

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES, ELECTION.

The **MINISTER FOR EDUCATION** (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [5.25]: It will be within the knowledge of hon. members that since the last session of Parliament our Chairman of Committees was defeated at the polls. Without in any way detracting from the welcome which I am sure we all extend to his successor, Mr. Baglin, I am confident I shall be voicing the feelings of hon. members if I say that from the personal standpoint we all deeply regret that Mr. Allen is no longer with us. He made an admirable chairman, his contributions to debate were always of value, and he was a very good friend to all of us. However, he was defeated at the polls, and it is now necessary for us to fill the office of Chairman of Committees. Therefore I have pleasure in moving—

That Mr. Ewing be elected as Chairman of Committees in this House.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM (North-East) [5.26]: I have pleasure in seconding the nomination. Hon. members will agree that we have in Mr. Ewing a man who will make a really good Chairman of Committees, one who will do his best to safeguard the interests of hon. members. I have pleasure in seconding the nomination.

Hon. J. EWING (South-West) [5.27]: I am deeply sensible of the honour conferred upon me, and I submit myself to the will of the Council.

Question put and passed.

Hon. J. EWING (South-West) [5.28]: I desire to express my gratitude to hon. members for having conferred this honour upon me. I can assure them all that I will do my level best to carry out the duties of the position, maintain the privileges of hon. members and uphold the prestige my predecessor established in the past. I am at a disadvantage, because I have been preceded by such excellent men of marked tact and ability, in whom the House has had the greatest confidence, and I can only hope that when my term expires it will be found that I have at least endeavoured to live up to the traditions of the past. I will do my level best, and I hope I shall give entire satisfaction to hon. members.

BILL—SUPPLY.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Read a third time and passed.

House adjourned at 5.32 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 12th August, 1920.

Questions.	Page
Boring plant	91
Shipwrights, industrial agreement	92
Tramway inspectors, Perth	92
State steamships, supervising engineer	92
Iron or steel works to establish in the State	92
Police—(1) Prince of Wales's visit, (2) Inspector Mann's retirement	92
Income tax returns	92
Kangaroo skins, royalties	93
Drainage, market gardens at Hoodsman's lake	93
Water, St. Ives	93
Boulder miners' strike	93
Firewood workers' dispute, relief	93
Leave of absence	94
Address in Reply, fourth day	94

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

QUESTION—OLD AGE PENSIONERS, RATIONS.

Mr. ROCKE asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, In view of his reply to a question relating to the discontinuance of the issue of rations to persons at Fremantle in receipt of old age pensions, in which he stated that the responsibility of providing for aged persons rests upon the Commonwealth Government, and that very few cases are affected, will he reconsider his decision and order the issue of rations to continue, pending further negotiations with the Commonwealth Government, in view of the fact that fifteen pensioners are suffering severely by reason of their inability to obtain sufficient food? 2, Is he aware that instructions have been given to discontinue the issue of rations known as "extras," which include milk, rice, sago, and oatmeal, to indigent persons? 3, If so, will he give further consideration to the question, as it especially relates to the cases of children? 4, Is the saving alleged to be effected due to the activities of the recently appointed business manager, Mr. Simpson?

The **MINISTER FOR MINES** (for the Colonial Secretary) replied: 1, If any of these pensioners are unable to obtain sufficient food they have the right to apply for admission to either of the homes for the aged. 2, Yes; as the issue was being abused. 3, The officer at Fremantle was instructed to report specially to head office in any deserving case. These are being considered on their merits. 4, As regards pensioners, yes; as regards extras, no.

QUESTION—BORING PLANT.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN asked the Minister for Works: 1, Is he aware that a boring plant has been lying under water for some considerable time at Fremantle? 2, Will salt water thus be the means of destroying

several thousands of pounds' worth of plant and machinery? 3, When is it the intention of the Government to raise this plant?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, Yes. 2, The salt water has already damaged the electric motor to the extent of £500, but the balance of the plant will not be seriously affected. Delay in recovering this plant will not further damage the motors. 3, As soon as shipwrights return to work.

QUESTION—SHIPWRIGHTS, INDUSTRIAL AGREEMENT.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN asked the Minister for Works: 1, Is he aware that all private firms and the Commonwealth Government have entered into agreements with shipwrights in regard to wages and conditions? 2, When are the Government going to fall in line in regard to such agreements? 3, Will he deal with this urgently, in view of the quantity of work now waiting to use the Fremantle ship?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, It is so understood. 2, Negotiations with all the unions who have members working for the Government are in progress. 3, Answered by No. 2.

QUESTION—TRAMWAY INSPECTORS, PERTH.

Mr. GREEN asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Is he aware that whilst overtime and Sunday rates are paid to the gripmen and conductors on the Government tramways, the inspectors are only allowed ordinary rates of pay for their extra duties? 2, Is he aware that under this arrangement men in these responsible positions do not average the same amount of wages as the gripmen or conductors? 3, Is it intended to remove this unjust anomaly by granting the extra rates to the inspectors? 4, If not, why not?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Yes. Ordinary rates are paid to inspectors for Sunday duty and no extra pay for overtime. 2, The average earnings of a ticket inspector amount to £252 per annum and a traffic inspector £295 per annum. The average earnings of motormen and conductors are from £230 to £240 per annum, including Sundays and overtime. 3, As traffic inspectors and ticket inspectors are on the salaried staff, and receive long service and sick leave, for which they are paid, have first class railway concessions, and 12 days annual leave in addition to all gazetted public holidays, and as these privileges do not apply to the wages staff, the unjust anomaly does not exist. 4, Answered by No. 3.

QUESTION—STATE STEAMSHIPS, SUPERVISING ENGINEER.

Mr. UNDERWOOD asked the Minister for Mines: What salary, or wages, has Mr.

H. Bennett drawn as supervising engineer of State shipping while he has occupied that position?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: Mr. Bennett was appointed as supervising engineer in January, 1916, vice Mr. Butcher, who resigned, and the salary for this work was fixed at £125 per annum. The amount paid to the end of June would therefore be £562 10s.

QUESTION—IRON OR STEEL WORKS, TO ESTABLISH IN THE STATE.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN (for Mr. Lambert) asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Whether during the negotiations for the export of iron ore from Yampi Sound, the Prime Minister offered the necessary money or any assistance whatever to establish iron or steel works in Western Australia? 2, If so, will the Minister inform the House of the particulars of such offer?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, No. 2, Answered by No. 1.

QUESTIONS (2)—POLICE.

Prince of Wales's Visit.

Mr. JONES asked the Minister for Mines: 1, How many ex-detectives and retired members of the police force were on duty during the Prince of Wales's visit? 2, What were the names of such ex-detectives and retired policemen? 3, How long were they employed on such duty? 4, What remuneration was paid to each individual so employed?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, Three. 2, Ex-inspector Mann, and ex-detectives Sampson and Egglestone. 3, (a) Ex-inspector Mann, 12th April, 1920, to 15th July, 1920; (b) Ex-detectives Eggleston and Sampson, from 22nd June to 8th July. 4, Ex-inspector Mann, 25s. per diem; Ex-detective Sampson, 17s. 8d. per diem; Ex-detective Eggleston—no claim has yet been received from the Fremantle Harbour Trust.

Inspector Mann's Retirement.

Mr. JONES asked the Minister for Mines: What retiring allowance or superannuation was paid to ex-Detective Inspector Mann on his retirement from the police?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: The amount due to him under the Police Benefit Fund regulations, he having been a contributor to that fund for a period of twenty-two and a half years.

QUESTION—INCOME TAX RETURNS.

Mr. HARRISON (for Mr. Maley) asked the Premier: 1, As certain tax form compilers are making representations through-

out the country districts that they possess special knowledge of deductions for income returns which are not specifically laid down in the forms, will he state the nature of such deductions allowed hitherto in regard to income from agricultural or pastoral pursuits? 2, Will he endeavour to persuade the Federal Taxation Department to extend the time for making up the returns from business sources so as to allow the State and Federal forms to be compiled simultaneously?

The PREMIER replied: 1, I have no knowledge of such happenings. 2, I will represent the matter to the Federal Government.

QUESTION—KANGAROO SKINS, ROYALTIES.

Mr. JOHNSON asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, What new royalties have been imposed on kangaroo skins, and when were they imposed? 2, What are the reasons for these new taxes on a section of our producers?

The MINISTER FOR MINES (for the Colonial Secretary) replied: 1, On grey kangaroo skins of $\frac{1}{2}$ lb. weight and over, the royalty has been increased from 2d. to 2s. per skin; under $\frac{1}{2}$ lb. weight and on damaged skins, the royalty has been increased from 2d. to 6d. 2, A very considerable proportion of the "greys" is taken from the South-Western Division of the State—practically the whole of which is a reserve for kangaroos. From this reserve grey kangaroos may be taken under License "A" (for which there is no fee) for food purposes. License "A" does not authorise the sale of skins, but were such a condition enforced, a considerable waste of valuable property would eventuate. As holders of License "A" are not debarred from selling skins of kangaroos taken for food purposes, it was considered, in view of the very high price that skins were fetching, and to prevent illicit destruction of kangaroos for other than food purposes, the royalty charge should be increased.

QUESTION—DRAINAGE, MARKET GARDENS.

Herdsmen's Lake Land Purchase.

Mr. VERYARD asked the Minister for Works: 1, Is it a fact that the Government have purchased the site known as Herdsmen's Lake? 2, If so, what is the area and price? 3, Has other adjacent land been purchased? 4, If so, what is the area and price? 5, Has Herdsmen's Lake, including the swamp lands in the Njookenbooroo district, been acquired for drainage purposes? 6, Is he aware that many of the settlers at Njookenbooroo, Osborne Park, and Wanneroo have their garden land partly or

wholly under water at the present time, and that they are in the same unfortunate position for the fourth year in succession? 7, Is he aware that many of the settlers in the before-mentioned districts have been finally forced (owing to being flooded out) to abandon the growing of vegetable products, thus causing a great scarcity of such products, which has resulted in record prices and an increase in the cost of living? 8, When is it proposed to commence the construction of the drain with a view of assisting the settlers, as well as to reduce the cost of living?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, Yes. 2, 1,073 acres 1 rood; £10,732 10s. 3, Yes. 4, 202 acres 1 rood 24 perches; £3,036. 5, Both areas have been acquired for settlement of soldiers. 6, No. 7, No. 8, The drainage of Herdsmen's Lake will be put in hand at once.

QUESTION—WATER, ST. IVES.

Mr. DUFF asked the Minister for Works: Is it true that the Government are charging the companies operating at St. Ives fourpence per gallon for condensed water, which is costing the Government only one penny per gallon to produce?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: It is true that the Government is charging companies, syndicates, and leaseholders at St. Ives fourpence per gallon for condensed water, which leaves no margin of profit over cost when the matter is dealt with by ordinary business rules and methods.

QUESTION—BOULDER MINERS' STRIKE, RATIONS.

Mr. MUNSIE asked the Colonial Secretary: What was the total cost of supplying rations to members of the Coolgardie miners' union at Kalgoorlie and Boulder during the trouble in November and December, 1919?

The MINISTER FOR MINES (for the Colonial Secretary) replied: £499 7s. 5d.

QUESTION—FIREWOOD WORKERS' DISPUTE, RELIEF.

Mr. MUNSIE asked the Colonial Secretary: What was the total cost of supplying rations to miners and others of Kalgoorlie and Boulder during the woodline trouble in June and July, 1919?

The MINISTER FOR MINES (for the Colonial Secretary) replied: This relief was not issued by, or charged to, the Charities Department. The expenditure was borne by the Premier's Office, and the figure supplied by the Treasury is £6,800 2s. 7d.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. Hardwick, leave of absence for a fortnight granted to Mr. Smith (North Perth) on the ground of urgent private business.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Fourth Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Mr. HARRISON (Ayon) [4.44]: I notice that in the first clause of His Excellency's Speech we have references made to the visit of the Prince of Wales. Although I was not able, owing to illness, to enter into the festivities and see for myself what was done in the metropolitan centres, and therefore did not personally see the enthusiasm exhibited here, yet I am sure there is just as loyal a section in our mining areas and in our agricultural districts, who were only prevented by duties connected with stock and other matters from coming to the metropolis for the purpose of expressing their affection and regard for the Throne.

Mr. O'Loughlin: Nobody has suggested otherwise.

Mr. HARRISON: We see a very great discrepancy between the revenue and expenditure. There has been a plus in revenue of £918,650, and a plus in expenditure of £934,860. This indicates that the activities throughout the State since peace was declared have been very considerable. The discrepancy, however, is a large one. I am sorry that the increase in revenue has not met the increase in expenditure. I realise that in the handling of increased revenue there must necessarily follow increased expenditure in the services that are rendered. I notice from the Speech that the Government are optimistic in regard to our future harvest. I thought I would get some local record of the returns for my electorate, but the only opportunity I had of doing so was on my way down in the train. I learn that for the Cunderdin district, which should give a fair estimate of the remaining portions of my electorate, in wheat for the year 1920 there were 69,797 acres under crop, and for 1919 54,191 acres, making an increase of 15,606 acres, which works out at a percentage increase of 29. In oats for 1920 there were 4,582 acres under crop, and for 1919 there were 3,087 acres, an increase of 1,495 acres, which shows an additional area under crop of 49 per cent. In barley there was very little done last year, only 167 acres being under crop as against this year 540 acres, an increase of 373 acres. If these figures are borne out to the same degree in other districts of the State, we may look for very much higher returns this year than we had last. Taking the present conditions, our rainfall and the prospects of our crops, I trust this estimate will be more than reached. We also have figures in regard to the settlement of returned soldiers. I do not want to traverse the figures given to us last night by the Premier, or to repeat what he

said. The Premier's figures should be more up to date than any I may have been able to get hold of. The mining industry is also touched upon in the Speech. This industry is gradually going backward. The Ministry and members of the Chamber should endeavour to assist in reviving this important industry. The fact of the matter is there are too many living on the game, too many engaged in buying scrip, in the flotation of companies and so forth, and there are too many persons between the prospector and the legitimate investor, who puts his money into mining in the belief that his investment is an investment and not a speculation. Whether it is possible to reduce the speculative element, and to do any good to the investing element, is a question upon which I am not qualified to give a definite opinion. It appears to me that, instead of assisting the industry, the position I have referred to has been a factor in retarding it. One of the items which the leader of the Opposition dealt with in his speech was in regard to industrial conditions. He argued that the interests of the employer and employee were directly opposed to each other. I do not agree with that.

Hon. P. Collier: The problem must remain unsolved if we cannot agree.

Mr. HARRISON: If the employer and employee are not working in unison for the benefit of whatever business they are engaged in, that business will suffer and the position of the industrialist will suffer also. If some method of profit-sharing, or of starting in our industrial sections a system of co-operation, were brought into use much good might be done. This is no new theme with me. I advocated it 25 years ago in a turner's and fitter's shop with which I was connected in Victoria, and which employed 100 men. If the men who were engaged in what was then called a union shop had seized the opportunity which was available then, they could have done great things. Each man paid so much a week into the union fund. It worked out at 2s. 6d. a week. If this money had been put into the bank it would have worked out at about £6 10s. per man per annum. With the money so raised these men could have bought a site at South Melbourne, a large area, for £650. The following year they might have been able to build upon it, and very soon they would have had enough plant to employ 20 men. Immediately the union had obtained the freehold of their land and their plant they could have employed a commercial head to look after the financial side of the business and these 20 men could have started out in a co-operative concern. They could have had their own by-laws and their own system of management, and in three or four, or five years at the most, they would have been able to absorb the whole of the 100 employees. If these men had been working collectively nothing could have withstood their operations because they had the pick of the technical knowledge then available. I believe that one of the solutions of industrial troubles lies through co-operation, or the profit-sharing system.

Mr. Green: If the workers did not eat, they would have money to burn.

Mr. HARRISON: It is all very well for members to belittle the idea. If it is not in accord with their views, let them put forward some better proposal. Here we have with us conditions that cannot possibly continue. There has been increase after increase in wages, and these increases in wages are not met by the equivalent in commercial value of the articles concerned. The wage balance must be made up in some other way. As things are at present, the purchasing power of the wages earned by these men is decreasing. Therefore, they are in a worse position than they were before. The Premier has just been through the difficulties of the Civil Service strike. He has promised the civil servants and school teachers that a board will be appointed to go into the question of their status, and the salaries they are to receive. If we are to have an efficient service we should also have another board. The board I have in mind is one which would bring our service up to modern conditions, so that we might get not only an efficient service but an efficient system. I am of opinion that this board might be made up of the head of some financial institution, such as a bank, another gentleman with wide commercial knowledge accustomed to handling business in a big way and files and documents and correspondence, and the third a member of the service who has had a sound education of a commercial nature before joining the service. I believe that by this means we would be able to create a board which would assist the various branches of our service to give us a more efficient system than we have to-day. Mention has been made of the wealth in our timber areas.

Mr. Munsie: What do you think of the settlement of the Civil Service strike?

Mr. HARRISON: What do you mean by that? Is it settled?

Mr. Munsie: So we are given to understand. I should like to know your opinion.

Mr. HARRISON: The civil servants have gone back to their duties and a board has been promised them. The Government have done what they promised to do. For the time being the civil servants are at work and the board is created. They have their work to do, but as to the strike being settled, I am not going to say whether it is or not.

Mr. O'Loghlen: What do you think of their claim for money whilst they were out?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. O'Loghlen: That is a fair question.

Mr. SPEAKER: But this is not question time.

Mr. HARRISON: I am not going to interfere with the two sections on the Address-in-reply. I still think it would be of material advantage to Australia, and Western Australia, and also to the Civil Service and the Education Department, if the decimal coinage and metric system were introduced.

The Minister for Mines: It cannot be done.

Mr. HARRISON: In the Education Department a fourth or fifth of the time now occupied in arithmetic and mathematics generally would be saved. The metric system is adopted all over the world with which we do business, except in Great Britain and other parts of the British Empire. At present in our export and import trade we have to transpose our figures into other systems of coinage. Under the metric system business men and others can see at sight the relative percentage values and can much more readily grasp the true position. In the matter of accountancy it is impossible to estimate the large amount of time that would be saved by the adoption of this system. With regard to our timber assets, I may refer especially to sandalwood, which is at the present time being sold chiefly to agents in Fremantle, who make a great deal of profit out of it. The whole of the lands on which the sandalwood grows are Crown lands. Is there anything to prevent the State taking up another industry in this connection?

