeat of the Labour party, or was it a great success for the Liberal party? That election was won by men outside the metropolitan area.

Hon. C. Sommers: Your Ministry know all about it.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): The hon. member knows perfectly well that his election was almost purely won by non-resident votes.

Hon. M. L. Moss: What, that majority?

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): Yes. So far as the metropolitan province goes, it exceeded my expectations by hundreds of votes, and the fact that Mr. Doheny could put up such a fight will cause Mr. Jenkins and Mr. Kingsmill some little uneasiness. A lot has been said about the non-party aspect of this House, and Mr. Moss particularly had a lot to say on that point, and also in regard to those who are seeking to make this a party House. If there is one statement more than another that savours of political humbug and political hypocrisy it is the statement that this is not a party House. The statement may have been true in the past, when there was only one section of the community represented in the House, when Labour had no voice here, and when, if there was a dividing line at all, it was between the extreme Conservatives and the Liberals. I well remember when I was in South Australia



—I am not sure whether it was two years ago or 18 months ago—the late Premier, Mr. Wilson, passed through Adelaide on his way to the old country; it may have been at the time that he was going to the Coronation. In an interview he gave to the Press in South Australia he stated his Government had certainly a narrow majority in the Legislative Assembly, but in the other Chamber they had a party comprising almost every member in it with the exception of two or three of the Labour party. Now, that was a true statement in regard to this House. When members talk about the non-party aspect of the House, it is time someone raised a voice in protest. The amendment is simply an endorsement of partisanship; though members may say what they like to the contrary, they know it. Realising in the other Chamber that they can only secure something like eight out of a membership of 50, they have transferred the fight from that Chamber to this House, and the amendment is simply an endorsement of partisanship. A good deal has been said about the constitutional aspect of the items contained in the Governor's Speech; and Mr. Moss said that we wanted a man to be judge who should be absolutely impartial, someone to whom we could look to be impartial in all things; but it is most significant that Mr. Moss does not use his own words in throwing the element of partisanship against one of the judges, but uses someone else's words when quoting the statement that one judge was a "sentimental humbug." There is one way of saying a judge is partial, and there is another way, and Mr. Moss evidently desired to take the way which would appear least hurtful to him. As for the constitutional aspect of these matters, I intend to say very little. From what I can understand from the speeches of hon. members, and from what I have learned, I am almost inclined to challenge Mr. Moss or any other member of the House to say there has been any illegal or unconstitutional action in connection with any of the proposals of the Ministry. There is an advance of £250,000 made to the Treasurer, something that was never made before.

The Colonial Secretary: Yes, it has been in existence for the last two years.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): That advance is to cover certain things, and one of those is the matter of "unforeseen expenditure." Although it may be said the Government had in contemplation the purchase of steamers and various other things to reduce the cost of living, it cannot be said that the Government had in view altogether the purchase of steamers; otherwise possibly some Trading Bill may have been brought down during last session of Parliament. Now, surely the words "unforeseen expenditure" cover all the Government have undertaken in connection with trading enterprises, and I challenge Mr. Moss or any other member of the Council to prove there is anything illegal or unconstitutional in connection with the purchase of these steamers.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: He has already proved it.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): If Mr. Moss wants to prove it, let him go to the law courts and prove it there, where other parties have tried to prove illegal expenditure and have, perhaps, proved it in the past. It is all very well for Mr. Moss or any other gentleman to use the majority in this Chamber to try to show something unconstitutional or illegal in connection with this purchase of steamers. I am rather inclined to think the public will not swallow the bait. There are one or two matters I would like to quote in connection with the constitutional aspect of the steamers purchase, although I do not intend to dwell on this matter. The name of the Governor has been drawn into the debate, and we who hold the position of Ministers of the Crown are under an obligation to see that the name of his Excellency the Governor is not used in a way it should not be used in connection with the debates here. I think it was Mr. Moss who said—not in that direct manner to which I have drawn attention just now, but rather by the indirect method—that according to *Todd* the Governor is treading on very thin ice in regard to this expenditure. And again, not in that direct manner which would appeal to the

public, but in an indirect manner, he says that Ministers have placed in the mouth of his Excellency the Governor certain proposals contained in the Governor's Speech. I will read one or two remarks from *Keith on Responsible Government in the Dominions*—a book hardly as old as *Todd*, but dealing right up to 1910. I will read a few extracts, because the Cabinet are not going to shelter themselves from any wrong-doing, if there is any, behind his Excellency the Governor.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: You cannot.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): In regard to the Governor and the law and the expenditure of public funds, it is said—

We have seen in the case of dissolutions the duty which the Governor has thrown upon him to try to secure supply before he grants a dissolution; whenever that is not done there will certainly be a time when the law will, strictly speaking, be violated if the public obligations are to be met. But this fact is subject to various considerations: in the first place, in the Australian colonies, which are, and have always been, by far the greatest offenders in this respect in virtue of the constant change of Ministries, the practice exists and has always existed for moneys to be paid out on a Governor's warrant, anticipating the sanction of Parliament.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: In the case of a dissolution?

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): It does not say so. It speaks of a dissolution here, but it applies to all cases. There is another remark—

In Tasmania, again, a very vigilant and careful Governor found it necessary without legal appropriation to approve the issue of certain sums of money to the judges, who were doing extra work during a vacancy in the bench: this action was attacked in the Assembly, but the Opposition failed to carry the motion of censure: it is clear, however, that the act was illegal.

Here is something that is extremely interesting to this non-party House, acting in the non-party way it always does—

In the case of Western Australia the same Governor, in 1909—

This was when the Liberal party were in office—

was forced to allow the meeting of Parliament to be delayed until July 28, after the return from England of his Premier, who had been there on a visit, and so the country was for a considerable period without legal authority for appropriation at all. In South Australia the habit of signing excess warrants has existed for no less than twenty years, and has been approved, if not recognised as legal, by no less than three Ministers, one after another, it being defended by one Minister as a convenient and, indeed, necessary means of procedure.

