

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 24th May, 1934.

	PAGE
Question: Fremantle wharf, pre-cooling stores ...	359
Adjournment, special ...	359

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

QUESTION—FREMANTLE WHARF, PRE-COOLING STORES.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Have plans been prepared for the construction of pre-cooling stores for fruit on the Fremantle wharf? 2, If so, what is the estimated cost? 3, In view of the loss sustained by fruit exporters, because of the non-provision of such stores, do the Government intend to provide pre-cooling facilities on the Fremantle wharf, and, if so, when?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, Rough sketches, following on receipt of Mr. Crowe's report on this question, were made. 2, £70,000. 3, It is not the practice to disclose Government policy when replying to questions.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. A. McCallum—South Fremantle) [4.32]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till Wednesday, the 30th May, at 4.30 p.m.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 4.33 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 29th May, 1934.

	PAGE
Leave of absence ...	359
Bills: Secession, 2r. ...	359
Constitution Acts Amendment (Temporary), 2r. ...	370

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. C. B. Williams, leave of absence for six consecutive sittings granted to Hon. A. M. Clydesdale (Metropolitan-Suburban) on the ground of urgent private business.

On motion by Hon. J. Nicholson, leave of absence for six consecutive sittings granted to Hon. L. B. Bolton (Metropolitan) on the ground of urgent private business.

BILL—SECESSION.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 24th May.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West) [4.36]: I do not intend to occupy much of the time of the House on this occasion, because in my opinion the position is simple and there is no need to go over all the arguments for and against Secession. We have had those arguments in previous sessions at considerable length, and they do not affect the present position at all. It appears to me that the House has been called together to give effect to what may be termed a mere machinery clause attached to a measure which this Chamber has already passed. The merits and demerits of Secession have been debated at great length, and a decision has been arrived at by the people. So far as I see, the Government, in accordance with that decision, are doing the correct thing in taking the step proposed in this Bill. The passing of the measure or of another of a like nature, is really the first step towards implementing the people's mandate. If we reject the present Bill without putting in its place another having the same objective, we shall be deliberately flouting the expressed wish of a majority of the people who voted at the Secession referendum. We must bear

in mind that that vote was not a minor matter. About 91 per cent. of the electors, I believe, voted at the referendum, and the majority was very substantial.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Was the proposal at that time to approach the Imperial Parliament?

Hon. W. J. MANN: I do not know that there was a definite proposal to that effect, but there was an implied proposal that if the referendum were carried some action would be taken to give effect to that decision. The action proposed in the Bill is what the Government, in their wisdom, believe to be the right course. We cannot permit matters to stay where they are. Something must be done. Unless we are devoid of all sense of fairness, we must assent to the Bill and allow the Government to proceed on their way with the question. To do other than that would, in my opinion, strike a blow at the very basis of our governmental system. We all subscribe to majority rule. Even we members are in this Chamber as a result of that system. Every member is here because a majority of the electors rightly or wrongly—perhaps some of the electors erred—decided that we are their preference and that we can represent them.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: A majority of a section of the electors.

Hon. W. J. MANN: There is not much to be gained by pursuing Mr. Holmes's suggestion too far. We are here because the people, by that system of majority rule, have sent us here. The principle I am enunciating is that we must not, and in fact cannot, ignore the instruction of the electors. The majority of the people have voted in favour of Secession, and we should, in all fairness to them, remember that they are the masters and that it is our duty to carry out their wishes.

Hon. C. B. Williams: That is something you have gone back on.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Either we must go forward with this Bill, or we shall be proclaiming to the world that we are not quite the right type of men to be in the positions we are holding. We shall be laying ourselves open to be described as an unstable or fickle-minded body of men quite unworthy of being associated with a Legislature. The Chamber passed a resolution authorising the Secession referendum, and we have a right to ask now whether that action was merely a farce, and whether members were

in earnest or whether they were merely fooling with a most serious question. I feel sure that all members were serious when voting either for or against the measure authorising the referendum. Further, I believe that at the time they voted, all members were perfectly clear in their minds that whatever the result of the referendum might be, they must be prepared to carry out the wish of the majority of the people. For that reason I can see no other course than to support the Bill. If we adopt any other course, it will be tantamount to admitting that all our past efforts to remove the disabilities of Federation were insincere. If we go back on past actions and say that we want to undo what has already been done, if we retract the allegations we made in the past, we shall be clearly admitting that we are a very foolish people, and that others should take our places here. I have said that I personally do not intend to cover any of the ground traversed in previous sessions, and partly in this session. However, I am convinced that the future progress of the State depends on the removal of the burdens which an unequal partnership has imposed on Western Australia. We must be freer to order our own course and to develop this State successfully. I was rather astonished to hear Mr. Macfarlane put up what I hope he will not feel hurt if I describe as a case that would do much credit to an Eastern States manufacturer.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: I put up statistics only.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I have no doubt whatever that the hon. member was quite sincere in his observations, but they came to me as a surprise. I did not think he viewed the question in that light. Let me say clearly that I was not impressed by his figures, and that in my opinion he did not put up a very good case.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Then you do not want to accept facts?

Hon. W. J. MANN: Facts are curious things, and I think no one knows that better than the hon. member. As representatives of the primary producers, our duty first and foremost is to look after the interests of the people who are primary producers.

Hon. C. B. Williams: We must see that they get a decent living and have decent conditions.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Yes, and a decent chance to carry on their avocations in something like a profitable manner. Almost the

whole of our national income is derived from primary production, and it is curious that, so far as my memory serves me, there has been no single instance of the primary producers of this State receiving assistance unless people in the Eastern States have been in a position to receive similar or greater help. Most of the amelioration, such as it has been, to that section of the community, has been the result of agitation in the Eastern States and we in this State have received some small benefit in consequence.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Are the primary producers here not on all fours with those in the Eastern States?

Hon. W. J. MANN: No, nothing like it. We are 50 years behind most of the Eastern States.

Hon. C. B. Williams: What, asleep!

