

coyne, and Dundas conscientiously vote for a land or an income tax or the abolition of the Upper House? These members are conservatives to the backbone, and can they vote for the preference to unionists? I came here as an independent, and I am as independent as any member.

MR. BOLTON: You are not independent now.

MR. H. BROWN: I am perfectly independent.

MR. BOLTON: But you have changed your seat.

MR. H. BROWN: I came in as an independent. I objected to Mr. James, for he was as rabid as some of the Labour party, but he was forced into the position by the Labour party in the House at the time, and I think it was very foolish of him to have given way so much. Can members on the Government benches candidly support the item in the Governor's Speech for the construction of the Pilbarra Railway by private enterprise? I say on this occasion, let members on the Government benches use the brains that the Creator has given them, instead of following the Labour platform. But members on the Government side have to vote as the political Labour party tells them to do: when the Ministry is in jeopardy they must sink all things, whether right or wrong, and vote for the party.

MR. MORAN: If no other member desires to speak, I should like to move the adjournment of the debate.

[MR. SPEAKER stated the question.]

MR. A. J. WILSON: I beg to move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion put, and negatived on the voices.

MR. F. GILL (Balkatta): I had no intention of speaking, but seeing that a certain amount of modesty is being exhibited, I shall try to do my best for a few minutes, and perhaps during that time some member will make up his mind to continue the debate. It would be a pity if we were to adjourn the debate at this early hour. [MR. A. J. WILSON: Adjourn, have a meeting, and then carry on.] Seeing that we have been sent here to carry on the business, we should bring the debate to a conclusion as early as possible. The adjournment of the debate at this early hour is

unreasonable; there has been so little of importance in the debate so far as it has gone. [MR. BURGESS: We look to you for something good now.] We are not making charges, we are here to rebut charges when they are made, but no charges worthy of being replied to have been made.

MR. BURGESS: I will show you where the honesty of purpose comes in, before the debate is ended.

MR. GILL: We have heard the speech of the leader of the Opposition, and I confess I was disappointed, as I generally look forward with great pleasure to the hon. member's speeches. [MR. RASON: I am so sorry.] You have some grounds for it. The speech the hon. member made in moving the amendment was disappointing, and I am sure it was disappointing to members on the Opposition side more than to members on the Government side. The hon. member did not seem to feel at all comfortable when speaking; and if the leader of the Opposition spoke the truth he would admit that he did not feel comfortable. The leader of the Opposition did not seem to be in his best form; but after hearing the reply of the Premier, I can see the reason for myself. The leader of the Opposition confined his remarks chiefly to the financial position. I am not a financial expert, therefore I do not intend to deal with details of that nature; but having heard the statement of the leader of the Opposition and the reply of the Premier, I am satisfied that any person, be he biased or unbiased, must acknowledge that there was nothing in the charges made or in the indictment put forward. After the reply of the Premier, there is nothing for members on this side to answer.

MR. RASON: Or before.

MR. FRANK WILSON: The Premier admitted the charge.

MR. GILL: That is news. There was one matter that the leader of the Opposition did not bring forward, and to me it appeared of some importance, and no doubt the Government will see that the matter receives the attention that its importance demands. I refer to that charge, and it was one of the most serious of the charges why the Ministry should be put out of office, that the member for Hannans had the audacity to champion



the Ministry somewhere or other. This point was put forward in a serious manner and given a place of importance in the indictment against the Government. Farther than that, I fail to see any ground for the charge, and with the member for Ivanhoe, I can only say that the object of the leader of the Opposition in moving the amendment was that he desired to put the Government out of office, not in the interests of the country—but in the interests of themselves. I think that is the plain English of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not impute motives.

MR. GILL: I do not wish to impute motives, and if the remark is not strictly in order I will withdraw it. I am only too anxious that—as the leader of the Opposition suggested, and I quite appreciate his opening remarks—this debate should be continued and carried through without any personalities whatever. [MR. FRANK WILSON: You are commencing badly.] It was a slip on my part; I had no intention of dealing with personalities. However, I am only too pleased to continue in the way the leader of the Opposition suggested; and I believe that up to the present it has continued in that direction, and that nothing of a very personal nature has been indulged in; in fact the debate has been somewhat dreary, generally speaking. [MEMBERS: Hear, hear.] In dealing with the indictment itself, I am really at a loss to find what the charge is against the Government, and I hope the leader of the Opposition will prime those members on his side of the House who are to follow, that he will give them something of a tangible nature that the Ministry can reply to. [MR. A. J. WILSON: What do you suggest for priming?] Something the Ministry will have an opportunity of replying to. At any rate, we have the member for Boulder (Mr. Hopkins) who stood up here and gave instructions that we had to clear our decks for action, and intimated that he had done so and was prepared to pour a broadside into the Treasury benches. But what was the result? He anticipated what the Ministry might do for the future, but he was not certain of this even, and that was the sum total of the charges made by the member for Boulder. He is generally