Mr. Green: Hear, hear! We are with you.

Mr. HARRISON: Sandalwood represents a source from which the State can obtain a much bigger revenue by trading in it than by the imposition of any royalty. I understand the present value of sandalwood in China is equal to £34 per ton at Fremantle. Why should not our State receive that high value instead of its going to the middleman? Our other timbers also are of immense value, and while we are cutting up areas for land settlement great care should be taken not to destroy timber which is of higher value than the land will represent for agricultural purposes. Further, there is the consideration that the timber value repeats itself if a policy of reafforestation is adopted. The member for Forrest (Mr. O'Loghlen) is an expert in this matter, and other hon. members are better acquainted with it than I am; but I realise that the money value of our timber has been materially increased by reason of the destruction of timber all over Europe during the war. We are going to have higher and still higher prices for our timber.

Mr. O'Loghlen: But the Premier puts land settlement before timber.

The Minister for Mines: He does nothing of the kind.

Mr. HARRISON: Forestry policy and land settlement should both go forward together. What we require is men who can adjudicate as between timber values on the one hand and values of land for agricultural purposes on the other. In the absence of expert advice of this kind, we are likely to destroy hundreds of thousands of pounds' worth of timber, with the only result of impoverishing the settlers who take the land on. We want advice that will prevent us from alienating possibly hundreds of thousands of acres of forest land which will be of no use to the farmers settled on it except as regards a pocket here and there suited for intense

cultivation. We should preserve our timbers as far as we possibly can.

The Premier: We do that.

Mr. HARRISON: On account of the increased value of timber all over the world, greater care than ever should be taken of our timber resources.

The Premier: That is being done.

Mr. HARRISON: I am not sufficiently conversant with conditions in the South-West to say whether it is being done or is not being done. There is a matter on which I must dwell for a little while. It is a matter to which I make it a practice to refer either on the Address-in-reply or in the discussion on the Loan Estimates. A portion of my electorate is still suffering from lack of facilities for getting its products to market. I refer to an area of land between two existing railways, the Dowerin-Merredin and the Eastern Goldfields lines. The settlers in question are very anxious to know what is going to happen in the matter of railway communication, and I trust the Government will give them some encouragement.

Hon. P. Collier: The Government have been giving them plenty of encouragement for years, but that will not carry those settlers very far.

Mr. HARRISON: The present cost of bringing their products to market is far too heavy, and they should be given some guarantee of relief.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Would they be satisfied with a tramway?

Mr. HARRISON: Personally, I would not mind what was done by the Government so long as they gave those settlers something like the conditions enjoyed by farmers elsewhere in the State. The settlers are quite willing to help themselves through the Government if only the Government will show a willingness to assist. They should be enabled to devote the two months they now spend in carting to preparing their seed beds for further production. With the higher prices for wheat these men are still further handicapped by their position. It is not fair to them in view of the promise made to them when they settled in the district, and I trust that in the near future they will have definite information as to the intentions of the Government. During the recess I was enabled, through the courtesy of the Government, to see something of our north-western ports and the conditions obtaining there. I have derived the impression that possibly Western Australia is too big a proposition for some of our men, who do not realise what this State is. Having a big State and big possibilities and big opportunities, we want to think in a big way. There are big assets, but there must be big expenditure before we can obtain results from those assets.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Do not forget that by your vote you helped to give away those northern areas for 20 years.

Mr. HARRISON: I did not. A good deal remains to be done in providing harbour facilities in the North-West if that portion

of the State is to have such a steamship service as will give the men there a chance. Neap tides occur only once a fortnight or once a month, and ships are frequently prevented from entering a port on account of the rise and fall of tides, which one can scarcely grasp unless one has seen it. There is an enormous difference between high tide and low tide in the north-western ports. In some of those ports the steamers cannot get near the jetty, and the people there state that if a proper survey had been made in the early days or if a proper survey were made even now, there would be accommodation for vessels of deeper draught, and this at less cost than the existing accommodation, which suits only comparatively small vessels. At Carnarvon we had proof of the energy of the north-western people in the form of the meat works which are being erected there, and which should soon be in operation. I commend the people of Carnarvon for taking the work in hand, and also for leasing it to be operated during a term of years by the contractor who is building it. He is to operate it on a commission basis, and to create business he will have to prove that the buildings and the facilities are of such a nature as to produce goods of a quality acceptable in the world's markets. Thus in a few years the Carnarvon people should have an established business which otherwise they would not have had an opportunity of securing. They will have a splendid asset in the shape of the meat works when a market has been created in other parts of the world for the products of the works. From what I observed at Broome, Derby, and Port Hedland, the pastoral soils there are better than one would expect. I have been in Queensland, and I want to make a comparison between the soils in our North-West and the soils in the pastoral districts of Queensland. At Eedya station, some miles out from Derby, I saw land which reminded me more than anything else I have seen here of Woodford station in Queensland. That station, at all events during my time in Queensland, was a large station for pure Hertford cattle. The condition of soil and the class of grasses and the water supply on this north-western station were similar to those on Woodford station, but the timber was different. The stock and the cows with calves at foot were in good condition, as also were the yearlings and the younger two-year-olds, while some of the older cattle were right up in condition and ready to go to the market. That station has suffered several bad seasons, and has had rain only just recently, and yet the stock were in the condition I have described, which fact goes to prove that the soil there lacks nothing for pastoral purposes. What the North wants is, as I have mentioned, shipping and harbour facilities. Without those facilities it cannot progress at anything like the rate it should. I want hon. members to consider the figures which we shall have to deal with if we tackle our North-West proposition properly. I was much struck with a paragraph in the report

of the Railways and Harbours Commissioner of the South African Union, where railways and harbours are combined in one department. I am sorry I have not been able to lay my hands on the report during the last few days, or I would have read the paragraph to the House. The Commissioner said that nothing had proved so successful in connection with the railways and harbours of South Africa as the installing of insulated cars between the freezing works in the inland territory and the ports. If this is good enough for South Africa and if it is profitable in a country where the conditions more nearly approximate to those of our North-West than any place I know of—we have tick in the North-West and there is difficulty with insects in South Africa—it should be good enough for us. If freezing works were established with railway facilities and insulated cars, to the ports we would be able to get the maximum value in quality from our stock. If the animals are pastured near to freezing works inland, it is possible to get a quality which is not obtainable if they are taken from their native pastures and travelled to the port. Thus we would get the advantage in quality. But on our stock we are losing in quantity as well as quality from the time the animal leaves its own pasture to be transported on the hoof to one of the outports. In the North-West we have about 600,000 head of cattle, and the losses through wastage and mortality owing to the lack of facilities, is enormous. In the vicinity of Derby it is estimated by a man who ought to know, that 15,000 head of cattle are lost to the State annually. Members can figure out for themselves what sum that represents in the aggregate. If this sum were capitalised it would pay interest and sinking fund on an enormous amount of money. Further, let us take the cost per head for conveying cattle from Derby to Fremantle. On the last shipment it was £7 17s. per head. If those animals were brought down in the shape of quarters of beef, nothing like the same amount of space would be required. We would also avert the 10 per cent. loss of flesh which is considered to be a fairly accurate estimate for the trip between Derby and Wyndham and Fremantle, and there is also to be reckoned the loss of quality. The shipments of cattle from the North-West to Fremantle may be calculated as being in the vicinity of 30,000 head annually and members can work out for themselves the value of the asset which at the present time we are simply losing. The loss of weight in transit is generally calculated at 10 per cent. If a bullock weighed 1,000 lbs. on the pasture, it would not be likely to pan out at more than 900 lbs. on arrival at Fremantle.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Generally they run about 600 lbs.

Mr. Underwood: And they lose the best meat, too.

Mr. HARRISON: Then there is the mortality which varies considerably on different trips. On the boat by which I

travelled down, we had 400 bullocks and we lost three or four. I was informed that two ships a fortnight ago, had a mortality of 160, and some members here know of instances of even heavier mortality than that. This mortality represents a very serious loss to the State and if it could be saved to the State the asset would be enormously increased. In good seasons growers would be able to put younger animals into the freezers, whereas at the present time it is not possible to travel them to the coast and ship them on the hoof. If growers could turn out animals in prime condition at three years old instead of four or five years, they would thus make room for other beasts on their fattening areas, which would be of material advantage. The problem in the North-West is a very big one indeed. The opportunities in the North-West are exceptionally great. The area of country is enormous. If we are going to keep the North-West empty, it will prove a very serious menace to the safety of Australia. If we could reap the full benefit of this asset created year by year upon the natural grasses and under the favourable climatic conditions of the North-West, it would prove a wonderful advantage to the revenue of this State. I would not be doing my duty, as a representative of this House if, after having visited that district and after having been so impressed by its possibilities, I did not express my feelings here.

The Minister for Mines: We cannot do it for the next half a century.

Mr. Underwood: Yes, you can; try!

Mr. HARRISON: I do not agree with the Minister. The assets are of such a nature that if the representatives of capital in other parts of the world only knew of these immense possibilities, the North-West would not long languish for want of capital. The possibilities are enormous and it is our duty to consider what we are going to do with the North-West. If we do not develop it, what will be the result? That is a problem we have to face. If the areas now held under pastoral conditions were subdivided and smaller paddocks were utilised, the carrying capacity of the country could be increased to a degree beyond conception. Of course, fencing material would be necessary, but provided that were obtainable, the possibilities in this direction would be really staggering. I do not intend to refer to the interior because, unfortunately, I could not go inland, but I believe if good fencing material and labour to erect fences were available—

Hon. T. Walker: Any other obstacle?

Mr. HARRISON: The money expended would be recouped in a shorter period than has been the case in any other line of production which has received Government assistance. If I were a young man and had sufficient money, I should like to take up an area in the North-West. In conclusion, I wish to repeat an argument which I have used before in this House. This State can be made safe and progressive by only one thing, and that is energy or work. We cannot do it by increasing taxation or by any other method.

We have far too many people in the State who are living on their wits and doing no work, and it is about time there was a change. — **THE MINISTER FOR WORKS** (Hon. W. J. George—Murray-Wellington) [5.26]: Members on the Opposition side have tried to make some capital with regard to what they term the secret purchases of the Government, instancing as a matter for the consideration of members the purchase of the business and concession of the Timber Hewers' Association. The member for Kanowna (Mr. Walker) waxed very strong in regard to this matter. He said that we had been operating in secret for many months and he accused me of being politically dishonest.

Hon. T. Walker: I did nothing of the kind.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Further, it was stated by one of the members on the other side of the House that I had turned a somersault on my principles, and that the whole matter of this purchase should have been referred to Parliament before it was proceeded with. It was admitted that the purchase might have been a good one, but it was made without authority. There was a further statement that I could easily sell the sawmills if I wished to do so. I am sure members opposite had no idea of attaching anything to my personal or private career or with the personal career of Ministers with whom I am associated. From my point of view, however, politically dishonest is privately dishonest. A man who knowingly tells lies in Parliament will tell lies in private life, and if he will do a dishonest thing politically, we may be sure he is a rogue and a vagabond and a thief in private life, and should be in gaol. Before I proceed to deal with this purchase and give the particulars of it, I wish to refer to the leader of the Opposition who, in his usual calm and temperate tones, spoke of the Trading Concerns Act passed by Ministers on this side of the House some time ago, which stipulated that no other trading concerns should be established unless the proposal was first approved of by Parliament. No new trading concern has been established or carried on by the present Ministry or by any of the Ministries with which I have been connected in the last four years in contravention of the Act which deals with State trading concerns.

Hon. P. Collier: I did not assert otherwise.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The instance I have to deal with is not the carrying on of a fresh business, but is the following of the legitimate course which must be observed with all trading concerns; otherwise they must perish. There is no business which can remain at a dead level. It must either progress or go down. Any business man can tell us that if he finds his business is not moving at all, he knows he is nearer to tottering to a fall than he is to getting on and making a profit. Let the hon. member ask some of the accountants and auditors of his acquaintance if it is not part of their

duty, when examining accounts and looking into a business, to advise the owner as to whether the business is or is not stagnating, and whether it is possible to make it progress. When the Labour Government started these business concerns, I suppose they felt they had all the advice at their command, and were pretty sure how these concerns could be carried on, and what would be the result; but without knowing their inner minds, I am satisfied they would never have started these concerns unless they had wished them to grow. Had they done so, they would have been at variance with the principles and policy laid down by the Labour bodies who believe in State enterprises, the object being as we all know that they may capture certain businesses, transport, manufacturing etc., and run them as, may I say, socialistic concerns. Perhaps that is not the correct word to use. What I mean to convey is, businesses in which all the people of the State have a share. If the State sawmills have simply to be started as a mushroom and to be held as a mushroom until they decay, the people of the State or hon. members on both sides of the House would feel that justice was not being done. I am opposed to State trading concerns, but as I am a partner in these concerns, just as hon. members opposite are, even though I do not believe in the State entering the avenues where private enterprise can give a better service, I am interested in seeing that the State does not lose by the existence of these concerns. I would be unworthy of the position I hold as a Minister if I did not regard my position as that of a trustee, and did not carry out to the best of my ability and experience everything that would assist in the development and furtherance of these concerns. The State sawmills have been extended, are still extending, and must continue to extend, or else they will prove a big loss to the State. So far as I can judge the policy of both sides of the House, taking the Forestry Act as a guide, is that the large privately held timber concerns should not be given unlimited areas or concessions for the purpose of what is termed exploiting the resources of the State. If that were not so, why did such a provision find a place in the Forestry Act that those holding concessions and leases were not to be allowed to have further permits. There is no doubt that that was the view of every member of this House and of the other Chamber as well. Just to show what the State sawmills mean, I would inform hon. members that our wages bill in connection with the State sawmills is £700 per day, or over £4,000 per week and £200,000 per annum. It will thus be seen that whoever for the time being is entrusted with the task of running these concerns will have to carry a heavy responsibility and will not be able to lightly regard any proposition brought forward with the object of enabling the concerns to successfully meet their obligations. Hon. members opposite know perfectly well that the experiment of cutting karri—it was not an experiment newly started by the State—can-

not be dealt with by itself. Those who cut karri timber years ago were the M. C. Davies Company at Augusta and Messrs. Millars at Denmark. I was at that time manager of the Jarrahdale Timber Company. We had nothing but jarrah to sell and I could keep the House going for hours by relating something of the controversy that took place all over the world in connection with the attempt which was made to introduce karri in the place of jarrah. A great quantity of karri was sold as being jarrah and it did the Western Australian timber industry a tremendous lot of harm because karri could not safely be used for the same purposes as jarrah.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Some of your leading patriots were the men who did it.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I merely mention the matter to show hon. members that as we are all partners in this concern, if we have to carry on a timber trade we must have jarrah as well as karri, so as to enable us to command the trade. It is essential therefore that jarrah and in fair quantities, too, should be associated with the karri mills, otherwise we shall not get either the Eastern trade or the trade of South Africa, India or London. That was recognised to a certain extent, how far I cannot say, by the Labour Government, when they established the State sawmills, because at Manjimup, the land which was taken up there, contained a certain amount of jarrah. It could hardly be called first class jarrah either as to quantity or quality, but it was certainly jarrah, and in order to carry on the State sawmill's business it has been necessary every year to purchase from the other sawmillers who have jarrah concessions a large quantity of jarrah timber of a value approximately £10,000 to £20,000 per annum.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Not in recent years.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Why has the railway mill at Dwellingup disposed of so much to private people?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is a fact that the State sawmills have paid many thousands of pounds per annum to Millars, the Timber Hewers, Lewis & Reid, and Whitaker's for timber necessary to send away to other parts of the world so as to secure the sale of karri. The member for Forrest mentioned the railway mill. It is perfectly true that until a short time ago that mill was disposing of its scantlings.

Mr. O'Loghlen: At a ridiculous price.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The scantlings were disposed of in Western Australia to the best advantage. Owing to representations made by me to the Government of the day, an arrangement was entered into by which the State sawmills obtained what I think is their right to deal with the timber produced at Dwellingup not required by the Railway Department and which was needed to enable the State business to be carried on properly and profitably. A statement was also made that the Government

refused the transfer of the permit held by the Hewers to other people who were desirous of purchasing the Timber Hewers' business. That is correct.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Why did you do it under the lap?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The reason of it was as I have already told the House the existence of the provision in the Forestry Act. The position, when it came seriously before the Government was as follows: The Timber Hewers' Co-operative Society was started some time in 1904 when, I believe, the Daglish Government were in power. At any rate, it was about that time because a former Minister of the Crown, Mr. W. D. Johnson, made an arrangement by which the Timber Hewers' Co-operative Society were sold eight miles of rails. I mention this because I am going to deal with it afterwards. The purchase of the rails enabled the society to get to Lucknow near Collie. The then Government recognised the advisability of assisting the society. They started saw milling operations there and later on at Holyoake, and have done a great amount of business. The position which arose about 18 months or perhaps two years ago was that the concession or permit at Holyoake was rapidly being cut out, and there was no further concession in the neighbourhood which could be given to them. Consequently what they were up against was that whereas they had some 36,000 acres of jarrah country in the Collie district stretching northwards, to keep their men together they would have had to shift from Holyoake and start on this other permit. If they had done that, it would have necessitated the removal of the plant and its re-erection, to get a railway line down and put up necessary houses and buildings. That in itself would have required 18 months to two years to effect, and the financial requirements would have created a very serious position. Of course I do not know anything of the inner workings of the society and I can only judge from my own observations and from conversations I had with the management about the problem that was facing them. They thought that if they could sell their concession to those who could deal with it, the buyers would be able to make a start with fresh capital, etc. When I tell hon. members that the community at Holyoake consisted of 500 men, women and children, that there were 148 children attending school there, that there were 95 houses occupied by the employees of the mills, that there were several business buildings, the responsibility of breaking up such a community was recognised. It was a serious matter for anyone to contemplate.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: No one on this side questions the wisdom of the purchase.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The matter had to be seriously considered and dealt with courageously. If that had not been done, the Government would have been deserving of condemnation from both sides of

the House. I would have been prepared to condemn the Government if I had felt that they had failed in their duty.