Hon. W. J. MANN: No, we are not sleepers. It is well known that those engaged in our primary and secondary industries have not the opportunities that are available to those in similar occupations in the Eastern States. Although we have celebrated our Centenary, we must realise that our actual growth really commenced with the discovery of gold.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Thank God for that!

Hon. W. J. MANN: We can date our upward march from that period. At the same time, Western Australia has suffered very severely as a result of the high protection policy of Federal Governments, a policy determined by the Eastern States for their own advantage. So far as we can see, that position will continue. It is of little use to this State and we cannot be expected to make any progress under such conditions. Experience extending over 30 years has produced for us from our Eastern States partners, persistent and flagrant neglect. It has produced some legalised larceny and unfulfilled promises, and, until quite recently, a very large measure of intolerance and arrogance. That is my summary of the treatment Western Australia has received from the people of the Eastern States. The opportunities afforded by the Federal Constitution have been seized upon by the larger States to make vassals of the smaller States, and, as I view the position under existing conditions, there is no prospect of any material alteration.

Hon. C. B. Williams: And the people you have been associated with politically

have been in office for 18 out of the 30 years.

Hon. W. J. MANN: The people I supported have been succeeded by a Government, whom the hon. member supports, and we are now in a bigger mess than ever before. I do not know whether the hon. member will agree that the Government he supports are responsible for it, but, at any rate, that is one of the causes of our present difficulties.

Hon. C. B. Williams: I was speaking of the Federal arena.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Secession has never been an ideal of mine; I want that to be perfectly clear. My support of secession has been forced by the constant evidence of unfederal treatment extended to Western Australia. As a young man I favoured Federation, and for many years I supported and worked for it. But I have now to admit in view of the treatment meted out to us by the larger States, that Federation has been disappointing in the extreme. We have been fooled by promises and by legislation that has been largely fraudulent. Perhaps I should not use that word, but, at any rate, the legislation I have in mind was not designed to assist Western Australia in any way. Now that the people of this State have bestirred themselves and have shown that they are determined to take more emphatic action than a mere protest, what do we find? A little while ago I made an arrangement with somebody in Melbourne to send me copies of the daily newspapers containing references to the secession movement in Western Australia. I have not received a great many of them but what did I find? In most of the issues in which reference was made to secession, there was little more than ridicule. A large proportion of the published references consisted of statements that, to be reasonably decent, should not have emanated from such a source. It is evident that there is no possibility of a majority of the people in the Eastern States viewing the question in a fair manner. Apparently the attitude they adopt is that they regard the secession of Western Australia from the Commonwealth as quite impossible, so that the agitation here does not matter. In the circumstances, they are content to continue to ridicule the movement and to carry on as in

the past. That will not help to relieve the situation. Apparently the Federal Government, at the last moment, have taken a slightly more serious view of the matter, because the Prime Minister has condescended to devote a little time to the consideration of this question, and he now has promised—still promises; we have had 25 years of little but promises—that if the people of this State will only sit quiet for a while, the Federal Government may do something for them. If that promise is sincere, then it is a pity it was not made many years ago. If that had been done, the Federal machine would have worked much more smoothly and Western Australia would not have been forced into a position that we can tolerate no longer. As a matter of fact, the people of the Eastern States have themselves to thank for the demonstration of keenest dissatisfaction on the part of Western Australia. That demonstration has been forced upon us, for our people have become not only disappointed but disgusted and determined, if it is at all possible, to effect a drastic alteration. If I cared, I could devote quite a lot of time to outlining the impositions forced upon Western Australia as a result of Federation, but I shall not do so. My position is quite clear. I regard it as my duty, and the duty of the House, to support the Bill, in order to give effect to the wishes of the people and to allow the matter to go before those at Home, to whom it has been decided to appeal for adjudication.

HON. E. H. ANGELO (North) [4.55]: I desire to associate myself with the Chief Secretary and other hon. members who have expressed regret at the accident sustained by the Honorary Minister. I am delighted to hear that he is better and I hope he will be able to take his seat in the House in the near future. As regards the Bill under discussion, I do not intend to take up the time of members at any great length. I will be as brief as possible in giving my reasons for supporting the Bill. In the first place, the Government have an undoubted mandate to do their utmost to secure Secession for Western Australia. I have thought over the matter and I cannot conceive of any better

method by which that objective can be obtained, than that indicated in the Bill. I have no doubt the Government gave the question ample consideration before introducing the measure. Mr. Holmes has suggested we should have gone to the Commonwealth Government first. Have we not been to the Commonwealth Government for the last two decades in our efforts to secure redress for the disabilities from which we have suffered?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You have been to the Federal Government to get more money, but I do not know that you have been to them for anything else.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: Had Mr. Holmes read the Case carefully, and particularly the details of the negotiations between the State Government and the Federal Government during the last 20 years, I am sure he would never have suggested approaching the Federal Government again. We have had nothing but a series of broken promises from them, of evasions of the findings of their own Royal Commissions, contempt for anything put before them in our interests, and, in fact, the whole of the negotiations have been of a most unsatisfactory nature. I was practically born and bred a Federalist. In 1883 my father, who was then military commandant of Western Australia, in a report on the defences of the State, closed the document with the statement, "We must have Federation." He regarded that as the only safeguard for Western Australia against invasion. I voted for Federation, and I was always keen about it until shortly after I entered Parliament in 1917. Mr. James Gardiner was then Colonial Treasurer, and he invited me to take a little more interest than was customary in the finances of the State. I was permitted to delve into the books at the Treasury and it was not long before I had abundant proof that the statement that Western Australia had suffered considerably as the result of Federation was perfectly true. I read the reports of the debates of the Federal Conventions that had been held and I saw that a number of the leading delegates at the gatherings had promised that after 20 years of the Federal regime, another convention should be convened, with a similar basis of representation, to deal with anomalies that had been experienced as a result of the working of the Constitution. Mr. Lefroy, afterwards Sir Henry, was then Premier of Western

