

of policy. Questions of individuals, questions of who should hold or should not hold office, honorary or otherwise, were not even approached. Only questions of policy were discussed, and we at all events—speaking for the delegates from this side of the House—approached that conference with a desire, if we could, to bring about that better state of affairs which it is admitted on all sides of this House it is desirable to bring about. But we could not then, and we cannot now, either with hon. members opposite or with any other party in this House, sacrifice what we believe to be the best interests of Western Australia, what we believe to be the true policy for Western Australia, at all events in the immediate present and future, that is a policy of administration rather than legislation. We cannot sacrifice that even though we should have to remain on these Opposition benches for years to come. Whatever may be the result of this division—and I hope indeed that all parties will agree that it shall be taken this week, so that the time of the country may not be wasted longer—whatever may be the result of this division, we—speaking for the party on this side of the House—shall, I trust, be found still doing our duty; and whether we remain on this side of the House or whether we cross to the other, that will be our sole object, to do our duty. If we remain here we shall continue to do, I trust, the duty of His Majesty's Opposition, using all the constitutional means within our power, but using only those weapons which men can use and do use with a sense of honour rather than with a sense of dishonour.

MR. C. J. MORAN (in explanation): I am sure members, and you, sir, also will allow me to make an explanation. I could not allow it to go forth that the Independents could control the policy of the Government, and yet be free from any responsibility to the country or the House. The Independents could not control the policy of the most powerful and honourable party in Australia, the Labour party. Were it a weak party without strength or organisation, we might; but we never sought to do so, and know that we are powerless to do so. That party, I believe, is above control. We are in sympathy with it. I believe farther, that we

could not get out of any responsibility. The full responsibility rested upon our shoulders and still rests upon them, for either keeping that party in power or putting it out. I may add that I reciprocate the generous, manly, and outspoken sentiments which have fallen from the lips of the leader of the Opposition in reference to the honourable negotiations which have taken place between us.

MR. M. F. TROY (Mount Magnet): It is with very great reluctance and diffidence I take any part in this debate; but I feel that when such an important matter as the life of a Government is being discussed it is but right and proper that I, as a member supporting the Government, should take some part in this discussion. I desire at the outset to reciprocate the remarks made by the leader of the Opposition when he said that this debate might be carried on without indulging in any mutual recriminations. I want to say that although I shall find it very hard to follow the example he set, I will do my utmost in this connection, and if I at all depart from the line of action I intend to take up, I hope that some degree of latitude will be allowed me in my endeavour to do what I think right and that I shall be credited with the best of intentions. I will only say that throughout the debate which has proceeded thus far there has been a good deal of talk about the question of alliances and about the meetings which members on this side of the House and members of the Opposition have had, and which members from this side of the House and members of the Independent bench have had. I feel I can safely say that whatever has transpired in connection with those discussions, has been of a nature with which the country can be made acquainted to the fullest extent. I am sure that no party—and I speak particularly of this party—has any desire to enter into any alliance or any coalition unless it be on the most honourable terms. It must be remembered that a meeting of the Independents was held, at which the question of an alliance was not discussed, because the Ministry or the Government called a meeting first of Ministerial supporters, and when the meeting of supporters was held, then the question of an alliance was discussed. It would have been criminal on the part of this

Government if they had not called together the Independents who had supported them so long and endeavoured to bring about stable government. [MR. THOMAS: Hear, hear.] And it would have been criminal on the part of the Government if they had not met the delegates appointed by the Opposition, with a view to bringing about a period of stable government, because unless this party can agree in one sense or the other, it must mean in the end an appeal to the country. I do not think that at the present time a dissolution would be in the best interests of the country. I say that not because I want it to be understood that I would be afraid to go back to my electors, nor because I want it to be understood that I would not be afraid to go back, but because I feel that if we have a dissolution, particularly at this time of the year, it will bring about a period of stagnation and bring on a portion of the people of this State a considerable amount of distress. I consider it is the duty of the Government to see that this condition does not obtain, and to use every honourable means in their power to bring about stable government.