Mr. O'Loughlen: A remarkable change in a few years.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: My hair is a little whiter than it used to be. When the hon. member's hair is as white as mine, he will have more wisdom. Further than that the shifting would have meant a cessation of work for perhaps a couple of years and the loss would probably have been more than the co-operative society would have been able to stand. The manager of the State Sawmills, Mr. Humphries, a very efficient officer and a man who I think is deserving of considerable respect from everyone, and who is assiduous and keen in business, urged upon me from the very first when I became Minister the necessity for starting a timber yard in Perth, the idea being that the large accumulation of scantlings and boards should be got rid of and turned into cash at once, in which case we would get a bigger net and quicker return for our timber than by shipping it overseas. Governments of which I have been a Minister were not agreeable to the extension of business enterprises, and regarded the establishment of a timber yard as a further encroachment upon those utilities which should be reserved for private people, who have to pay taxes.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I turned that down because it was not a payable proposition.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am giving the House the reason why Governments of which I have been a member turned it down.

Mr. Green: Timber has gone up 100 per cent. in the last 12 months.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Timber Hewers' Co-operative Society had a yard at Carlisle and did a fairly good business. The trade they were doing amounted to £2,500 per month, and the business we are doing to-day exceeds £4,000 per month. On that score, at any rate, hon. members cannot blame those responsible for the purchase.

Mr. Green: But you have increased the price by that much.

Mr. O'Loughlen: We are not blaming you. There was no question as to the justness of the purchase; the only question was as to the outcry of Ministers and others that we did a similar thing.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I will answer that directly, and I want to get this narrative of facts into "Hansard." No doubt it will tickle the hon. member's romantic fancy.

Mr. O'Loughlen: We rejoice in your conversion.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I will tell the hon. member a little more directly. We could not have purchased the timber hewers' business unless we had taken the whole of their assets, including the yard at Carlisle. We therefore had to take that yard, with

the result shown. We have also brought our bricks into the business at Carlisle in a very profitable way, and very much to the convenience of those who want a few bricks with which to finish a job when they are hard up for material. It is unnecessary to deal with all the steps taken in the purchase of this concern, but I desire to answer legitimate inquiries. The amount of cash paid to the hewers was practically £61,500, and approximately £23,000 was required to square up their balance sheet, that is, to pay their debts in exchange for which we got their assets. It has been stated by one hon. member that it would have been possible for the Government to purchase this concern for a lower sum. I can only say that no such possibility came before me, or any other member of the Government. I know at one time it was offered at a lower sum. At that time the Government would have nothing to do with it, and when we purchased the shareholders could have obtained the same price as the Government paid from some other proposing purchasers in Western Australia.

Mr. Pickering: What were the assets worth?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I will tell the hon. member directly. What we did was to take the balance sheet, and go exhaustively through the whole of the assets of this company. We took stock of all the machinery, plant, and belongings of that company. It had been the practice of this company to write off their assets on a ten years' basis, and we obtained all the benefit of the depreciation that they had written off. One item that was written off was eight miles of rails, to which I have already referred, and which were provided by Mr. Johnson in 1904. On the balance sheet the value of these eight miles of rails appeared as £3,500. There are over 600 tons of rails in the lot. The price of new rails then was £13 per ton, the value being £10,800; and of second hand rails £12 per ton, the value being £7,200. These were new rails, and I will explain the peculiarity in this matter to hon. members. Some three or four years ago, I obtained on loan from the hewers' society eight miles of rails, which they had purchased from Mr. Johnson in 1904, on my undertaking to replace them three months after the close of the war. The only way I could replace them was with new rails that came from Broken Hill. Therefore, when I took over the rails I took over new rails, the value of which was £10,800, although shown on the balance sheet as £3,500. I also took over a new locomotive, which we put together for them at the State implement works, this being paid for by them. The price we paid for the locomotive was £3,500, whereas the maker's price in England at the time we took it over was £5,500. I will quote a few of the assets, and then deal with other reasons which operated in connection with the purchase of this concern. The amount so far as the balance sheet on the 30th November is concerned, required to pay each of the share-

holders £250, was £61,500. They owed the Commonwealth Bank £10,924. They had bills payable in connection with the freehold of the Carlisle yard to the amount of £1,850. To sundry creditors they owed £6,938, and there was a reserve in connection with the State and Federal taxation of £2,500. Certain accrued expenditure amounted to £700, and the total was £84,412. The whole of the assets were most carefully and exhaustively gone into. Reliable men went through the yards and the mills and everything the company had, and accountants went through the books and verified everything in connection with them. We went carefully through the book debts, and the amount we reserved in our valuation in connection with the book debts, I am pleased to say, has hardly been touched by bad debts. In fact, we had more than we expected to have in our calculation. The valuations were as follows:—Fixed assets £57,839, floating and liquid assets £50,927, or a total of £108,766, against the £84,000 owed in capital paid. In placing this before the Government I stated that this difference of £24,354 was that arrived at by Mr. Humphries and his staff. I thought it wise to make further reductions, and did so, having had the benefit of a long experience in the trade, my knowledge of which I think is fairly good.

Mr. O'Loughlen: A long and useful experience.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: From the assets in connection with the Asquith mill line construction, £14,000, I wrote off £1,000, because I considered that, the earthworks, etc., having been done a number of years ago, we would have to meet a big depreciation. There was a certain quantity of rails at Holyoake, and I wrote off £1,000 from them, because I considered it a fair thing to make a bigger provision for wear and tear than had been made by the society.

Hon. P. Collier: If the valuation made by your officers was so far out what value can you place upon their valuation on the other items?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is not quite fair.

Hon. P. Collier: The Minister is ridiculing the valuation made by his officers.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Nothing is further from my mind. I will explain that.

Hon. P. Collier: But that is the fact.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: On mill buildings I wrote off a further £3,000, and the sum of £2,500 on locomotives, making a total of £7,500, and leaving a net surplus of £16,854. The hon. member said I was belittling the valuations of my officers.

Hon. P. Collier: This shows you did not have confidence in the judgment of your officers.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: That may be in the mind of the hon. member, but to my way of thinking it shows that I did not wish to make out too rosy a case. I have

had too much to do with matters of this sort during my life. We wanted something to come and go on, in case the legitimate expectations of our officers were not realised. On the figures the deal has been a good one for the State. We had as a Government, adjoining this concession, some thousands of acres of good jarrah country. To use that timber it would have been necessary for us to put up a mill capable of producing 50 loads of timber per day. The mill at Holyoake had been producing 50 loads per day, and since we have taken it over has consistently exceeded that. The member for Forrest (Mr. O'Loughlen) knows what I said to the men when we made the deal.

Mr. O'Loughlen: I wish you would make it public.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member can publish it; he has the particulars. The men have responded well, and we have a splendid outturn from the mill. I am satisfied anyhow. To provide the necessary railway with which to work our concession, a bush line, mill plant, rolling stock, buildings, workers' houses, and water supply, the cost, on the estimate of Mr. Properjohn, the outdoor superintendent of the sawmills, would have been £40,000, and the erection of all this would have taken two years. We would have had, in order to run our concession, to lay down a bigger length of line from the Government railway to our mill than we had to lay through the Holyoake mill to our concession. By purchasing this mill we got one capable of giving 50 loads of timber per day, and we could go right into it instead of waiting two years.

Mr. Green: It was no good waiting that length of time, as you will be out of office then. You drove a hard bargain.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: I did not drive any bargain at all. No one knows better than the member for Forrest that if we had not purchased that concession, or had allowed anyone else to get it, the particular community concerned would have had to be broken up. No Government could callously and carelessly see a community of 500 men, women, and children dispersed in that way. If we had allowed the sale of this mill to any of the other people the mill would have had to be moved to other concessions near Colliie.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Why do you not admit that the others were Millar's Timber Company?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: I understand that the Timber Corporation made an offer to the timber hewers, and it was said that the Timber Corporation were Millar's. Millar's said it was not so. There is no blame attached to us because of that.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You have done a good thing.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: In addition to the mill and plant we got 16,000 acres of freehold land, known as Bull's lease, or concession, and we also got 36,000 acres of jarrah permit.

Mr. O'Loughlen: It is not worth much.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: This represents a considerable area of timber country. The Minister for Railways, by a process of legitimate legerdemain, obtained this 36,000 acres and this 16,000 acres from the State sawmills as a reserve for railway sleeper supply. We shall probably want the land back again in the years to come, but the value of this area in the meantime will have to be paid to us as against the financing of the transaction. Hon. members can see the papers; there is no objection to their seeing any of the papers. But there exists no justification whatever for the statement that in this transaction there has been any more secrecy than necessarily there must be if business is to be done.

Mr. O'Loughlen: You did not hold that view when you were sitting in Opposition.

Hon. P. Collier: We should have proclaimed it to the world when we wanted to do anything.

The Minister for Mines: But a member of the Opposition knew all about these negotiations.

Mr. O'Loughlen: We were attacked in this connection by the same Minister who is speaking now.

THE SPEAKER: Order!

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The member for Forrest (Mr. O'Loughlen) was at Holyoake when the agreement was signed. He can, if he wishes, rise here and say anything he pleases; but I defy him or anyone else to attack this purchase on business grounds.

Hon. P. Collier: The member for Forrest will take up the challenge.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am quite certain that if he did do so, his friends in the timber industry would begin to consider whether he deserves the unlimited love and trust which they accord to him at the present time.

Mr. O'Loughlen: I succumb, like the farmers' and settlers' delegates after this morning's leader in the "West Australian."

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: That, as briefly as I can give it, is the history of the purchase. There has been no more secrecy in connection with the matter than there must be in all business matters.

Mr. O'Loughlen: There has been a reversal of policy on your part.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Hon. members know that trading concerns involving a very large amount of State capital have been established in Western Australia. As Minister for State trading concerns, I have the responsibility of businesses representing something like one million sterling, and I say that no business can be successfully conducted unless ordinary business reticence is observed. One cannot cry on the housetops everything that one is going to do; if so, one's competitors will know all about it. Therefore politicians should discriminate between legitimate trading concerns, with which I have been dealing, and those which I may describe as romantic plunges into the realms of busi-

ness in search of something or other which the plungers do not understand.

Mr. O'Loughlen: What have you in mind; fish shops?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: By the purchase of this sawmill we have acquired a business with a goodwill representing a turnover of many thousands per annum. We have acquired a share in the overseas trade with Africa, India, and elsewhere, a share representing about 15 per cent. of the total timber exports of Western Australia. That in itself has made, and will continue to make, a big difference to the results of the trading of the State sawmills. An hon. member opposite has accused me of being enthusiastic. But my enthusiasm has generally boiled itself down when it comes to plain facts. I wish the hon. member himself would recognise this, that when a man puts his hand to the plough he should not look back. Parliament and the public have the right to expect of me, as trustee of the State trading concerns, honesty in all I do. They have further the right to expect that if I possess experience, no matter how dearly I may have bought it, I shall give the benefit of that experience to the State, and not withhold it. Without wishing to boast in any way, I hope I have been decent to the State, decent to the trading concerns, and decent to my own character.

Mr. MUNSIE (Hannans) [6.7]: I fear I shall have to occupy some little time in connection with the matters mentioned in the Governor's Speech.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Members of the Country party want to speak on Tuesday.

Mr. MUNSIE: I quite realise that members of the Country party do not know exactly where they are, after to-day's conference. I must admit that there is very little in the Governor's Speech, or very little that a member can say much about. In fact, the Speech is more utterly devoid of policy than any Speech that has been delivered since I have been a member of the House.

The Minister for Mines: That is said of every successive Governor's Speech.

Hon. P. Collier: Yes; they get progressively worse.

Mr. MUNSIE: I hope that the next Governor's Speech will at any rate give members a clearer outline of the intentions of the Ministry. The first paragraph that catches my attention in the Speech is No. 3—

In common with every other country in the civilised world, Western Australia is faced with grave problems of reconstruction following upon the disturbances of trade, commerce, and industry during the war.

I should have liked to see those sentences followed by something expressing the intentions of the Government with regard to overcoming the difficulties referred to.

The Minister for Mines: We have stated that in the remainder of the paragraph.

Mr. MUNSIE: I fail to see it. However, the paragraph continues—

My advisers, however, because of the ability of the State to produce in abundance many of the things of which the world is most in need, feel that the prospects are encouraging, and that vigour, enterprise, and goodwill amongst the people are alone necessary to replace the material losses of war and to inaugurate a period of expansion.

Mr. Thomson: Emphasise the goodwill.

Mr. MUNSIE: Goodwill probably will have a very beneficial effect, but I would have liked to see the Government make an attempt to bring about goodwill among the people. The Government seem absolutely devoid of any policy whatever. The Speech contains no hint of what they intend to do to bring about goodwill. Last night the Premier said that Western Australia was never more prosperous than it is to-day. There may be a considerable number of people in this State who are doing fairly well—I believe there are. But I wish to repeat, and with emphasis, what I stated by way of interjection during the Premier's speech yesterday, that never during the 21 years I have spent in Western Australia have I known the working classes of this State to be so badly off as they are to-day. I say that, believing it to be absolutely true.

The Premier: I have no doubt you believe it, but it is not so.

Mr. MUNSIE: The Premier himself knows that the average working man cannot clothe his family as they ought to be clothed, and that he cannot afford to supply them with boots at present prices; and yet the Premier talks of wonderful prosperity.

Mr. O'Loughlin: Let the Premier come with me for a week-end, and I will show him.

Mr. MUNSIE: Let the Premier walk up to the James-street school, or let him visit any other State school in the metropolitan area, and have a look at the children going into school and coming out. Even on these bitterly cold and frosty mornings four boys out of five are going barefooted, because their parents cannot possibly buy them boots.

The Minister for Mines: That is not correct.

Mr. MUNSIE: It is correct. In the hottest summer weather I myself have seen the children attending the James-street school come out in order to proceed to the Crawley baths, and the great majority of the boys could not possibly stand still on the hot asphalt when the teacher called them to attention, simply because they had no boots on their feet.

The Minister for Mines: If one says there is prosperity, it does not follow that there is no poverty.

Mr. MUNSIE: The Minister for Mines knows perfectly well that there is a very great deal of poverty. There are hundreds of people in the metropolitan area to-day going hungry; and their children, too, are going hungry. These people are not able to get enough to eat.

The Minister for Mines: Pure rubbish!

Mr. MUNSIE: It is a fact. And then we find this National Government, these preachers of prosperity, anxious to save a shilling here and there, though they do not object to spending thousands of pounds in other directions; we find them putting on a business manager first of all in the Charities Department, to cut out the rations of the old-age pensioners. That is the kind of economy the Government are practising.

The Minister for Mines: The leader of the Opposition knows, and you also know, that everybody who begs is not deserving.

Mr. MUNSIE: I know that, but does the Minister for Mines contend that because the Federal Government were mean enough only to increase the old-age pension from 12s. 6d. to 15s. per week, the State Government had a right to cut off the few little provisions that were given to old-age pensioners to enable them to live? Was that good policy? And does the Minister for Mines agree with that policy?

The Minister for Mines: I may, or I may not. You should give notice of that question.

Mr. MUNSIE: I say straight out that I do not agree with that policy, and I am prepared to express my disagreement, and so should the Minister for Mines be. Next there is the paragraph of the Governor's Speech dealing with finance. I do not want to touch on the subject of finance, because no stronger indictment has ever been made against any Government on the score of finance than that made by the leader of the Opposition against the present Government during his speech on the Address-in-reply.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. MUNSIE: Before tea I was—

Hon. P. Collier: Before the hon. member proceeds I think we ought to have a quorum. It is not very creditable if the Government cannot keep a quorum at this early stage of the session.

The Premier: It is not very creditable to either side of the House.

Bells rung; quorum formed.

Mr. MUNSIE: Before tea I stated that in regard to paragraph 4 of the Governor's Speech, the leader of the Opposition had so successfully dealt with the subject that it was unnecessary for me to say anything farther upon the point. In regard to paragraph 5, all I intend to say is that the Premier has here brought to bear his usual optimism. I hope his anticipations will be fully realised, for manifestly it is in the interests of the country as a whole that we should have a bountiful harvest. I hope we shall get it. In respect of the settlement of returned soldiers on the land, I believe the Government have attempted to place a considerable number of men. But I hope that the Premier, in any future statements he may have to make in regard to the land settlement of returned soldiers, will give the public to understand the true position. This paragraph in the

Governor's Speech will lead the public to believe that some 3,000 extra settlers have been placed on the land. The Premier himself readily admits that that is not so; he admitted the other night that one-third or more—

The Premier: More than one-half.

Mr. MUNSIE: That more than one-half of the 3,000 have merely taken possession of farms purchased from other people. As I say, I hope that in any future statement in regard to the settlement of soldiers on the land the Premier will tell the public the true facts. I do not altogether approve of the wholesale—I do not say that it should not be done in some instances, for in this respect a soldier has the same right as others—I do not approve of the wholesale system of buying out practical farmers to put inexperienced men in their places; it is not to the advantage of Western Australia.

The Premier: It does not mean that in every case. In some cases we have bought blocks of land without improvements.

Mr. MUNSIE: But in many instances farms have been purchased as going concerns from practical farmers, and soldiers have been put on those farms.

The Premier: I admit that.

Mr. MUNSIE: Paragraph 7 deals with mining. Like the leader of the Opposition, I am sorry to see in the Speech the pessimism displayed in respect of gold mining. I do not know why we should be so pessimistic about the goldmining industry. I admit that during last year the quantity of gold won decreased; but we must take into consideration the fact that for two months out of last year the output absolutely ceased on the Golden Mile, which of course had a big effect on the total output of the State. However, in regard to the goldmining industry generally, during the last nine months it has looked particularly bright, indeed never was it brighter. The member for Kimberley (Mr. Duraek) in moving the Address—replied made use of these words—"With the high prices prevailing for our wheat and wool and other raw materials prospects never looked brighter." That, I believe, is true in regard to our wheat and wool producers. But that is not all that is required. The consumers of the products of those two industries stand for some consideration, and while wheat and wool are bringing enormous prices, tens of thousands of our people are not in a position to get, or at least not in sufficient quantities, the products from those two industries. The hon. member went on to say—"with the high cost of commodities and the increase in wages mining is not looking too well." I admit that the cost of mining requisites has gone up considerably during the war. Here let me say that the Government of Western Australia were lacking a little in their duty to those in the industry. Prior to the outbreak of war, we had in Western Australia one firm that was almost solely responsible for the importation of fracter, namely Strelitz Bros. After the outbreak of war that firm ceased

doing business, and the Government made certain arrangements. But I contend that the Government could have assisted mining a little further in respect of explosives had they undertaken the full responsibility of importing fracter. Now let me make an explanation in regard to the remarks of the member for Kimberley, concerning the increase in wages. For the last 20 years the men on the Eastern goldfields have been the most peaceful body of workers in any State of the Commonwealth or of the Dominions. For their self sacrifice, for their peacefulness they are to-day the worst paid section of workers in Australia; that is to say, in relation to the cost of living. The hon. member spoke of increased wages. I admit that about four years ago the lower paid men, the men on the minimum, the truckers and shovellers, received a magnificent increase of twopence per day. They accepted that increase and worked on for three years, at the end of which time a case was cited in the Federal Arbitration Court. As the result of that citation the men on the minimum received the splendid increase of one penny per day, but a considerable section of the wages men working underground in Kalgoorlie sustained a reduction of sixpence per day. As a matter of fact, the machine men are working in Kalgoorlie and Boulder to-day for less wages than they received 20 years ago. Yet the hon. member complains that the increase in wages is responsible for a depreciation in mining prospects.

