

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

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

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

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

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

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

Hon. F. Connor : Government by caucus.

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

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

Hon. F. Connor : Do not worry.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Hon. J. F. Cullen: The lot.

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

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

Hon. J. CORNELL: What is capital?

Hon. M. L. Moss: Sovereigns.

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

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

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

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

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

Hon. W. Kingsmill: The simple life?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Hon. F. Connor: Minority rule.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Hon. F. Connor: Brisbane.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Hon. M. L. Moss: They did.

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

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

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

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

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

Hon. W. Patrick: Rubbish!

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

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

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

Hon. W. Patrick: That is absolute rubbish.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Hon. J. CORNELL: Oh, no.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

House adjourned at 9.23 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 4th July, 1912.

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

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

QUESTION—FRUIT INDUSTRY.

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

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

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

MOTION — FREMANTLE COUNCIL ACCOUNTS.

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

PAPERS—PETITION OF JOHN MAHER.

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

QUESTION—FORMAL MOTIONS.

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

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

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

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

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

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