

bouring localities, a falling-off in the timber trade would be one of the worst calamities conceivable. The one other matter to which I should like to refer is the dairying industry, mentioned the other night by the member for Forrest (Mr. A. J. Wilson). I have been connected with that industry all my life; and I remember the time when a large quantity of butter was made in the Southern Districts, at Bunbury and the Vasse. In fact, Perth and Fremantle were for many years almost entirely supplied from those districts; and we scarcely ever saw a pound of imported butter. What was done then can be and ought to be done now on a much larger scale. There is no doubt that the country can produce the butter; but some little encouragement is needed, such as the establishment of model dairy farms. The principal reason for the falling-off in the butter supply, in the Southern District at any rate, is the higher rate of wages and the high prices of mutton and wool; and there has been a good market for chaff also. Perhaps we can scarcely expect that the prices of mutton and wool will continue at the high rates now ruling, though possibly they may. However, as I have repeatedly said, the time must come when the farmers of this State will have to turn their attention to the dairying industry. I can say for myself that I always found it pay better than anything else. [HON. J. P. McLEARY: What about the rickets?] I need not deal now with that matter. I hope that the Government will give serious attention to both of the subjects with which I have dealt.

MR. J. E. HARDWICK (East Perth): Nearly every available topic of public interest has been touched by the preceding speakers; and some of them have touched on much that is not, in my opinion, calculated to elevate in the slightest degree the tone or the dignity of this House. As I am nearly the last of the speakers on the Address, perhaps I shall be pardoned if I endeavour to break the monotony of this long and tedious debate by making some passing allusions to the weather. The present delightful weather, and particularly the sunshine of last week, are extremely gratifying, and have, I think, contributed largely to the good temper of the House.

Even since the result of the Coolgardie election has been known, I am pleased to notice that a good disposition still prevails. However, as I said, we have had a week of sunshine; and I am inclined to regard that as a good omen for the Moore Government, as a happy augury indicating long life and prosperity to their administration. I am also inclined to think that the path of parliamentary advancement and honesty will be lavishly illuminated by the rays of political sunshine, and that the actions of the Moore Government will at all times stand the light of day. I notice a number of vacant chairs at the present moment on the Opposition side of the House; and I have not the slightest doubt that in the speeches of Opposition members there has been much misrepresentation and delirium and diatribe and invective. In my opinion, the cause of this exhibition is not far to seek. I do not know why we on the Government side have been subjected to so much unwarranted abuse from the Opposition benches; but the chances are that the impending elections have had something to do with drawing it forth. However, I will endeavour to throw a little radium upon some of the speeches of members opposite. I will promise not to throw any mud. If we care to scrutinise and analyse those speeches, I have no doubt the result will show probably 90 per cent. of that compound known in parliamentary fiction as political birdlime, all spread with the object of helping their friends who are contesting the present by-elections.

MR. BOLTON: You must be using the old reports of last session.

MR. HARDWICK: The hon. member must not worry, because I will give him a little attention later on. However, the member for Leonora prefaced his remarks by telling the House that he would speak in the language of truth. If the hon. gentleman had not made that statement it might have left some slight room to doubt his veracity. To that I am not going to do more than perhaps remark that he is an ex-Minister for Works, and that the very sincere speech he made in opposition to the present Minister for Works might probably be actuated by some slight jealousy. He did not fail to produce a little dodger with a photograph in the corner. In regard to that, anyone

possessed of the early rudiments of phrenology must acknowledge that photograph shows a master mind. We can see the faculties of administration and determination very pronounced, also generosity and brotherly feeling above the average. I am rather pleased to see that form of advertising, and to-morrow, if I were contesting a seat in Leonora or Mount Margaret, I would—[MR. TAYLOR: Send your photo. round]—I would, because it is a capital suggestion. One thing be sure of: I would not chop my whiskers off. I have also another little dodger or leaflet here. In strolling the other day between here and Midland Junction, I found it at the mercy of the wind, and thought no wrong in picking it up to see if there was a photograph of any politician on it. One corner was missing, but that might have been struck off by lightning. Probably the matter on this leaflet is worth reading, and with the kind permission of the House I shall endeavour to read some of it. It may edify my friends opposite to some considerable extent, because it contains matter of a very valuable nature. It is built on the "yes-no" principle. [MR. TAYLOR: Then it must belong to the Government.] Very likely it belonged to the past Government, because these are the utterances of an ex-Minister of the Labour Government. There is an extract from the *Kalgoorlie Miner* of the 15th July, 1905; and it says that a gentleman by the name of Mr. Johnson—and I am given to understand that there is a gentleman of that name contesting an election at Guildford—