The Minister for Works: Do you mean that as a general rule the wages are less?

Mr. MUNSIE: No, I say that one out of every two of the machine men working on the Golden Mile to-day is receiving less. Twenty years ago that man was paid 13s. 4d. a day, no distinction being made between the two men. But the Federal Court awarded the man on the truck 12s. 9d. per day, or sevenpence a day less. The man on the handle receives 13s. 4d. but the man who actually does the work is getting 7d. per day less than he got 20 years ago. Therefore it is up to hon. members not to complain about the increase in wages, particularly in the mining industry. I hope that paragraph 7 was not inspired. In any case it is not a good augury for the Government of the country to introduce such a subject knowing as they do that the employees of the goldmining industry have their case cited before the Arbitration Court. I do not believe the paragraph represents the Premier's views, for I am convinced that, left to himself, he could not display the pessimism exhibited in this paragraph. The next paragraph deals with prospecting. I want to again emphasise the fact that a good deal of prospecting has been done during the last seven or eight months with wonderfully good results. All that I am sorry for is that the first discovery should have been made on Hampton Plains. Had it been at St. Ives there would

have been a much brighter tale to tell to-day. Personally I have every confidence in the outlook. I have been to St. Ives and seen several shows, and I have seen the products again since I came back. The general reports from St. Ives, from the surface to the bottom of the deepest shaft, show the brightest prospects. We have never had a better outlook for mining. As a total proposition Hampton Plains, I admit, is not what it was boomed to be; but nevertheless we are going to get two or three reasonably good mines at Hampton Plains. I am sorry that the boom took place at Hampton Plains seeing that it was on private property. Possibly there would have been better results had the Hampton Plains Company been less grasping. The boom started there about 12 months ago, and surveyors were constantly at work after that, but only within the last two months, after people had been working leases continuously for several months, have the company discovered that several of the leases are "adjoining blocks" and belong to the company. That is not giving these men a fair deal. Regarding the company's appeal to the Government, they have not been fair to those who have taken up leases on the property. Members of the Kalgoorlie road board came to Perth and asked the Minister for £3,000 to construct a road to Hampton Plains. I admit that the road was necessary. The company offered to contribute a quota of the cost, and the road board offered to find a quota, provided the Minister made up the balance. To the Minister's credit, be it said, he came to light with the money and the road was constructed. The instant the road was completed, the company issued a circular to every leaseholder charging him on his lease sufficient to compensate them for the money they had contributed as their share of the cost of the road, so that the company are really paying not one penny of the cost, but are taking it out of the pockets of the leaseholders.

The Minister for Works: That is not how it was represented to me. I understood that the £1,500 found by the company was their own funds.

Mr. MUNSIE: Yes, they put up their own funds in the first instance, but they are now making a charge against the leaseholders in order to recover the money from them. That is not a proper way for the company to treat people who are trying to do something to further the mining industry. Regarding Mount Monger, I totally disagree with the action taken by the Minister for Mines. I quite agree with the regulation issued by the Mines Department to prevent the exploiting of the public in the matter of prospectuses and the flotation of companies. Had mining been a Federal matter, and had there been development of the same magnitude as that at Hampton Plains, Mt. Monger, and Ive's Find, the Federal Minister would have been

in Kalgoorlie, distant though it is from Melbourne. If developments of the same importance had occurred in New South Wales, away from the capital city, the Minister would have been on the spot pretty soon and pretty often. I say it was the duty of the Minister for Mines to establish himself in Kalgoorlie for a month, six weeks, or even two months.

The Minister for Mines: Where were you? I did not hear from you.

Mr. MUNSIE: The Minister did not have much chance to hear from me. If he was not in Albany, he was in the Eastern State. He was not in this State very much.

The Minister for Mines: I did not hear from you or see you. You waited to see which way the cat jumped before opening your mouth.

Mr. MUNSIE: I was on one deputation to the Minister himself, and I was on several deputations at Kalgoorlie. The Premier passed through Kalgoorlie twice, and I was present at the deputations which waited upon him. I say it was the duty of the Minister for Mines, not the Premier, to be there, although I give the Premier credit for having been there.

The Minister for Mines: Where were you when I was in Kalgoorlie? I was there three times and did not see you.

Mr. Hudson: One of you must be wrong. The hon. member said he was on a deputation to you.

Mr. MUNSIE: That was in Perth, not in Kalgoorlie. The Minister for Mines made a mistake in sending a Government official to sample any show at Mt. Monger. I admit that there were afloat reports and rumours of all descriptions regarding the values being obtained at Mt. Monger. To ease the feeling that prevailed, the Minister announced that he intended to send one of the heads of the department, either the geologist or the mining engineer, to sample the various shows. The expert went along, and the leaseholders, shareholders, and public generally were looking for the expert's report. But what happened? The Minister, after a very long time, issued a statement through the Press, but not one man, whether leaseholder, shareholder, or member of the general public, who read that statement gleaned from it anything more about the conditions at Mt. Monger than he knew before.

The Minister for Mines: That is pretty clever. You could not do that.

Mr. MUNSIE: I do not know whether it is clever. I think it is absolutely misleading. If the Minister had set out to damn the field at Mt. Monger, he could not have been more successful. If the Press can be believed, the Minister has recently sent an expert out again to report on the developments at Mt. Monger. What is the use of sending an expert there again? Reports are again being circulated of rich developments at the 105 feet level in the Lass o' Gowrie, and the 40 feet level in the Mt. Monger Proprietary. But what is the use of sending an expert

there again if the Government do not allow the public to learn what his opinion is? There can be only one of two things. The man who sampled the Mt. Monger shows was quite capable of taking a genuine sample and giving a correct report of the values. He sampled several shows, but either the report showed the values to be so low that the Minister declined to publish it through fear of doing harm to shareholders or it was so fabulously rich that he was afraid it would cause a rush which might not be justified.

The Minister for Mines: It might have been neither of those two things.

Mr. MUNSIE: I do not care what the reason might have been.

Mr. Johnston: There is a mystery, anyhow.

Mr. MUNSIE: When the Government, through the Minister for Mines, took upon themselves the responsibility of sending an expert officer to Mt. Monger, and notified the public that they were doing so, and doing it on behalf of the public, the public should have been given the result of the investigation.

The Minister for Mines: They were.

Mr. MUNSIE: I say they were not. There is not one leaseholder at Mt. Monger who knows what Mr. Blatchford's report was, unless the Minister has told him. The report has not been published or given to the country.

The Minister for Mines: It has been published.

Mr. MUNSIE: That statement is not correct. Is the Minister prepared to lay Mr. Blatchford's report on the Table of the House to verify the report which he himself submitted? I know he is not. I know positively that Mr. Blatchford would not put in a report such as was published in the "West Australian." At that particular time there was a great stir owing to the Federal Treasurer having resigned while on an important mission to London. It was announced that the Prime Minister would make a definite statement as to the reasons for the Federal Treasurer's resignation. That definite statement duly appeared, and, on the following day, the statement of the Minister for Mines appeared in the Press, and not a man or woman who read those statements knew any more after reading them than before. They were both clever in disguising the true facts. Mr. Hughes told us nothing of the reasons why Willy Watt resigned. Likewise the statement of the Minister for Mines told us nothing about Mt. Monger. I believe that if the Minister publishes the report of the expert's second visit to Mt. Monger, it will not prevent this district from going ahead as a gold producing centre.

The Minister for Mines: Why did not you say that long ago?

Mr. MUNSIE: I did say it long ago.

The Minister for Mines: Why, you were waiting for the cat to jump.

Mr. MUNSIE: I was not.

The Minister for Mines: When did you say it?

Mr. MUNSIE: To a deputation which waited on the Premier at Kalgoorlie, urging the necessity for accepting Creedon's offer to keep the prospectors at Mt. Monger.

The Minister for Works: About the water business?

Mr. MUNSIE: Yes.

The Minister for Mines: I said it before you did.

Mr. MUNSIE: Evidently the Minister for Mines had not much influence with the Government, because they turned it down.

The Minister for Mines: They did not turn it down.

Mr. MUNSIE: The question had been discussed in Kalgoorlie with a deputation which waited on the Minister for Mines himself. The Minister had gone East, the request had come to Perth, Mr. Creedon himself had come to Perth and had gone back to Kalgoorlie, when the Premier arrived and the local governing bodies raised a deputation and asked the Premier why it had been turned down.

The Minister for Works: You have not the whole of the facts.

Mr. MUNSIE: The Premier knew nothing about it, but he read a telegram which had been sent by Mr. Colebatch to the Kalgoorlie council. This telegram was read by the deputation. The Minister for Works knows that the first offer made by Mr. Creedon was turned down, and eventually somebody else's offer was accepted.

The Minister for Works: It was accepted within 48 hours.

Mr. MUNSIE: There was a lot which I had intended to say in connection with tributing, but seeing that the leader of the Opposition has given notice of a motion for the appointment of a Royal Commission, and seeing that the Minister has assured the member for Menzies (Mr. Mullany) that he intends to deal with tributing in the Mining Act Amendment Bill, I shall have sufficient opportunities later on to deal with this matter. In passing, I may say that I do not know of any legislation which is more urgently required than legislation dealing with tributing.

The Minister for Mines: An election is approaching.

Mr. MUNSIE: I am not afraid of the election. For over four years I have advocated the introduction of legislation to deal with tributing. I do not believe the Minister can successfully deal with tributing by an amendment of the Mining Act. The question requires a Bill to itself. I am prepared to discuss the amendments when the Minister brings them forward. There is no section of the working community in this State that has been robbed to a greater extent than the tributers on the Golden Mile. I believe the same conditions prevail in other parts of the State where tributes are let. The tributer has no say of any sort. He simply has to work and take what the com-

pany likes to give him. That is another reason why I am pleased to see that the leader of the Opposition intends to move for a Royal Commission on this matter.

The Minister for Mines: That would only delay it.

Hon. P. Collier: We could do it all in a fortnight.

Mr. MUNSIE: The Royal Commission would, at all events, afford Parliament a better idea of the conditions prevailing on the goldfields and the remedies required to alter that position. A Royal Commission of this kind is necessary in the interests of the shareholders of some of the big mines in Kalgoorlie and Boulder. Either these mines have been badly managed in the early days, or there has been a deliberate conspiracy to defraud the shareholders. In the interests of the mining industry generally this Royal Commission is required.

Mr. Mullaney: It may have been a bit of both.

Mr. MUNSIE: Probably so. When a big mine ceases operations from the company standpoint, because it cannot any longer make both ends meet, it advertises for tributers. The remarkable thing about it is that when an outsider asks for a tribute he is requested to point out where he desires to work. The company, in nine cases out of ten, sends a man down to sample the place that is specified, and if it is found to be worth looking at the management usually reserve it for their own purposes. With very few exceptions on the Golden Mile, the management of the mines are directly interested in all the good tributes. That is why I say there is conspiracy somewhere.

Hon. P. Collier: They make very big profits.

The Minister for Works: Would that not be fraud against the shareholders?

Mr. MUNSIE: Yes. The shareholders do not know what is going on. We have the case of a big mine which is in liquidation. The company started to let tributes and during the period of two years of tribute it has made a clear profit of over £33,000. I am of opinion that the management and staff of that mine have made considerably more than that. The shareholders should know that these things are going on, and the Royal Commission will be one means by which they will be made aware of them.

The Minister for Mines: The leader of the Opposition will have no case at all directly.

Mr. MUNSIE: A great deal yet remains to be said, and I have a great many facts still to bring before the Chamber that will surprise hon. members. The Government will get all the facts.

The Minister for Mines: Why did you not send them along?

Mr. MUNSIE: The Minister knows as well as I do that in the past it has been almost impossible to get evidence from the tributers. They will go to him, as a member of Parliament, or as

Minister for Mines, and point out how they are being robbed under the conditions of tribute, but when they are asked for the statement that is issued to them by the company, showing their returns, and asked for permission to make use of that statement on the floor of the House as evidence, the tributers invariably say, "No, I might lose my tribute if I did." Nearly all the tributers on the Perseverance, however, are prepared to put in their statements as evidence, and I have a considerable number of copies of such statements. These tributers are not to be bluffed any longer, and I have plenty of evidence to produce on their behalf.

The Minister for Works: Does that prove that the staff of a mine is robbing the shareholders?

Mr. MUNSIE: Although the staff of a mine on which there are good tributes may not be working on it, they may be interested in the tributes, and a man has no chance of getting on to such tributes unless he takes in some of the staff with him.

The Minister for Mines: Why are we not advised of this position?

Mr. MUNSIE: The Minister has known it for years.

The Minister for Mines: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. MUNSIE: The Minister knows that these conditions have prevailed for years, and that the tributers have been consistently robbed.

The Minister for Mines: No deputation of tributers has ever mentioned any such thing to me.

Mr. MUNSIE: I have been told of one case in which two men worked for nine weeks. They broke out the ore, had it carted and crushed, and in that period cleaned up from the ore produced £497 worth of gold. Their dividend, however, was 16s. 1d. per week each, and the company took the rest. Does the Minister think that is fair?

The Minister for Mines: I do not say that. Why do you not send this information along officially? We ought to know the facts.

Mr. MUNSIE: I will give the Minister all the facts when the tributers' Bill comes along.

The Minister for Mines: That is a nice attitude for a public man to adopt. You are asking, on behalf of the tributers, for legislation to assist them. Why do you not provide us with information to enable us to put that legislation before the House in proper form?

Mr. MUNSIE: I am prepared to give the Minister all the information I have. Every time he has been to Kalgoorlie to see the tributers, he has been kept away from the men who are prepared to submit the companies' statements, and has gone to those who are not so prepared.

The Minister for Mines: That is not correct; I have been to every one.

Mr. MUNSIE: The Minister did not see the A.W.U. members.

The Minister for Mines: They never asked to see me.

Mr. Green: They wired you from Perth.

Mr. MUNSIE: I want some explanation in regard to paragraph 13 of the Speech. By interjection the Premier inferred that the last section of the paragraph 13 was correct, namely, that the Commonwealth Government would do much of the propaganda work and pay the fares of immigrants, the selection of whom would remain entirely in the hands of the State authorities. I am sorry the Premier has not given us more information as to that paragraph, so that we might know the truth.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: How can it be true?

Mr. MUNSIE: We have a definite statement to the contrary published in the Press, over the signature of the Prime Minister, and yet the Premier says that the statement in the Governor's Speech is true and that the State Government have the selection of the immigrants. Their responsibility, he says, starts when the immigrants land in Australia. I hope the Premier will give us some information later on.

The Minister for Mines: I will give you some now. This Government has never agreed to allow the Federal Government to select the immigrants. The understanding arrived at in Melbourne was that the Federal Government would select the class of immigrant that we desired, that we would not take them unless we were satisfied, and that we were to take them as we wanted them.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MUNSIE: The Speech refers to the Shops and Factories Bill, introduced last session, and also says that a Bill will be presented to continue the operations of the Prices Regulation Act. I hope that when the latter measure is before us the Government will accept an amendment to the hearing of the evidence in open court. Last session, after a two hours' discussion on an amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition, I remarked that the whole of the evidence taken before the Commission should be taken in open court and be open to the Press. When that was defeated I also stated that the Government might as well place the Bill in the waste paper basket, and that I did not believe the Bill would do any good. I have no desire to disparage any good the Commission may have done; probably they have succeeded in keeping down the cost of some commodities, but they will never make a success of price-fixing under a system of fixing prices by Act of Parliament, unless the evidence given before the Commission is open to the public. I can see no objection to such a course. The principle has been adopted in South Australia in certain directions. The evidence taken there has shown the necessity for further powers being given to State Governments to deal with price fixing. Before the Price Fixing Commission in South Australia the Vacuum Oil Co. asked for an increase of 1s. per case on kerosene. The Commission first of all refused

to accede to the request, but after some argument, it was decided to adjourn the case so that further inquiry might be made. They were told point blank by the representative of the Standard Oil Co. that if they did not agree to the 1s. increase, there would be no oil imported into South Australia. Here is something for the Federal Government to take on, for evidently the South Australian Government have not the necessary power. The Federal Government should say to such people, "You will not be allowed to import any oil into Australia."

The Minister for Mines: Why should not the British Oil Co. do it?

Mr. MUNSIE: The British Oil Co. have no representatives in Australia and are only negotiating now in that direction. Here is an opportunity for the Federal Government to encourage British production, and assist the British Oil Co. If the Standard Oil Co., powerful as it is, knew that the Federal Government could obtain supplies from the Persian oilfields they would quickly climb down rather than lose the whole of the Australian trade. They would climb down, and probably would enter into competition with the British Oil Co., and then most likely we would get oil cheaper than we get it to-day.

Mr. Green: Both companies are in the one joke, anyhow.

The Minister for Mines: There you are! It is no use passing that on to the Prime Minister.

Mr. MUNSIE: The member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Green) no doubt believes he is right, but I do not think he is.

Mr. Green: Yes. I have got the dinkum oil.