Australia, and he wrote to Mr. W. M. Hughes, the then Prime Minister of Australia, reminding him of the promise of another Convention, and suggesting that one should be convened. That was in 1920. Mr. Lefroy showed me the reply from Mr. Hughes, thanking him for having reminded him of the promise and declaring that he would take immediate action to call a convention. As soon as we received that reply a motion was moved in the Assembly for the appointment of a joint select committee of both Houses to prepare Western Australia's case for the coming convention. It was pointed out that no doubt when the convention was called, a hasty election might take place and delegates might be appointed who, perhaps, did not thoroughly understand the case, whereas if the joint select committee prepared a brief for those delegates, we might get somewhere on our journey. That select committee was appointed, and I had the honour of being its chairman. A good deal of evidence was taken, and Sir James Mitchell, who had followed Mr. Lefroy, loaned to us Mr. Owen, the then Under-Treasurer, to prepare the case. A good deal of publicity was given to our proceedings, and as a result letters were received from South Australia, Tasmania and Queensland asking to be advised as to the lines we were working on. Those States were duly advised and they took action in their respective Parliaments to prepare their respective cases. In the meantime, Mr. Hughes had introduced in the Federal Parliament a Bill for the convening of the promised convention. The Bill passed the first reading and went into the second stage. But immediately Mr. Hughes saw that the smaller States were taking joint action with a view of going to the convention prepared with some solid arguments, he made a formal announcement that there would be no convention. The first we knew of it was the notification in the Press. Mr. Hughes added that he would, however, call a special constitutional session of the Federal Parliament to amend the Constitution as might be found necessary. What good would that have been to the smaller States, with five members from Western Australia, five from Tasmania, and seven from South Australia, as against 58 members representing the larger States. The proposal was ridiculous. Had that convention been called there would have been no reason for the Bill now before us. What followed? The Federal Government ap-

pointed a Royal Commission with no Western Australian representative on it. We know how favourable to Western Australia was the report of that Royal Commission. But what was the result? Nothing but evasion. We got one or two doles, but they were not comparable with what had been recommended by that Royal Commission, which had not on it a representative of Western Australia. Had the recommendations of that Royal Commission been put into effect, there would have been no need for this Bill. It is unnecessary that I should enumerate all the evasions, the broken promises, and the unsympathetic treatment we have met at the hands of successive Federal Governments. I was a federalist, and only reluctantly have I been compelled to change my views, for I can see there is no hope for Western Australia unless we get Secession. Mr. Holmes and Mr. Macfarlane have pointed out the difficulties with which we shall then be confronted. But is there anything in life worth having which does not mean a lot of trouble and worry, and perhaps the expenditure of a lot of money? Take my own personal case: For months past I have been working hard, worrying and spending a lot of money to get here. But I have got here, and it is worth it, for I now have the honour of addressing this august Chamber and being able to mingle with the cream of Western Australia's intelligence. Mr. Holmes has spoken of the big grants we have been getting from the Federal Government and the Loan Council.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Loans, not grants.

Hon. E. H. ANGELLO: The stocks of Western Australia were higher than those of any other State before we joined the Loan Council. Regarding the grants made to us, where have they come from? Out of our own pockets, collected by the middle man, collected by the Federal authorities and returned to us after the deduction of a high commission to carry out an unnecessarily expensive administration. We are told that if we get Secession we shall find it very difficult to start as a new nation. But can those members who have read the history of the world say there was ever a nation that started off on a surer foundation than we shall have to build on? We have a million square miles of country, and we have every known climate for the production of what is required by the human race. Already we are producing more beef and mutton than we can eat, growing more wool than we can

wear, and more wheat than we can consume. We have fruit sufficient to supply the whole of Australia. We have unlimited marine wealth along our shores, and last of all we have gold, 80 per cent. of the gold production of Australia. That should enable us to pay our overseas debts and finance ourselves. Has any nation worth remembering ever started on a surer foundation?

Hon. H. Seddon: Then what are you growling about?

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: I am not growling. I am saying, let us get a start as a nation. All we want is careful government, and I think we can get that from the people of Western Australia. I am sorry to hear that Mr. Collier may not go Home, for I certainly think he should go.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: His Government are not supporting the Bill.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: But I am supporting the Government that have brought down the measure, and I am sorry that Mr. Collier is not going. Some people tell us it is impossible to get Secession. If we are not able to get it, would it not be splendid to have at Home a man like Mr. Collier to get the next best thing for us? I am convinced that something is going to eventuate from this agitation, something that will be of advantage to Western Australia. All I hope is that this something will enable our cinderella State to get out of the ashes in which she has been grovelling, take a seat in the coach of progress that will take us along to that happiness and prosperity that our people deserve.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East) [5.10]: Whilst I regret the loss at the recent elections of some old members who had sat with us for many years past, I join with others in extending a welcome to the new members, feeling sure that after a time, when they gain a little knowledge of our proceedings—except Mr. Angelo, of course, who is already well versed in Parliamentary practice—they will prove to be very useful members. We have before us a Bill to which is attached an address and two petitions. The position now created with the influx of new members renders it necessary to expand a little in the field of happenings on the Secession issue, and I hope, Sir, you will extend to me a little leniency, although I have no intention of speaking at length. I am astonished that at this late hour in the proceed-

ings such strong opposition to the Bill should come from certain sections of the House. For many years past the people of Western Australia have been rightly complaining of the unjust treatment meted out to the State by successive Federal Governments, who have broken right away from the spirit of the Convention that framed the Constitution. The more we study that phase, the clearer do we see that they have made use of the powers which were extended to them during the war period, to make their own position more comfortable at the cost of the States. More than that, during the war period they saw how elastic the Federal Constitution really was, and they have not since let up in the extending of it in many directions. This State, like all the other States, has suffered in having our best public servants taken from us. Time and again have officers of the State service been taken into the ever expanding Federal services, at salaries ranging from £400 to £500 more per annum than they were previously getting. Consequently, a very difficult position has been set up. As one with certain ministerial experience, I have seen, year in and year out, the loss of our best officers to the Federal service. The Federal Government can well afford to attract them with larger salaries, because the Federal Government have the money to expend. In pre-Federation days we were all assured that the expenditure necessary for the Federal Government would mean only shillings per head of the population. To-day it has reached something like £12 per head. Sir John Quick in his work, "Legislative Powers," cites a speech by the Hon. Edmund Barton at the town hall, Sydney, in 1898, where he said—

In the Federal Convention debates, official estimates and speeches delivered during the Federal campaign, 1898, it was generally stated and agreed that the new Federal expenditure consequent on the establishment of a Commonwealth Government and Federal institutions, departments, and services, would be about £300,000; that the expenditure in connection with old colonial services and departments taken over from the States would be about £1,250,000, and that thus the annual cost of Federation, including the new and the old services, would be about £1,550,000.