MR. MORAN: What are the best means?

MR. TROY: To enable the Government to carry on with a majority.

MR. MORAN: That is the object. What are the means?

MR. TROY: With a view to the policy which has been propounded in the Governor's Speech being carried into operation.

MR. MORAN: There is no compromise about that. It means every horse going into one stable.

MR. TROY: That is the hon. member's interpretation; but I hold that if there are certain non-Labour members who say that they agree with all the principles of the Labour party, those members will make no sacrifice by throwing in their lot with the Government, and assisting in placing democratic measures on the statute-book. It has been said by some that the Government should not have treated at all with the Opposition, and should not have treated with the Independents. [MR. MORAN: There is a great difference between the two.] It is a great difference indeed; and it is ridiculous for any member to say he would have held aloof, and

would not have condescended to treat with any party. It is the duty of the Government to discuss any proposal which will tend to bring about stable government; and those people who say they would not depart from any position they have taken up are not taking a common-sense view of the position, and certainly not acting in the best interests of the country. I, when consenting that delegates should be appointed by this party (Labour), and that a coalition should be discussed, have always expressed the opinion that the terms and conditions should be set down in writing, and that every member who agreed to those terms and conditions should append his signature thereto. Only by that means can we prevent some people from going back on the statements they make.

MR. THOMAS: Give us their names. Do you refer to the member for Collie?

MR. TROY: No; I do not.

MR. THOMAS: He went back.

MR. TROY: I do not think so. I think the member for Collie possesses very high principles, and endeavours to carry out those principles. As to the no-confidence amendment of the leader of the Opposition and the Premier's reply, the Government has been acquitted of all or of the majority of the charges made against it. During the past twelve months, wherever members of the Opposition have addressed social gatherings and other meetings, they have always accused this Government of doing what was not in the interests of the country. They have gone out of their way to accuse the Government of administrative incompetence, and have pledged themselves to move a vote of no-confidence when Parliament assembled. And when that is done, what do we find? That those members are absolutely unable to substantiate any of the charges which they made before the House met. Those members say also that the measures passed by this Government were in the interest of a class, and against the interest of the country in general. They say this is Labour legislation. On the other hand, they assert that this party is not passing any Labour legislation. The Government is accused on the one hand of being a Labour Government and on the other hand of not being a Labour Government. So anxious have



Opposition members been to condemn the Government, that they have not been particular as to what means they employed to bring about its downfall. The only indictment which the leader of the Opposition has been able to bring against the Government is the indictment as to finance; and I think it will be acknowledged that the Premier has secured his own acquittal on the charge of maladministration. If he has not satisfied Parliament that his administration has been sound, I think it must be admitted that he has satisfied the country. Throughout the country it is generally admitted that the Premier's reply to the hon. member's charges has done the Premier credit, and acquitted him of the charge of maladministration. It has been freely asserted that the Government converted a surplus of £83,000 into a deficit of £46,500, thus making on the year's transactions a distinct loss of £129,000. But what do we find was done by the preceding Government? How were the finances conducted by it? We find that Government started with a surplus of £231,000, and ended its financial year with a surplus of only £83,000. In that financial year that Government incurred a loss of almost £150,000. Again, this year the revenue has not been so buoyant as in previous years. This year we received from the Federal Government a much smaller sum than was received last year when our predecessors held office.

MR. GREGORY: No; the revenue was larger this year. I gave the figures last night.

MR. TROY: The member for Menzies (Mr. Gregory) said the previous Government carried out a number of public works. This Government may not have spent so much on public works in Perth as the previous Government spent. This Government did not waste money by erecting ornamental buildings in this city, buildings which can serve no definite purpose. But if there has been much more expenditure by this Government, it has been on the development of our mining, pastoral, and agricultural industries. This Government, instead of erecting public buildings and carrying on what our opponents are pleased to term a spirited public works policy, has expended the money, not in the city, but in the development of the industries of

