

BILLS (2) FIRST READING.

- 1, Merchant Shipping Act Application Act Amendment.
- 2, Midland Railway.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

House adjourned at 8.11 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 22nd October, 1919.

	Page
Questions: Hampton Plains, Woodline extension ...	985
Justices of the Peace ...	985
Horse Purchases, Defence Department ...	985
Railway Extension, Yuna-Mullewa ...	985
Select Committee, State Children Department, extension of time ...	985
Leave of Absence ...	985
Personal Explanation, incorrect division list ...	985
Bills: Merchant Shipping Application Act Amendment, 3R. ...	985
Midland Railway, 3R. ...	985
Prices Regulation, Com. report ...	985
Road Districts, Com. ...	985
Constitution Act Amendment (No. 3), 2R. ...	989
Annual Estimates, 1919-20: Votes and Items discussed ...	995

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

QUESTION—HAMPTON PLAINS, WOODLINE EXTENSION.

Mr. LUTEY asked the Minister for Mines: Has there been any application by the woodline companies for permission to run spur lines to, or near, the new finds at Hampton Plains?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: No.

QUESTION—JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.

Mr. PICKERING asked the Premier: In view of the decision of both Houses of Parliament, will he consider the question of withdrawing all commissions of the peace, with a view to an equitable distribution of such commissions in the spirit of the Justices Act Amendment Bill?

The PREMIER replied: No.

QUESTION—HORSE PURCHASES, DEFENCE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. MALEY asked the Premier: Will he make representations to the Defence De-

partment to ensure that any horses required for artillery or other purposes within this State be purchased locally?

The PREMIER replied: Yes.

QUESTION—RAILWAY EXTENSION, YUNA-MULLEWA.

Mr. MALEY asked the Minister for Lands: 1, Has he given consideration to the suggested extension of railway from Yuna to Mullewa? 2, Is he aware that this connection, if made, would obviate the haulage difficulties on the steep gradients of the present Geraldton-Mullewa line? 3, What area of land is it estimated the extension of this railway would make available for selection outside a 12-mile radius of present railway facilities? 4, What area has been already alienated outside this radius?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, No, but information will be obtained. 2, No. 3, 132,560 acres. 4, 21,440 acres.

SELECT COMMITTEE, STATE CHILDREN AND CHARITIES DEPARTMENT.**Extension of Time.**

Mr. SMITH (North Perth) [4.35]: I move—

That the time for bringing up the report of the select committee be extended for three weeks.

The committee have sat on a good many occasions and have taken a considerable amount of evidence, but we find that the work still to be done will prevent us from submitting our report in less than three weeks from now.

Question put and passed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. Hardwick leave of absence for two weeks granted to Mr. Piesse (Toodyay) on the ground of ill-health.

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

- 1, Merchant Shipping Act Application Act Amendment.
- 2, Midland Railway.

Transmitted to the Legislative Council.

BILL—PRICES REGULATION.

Further report of Committee adopted.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—INCORRECT DIVISION LIST.

Mr. MALEY (Greenough) [4.40]: I desire to make a personal explanation. The "Hansard" report of the division taken on the amendment moved by Mr. Angwin in

Clause 222 of the Road Districts Bill, appearing on page 931 of the current number of "Hansard," omits my name from the eyes. I can ask the Colonial Secretary to vouch for the fact that I took part in the division. I have been informed that although the "Hansard" report of the division may be wrong, the "Votes and Proceedings" are always right. However, the same error has occurred in the "Votes and Proceedings." I should like to have the error corrected.

Mr. SPEAKER [4.41]: The hon. member drew my attention to the matter yesterday, and I told him that the error would be rectified.

BILL—ROAD DISTRICTS.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 16th October.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; the Minister for Works in charge of the Bill.

Postponed Clause 86—Voting in absence:

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: In order to meet the point raised by the member for North-East Fremantle, I move an amendment—

That in Subclause (1), line 11, after the words "or of any other district" there be inserted "or to any person whom the Minister may appoint."

Of course there will be certain consequential amendments.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The amendment will get over the difficulty to which I drew attention, for we have throughout the State a large number of postal vote officers whom the Governor could appoint to take absent votes under this Bill also. But before the Bill passes another place, the Minister might look into the question of providing that a person who resides outside the distance provided in the Bill, or a person who is disabled by sickness, may apply to have a postal vote sent to him. This course might obviate the appointment of a large number of postal vote officers in road districts. Only large areas are affected.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I will certainly look into the matter, as the hon. member suggests. The member for South Fremantle, the other night, was a little doubtful as to the meaning of the word "writing." If he will turn to the Interpretation Act he will find that the difficulty he fears is non-existent.

Mr. ROCKE: I am glad the Minister has called attention to the provision in the Interpretation Act. According to that, a recent election held in the Fremantle district could be upset. Apparently the returning officer concerned knew nothing whatever about the provision in the Interpretation Act.

Mr. MALEY: The conduct permitted under the existing Act has been nothing short of scandalous. I should like to see a provision inserted prescribing that any rate-

payer requiring a vote in absence shall obtain in writing the approval of the returning officer. In the past any justice of the peace has been required to issue a postal vote to any ratepayer who demanded it. If the provision I suggest were inserted, it would overcome a very serious objection to the principle of voting in absence.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: As I have said, the point will be carefully gone into. When the regulations are being framed we shall endeavour to provide against the irregularities that have occurred in the past. We propose to have a new form for the ballot papers and on this the provisions will be shown.

Mr. MALEY: The Act provides that the returning officer shall prescribe the forms for the election. He could take them around himself, or he could employ any road board official to take them round.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: He could not do that under this clause.

The Minister for Works: These forms will all be numbered.

Amendment put and passed.

The CHAIRMAN: In Subclause (2) of the same clause it will be necessary to have consequential amendments made.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move—

That the consequential amendments necessary to give force to the previous amendment be made.

Question put and passed.

The CHAIRMAN: That motion will apply to Subclauses (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (9), and (12).

Mr. WILLCOCK: Subclause (6) provides that every ballot paper shall bear a distinct number. Will not that allow of any paper being traced by an interested party?

The Minister for Works: How could he get hold of them?

Mr. WILLCOCK: A candidate would have a scrutineer present and that scrutineer could trace the numbers. In the event of an elector having for a consideration agreed to vote in a certain direction, the candidate interested could instruct his scrutineer to watch for that elector's ballot paper. There would be no secrecy about the ballot. The ballot papers should not be identifiable.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: In theory, what the hon. member suggests could be done, but in actual practice it could not. The scrutineer could see the ballot paper, certainly, but he could not trace from which district it came, nor would he have time to note the numbers. Even if he did, it is unthinkable that he would be able to go to the officer who issued the ballot paper and get him to show the counterfoil, in order that the necessary search might be made. I do not think there is any possibility of infringement of the secrecy of the ballot. The numbers are necessary to permit of the tracing of the issue of ballot papers in case of any question arising as to the validity of the election.