Mr. MUNSIE: In any case, neither company is willing to lose the whole Australian trade. It is too big a trade to lose. There are several other Bills promised by the Governor's Speech. One of them is for the appointment of a Commissioner of State trading concerns. A good deal has been said as to the attitude of the Government towards State trading concerns. The Minister for Works seems to think that we on this side are accusing him of something dreadful, and that we disapprove of his action in purchasing the timber hewers' property. But the Minister is quite wrong. There is no member on this side of the House accuses the Minister of having done wrong in purchasing the sawmill. We agree with his policy in that respect: it is our policy. But the hon. gentleman wants to be very, very careful indeed, or else he will break his neck while trying to turn somersaults. He is the very biggest opponent of purchasing anything on behalf of the State. What we complain of, therefore, is the inconsistency of the hon. gentleman. He condemns State trading concerns, lock, stock and barrel, root and branch; and then at the first opportunity he spends £84,000, without the authority of Parliament, in purchasing something that is going to extend a State trading concern. Now the Government propose to pass a measure for the appointment of a State trading concerns Commis-

sioner. I cannot discuss that Bill, because it is not yet before the House; but, as the leader of the Opposition said, if the measure means anything, it means making State trading concerns permanent in Western Australia.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: They are permanent.

Mr. MUNSIE: I know that, and so does the member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood), and so does the Premier; and, but for his knowledge of that fact, the Premier would have brought down a motion for the sale of those concerns. But he knows that for such a proposal he can get a majority neither in this House nor in the country. Another Bill promised is for the purpose of removing the disqualification of women to sit in Parliament. I would have liked to see the Government go still further and remove all the disabilities of women. However, the Bill in question will have my whole-hearted support. A woman has as much right to the full franchise in any British Dominion as any man has. Next, I want to deal briefly with some of the actions of the present Government. I do not know how long this session is likely to last, but if the Government introduce all the Bills that they have announced up to date, and proceed with them, it will last till Christmas.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Is there any chance of its lasting over the elections?

Mr. MUNSIE: Last session, no matter what Bill was being discussed in this Chamber, if any member on the Opposition side rose to speak for a second time in Committee, or even if two or three members spoke on the second reading, the cry from the Ministerial benches was, "For heaven's sake give us a chance; you are criticising us as to what we should do; let us get the session over and get into recess, so that we can do something from the administrative point of view." That was the cry from beginning to end. Personally, I felt sympathetic towards the Government, and repeatedly refrained from speaking when otherwise I might have spoken. I wanted the Government to have the opportunity they asked for. Well, they got into recess, and they remained there for eight months.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: But Ministers had to go East.

Mr. MUNSIE: During the recess Ministers have done nothing but joy-ride to the Eastern States. The Premier says now that everything in the garden is lovely, but I fail to observe any beneficial Ministerial action from an administrative point of view.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Ministers did no harm.

Mr. MUNSIE: Yes, they did. Immediately upon getting into recess they taxed the users of the Western Australian Government railways to the extent of about £270,000 annually.

The Minister for Mines: We had to raise fares and freights in order to pay the increased wages.

Mr. MUNSIE: The increased wages had been granted, and the Government knew they had to pay them, and were in fact paying them, for at least three weeks before the

close of the session. A question was put from this side of the House to the Minister for Railways whether anything definite had been decided upon by the Government with regard to increased railway fares and freights; and we were assured that Government had never considered the matter.

The Minister for Mines: Quite correct.

Mr. MUNSIE: The Minister says it is quite correct. I have no wish to be discourteous, but I doubt that statement. First of all, knowing the hon. gentleman as I know him, I cannot credit that he would leave for the Eastern States on the day after Parliament prorogued—

Hon. P. Collier: On the same day.

Mr. MUNSIE: Would go East, allowing the Government to fix, behind his back, the fares and freights of his department.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: In to-day's newspaper the Honorary Minister is reported as stating that the Government had been discussing the matter for weeks.

Mr. MUNSIE: We know that that is the case. The increased fares and freights had been agreed to before the Minister for Railways went East. The Government waited for Parliament to prorogue, and then they came along with the increases. Again, we were told from the other side of the House that even if there were increases they would not exceed a total of £100,000. From the Government's own admission we have since learned that the increases total £275,000.

The Minister for Works: Then we have done something.

Mr. MUNSIE: Yes, and immediately afterwards the hon. gentleman spent £80,000 on a sawmill.

The Minister for Mines: You are very much astray in your facts.

Mr. MUNSIE: I would like the Minister for Railways to give us the exact date on which Cabinet agreed to increase fares and freights. He was not in the State when the increases were published. There is another little matter of taxation to which I desire to call attention. It may not amount to very much, but to my mind it is unfair; and when I see what I consider unfair taxation imposed on any section of the community, I am prepared to object on that section's behalf. The incidence of this taxation is on the sporting public of Western Australia, in the metropolitan area more particularly. The regulations of the Government railways provide for first class and second class fares. Now, if a passenger wants to travel to the race-course on a race day, he has to go in a horse train on a second class ticket. For the special trains—and there are three of them—the Government will not issue second class tickets, thus obliging each passenger travelling by those trains to buy a first class ticket, which, moreover, costs more than double the ordinary first class fare. On top of that, the Government provide him with a cattle truck to ride in. That is not a fair deal. The sporting community are already paying a fair tax, and if a man wants to go to a race-course for an afternoon's enjoyment he has

just as much right to do so as another man has to go to a football or cricket match.

Mr. Underwood: A man must be prepared to pay for his sins.

Mr. MUNSIE: I am prepared to pay for my sins, but I am not prepared to be imposed upon without protesting. I contend that the present attitude of the Railway Department in this connection represents an imposition on those travelling to and from the race courses.

The Minister for Works: They will never feel it.

Mr. MUNSIE: I could say a great deal concerning matters that are not in the Governor's Speech but that ought to be there. However, I will refer to just two items. It has been stated by hon. members opposite, and especially by the leader of the Country party to-night, that there is no class struggle in Western Australia. The sooner the Government realise, and the Western Australian people as a whole realise, that there is such a struggle in progress here, the better it will be for all sections of our community. However, the Government in the course of a fairly lengthy programme make not one reference to industrial legislation, with the exception of the Shops and Factories Bill introduced last session. No Government have had a better opportunity for realising the urgent need of amending industrial legislation than the present Government, but there is not one word from them on the subject. And still they say, "We want industrial peace." The instant trade unionists, tired of waiting month after month, or possibly year after year, to get their grievances tested decide to cease work, they are told that they are Bolsheviks or something of the sort, and informed that they must be tolerant. But toleration has not got to be all on one side.

The Minister for Works: What is your remedy for the industrial unrest?

Mr. MUNSIE: Improved industrial conditions.

The Minister for Works: What are they? The Trades Hall cannot tell us.

Hon. P. Collier: Appoint you industrial commissioner.

Mr. MUNSIE: In my opinion the time has long been ripe for the introduction of amending industrial legislation. Our present Arbitration Act is utterly obsolete.

Mr. Underwood: How would you amend it?

Mr. MUNSIE: First by abolishing the provision that a Supreme Court judge shall sit as President of the Arbitration Court. A practical man is wanted in that position, not a Supreme Court judge. I fully acknowledge that every judge who has sat as President of the Arbitration Court has given true awards according to his lights. But a Supreme Court judge does not know. In any case, we are not likely to get industrial peace while our industrial legislation stands in such urgent need of amendment.

Mr. Underwood: What other amendments do you want?

Mr. MUNSIE: If the hon. member does not know what amendments I require in the Industrial Arbitration Act, and if he would like to know, I shall finish my speech in five minutes and shall then be prepared to devote a quarter of an hour upstairs to writing out my proposed amendments for his perusal.

The Minister for Mines: Why go upstairs when the stage of His Majesty's Theatre is available?

Mr. MUNSIE: There is another industrial Act that seriously requires amending. I refer to the Workers' Compensation Act, and I have already given notice of motion in the direction of securing an expression of opinion from the House that an amendment of that measure is necessary.

Mr. Hudson: You do not say in what direction.

Mr. MUNSIE: I will tell the hon. member when my motion comes forward.

Mr. Hudson: It would be convenient if we knew now.

Mr. MUNSIE: I do not think the Speaker would permit me to refer to that subject now.

Mr. Underwood: There are members on this side of the House prepared to help you if you tell them what amendments you desire.

Mr. MUNSIE: I can tell hon. members this, that Western Australia is far behind every other State of the Commonwealth so far as the Workers' Compensation Act is concerned, and also a long way behind other British Dominions. The workers in this State are considerably worse off than the workers in England. The legislation there is much further advanced in the interests of the workers than is the case in Western Australia. The Government are continually crying out about industrial unrest, but they do not seem to realise the necessity for the introduction of legislation to afford relief. There is another matter I wish to refer to before I resume my seat, and it is that of the strike of civil servants. In this connection I want to lay the blame for that strike on the shoulders of the Government. There is no question about it that the Government were entirely to blame.

The Minister for Mines: Hear, hear!

Mr. MUNSIE: The Minister for Mines interjects, "Hear, hear."

The Minister for Mines: All Governments are to blame.

Mr. MUNSIE: The Government occupy their position so as to be able to do things.

The Minister for Mines: And when they do anything the Opposition criticise it.

Mr. MUNSIE: That is what I am doing. It was the Minister for Mines who, about four months ago, demanded of the civil servants that they should accept a board.

The Minister for Mines: That is news to me.

Mr. MUNSIE: Then the Government of which he is a member refused to grant the civil servants a board until those civil servants issued their ultimatum.

The Minister for Mines: That is incorrect.

Mr. MUNSIE: It is not incorrect; it is quite true.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Who is to be the chairman of the board?

Mr. MUNSIE: I noticed in to-night's paper that Mr. Justice Northmore is to be appointed chairman. I repeat that I blame the Government entirely for the strike which occurred. If they had granted the board when the civil service were appealing for it, the strike would not have happened. After the strike had taken place and the second offer was made by the disputes committee of the service, the Government, in my opinion, were foolish not to accept it with both hands. The Minister for Works shakes his head. I believe it would have been a much better settlement in the interests of the people than the settlement which was afterwards concluded. In that connection I want also to say that there is something behind the settlement which the public have not yet been told. I do not know what it is, but there is certainly some secrecy. The Minister for Mines laughs, but he knows all about it.

Mr. Underwood: You will never get to the bottom of it.

Mr. MUNSIE: That was what the hon. member used to say when he was a Minister.

The Minister for Mines: I am smiling at your imagination. You will be smashing some of the globes over your head if you soar so high.

Mr. MUNSIE: The service were compelled to back down altogether, and then we were told something else, though not through the Press. Every man in the street knew it. Mr. Jackson, the solicitor, came in at the last moment. Who he represented I do not know, and all the members of the service did not know either.

Hon. P. Collier: Jackson is the extra Honorary Minister.

Mr. MUNSIE: He was the gentleman who fixed up the settlement, and it was common knowledge, not given to us, as I have stated, through the Press, that the civil service were not going to refund the money. Then the Government came to light and made a pronouncement that there is nothing in the rumour. We find now that they have extended the time for the commencement of the repayments by three months. I undertake to say that the Government are not going to collect any of this money.

The Minister for Mines: Yes, they are.

Mr. MUNSIE: The Government have got out of it in an underhand way.

The Minister for Mines: That is a reflection on the disputes committee.

Mr. MUNSIE: It is not. It is good business on the part of the disputes committee to get what they want from the Government, who were unwilling to give it to them.

The Minister for Works: Do you think they should pay it back?

Mr. MUNSIE: No. I think the Government should have accepted their offer to work it out. The Government would then have got a better deal from the service.

The Minister for Mines: Perhaps no one should pay back anything.

Mr. MUNSIE: Everyone should pay what he owes. The Premier's argument will not hold water. His illustration was that if the Government established such a precedent everybody else who came out on strike would want it followed.

The Minister for Works: And would they not?

Mr. MUNSIE: Everyone in a position like that of a civil servant would be justified in doing so. Ministers know that when the service went back to work they had to catch up the work which was lost during the time they were out on strike. But if it had been the miners who went out they would not have had anything to catch up except perhaps the wages that they had lost.

Mr. Underwood: Do you think they can catch up the last trip of the "Bambra"?

Mr. MUNSIE: No. Neither the service nor the Government can do that. The "Bambra" is on a sandbank. Who is the hon. member blaming for that? The civil service? All I desire to say in connection with the strike is that I hold the belief that if the Government had exercised tact or had been in the least bit, I will not say lenient, but just, to the service before they went out, the unfortunate strike would not have taken place. When the service did go out, the Government, in the interests of the people, should have accepted the second offer made by the disputes committee.

The Minister for Works: That is a matter of opinion.

Hon. P. Collier: The hon. member is expressing his own opinion.

Mr. DAVIES (Guildford) [8.40]: I intend to confine my remarks on the Address-in-reply to a subject to which I will not have another opportunity of referring during the course of the session.

Hon. P. Collier: You will not have any other, because this will be your last session.

Mr. DAVIES: We have heard that before.

Hon. P. Collier: You had better make the best use of it now.

Mr. DAVIES: The matter I wish to refer to is the paragraph in the Governor's Speech which reads—

In common with every other country in the civilised world, Western Australia is faced with grave problems of reconstruction following upon the disturbances of trade, commerce, and industry during the war.

So far as Western Australia is concerned, I do not think that we are faced with the problems of reconstruction following upon disturbances of trade. Where the Government are faced with problems of reconstruction is in the industrial arena, and it is only fair that members should offer constructive criticism to the Government and make suggestions whereby they may improve the

conditions which exist to-day. As one who has always favoured compulsory arbitration, I am going to say that there are many directions in which the existing Act may be amended with considerable benefit to the workers of the State. During last session of Parliament I mentioned that if there was one amendment which was more necessary than any other it was that when the court once arrived at a basic wage that wage should have common application throughout the State. I mean, of course, where the conditions are equal; I do not mean to say that it should apply on the coast and at Kalgoorlie as well. It has been my experience as an advocate, having lodged a plaint before the court, to wait 19 months before the case could be heard and in the meantime the workers were receiving less than the basic wage. I may deal also at this juncture with the question as to who should fill the position of president of the court. I was appearing in the court when Judge Northmore made the statement to the effect that unions would have to show some cause other than the high cost of living before he would grant an increase in wages.

Mr. O'Loghlen: A callous announcement.

Mr. DAVIES: A statement such as that shows clearly that a Supreme Court judge is not familiar with industrial conditions.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Did anything you said induce him to make that remark?

Mr. DAVIES: I do not think so. The New South Wales Government have lately appointed Mr. Beeby to the position of judge of the Arbitration Court of that State. There is something to be said on behalf of the Storey Government who made that appointment as Mr. Beeby was a nationalist. I wish to refer to one or two other matters which I think will have the effect of improving the Arbitration Act. Power should be given to the court to vary an award during the existence of that award or industrial agreement. Unions have approached the court in Western Australia and have been given an award for three years, though at any time after the expiration of 12 months they could appeal to the court for a variation of the award and conditions.

Hon. P. Collier: In the meantime the cost of living goes up 20 per cent.

Mr. DAVIES: That has happened. In November last, according to Knibbs' figures, the cost of living in Western Australia increased by about 25 per cent., and in June it had increased to about 58 per cent., yet an award had its currency during the 12 months in which those increases took place. But I give the present President of our State Arbitration Court credit for having said that he was prepared to vary the award, notwithstanding that to do so was against the Act. I think the Government ought to amend the Act so as to give the court power to vary an award during the existence of that award, or of an industrial agreement. The Government should increase the powers of the court to make an award retrospective. In 1913 two unions in this State

approached the court together with their plaints. One union had an agreement with the employers under which the award should be made retrospective to the date of application, but the other union had no such agreement. Both unions were delayed 19 months in reaching the court. When the cases were heard, the one union drew from £1,000 to £1,500 back pay, while the other union was deprived of any such relief, and had to be satisfied with its new award from the date of that award.

The Minister for Mines: Would it not be better for the unions to approach the court earlier?

Mr. DAVIES: They cannot do so; they have to wait their turns.

Mr. Troy: The Act gives the court power to make an award retrospective.

Mr. DAVIES: No, it does not give any such power.

Mr. O'Loghlen: The Federal court has that power under certain conditions.

Mr. DAVIES: Yes, but only under certain conditions. Another important amendment would be to allow the court to bring into existence what is known in the Federal Arbitration Act as a board of reference. Attending a meeting of the big railway union the other day, I was much struck on hearing discussed case after case of breaches of the award and want of interpretation. Time after time in the Arbitration Court have I seen advocates taking up the time of the court with breaches of award, and cases of want of interpretation, while unions were waiting clamouring for original awards. If the Act provided for the creation of a board of reference on which employer and employee would be mutually represented, these matters could be adjusted very quickly. During the eight years that I was secretary of the Midland Railway Company's Employees' Union, a private concern, not one appearance was made before the court for a breach of the award, or for want of interpretation. Yet during that period the big railway union was in the court two or three times annually, owing to the fact that the officers of the Railway Department were not prepared to view a question in what the men deemed to be a reasonable light. The officers had their views, and the members of the union had quite other views. In consequence, there were frequent clashes, and the union had to await the attention of the court. These things could be easily settled by a board of reference having the confidence of both parties. I make that suggestion, believing that the appointment of such a board would be in the best interests of the working classes and of the State generally.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Surely, with all your influence, you could have prompted the Government to that long ago.

Mr. DAVIES: I have had no opportunity. Now let me refer to the basic wage. I noticed the other day that Mr. Justice

Starke, President of the Federal Arbitration Court, said he thought the time had arrived when he should be allowed to discriminate in his awards between married and unmarried men. In that respect I disagree entirely with Mr. Justice Starke.

Mr. Thomson: I do not.

Mr. DAVIES: I think it would be the worst possible thing for any State if a judge of an Arbitration Court were allowed to discriminate between married and unmarried men; it would be wicked for a judge to prescribe different rates of wage for the married and the unmarried.

Hon. P. Collier: You need not be afraid; the workers would never submit to it.

Mr. DAVIES: But they have submitted to it, in our own Government Railways. I agreed with it at the time, because it was a necessary expedient during the currency of the war.

Hon. P. Collier: That was not the same thing.

Mr. DAVIES: It was not exactly the same. Still there were numberless complaints from the workers in that regard. It was a discrimination. Take the gangs of men along the railway between Perth and Kalgoorlie. In each gang there were, say, three married men and two single men. The married men were in receipt of 1s. a day more than the single men, although the single men were doing the same work. Still, that was given by the Government to tide the married men over a period of difficulty, until they could approach the court.

Mr. Munsie: If that had been a private concern, all the married men would have been put off and the single men retained.

Mr. DAVIES: On the Midland railway they were given the shilling bonus and not one married man was put off. I hope the Government, when bringing down the amending Bill, will not adopt the suggestion made by Mr. Justice Starke.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Do you think they will?

