

MR. DOHERTY (North Fremantle) : I have a grievance against an hon. member of this House, but I shall not follow the tactics of the Premier, who first subjected his enemy to the lash, and afterwards disclosed his name. I prefer to disclose the name at once. The hon. member to whom I refer occupies a seat on the Ministerial side of the House—in short, he is no other than the right hon. the Premier himself. My grievance against the Premier is that, although I have taken a great interest in the subject now before the House, and have studied up my points, I find that, in fact after fact and figure after figure, the Premier has forestalled me and left me stranded. I had made up my mind not to speak on this subject, but the electors of North Fremantle said it was my duty to express my opinion. They told me I was their representative, and I can fairly say I represent their bone and sinew, and I may also say that I represent the intelligence of that constituency. On the hustings, I promised the working men I would support the policy of the Government—the policy of protection. I am a protectionist, and always shall be, and that is what the people of North Fremantle wish me to be. And for what reason? They know perfectly well I will protect the industries which provide them work. They prefer to hear the hammers of prosperity ringing in the shipyards, and the hum of the spinning wheel and of the shuttle in the factory producing broad cloth from our natural product, wool. They know that those sounds mean the bringing up in this colony of a class of wealth-producing artisans. I know a good deal has been done by the Government for a certain class of workers in Western Australia, by the removal of the duties on mining machinery. I absolutely disagree with that policy. I think we should, in order to encourage local industry, have a duty on mining machinery. I object to large orders for this class of machinery going to a neighbouring colony—a state of things which means that our working people are losing over £4,000 a week. It is criminal that we should allow every article we want to be sent here from another colony. One hon. member (Mr. George), who is a good authority on mining and mining machinery, tells me that it is very difficult

for people in his line of business to get on, and that he is very much worried indeed. I think I am not betraying his confidence when I say that the other day he told me he employed a man and a boy, and that he intended to take the man into partnership, and he would arrange to look after the boy. I must say my sympathies are with that boy. I hope we shall see the time when that hon. member will have 100 departments, and 100 men in each department. I would like to read to hon. members the following extract from a *Morning Herald* interview with Mr. R. Teece, general manager of the Australian Mutual Provident Society, who recently visited this colony :—

Perth has grown enormously, but the houses are not to be regarded as desirable structures, in many cases. There is no drainage, and the sanitary arrangements are wretched; in fact, the sanitation at Kalgoorlie and Coolgardie is far ahead of that of Perth, probably owing to the more brainy, progressive men whom the goldfields have attracted. Hotel accommodation at the goldfields is equal to that provided in any of our provincial towns; not, of course, equal to the best in Sydney or Melbourne, but first rate, nevertheless. And water, which was unobtainable a couple of years ago, may now be had—a bath costing 2s., double the price of a drink. Rents are high, as may be supposed. A house rented at 15s. a week in Sydney would cost about £2 in Perth; in fact, rents are so high that the capital cost is paid in four or five years.

One of the causes of the high cost of living, we all admit, is the rent, but there is another cause which prevents an increase of population, and the result of which is the sending away of £80,000 per month. The fact is that men are afraid to bring their families here because we have not a decent system of sewerage. The Government should take this matter in hand at once. If we had a proper system of sewerage it would bring population here, and keep healthy the people who are here already, and would also give employment to surplus labour. Now is the time the sewerage work should be carried out; and if the Government will not take that in hand, why not give the Municipal Councils of Perth and Fremantle power to borrow money in the home market for the purpose? If population were brought, prosperity must follow. Figures cannot possibly tell us whether a population is contented or happy. The whole *crux* of the question as to whether the Government is good or bad is the con-

dition of the people. If you have a contented, happy people settled in a rational way, you have good government; but if the people are discontented and uneducated, we naturally say "There is bad government." I ask any member of the Opposition whether he can say we have a discontented people in Western Australia. Anyone who takes the trouble to go down the streets of the city will see about the best-dressed, happiest-looking labouring people and artisans in the world. A good deal has been said about the "meat ring." I think there is a good deal of "Mrs. Harris" about this particular cry. There is an old saying that wherever there is smoke there is fire. The member for West Perth (Mr. Wood) has told us he knows every house in Perth, and I would gladly join with him in an endeavour to discover the oppressors of the people to whom reference has been made. It would be a good thing if we could only discover those oppressors. We would be like Diogenes, only we would want two lanterns instead of one. No doubt every hon. member has received a letter or circular from one Clu Lee, in reference to the meat trade. That gentleman cannot possibly have understood there was an Alien Bill in the wind, or he would not have given so much publicity to his name. When I read his note, I thought of those lines by Bret Harte--

For ways that are dark and tricks that are vain,
The heathen Chinese is peculiar.