Mr. MALEY: Is it intended to issue to each ratepayer who wants to vote in absence an individual paper for each vote that ratepayer possesses? If this were done it would in some measure protect the secrecy of the ballot.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It must be remembered that the system is not yet in proper form. I can assure the hon. member that every precaution will be taken to see that there is no hanky-panky. The regulations will be submitted to the road board executive and to such persons as may be able to give advice. There will be no attempt made to interfere with anything but past abuses.

Mr. WILLCOCK: I am not yet satisfied. On these postal vote slips a definite number is to be printed which will make them identifiable. I object to numbers on a ballot paper. There are no numbers on parliamentary ballot papers and there should be none on road board ballot papers.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I cannot see what difference it makes.

The Minister for Works: The member for Geraldton said "for a consideration."

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Then that would be bribery, and it would serve the man jolly well right if he was found out. I do not care if every ballot paper is marked. We want to stop the pernicious practice of justices going from door to door for votes. The other point does not matter a hang. I remember that years ago, when standing for a seat in a municipal council, I had a majority of the votes before election day. That could not happen now. At the present time, we find justices of the peace, among them land and estate agents, going around trying to get a particular candidate into a council in order to block certain things which are for the benefit of the residents. This clause will prevent that sort of thing.

Mr. PICKERING: It is quite necessary to number the ballot papers, otherwise there would be no check on the number of ballot papers issued, and a dishonest person might issue them improperly.

Clause as amended put and passed.

Clause 155—Allotments shown on plans not to be further subdivided without consent of board:—

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move an amendment—

That in lines 2 and 3 the words "whether such plan has been approved before or after the commencement of this Act" be struck out, with a view to inserting other words.

Last week I agreed to postpone this clause in order to meet the objections raised and, if the words are struck out, I intend to move three new subclauses which will overcome the difficulty.

Mr. THOMSON: The proposed new subclauses do not appear on the Notice Paper. The clause as drafted would be quite satisfactory.

Mr. ROCKE: You did not hear the debate.

Mr. THOMSON: I regret that I did not, but I have attended meetings of the Road Boards Association—

The Minister for Works: The Road Boards Association approve of this.

Mr. THOMSON: I prefer the clause as it stands.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move an amendment—

That the following subclauses be added:

—“(3) Any ratepayer may, within 14 days from the approval by the board of any further subdivision as aforesaid, appeal to the Minister against the granting by the board of its consent and, if the appeal is allowed, the Minister may annul the consent of the board. (4) Notice of every appeal and of the time and place appointed by the Minister for the hearing shall be given by the appellant to the board and the board shall be entitled to be represented on the hearing of the appeal. (5) Every appellant shall deposit with the Minister the sum of £5, to be forfeited to His Majesty if the appeal is dismissed, or returned to the appellant if the appeal is allowed.”

Mr. PICKERING: Should not there be a time limit for the notice of appeal? A similar provision appears in other parts of the measure.

The Minister for Works: Provision is made for any ratepayer to appeal within 14 days.

Mr. PICKERING: The difficulty is that we have not the amendment before us in print.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The amendment is a great improvement on the clause, especially as it will empower any ratepayer to appeal if he considers it is in the interests of the public health to do so. Last evening I received a letter, dated 21st October, from a gentleman in Perth, who knows the position thoroughly, pointing out that during the last two days a person who owned two lots each of 40ft. frontage in the city of Perth had divided them into three blocks each, having a frontage of 26ft. 8in. and that the plan of subdivision was approved a few days ago by the Perth City Council and lodged in the Titles Office. Also, within the last 10 or 12 days, a person had sold the back portion of his land having a frontage only to a right-of-way and not to a street.

The Minister for Works: What were the Perth City Council doing?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The city council have no power under the Municipal Corporations Act to prevent it. I have made provision for it in my amending Bill. This shows the necessity for such legislation to prevent the occurrence of slum conditions.

Mr. THOMSON: I hope the member for North-East Fremantle is correct in his statement, but I fear the amendment will not give much relief. It is damnable that in a

State like this, where there is so much land, blocks are being cut up with a frontage of only 26ft. This sort of thing must lead to slums.

The Minister for Works: We have them in places now.

Mr. THOMSON: Unfortunately we have.

Mr. Rocke: We have them in Fremantle worse than in London.

Mr. THOMSON: I would not go so far as that, but it is a pity that we have slums in a new country.

Mr. Green: Did you read the Fremantle "Herald's" exposure of the slums of Fremantle?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They have not lived in Fremantle long enough to know anything about the place.

Mr. THOMSON: We should prohibit any land, having less than 66ft. frontage, being subdivided for residential purposes. That standard should be set up in this Bill. I have long been connected with road boards and sometimes, unfortunately, members of those boards are interested in subdivisions.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I refer the hon. member to the second schedule of the Bill, paragraph 2—"Plans of buildings to be approved by the board." Portion of that paragraph reads—

It shall be unlawful for the board to approve of any plan which does not show that every proposed building intended to be or capable of being used as a dwelling-house will have in the rear or on one side thereof an open space, exclusively belonging thereto, of the following extent, namely, an area equal in width to the full width of that allotted to the building, and of a depth of at least 20 feet, and that the area of such building and open space will together be not less than the area for the time being fixed by proclamation as the minimum area to be allotted to any building in the locality (defined in the proclamation) in which such building is to be erected. No building shall be commenced until a plan and specification thereof shall have been laid before and approved by the board in manner aforesaid, and no building shall, without the consent of the board, be erected or constructed otherwise than in accordance with such plan and specification.

Mr. Thomson: Are these regulations mandatory upon every road board, or can they be brought into existence as required?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I think that the hon. member will find that the Bill will be all right.

Mr. MULLANY: It appears to me that this gives very little encouragement to any ratepayer to appeal to the Minister. There may be reasonable grounds for making an appeal which the Minister would be inclined to accept. I think this should be left to the discretion of the Minister.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not object to this being left to the discretion of the Minister, and with the permission of the Committee, I will substitute the words

"which may" for the words "to be." The subclause will then read:—"(5) Every appellant shall deposit with the Minister the sum of £5 which may be forfeited to His Majesty if the appeal is dismissed, or returned to the appellant if the appeal is allowed."

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. WILLCOCK: Perhaps an amendment could be moved to provide for any appeal which may be frivolous.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is left to the discretion of the Minister.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Schedule 1—agreed to.

Schedule 2:

Mr. THOMSON: What is the position in regard to paragraph 2 of this schedule? Would it be compulsory upon roads boards to abide by these building regulations, or are these to be part and parcel of the Act?

The Minister for Works: They would be part and parcel of the Act or they would not be here.

Mr. THOMSON: Must everyone in future, who is erecting a building in a road board district, submit his plans and have a sufficient area of land surrounding such building?

Mr. MALEY: What will be the qualifications required in a surveyor in this connection? Must he be a building surveyor?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Paragraph (1) of the regulations says that these are not part of the Act, but will only be adopted as the road boards think necessary. When it is necessary to bring them into operation this will be done. In some districts it is not necessary that this should be done. If the building by-laws had been put into operation many years ago by the local authorities, people would not have been able to put up the make-shift homes they did but which have since grown into comfortable residences.