Mr. DAVIES: No, I do not. Let me say there should be some discrimination, but not by the president of an arbitration court. Such a discrimination should be exercised only by the Government. I want here to commend the present Government of New South Wales and their predecessors for bringing down what they call the family bonus.

Hon. P. Collier: You would be all right under that.

The Minister for Mines: He will not be allowed to vote on the question.

Mr. DAVIES: Similar provision should be made by the Government at the earliest possible moment. There is in some parts of Australia an agitation that the basic wage should be increased to include a family of five children. I do not agree with that. Every time the basic wage is increased, the single man gets the benefit and so, too, does the married man without dependants, while the man with four, or five, or six children goes further back every time.

The Minister for Works: Such a man is going forward, I think.

Mr. DAVIES: For the benefit of the State, yes. It is the best thing for the State that men should go forward in that direction. I hope the Government will take early steps to make provision for the larger family; because, as the member for Hannans (Mr. Munsie) has said, there are people in this State suffering to-day owing to the fact that they have a number of small children. Because one can stand on the street corner and see children going to school without shoes or socks, it does not follow that the parents of those children are poverty stricken. Of the number of children that I have, only two, who travel by train, go to school in shoes and socks. The rest go barefooted, but not because we are poverty stricken.

Mr. Munsie: But a large number do so because their parents cannot afford shoes and socks for them.

Mr. DAVIES: It may be so. In regard to the nationalisation of industry, I think past Governments have been hardly fair to the community in knocking off just where they did. It is a question which all sections of the community must take up sooner or later. Not only here but in England and France, and in Italy, are the authorities awakening to the necessary change of policy.

Hon. P. Collier: We set the policy for the whole world.

Mr. DAVIES: There can be no doubt about that. Western Australia is the most democratic country in the world.

Mr. Troy: And the most reactionary.

Mr. DAVIES: It was a Western Australian Government that brought in the first price-fixing measure the world ever knew. That was the Labour Government of which my friend opposite was a member.

Hon. P. Collier: We have been in the lead right through.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: And the Farmers and Settlers' Association want to take credit for all our good work.

Mr. DAVIES: In the Address-in-reply debate last session the leader of the Opposition said he believed the solution of the difficulty lay in national control. I believe that. I have believed it for a number of years and I believe it to-day almost as sincerely as I did 20 years ago. But let me point out what is happening in the world to-day. I shall refer, first of all, to the threatened industrial appeal of the coal miners of the United Kingdom. They threatened to hold up the country unless the British Government nationalised the mines. The Government brought in a commission and set up Mr. Justice Sankey—

Mr. O'Loughlen: The best man in the world for the job.

Mr. DAVIES: Mr. Smillie, the miners' advocate before the Commission, got a promise from the British Government that whatever Mr. Justice Sankey's report might be, it would be adopted. Mr. Justice Sankey re-

ported that it would be best for the United Kingdom if the mines were nationalised. Mr. Bonar Law subsequently repudiated the undertaking given, and Mr. Lloyd George supplemented his decision by saying that if the miners of Great Britain desired nationalisation, let them go out into the electorates and convince the people that nationalisation was better than private ownership; and that if the public would agree to accept nationalisation, the Government would bring it into existence. But he also added these significant words, "The miners of Great Britain do not want nationalisation; they want control of the mining industry, which is syndicalism in its worst and least intelligent form."

Mr. Troy: Like the twister that he is.

Mr. DAVIES: Let us come back to Australia. Throughout my life I have endeavoured to avoid being one-eyed. I want to quote a man who has the utmost respect of hon. members opposite, namely, Mr. Frank Anstey, M.H.R. Only a few weeks ago Mr. Anstey, speaking at the Bijou Theatre, Melbourne, said, "If the Nationalist Governments of Australia have no industrial policy, our party (the Labour party) also are not facing the situation squarely." It amounts to this, that as members of Parliament we here are not facing the position squarely to-day. And until the position is faced squarely there is no hope of solving the industrial difficulty.

Mr. Troy: Do you know why we are not facing it? I will tell you why.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DAVIES: The coal position is the beginning and end of all things. If we cannot get coal we might as well close up and go to another country. Mr. Willis is a man who, I think, has the confidence of the coal miners of Newcastle and of New South Wales generally, and I intend to quote one or two things which he has said not merely once, but twice or three times. His first statement was—"The miners of Newcastle do not want nationalisation of the mines." To-day there is an international conference sitting in Geneva at which Australia is represented by Mr. Theodore. That conference has carried a motion for the nationalisation of the mines of the world. To-day that nationalisation policy is being repudiated by the miners of New South Wales.

Mr. O'Loughlen: By Willis, not by the miners. Willis also said they did not want political action, but they put him in his place.

Mr. DAVIES: Mr. Willis made that statement.

Mr. Green: Are you trying to discredit the miner of New South Wales or what?

Mr. DAVIES: I am trying to do nothing of the kind.

Mr. Green: I want to know.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DAVIES: If the hon. member will have patience, I will bring out the point as well as I am able to. I think there is only

one solution of the difficulty, and that is co-operation. I will show how I think this can be brought about. Mr. Willis, whether representing the miners or not, has repudiated nationalisation. He said that nationalisation was merely capitalism in another form. We have had the unique experience in Western Australia—unique in the history of the world—of the civil servants and teachers going out on strike. Those teachers did not go out on strike against private enterprise or against capitalism.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Private enterprise would not employ them.

Mr. DAVIES: They went out on strike against the Government, against constituted authority, and when I say constituted authority, I do not use the term in its hackneyed sense.

Mr. Green: Cut that out!

Mr. DAVIES: I mean they went out on strike against the Government which at one time had the confidence of the people.

Mr. O'Loughlen: In Denmark a few months ago there was a strike against the King, and he dismissed the Ministry.

Mr. DAVIES: Yes, and in London the policemen went out on strike, but there has been no strike worthy to be compared with the strike of civil servants and teachers in Western Australia.

Mr. O'Loughlen: It seems to show that there were some deep-rooted grievances.

Mr. DAVIES: It does and I am coming to them. I think, with other members who have spoken, that the fault lies entirely at the door of the Government. I will tell members why.

Mr. Troy: How many civil servants are there in your electorate?

Mr. DAVIES: Very few. For the Government to grant a board to-day is no concession to the civil servants. It should have been granted long ago. The very tardiness of the Government in this respect shows that they are not equal to the conditions that prevail to-day.

Mr. O'Loughlen: What are you going to do about it?

The Minister for Mines: You are very hard on him.

Mr. DAVIES: Mr. Willis, who made it clear that he was speaking on behalf of the miners, said what the miners wanted was a fair and equitable share in the control of the mining industry.

Hon. P. Collier: That is what it is coming to.

Mr. DAVIES: I agree with that, but it is not nationalisation.

Mr. O'Loughlen: It does not matter what you call it.

Mr. DAVIES: If it does not matter what you call it, why quarrel with capitalism when the syndicalist says that nationalisation is capitalism? In a way, nationalisation is capitalism, and so is socialisation. I admit that nationalisation has not given its advocates what they had fondly hoped for.

Hon. P. Collier: It is a step on the road.

Mr. DAVIES: No, we are going back.

Hon. P. Collier: Oh, no!

Mr. DAVIES: Briefly stated, the policy of the socialist-nationalisation—implies the public ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange.

Mr. Jones: No, the socialist policy is different.

Mr. DAVIES: It is the difference between the hon. member for Fremantle and myself.

Mr. Jones: It is a bigger difference than that. For God's sake do not let me hear that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DAVIES: The member for Fremantle has shown the difference between himself and myself by leaving the Chamber. Mr. Willis said, "It was a mistake to say that social ownership was synonymous with socialism." The socialisation of industry, according to the "Worker" newspaper, means that the workers must obtain full control of industry. There is one country which to-day is said to have full control of industry, and what is the position there?

Hon. P. Collier: Which country?

Mr. DAVIES: Russia.

Hon. P. Collier: What do you know about it?

Mr. DAVIES: What do any of us know about it?

Hon. P. Collier: Therefore you are not in a position to criticise it.

Mr. Green: The whole of the Russian people are now united to fight for their country and they never were before.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DAVIES: Nationalisation is more forward in Australia than in any country in the world. A man can travel from the United Kingdom to Australia in a Government-owned ship.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Are you sure?

Mr. DAVIES: Yes, on a Commonwealth-owned steamer.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Not unless you are a member of the crew.

Mr. DAVIES: I mean that there is a fleet of Government-owned steamers running between the United Kingdom and Australia.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I am hoping they will cater for passengers.

Mr. DAVIES: There are Commonwealth ships on the stocks to-day designed to carry passengers.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Very few.

Mr. DAVIES: I think there are seven. A man might travel from the United Kingdom to Australia in a Government-owned steamer, land at Fremantle on a Government-owned wharf, and travel on a Government-owned railway to the city. Here a man might live in a Government owned house—a worker's home. He can use Government electricity, he is supplied with Government water, and I believe that shortly he will be able to get Government firewood. There is no other country in the world where one can find so much nationalisation as we have in Western Australia. In most other parts, the water or the light is supplied by private enterprise.

Here, too, we have Government-owned trams. Therefore, so far as it is possible to get a perfect system—

Mr. O'Loughlen: It is not perfect.

Mr. DAVIES: So far as it has gone, we have nationalisation in its complete form.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: And railway freights are cheaper here than anywhere else.

Mr. DAVIES: Professor Mills, who was brought here under the auspices of the Australian Labour party, delivered a lecture to the men at the Midland Junction workshops. He said—"Gentlemen, go back to your work and always remember that, when striking with your hammer or using your file, you are working for yourselves and for the people of Western Australia. I have come from a State in America where we talk about our socialism and nationalisation, but in Western Australia you have it indeed." Yet, I say without fear of contradiction that there is as much unrest under nationalisation in Western Australia as there is in any part of the world under capitalism.

Hon. P. Collier: The root of the whole thing is not nationalisation but money, and that is privately owned.

Mr. DAVIES: Mr. O'Grady, a Labour leader in the United Kingdom—

Mr. Troy: He is not a Labour leader. He is a Labour renegade.

Mr. DAVIES: He stated that during the last few months of the war in the national munition factories of the United Kingdom, the workers' grievances were not redressed as quickly under State control as they were under capitalism. I shall dilate on that only to show that it is necessary to-day to give way on the whole of our ideas and come down to something new. When I say something new, I do not infer that co-operation is new, but I believe it would be the salvation of this State. A few weeks ago Professor Meredith Atkinson visited this State.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Did you hear him lecture on Russia?

Mr. DAVIES: I heard him as often as I possibly could. I made it my special business to go to the Midland workshops when he addressed the meeting of men. At that meeting he said there was only one solution of the industrial problem and that was to have triangular control. Last session I was given the privilege of seconding the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply, and I stated that I would be prepared to support the Bill for the appointment of three railway commissioners on condition that the workers were permitted to select one of the commissioners. I regret to say that the idea received no support in the House, with the exception of that of the member for South Fremantle (Mr. Roche). Professor Meredith Atkinson addressed a meeting of 1,300 men at the Midland workshops and told them that there was only one solution of the industrial problem, namely triangular control. He told

them they would need to have their shop committees, even though it was a State-owned concern, on which the men, the management and the general community should be represented. When he spoke of triangular control, he spoke of what was true. The leader of the Country party said we ought to have profit sharing. I hope I shall never live to see the day when profit sharing is adopted. If any form of robbery was ever introduced into a country, that form of robbery was profit sharing. I appeal to members of the Opposition to drop for the time being at least the question of whether we shall nationalise an industry or not. Let us come to that position where the workers may obtain their just control of industry. They are entitled to it; there is not the slightest doubt about that. The Government would be wise if they brought into existence a measure now. It is not the first time I have mentioned this matter here.

Mr. O'Loughlen: To provide for what?

Mr. DAVIES: For shop committees.

Mr. O'Loughlen: And after that?

Mr. DAVIES: They would make recommendations as to the working conditions, the wages, and so on.

Mr. O'Loughlen: And a share in the profits?

Mr. DAVIES: There are no profits in our national industries. I am referring particularly to the Government railways.

Mr. O'Loughlen: What about increased wages?

Mr. DAVIES: I believe that if the workers are given a fair share of the control of an industry they will also share in the responsibility. I have been informed that the state of affairs at the Wyndham meat works is shocking.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You are dealing purely with the conditions given in the Whiteley report.

Mr. DAVIES: No. That does not go as far as this, though it does go as far as profit-sharing and co-partnership.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It goes in for control.

Mr. DAVIES: A job can always be put up in regard to profit-sharing. Take the wharf labourers, for instance.

The Minister for Mines: What were you going to say about the Wyndham meat works?

Mr. DAVIES: The conditions there are shocking.

The Minister for Works: In what respect?

Mr. DAVIES: There is not that co-operation between the management and the workers that should exist. I do not know where the fault lies. I am told that at Wyndham there are sometimes a dozen or 15 bullocks on the ground. If the management does not give the men what they want the carcasses, I am told, may remain there and rot so far as the men are concerned. I ask the Government and hon. members generally to remedy such a state of affairs

if possible. Again, a man from Port Darwin said to me recently, "Do you know what the condition of affairs is at Port Darwin?" I replied in the negative, and he said, "There are men working on the wharf in Port Darwin who are engaged at a 40 or 44-hour week, and for whom a weekly wage is prescribed because they would not accept any other condition, and who are receiving from £7 to £7 10s. a week, although for 13 weeks on end no steamship has entered Port Darwin." These men were drawing wages all the time.

Mr. O'Loughlen: That is readily understood in a place like Port Darwin. The sooner men in Port Darwin and in the coal mining industry are guaranteed a weekly wage, the better.

Mr. DAVIES: If we are to have our public services carried out at a reasonable cost—

Mr. O'Loughlen: Port Darwin is an exceptional case.

Mr. DAVIES: These conditions prevail at these places, because they are so far removed from the seat of government that no one knows much about them, and the men are a law unto themselves. They are the masters of the situation, and apparently the management is of no account at all.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Did you hear Professor Atkinson at the 'Commercial Travellers' Club? He was all things to all men there.

Hon. P. Collier: He was rather good to his audience.

Mr. DAVIES: I do not entirely agree with him in his references to Russia. He had not been there.

Mr. O'Loughlen: He has travelled extensively in Russia.

Mr. DAVIES: Not since Sovietism began there.

Hon. P. Collier: He has read more than most men about Russia lately.

Mr. DAVIES: His knowledge would depend upon whether he had read one side as well as the other.

Mr. Nairn: Did he recommend that form of government for Australia?

Mr. O'Loughlen: No, he did not.

Hon. P. Collier: It is an unprofitable thing to discuss, after all.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DAVIES: I should like to quote a few remarks on the question of whether direct action is or is not profitable. Reference has been made to the fact that men who did not get what they desired immediately adopted the method of direct action. I have here two authorities on the point, and I presume both are well known to members on the other side of the House. One is Mr. Bodkin, secretary of the Railway Workers' Industry Branch of the A.W.U., Sydney. He said—

I have been deeply interested in the progress of arbitration, and while I can find many faults with it, it appears to me, on reviewing direct action methods that arbitration is by far the better method. To quote Broken Hill, a section of the people

there mostly depend on direct action in order to gain their ends. Nine years ago the miners of that centre were better off by fully ten per cent. than were the navvies in the Sydney district. Since then the miners have lost many months' work. The railway workers during that period lost no time, and have depended solely upon arbitration. They have gradually improved their condition until at the present time they have passed the Broken Hill men by increases of fully 20 per cent. in wages. Then, take the case of the seamen. After having been on strike several months they resumed on their original demands of 35s. a month increase. The loss in wages to those men ran into many thousands of pounds. For the whole of that period the A.W.U. was interesting itself in the Board of Trade, and received an increase of 34s. a fortnight, as against 35s. a month obtained by the seamen.

There is another authority, Mr. James, the member for Logan, whose resignation from the Parliamentary Labour party was recently announced. On January 8th he made his first appearance in the House since the incident. He took his seat on the back Opposition benches.

Mr. O'Loughlen: You know the sort of constituency he represents?

Mr. DAVIES: Mr. C. Collins resumed the debate on the financial statement, and said if they were going to increase their population and develop the State they would have to borrow a great deal more. The newspaper paragraph I am quoting from continues—

He blamed the Federal Government for the continuance of the marine engineers' strike, which was strangling North Queensland, and holding up the development of one of the greatest coal fields in the world, at Bowen. Mr. Collins made an impassioned appeal to the Queensland industrialists to realise that there was no such thing possible as a millennium. Men must work out their salvation by the process of evolution. He would preach to them the gospel of Carlyle—they must work. He did not believe in direct action. That was a form of atavism. Those who adopted direct action were driving the Labour movement back into the wilderness from which it had been led in the days when it was not so popular as now.

Hon. P. Collier: He is a very fine old chap.

Mr. DAVIES: Whilst I advocate compulsory arbitration, I admit that there are many unions which are not willing to go to the Arbitration Court.

Mr. O'Loughlen: With some justification.

Mr. DAVIES: In some cases. The miners of Kalgoorlie were unfortunate in deciding to go to the Federal Arbitration Court at the time they did.

Mr. O'Loughlen: The results show it. Why should that be the case?

Hon. P. Collier: After Judge Northmore's statement that you referred to.

Mr. DAVIES: That was years ago.

Hon. P. Collier: It was just after that when they decided as they did.

Mr. DAVIES: I am pleased that they decided at length to appeal to our local Arbitration Court.

Mr. O'Loughlen: In desperation.

Mr. DAVIES: And I hope the wages in the industry will be greatly improved.

Hon. P. Collier: The reason why arbitration has to a certain extent broken down is that various Governments have not kept the legislation up to date all over Australia.

Mr. DAVIES: There is a good deal of truth in that. To succeed in this matter requires the assistance of all parties. Let me ask hon. members to review again the speech delivered by General Smuts in South Africa a few days ago, when a monster address was presented to him containing over 25,000 signatures of citizens of Cape Town.

Mr. O'Loughlen: It was more Imperialism than industrialism.

Mr. DAVIES: With their black labour problems and other difficulties they have more to contend with than we have in Australia. Surely with a white Australia, and people of our own kith and kin, it is possible with this grand country of ours to make better progress than we are making to-day. We shall make that progress if all parties will co-operate to do their best for the State. With regard to the question of the cost of production, it is a fact that British coal is being sold on the Continent at £12 per ton, and that it is cheaper for British owners of industries to purchase coal in Newcastle, New South Wales, and take it home than it is to buy British coal.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I suppose you know the British Government have the exporting of it.