That was when Federation was first being mooted. To-day the cost is over £60,000,000. To give the exact figures for the financial year ended 30th June, 1931, the

expenditure of the Commonwealth Government was £69,335,546, while in the following year there was a drop of a little over £8,000,000. What a vast difference between those huge sums and the amount of £1,500,000 which we were told Federation would cost! That shows the extent to which the Commonwealth authorities have been reaching out. It should be remembered that at the time the annual values of Customs and excise duties taken over from the several States totalled roughly £8,000,000. In the work I have quoted the following paragraph also appears—

The States surrendered to the Commonwealth all the revenue derivable from Customs and excise duties. The annual value of duties from these sources under the State tariffs was estimated at from £7,500,000 to £8,000,000. The Commonwealth would not, of course, require all that immense revenue to pay its way, and it was part of the scheme of union that the Commonwealth should be entitled to apply only one-fourth of the net revenue from Customs and excise for Federal purposes, and after debiting expenditure of the transferred services, should pay over the surplus revenue to the State, month by month, during the period of 10 years.

In 1901-2 the amounts returned to the States totalled a little over £7,000,000, while in the following year the total was £8,000,000. Then came the per capita payments, which constituted a complete departure from the original arrangement. Our goldfields friends have offered very warm opposition to the Bill. I think I am right in saying that had the people of the goldfields, who voted so solidly for Federation, known what was going to ensue, there would not have been such an overwhelming majority on the goldfields in favour of joining this State with the Federation, notwithstanding that many who were then residents of the goldfields had no intention of becoming permanent residents of Western Australia. I know what I am talking about because I was on the goldfields at the time. During this debate reference has been made to many benefits received from the Federal Government, but the member who made it, as well as the people of the goldfields, forget the benefits received from the State. The impression conveyed is that the people of the goldfields have been muled in unjustifiable charges. Mention has been made of

the Mundaring water scheme, which has been of wonderful assistance to the goldfields. We have been told that the goldfields people have paid for the scheme. They have done nothing of the sort. Far from it. Mr. Williams mentioned that I had been responsible for increasing the water rate charged to the goldfields people. Of course I increased it. I increased the charge to an industry that was showing good profits. We had been supplying the water at a little over half the cost, and the taxpayers of the State had been called upon to make good the difference. Until the crisis came, the annual contribution by the taxpayers ran into many thousands of pounds—I think about £64,000.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Has it not been £100,000 a year for 25 years?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The amount was made available by the Mines Department to the Water Supply Department to meet the loss incurred in supplying cheap water to the goldfields. For a time it was necessary to grant concessions in order that the mines might be kept working, and nobody found fault with that policy, but why should it now be claimed that all the benefits have been received from the Commonwealth and none from the State?

Hon. R. G. Moore: I did not say that.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I did not mention the hon. member, but perhaps he said something to that effect and my reply fits. Sporting bodies on the goldfields were receiving 5,000,000 gallons of water a year free of cost, and the expense of delivering that water to them was 5s. 1d. per thousand gallons.

Member: Which sporting bodies?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Those in charge of the racecourse and trotting ground. Another point to be remembered is that on last year's Estimates £110,000 was provided for the development of mining and the State receives the princely sum of £29,000 for mining leases, apart from which the only revenue derived is that from income taxation. I do not mention these facts in any hostile spirit, but the people of the goldfields should realise how much the State has done for them.

Hon. H. Seddon: Is that all the State has received? What about the railway revenue from the goldfields?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: That is a concern apart altogether from such an undertaking as the water supply scheme.

Hon. H. Seddon: It is not.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Yes, it is. The railways are a public utility, a trading concern, and they are not getting much from the goldfields at present because, unfortunately for us, the bulk of the trade is being done by the trans-Australian railway owing to the cheap rates offered on that line.

Hon. T. Moore: Do the people of the metropolitan area meet the whole of the cost of supplying them with water?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: They are rated for the water they use.

Hon. T. Moore: Do they pay the whole of the cost?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I have no desire to set one section of the State against another section. The goldfields people, however, claim to be dissatisfied and they say that if Western Australia secures Secession, they want the Federal Government to take them over, together with the port of Esperance. The people of Esperance, however, do not wish to go with the goldfields. That part of the State has only a small population, and yet there was a majority of 200 odd in favour of Secession. The same applies to Yilgarn-Coolgardie, in which electorate there was a three to one majority in favour of Secession. Consequently, those districts do not wish to join with the goldfields; they wish to remain with the State and secede from the Commonwealth. What has been mainly responsible for increasing mining costs on the goldfields? In 1916 the cost of mining was about 19s. per ton of ore treated, and in 1924 the figure was 38s. What was responsible for the bulk of that increase? It was mainly the increased tariff. The duty on some of the mining machinery, which formerly was admitted free or charged only 5 per cent. duty, was increased tremendously. Some of the mines have succeeded in reducing their treatment costs substantially, but that has been due to the introduction of improved machinery upon which heavy Customs duty had to be paid to the Commonwealth. Mr. Thomson was quite right in the references he made to Wiluna. The Western Australian Government guaranteed £300,000 to the Wiluna mines and the Federal Government backed the guarantee afterwards, taking a sort of second mortgage, but knowing full well that the State

had to accept the responsibility. Then the Commonwealth collected about £100,000 duty on the machinery imported. The management of the Wiluna mines, after investigation, found that the best proposition would be to use crude oil, and directly they started to use crude oil, on went the tariff and the Federal Government benefited again. The goldfields people have been very fortunate indeed in the treatment they have received from the State.