Now, further than that, I want to draw attention to an incident that occurred in Transvaal last year. The Act of Federation which brought about the South African Union occurred last year. In the Transvaal there were two Houses of Parliament, the Upper House and the Lower House. For a short session they were only to be paid a certain amount. A Bill was sent up to make legal a payment for the full session of the year. The Upper House would not pass that Bill, but the Lower House did so. It was finally decided to pay the amount. Some persons in the Transvaal decided to test the matter before a court of law, and the court held the payment was illegal; but despite that fact, the Government decided that they were quite justified in paying the money. Certain questions were asked with regard to this in the House of Lords, and certain decisions were given. Lord Crewe was asked by Lord Northcote, the late Governor General of Australia, some questions in regard to the matter, and this is the synopsis of the answer Lord Crewe gave—

He admitted, however, that a Governor must not normally, whether advised by Ministers or not, participate in an illegal action. Such participation could only be approved in case of most supreme public necessity, and normally in such cases the action would not be such as would be pronounced

illegal until after it had been taken. Moreover, the Governor has his Attorney General and his legal advisers, and he presumably, not as a rule being a legal expert himself, was entitled to take the view of the state of the law from them. That being so, he did not think that it was reasonable or necessary to lay down instructions for a Governor as to what he was to do if action were proposed to him which he considered illegal, but he recognised the principle that a Governor of a Colony, even when acting as Governor in Council, was not to regard the advice of his Ministers as having an authority superior to that of the law, and that except in the case of the most urgent public necessity it was his duty to refuse to approve an illegal action.

As I say, Ministers do not desire to shelter themselves behind his Excellency the Governor. It is our duty to shield the Governor in any attack, intended or otherwise, made upon him. There is no question that the amendment, stating that something illegal or unconstitutional is being done when it is not being done, is not only a slur upon the Ministry, but a slur on the Governor. In regard to the second part of the amendment, to which a considerable amount of criticism has been devoted, and of which a good deal has been made, it may be said that some slight has been placed upon the Council. With the Colonial Secretary, all I can say is that no slight was ever intended. I think members are fully satisfied that no slight was meant to be put upon this Council in any shape or form. Further than that, I contend that no slight has been sustained by the Council in connection with the Governor's Speech. I have here a list of unauthorised payments that have been made and assented to, sometimes many months afterwards, by Parliament. Some of them, the Colonial Secretary informs me, have not yet been assented to.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: It is time it was stopped.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I think the promptings which have taken place among the Opposition, if I

may so term those hon. members, during the course of this debate might have led them to refrain from indulging in the bad taste of referring to a single prompting by the Colonial Secretary.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: I was not referring to the prompting.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I thought you were. I am quite sure any unbiased person would concede that there has been no slight placed upon the Council. Almost the very same wording has been observed in this Speech as in all Speeches of a similar nature which have been delivered before. One word, the word "ratify," may have been used instead of "approve," and this non-party Chamber has picked upon this little point in his Excellency's Speech in order to assist their friends somewhere else. I just want to say a few words in connection with the speeches that have been made. Mr. Sanderson, who is not as yet so well versed in the art of political diplomacy as many other members here, has stated candidly that he cannot dissociate himself from his political views outside. That is a candid admission for which I honour Mr. Sanderson. I may say that having regard to the non-party attitude of this Chamber, I, for one, thought it would be well to place Mr. Cornell over in that seat behind Mr. Kingsmill. I thought it would be more in keeping with our non-party professions made from time to time if some of us were over there and some of the other side over here. I wanted to put Mr. Cornell over there, because I knew he would be impregnable against the blandishments of Mr. Kingsmill, and I wanted Mr. Sanderson over here because I thought, on the other hand, that he might be susceptible to some of our blandishments. I was with Mr. Sanderson for a day or so some years ago and we used to argue out things pretty fully, and from what I knew of his views I thought we might possibly catch him. But Mr. Kingsmill, so keen was his regard for the non-party attitude of the House, had already commandeered the seat for Mr. Sanderson, and consequently Mr. Corne-

was forced to take a seat behind us. I cannot get away from that subject without drawing attention to the attitude adopted by Mr. Kingsmill. The hon. member said that he would speak the more freely on account of the remoteness of his offence, but that as a member of previous Governments he had been guilty of some of these unconstitutional practices, as he terms them, himself. And he said also that previous Governments, and the previous Government, had been guilty of infinitely worse unconstitutional practices than had the present Government. The only justification Mr. Kingsmill claimed for not having taken a stand before was that the present is the most recent occasion. Yet he admits that not merely one or two, but numerous instances, have occurred of a similar nature. Why did Mr. Kingsmill only recognise that wrong has no precedent when a Government came into power holding different views from his own?

Hon. W. Kingsmill: How do you know that?

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): Evidently Mr. Kingsmill has not followed out that rule which asks us to take the mote out of our own eye before attempting to take it out of the other fellow's. It would have been infinitely more creditable in Mr. Kingsmill, to whom we are told are entrusted the privileges of the House, had he made a stand against these practices on some previous occasion, instead of waiting for this party to come into power.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: The previous Government made a wrong step which you condone and carry on.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): Mr. Kingsmill said it was unfortunate that it should have occurred during the regime of the hon. gentleman who now leads the House. It was indeed unfortunate, and I take it had there been another gentleman of the Liberal party, leading the House Mr. Kingsmill would have probably had nothing to say, even on the present occasion. Mr. Moss had a good deal to say in connection with the Trades Hall, and he waxed very sarcastic in regard