Sir H. B. LEFROY: Under Clause 20 of the Bill these regulations will only apply to such districts as the Governor in Council may make them applicable.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That means at the request of the road board?

Sir H. B. LEFROY: I take it that this is so.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The position as set forth by the member for Moore is the correct position. Until Clause 201 is carried into effect the regulations do not apply. The road boards throughout the country must set it in motion, and the Governor in Council will then deal with the matter.

Mr. THOMSON: The Minister stated that these regulations would apply, and the member for Moore has pointed out that they would only apply if the board wished them to do so.

The Minister for Works: You were so involved that I misunderstood you.

Mr. THOMSON: I want to compel every road board to abide by these regulations. It is a crime that we should permit, in any portion of the State, houses to be built close to each other as is the case in the metropolitan area. To-day what may only be a road board centre may in time to come be a large city. If we cannot do anything now to make these regulations compulsory, perhaps something can be done in another place.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have never known a man engaged in building who has not always endeavoured to bring about compulsion so far as building regulations are concerned. Architects are just as bad. The Bill as it stands is correct. If members of road boards are of opinion that the district is advancing to such an extent that it is necessary to adopt by-laws such as these, they can frame them. The area is limited under the Bill. The Minister has just inserted a clause to provide that an area shall not be re-subdivided without the consent of the board and without giving the ratepayer the opportunity of objecting.

Mr. Thomson: To what extent are they limited?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: To half an acre. The Minister has just stated that to assist the road boards it is proposed to draft model by-laws and the road boards will be given an opportunity of adopting those by-laws, if they so desire. Then under Clause 159 power is given to the local boards to make by-laws independently of the model by-laws.

Mr. PICKERING: The second paragraph of the second schedule requires some explanation. It says, "and it shall be unlawful for the board to approve of any plan which does not show that every proposed building intended to be or capable of being used as a dwelling house will have in the rear or on one side thereof an open space exclusively belonging thereto, of the following extent, namely, an area equal in width to the full width of that allotted to the building and of a depth of at least 20 feet." Will the Minister explain what that means?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not think it is necessary to attempt to explain the paragraph which has been quoted to the member for Sussex, who is a professional architect. I should say that if a building was 36 feet wide there would have to be provided an open space 20 feet by 36 feet.

On motion by the Minister for Works the Schedule was amended by the insertion of the following paragraph to stand as paragraph (j)—"The numbering of houses."

Schedule, as amended, put and passed.

Third schedule :

Mr. ROCKE: I would like to call attention to something which I think needs to be rectified. It is provided, in connection with orders for possession or sale of land, that no application shall be made until the expiry of three months after a notice of intention to make the application has been given by the board. What is the meaning

of the words "has been given." The board may not be able to trace a person. Would it not be sufficient if a notice were posted on the property?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not think that would quite fill the Bill. The schedule states that no application for order for possession shall be made until the expiration of three months after the notice of intention to make the application has been given by the board to every person appearing, on search in the office of titles or registry of deeds, to have any interest in the land. That should be quite clear. If there should be a mortgage on the land, the notice would go to the mortgagee.

Mr. ROCKE: I do not see how a notice can be given if the address of a person is not known. A person may be away from the State. Provision should be made for notice to be sent by registered post and proof of that could then be accepted that notice had been given.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Clause 343 deals with service of documents on owners and occupiers of land, and it provides that when any document is required to be served on an owner or occupier whose name or address is not known or who is absent from the State, the document may be served by placing it on some conspicuous part of the premises referred to. That will meet the hon. member's objection.

Schedule put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT (No. 3).

Second Reading.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. T. P. Draper—West Perth) [5.0]: The object of the Bill is to amend the Constitution Act, and it deals with six subjects. The first one relates to making women eligible to become members of Parliament. Clauses 1 and 2 relate to this. The second matter referred to in Clauses 3 and 4 deals with the franchise of the Upper House. The third matter, dealt with in Clause 5, relates to the disqualification imposed upon members of Parliament as regards contracts with agents of the Crown. The fourth matter of this Bill is to abolish the necessity for a Minister, upon appointment as such, seeking re-election. Clause 6 deals with that. The fifth object of the Bill relates to the power of the Legislative Council to amend Bills sent to that House by the Legislative Assembly for acquiescence. The last clause of the Bill deals with an automatic prolongation of the life of Parliament for a few weeks. As regards the first object of the Bill, upon the question of removing the disqualification now imposed upon women from sitting in Parliament, no long discussion, I think, is necessary. In other countries the disqualification has been removed, as some recognition of the

part which women have played during the last four or five years, during the critical times of the war. I confidently expect that this amendment of the Constitution Act will be passed without opposition. As regards the next amendment, dealing with the franchise for the Upper House, I am not going to profess for one moment that it broadens the franchise; but Clause 3 provides the substitution of a new paragraph for the present paragraph (2) of Section 15 of the Constitution Acts Amendment Act, 1899. One of the qualifications for a vote for a province under the existing Act is being a householder within the province and occupying any dwelling house of the fair annual value of £17. A great deal of friction and uncertainty, and I think a good deal of heartburning, has been occasioned, especially on the goldfields, by reason of persons thinking they have a right to vote, and making claims to vote, under that qualification. Sometimes the claims have been rejected; and sometimes such persons have got upon the register and have voted, and then, I understand, have been prosecuted for doing so. Every time an election occurs, and especially upon the goldfields, friction arises under this provision. I have endeavoured by Clause 3 of the Bill to make the matter clear, and to remove at any rate this ambiguity. If the clause passes, the question of rates and taxes need not be taken into consideration at all. Voters are constantly asking the Chief Electoral Officer and returning officers what is the meaning of "clear annual value." While lawyers can answer that question, the general public seem to have very little idea on the subject.

Mr. Munsie: I have never known two lawyers to give the same opinion on that question yet.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The result has been hopeless confusion. "Clear annual value" to my mind means the value after deducting outgoings, such as rates and taxes. That is the general interpretation of the phrase. Therefore, if one calculates the value quite irrespective of rates and taxes, all ambiguity on that account is removed. But there is another difficulty. I believe questions have arisen—I do not know why—as to people being required to have been in the occupation of the premises for a year or thereabouts. In order to get at the actual value of premises, it is calculated on the basis of 6s. 6d. per week. If any hon. member likes to do a small arithmetical sum, he will find there is not very much difference between this and £17 a year.

Mr. Munsie: What about the man who resides in a house of his own? How is he going to value the house?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am dealing only with the amendment of the household franchise, and have not touched any other qualification. The paragraph proposed by this clause, in place of the existing paragraph, reads—

Is an inhabitant occupier as tenant of a dwelling house within the province.

The new paragraph goes on to define, for the purposes of this qualification, what a dwelling house is; and I think the words used will probably be familiar to the leader of the Opposition—

(a) The term "dwelling house" means any structure of a permanent character, being a fixture to the soil, which is ordinarily capable of being used for human habitation, and in respect whereof the occupier is liable for and pays a rent at the rate of not less than 6s. 6d. per week, irrespective of rates and taxes.

The essentials are that it must be of a permanent character and must be a fixture to the soil.