Hon. T. Moore: And we are fortunate in having the goldfields.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Was the duty imposed on crude oil because the Wiluna people decided to use it?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: No, but directly they started to use it, the duty was imposed. The Commonwealth Government gave a guarantee that was not likely to cost them anything, and immediately reaped a good return from the tariff duties on the machinery and the oil.

Hon. J. Nicholson: At whose expense were the goldfields opened up?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: At the expense of the State, of course; the Federation was not in existence then. The goldfields people persist in reiterating that they are the backbone of the State and wish to continue in the Federation, but there would be a much better feeling if they realised how much the State has done for them.

Hon. R. G. Moore: Who is complaining?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The hon. member often complains, and Mr. Elliott complained. Following on the agitation for Secession, a Bill was presented to Parliament to authorise the taking of a referendum of the people. The measure was agreed to by both Houses, the referendum was taken and two-thirds of those who voted expressed the desire that the State should secede from the Commonwealth. The party now in power promised at the elections to give effect to the will of the people, and they are honouring their promise in the only way in which it will be possible to achieve anything, and that is by providing for the presentation of an address and of petitions. It now remains for members here either to accept or to reject the Bill. In deciding their attitude, members should appreciate the right of the majority to rule, and they should also remember that they have been elected to this House by a majority of the electors.

Hon. C. B. Williams: A majority of the electors of the Legislative Council may be a minority of the whole of the people.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: A majority of the electors of this House have sent us here, and how can we now say to those people, after having appealed to them for their opinion, that they were wrong and that we know better than they do? I do not think we can reasonably adopt that attitude.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Had the Government come off the shelf and adopted a definite attitude, the decision might have been different.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Were they on the shelf?

Hon. C. B. Williams: The Labour Party were on the shelf during the elections. Everyone knows that. If they had come off the shelf what would the people have said?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: That does not matter. I am referring to the action taken by the Government. They have introduced this Bill, and are entitled to credit for good intentions. I am not a supporter of the present Government, although Mr. Williams is. The Government consider that the best way to give effect to the will of the people is by introducing a measure of this kind, and I consider that members should support the Bill in order that another step towards the goal may be taken. More especially is this necessary, seeing that the Federal Government have constituted a committee to prepare a case in defence. In the Press announcement of the appointment of the committee, mention is made of the fact that we are suffering disabilities. The Commonwealth authorities have taken many years to recognise that fact, and for as many years they have departed from the spirit of the Constitution. Had they faithfully observed the spirit of the Constitution, we would not be here to-day discussing matters pertaining to Secession.

HON. H. V. PIESSE (South-East) [5.29]: Before speaking on the Bill may I be permitted to express my sorrow at the accident that befell the Honorary Minister during his tour of the province of which I am one of the representatives. I am pleased to hear that he is making complete recovery, and will not suffer any permanent injury. I

wish to extend a welcome to the newly elected members. We are all very sorry to have lost the two old Western Australians, Sir Edward Wittenoom and Mr. Edwin Rose. Those gentlemen have been great pioneers in Western Australia, and have done wonderful work. Sir Edward Wittenoom was one of our oldest Parliamentarians. Mr. Rose carved a way for himself in the North, and was of great assistance in developing the North-West of this State. I congratulate the Chief Secretary upon the speech he made in moving the second reading of the Bill. Although he definitely stated he was not a secessionist, he is carrying out the will of the people.

The Chief Secretary: I do not think I expressed my views in that direction.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I am glad to know that, and am also pleased that the Government are endeavouring to carry out the will of the people.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: They will not have anything to do with it.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I thought when the Bill came before us we would only have to discuss controversial points as to the presentation of the Case to the British Parliament, and the personnel of the delegation.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: We have all got astray through an over-generous chairman.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I have been forced to speak on this Bill, as a primary producer, after having listened to Mr. Macfarlane.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Now we shall hear some wisdom.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: Mr. Holmes, as was the case with my father, originally voted against Federation. The province I represent recorded one of the biggest votes in the State against Federation. I am not, however, going to follow in my father's footsteps, although I remember he said, after his return from the Federal Convention, there was very little hope of getting out of the Federation unless all the States agreed to our getting out. We have had to put up with so many disabilities at the hands of the Federal authorities that I am an avowed secessionist. When Federation was inaugurated, the main object was the defence of Australia, and the promotion of trade within Australia. The removal of Customs duties between the Colonies proved a great detriment to

Western Australia. During the war, Federation made great strides, and the management on the part of the Federal Government was excellent. In the years 1920 to 1930 the smaller States began to feel the seriousness of the financial position. Many Acts passed by the Federal Government were detrimental to the interests of the smaller States. The Navigation Act was disastrous. The higher tariffs that were levied were of great assistance to industrial enterprises in Victoria and New South Wales, but they also helped to impoverish the smaller States. The arrogant administration of the Federal Government from Melbourne, and later from Canberra, was also inimical to the smaller States. I am confident that people in the Eastern States do not realise the seriousness of the position that Western Australia is in. I am of opinion that if the Case that has been put up could be broadcast in the other States, much benefit would accrue to us. I do not suppose the average man would take the trouble to read the whole of the Case, but if people would only glance at a few of the statements that are set out therein, they would get a better understanding of our feelings with regard to the disabilities under which we labour.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Then you agree with me after all.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I think the public in the Eastern States should have the opportunity to judge the merits of our Case. That would be a great assistance in educating them concerning the disabilities under which we are suffering.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: That is the true fighting spirit. Keep on!

Hon. A. Thomson: We have been trying to educate them for 30 years without avail.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I congratulate the committee that was appointed by Parliament upon the excellent Case they have prepared. Many people have asked how a new Dominion in Western Australia would finance itself. This State has the largest gold production in the Commonwealth. That must be of tremendous advantage to us.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: And the largest per capita debt in the world.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: We would also be able to put out our own note issue. No doubt the Federal Government keep the printing press going pretty well.