to brass bands leading the procession. Various other members have also drawn attention to the fact that on the memorable occasion when so many people turned out to back up the Labour party in their efforts a brass band was utilised. I do not know that there is anything to get so violent over in regard to a brass band.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Probably you did not hear the band.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I think that at the opening of Parliament a brass band used to be stationed here, and also in connection with military manoeuvres and on many other occasions brass bands are greatly in evidence. I am sure if Mr. Connor had been present on that day he would have been quite happy to hear that brass band playing the "Roast Beef of Old England" and the "Bold Buccaneers," or something of that kind. But this is not the only occasion on which brass bands have been used in aid of political parties. Possibly Mr. Moss is not aware that a branch of that party to which he belongs—perhaps chivalry should withhold me from disclosing this—the Women's Liberal League, when they finished up that wonderful conference and went on the river for a picnic, came down with song and music to the tune of, "We will hang John Brown to a sour apple tree." But "John Brown" was not the name they used, it was "Andy Fisher." That is the sort of music the Liberal League provides for those holding opinions not in accordance with their views. Yet we find member after member getting up and complaining about the brass band playing the "Roast Beef of Old England" because we were to try to bring down the price of meat. A good deal has been said in the course of the debate about electors without brains. Mr. Moss practically referred to the fact that we want electors with brains in order to be able to prevent the march of political agitators who are likely to bring ruin upon the country. It is a poor compliment to the electors that two-thirds of them should be characterised as having no brains.

Hon. M. L. Moss: I never made any such remark.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): It may be that Mr. Moss may think of these electors as he does of—the civil service, I think it was; I made a note of it. Mr. Moss, in speaking of the civil service—a great body of men and women who, I believe, are equal to any other body of men and women trying to do their duty and carry out their work in a proper manner throughout the Commonwealth—Mr. Moss, referred to the civil service as a refuge for many derelicts who could not make their way outside. That is the way a large body of electors in the State are stigmatised by the hon. member. And when he states we want electors with brains, that these are the people to run the country, and that they can only be found in the ranks of electors to this House, it is a poor compliment to the men and women of the land. Much has also been said in connection with capital being driven out of the country, and we have had the usual pessimistic utterances of Mr. Moss, holding up to us that the Labour party are bringing ruin to the country, that capital is being driven out, and that you want men and women with stakes in the country. Good old gags these are; I have heard them for the last twenty or thirty years. So far as I can see, the family is the best stake you can possibly get. Whether he has a thousand pounds or a thousand pence, the man who is trying to rear his family, and bring them up in the best way he can, has just as much a stake in the country as a man with two or three thousand pounds. I would like to say I have five stakes in the country, all boys, and I do not know but that I am doing my best to get an interest, and a considerable interest, by trying to rear my family here. Those boys will each require a moiety of Mr. Connor's beef, Mr. Piesse's apples, and, no doubt, of Mr. McLarty's pigs. These are the sort of stakes you want in the country. Talk about a man with ten, twenty, or thirty thousand pounds as the only one who has any stake in the country, and the only one with brains to control the destiny of the country, requires language that I, for one, cannot find to describe. Mr. Moss in making the statement in re-

ference to capital and stakes in the country, etcetra, said the Labour party were bringing ruin to the country, but Mr. Sanderson takes up an entirely different attitude. Here we have two gentlemen, standing high in their profession, one saying that we are bringing ruin to the country and the other saying that all our legislation, all our Arbitration Acts, all our Early Closing Acts and all our Acts dealing with social reform are helping the capitalists. I cannot understand it. Mr. Sanderson freely admits that all this legislation the Labour party are bringing into existence is only helping the capitalists. It is the best possible thing that could happen, Mr. Sanderson believing as he does and Mr. Moss believing as he does, to pass over all legislation to the Labour party which is doing so much to help the capitalists. According to Mr. Sanderson every bit of legislation excepting the iniquitous land tax is intended to help the capitalist. He is on a good wicket. There is one thing Mr. Moss and Mr. Sanderson are agreed upon and that is that we should look to America and other countries as examples of prosperity, that these are the countries which are prosperous and which we should copy to be prosperous also. I want to give a few figures in connection with the prosperity of America and England. I think it only right to do this because it is well to know what kind of prosperity we are asked to look to. In the United States of America, as Mr. Cornell has pointed out, there are 15 million underfed, under-clothed, and wretchedly housed people, and 99 per cent. of the wage-earners are without any property whatever. That is wonderful prosperity; one per cent. have all the property. Over four millions of the population are absolute paupers; one-third of the population of New York receive aid from public sources, and one-tenth of those who die are buried in the potters' field. The article goes on to say—"And this, in degree, is what the Trusts acting through the agency of place-hunting politicians would bring about in Australia." That is in America. I want also to draw attention to a few figures presented to the British House of Commons

by Dr. Drysdale in an official report made to the British Houses of Parliament. He stated that out of 100 children eight died in the first year of their life. That was among the well-to-do classes, and as many as thirty out of every hundred succumbed among the children of those who were poor. This is largely due to the fact that at the bottom of society, wages are so low that food and other requisites of life can be obtained only with great difficulty. Another authority, Dr. Playfair, stated that among the upper classes, eighteen out of every hundred children died before they reached the age of five, but of the children of the working class 55 out of every hundred died before they reached the age of five. In writing up this article it is stated—

... But British Minister Haldane says, "the Empire was never more prosperous than it is to-day," and he looks forward to "a great expansion of trade with the awakening East." There is something horribly wrong with the Empire that is busy making cotton for the Chinese and coffins for its children.