The term includes part of a building when that part is separately occupied as a dwelling: Provided that when a dwelling-house is only part of a building, and any other part thereof is in the occupation as a dwelling of some person other than the occupier of the first-mentioned part, such first-mentioned part shall not be a dwelling-house within the meaning of this section, unless it is structurally severed from such other part of the building, and there is no direct means of access between such parts.

That consideration will often occur in buildings. But a very simple example of what would be included in this new paragraph is the flat. Flats have no direct means of access between them, and their structure is severed in that sense, although they may be part of one building. The new paragraph proceeds—

(b) No person shall be qualified by reason of being a joint occupier of a dwelling-house.

(c) Where a person inhabits a dwelling-house by virtue of any office, service, or employment, and the dwelling-house is not inhabited by anyone under whom such person serves such office, service, or employment, such person shall be deemed to be an inhabitant occupier of such dwelling-house as a tenant.

As an instance of this among many others, let us take a house on a mine. It may have been built for the manager, or some other official of the mine. But it belongs to the mining company, though it is occupied by someone by virtue of his service or employment. He pays no rent for it; he occupies it by virtue of his office. This amendment would admit such a person to be qualified as a householder to vote for the Legislative Council.

Mr. Jones: Who would value the house if the tenant was paying no rent?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I do not think the question of a valuation of 6s. 6d. per week would trouble anybody very much. There are very few houses of a permanent nature which are not worth 6s. 6d. per week. In fact, I venture to suggest that this franchise, if adopted, will really admit anybody who is permanently residing in this State and is a householder of any description.

Mr. Lutey: The same thing was said about the last qualification of £17.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: In trying to meet that, I have brought in this provision.

Mr. Willcock: Why have a restricted value at all?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I suggest we can deal with that question in the Committee stage.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: A goldfields resident might have a house worth 6s. 6d. per week, without owning the land on which the house was built.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am quite willing to consider technical objections at the next stage of the Bill. Then there is another extension of the franchise, which is being brought about in view of the fact that many returned soldiers have found themselves disfranchised for the Legislative Council. It is hard to discriminate between those returned soldiers who have been disfranchised and those who have not. An Act was passed in 1917 providing that any elector for the Legislative Assembly should be deemed to continue to live in the electoral district in which he was registered when appointed an officer or enlisting as a member of the naval or military forces. As regards the Legislative Council, however, the qualification of residence was retained so long as the wife or the family of a soldier absent on active service remained in occupation of the house in respect of which the soldier was entitled to registration. That, however, does not affect any other qualification which he might have had. Many of the returned soldiers, as I say, have already lost previous qualifications on which they were entitled to vote.

Mr. Willcock: But it does not give a returned soldier a vote just because he was a soldier.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: No, but this clause will, whether he has the qualification or not.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Whether he left Western Australia or not?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: If he has served in the forces in the recent war.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: But he could have served here!

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The next provision deals with the question of contracts by members of Parliament. It is a matter which I desire hon. members to study closely for themselves. I will endeavour to give them references to some of the Acts which it will be necessary to deal with. The only exceptions at present to our contracts disqualifying members of Parliament are those relating to the occupation of Crown lands, and those where a member of Parliament is a shareholder in a company of more than 20 members. When this disqualification was originally imposed, long before Western Australia was thought of as a civilised country with a separate government and constitutional practice, it was imposed, of course, to prevent a contractor for public works, by reason of political influence obtaining contracts from the Government. That principle is perfectly sound, and I am not suggesting for a moment to increase the number of

exceptions where it is a direct contract by the member with the Crown as such. But the difficulty arises in this State owing to the number of agencies which have arisen—I call them agencies—agencies of the Crown, dealing with all manner of things quite outside the ordinary scope of government as it was understood when the Constitution Act was passed. It is a difficult matter to bring in an amendment of this kind, which will preserve the necessary safeguards of Parliament, and which also will be founded upon some definite principle. I have endeavoured to disregard all cases of individuals, and I am confining the instances generally to contracts not made with the Crown direct, but made in the ordinary course of business with separate corporations, with corporate bodies which in a sense are agencies of the Crown. If hon. members will look at Sections 32 and 34 of the Constitution Act of 1899, they will see that any person who directly or indirectly, himself or by an agent, for his benefit executes or enjoys in whole or in part any contract with the Government or its agent, or the person who acts for the Government, he is disqualified from holding a seat in this Assembly. Those words are very wide indeed. It is difficult to say what they will not cover, and the difficulty that I see is in deciding clearly what is an agency of the Crown. If all these bodies which have been made corporate bodies were regarded as agents of the Crown for the purpose of this Act, I have no hesitation in saying that a member of Parliament could not live in this State in the ordinary way at all. Everywhere one goes one comes across State agencies providing the ordinary machinery and requisites of civilised life, and if this wide interpretation is to be put upon Sections 32 and 34 of the Constitution Act, then life in Parliament becomes impossible.

Mr. Willcock: One could not have an agreement with the State sawmills.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Not on the wider definition. There must be no doubt about it: we require to make it perfectly clear what we can do. Bear this in mind, and look at Sections 32 and 34, and it will be seen there is a grave necessity for making the position perfectly clear. The point is not being raised for the first time in Parliament. I was looking at some debates of another place the other day, and I find the question was there raised by Mr. M. L. Moss some years ago. I am not certain that it did not get to a select committee. However, there is some valuable information to be obtained from the report of that debate. Perhaps owing to the lateness of the session the proposal, while it was received with favour, did not get beyond the Legislative Council. As an instance of what may be classed as agencies of the Crown, take the Commissioner of Railways. He is said to be an agent of the Crown. He was made a separate corporation by the Railways Act of 1904. And the Commissioner of Railways, of course, also governs the Tramways Act,

and has control of the supply of electricity as well. If the Commissioner of Railways is an agent for the Crown, no member of Parliament can contract with him. And, while we all have our passes, the question arises whether we could consign goods. Because a contract for the consignment of goods by railway is a contract from which one derives some benefit, and is made for one's benefit; otherwise one would not enter into it. If we are going to include under the word "agent" a corporation of this kind it will be impossible for a member to remain in Parliament.