Hon. J. Nicholson: You are not going to add to the responsibilities of the Government Printer, I hope.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I remember that my father, when he bought sandalwood and other things in the old days, always used "shin plasters." That is how he financed his business. The reputation he enjoyed in those days is synonymous with the reputation Western Australia enjoys to-day. If we issued notes in Western Australia, we could always make provision to meet them when they were presented. In this State we have a greater percentage of males than in any other State of the Commonwealth, and the revenue from customs and excise, beer, spirits, etc., would be of greater per capita value than in the rest of Australia. We shall be relieved from our proportion of the expense of maintaining Canberra. As to the Australian navy, it cannot be said that this very often visits our waters.

Hon. R. G. Moore: What did we do with the "Emden" during the war?

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: We tore it to pieces. It is not to be imagined that Western Australia would have to do without the assistance of the Australian or the British navy.

Hon. C. B. Williams: How we are going to keep down the socialists is what worries me.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: We would send for the hon. member. There is no doubt the Federal Government have conserved their expenditure on account of the defence vote. They are endeavouring to starve out the smaller States. I admit that the post office arrangements have been good. The cost per head of the population for the services was less before Federation than it is to-day. Nevertheless, an excellent postal and telephone service has been provided at a reasonable cost. If Western Australia seceded from the Commonwealth, the tariff that would be imposed would be a great help to us in carrying on. It would not be decided at once whether we should have a revenue tariff or a high tariff. In the case of a revenue tariff, our producers would receive an immediate benefit. Should a high tariff be imposed, as we have it to-day under Federation, the people of this State would not have to pay any more for their goods than they do to-day. I am not in favour of high tariffs.

Hon. C. B. Williams: That is nonsense.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I do not think we would have to pay anything like the present price for our machinery, etc., and a tariff would certainly mean a greater demand for the products of our own factories. It is estimated that we should be able to employ

another 20,000 or 30,000 people in Western Australia if we put up a tariff wall against the Eastern States.

Hon. C. B. Williams: And we would bring down wages to the equivalent of the earnings of the farmers.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: Wages would be increased.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Nonsense!

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: If these things happened, there would be a great increase in the local consumption of primary products. Mr. Macfarlane appeared to be quite satisfied that under Federation our secondary industries had progressed up to the limit. When I was a lad attending the High School I lived in Aberdeen-street, the other side of Russell Square. On my way along Milligan-street to school each day I used to see manufacturing businesses that had started. There were leather and harness manufacturers, bootmakers, and so on. After Federation, all these industries went to the wall. I remember hearing my father say that the Ezywalkin Company had purchased land and bricks with the object of erecting a factory in West Perth. When Federation came about, the company sold the land and the bricks and erected its factory in Victoria. We know what a great success that factory has been in Australia. One may ask if it would have been a success in Western Australia under the Federal yoke. I think the answer is in the negative. Somewhere about 1924 my firm established a self-raising flour plant in Murray-street.

Hon. C. B. Williams: That is a good wicket.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: A splendid one. We spent £3,000 or £4,000 on machinery, but within six months we had to close down because Eastern States manufacturers undersold us.

Hon. G. Fraser: There was also the factor of the lack of patriotism on the part of people in Western Australia.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: Instead of the Federal Constitution helping this State in the matter of finance, it has power to destroy it. We gave the Federal Parliament control over our destinies. Federal Governments have repeatedly infringed the Constitution. The Federal Arbitration Court has taken control over the wages and conditions appertaining to State employees. We remember the unexpected interpretation of the High Court concerning the Financial Agreement.

This invested in the Commonwealth power which gave them definite rights to attack and undermine the sovereignty and independent rights of the smaller States. Then there was the evasion of the Surplus Revenue Act of 1910. As a result of that, the Federal Government were no longer obliged to pay to the States the surplus revenue enjoyed by the Commonwealth. It was arranged that at the end of each year the surplus revenue would be divided between the States on a per capita basis. The Federal Government have overcome that obstacle by political trickery, and at the end of the financial year the surplus funds are paid into a trust fund, and the smaller States can no longer participate in them. The Constitution provides that the Federal Government shall not tax State property in any way. We heard in Mr. Thomson's excellent speech last night how duties were imposed upon the railway engines that were required to haul our big crops in 1924-25, and the extent to which duties had to be paid on the machinery required for the development of the mining industry at Wiluna. When the Premier of the State at the time put up a case to the Prime Minister, Mr. Bruce, he received a curt reply to the effect that the Federal Government could not possibly relieve this State of the duties on the engines, although they were required so badly for the haulage of our bumper crop. The Western Australian Government had invited tenders for those engines, both in Australia and in England. Notwithstanding that, the State Government were not able to place the orders for the engines with any firm in Australia because of an earlier Commonwealth order, and it was therefore impossible to obtain them from within the Commonwealth. Notwithstanding the position, the Federal Government would not give way, and insisted upon a payment by the State Government of £32,000 by way of duties.

Hon. C. B. Williams: It taught Western Australia to make its own engines.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: There is no doubt we have in this State men capable of producing any article as well as it can be produced in any of the Eastern States.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Since 1925 we have built our own engines.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: It has been stated that defence would be the greatest difficulty for the State to overcome. I maintain that the withdrawal of Western Australia from

Federation will not involve the severance of the race. Prior to Federation, Western Australia provided her volunteers for the South African war. Surely we will still be part of the British Empire, and it must not be forgotten that all British colonies, dominions, and states, rallied round the flag in 1914, and if we were faced with any serious attack in Western Australia, we could rely upon the British Empire and the rest of Australia for assistance. With regard to pensions, this State would be in a better position to pay its old age and war pensions as it would be collecting the whole of its revenue without having to contribute towards Federal expenditure. As set out in the Case, Western Australia would be prepared to take over its proportion of the public debt. It has been stated that the cost of the trans-railway would have to be paid for, but I understand there is no debt on this railway; it was built out of revenue, and a note issue, and moreover, more than half of the line is in South Australian territory. The Commonwealth may want to charge Western Australia for its proportion of works built out of revenue. If so, I take it the Commonwealth would give this State a credit in the same proportion for its equity in the works carried out in the Eastern States. We are partners of the Eastern States, and a greater proportion of revenue has been utilised in the Eastern States than in Western Australia. Coming back to the delegation, I am of the opinion that the Premier should go to England. I know of no one better able to place before the Imperial authorities the serious position of our State. He will have the right under the Bill to appoint the delegation, and I do not know that he has said definitely that he will not accompany the delegation.