It is well to point out the prosperity of America and these other countries. I might state that in connection with those revelations which were made by Upton Sinclair in *The Jungle*, which almost appalled the civilised world, a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into some of the allegations, and that commission stated that conditions were worse than Sinclair had portrayed them in his book. I hope Australians will take warning and not be led away by the appeal to the prosperity of America, England, Germany and other places. Reference has also been made to the high cost of living and high wages, and it has been stated that the high cost of living has been brought about by the high rate of wages. I am not going to deny that that is not true; in many cases it is true. High wages tend to make the cost of living high, but that is not all that is operating to bring about the high cost of living. It is the elimination of competition by trusts, monopolies and honourable understandings—another name for trusts—which is as much responsible

for the high cost of living as the high rate of wages. I am not going to deal with the question of protection or freetrade, but I would like to say that probably my views on this matter are in accordance with the views of many members with the exception that, while they are prepared to argue the question of freetrade or protection only, when it comes to protection and land values taxation, which must go with any system of freetrade, it is quite another matter. Until the people of Australia wake up to the fact that salvation lies to some extent in a revision of the Customs, it is not much use of State Parliaments endeavouring to take any action in the matter. I want to say a few words in connection with the Arbitration Bill which was before the House last session. Mr. Moss gave what he stated was a fair summary of what took place in connection with that Bill. While it may be to some extent fair, I say emphatically that Mr. Moss did not give what may be stated as the whole facts in connection with the rejection of that Bill.

Hon. M. L. Moss: What did I omit?

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): The Bill consisted of 16 clauses. When it came before this Chamber six of those clauses were amended. That is more than one-third of the Bill. Not only did the Council decide to amend and reject certain clauses of that particular amending measure, but went one further and decided to make the principle of the Bill under which we were working more reactionary than it was then, and Mr. Moss, himself, I think, moved for the elimination of the pastoral and rural industries from the Bill.

Hon. M. L. Moss: You know these amendments were not insisted on; in the end they were all put back.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): The hon. member knows what an oath is that warns us to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. I am going to give not only the facts relating to the Bill when it left this House, but at the time it was before the House Mr. Moss tried to make this Bill more reactionary than it was by the elimination

of those industries from the definition which would have prevented shearers and those engaged in rural industries from taking advantage of arbitration. The Bill went back to the Assembly and reference has been made to the arbitrary action taken by the other place in connection with this measure. What did the other place do? They agreed to three out of the six amendments made and returned the Bill. There was a deadlock in connection with two clauses, and I am inclined to think that if when the managers had met the night this Bill was discussed, the majority of this House would have been inclined to pass this measure even then, had it not been for a sense of loyalty to those who were appointed to represent this House, and I think the majority of members have regretted that they did not pass the measure at the time. Reference has been made to agitators, and again I have to refer to Mr. Moss in this connection. Mr. Moss stated that had not it been for agitators, who were always trying to create strife, and who did not tell people that they were far better off here than in other parts of the world, we would not have had the trouble we have had. I want to quote a statement made by two of these agitators on the goldfields, and it was to the goldfields Mr. Moss particularly referred, because he spoke of 13s. 4d. per day as the money earned by miners at the Boulder. The following remarks were made by Mr. G. McLeod, secretary of a union of almost 3,000 strong, probably the most militant union in Western Australia, and by Mr. H. Glance, the general secretary of that body, which comprises about 5,000 members operating throughout the eastern and northern goldfields. They made passing reference to the early termination of the existing agreement between the mining companies and the miners, and added—

They were proud to be able to say that, when the miners entered into an agreement, they were prepared honestly and faithfully to carry it out. The existing agreement had been in force three years, and although conditions in that time had altered, and the cost of

living had increased, they had stuck to the agreement without asking for concessions.

I ask members if they call those men agitators?

Hon. D. G. Gawler: You would not call them agitators, would you?

Hon. M. L. Moss: That is not the class I am driving at at all.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): Mr. Moss referred to agitators and principally on the goldfields.

Hon. M. L. Moss: There are plenty on the goldfields.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I am referring to those men who are holding the highest and most responsible positions in connection with unionism on the goldfields. I might go further and say that in the metropolitan area, had it not been for some of these agitators upon whom Mr. Moss looks with such scorn, we would have had trouble here which possibly would have left this city in a very bad position. In connection with the transport trouble which seemed likely to take place, it was only the hard work, perseverance, courage, and energy of some of these agitators in responsible positions that saved the situation. I know something of the inside running, and I say that the people of Western Australia should think more of these despised agitators. Let me say also to make a statement like that to which I have referred requires a little bit of grit and courage. It is not always an easy matter to stand up before 300 or 400 miners, some of them perhaps smarting under an injustice, and many of them thinking that they should have higher wages and better hours; and I repeat, it requires grit to stand before them and say that they had better wait until their agreement expires or to try and settle their troubles without having recourse to striking. I think hon. members might think twice and well before they make so many references to labour agitators. Another matter which has been touched upon by Mr. Moss—I am sorry to have to refer so many times to that hon. member, but he was the first speaker, and I look upon him as the leader of the Opposition in this

non-party Chamber, and I think other members of this Council regard Mr. Moss as such—is that the Labour party, almost to a man, are in favour of unification. Mr. Lynn could hardly agree with Mr. Moss, and he stated that so far as New South Wales was concerned the Labour party there were not unificationists; I want to say that that statement is an absolute libel, and it is thoroughly incorrect, and cannot be borne out. I for one opposed unification by every means in my power, and I say here and I say it advisedly, that that which is making towards unification and working the hardest to bring it about, is action such as that which is being indulged in in this non-party Chamber in connection with the amendment. Nothing can go further towards bringing about unification than that, and I say here, and I say it advisedly, that if such an attitude is persisted in, and if the Labour party is to be compelled to fight this Chamber in order to get some of its measures through, I for one will do my best for unification in order to get justice where it is denied.