Mr. Roche: He could not buy a railway ticket for his wife.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: If hon. members will read the words of the sections referred to they will see that they are exceedingly wide. Of course it is not likely that a court would construe the words in their widest interpretation if the court could help it, but the court might be forced to accept such construction, and it is time these provisions were put right. Quite a lot of institutions are controlled by personal bodies charged in a corporate capacity. Take the Agricultural Bank, which is governed by trustees. The trustees are a corporation. Members will see that in Sections 5 and 6 of the Act of 1906. Take, again, the Fremantle Harbour Trust, which is governed by the Act No. 17 of 1902. I am not giving this as an important instance, but the Fremantle Harbour Trust is a separate body and should be regarded as an agency of the kind I have been describing. The Fremantle Harbour Trust has power, amongst other things, to sell goods, and make a profit. I only mention this as an illustration. I do not regard the Fremantle Harbour Trust as of very much importance in this respect, but I am showing it as one of the so-called agencies of the Crown which might be covered by Sections 32 and 34. Besides the Fremantle Harbour Trust, we have the Bunbury Harbour Board. The powers of that board are very similar to those of the Fremantle Harbour Trust and its constitution is the same. Take, again, the Conservator of Forests. He is a corporate body, created last session.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: One of the bloomers we made.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The conservator of Forests may be said to be a Crown agency, and has power to make certain contracts. Take, again, the soldier settlement board, also a corporation. Hon. members will see that in Section 5 of Act No. 9 of 1919, the board has power in certain cases to make certain contracts. The board has no power to purchase land, but it has power to make minor contracts. They are not of great importance; perhaps Section 13 contains the only one worthy of consideration.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Water supplies afford a good illustration.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am coming to that. Take the Industries Assistance

Board. That is a corporation by Section 4 of the Act which can certainly be regarded as an agency of the Crown. I need not tell hon. members what is the kind of contract the Industries Assistance Board makes. The Minister for Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage is made a corporation under Sections 5 and 8 of No. 43 of 1909. He controls not only that Act but the Water Supply Act of 1893, the Goldfields Water Supply Act of 1902, the Water Boards Act of 1904, and the Rights in Water and Irrigation Act of 1914. He also controls other Acts which I will not just now mention.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Before tea I was dealing with the various bodies incorporated which might be regarded as agencies of the Crown, and I pointed out that the Minister for Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage is expressly made a corporation for the purpose of controlling, not only the Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Act, but also certain other Acts. The principal contracts under the Acts over which the Minister for Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage has control are contracts for the supply of water. I am not referring to rates; I am not suggesting that the water supply, for which there is an ordinary rating allowance, is a contract within the Constitution Act. The most one can say of that is that it is a statutory contract. In addition to the ordinary supply of water on the payment of rates, all these Acts contain provisions for the supply of water under agreement, subject to the conditions of such agreement. If members care to look at the Acts they will see that Sections 38, 43, 61 and 99 of the Metropolitan Water Supply Sewerage and Drainage Act, 1909; Section 3 of the Water Supply Act 1893; Sections 28 and 38 of the Goldfields Water Supply Act 1902; Sections 57 and 58 of the Water Boards Act 1904; and Sections 16 and 42, Subsection 2 of the Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914 all provide for contracts of the nature which I have mentioned. Now we come to what is a very important part of this subject, and a part which is constantly increasing namely, the State trading concerns. These are all incorporated under Section 6 of Act No. 12 of 1917. All these State trading concerns make contracts in the ordinary course of business for the supply of goods and material or the rendering of services which occur every day in the ordinary course of life. At the present time, we have incorporated as State trading concerns, the Government saw mills, the brick works, the implement works, the quarries, the State steamships, the State hotels, shipment of North-West cattle, and State ferries. There is also another State trading concern, the Wyndham meat works, which is incorporated under Act No. 16 of 1918. It seems to me ridiculous, by any implication or construction of law, that a member of Parliament should be prevented from purchas-

ing timber from the State saw mills, or bricks from the State brick works; or from buying agricultural machinery from the State implement works, or from buying stones from the State quarries, or from taking a passage by a State steamship, or making a contract for freight for his cattle or produce. There is also another contract which might be made by anybody. Suppose a person stayed at a State hotel for a week; that is a contract. I might also mention the State ferries. A contract, of course, does not necessarily have to be in writing. A majority of the contracts in the course of business are verbal, and it makes no difference whether the contract is verbal or in writing, so far as the purposes we are dealing with are concerned. The exceptions at present in the Act are contracts in respect of leases, or licenses or in respect of the sale of Crown lands. This is the only definite exception mentioned in the Constitution, and then we have the provision about being a shareholder in a company with more than 20 members. The additional exceptions which I propose to include do not apply to any direct contract with the Crown, and they do not apply to any contract, no matter with whom such contract is made, whether a Government agency or not, for the construction of a public work. That I have expressly kept out of the exceptions, because the construction of public works was really the foundation of this disqualification originally. Clause 5 of the Bill simply provides that to Section 35 of the Constitution Act Amendment Act 1899, which deals with one exception I have mentioned, shall be added, "nor to any contract or agreement, not being a contract for the construction of any public work within the meaning of the Public Works Act 1902, made in the ordinary course of business with the Commissioner of Railways or under the Government Savings Bank Act 1906, or with any person or body charged in a corporate capacity with the administration of any Act or any State trading concern." Those words, "or with any person or body charged in a corporate capacity with the administration of any Act or any State trading concern" apply to the various bodies which I have previously mentioned. So far I have adopted as a principle a contract with a body which has a separate corporate existence and which might be held to be an agency of the Crown. This is a safe guide to go upon. There might be individual cases to which the disqualification should not apply as a matter of common sense, but when once we attempt to deal with individual cases, we find ourselves in difficulties and it is very hard to discriminate. As an instance of that, I have not dealt with a case of the following kind: A member of Parliament who is a King's Counsel, and has thereby a perpetual retainer to act for the Crown, will still remain disqualified from taking a brief from the Crown direct. Once we attempt to deal with individual exceptions, a hard and fast line cannot be drawn, but there are one or two things I have had to include.

One is a contract with an authorised agent of the Minister of the Crown who is charged with the administration of the Wheat Marketing Act 1916. There is no corporate body dealing with the Wheat Marketing Act 1916, and there might be very simple contracts with the Minister of the Crown charged with the administration of that Act and certainly those contracts should be excepted. Then I have also made an exception to contracts made with the Minister who has the control of State farms, which might sell or buy produce in the ordinary course, and smelters and State batteries. These are not incorporated, but it is certainly advisable to extend the exception to contracts with those bodies. Although some people might be prejudiced and think it is not advisable to make these additional exceptions, they should bear in mind that we are now still carrying into force the disqualification which originated in very different times, before adult suffrage was introduced and before the duration of Parliament was curtailed. They should bear in mind the publicity given to all public transactions. We are elected on an adult suffrage and Parliaments cannot last more than three years. There is very little risk, indeed. I go so far as to say there is no risk in permitting contracts such as I have mentioned to be made by members of Parliament, and we are not jeopardising the safety or purity of our Constitutional Government. The next object of this Bill is to remove what we can all regard as something, the use and purpose of which has ceased to exist. It seems to me absurd for Western Australia to continue the practice that where a member receives appointment as Minister of the Crown, he must go before his constituency before he can accept it. The practice in that respect is very old, but it has been modified and abolished by nearly all Governments whose foundation depends upon the principles of the British Constitution. I propose to abolish this. Clause 7 of the Bill deals with the disputes which may arise between the two Chambers which form part of our Constitution. I am not introducing, I hope, controversial matters but simply adopting the recommendations of the Joint Committee of Parliament, which was appointed during the ninth Parliament of Western Australia, the second session. The report of this select committee of the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly has been printed. The Committee was appointed to inquire into the procedure on money Bills, and some hon. members of this Chamber were on that committee. The report made recommendations to this effect—

Both committees are agreed on the following points. The present position with regard to money Bills has resulted in constant friction between the two Houses and urgently requires a remedy. The cause of this friction is to be found in the wording of Section 46 of "The Constitution Acts Amendment Act, 1899. The faults in

this section are two. It leaves uncertain whether requests made by the Legislative Council can be repeated. It applies equally to clauses in all Bills in which any financial provisions are found. The remedy the committees propose is the introduction of legislation repealing the above quoted section, and enacting provisions which will lay down a simple and well defined procedure. With this object in view the two committees have agreed to the draft of a Bill, copy of which is attached to this report.