Hon. C. B. Williams: He has said he will have nothing to do with it.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I consider the Premier should have the able assistance of Mr. Latham, the Leader of the Opposition, who is a practical primary producer, and as deputy Premier in the Mitchell Government, he must have first-hand knowledge of the grave disabilities under which we labour.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Do you think he would go?

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I do not know. I consider also that the Leader of the Nationalist Party, Mr. Keenan, should be one of

the delegation. He, too, would be able to render very valuable assistance, because of his wide knowledge of every part of the State, including the goldfields. Should the Premier be unable to accompany the delegation, I trust that a member of his Government will be chosen. The Minister for Works, Mr. McCallum, has attended the Loan Council meetings with the Premier, and is in direct touch with questions of finance which are of such great importance to the State, and moreover, his power of debate would be invaluable. He would render great service to the State if he were chosen as one of the delegation.

Hon. C. B. Williams: But the Labour Party will have nothing to do with it.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: My experience of the hon. member is that if he wants to talk on anything, he can make out a very good case. In suggesting Mr. McCallum, I do so because he is a man of forceful character and a powerful debater, and I am convinced that he could put up a splendid case for the State.

Hon. C. B. Williams: They are all anti-secessionists.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I have such confidence in the Premier that I know he will make a wise choice. In the event of appointments being made outside Parliamentarians, I hope he will consider the claims of Mr. H. K. Watson, who has rendered such valuable services to the movement. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, debate adjourned.

BILL—CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT (TEMPORARY).

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [5.53] in moving the second reading, said:—Last session an amendment of the Constitution Act was passed, with the support of an absolute majority of both Houses, for the purpose of indemnifying a member of Parliament against a possible infringement of the Constitution Act by reason of his having accepted a seat on the Lotteries Commission. It was the intention of Parliament that the Bill should free the member from all

penalties and also preserve to him his seat in the Legislative Council—in other words that legal action, already taken against him, should be nullified. This Bill was agreed to only after a careful consideration of the special circumstances surrounding the case. The Bill that was passed failed to achieve the object this House had in view. The Chief Justice who heard the case, in which the member of Parliament was sued for a penalty for sitting and voting while under a disqualification, held that the measure had not a retrospective effect. Every member who supported it and even those who opposed it, believed that it had. Acts of Parliament, however, are interpreted in courts of justice without regard to what members may have believed or what they may have thought, but by the way the measures read, and we have been told by the Chief Justice that the amendment of the Constitution Act refers to the future and not to the past. The case is before the Full Court, and should the Full Court dismiss the appeal, Mr. Clydesdale—the member concerned—will not only have to meet the penalty and pay the costs, but will probably forfeit his seat.

This Bill, however, does not go so far as the Bill of last year was considered to go. It does not seek to interfere with the rights of a litigant. It merely qualifies Mr. Clydesdale to retain his seat. The case, as I said before, is now before the Full Court, and the plaintiff has presented his claims to the penalty which, under the judgment of the Chief Justice, was payable to him by the defendant. The Bill in no way attempts to defeat that object. If the decision of the Chief Justice be supported by the Full Court, the plaintiff, notwithstanding this measure, will still be free to recover the penalty and costs. But, with the help of this Bill, if it becomes law, the defendant will be able to hold his seat. This measure is introduced to protect him to that extent and to that extent alone.

With a House constituted as it was before the biennial elections for the Council, it would not be necessary to say anything in support of this Bill. I should be merely asking the House to do only one of two things it sincerely sought to do towards the end of last year. But there are

new members who may not be acquainted with the facts which led the Legislative Council last year to pass the legislation to which I refer.

There have been changes in the personnel of the House, however, since the elections, and it is necessary that the new members should be acquainted with the whole matter. The facts may briefly be stated. When the Lotteries Bill was before Parliament in 1932, it was no secret that Mr. Clydesdale would be chosen for a place on the proposed Commission. He had for 16 years been working in the cause of charity, and had had much to do with lotteries for the purpose of raising money for benevolent objects. Our predecessors in office considered he possessed special qualifications for the position, and they appointed him although he was then a member of Parliament.

The Commission was to be a body corporate. No portion of the remuneration of its members was to come from the Crown. It was all to come from the proceeds of the lotteries. In the Lotteries Bill, as originally introduced, there was a clause designed to protect members of Parliament, but subsequently the Government—that is, the previous Government—regarded it as unnecessary, and deleted it in another place. That clause was in the Bill which came before this House in 1932. I saw Mr. Scaddan, the Minister who was in control of the measure in another place, and I expressed the opinion that the indemnifying clause was not as comprehensive as it should be. He said, "It ought not to be in the Bill at all. It is not necessary. We struck it out in the Assembly." I am mentioning this to show that the Minister who appointed Mr. Clydesdale to the Lotteries Commission sincerely believed that in doing so he was not involving him in any liability under the Constitution Act. No one in Parliament differed from the view of the Minister, who was acting under legal advice supported, I understand, by the late attorney General, Mr. T. A. L. Davy. Mr. Clydesdale was honestly induced by the Government to accept a seat on the Commission, and no one will suggest that in accepting it he had a doubt that he was leaving himself open to a charge of violating the Constitution Act. If he had entertained even a slight suspicion that it might be so, it is incredible that he would

have run the risk of incurring a heavy penalty, with added costs, followed by the forfeiture of his seat in Parliament.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Clydesdale relied on the assurances of the Government of the day that everything was right. He undertook the work for paltry fees from the proceeds of the lotteries he had helped to organise—fees that could not possibly compensate him for the time and labour involved. Such a thing as corruption does not come into the matter at all. There are evil minds in every community, but no one has suggested corruption, no one has even thought it. Mr. Clydesdale was, and is, a political opponent of the party that appointed him. They appointed him in all good faith, and this Ministry has felt it to be its bounden duty to try to save him from the worst consequences of the action of its predecessors. Twenty members supported the second reading of the previous Bill, and endorsed the principles of the measure—principles which were very much more far-reaching than those in the Bill before us now. The Act which was passed, and which is said to be defective, can no longer be regarded as the measure of the Government which introduced it. It has become the measure of Parliament—the measure of the Legislative Council and of the Legislative Assembly; and although we have new members here, I feel that they will regard this Bill as an attempt to rectify, to the small extent sought, the error held to be in the previous measure which was supported in this House by more than an absolute majority of its members.