the country. The Government has been charged with throwing overboard the progressive public works policy initiated by its predecessor. What is that policy after all? We find that at a meeting of contractors held in Perth the action of the Government in departing from this policy is violently condemned; condemned because the Government will not spend money in the towns, so as to assist in bringing to and settling in the towns the greater portion of our population, instead of settling it in the country. And while Ministers spend money in developing the industries of the country, I shall always be most happy to support it. With regard to those persons who call themselves leaders of private enterprise, and who pride themselves on their strenuous individualism, we find that their enterprise means looking to the Government to provide contracts for which they may tender. We do not find those who pride themselves on their individualism going out to develop the resources of the country and striking out for themselves independently of the Government; but we find them always at the doors of Ministers endeavouring to secure contracts for the erection of buildings. I do not think that encouraging these people is in the best interests of the country; and if that is private enterprise in Western Australia, I think there is no harm in our abolishing that sort of enterprise.

MR. FRANK WILSON: But it is not, you know. You have made a mistake; you have found a mare's nest.

MR. TROY: Then I will get you to hatch the eggs. It is said Ministers have shown incapacity in the administration of their departments. This has been spread abroad throughout the country by one newspaper after another. Many of the papers in which hon. members opposite have interests severely condemn the Government, and condemn it in a manner which is absolutely unscrupulous.

MR. A. J. WILSON: Do not take the *North Coolgardie Herald* seriously.

MR. GREGORY: I thought he was speaking of the *Democrat*, with which so many Ministers were connected.

MR. TROY: I am speaking of the *North Coolgardie Herald*; because I think it is after all the most unscrupulous



organ in Western Australia, or the most unscrupulous this Government has had to deal with; an organ which circulates largely in the Mount Margaret goldfield, one of the outmost parts of the State. That paper has said that Mr. Hastie could not find the funds to help prospectors or reduce battery charges, because Labour members cannot exist on £200 a year, and billets must be found for them. That is a most unfair and unscrupulous statement. There were no billets found for Labour members in connection with public batteries, anyhow not to my knowledge; and that was not the reason why the public battery charges could not be reduced. Again, the paper said that Mr. Holman had to levy extra rates on those using the railways, so as to keep his supporters quiet. That is the sort of criticism levelled at this Government; and that is the manner in which people are educated as to how the business of this country is being conducted. Again it has been said:—

Mr. Taylor's hospital nurses must wait for the eight hours, and Mr. Johnson's workers must be sweated on contract labour, so as to enable the Government to find room for their friends and to satisfy their supporters in Parliament.

That is not so. Any fair-minded member of this House recognises that this Government, above all other Governments, when any appointments have been made, have allowed no political influence to be used; and knows that if an endeavour has been made to use political influence, the Ministers controlling the various departments have not been influenced by that political influence. Again this paper says:—

It is time to endeavour to discover one single good administrative action from the present occupiers of office.

I saw that article when I was on the Mount Margaret goldfield. It was printed in the *East Murchison News*, having been copied from the *North Coolgardie Herald*; and it was circulated over a large portion of this State. I found it when I was visiting my constituency; and I did my best to curtail the circulation of an article such as this. I believe the member for Menzies has a controlling influence in that paper, but I do not think he would be a party to such criticism as this. It is a system of criticism to which I do not

think any honourable person would be a party, and I think that, although the member for Menzies had a controlling influence in the newspaper, he had no hand in this.

MR. GREGORY: Allow me just one word of explanation. I can quite understand the insinuation in reading an article of this sort. Twelve months ago I did own the property in which this article was printed, but I was since foolish enough to hand it over to other people to form a company. True, I have some shares in the company; but there my responsibility ends. Perhaps if the hon. member had been fair he might have given some history of the *Democrat*, of which several Ministers of the Crown were directors; and I would not think that any such gentlemen would be responsible for any of the class of articles read by my friend opposite.

MR. TROY: I am pleased to accept the assurance of the member for Menzies. I can quite recognise, as I have already said, that he was no party to such articles and to such criticism as that. It is unfair criticism levelled against the Government, and to my knowledge it has done the Government a great deal of harm.

MR. GREGORY: You have never seen such criticism there as you have seen in the Murchison papers.