announced that he had always been a consistent advocate of the leasehold principle of land tenure in respect of goldfields residential areas, and that personally he would not seek to take up the fee simple of the block on which stood his own Kalgoorlie residence.

LABOUR MEMBER: What does Farrell give you?

MR. HARDWICK: On the "no" side is:—

Result of search lodged at Warden's Court, Kalgoorlie, October, 1905:—

Residence area 907R.—Name of holder, William Dartnell Johnson.

Has the freehold been applied for?—Yes.

Date of application for freehold and name of person applying.—The freehold was applied for on 21st July, 1905, by William Dartnell Johnson, the Crown grant to issue in his name.

MR. TAYLOR: Is the hon. member in order in reading about Mr. W. D. Johnson in this debate? I do not see how it affects the Address-in-Reply. He is not a member of this House, and I do not think the hon. member is in order in using this for party purposes.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is in order. Unfortunately, as I have pointed out before, so long as a member keeps within the four corners as described in the Address-in-Reply, I am unable to prevent him from going into any matters of detail. I understand from the hon. member that this has some political bearing?

MR. HARDWICK: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Then the hon. member is the best judge of that.

MR. HARDWICK: The member for Mount Margaret should be the last member on that side of the House to challenge statements of this kind. He really forgets that he, during this debate, made reference to an ex-Minister of the Crown who had gone to seek election at Pilbarra, and he occupied this House for fully an hour reading extracts from the newspapers. [MR. TAYLOR: Dealing with his opinions on this Government.] Is this a somersault, or a handspring? I am only endeavouring to ascertain what sort of a gentlemen this candidate is, for I may have a vote up at Guildford. Mr. Johnson, speaking in St. Mary's Hall, Kalgoorlie, said:—

I am absolutely opposed to the purchase of the Midland Railway at the stipulated price of £1,500,000.

MR. TAYLOR: What is the date of the issue?

MR. HARDWICK: The hon. gentleman can have a look at this when I have done. According to *Hansard*, this is what Mr. Johnson said in Parliament:—

On these valuations, the Government consider the asset is worth the price submitted. We as a Government think that the concession is worth £1,500,000 on the valuation submitted. No member has said the asset is not worth that sum.

What do you call this? A sudden reversal of form? I will tell something farther. Here is an extract from the *Boulder Evening Star*:—

Mr. Johnson, speaking at Boulder, said "he favoured the nationalisation of the liquor traffic."



Among the names of those who sought to lease the Criterion Hotel at Kalgoorlie, immediately after his defeat for the South Province, appears the name of Mr. W. D. Johnson. I suppose the gentleman favoured drink being put down with a strong hand, probably the hand of Labour.

MR. TAYLOR: Probably with the hand you would put it down with.

MR. HARDWICK: I have not acquired the gout yet.

THE SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must not be personal.

MR. HARDWICK: At Bonnievale also Mr. Johnson said:—

He had been associated with Labour on the fields for years; all his interests were on the fields. He admitted there might have been criticism of his actions in the past, but his worst enemies could not accuse him of being disassociated with the fields.

Here is an extract from the *West Australian* of the 5th July:—

As a matter of fact, he came with a Gladstone bag, and he was going to tell them that he had severed his connection with the gold-fields, and he had no farther interest there.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is going exceedingly far.

MR. HARDWICK: Am I to cease reading this?

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think it has any bearing at all on the matter before the House.

MR. HARDWICK: I would not have referred to it, because I would not care to injure Mr. Johnson's chance of entering this House; but the privilege was granted to the member for Mount Margaret during this debate to refer at great length to the member [candidate] for Pilbarra.

MR. TAYLOR: I never spoke of the member for Pilbarra.