Hon. P. Collier: That increased cost of production is not due to the miners' wages.

Mr. DAVIES: It has been admitted on all sides that the cost of production in the United Kingdom has gone up enormously.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Not so much as it should had they kept to their agreement.

Mr. Nairn: Coal is 54s. per ton in England.

Hon. P. Collier: There are some big profits being made somewhere.

Mr. DAVIES: There is the freight, and there are the agents' charges. The price paid in France and in Sweden is £12 per ton.

Mr. Nairn: That is because of the exchange.

Mr. DAVIES: That may have a lot to do with it.

Mr. Nairn: It has all to do with it.

Mr. DAVIES: If exchange has to do with it, has not exchange to do with the 140,000 tons of coal purchased from New South Wales?

Mr. Green: It is not on the same parity.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: When I was in England recently, you could buy coal at £4 10s. a ton, delivered, by the hundred-weight.

Mr. DAVIES: If we desire to cut down the cost of living to a reasonable figure, we must have some thought for the cost of production.

Mr. O'Loghien: Production in the timber industry went up 30 per cent., and the retail prices of timber went up 100 per cent., in recent months.

The Minister for Mines: You have often quoted it as proof that whenever wages go up the commodity will go up the same amount.

Mr. DAVIES: I can speak of the brick industry with some authority. To-day the State brickyards are selling bricks at exactly the same price as the private employer.

Mr. Green: No, 5s. cheaper.

Mr. DAVIES: That may be so for special orders.

Mr. Green: No, for bricks of similar quality.

Mr. DAVIES: Anyone can go to Mr. R. O. Law's office—he is the biggest employer in the brickmaking industry—and ask his price for bricks, and Mr. Law will say, "Whatever the State is selling at."

Mr. O'Loghien: If it were not for the State brickyards, what would Mr. Law's price be?

Hon. P. Collier: The State is policing the trade.

Mr. DAVIES: Private employers to-day are prepared to take the cost of production at the State yards as their selling basis. Whether it is in timber or bricks, the private employer will inevitably put into the witness box, in arbitration proceedings, the manager of the State yard or mill, and when he has given his evidence, say, "These are our costs also." The private employer, however, can make a handsome profit between his working expenses and the price he gets, while the State enterprise can only make both ends meet.

Mr. Green: The State brickyards made a profit last year.

Mr. DAVIES: I hope this year they will do much better.

Mr. Green: And this year too they made a profit, and are selling at 4s. a thousand cheaper than the Cardup brickyards are selling at.

Mr. DAVIES: Cardup is an exceptional yard. It is regarded by all architects throughout the metropolitan area as "the brickyard." But to-day the State yard is fast catching up to the Cardup yard, and I hope will very soon surpass it. In my opinion it is not a question of whether we shall nationalise industries or not, but of whether we shall get co-operation between employers and employees. I appeal to hon. members opposite, and to all members of the House, to co-operate; and I say that I am prepared to do everything possible to get conditions back to normal in Western Australia.

[The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.]

Mr. PICKERING (Sussex) [9.32]: I have observed that previous speakers in addressing themselves to His Excellency's Speech have carefully avoided any reference to the first and second paragraphs thereof. I prefer to start at the beginning, although I can pro-

mise to be brief. The two paragraphs in question deal with the Prince's visit. I think that, with His Excellency, we may congratulate ourselves upon the visit of His Royal Highness to this State. I do not know that anyone could have made a deeper or more favourable impression upon the people of Western Australia than the young man who has recently left our shores; and I think his visit to this continent has done much to disabuse the minds of those people who favour elective governments, and to impress upon them the advantages of our present form of government. It has often been suggested that the throne of England could easily be dispensed with, and that an elective form of government would be better suited to the British Empire. But I think the visit of the Prince has shown that in a hereditary monarchy we have the best solution of the difficulty of finding a permanent head of the British Empire. To my mind it is impossible to conceive any elective form of government that could combine the various dominions and colonies of the British Empire so well as does the present form of government. I pass now to the third paragraph of the Speech, in which, as has been so ably pointed out by the leader of the Opposition, we find almost the crux of the Ministerial programme. The paragraph says—

In common with every other country in the civilised world, Western Australia is faced with grave problems of reconstruction following upon the disturbances of trade, commerce, and industry during the war. My advisers, however, because of the ability of the State to produce in abundance many of the things of which the world is most in need, feel that the prospects are encouraging, and that vigour, enterprise, and goodwill amongst the people are alone necessary to replace the material losses of war, and to inaugurate a period of expansion.

We find that the three specific things which are to create a happy state of prosperity in Western Australia are enterprise, vigour, and goodwill. I place enterprise in the forefront because I believe that is really the only one of the three things that exists in this State to-day. We speak of vigour, but when we observe the attitude of the Australian people we find that vigour is the last thing they desire. The workers of Australia to-day desire a 40 hours week in preference to the 44; and an eight hours day, six days a week, is anathema to them. If we are going to overcome the difficulties confronting us, it will certainly not be by evasion of our responsibilities. It must be by recognition that only by increased effort shall we get increased output, and not by diminution of effort, as suggested by the diminished working week. The Speech mentions goodwill. Where is goodwill to be found? Let us turn our thoughts not only to Western Australia but all over the world, and we find that all over the world illwill is rampant instead of goodwill.

Hon. P. Collier: That is an inevitable result of the world-wide catastrophe.

Mr. Green: It is a prelude to change.

Mr. PICKERING: Perhaps the position could not have been otherwise, but illwill is more extreme to-day than it ever was. Instead of goodwill we find strikes and wars all over the world. We find thrones tottering and falling, and various forms of government in the melting pot. We find that even the old, well worn remedy which has failed so frequently, that of bloodletting is being resorted to. I say, therefore, that we lack two of the essentials to the fulfilment of the programme which the Government submit to us for consideration. This brings me to the question of our social and industrial relations, a very important question, which was dealt with by the leader of the Opposition. What do we find? That the Government, in the Speech, take no note, as has been well remarked by the leader of the Opposition, of this very vital issue. It seems to me that the Government are, ostrich-like, burying their heads in the sand and hoping that the evil will pass over them.

The Minister for Works: What is the evil?

Mr. PICKERING: The industrial unrest and social unrest existing in Western Australia to-day. The Commonwealth is at least making an effort to meet the position. It seems to be trying at the present moment to pass legislation which will relieve the distressing situation existing between employers and employees.

Hon. P. Collier: There was never such need for it as to-day.

Mr. PICKERING: Yes, and yet there is no mention of it in the Government's programme. We have just listened to an eloquent discourse on social unrest from the member for Guildford (Mr. Davies). His suggestions were such as will take some time to become practical. But I think the suggestion offered by the leader of the Opposition is a wise one, and one which may well be adopted. It is similar to a suggestion made by Professor Atkinson in the course of an address to the Commercial Travellers' Club on the 6th July, 1920. I will quote from that address—

It must be perfectly obvious that most of the factors of the high cost of living were world factors, and beyond Australian control, but there were local palliatives which could be administered. Incidentally, Australia was the best situated of any country in the world, and her people should be thankful for her comparative mercies. The people who were suffering most were the wage earners and the people on moderate fixed salaries. The first thing to be done was to secure to them a basic wage, the purchasing power of which would enable them to live in a decent standard of comfort. The basis of the standard of living must first be fixed, and then they might well adopt the plan of allowing the basic

wage to vary with the cost of living according to the statistics issued by Mr. Knibbs from quarter to quarter.

That solution has my complete endorsement.

Hon. P. Collier: It represents the only logical course.

Mr. PICKERING: There are many things that contribute to the distress of our people, and one of them is the crowding of the people to our centres. That crowding is due to several causes. One of them undoubtedly has been the war. The wives and children of the men who enlisted from the country districts naturally came to the cities when the chief cause for their staying in the country was removed. On their coming to the city, the attractiveness and convenience of city life, and the comparative cheapness there of certain requirements, proved a sufficient inducement for them to remain there; and so they remained. Another factor that has contributed in a very large measure to the crowding of our people into the cities is the erroneous fiscal policy of Australia—high protection. That is my sincere conviction. In Australia we have a country whose main resources lie in the primary industries; but instead of recognising that fact, the Governments of Australia have built up highly protective tariffs to foster the secondary industries, to the detriment of the primary industries, upon which the future prosperity of the Commonwealth, and especially of this State, mainly depends.

Hon. P. Collier: Especially this new tariff.

Mr. PICKERING: Yes, this new tariff which is penalising in every conceivable manner the people whom we most desire to settle upon the land. Let me instance two or three items which are very much disapproved of by the farmers of Western Australia. The new tariff imposes high duties upon wire netting, barb wire, and farm implements—all things absolutely essential to the development of our chief primary industry. The one thing that is essential to the proper development of our wheat areas is an adequate supply of wire netting and barb wire, because without these commodities the farmer is unable to deal with the dingo pest. Until we can provide our settlers with proper security in this respect, they cannot profitably run sheep. It is suggested that the sheep might be yarded at night, but that is a grave error in sheep farming, especially during the lambing season. It is absolutely essential to give one's stock as much freedom as possible, and one cannot do that if one has to yard them at night. And yet we find the Commonwealth Government ostensibly advocating an immigration policy. There is no immigration policy to Australia that is not based upon settlement on the land. If the Federal Government were sincere as regards their immigration policy, they would rather be taking duties off farming requirements and implements than putting them on.

Mr. Green: You would not get those requirements and implements then. We must manufacture them in Australia.

Mr. PICKERING: We cannot manufacture them in sufficient quantities for our requirements.

Mr. Green: That is why we want the secondary industries.

Mr. PICKERING: I am quite prepared to support secondary industries on proper lines, but not on the lines of prohibition.

Mr. Green: You will have to depend on Australian production.

Mr. PICKERING: What I wanted to come at was this, that the protective policy is concentrating our people in the cities, and thus contributing very considerably to the increased cost of living. The moment the outside world is able to bring anything into Australia in spite of our high tariff, there is an application to the Minister for Customs to have the tariff raised. What is the effect of the increased tariff? The bolstering up of inefficiency in every aspect of Australian manufacturing. England before the war was just as inefficient as I think Australia is to-day, in regard to equipment, methods, and buildings. But when the war came, and the inefficiency was clearly demonstrated, England at once adopted up to date methods. Australian prohibition is fostering inefficiency in every possible way, and the result of inefficiency in manufacturing is restriction of output, and the restriction of output means raising the price of the commodity. We are putting up the prices of commodities beyond their value. It does not matter how we fix prices, they will stay at that value. I have very little faith in the system of price fixing, and if that system is extended to primary industries, it will have the one effect of putting up prices, and if we limit the price of commodities produced by the farmers, those commodities cease to become payable propositions, and the farmers will then turn them down. We talk about making country life attractive so as to induce people to go into the country. How are we going to do that? The proper solution is to make city life as unattractive as possible. Unfortunately, however, we spend all our efforts in providing every convenience in the cities; we have the member for Canning (Mr. Robinson) asking for increased tram services for South Perth, and all the time the country is starving for good roads. But those good roads and the many conveniences that are so badly needed in the country can go hang. In the cities there is everything to make life attractive. Races take place every week and sometimes twice a week.

Hon. P. Collier: We have jazzing as well.

Mr. PICKERING: There are the trots nearly every Saturday night, and if we go down the main street we find four or five picture halls, and other halls as well, offering various kinds of entertainments, and as the leader of the Opposition said, when the halls are not used for entertainment they are used for jazzing.

Hon. P. Collier: How do you like it yourself?

Mr. PICKERING: Unfortunately I have never learned to jazz.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I cannot afford to go to the trots.

Mr. PICKERING: Neither can I, but I go when I have the courtesy of a ticket extended to me. We find that Mr. Mahon proposes to introduce legislation the effect of which he claims will be to keep the people in the country. I call that an unjust interference with the liberty of the subject. The only way in which we can legislate to keep people in the country is to induce people to go into the country by offering them all the facilities which will make life attractive there. They should have good roads and conveniences such as agricultural halls. In regard to these, however, the Minister for Works has cut out all assistance. We no longer get pound for pound assistance for the establishment of agricultural halls. The country people should also have schools, medical and nursing attention, the telephone, and many other things that should be indispensable to life in the country. But whilst we make the conditions in the city unusually attractive, we are preventing people from migrating to the country. I am going to suggest that we should consider the question of altering the fiscal policy. I know this is not a State matter, but we might educate the people in the direction of showing them what has made the cost of living so high. The policy of the Country party should be to bring down a revenue tariff. If that were possible, there would be some prospect of remedying the position. Our attention is drawn in the Governor's Speech to the financial position of the State and I do not think we can take too much credit in that regard. I should like to read another extract from Professor Atkinson's speech delivered at the Commercial Travellers' Club. He said—

There was only one nation which adopted what economists considered the sound policy of financing to the greatest possible extent out of taxation, and as little as possible from loans. The only country which had the courage and wisdom to do that was Great Britain. At the present time they had the spectacle of Britain raising by taxation four times as much as before the war—a feat without parallel in history. The Americans on the other hand, bloated as they were with war-made wealth, had a remarkable opportunity to finance their share in the war almost entirely from taxation, but they ignored it, and financed by huge bonds. The financial position of Australia would have been much stronger if her Government had financed far more from taxation and far less from loans than it did. The other great countries at war financed almost entirely from loans, a fact which showed how splendidly heroic was the British policy.

If we are in earnest about the position as it applies to Australia, and to our own State, it is not by floating loans that we can improve it. To my mind, and I regret to say it, it will be by an equitable and just increase in taxation, and the people of Western Australia must be prepared to face that position if they are really anxious to lift the debt from the State. I come next to the question of the settlement of returned soldiers and I would like to give my commendation to the Government for the measure of success which has attended their efforts in this direction. I have had considerable experience in connection with the settlement of returned men in my electorate, and I am glad to say judging from the letters I have received and from the visits of inspection I have been able to make, and also judging from the increased area under crop and the increased clearing which is taking place in the South-Western part of the State, there is every indication that the policy adopted by the Mitchell Government will give satisfactory results. I realise that the successful settlement of returned men lies in the repurchase of partially improved properties. But it was with regret that I received an answer to my question the other day that with regard to the settlement in Australia of ex-Imperial men, that settlement will take place mainly on virgin land. If settlement on virgin land was not good enough for our own men who are cognisant of the conditions and are inured to the life and are thoroughly fitted for the development of the country, how much more unjust and difficult will it be for those men who have never seen Australia and know nothing of its conditions? The Premier's reply to my question was that the time was too limited, or that it had been left too long to take any steps in that direction. Yet I remember, since my advent in this Chamber, hearing the Premier enlarge upon the necessity for improving the country before selection.

The Premier: It should be done, too.

Hon. P. Collier: It was included in the policy drawn up by a committee appointed by the Lefroy Government of which the present Premier was a member.

Mr. PICKERING: If we are in earnest about our immigration policy and we make enough song about it, we should be doing our utmost to make the position so that when these people come here there will be a certainty of them being able to make good. I am speaking from practical experience extending over 15 years of pioneering on virgin country, and that has jolly near ruined me. When I first took up land I had some years of experience of Australia. I do not know how I would have fared but for that experience. I will admit that the area I took up was absurdly large, but it was an area which was foisted on me by a land agent at that time whose policy it was to get rid of as much land as possible.

Mr. Troy: That was a mistake.

Mr. PICKERING: The first thing that should concern the Government is to make certain that the successful settlement of the returned men will be assured. All the areas taken up by them should be partially improved. It need not be necessary to improve them too much, but they should be sufficiently improved to give these men a chance to get something in immediately they take up the property. The Government should also have depôts ready where the new arrivals could be trained in the various phases of agricultural work. A man who takes up land in the South-West may get hold of impenetrable and heavily timbered country, and he has no idea, unless he has had previous experience, how to tackle the work. It is important also that the settlements should have every possible convenience in the way of schools, telephones, post offices, halls, etc., so that when the new arrivals go there, there may be some additional inducements to keep them on the land.

Hon. P. Collier: In the South-West only small holdings will be required and those facilities should not be difficult to provide.

Mr. PICKERING: That is so. I want to refer briefly to the question of mining for oil. I have given notice of motion in this connection and therefore to-night I only propose to deal briefly with the question because I intend to refer at length to it when submitting the motion, unless the Minister satisfies me that he is in earnest about it. But I want to give a brief quotation from a book entitled "The Oil Conquest of the World," which will show to members how vitally important this business is. The quotation is as follows:—

What do we get from petroleum? If this question were submitted to the average individual, probably he would produce a list comprising a round half-dozen articles—those with which he is most familiar, such as petrol or gasoline, naphtha, paraffin, or kerosene and lubricating oil. True, this catalogue would be fairly complete, but it could be dismissed as imperfect, since it would indicate only the broad groupings of these series of products. It is not conclusive, for the simple reason that each classification is divided and subdivided to meet the requirements of exacting commerce. As a matter of fact, over 200 different products are derived from petroleum, each of which commands a distinct marketable value, but the majority of which are unknown to the general public; because they are utilised as substitutes, or in little known industries, such as medicine and the manufacture of aniline dyes. One would not be far wrong if one expressed the opinion that the community to-day eats, drinks, and sleeps—in fact exists—upon petroleum. The fact that a round 200 articles are obtained from this liquid mineral conveys a vivid impression of the varied requirements which the nonseating, unprepossessing, raw material is made to fulfil, and also of the immense demand that is made upon the chemist to

fit the products for such an array of application. It emphasises the extreme dependence which the world at large is forced to place upon oil to-day. Mankind cannot possibly get along without it. It is the most useful and ubiquitous servant which has ever been revealed.

I have taken a big interest in this question in its application to mining. Since I have been in the House it has been my privilege to voice an earnest wish that succeeding Ministers for Mines should make a real effort to place this industry on a proper basis. I approached the late Minister for Mines and I have approached the present Minister, not indirectly, but through the medium of this House, but unfortunately up to date nothing has been done in this matter. There are in Western Australia to-day companies only too anxious to exploit this industry. But they cannot get a straight-out statement from the Minister as to whether he is prepared to afford them necessary facilities. And when we approach the question of forfeiture and other essential questions, it is found to be very difficult to get this industry on a proper basis.