MR. TROY: No. I must confess that I have not seen criticism of that character in the Murchison papers. If criticism of that sort appeared in the Murchison papers it would not meet with the commendation of the people of Murchison. The member for York had a good deal to say regarding the administration of the late Minister for Lands (Hon. J. M. Drew). I know that members of this House recognise that Mr. Drew has done very good work indeed in connection with that department. [MR. FOULKES: Then why was he removed?] He has done considerably better work than any of his predecessors. He was removed because he had done such good work that the department had doubled its importance during his term of office, and the work had to be divided among two Ministers. Mr. Drew is a modest man. He is not one who goes about the country telling people what he is doing, and having himself photographed, and having his photograph in the *Western Mail* showing



him judging some poultry or some swine at a show. Mr. Drew does not care about going round the country and coming back to the newspapers and having himself boomed. He is recognised as a man who is not a faddist, but who is a practical Minister. In the Victoria District he has done a great deal for land settlement in this State, and nobody can deny that in connection with the administration of the Lands department he has done very good work indeed, and better work than his predecessors. [MR. GREGORY: He is the best Minister, because he is not bound down.] It may be remembered that while this hon. member, whom some gentlemen call a faddist, had to administer this important department he had at the same time to represent the Government of this country in the other Chamber. He was the only representative of the Government in the other Chamber, and he was compelled to take upon himself that duty as well as the duties of his office. The member for Boulder (Mr. Hopkins), who was the previous Minister for Lands, had some little to say the other night in connection with this matter; but I have noticed that since that hon. member was relieved of his Ministerial responsibilities he has religiously kept away from the House and has been seen very little in it. Therefore because he was absent, he is not in a position to say how the administration of this country was carried on.

MR. GREGORY: You know that he was ill.

MR. THOMAS: That is rather unfair. We all knew why he was absent.

MR. TROY: I withdraw that accusation if such was the case; but if he was ill, or if there was illness in his family, I had no knowledge of it. The member for York (Mr. Burges) in his usual wild and breezy, I might say bushfire, manner made statements regarding the Mines Department and said:—

The mining industry seems to be going down, for I notice by to-day's newspaper that there was a falling off in the exports of from £800,000 to £900,000. That is the statement I read this morning. I have not the report with me, but I can get it. It appeared in the *West Australian* newspaper, and that paper is generally correct.

With his usual extravagance and inaccu-

racy in all his arguments, the member for York made it appear that the gold-mining industry was in a very precarious position indeed. He said there had been a falling off to the extent of from £800,000 to £900,000, whereas there had been only a falling off of £70,000 in six months. I agree that in some parts of the State the gold-mining industry is not what it was in previous years; but in other portions of the State it is in a more prosperous condition than it has been during any previous time in the history of the State. I admit that in the outermost portions of the State, in places like Mt. Morgans and Peak Hill, the industry is not in such a flourishing condition as it was at one time. I believe that the big mines about Mt. Morgans are not doing so well now, and in one or two places on the Murchison the same thing obtains; but the prospecting industry is the chief branch of the mining industry, because it does more for the State than any other branch of the mining industry. On the Murchison particularly, through which I travelled a few weeks ago, the prospects of the mining industry generally are brighter and more prosperous than during the last five or six years; and this is not owing to the big companies, but is owing to the prospectors, to the men who have gone out and found new country, and who are working mines in the older districts which were abandoned by companies. Mines in some places also are becoming of much lower grade. There are not the same high values as existed in previous years; and this, to some extent, must also have an effect on the amount of gold produced. I should like to see more encouragement given in connection with this industry, and especially to the prospector, the man who does his utmost to develop this most important industry. We hear a good deal about the development of our agricultural industry and resources, and a little about the development of our pastoral resources; and we heard a little the other night about the development of our timber resources. I say that the agricultural industry in this State would not have progressed so far had it not been for the gold-mining industry, and that there would have been very little land settlement in this State. If this gold-mining industry is not encouraged and people