MR. SPEAKER: I want to put an end to one custom followed this session, and to quote from an authority. For the future I intend to adhere strictly to the rule, that is: When any member rises in explanation, unless the speaker in possession of the Chair gives way, he must wait till the completion of the speech of the member speaking. I will quote some authority for that conclusion I have come to. It is:—

The proper time for explanation is at the conclusion of the speech which calls for it, but it is a common practice for the member desiring to explain to rise immediately the statement

is made to which his explanation is directed, when, if the member in possession gives way and resumes his seat, the explanation is at once received; but if the member who is speaking declines to give way, the explanation cannot then be offered.

So I intend to adhere to that in the future. It is very unfair to the hon. member speaking that these explanations are so often made.

MR. HARDWICK: I was only showing the marvellous elasticity of Labour principles. I may also refer slightly to the speech of the member for Mount Margaret. The hon. member in speaking to the Address-in-Reply also went so far as to tell the House that he rather emulated the example of the member for Leonora by speaking in the language of truth. Even that admission coming so late from the hon. member will be welcomed by both sides of the House; but I must say that I really think his speech was a masterpiece. He eventually attempted to point out to the House that he was no kerbstone orator or esplanade politician, and that he had won his spurs fighting the cause of Labour for twenty-five years. I have met that class of politician before to-day. They tell you how they have fought the cause and what their forefathers have done; but if I, in my public capacity, were called upon to send men to the front to defend the good old Union Jack, that is the class of individual I would pass out—the man who tells us how he fought in years gone by. My experience is that gentlemen of that calibre are the very first to run if they hear a sedlitz-powder fizzle. The member for Mount Margaret thumped the table and knocked the books on the floor, and behaved in such a frantic fashion that he almost made me forget my belief in Pythagoras that the souls of animals transfused themselves into the trunks of men. Also in reply to an innocent interjection from this side of the House he told members—I was going to say in the language of the poets, but I may be wrong there—that if anyone tried to use such language to him from the floor of the House he would resent it with a blow. I am inclined to ask myself the question whether the hon. member is largely interested in any undertaking establishment, or whether he has a private cemetery of his own. I am sorry the

Leader of the Opposition has left the Chamber, for I certainly intended to give him a little attention. [MR. HEITMANN: He can defend himself.] Perhaps the hon. member will represent him in his absence. I only intend to touch lightly on that member because I recognise that he is burdened with the dignity of those members who sit with him. One of the Ministers spoke the other evening, and the Leader of the Opposition in reply to a modest interjection of my own made a remark of a very personal nature. He said that if I were not bald I would be sitting on the Opposition side of the House. I wish to know whether it is hair or brains that is the first qualification for members of the Opposition party. If it is hair, before I could join them I should have to let my own grow; but if it is brains, that is a different thing altogether. The Leader of the Opposition above all others should not indulge in personal reflections. It is setting a bad example to the members of his party. Not only that, it was a very bald statement. As one representing a metropolitan constituency I may slightly touch on taxation. I am of opinion it is little or no use discussing the question at this particular stage. We must wait until the Bill is brought forward by the Government. But it is quite evident in my opinion that it is the wealth of the State that must foot the Bill. There will have to be a form of taxation that will not fall on the shoulders of the poor man. What would be the effect of a tax on the poor man? The way they are constituted at present it would be impossible for them to pay it; in fact they could not pay it. I have always regarded it as a very difficult operation endeavouring to collect feathers from a frog. As to the question of taxation, my opinion is that the possessors of large estates, probably agricultural areas, should be educated to the fact that their ownership in title is only a trust committed in the supreme interests of the State, and if the owners cannot and will not produce from that land they must give it up and make room for those who will. It is not necessary to dwell at length on that question. It is a matter for extreme regret that the Government have not given us some definite information as to what they intend to do in regard to the gambling