Hon. M. L. Moss: That is a threat.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I would remind the hon. gentleman that interjections do not worry me much; I am not particularly keen in wasting my time in order to get over interjections, consequently I hope the hon. member will not be annoyed if I do not take any notice of them. Much has been said with reference to centralisation. I do not know any other place in the world where the system of centralisation has been indulged in by previous Governments or parties than has been the case in this State. It is fairly bad in Sydney and Melbourne, but I should say it is equally as bad in Perth or, I should say, in Western Australia. I should say, like Mr. Cornell, that if a vote of mine can bring about a reform of this Chamber that vote will always be given. I for one do not hold the opinion that many do with reference to this Chamber; I am not one who believes that the Chamber is composed of what is understood to be old fossils who have no intelligence. I do not

think I have any animosity against any member in this Chamber, but to my mind, on the score of expense, its existence is not warranted, and if we could bring about diffusion of power by such means as the initiative and referendum, it seems to me that one Chamber will be sufficient to control the affairs of Western Australia.

Hon. M. L. Moss: One referendum will cost more than a year's salaries of members of this House.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): Mr. Sanderson, who is not present just now, when contesting his election, had a good deal to say about humanitarian legislation, and he classed himself as a supporter of all that would tend to uplift and bring about better conditions for those who were on the lower rung of the ladder. I might say that I got one of Mr. Sanderson's pamphlets under my door, and it almost led me to give him my second vote, but reading his speech here I should be exceedingly glad to know what line he wants this humanitarian legislation to take. To my mind the attitude he adopted was simply the attitude of despair—that whatever legislation was brought down, nothing would be of any benefit to those who were on the lower rung of the ladder. Mr. Colebatch, in speaking about the non-alienation of Crown lands, the other evening, referred to the fact that we could not say that we had received a mandate from the people, and that it had not been before the people in the way that many of those other questions to which we had drawn attention here, but I think if there was one question that was before the people more than another during last session it was this particular one.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: I stated that your paper repudiated it, and said it would probably be altered.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): The paper or the party?

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: The paper.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I only go by what the party do. So far as repudiating it is concerned, I think the party did quite the reverse, and I say, if there was one thing the



mandate of the people was given upon it was that question.

Hon. B. C. O'Brien: It was a great cry at the finish.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): Mr. Colebatch went further, and I hardly like to use the term, but he made a cheap sneer at the Labour party. Mr. Lynn also drew attention to the same matter, and it was either Mr. Lynn or Mr. Colebatch who said that the Labour party had not the adaptability and all other things necessary to carry out the State's financial policy. I think the time has gone in a country such as this for innuendoes or sneers of that kind to be made by anyone. The Labour party have shown themselves to be as capable as any other party in handling the finances of the country, and in connection with the Federal Parliament they have shown themselves to be indeed very capable--

Hon. M. L. Moss: Taking money from the people's pockets.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): In bringing about, if I may use that good old term, stable government. The Labour party in the Commonwealth have this year a surplus of £2,000,000, and that fact is causing a good deal of anxiety to many of those who are in opposition to them. Had that amount been a deficit instead of a surplus, what a howl of indignation there would have been. Now there is a surplus of £2,000,000, and we are told that we are robbing the people, and that we are taking this money which should be in the pockets of the people, and that, too, in view of the vast undertakings which are going to be carried out during the next few years.

Hon. E. McLarty: Taken out of the pockets of a few people.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Australia was never more prosperous than it is at the present time.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): First we are told that we are taking this money, through the customs, out of the pockets of the people generally, and now we are told by Mr. McLarty that we are taking it out of the pockets of a few. If one really could get down to settled opinions they would form very entertain-

ing reading. Mr. Colebatch also referred to the workers' homes, and he drew attention to a small pamphlet which has been issued showing the drawing of the proposed homes. I would like to assure Mr. Colebatch that it is not intended to adopt that design for all the proposed workers' homes; the homes will provide rooms not only for the man and woman of the house but also for the babies. Reference has also been made to the convention constitution, and instances were given of the way in which the present electoral system will work in connection with convention constitutions. I would like to draw attention to the vote that was recorded in South Australia some time ago, and of which a good deal has been made by the Liberal Press, and that is that in that State, for the sixteen seats won by the Labour party more votes were cast than for the 24 seats held by the other party. If the convention constitution paws out so badly in connection with our Liberal system, it seems to me that the other constitution does not work much better. Mr. Sommers also drew attention to the same matter, and referred to the fact that 500 might vote one way and 501 the other way and secure all the representation. What I would like to know is why the various Governments he has supported up to date have not done anything to try and remedy that state of affairs. Liberal Governments have been in office almost the whole time since Responsible Government, and nothing whatever was done until two sessions ago, when an effort was made to bring about a better state of affairs, and yet we find the Labour party are being blamed for the bad electoral laws. The desire to cut up the Federal Senate into constituencies, was that the party might not secure any representation therein. I have been struck during the course of this debate with the patriotism of hon. members. Mr. Connor who spoke very eloquently for two and a half hours on beef, and most of the other members devoted almost the whole of their speeches to beef—in fact the whole atmosphere has been electrical with beef—I say that Mr. Connor, who has such a wonderful interest in that commodity, wound up his speech by damning Collie coal, saying there was

no good in it and that nothing could be gained by using it. Even Mr. McLarty, who also has a considerable interest in the meat industry, but who represents the constituency from which Collie coal comes, could not allow that remark to pass unchallenged, and Mr. Clarke also drew attention to the same thing. It is remarkable what patriotism some hon. members have so far as their own industry is concerned, but when it comes to another industry their patriotism is of a somewhat mild order. Then I might mention that Mr. Sommers in that speech of his, which I shall not attempt to describe—the larger portion of it was mere childish ridicule—drew attention to some of the fishing grounds of Western Australia. I think the Federal trawler “Endeavour” only went as far as Geraldton, whilst the principal fishing grounds of Western Australia are up near Shark Bay; but, apart from that, Mr. Sommers did not seem to care what he led the world to believe in regard to our fishing grounds, no more than Mr. Connor cared what he led the world to believe in regard to Collie coal. Yet both hon. gentlemen were highly indignant at the Colonial Secretary stating in the House that beef was 1s. 2d. per lb. One hon. gentleman said such a statement would ruin the credit of the country. But there was no question of ruining the credit of Western Australia when they were dealing with Collie coal, and there was no thought about ruining the credit of Western Australia when Mr. Sommers stated that the “Endeavour” had caught nothing but a few stingrays, instead of fish. Mr. Sommers, with that keenness for which he is noted, might have mentioned some of the fishing grounds referred to in the official reports that have been made by Mr. Dannevig on the work of the Federal trawler “Endeavour.” The fishing grounds which he refers to are not situated at Fremantle, or at Geraldton, but down near Esperance, a place of which Mr. Kingsmill has given such a wonderful eulogy. Mr. Dannevig says—

The “Endeavour’s” catches have on several occasions reached 500lbs. of fish per hour of fishing, and it is probable that at least 300lbs. per hour may be relied upon over an extensive area.