are not encouraged to go into the desert portions of the State, and if conditions are not made better for them and if every assistance is not given them, the gold-mining industry cannot flourish, and in consequence the agricultural industry cannot flourish. A little time ago a great deal of criticism occurred in connection with the administration of State batteries. I believe that the late Minister for Mines did his utmost to make these batteries pay and to carry them on in the interests of the prospectors and leaseholders generally; and I believe that the present Minister for Mines is using his best endeavours to put that system on a proper basis and to run it only in the interests of those for whom it was established. It has been said that a great delay has occurred in connection with the erection of some of our batteries. If this occurred during the term of the late Minister for Mines (Hon. R. Hastie), similar delays occurred in previous years. To my knowledge delays occurred in the erection of batteries at Menzies, Norseman, and Southern Cross. These delays are sometimes unavoidable. I do not think Ministers receive the fair consideration that they should get from people in connection with the administration of their departments. At Black Range when a boiler became of no farther use, some time elapsed before another boiler could be sent there; but I know that it was sent from Perth to Black Range and that the battery was working after only a month's loss of time; yet in the majority of the papers circulated on the goldfields—[THE MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The *North Coolgardie Herald* was one of them]—it was stated that three months had elapsed before the battery could again continue operations. That was not fair. On no other previous occasion has a boiler or any other material been forwarded so quickly or a battery been able to continue operations in the same time. I believe this State battery system is the most important system in our mining industry, and it would be wise on the part of the Minister to seriously consider the advisability of appointing the commission asked for the Prospectors' Association. I know a good deal of misapprehension exists as to the control and administration of batteries, and I think if the Government took this matter into their con-

sideration and appointed a Commission, it would clear up many grievances that exist to-day. I do not think the Commission would be a very expensive one, and recognising that it would inquire into an industry that has done so much for the advancement of the State, if it were expensive it would be money well spent. A little has been said regarding the purchase of the Midland Railway, and I as a representative of that portion of the State which will be materially affected by the purchase of the railway, cannot allow the debate to end without adding my quota to what has been said. The member for Forrest (Mr. A. J. Wilson) has been pleased to say the purchase of the railway will only be in the interest of a paltry handful of people.

MR. A. J. WILSON: The hon. member is misquoting me. If he wishes to quote what I say, he should do so correctly. I deny that I said the purchase of the line was in the interests of a handful of people.

MR. TROY: Perhaps I would be more correct in saying that the hon. member stated that the line would only give facilities to a paltry handful of people. Does the member consider that the people who live in the Irwin, the Geraldton and the Greenough districts, as also in the Murchison, East Murchison, Mount Margaret, and North Coolgardie districts are only a paltry handful of people?

MR. A. J. WILSON: Do you not want a line to Black Range? The people then can go round that way.

MR. TROY: The hon. member's ignorance of the geography of the State does not allow him to know that Black Range is a portion of the Murchison field, and the inhabitants embraced in that locality are included in the paltry handful of people referred to by that member.

MR. A. J. WILSON: People will be able to enjoy their summer holidays at Leonora then and not at Geraldton.

MR. TROY: I had hoped that the matter of the railway would have been fully discussed in the House, for the purchase of that line will be of material interest to the people of the Murchison, Geraldton, Greenough, and the Irwin districts. If the company are being compelled to sell the land because the Government of the State intend to bring into force a tax on the unimproved value



of land, then I say they will sell it not to any great advantage to themselves. I do not consider the amount asked for is altogether fair to the country; I think the property could probably be bought at a much lower price. It has been said that the Midland Company can sell their land and settle people upon it. If they do so they will make the railway of greater value, and if the company enhance the value of the railway, in the future the Government will have to pay a greater price because of the development of the land. If the land is developed the Government may in future have to pay as much for the railway as they are now asked to pay for the railway and land combined.

MR. A. J. WILSON: Are not the company entitled to something for developing the land? Are they not entitled to compensation for settling people on the land?

MR. TROY: I cannot take the hon. member's remarks as being serious, because I know he would consider it presumption on my part to question anything he says, and I do not wish at present to be accused of presumption. Whenever the member for Perth addresses the House he always gives a very enlightened exposition of trades unionism.