evil. I refer particularly to horse-racing. In my opinion, and perhaps I know as much or a little more than most members in the House about this particular evil, if it were not for the surfeit of horse-racing we have in this State, the poverty that exists within our boundaries to-day would not be present. When we consider the great number of horse-races, and those who follow the calling, who do not toil, neither do they spin. [MEMBER: You know a lot about it.] I am sorry to think the Government have not done something in the direction of minimising or regulating this great evil. There is also to be a Bill regulating the liquor traffic, and I am of opinion that such measure should embody local option, also that something should be done to prevent the granting of farther licenses until a Bill becomes law giving power to the State to obtain whatever benefit can be derived through granting licenses for hotels. Within the boundaries of the city of Perth if a man is able to obtain a license almost anywhere it is a competency for him for life. A license was granted only a few weeks ago within my own electorate. What does it mean? When a man obtains a license he can sell it at a very high figure and effect a competency. That should not be so. I would like the Government to give some information in regard to a railway from the Williams to Fremantle. I was given to understand that some time ago a Commission was appointed to recommend what railways were likely to open up the best agricultural areas, and I believe a trunk line from the Williams to join the Jandakot line was suggested by the Commission. I hope we shall hear something from the Government later on in regard to this railway. A line has also been projected for some time from Beverley to Wandering. It was my privilege some time ago to travel with the Leader of the Opposition from Beverley down the Dale river to Wandering, and the progress that is going on in that district warrants the Government in coming to the assistance of the settlers to enable them to get their produce to market. The soil is excellent, and well suited for close settlement. At present it is impossible for the people, especially in the winter months, if they have only a few miles to go, to cart their produce, for the land is of such a boggy nature that it



is impossible to get goods to market. I hope the Government will do something in this direction now that we find lines can be constructed so cheaply. One member of the Government said that railways could be constructed now almost as cheaply as macadamised roads. I think a select committee should be appointed, not a Commission, to consider what is the best means of cheapening and improving our fish trade. It is a matter for regret to find that the fish trade is almost entirely monopolised by foreigners. This should be a very profitable industry, but at the present price of fish it is impossible for poor people to obtain it. On the goldfields we find not only the fish trade, but the fruit trade in the hands of foreigners. There seems to be something wrong about that, when a particular class of people can obtain a monopoly of a trade, as undoubtedly it is done in this direction. I was pleased to notice in the Governor's Speech that special provision will be made to assist in the development of the North and North-West mineral areas. That great country is teeming with possibilities, and, as was pointed out by the member for North Fremantle the other evening, there are gold, tin, tantalite, copper, and many other minerals which could be worked. Someone interjected "empty bottles," but I may point out that the empty bottles were innocent enough: it was the full ones we had to steer clear of. From the northern portion of the State we shall have to draw the bulk of our mutton and beef supplies for all time. The asset we have in the leasehold lands in the North is something enormous, and I think the Government should come to the fore and spend money in opening up and developing that country. I am not prepared to argue that a railway would pay from the very start. It may do, but I think if it did not pay directly the Government should certainly make a move in the direction of running a line of railway into that country. They have nothing to fear, for there are immense possibilities there, and we have an asset in that country worth thousands and thousands of pounds. I would like to see next session the Government bring forward a Bill with the idea of constructing that particular railway. I wish to refer to the member for North Fremantle, and it is

about a letter which appeared in the morning Press. It is only a short letter, and with your permission I will read it. The letter is signed by Mr. Higham. I would direct the attention of the Leader of the Opposition also to this letter, for he played an important part in the matter, and it is just as well he should listen to it. The letter says:—

I desire to take very grave exception to the statement published by you to-day of the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly in which Mr. T. Bath, M.L.A., is reported as follows:—"The Minister for Works had stated that nobody authorised to take postal votes assisted in his election. He (Mr. Bath) had seen them wearing Mr. Price's colours and bringing supporters of Mr. Price to the polling-booth. He thought it desirable that no other than Government officials or men with impartial minds should be appointed to take postal votes."

I interjected here, "Could you give us the names?" Mr. Bolton said "Yes; Learmonth and Higham."

MEMBER: That has been proved since in both cases.

MR. HARDWICK: The letter says: "Presuming, as Mr. Bath did not correct Mr. Bolton's interjection that either Mr. Learmonth or myself was referred to"—

MR. BATH: This was presumption on the part of the writer of the letter.

MR. HARDWICK: You did not contradict the statement of the member for North Fremantle. I am only reading what is in the letter, and merely suggesting to you that there should be an apology made. I hope members will not shelter themselves behind political privilege.