Under these circumstances it is evident that a commercial enterprise, if properly handled, would pay handsomely, while the retail price need not exceed 3d. or 4d. per pound. The distance from Port Adelaide to these grounds is about 500 or 600 miles, and only slightly less from Albany. Trawlers working from these ports would probably make fortnightly trips (including short time), and might, on our present information, be expected to average 10 tons per trip.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: That is Eucla, not Esperance.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): It is coming round the coast into Western Australian waters. Further on Mr. Dannevig goes on to say—

The good fishing grounds in the Bight referred to are situated within 100 miles from the port of Eucla, which, when some day it is connected with the trancontinental railway, may become an important fishing centre, and supply the goldfields at regular intervals with cheap and fresh fish. This, of course, would equally apply to the Eastern markets. When, as it is understood is contemplated, the Esperance harbour in Western Australia is connected with rail, that port also will become an excellent centre for distribution. It is situated about one day’s steam from the grounds as now known; and, possibly, good fishing might also be obtainable there at a shorter distance. This depends upon the western extension of the Bight grounds, which has not yet been determined.

I think those hon. gentlemen who talk so much about their patriotism and who condemn that poor fellow McCallum for the statements he is supposed to have made in the English Press—I think he did make them, to be honest—might well look round and see whether they cannot infuse or instil a little more patriotism into their own natures, in order that Western Australia might be enabled to go ahead. These gentlemen are not the only ones who are not imbued with patriotic motives. Mr. Kingsmill, in referring

to the trading enterprise of the Government in connection with the North-West coast, spoke of the great disabilities which the ships would have to encounter in going along that coast, and he stated that every ton of coal the steamers would burn would have to be taken up the coast and brought back, whereas those ships which trade to Singapore have the opportunity of getting coal at both ends of the voyage. I take it that the journey to Singapore would take just twice as long as the journey to Wynham, and that a boat would go from Fremantle to Wyndham and back again in the same time as a boat would go from Fremantle to Singapore.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: No.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): Well something like it. Yet we are told that the Singapore boats get coal at both ends. These are some of the patriotic statements of hon. members. Had they been made by any members of the Labour party the indignation in connection with the criticism of them would have known no bounds. I would like to refer to some statements made by Mr. Sommers, but seeing that that gentleman has moved for a Select Committee to inquire into certain matters I do not intend to deal at any great length with his speech. I want to say, though, that the constitutional usage of this House, from all I have heard in regard to it in the past, will not permit me to describe in the language I would like to use the speech of that hon. gentleman. I would go further and say—

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Write it down and hand it up to the bench.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I am not going to read a speech as Mr. Sommers did; my notes are here for any hon. member who desires to read them afterwards to see what has been written down, and probably if Mr. Sommers would hand over his book also it would be extremely interesting.

Hon. C. Sommers: Here it is.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I would also like to say that, not only the constitutional usage of this House, but also all I have heard about

the tone of this Chamber, will not give me language enough to criticise Mr. Sommers' speech in the way I would like.

Hon. C. Sommers: Your Premier sets a good example to anybody.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I am not speaking of the Premier, but of Mr. Sommers. I take it that if Mr. Sommers wishes to fight his election battle over again, this Chamber is hardly the place in which to do it. I can find no language in which to adequately describe the classical expressions used by the hon. member. Let me say that I have been connected with a large number of working men's organisations, and have attended many meetings in which men have been smarting under injuries infinitely worse than Mr. Sommers smarted under, and men too, perhaps, not as well educated as Mr. Sommers, but never have I heard in any assembly language used in debate such as the hon. member has used here. Had not the hon. member called for the production of certain papers, I would have had something further to say. I am glad that a Select Committee has been appointed, and if he had not moved in that direction I would have challenged him to do so. However, it is perhaps just as well to let that matter remain in abeyance until the committee have reported. But there is one matter which I do wish to make a remark or two upon in connection with that speech, and that is on the matter of spoils to the victors. It ill becomes any man who is a supporter of the late Government to mention one solitary word in regard to spoils to the victors. Those hon. gentlemen who would support a Government responsible for such a measure as the Redistribution of Seats Act should say nothing about spoils to the victors. Those gentlemen who would support a Government responsible for the removal of an honourable gentleman who sits in this Chamber from a licensing bench, simply because he opposed them, and who would be responsible for removing another gentleman on the Murchison goldfields, who holds as clean a name as any man in the community, simply because he was an active worker against

their own particular candidate, are not those who should say anything on the subject of spoils to the victors.