MR. A. J. WILSON: And the political Labour party.

MR. TROY: That is a branch of trades unionism, I presume. I have come to the conclusion at last that the education of the member for Perth has been confined to the demerits of trades unionism, for whenever he speaks in the House and is at a loss for an argument, or wants something to say, he gets back to his old subject, the injury trades unionism is doing the country, and the dominating influence trades unionism is having on the politics of the country. I have heard that member say that the Labour party should be condemned because its representatives are all members of trades unions. At a reception in Perth given to delegates attending a trades union Congress a few days ago, the member for Perth advised those present, if they wished to send representatives to Parliament, to select those representatives from their own ranks, and not go outside their ranks at all. I know what has influenced the hon. mem-

ber to speak in that strain; he is fearful lest he may lose his seat to one who has taken an active interest in political matters, although not a trades unionist, but one who has taken an interest in political matters and who when he speaks in this House will discuss far more important topics than can the hon. member for Perth. The Government are condemned because they are a Labour Government. It is a peculiar thing that not alone in Western Australia but throughout the whole of Australia, when the Labour party become numerically strong they earn the hostility of every other section in the community; but whilst they remain in a minority they are jolly good fellows and there is nothing against them: their policy is not wrong, it is a most progressive policy. But once they become the dominating factor, once they come into direct opposition or take their seats on the Ministerial benches, they become a dangerous element whose influence is absolutely against the interests of the State, they become a party who are doing considerable damage to the credit of the State. Not long ago in East Perth I had the honour of listening to a very able speech—[MR. HARDWICK: Hear, hear]—not by the member for East Perth but by Sir John Forrest, when he condemned root and branch the Labour party; yet what do we find to-day? That Sir John Forrest has so far forgotten his hostility to the party that he has gone back on what he said in this State by accepting a position in a Government that is kept in power by Labour men.

MR. A. J. WILSON: It is the Labour men who have forgotten his hostility.

MR. TROY: I have no doubt the same position would obtain in this State if the Labour party were in a minority and two sides were bidding for their support: the same condition of affairs would be seen in this House. We should find that the whole of the Labour members were jolly good fellows and their policy was the best in the interests of the State; but so long as we occupy an important position in the House we shall always be held up to the country as a bogey, a party that should be defeated at any cost.

MR. RASON: Your course is very plain then.



MR. TROY: A good deal has been said regarding preference to unionists, and the Premier has very properly in the Governor's Speech said it was the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill to provide for an amendment of the Arbitration Act. At once it is said the Premier's intention is to give preference to unionists. I know many people in the State and many members in Opposition think such a measure should not be passed by the House at any cost; but there is no great harm in such a measure: it is a very justifiable proposition indeed. Such a law exists in New Zealand and in New South Wales, and it merely gives the court power to grant a preference where the court thinks it desirable. A preference to unionists is desirable and justifiable because the court gives preference to those who are registered under the Act, and have taken on themselves all the responsibility and made all the sacrifices, but receive no more advantage than those who do not belong to unions, and who receive the same advantages as unionists. Although some members in Opposition say that preference is unjustifiable, yet the present Act provides for a preference. Only a few days ago Mr. Justice Parker said, in the Arbitration Court, that the court had power to give preference to unionists; so those who say preference to unionists is so harmful have assisted in passing a law through the House which gave the preference they now condemn.

MR. GREGORY: It must have been very vague when it was only discovered a few days ago.