Hon. members will see that Clause 7 of this Bill is identical with the Bill recommended by the joint committee.

Hon. P. Collier: Have you the names of the members of that committee?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The report is signed by the Chairmen, Hon. Walter Kingsmill and Mr. M. F. Troy. The report also says—

It will be seen that the Bill enumerates the measures which the Council have no power to amend, namely, taxation Bills, loan Bills, and Bills appropriating revenue for the ordinary services of the year. In the case of these Bills the Council have the right to request amendments, but not to repeat or insist on their request. Apart from these last-mentioned Bills, there are other Bills which contain provisions directly or indirectly financial, but of which the majority of the clauses have no connection whatever with finance. With regard to such non-financial clauses, both committees are agreed that they should be freely open to amendment by the Council, subject to paragraph 10 hereinafter. An agreement having been reached on these points, there remains only the question of the method in which the financial clauses of these last-mentioned Bills should be dealt with. It is obvious that there are only two or three ways of dealing with such clauses. In England they are absolutely excluded from amendment by the Lords, but such a course is impossible in this Parliament, since the right of the Council to request amendments in financial provisions is established. It is equally impossible to adopt a course by which amendments might be requested by the Council, as the same Bill would thus be subjected to two forms of procedure and the present trouble would be perpetuated. It has been proposed by the committee of the Assembly to insert a provision in the Bill by which the Council should be allowed to make amendments in these clauses, but be debarred from insisting upon them if disagreed to by the Assembly. To this proposal the committee of the Council does not agree; but holds that all the clauses in Bills of this kind should be equally open to amendment. In these circumstances, the committee have decided to make their reports to their respective Houses. The point on which they have not arrived at an agreement, they consider may well be left to the decision of the two Houses. They recommend that the

Bill they have drafted be introduced at the first opportunity. The provision in dispute may be introduced by way of amendment, and be submitted for consideration in accordance with the usual forms of procedure.

The clause I have now brought before the House simply embodies the points on which the committee of both Houses have agreed. At the conclusion of the report hon. members will see the clause which the committee of the Legislative Assembly desire to insert, and with which the committee of the Legislative Council disagreed. The clause is not inserted in this Bill. It is quite open for hon. members, who desire to have it inserted, to move in that direction. The only other matter remaining for me to deal with is on the question of the life of the present Parliament. The present Parliament commenced to sit on the 20th November and it expires on 19th November next year. Unfortunately, for many years now, the elections have taken place at the wrong time of the year. These used to take place about the month of April or May, and taking place as they did when, after Parliament was elected, there were three full working sessions to follow without any break in the ordinary course. Further, there was a chance of bringing down the Estimates before the money was spent, and Parliament was not obliged to sit after Christmas in the hot weather. I think we are all agreed that to sit in the hot weather is neither conducive to good legislation nor to the temper of hon. members. The amendment I propose would do away with this difficulty. The difficulty, I think, commenced after the general election, when the Rason Ministry took office. That would be about August or September, 1905.

Hon. P. Collier: November, 1905.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The ordinary Parliamentary sessions were, therefore, out of joint, and every Parliament subsequently, to my recollection, has been elected about September or October. The result has been that the House does not meet until October or November, and the first session of Parliament is, therefore, of very little use. The Estimates have not been brought down until the money has been spent, and it is almost impossible when commencing a session at such a late date to bring forward a satisfactory programme for the sessional work, bearing in mind that it is really almost useless to sit during the hot weather. If the amendment which I suggest is adopted, we shall always have three working sessions, whereas at present we only have two. If Parliament expires, say, in September or October or November, there is no time for any proper working session, with the result that the session is valueless from the legislative point of view. This difficulty apparently has occurred in South Australia. The clause I have drafted for changing the date is the same in its purpose and effect as that which has been adopted by the South Australian Parliament. I think the South Australian Act is numbered 959. This clause provides

that, subject to Parliament being dissolved sooner, which may always occur, notwithstanding the limit of time prescribed by Section 21 of the Constitution Acts Amendment Act, 1899, which prescribes three sessions, "whenever any Legislative Assembly would expire by the effluxion of time between the last day of August of any year and the first day of February next thereafter, such Legislative Assembly shall continue up to and include the day next preceding such first day of February and no longer." Thus if Parliament, not by reason of a dissolution but by effluxion of time, should expire at any time between the end of August and the first day of February, it would automatically continue, although it might exceed the three years by a short time only to the first day of February. I put in the first day of February in order to make the extension as short as possible, so as to obtain a full working session for this Parliament next year no matter who may be in office. But we want something further than that. South Australia has also provided, in order to continue having the elections held some time in the early months of the year, a clause by which the duration of Parliament may be less than three years. "Whenever the Legislative Assembly would expire by effluxion of time between the last day of January and the first day of September of any year, such Legislative Assembly shall cease and determine on the last day of January of that year." In that case the life of Parliament may be shortened by a few months, but, whether Parliament would be shortened or whether it would be lengthened, the elections would be automatically adjusted so as to take place, if these dates be adopted, about the month of March in any year during which an election may take place.

Hon. T. Walker: Is not March the mad month?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It has not affected me. As far as these dates are concerned, they appear to me to be the most convenient. It is the principle I am trying to work in, that by which the election dates will be automatically adjusted to a suitable date, and one which would provide for the continuation of future Parliaments to such time as would enable the elections to be taken at such date as is found to be suitable. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. P. Collier debate adjourned.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1919-20.

In Committee of Supply.

Resumed from the previous day; Mr. Stubbs in the Chair.

Premier's Department. Hon. J. Mitchell, Minister.

Vote—Governor's establishment, £1,812.

[38]

Mr. WILLCOCK: I have no intention of criticising the present occupant of the office of Governor, but it is time that the Government gave some indication of their policy in connection with that office. We know that, during the past two or three years, various resolutions have been passed favouring the abolition of the office. I have asked questions in this House on two or three occasions and the then Premier stated that the whole position was going to be taken into consideration and that something like an agreement would probably be arrived at between the States. I do not know whether anything practical has resulted. Anyhow we have not had any indication of the policy of the Governments of the various States. It is about time, therefore, that something was done in the direction of bringing to an end an office which is purely ornamental. We have had a cry from all over Australia that expenditure should be curtailed, and I do not think there is another item on the Estimates which lends itself so readily to curtailment as this, with advantage to the citizens of the State generally. The position could well be dispensed with altogether, and whatever duties have to be performed could very well be carried out by the gentleman who fills the office of Chief Justice at the present time. There may be a necessity for the position of Governor General in Australia, but so far as the individual States are concerned, there is no longer any need for State governors. According to the Estimates, we would effect a saving of £1,800 by the abolition of the office, and to that would have to be added the salary which the present occupant receives. Altogether I am certain we could effect a saving of over £5,000.