The Minister for Mines: That statement is not correct.

Mr. PICKERING: Turn to the treatment you have meted out to me.

The Minister for Mines: You say that these companies cannot get a statement from me.

Mr. PICKERING: Well, I have not been able to do so.

The Minister for Mines: You can get it any time you like to come along for it.

Mr. PICKERING: I am glad to hear that the Government are at last prepared to consider the placing of the industry on a proper footing. It is to be hoped that the Government will not put such a value on the area required as to preclude the necessary searching for the oil, and that they will not, by their terms, preclude the exploitation of the oil resources when found. The only reasonable basis is the pound for pound basis.

The Minister for Mines: We will give them the right to lift the oil if they can discover it.

Mr. PICKERING: Will you give us the right to take the oil?

The Minister for Mines: No.

Mr. PICKERING: Are you going to look for it yourself?

The Minister for Mines: I am a bit busy at present.

Mr. PICKERING: It is the duty of a country to do its best to assist in the exploitation of its oil resources.

The Minister for Mines: I am not going to forget my responsibilities to the State by giving away its resources in that fashion.

Mr. PICKERING: Now I come to the question of the forest industry of the State, a primary industry in which naturally I am interested. The longer I am in this House the more do I learn to appreciate the value of that measure which was put on the statute-book by the then Minister for Forests. Too long have the forests of the State been ex-

ploited. When we consider the position of the forests and the wood supply of the world, it must be borne in upon members how vitally necessary it is that we should conserve our forests. I find that the forests in America, from which is taken the wood pulp required for paper making, are likely to cut out in another 25 years at the present rate of consumption. So far as I am aware we have none of that pulp in Western Australia, and it therefore seems essential that the policy of conservation and reafforestation should be observed.

Hon. P. Collier: And very rigidly, too.

Mr. PICKERING: Yes, very rigidly, too. And it is necessary that we should at once see about planting the varieties of trees which I have indicated. We should do our utmost to assist the Conservator of Forests because we have to thank him for having brought us to realise the importance of our forests. On the whole the State owes a deep debt of gratitude to the Conservator of Forests.

Hon. P. Collier: To me, rather, for having appointed him.

Mr. PICKERING: Yes, to you for having appointed him. I should like to add my tribute to the leader of the Opposition for having made such an appointment.

The Minister for Mines: I had to approve of the appointment.

Mr. PICKERING: I am not going to make this a mutual admiration society. I note also that there is in the Speech some reference to our secondary industries. I am glad to see a recognition of secondary industries, and to know that the Government say that our secondary industries are steadily expanding and that the Government will continue to give to these every possible encouragement and assistance in order that wider avenues of employment may be afforded to the people and additional sources of wealth exploited.

Hon. P. Collier: That is delightfully general.

Mr. PICKERING: It is. I am not sure what it means. Perhaps the Minister will tell us.

The Minister for Mines: See for yourself what it says.

Mr. PICKERING: It does not say much. I am glad to know that we have established in this State a chemical factory. I believe it is going to do much to further the development of some of our primary industries, such as manganese. I believe this factory has in conjunction with it a vast store of manganese, and that this will require some assistance being afforded the company in the way of facilities to deal with this manganese, which is of considerable value.

The Minister for Mines: The company is not making the value.

Mr. PICKERING: No, but it is going to develop it. There are also porcelain works and paint-milling works. What I hope to see established as soon as possible is the woollen industry.

The Minister for Mines: Hear, hear! We are on the move with that.

Mr. PICKERING: I am glad of it. We are faced with the difficulty of getting skilled workmen for these special trades. Take the porcelain works, which it was my privilege to open, much to the annoyance of the member for East Perth (Mr. Hardwick). One of the troubles which confront this important work is the absence of skilled workmen. The management have gone to the Eastern States in an endeavour to find the men, but unfortunately the men were not available, and so it is necessary for the management to send to England for those men. The moment those men are engaged under contract there will be trouble about bringing them into the State. That trouble must be overcome, because we have not the skilled men in the State, and if we want to educate our own people we must bring out trained men to do it. I hope the Government will assist in this direction.

The Minister for Mines: It is a Federal matter.

Mr. PICKERING: Then perhaps the Government will make representations to the Federal authorities. If we are to establish these works it is essential that we have men who understand the work.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Where are you to get the trained men?

Mr. PICKERING: The manager tells us they can be obtained in England. The lack of skilled labour is one of the biggest problems confronting Western Australia.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They are 200,000 short in England.

Mr. PICKERING: That is so, and therefore we cannot look to England for the skilled labour we require.

The Minister for Mines: You only want a percentage of trained men to train others.

Mr. PICKERING: Exactly. We have tried the system of apprenticeship and found it impracticable. But there are one or two methods which have been exploited with success. One has been tried in Germany. All are prepared to admit that before the war Germany was one of the most efficient countries in the world.

Mr. Green: This is disloyalty!

Mr. PICKERING: I am speaking not from the point of loyalty but from the point of truth.

Hon. P. Collier: Are they then incomparable?

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Mr. PICKERING: The point I am dealing with is efficiency, and before the war efficiency predominated in Germany more than in any other country. The system they had was to license master tradesmen, and instead of the work being let out to general contractors, each licensed tradesman dealt with his particular line in the particular building where it was carried on, and therefore he had a continuous staff working under him, and so it was possible to train apprentices. It worked very well in Germany; whether we can introduce it here remains to be seen. Take the plumbing trade. Because we

license our plumbers we have very little difficulty in getting licensed plumbers. So I believe it would be an improvement if we adopted such a system throughout, or, failing that, if we adopted the system obtaining in Switzerland, where an inspectorial staff attached to the Education Department examines the school children with a view to discovering their special aptitude and equipping them until they become qualified mechanics in various trades. I think the Government should, if necessary, go so far as not only to make the training of such children free, but to supply them with pocket money during the time they are engaged in learning their trade. This is a possible solution of the greatest difficulty we are confronted with, and I hope the Government will try to evolve some method by which we shall be able to look forward to a future in which there will be an ample supply of skilled workmen. Like other members I must refer to the Civil Service strike. The leader of the Opposition quoted a letter I wrote regarding the strike. I would like to tell the hon. member that that was not the first letter I wrote on the subject.

Mr. Jones: Oh, we all know that.

Mr. PICKERING: There is a letter which even the member for Fremantle does not know of, and I intend to read it to show that I had a lively recognition of the coming event before it eventuated. On the 23rd January, 1920, I wrote to the Premier in the following terms:—

Your attention must have been drawn to the fact that the Civil Service is taking a ballot on the question of strike or no strike. I venture to think that this ballot is placing many loyal officers in an equivocal position. It is unfortunate at this juncture that Parliament is not sitting, and consequently members are not afforded the opportunity to express their views with regard to this crisis. Recognising this fact, I think it my duty to suggest for your consideration the desirability of an immediate reorganisation of the Civil Service, with a view to a reduction in numbers, and an increase of emoluments for the restricted staff. There are, of course, some departments which are considerably undermanned, but I think in the main that a considerable reduction might be easily effected. This will, doubtless, cause considerable hardship on the retrenched, but will result in a more efficient and satisfied service.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Are you sure that is true?

Mr. PICKERING: That is my opinion.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You did not say it was your opinion; you said it was so.

The Minister for Mines: It was not much to go on.

Mr. PICKERING: True, but what did the Government do; they let the thing slip on and on until there was a strike.

The Minister for Mines: That is not correct.

Mr. PICKERING: That is my opinion.

Mr. Jones: That is a very good letter.

Mr. PICKERING: I felt it my duty, as the representative of a constituency, to say what I thought, and I am prepared to stand by what I write and say.

Hon. P. Collier: Can you tell us what the pledge was?

Mr. PICKERING: The pledge which I allege was made, I am told was not a pledge at all. One way to get the Civil Service on sound lines is to have it reorganised by experts appointed to go through every department, experts who are conversant with the work and who could thoroughly reorganise the service.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Where would you get the experts?

The Minister for Mines: That is the point.

Mr. PICKERING: There are men outside the service.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They would never do it.

The Minister for Works: They would be lost in a fog in five minutes.

Mr. PICKERING: Let us get rid of that fog.

The Minister for Mines: It is worse than a smoke screen.

Mr. PICKERING: It is about time we got at the root of the evil and cleared it away.

The Minister for Mines: Will you take on the job?

Mr. PICKERING: Yes, on condition that the Government pay me my fees. I am not going to scab on a job like that.

Mr. Jones: Now we understand the strength of all this.

Mr. PICKERING: I have never hesitated to express my opinions or proposals in connection with the Civil Service, and I am prepared to face the music. Unless the Government are prepared to have the departments thoroughly investigated and reorganised, they will not be fulfilling their duty to the State. The Government will have to face the position of retrenchment in the Civil Service, and they will have to give proper pay for proper work. I do not advocate restricted pay to any man. Every man is worthy of good pay so long as he gives a fair return for the money. The majority of employers to-day do not care how much they pay so long as they get a return commensurate to the payment.

Mr. Lutey: You do not know the mining industry.

Mr. PICKERING: No; I am referring to the building and farming industries, with which I am conversant. I am satisfied that the majority of employers in those industries are prepared to pay good money for good work. One of the main things we must look for in the Civil Service is efficiency, and the head of a department who can show that his department is run more cheaply than another should get the highest pay and the best position.

The Minister for Works: How could you get comparisons for a thing of that sort?

Mr. PICKERING: I am not occupying a departmental position but, if I were in the position of the Minister for Works, I should certainly try to solve the question. I believe it is possible to cut down our Accounts Department considerably. Why not have one department to deal with the accounts for the whole of the service? In some country towns in this State we find as many as five paymasters.

The Minister for Works: Oh, no!

Mr. PICKERING: It is a fact.

The Minister for Works: That was stopped years ago.

Mr. PICKERING: There were five paymasters in one town. This shows the necessity for reorganisation, and the sooner it is taken in hand the better. There is another point in connection with the Civil Service, namely the question of housing. The sooner we can bring about a better condition with regard to the office accommodation, and the sooner we can put the offices on commercial lines, the sooner we shall get the Government service on business lines. The smoke screens and fogs are mainly due to the walls that separate the different departments. Go to the Works Department.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is due to the buildings.

Mr. PICKERING: As soon as money can be made available to improve the buildings, it should be done, for such work would repay us.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Pull down the lot and rebuild?

The Minister for Mines: But you think we have no right to spend money in the metropolitan area.

Mr. PICKERING: This is a business proposition.

The Minister for Works: You take the Education and Mines offices and see if you can improve on them.

Hon. P. Collier: You could not improve on them.

Mr. PICKERING: The Minister has done that work well. I wish to refer to the question of main roads. I think we might, with benefit to the State, adopt something of the principles of the country road board Act of Victoria. It is evident that our present system of maintaining main roads is anything but adequate. We have the poorest main road system of any State in the Commonwealth. Victoria has a central road board which was financed to the extent of four million pounds to start with. It was a good start.

The Minister for Mines: That is the difference between Victoria and Western Australia.

Mr. PICKERING: This board has entire control of the main roads. It can deviate, alter them, lay them out, and do what it likes. It can carry on all work that is necessary, independent of the individual boards. The country boards will not take the neces-

sary action. They will not levy the requisite rates, or deviate the roads for fear of offending their neighbours, and they do not always take the easiest grades. This Act enables the central road board to control all roads, to take the best contours, to get the material where they require it, and to spend the money where it is most needed. It would be worth while for the Minister for Works to study this Act if he has not already done so, with a view to making some amendments to our own Roads Act.

Hon. P. Collier: That is the only weak point about the Minister for Works—the main roads.

Mr. PICKERING: I must call the attention of the Minister for Railways to the question of motor traffic. I shall be glad to make available to him, as was suggested by the member for York, certain information with regard to gasoline propelled motor cars for inter-urban service.

Hon. P. Collier: Information from Canada?

Mr. PICKERING: From Illinois, I think. I have some information from the "Railway and Locomotive Engineer Magazine" and from the "Scientific American."

The Minister for Mines: I have a better one; from England.

Mr. PICKERING: I am not advocating anything from America; I shall be better pleased if the Minister can get what he wants from England.

The Minister for Mines: I shall lend it to you.

Mr. PICKERING: I shall be pleased to read it. It has been demonstrated that this system of traffic on spur lines and short country lines can be used at considerable profit and saving. This State has been crying out for locomotion of this description for years, and the least the Minister for Railways can do is to introduce one or two of these cars and experiment with them.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Petrol cars?

Mr. PICKERING: Yes.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Petrol is much cheaper there than it is here.

The Minister for Mines: They have not proved successful in Australia. They have been experimented with a good deal in New South Wales, the latest type, too.

Mr. PICKERING: I am anxious that proper facilities should be afforded to the people in the country.

The Minister for Mines: We are advertising through the Agent General for three two-ton petrol engines, together with coaches and wagons.

Mr. PICKERING: I am glad to hear that. The position in Western Australia is very urgent because we cannot give a frequent service. The saving of labour and the reduced cost of running motors would enable us to run two trains where, at the present time, only one can be run, and they would also be profitable to the department.

Mr. Lutey: What about trying them on the goldfields?

Mr. PICKERING: I have no objection to these cars being tried all over the State so long as they are a paying proposition. There are one or two matters concerning my district to which I wish to refer. I want to know when we are going to get the long promised Margaret River railway. Authority has been in existence for its construction for a long time and tenders have been called. I am informed that the conditions in the tender submitted were so unsatisfactory that local people could not tender for the work. The Premier should realise the absolute necessity and urgent need for giving to people in the Augusta and Margaret River districts facilities which they have lacked for some 60 years.

Mr. O'Loughlen: You put that proposition up every year.

Mr. PICKERING: And I intend to do so every year.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Then you ought to withdraw your support.

Mr. PICKERING: I am thinking seriously of doing so. If I cannot get it, there will be trouble. A maternity ward at the Busselton hospital is an urgent need. Notwithstanding the high cost of material, it is essential that this convenience should be afforded. I hope the Premier will realise the need for it. I have written about it again and again, and I am tired of being put off with excuses, because I know that the amount of money involved is so small.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Has the Premier any serious intention?

Mr. PICKERING: He tells me that he has.

Mr. O'Loughlen: The Government put you off year after year and it is getting monotonous.

Mr. PICKERING: Considerable dissatisfaction has been expressed in my electorate over the appointment of a Swede to control one of the tuart mills. There were several applicants amongst a number of millers, and yet this Swede was picked out in preference to the others.

Mr. O'Loughlen: What is his name?

Mr. PICKERING: I think it is Neilson. I hope the Premier will give his attention to this matter.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Have you dealt with Brookhampton?

Mr. PICKERING: That has been the subject of deputations to the Minister for Mines, and I trust that they will result in justice being done to that portion of my electorate. I have not hesitated to complain about the iniquitous freights imposed upon the people of the farming districts for goods carried over the railways. The farmers contend that they pay the whole of the freights in Western Australia.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: How is it they do it?

Mr. PICKERING: Because we pay for everything that goes to the city and for everything that comes from the city. If we send anything to Perth we are debited with the freight upon it, and if we get anything from Perth we are again debited with the freight.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The farmers should provide for themselves that which they need.

Mr. PICKERING: They cannot provide themselves with clothes, with sugar, with tea, and with numerous other things. Anything that acts detrimentally to the settlement of the land and injuriously affects the primary producer is inimical to the development of this country.

On motion by Hon. W. C. Angwin, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.38 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 17th August, 1920.

	Page
Swearing in	126
Obituary, Hon. Henry Daglish	126
Adjournment, special	127

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

SWEARING-IN.

The Hon. Ephraim Mayo Clarke, who was not present when members were sworn in after the biennial elections, took and subscribed the oath and signed the roll.

OBITUARY—HON. HENRY DAGLISH.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [4.35]: Hon. members will have observed, I am sure with a great deal of regret, the announcement in this morning's newspaper of the death of the Hon. Henry Daglish, a gentleman who for the past 20 years has played a prominent part in the public life of Western Australia. His friends, among whom may be counted many old parliamentary associates, are well aware that for some time past he had been in failing health; and those of us who saw him immediately prior to his departure for the Eastern States to seek treatment, cannot but have been impressed with the splendid fortitude with which he bore his sufferings and his anxieties. It was just after the consummation of Federation that Mr. Daglish first became a member of the Parliament of Western Australia. He was elected for Subiaco as its first Labour member. The Labour party at

that time was a new party, a small party, and a struggling party; but so conspicuous was the ability of Mr. Daglish that when, about three years later, it fell to the lot of the Labour party to assume the reins of government in this State, he was by common consent chosen as its leader, and became the first Labour Premier of Western Australia. Subsequently he held office as a Minister in a Liberal Administration, and in all he represented the electorate of Subiaco through the lifetime of four Parliaments. After leaving political life he rendered very important service to the community as a member of the Arbitration Court. Whether as a public servant, as a member of Parliament, as a Minister of the Crown, or as Premier of this State, he devoted himself with single-mindedness of purpose to the best interests of this country; and those of us who were intimately acquainted with him cannot fail to feel the deepest sympathy with the almost tragic circumstances of his lingering illness and his death. I am sure that our sympathies go out to Mrs. Daglish and the deceased gentleman's family in their bereavement. I move—

That this House desires to place on record its appreciation of the public services rendered to the State by the late Hon. Henry Daglish, and to express its deepest sympathy with his family in the loss they have sustained; and that the President be requested to forward the foregoing resolution to the widow of the deceased gentleman.

Hon. J. EWING (South-West) [4.38]. It is with very deep regret indeed that I rise to second the motion moved by the leader of the House. I can claim to have been a personal friend of the late Mr. Daglish. I admired him in his political life, and I always found him a straightforward, honourable, and generous man. It was my privilege during the last two or three years to meet him very often, and I can endorse the statement of the leader of the House that the deceased gentleman's fortitude was quite remarkable. He gave very faithful and good service to the State. Although I was opposed to him in politics while I sat in another Chamber, I always found him a generous leader of his party, and a man willing and anxious at all times to further the interests of the State. It is with very deep regret that I second the motion.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY (Central) [4.39]: I desire to add my expressions of regret to those which have been uttered by the mover and seconder of the motion, and I believe I am expressing the opinion of all with whom I am associated when I say that the deepest sorrow is felt that there should be need for the motion. While I came into close contact with the deceased gentleman, I had political differences with him on occasion; but I always found him a good friend and an honourable opponent. In his position