MR. TROY: It has been said, and the leader of the Opposition said this to my great surprise, that the Labour party had harmed the credit of the country. [MR. RASON: Hear, hear.] The leader of the Opposition has in his time made many assertions, and lately he has seen his way clear to go back on those assertions. [MR. RASON: Oh, no.] I am sure that when he considers this matter fairly, he will recognise that the Labour party has not done anything to discredit the State, and that the existence of the Government of this State has not harmed the State's credit. The people who are harming this country's credit and the whole credit of Australia are those who have been called "the stinking-fish

party," the people who are always saying "The Labour party ruin the country"; the people who leave Australia and go to England, and who hold up to the people in England, who are ignorant of the position of things in Australia, the great harm and damage the Labour party are doing to Australia. I say that it is wrong. Not only is it wrong, but it is an unscrupulous opposition. It is disloyalty to the country, as the Minister for Lands (Hon. T. H. Bath) has said, and it can only reflect in the end upon those persons who go out of their way to make use of such base and contemptible arguments. Some members have said during the course of this debate that they disagreed with the Premier and with the policy of this Government, and without any recrimination at all I can only say I am pleased at the action which has been taken by the member for Forrest (Mr. A. J. Wilson). I think it is an action which should have been taken long ago, which should have been taken when this Government first took power; and I advise the Opposition when he takes his place amongst them, if they desire to have him brought to a sense of loyalty, to a sense of duty, and to a sense of honour, to do their best daily to swathe his head with wet bandages, and that failing that they will have invented an automatic machine which will serve the purpose of reducing swollen heads. [MR. RASON: I will make a note of that.] A few remarks have been made by the member for Mount Margaret (Mr. Taylor) which I very much regret. I do not think those remarks should have come from that hon. member, considering that whilst he condemned the Government he, with every sense of complacency and self-satisfaction, sat in the Ministerial office and assisted the Administration which he now condemns. [MR. TAYLOR: I have not condemned the Administration.] I want to say farther that last night we had an exposition—and I say it in all kindness to the member for Mount Margaret—of the manner in which he had made stupendous improvements in connection with the administration of his department, and we were again told of the sacrifices he had made in connection with the Labour movement. I really think that old argument is worn too thin. What we want now is not to know what



has been done in the past. I recognise with every sense of gravity that this party is on its trial, that the Government has been and is on its trial, and is acquitting itself very well indeed, acquitting itself to the satisfaction of a great portion if not a majority of the people of this State; and I think that the first duty of a Labour member to his party is one of loyalty. If one cannot be loyal to his party, he should take the only honourable course open to him, and not stay in a party and condemn it as this party has been condemned, but take up his position against the party. I think that not only will the party commend him if he does that, but the country will commend him as having taken the action of an honourable man. There is in this party a good deal of loyalty. There is a good deal of loyalty to Labour principles and to Labour ideas. People who talk about principles and indulge in a great deal of high falutin and give utterance to a lot of platitudes about the ideals and high aspirations of the Labour party should prove their sincerity by trying to put them into practical operation. It is very easy to condemn, very easy to pull down, but very hard indeed to build up, and I am sure that some of those people who condemn the members of their own party who are indeed doing their very best, would, when put to the test, be found to be wanting.

MEMBER: Do not look at the member for Beverley.

MR. A. J. WILSON: What member has condemned the Labour party?

MR. TROY: The member for Beverley. I do not intend to say anything more regarding the member for Mt. Margaret, beyond this. The hon. member talked about the strenuous fight he put up in Queensland; and whilst he may term as jellyfish politicians those who will not support him in the stand he says he has taken, I want to remind him that much language in a very loud voice and with emphatic gesticulation is not strength, it is only foolishness, and does not commend him in the eyes of this House, and certainly should not commend him in the eyes of the country. It is the easiest thing in the world for a man to get up in this House and say what he would do, and talk about the

backbone he possesses; but it is the hardest thing in the world to prove that he possesses that backbone, and that when put to the test he can carry out the promises he makes and the assertions to which he gives utterance too readily. I recognise that the Premier, in dealing with one or two members, possibly did not extend to them that courtesy and friendliness which I on my part would like to have seen him give them. Still, at the same time the mere fact that the Premier has replaced several members of his Cabinet by some other members is no excuse at all for those members bearing any hostility to the Government.

MR. TAYLOR: It has never been made an excuse.

MR. TROY: Because the Government, after all, are but the instruments of this party to place measures on the statute-book.

MR. TAYLOR: The party are the instruments of the Premier.