Mr. Smith: The expenditure altogether comes to about £10,000.

Mr. WILLCOCK: At the present time we have representation in the centre of the Empire. That representation is attended to by the Agent General and by the High Commissioner, and everything that is necessary could be done by those officials. In former days the Governor of a State held a highly responsible position. He had many administrative acts to carry out. It might also have been said before the war that it was necessary that there should be a link between the State and the Empire, so as to kindle the patriotism of the people.

Hon. P. Collier: We have Anzac as a link now.

Mr. WILLCOCK: The result of the late war, and the action of the people of Western Australia particularly, has proved that there is no longer required anything to make us more loyal than we have shown ourselves to be. Therefore the Governor, who might have been said to have been here to cement the friendship between the Empire and the various States, is no longer required for that purpose, and we can very well do without him. The utility of the office now amounts to practically nothing,

and I am certain that no one can advance any serious argument why the office should be continued. This question of the abolition of State Governors has also been discussed in Canada and in various other dependencies of Great Britain.

Mr. Smith: They have no imported Governors in Canada.

Mr. WILLCOCK: The position is no longer one of any importance, because there are no duties of any great consequence to be carried out. The Premier should be able to give an indication of the policy he intends to adopt. We would like to know whether the Premiers at their recent conference came to any agreement, and whether it is intended to take common action in order to cut out this absolutely useless position.

The Premier: I do not think anything was ever done at the Premiers' conference.

Mr. WILLCOCK: It is about time, then, that some agreement was arrived at. The Premier of this State should now take the lead. There has been considerable agitation in two of the States with reference to the abolition of the office and we now could give those two States a lead. A common agreement might easily be arrived at. As a protest against the inactivity shown in the direction of taking a practical step towards the abolition of the office of Governor, I move an amendment—

That the vote be reduced by £12.

Mr. GREEN: I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment. In these times when the cry is one of economy, the duties of this office could well be discharged by a citizen of the State, one who has done good service in the past. It might be a prize which could be given to one who had done useful political work, and holding an office such as this would still keep him in an important post and the appointment would likewise be of benefit to the State. The advantage of giving such a position to a citizen of the State would also be that it would remove from the office all the absurd trappings which at present exist, and which go to build up in the State an imitation of the aristocracy of the old land. This, however, entirely fails, and in its place we are left with a futile snobocracy. It is entirely undemocratic and un-Australian in spirit. It is necessary for us to raise our voices in the direction of abolishing that kind of thing. I have nothing whatever to say against the present occupant of the office. All will agree that the gentleman who fills it does so capably. I make bold to say that the post has altogether outlived its usefulness. It is against Australian spirit. The Eastern States have shown in no uncertain way that the idea is gradually growing in the minds of people there that State Governors, if retained, should be appointed by the people of the State. On the score of economy, I should like to quote figures from "Whittaker," comparing the salaries paid to the Governors of the different provinces of the Do-

minion of Canada with the salary paid to the Governor of this State. We have a population of, roughly, 320,000. There is no province in Canada except Prince Edward Island with a population of 93,000, which has a population so small as ours, and the Lieut.-Governor there is paid £1,400. Ontario, with a population of 2½ millions—equal to half the population of the whole of Australia—pays its Lieut.-Governor £4,000 the same as we pay our Governor. But, with that exception, no province of the Dominion pays its Lieut.-Governor more than £1,800. Quebec, with a population of 2,318,000, pays £2,000—

Mr. Underwood: What do they pay their members?

Mr. GREEN: Five hundred pounds a year. Nova Scotia, with a population of 492,000, pays £1,800, New Brunswick, with a population of 351,000, pays £1,800, and Manitoba, with a population of 553,000, pays £1,800. With the exception of Ontario and British Columbia, which have a population seven times as great as ours, we are paying our Governor double the salary paid to similar officials in the Canadian provinces. I am not sure whether Lieut.-Governors in Canada are appointed by the Crown; I think they are elected by the people, but the figures show that the salary we are paying is absurdly high. For the sum of £2,000 a year, we could get a person who has rendered good service to the country—possibly as a Labour politician—to take the position, and invest it with the democratic spirit which should characterise and surround an Australian Governor. We should then not have these social nobodies trying to ape the cheap imported aristocracy and create the social jealousies manifested in the social notes of the "West Australian" dealing with those who were at Government House, how they were dressed, and the Misses So-and-so who were brought out.

The Attorney General: Do you always read those notes?

Mr. GREEN: A portion of them. The fact that the Attorney General considers it absurd to publish notes of that kind, shows he is with me that this sort of thing has outlived its usefulness and should be abolished. I support the amendment.

The PREMIER: The member for Geraldton approves of having a Governor.

Mr. Willcock: I said a Governor might be necessary.

The PREMIER: The hon. member said the Crown must have direct representation.

Mr. Munroe: Have not we got it with the Governor General?

The PREMIER: The member for Kalgoorlie drew a comparison with the provinces of Canada. The position is totally different. We have always contended that we should remain a sovereign State. This necessitates the appointment of a Governor now just as in pre-Federal days. Perhaps there is greater reason for State Governors now than prior to Federation. The fact that we are federated and have a Governor General does

not remove the necessity for a State Governor. As a sovereign State, we want the right to communicate direct with the Crown.

Hon. T. Walker: Cannot we have a sovereign State if we have a Governor taken from the people of Western Australia?

Mr. Munsie: Are the Eastern States proposing to part with their sovereignty by advocating the abolition of imported Governors?

The PREMIER: If the Crown is to be represented here, and if we are to have the right to communicate direct with the Crown, it must be through an appointee of the Crown, which is the present position. If it is a matter of expense alone, that is another question.

Mr. Troy: How are the provinces of Canada in a different position?

The PREMIER: The provinces of Canada occupy a very different position. They are not sovereign States as we are, and as we must remain. This is of great advantage to the State. Nothing could be done to alter the present system unless all the States were in accord. That is not the position, and I doubt whether it will be.

Hon. T. Walker: Give us some idea of the utility of the position.

The PREMIER: So far as I know this question has not been discussed at any Premier's Conference. At one time the South Australian Government had the matter included in the agenda paper but, for some reason, the question was not discussed.

Mr. Smith: Being a sovereign State, why have we to consider the other States?

The PREMIER: The appointment of Governors is laid down by the Colonial Office. It is proposed to reduce this vote by £12 by way of protest. How will that change the position? Will it be a direction to the Government that this House disagrees with the appointment of Governors. It is quite futile to make a reduction or enter a protest. Members have expressed their views on the matter, but it will not be possible by reducing the vote to determine whether Governors shall continue to be appointed as at present. Members opposite want a Governor, but one appointed from the people of the State. There are many reasons why that would not work satisfactorily. Certainly it would be less objectionable than appointing someone from the Eastern States.

Hon. T. Walker: Oh no, from Northam.

The PREMIER: I would willingly take the job.