Hon. C. Sommers: I have a lot to say about them yet.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): Time is getting on, and, although there is so much more I would like to say—

Hon. C. Sommers: Do not spare me.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I feel it is hardly right to keep members here. I wish to deal, however, with a few remarks made by Mr. McLarty. He had a good deal that was interesting to tell us in connection with the meat industry and various other matters, and he referred to his brothers and what they had to endure in the past, and the pluck that actuated them in working up the particular station in which they were interested. I for one have no envy of Mr. McLarty's brothers or himself, or anyone else who has been successful in an industry of that kind, and I say all honour to those who, like Mr. McLarty and his brothers, have endeavoured to do something for the country they are in as well as something for themselves. The statement to which I draw attention is the statement by Mr. McLarty, "Where will we find a member of the Labour party who would have the pluck to do such things," such things as those to which he drew attention. I might give a number of instances of members of the Labour party who have performed infinitely more plucky or heroic actions than those of Mr. McLarty's brothers, but I do not wish to mention names, though when a statement like that is made it is one that hurts. We find men going into the auriferous areas of the country and going day by day underground, facing danger of all kinds, and I take it members will agree with me that these men have exhibited just as much pluck as those who have gone into the interior to build up cattle stations. Only on Saturday we noticed in the *West Australian* that one man, Leonard Cullen, received the Clarke medal for bravery in rescuing a fellow-man, although it was almost certain death to do so. These are examples of pluck equal to those other

examples given. There are one or two remarks made by the Hon. J. D. Connolly it will be perhaps as well to draw attention to before I sit down. The Hon. J. D. Connolly and the Hon. R. D. McKenzie found fault with the Government because it was stated in the Governor's Speech that new fields had been found at Mount Jackson and Ora Banda. No one knows better than these two gentlemen that Mount Jackson and Ora Banda were virtually played-out old fields, and that new discoveries have taken place there during the past year or two. Mount Jackson was practically deserted; there has been no mining there for years. And the same may be said in connection with Kurnalpi. For years past nothing has been done there, yet to-day thousands of ounces are being brought in from Kurnalpi. Is it wrong to describe these places as new fields? It strikes me that members must be exceedingly hard-up for arguments to bring out such as these in connection with the administration of the Government. The Hon. J. D. Connolly defended the purchase of the aborigines' station because it was something for the benefit of the aborigines, yet he condemns any trading enterprise which is for the benefit of whites.

Hon. M. L. Moss: No. He said you should put chiling works there to reduce the cost of living, and advised you not to do something useless.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I wish to refer to the hon. member's remarks in connection with the Trades Hall, and also to a statement in regard to miners' unions and politics. It has been said that certain matters have been an election cry. I think I stated to one member it was purely an election cry in regard to the Trades Hall, and I thoroughly believe the outcry in connection with the Trades Hall has been made for purely electioneering purposes. What are the facts in connection with advances to trades halls in this State? Many and many a trades hall has received grants from various Governments. This is not the first grant by any means. Dozens of grants have been made to various trades halls throughout Western Australia by

different Governments. It has been said that trades-hall people are not to-day what they were in the past, that they are now more political organisations than industrial organisations. That is not so. There was just as much of the political attitude in the past as there is to-day. I have been connected with trades halls since I have been in Western Australia, something like 17 years, ever since they came to any growth at all, and I can say that political action and influence were just as much in evidence in those days as to-day.

Hon. F. Connor: We accept you as being more genuine.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I do not take that as a compliment. There are hon. members working in the trades halls equally as genuine, if I am genuine, as myself. Why is it that such an outcry or such criticism has been devoted to the proposed grant to the Perth Trades Hall? I say emphatically that behind it all is the mere question of an electioneering cry. In connection with the trades halls there is something like £10,000 or £15,000 subscribed in death dues, accident dues, and other dues for the benefit of those who would otherwise perhaps be forced upon the State. That is not politics. Is there anything in connection with the Liberal League by which benefits and otherwise are paid to those members who fall in a bad way? Yet we are told that the Trades Hall is a purely political organisation, though they are paying these benefits to which I am directing attention. The Hon. J. D. Connolly said that the Labour party were opposed to immigration, and he said that the last year his Government were in office something like 10,000 immigrants were brought out, but that since we have been in office during the last nine months there were only 7,000 immigrants brought to the shores of Western Australia. The figures I have may not be exactly correct, but I think they are just about right. During the twelve months ending 30th June, 1911, the last financial year of the previous Government, we received 7,606 immigrants. To the 30th June, 1912, we received 9,601 immigrants, or an increase

of 1,995 in the financial year that we have concluded. From October, 1910, to October, 1911, the total number of immigrants received was 8,678. From October, 1911, to 30th June, 1912, that is covering the period the Labour Government have been in office, the total number received was 7,741 immigrants, almost as many as were brought out in the twelve months by the previous Government.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: Will you keep it up?

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): Half a moment; I have not quite finished. The approximate number for the twelve months will be about 10,000 immigrants, providing for those at present on the sea. Now this is very interesting to the hon. member who asked that question. At present there are 4,317 nominations approved and waiting for passages.

Hon. M. L. Moss: Who made the contracts under which you are bringing them out?

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): Never mind the contracts; we shall deal with those next year. I have one or two remarks to make before I sit down. There are many others I would like to draw attention to, but time is getting too late. When I first came to the Chamber I remember listening to speeches on the Address-in-reply, and I was struck with the extreme Socialistic Chamber into which I had gained a footing; and I remember on going back to Kalgoorlie that I met Mr. Cornell, and knowing he was fairly more of an extreme Socialist than myself, I told him that he was only wasting his time in dealing with the moderate views of the Socialistic and Democratic Federation of Kalgoorlie, and that he should by all means try to secure a footing in this Chamber, because of the extreme socialistic views of hon. members. I wish to read a few extracts from their views. They will be found in the *Hansard* records of the debate in 1910. The late Mr. Throssell, it will be well remembered, drew attention to the fact of the great difficulty agriculturists had in getting agricultural machinery, and he expressed himself in very emphatic and