MR. TROY: I accept the excuse of the hon. member, because after all I do not wish to indulge in any more of this recrimination. What I have said has been said to remind the hon. member that this House will not be influenced by what I may call bombast. Every member on either side of the House has already judged the situation. If the members who have a grievance against the Premier will but emulate the example the Premier gave them when he was conferring with the Independents, if they will but say "I am willing to sink my own individuality, willing to work in the interests of the party and the interests of the country," this House must respect and commend them. I assert here that—no matter when it happens—if this Government goes out of office, and if, as some say, the inevitable result will be a dissolution—[MR. A. J. WILSON: Which you hope will not take place]—I do not profess to hope about these matters; I do not say, like some people, "Let us go to the country," because I know what it means. I know that if we go to the country, it will bring about a period of stagnation, and will be in the worst interests of the country. The member for Mount Margaret and the member for Forrest know that what they accuse me of is not correct. On this motion I shall loyally support the Government. I



do not think it is necessary for me to say that, because my loyalty so far has not been questioned, but I assert that I shall support the Government as loyally as I have outside this House and as I have so far in this House. I shall refrain from indulging in the recrimination which some have indulged in, and from endeavouring to make the position of the Government a more awkward one than it has been during the past 12 months. I feel it will be generally admitted throughout this country that the Government has indeed done well. It will be generally admitted that a party so inexperienced and so new to office, and not only so but so new even to the ordinary rules of this House, has indeed, whilst conducting the affairs of the country, conducted them honourably and creditably, and in a manner which has been in the interests of the whole of the people of the State. I do not think the Government has any fear in making another appeal to the electors. I want to say, in conclusion, that I shall vote both against the amendment and the amendment on the amendment, and use my best endeavours to keep this Government in power and to assist in bringing forward the legislation which has been embodied in the Premier's policy speech, and which I believe is absolutely in the best interests of the State.

MR. J. C. G. FOULKES (Claremont): The amendment by the leader of the Opposition is to the effect that His Excellency's advisers have not the confidence of a majority in this House. I think it hardly necessary to debate that point, because the speeches already made by various members drawn from the various parties in the House show conclusively that the present Government have not the confidence of a majority. Not only has an attack been made by the leader of the Opposition, but an attack has been made, and accepted in the spirit in which it was meant, by the Leader of the Independent party, and an attack has been made by members who have hitherto been supporting the Government. Those members have supported that attack with a view to ejecting the Government. So that as regards numbers alone, the Opposition can show from this debate that a majority of members in this House has not sufficient confidence in the Government to

keep it in office. One is correct in coming to this conclusion, judging by members' speeches; but whether one is correct in coming to that conclusion by reason of the votes which those members will cast, time alone will tell. The Premier has frequently appealed to members to keep his Government in office because the Government has been honest in all its transactions since it came into power. I do not like these appeals and protestations as to honesty. In most commercial transactions, immediately a man begins to boast of his honesty, in nine cases out of ten one has to take precautions for one's protection. These frequent protestations of honesty are apt to engender suspicion. I have every confidence in the personal integrity and honesty of every member of the Government. No one on this side of the House has accused them of dishonesty. But surely there is no need for members of an Australian Government, or of any Government under the British Crown, to make continual protestations of their honesty. We assume at all times that members of any Government in the British Dominions are honest. We know that, so far as I am aware without exception, ever since responsible government was granted in Australia, every Minister of the Crown has shown himself free from all corruption and dishonesty. I should like to bring to the Premier's recollection—and as he is not here perhaps the Minister for Justice will place the matter before him—that page in the history of Greece which deals with the career of a man named Aristides, who was practically ruler of Athens. He made continual protestations of his honesty. He made them so frequently that at last the Athenian people turned against him. They became so tired of his boast of honesty that they sent him into exile for 10 years. I therefore suggest to the Government that if they wish to remain in power they should take care that the fate of Aristides does not befall them. The Premier pleads for his continuance in office because the country is behind him; and he instanced the two recent by-elections for Brown Hill and Leonora. But he forgot to mention certain facts regarding those elections. He forgot to tell the House that the member for Leonora (Hon. P. J. Lynch) represents a constituency having no less