There is a precedent in this State for the course which is being followed. For the information of new members I may point out, as I pointed out last year, that the late Mr. Septimus Burt, the Attorney General in the Forrest Ministry, introduced in 1894 a Bill which absolutely stayed legal proceedings against a member of the Legislative Assembly who, in an unguarded moment, had made a contract with a Government board in reference to some printing, and so had infringed the Constitution Act. And the Bill was passed without a division in either House of Parliament. All who knew him will agree that the late Mr. Burt would have been the last man in Australia to introduce such legislation if it could be urged that, no matter what the reasons for it might be, it was opposed to moral principles. The same thing has been done in Canada; and, as Mr. Bax-

ter pointed out when the Bill of last year was before the House, the Government of Tasmania found it necessary in 1932 to pass an amendment of the Constitution Act of that State for the protection of members generally, and the Act was made retrospective.

The question boils itself down to this. Is the Legislative Council of this year to go back on the Legislative Council of last year? Is it going to say that although a few months ago we went to the farthest degree, as we thought, to protect Mr. Clydesdale—although we then intended to protect him against penalty and disqualification—we shall not now go to the limited extent of merely saving him his seat in Parliament? Despite the absence or unavailability of some members who supported the Bill of last year, I feel certain that hon. members will do the right thing, under all the circumstances, and give the absolute majority required for the second and third readings of this measure. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East) [6.7]: I second the Chief Secretary's motion. It is to be regretted that we are under the necessity of dealing with another amending Bill on a very troublesome subject. That subject was troublesome before the previous measure was enacted, and is troublesome still. All through, the intention has been as described by the Leader of the House, to ensure that Mr. Clydesdale shall not be in the position of having contravened any section of the Constitution Act by accepting a seat on the Lotteries Commission. The hon. member was assured that he was not contravening the Act. It is interesting to give consideration to our Constitution Act in its entirety. We are working under an old Constitution Act, framed many years ago, when the activities of the State were far different from what they are now. Those people who assert that the Constitution Act is sacrosanct are foolish. It is no more sacrosanct than any other Act of Parliament. We must amend our Constitution Act. That should have been done years ago. An attempt at amendment was made in 1919, but this House would not pass the Bill. The Chamber as then constituted declared that the Constitution Act was sacrosanct.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: There was plenty of time to amend the Act last year.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: If an attempt were made to amend the Act, Mr. Holmes would be one of the strongest opponents of the Bill.

Indeed, he led the opposition to the Bill of 1919; and I know he would not change his views in the meantime. However, conditions change with the times. While the Constitution of Great Britain has to a great extent remained the same for many years, conditions there have not changed greatly. Here, on the other hand, conditions have altered materially. We now have State trading concerns and Government utilities with which every member of Parliament is concerned one way or another. If action were to be taken against any individual member on that account, we might find ourselves in an unenviable position. It is to be regretted that so far Parliament has failed to put Mr. Clydesdale's position right. In the first place, Mr. Clydesdale was looked upon by the Government of which I was a member, and on behalf of which I put the Lotteries Bill through this Chamber, as specially suitable for a position on the board, in view of his having special knowledge of the work of organising lotteries. And not only that, but for many years Mr. Clydesdale had been urging on various Governments to bring in a measure for the establishment and control of lotteries. For what purpose? What was his object? His object was to keep within the State hundreds of thousands of pounds pouring out of it every year not only to Tattersalls in Tasmania and the Queensland Golden Casket, but to sweepstakes in Calcutta and Dublin, with the result that Western Australian charities were starved. Queensland obtained from abroad money not only to maintain its existing hospitals but to build new hospitals. Legislative action was taken here for the establishment and control of lotteries, and with what result? Never before was there such a political storm in Western Australia as when that legislation was mooted and when it was passed. In my long parliamentary experience I do not recollect any other legislation that caused so much trouble and made so many bad friends. Mr. Clydesdale was looked upon by the Mitchell Government as the right man to control the Act until such time as it was working smoothly. He was assured that he would be quite safe in accepting the position. The present Government are to be commended for honouring the previous Government's pledge. Parliament also has honoured that pledge. The present Bill does not ask us to go as far as the previous Bill went, but

simply to ensure Mr. Clydesdale's retention of his seat. In the name of all that is reasonable, Mr. Clydesdale surely has suffered enough already. Hon. members must realise the unfortunate man's position. The present Bill authorises Mr. Clydesdale to occupy the position on the Lotteries Commission to the end of the year. I do not think he will hold the position beyond that period; he has had quite enough. I appeal not so much to the old members as to the new members of this Chamber. A very large majority of the House has already voted in favour of honouring the promises made to Mr. Clydesdale. Old members cannot go back on what they have already approved; and I appeal to new members to do the right thing by supporting the Bill, so that Mr. Clydesdale will be secure in a position which, through no fault of his own, he will otherwise be forced to vacate. Hon. members generally are quite entitled to say, "We must maintain the good name of the Legislative Council by supporting the Bill." As the previous Bill was supported in order to honour a promise that was given, so must the present Bill be supported. I hope hon. members will take that view. What was done by the previous Government and by Mr. Clydesdale in all good faith, should be ratified. I trust all members of the Chamber will act in harmony to place the matter on a sound footing, as was intended by the previous Government and is intended by the present Government, thus attaining a position in favour of which the two Houses of the Legislature have already voted.

On motion by Hon. J. J. Holmes, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 6.15 p.m.