MR. TAYLOR: Read the electoral departmental inquiry.

MR. HARDWICK: That only referred to Mr. Learmonth. I am reading this letter signed by Mr. Higham.

MR. TAYLOR: It refers to scandalous procedure during an election.

MR. HARDWICK: Here is the man's statement, and if you will wait till I read it I think you will see there is some slight justification for an apology being tendered to the two gentlemen. Mr. Higham says:—

I wish to state most emphatically that I was in no way connected with Mr. Price's committee, nor did I attend any of their meetings. I neither wore his colours nor those of the N.P. League during the election, and I drove no one but my wife to the poll. Farther, as one authorised to take postal votes, my services were equally as valuable to

one party as the other. This Mr. Needham's friends know from the previous election. I did not visit any voter unless requested to do so, and then only to take the votes of those sick or qualified by old age or infirmity.

It goes on a little farther.

MR. BATH: On a point of personal explanation, as the hon. member has brought forward this matter—

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member was not present when I read a quotation from *May* respecting explanations. If the hon. member gives way, this is the proper time to make it.

MR. HARDWICK: Certainly, sir.

MR. BATH: I may say that when I made that statement in regard to the gentlemen authorised to take postal votes bringing electors up to the poll, I did not have Mr. Higham in my mind at all. I had no thought of Mr. Higham; and seeing I made no imputation on that gentleman, there is nothing to apologise for or any explanation to offer to the paper.

MR. HARDWICK: I must say that I do not know Mr. Higham. I never remember meeting him. Undoubtedly I have heard the name of Higham for many years, and I have always understood that Mr. Higham was a worthy and respected citizen.

MR. TAYLOR: So he is.

MR. HARDWICK: I think that in a case like this, when he gives a denial most emphatically, the very least the member for North Fremantle should do is to apologise for making an error.

MR. BOLTON: I made no error, neither have you the right to hold a brief for him. He can protect himself.

MR. HARDWICK: The hour is getting late, but I may perhaps make one passing reference to that political "Carbine," the member for Kanowna (Mr. Walker), who undoubtedly gave us an excellent display no later than yesterday of how to handle the parliamentary bagpipes. The hon. member has been credited with being a master of elocution. To think that he should have fallen so low as to abuse the Government so much! I referred to him as that great political Carbine.

MR. WALKER: There is no Carbine that could play the bagpipes.

MR. HARDWICK: That is so, but Carbine was a great leader, and always

commanded a following. Probably the hon. member made an effort to lead a party some time ago; but there was a rumour current—there may be no truth in it, and it may be only one of those things one hears every day—that if the hon. member had been elevated to that most dignified post, there would have been a rush to this side of the House. [MEMBER: We have got him since.] I just referred to this matter, as it is only a rumour. I am told that my hon. friend has a good policy; but gentlemen opposite charge this side of the House with stealing their policy. The chances are that, being possessed of very liberal ideas, we may have taken a few liberal planks and left those which the white ants have possession of still in the hands of the hon. gentleman. Take, for instance, the non-alienation of Crown lands. Members opposite talk of their policy. They were in power for ten or twelve months, and they would not bring in one of their most important planks, the non-alienation of Crown lands. I think the Minister for Lands was indorsing or granting titles when he was Minister.

MR. BATH: The hon. member is incorrect. I stopped the sale of lands.

MR. HARDWICK: I do not think I will make any attempt to say anything farther. I think I have explained very clearly the position which members occupy; and I hope the member for North Fremantle will not be wanting in his apology to a worthy citizen whom I think he has wronged.

MR. J. C. G. FOULKES (Claremont): A good deal of reference so far has been made in regard to the various recriminations which have taken place during this prolonged debate. I attribute the existence of these recriminations to one cause, and it is this. I have noticed with great regret that for some years past it has been the practice of Cabinet Ministers to take part in by-elections. Some three years ago when I was a member of this House, some Ministers took part in an election at North Fremantle. Mr. James, my leader at the time, who held the post of Premier, defended the action he had taken in sending some of his colleagues there to take part in that election. I, when the matter was brought before the House, strongly dissented from the policy adopted of sending some of his