No doubt Clu Lee makes out a very good case. He says the monetary advantage in favour of live stock would amount to £60,000. May I tell hon. members that, taking his figures as 100,000 head of sheep at 6s., and 10,000 head of cattle at £4, the freight would amount to £70,000, but some men would go round and charter a vessel which would carry the stock for £10,000 less. That makes a difference of £60,000, which profit goes to the shipper in another colony. How many hands does he employ to distribute this amount? One or two--two to distribute the whole lot. Now, what is the case in the firm to which I belong? We have to pay £40,000 a year in wages as against £300 which he would pay. Is it not better that we should have some advantage, than that the trade should go

to the other colonies? Are we going to protect South Africa or New South Wales? No, it is our bounden duty to protect the people who are living here. The district of Kimberley to-day sends down from eight to ten thousand head of cattle. To whose energy was that due? To that of Western Australia. Does not our own country require protection? Certainly. I do not intend to take up the time of the House, but I must reply to the member for North Perth (Mr. Oldham). The pathetic appeal which that hon. member made to the House at the end of his address almost brought tears to my eyes. The hon. member drew a striking picture of the prophet Elijah turning his face to the East three times a day, and compared the position of the prophet with that of the people in this colony, whose faces are invariably, according to him, turned towards the East. I am not a biblical student myself, but I have consulted a gentleman who is an authority on that subject, and he says that it was Daniel who had his face turned towards the East, and not Elijah. Then one member brought in the patriarchs, on the question of frozen meat, but what the patriarchs had to do with frozen meat I am still unable to understand. They had in their time, no doubt, a great deal of difficulty to live, and, when they had not sufficient of their own, they made a desperate rush on their neighbours, and secured all they could get. There is only one patriarch whom I know of who has anything to do with Western Australia, and he was put on to the water department. He went to the goldfields, and telegraphed to headquarters that "they made a way in the wilderness, and a river in the desert." One patriarch is enough in this country. I am sorry that the hon. member for East Perth is such a bird of passage. I heard his speech, but I am still in doubt what it really meant. A diagnosis of his case would show something like this: "I am, I am not. I would, I would not. I will vote, I will not. I will pair." I remember, with delight, some time ago hearing the hon. member address a large audience of working men. All the little shoemakers in town attended that meeting, at which he discoursed on protection. I wish he was plucky enough to come over to our side, where he might do some good. If he

took a serious view of the question. I think he would make a good member on this side of the House. I did not intend to say anything about the hon. member for South Fremantle, but he really asked me to. There is a unanimity about the members for Fremantle which I like: they all try to get as much money as possible out of the Government. The hon. member for South Fremantle said, "If you want anything from the Government, ask three times for it." If the hon. member got his way, there would be no surplus at all. It would all go to Fremantle. He went to the Government with a request containing 22 different items, one being for a road 42 miles long. Altogether, the money that he asked the Government to expend on behalf of Fremantle would have totalled up more than the two and a half millions required for the Coolgardie water scheme. I should not think that the Government would have much of a surplus, if they gave the Fremantle members all they asked. The hon. leader of the Opposition, in his own peculiar style, told us that the farmer would eat anything. I was told by someone in York that lawyers could swallow anything. There was a case there in which they swallowed a whole estate. The hon. leader of the Opposition also told us that the farmers did absolutely nothing: they were a bad lot.

MR. LEAKE: I do not think I said that.

MR. DOHERTY: You said they would not produce.

MR. LEAKE: I said they do not produce enough to feed us.

MR. DOHERTY: When I was in York I was shown the Leake estate, and I was told that the owner of that property did nothing with it, and that it was closed up.

MR. LEAKE: It does not belong to me. I have not got any interest in it.

MR. DOHERTY: The estate bears your name, anyhow. I have only one more gentleman to deal with, the hon. member for the Swan (Mr. Ewing). I regard him as a particular friend of mine. Outside this House he is one of my friends, but when he gets into his seat here I hardly know him: he is a lion in the House and a lamb outside of it. It is probable that, before the Federal Convention meets again, there will be a vacancy among the delegates, and I re-

commend the member for the Swan to fill it. There is said to be a lion in the path. Could we not send our lion to Melbourne, where he might be able to do some good? I notice that the member for North-East Coolgardie complained of the manner in which the duties were levied. I do not know if he is a pupil of the hon. member for South Fremantle, but there is no one knocks more frequently at the Treasury door than that hon. member (Mr. Vosper). Day after day you see in the papers that "Our intelligent member, Mr. Vosper, has got £500 for a school, and £800 for a road, and £500 for an institute."

MR. VOSPER: That shows I attend to my business.

MR. DOHERTY: You take the money from the farmer, and spend it on the miner. The other day the hon. member went to the Government with a telegram from Kanowna, saying that the population was increasing at the rate of 200 a day owing to the new find of gold, that the tucker was running out, and that there was not a drop of whisky in the place, and they wanted £500 to cope with the difficulty. (General laughter.) Their difficulty was the whisky. I will now bring my few remarks to a close. It is my wish that the Government will not fulfil their promise next session of reducing any of the duties. If they do, I shall vote against them. I think these duties are a necessity, and I think the country would, one and all, vote that we should help our local industries, and give every advantage we can to Western Australia, and to the people who live here.

MR. WILSON (the Canning): I have listened with considerable amusement to the remarks and the contribution of the member for North Fremantle (Mr. Doherty), and the connection his remarks have with the subject before this House, the policy of the food duties, I cannot perceive. There is one thing however that appears to me very patent, and that is his advocacy of his own profit for his own industry. I do not consider this most important subject from the standpoint of Messrs. Connor & Doherty, or that of Messrs. Forrest, Emanuel & Co. I want, if possible, to consider the question from the point of view of the people of this colony. The question has been approached