clear terms in favour of the establishment of the manufacture of agricultural implements in the State. He said that he would give his heartiest and strongest support if any Government would decide upon the establishment of these works. He also went further and stated that the establishment of a State hotel at Gwalia was one of the best undertakings that had ever been entered into in Western Australia, that the supply of good liquor, with the exercise of real good management had brought about quite a revolution in connection with the liquor traffic. Mr. Patrick while claiming for Geraldton district that it was central and contained the largest available extent of country so far as sheep were concerned, contended that in any case the Government should go on with the proposed works at Wyndham, comforting himself with the reflection that other similar works would follow. Mr. Connor said that he should try to develop the country by the erection of meat works, and that in following this course the Government would be doing something for the benefit of the State generally. Mr. Patrick supported that, with the reservation that he wanted the works to be at Geraldton. Mr. Throssell desired State manufacture of agricultural implements, and State sale of liquor. Mr. Hamersley said that in some places, as for instance, Victoria and South Australia, the farmers were always attempting to induce various Governments to institute the elevator system, and remarked that the most important and successful countries trading in wheat had this system in vogue. Mr. Kingsmill interjected "What about the ships?" whereupon Mr. Hamersley said that we would have very little difficulty in getting ships to come here, and that if we could not get them the country was socialistic enough and sufficiently ambitious, and he did not see why we should not build these ships for ourselves. Therefore it will be seen a wonderful change has come over the opinions expressed by members of this Chamber. In 1910 they were so extremely socialistic that I, for one, considered Mr. Cornell was indeed wasting his time at Kalgoorlie with the socialistic Demo-

cratic Federation, and it was through my telling him of this that he first decided to seek a place in this Chamber. It is a wonderful change that has come over hon. members in this non-party House. When there was only the Liberal party in existence it was all well and good. They believed in socialism, in having anything and everything at all. Everything in the garden was lovely. But to-day there is another party. The Labour party happened to get control of the Government benches, and I am afraid this Chamber has had to take up the role usually adopted by the Opposition in another place. I do not know that I need say anything more. Personally, as far as concerns any amendment or any motion which may be submitted here, it does not affect the Ministry or myself in the least, but I do say in connection with the amendment before the House that it contains a reflection on His Excellency the Governor which should not be tolerated by the majority of members sitting here. I only hope that during the coming session members, according to their professions, will be prepared to give a fair deal to the Ministry, and I hope that in doing this they will be actuated by a desire not only to give us a fair deal, but to give a fair deal to all parts of the country. Then I am sure Western Australia will not go backwards, but will move forwards and upwards.

Amendment (that the words proposed to be struck out be struck out) put, and a division taken with the following result :—

Ayes	..	..	..	16
Noes	..	..	..	5

Majority for .. 11

#### AYES.

Hon. M. P. Colebatch	Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. F. Connor	Hon. M. L. Moss
Hon. D. G. Gawler	Hon. C. A. Piesse
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. A. Sanderson
Hon. A. G. Jenkins	Hon. C. Sommers
Hon. W. Kingsmill	Hon. T. H. Wilding
Hon. R. J. Lynn	Hon. J. F. Cullen
Hon. C. McKenzie	(Teller).
Hon. R. D. McKenzie	

## NOES.

Hon. J. Cornell  
Hon. J. E. Dodd  
Hon. J. M. Drew

Hon. J. W. Kirwan  
Hon. F. Davis  
(Teller).

Amendment thus passed.

Amendment (that the words proposed to be inserted be so inserted) put and a division taken, with the following result:—

Ayes .. ..	16
Noes .. ..	5
Majority for ..	11

## AYES.

Hon. F. Connor  
Hon. J. F. Cullen  
Hon. D. G. Gawler  
Hon. V. Hamersley  
Hon. A. G. Jenkins  
Hon. W. Kingmill  
Hon. R. J. Lynn  
Hon. C. McKenzie  
Hon. R. D. McKenzie

Hon. E. McLarty  
Hon. M. L. Moss  
Hon. C. A. Plesse  
Hon. A. Sanderson  
Hon. C. Sommers  
Hon. T. H. Wildlog  
Hon. H. P. Colebatch  
(Teller).

## NOES.

Hon. J. Cornell  
Hon. J. E. Dodd  
Hon. J. M. Drew

Hon. J. W. Kirwan  
Hon. F. Davis  
(Teller).

Amendment thus passed.

The PRESIDENT: The question now is, that the Address-in-reply as amended be agreed to.

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

*House adjourned at 10.28 p.m.*

## PAIRS.

Hon. J. D. Connolly  
Hon. W. Patrick

Hon. R. G. Ardagh  
Hon. B. C. O'Brien

## Legislative Assembly,

*Tuesday, 16th July, 1912.*

	PAGE
Papers presented .. ..	443
Question: Insane patients, applications for release ..	443
Address-in-reply, seventh day .. ..	444

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

## PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Minister for Works: 1, Papers re petition of John Maher for compensation (order on motion by Mr. Dwyer). 2, Amendment of by-laws (schedule 1) of the Goldfields Water Supply Administration.

## QUESTION — INSANE PATIENTS, APPLICATIONS FOR RELEASE.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON asked the Honorary Minister: 1, Has a petition been received from a number of patients at the hospital for the insane, Claremont, asking that any inmate who considers himself (or herself) unlawfully detained in the institution should be enabled on application to have his (or her) case publicly investigated by a judge of the Supreme Court, provided the applicant shows cause to the satisfaction of the judge that such investigation should be held? 2, Is it true that patients in similar institutions in the State of Victoria have the privilege mentioned? 3, In view of the immense importance of this privilege to the unfortunate persons concerned, is it the intention of the Government to grant the request of the petitioners?

The HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. W. C. Angwin) replied: 1, A petition has been signed by three or four patients on this matter, and several patients have written to the judges of the Supreme Court asking for release. The letters have been sent on in each case, and the judges, after making full inquiry, considered it unnecessary to go any further in the matter. No attempt has been made by the Lunacy authorities to prevent any case being fully investigated by the judges. 2, Yes. 3, Provision already exists under Section 107 of The Lunacy Act. 1903.