able to fire a pretty heavy gun, but on this occasion he used blank cartridge, having nothing else at his disposal, evidently. With regard to the member for Perth (Mr. H. Brown), I would like to say a word or two on some remarks he made. One of his remarks was that the Ministry have come down with a lot of drastic legislation in favour of their own particular friends the trades unionists. That is a most ridiculous statement. Any person can stand up in this House or any place to make a general charge of that description. Why did not the hon. member point out the drastic legislation he was alluding to, and state in what way it was framed or brought forward in the interests of friends, or Ministers or members on this side of the House? Charges of that sort fall to the ground; there is nothing in them; in fact they are not worthy of the notice of members generally; but you do not like to let those statements go forward to the world without contradiction. He also dealt briefly with the day-labour system. That is a matter we expected him to deal with. We know that he is a great opponent to the day-labour system. Whether it is from conviction or not I do not know. But one would have thought that from the experience he has had in the City Council and from the experience of some works carried on by the contract system, he would have been an advocate for some other system so far as giving it a trial is concerned, at any rate to see if improvement could be made; but we find that he is still as great an opponent as ever.

MR. MORAN: I think the principal trouble now is to get work of some kind. That is more important than whether the work is to be done by day labour or contract.

MR. GILL: We have an instance. An hon. member interjected with regard to the Wellington Street drain. That should be an object-lesson to the member for Perth to-night. We are given to understand now that the work having been a failure, it will cost some £2,000 to put it in order again. That is a very serious matter to the residents of Perth. We also find the same state of affairs prevailing in regard to one of the roads in one of the north wards of the city; and this is another instance of his contract system



--a system which I maintain has proved a failure, with regard to such works, at any rate. A statement I heard made in the East some time ago by a foreman on a contract strikes me as carrying a good deal of truth in it. In discussing the question of contract *versus* day labour, he said, "The contractor does not make his greatest profit out of the work he does, but out of the work he shirks." There must be a good deal of truth in that statement, if we judge by the results we see in and around Perth. There was one other matter which the hon. member mentioned. He brought up that old sore, the coast *versus* the goldfields, and that was with reference to the price of water. He stated that the Minister intended reducing the price of water on the goldfields, but that although they are getting the water there for 3s. per thousand gallons, the people of Perth, where there is a gravitation scheme, are paying at the rate of 2s. a thousand; but he failed to mention the fact that the late Minister for Works, who is Minister for Mines at the present time, indicated some few weeks ago that it was his intention, or the intention of the Public Works Department, at a very early date to reduce the price of water for the city of Perth. That is a matter he forgot, conveniently I dare say, for the time. [MEMBER: It has never been attempted before.] It has never been attempted before; but I think that in all fairness he should have mentioned that matter to-night. I do not intend to pay any more attention to the member for Perth; nor do I intend to continue this debate any longer; but I would say I hope that the members of the House will bring the debate to a very early conclusion. Unless we have something of more importance brought forward than we have up to the present there is nothing at present against the Ministry. The Daglish Ministry has been in power for 12 months, and if we judge it by what has been brought against it, we can only say it has been an exceptionally successful Ministry.

MR. GREGORY: That is why you made the change?

MR. GILL: They are too successful.

MR. HEITMANN: That is why you (Opposition) want to make another change.

MR. GILL: If there is nothing more serious that can be brought against the Ministry than has been brought against it by the leader of the Opposition—and I look upon this as the main charge, as he has been undoubtedly for a long time preparing for this, his greatest effort-- [MR. RASON: Oh, no]—well, I am only judging, of course, by the remarks which have fallen from the hon. member at different times. I know that some months ago he indicated at Midland Junction that he intended to take this action as soon as Parliament met, and on different occasions since.

MR. RASON: And months ago you were going to defend; so you have been preparing too.

MR. GILL: I think I am justified in assuming at any rate that the hon. member has been for some time preparing for this his greatest effort; and what has it resulted in? He has not brought a serious charge against the Government—[MR. HEITMANN: Froth]—nothing more substantial than froth. I hope members will follow the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition and vote in the interests of Western Australia. He advised members, or pleaded with members, to do their duty to the country and vote in the interests of the State. If they vote in the interests of Western Australia they will vote to keep the Ministers at present in power for another term. [MR. BURGESS: Shocking!] If the member for York or any others have any doubt about going back to their constituencies in the event of voting to keep the Ministry in power, I advise them simply to take the speech of the leader of the Opposition and the reply by the Premier, and that will be ample justification for their supporting the Government.

MR. H. CARSON (Geraldton): I desire briefly to refer to the public works policy of the Government as enunciated in the Governor's Speech, and also to intimate to the Government how I shall vote, or the attitude I shall take up in respect to some of the legislation foreshadowed, and also let the House know how I shall vote on the Address-in-Reply. Whilst I believe that all the works the Premier has enunciated in that Speech are very necessary for the fullest development of the vast resources of this huge