Mr. Lambert: As a beauty boy, we should get Billy Hughes

The PREMIER: Members, whatever their opinions, must realise the futility of reducing this vote. Is the amount to be deducted from the Governor's salary or from the wages of one of the gardeners? Every time the Estimates have been presented during the last 14 years, we have had the same protest, the same discussion, and the same proposal for reduction.

Hon. T. Walker: Every time it is more popular and comes nearer.

The PREMIER: It has not yet been accepted, at any rate. I hope the Committee will not agree to the reduction. This is not the right time to enter a protest against the system. I was glad to hear from those members who have spoken that they approve of the present occupant of the office.

Mr. ANGELO: While agreeing to a great extent with the members for Geraldton and Kalgoorlie, I do not intend to vote for the reduction because this is not the right time or the right method to achieve their object.

Mr. Lambert: What do you suggest?

Mr. ANGELO: That a motion be moved that the position be dispensed with, and that a Lieut.-Governor be appointed in lieu. Next year the Premiers of the various States will meet the Prime Minister to discuss the financial position, and this subject could well be dealt with then. If a motion were tabled on the lines I suggest—

Mr. Lambert: Would you support it?

Mr. ANGELO: Decidedly, and there would be a good chance of getting it carried. When the Premier went to the conference, he would be armed with that resolution. It would be a lopsided and ridiculous position if this State dispensed with its Governor, and the other States retained their Governors. If the conference agreed to dispense with the State Governors—

Hon. P. Collier: There is no suggestion to dispense with the Governor altogether.

Mr. ANGELO: Or resolved to have Lieut.-Governors, the Chief Justices could very well take the dual position.

Mr. Lambert: I regret that the Premier did not clearly indicate the views of the Government. The Committee desire, and the country expects unnecessary expense of this description to be curtailed and some sincerity shown in the desire to curtail it. In a small State like Western Australia, a Governor is not necessary. It is unnecessary to parade the nonsensical social side. Even those who participate in many of the social functions at Government House do not desire their continuance as part of our social life. I have nothing to say against the present occupant of the position. Until people become more sensible and realise the stupidity of the circus-like displays in their social activities, we shall have to tolerate a continuance of the present state of affairs. This sort of thing cuts no ice with me and, apart from the Governor's hospitality at a decent lunch, may have little attraction for them. In the last Governor we had an old humbug who ought to have been got rid of much sooner.

The Premier: I do not think you ought to say that.

Mr. LAMBERT: In deference to the wishes of the Premier I will not go on with that. Appointments have been made in the past which have justified the use of the strongest possible language. We had the assurance of the late Mr. Frank Wilson that the then occupant of the position had above the heads of the Government cabled direct to the Home office requesting to be re-appointed for a fur-

ther three years. The strongest possible exception should be taken to people of that description occupying this high office. The Premier has stated that there should be some unanimity of opinion between all the States and the Commonwealth in this matter before anything is done, but I say that we should show the lead. I am not prepared to lag behind with the conservative fossilised ideas of the Eastern States and their Parliaments. They have made very little progress themselves, and their ideas of democracy are a disgrace. I am not prepared to hang on any longer to the Eastern States in this matter. Indeed, I would cut out Federation altogether if only to get away from their imports and everything connected with them. Only quite recently the Home office stated that if the different States of the Commonwealth arrived at a unanimous decision they would take action. This House should indicate by resolution or in this manner that we will no longer tolerate this unnecessary expenditure. The position is a needless one and is a shameful extravagance; and it is totally inefficient so far as office goes. We should also show that the mode of selection in the Old Country is repugnant to our ideas of what is common decency.

Mr. Smith: What is the mode of appointment?

Mr. LAMBERT: If we must have a Governor, the position should be given to our own Australian men, who in their younger days have done yeoman service to the country.

The Attorney General: I do not think you would get many candidates.

Mr. LAMBERT: I would not mind being a candidate myself. I only hope the Treasurer will allow this matter to go to vote, so as to get the feeling of the members in this connection. He need not take exception to it because it is not a matter of policy. It only affects the attitude that we should adopt in this connection. I do not think the Treasurer would for a moment try to justify the present method of appointing Governors. Some little time ago it was looked upon as a disloyal act for a man to criticise the occupant of the position of Governor. Some of our imported politicians maintained that we should have some silken tie between the colonies and the British Empire. But we are no longer dependencies of the British Empire. We are partners in the British Empire and in the League of Nations, and have voting power similar to that of other parts of the British Empire.

The Minister for Works: We always were a part of the British Empire.

Mr. LAMBERT: I admit that. The statement recently made by Lord Milner alters our whole status as a Commonwealth and the status of the other parts of the British Empire, including Africa and Canada. We have been a part of the British Empire as a dependency, but now our status is very much higher. In this war we had no say as to whether we should fight another nation or not, but, if there were a war to-morrow, we should have a say before our manhood was

taken away from the country. We do not require imported Governors to show our loyalty to the British Empire. We do not require any silken bonds to show our kinship. We do not require to show that, by allowing the Imperial Government to choose some out of date and out of work official to act as a State Governor, our sympathies are with the British Empire. It is time that some economy was instituted in this direction. We cannot afford to pay for the upkeep of a place like Government House any longer. I do not think the present Governor would blame hon. members for discussing the matter.

Mr. Davies: What if he did?

Mr. LAMBERT: I should be sorry that a gentleman who has held such honourable positions in the service of the Empire should take umbrage at anything we have said here. I moved a motion in connection with this matter some time ago, and the late Mr. Frank Wilson gave me an assurance that he would cable to the Colonial office asking them not to make the reappointment of the then Governor, and requesting them to make no appointment during war time. Our financial position to-day is worse than it was then. If this action was justified then on the score of economy, it is more justified now. I hope the Treasurer will realise that this House desires to express an opinion in most emphatic terms against any further expenditure in this direction, and will allow the Committee to vote upon the amendment moved by the member for Geraldton.

Mr. LUTEY: I hope the amendment will be carried as an indication of the feeling of hon. members. I am sure that a great majority of the people understood when Federation came into being that, instead of having six Governors and one Governor General, there would only be one Governor in Australia. The Treasurer says that the Premier's conference has not yet come to a decision on the matter. If we carry this amendment, however, it will be an indication to the Premier as to what we feel in Western Australia. I do not know why the Premier's conference has to sit at all. The member for Gascoyne says that when they meet the Prime Minister they will deal with this matter. He also in the same breath speaks of Western Australia as being a sovereign State. It is an insult to a sovereign State to bring up such a question before an un-elected body, which has no right to deal with the matter, hon. members should have sufficient courage to say what they think. If they agree to this amendment they will be carrying out the wishes of the majority of the people of the State. One hears frequent complaints about the way in which the Government offices are spread out all over the place. The Governor's residence would be an ideal spot for Government offices, and if offices were erected there it would save people the trouble of tramping all over Perth, as they have to do to-day, whenever they want to visit these offices. In the early days the Governors were looked upon as kings. They were Governors indeed, for they had plenty of work to do. As the

position is now it is only right and proper that the Chief Justice or some other leading citizen of the State should occupy it. I hope the amendment will be carried.

Sir H. B. LEFROY: The position to-day is very much the same as it was in 1912 when this House was informed by the then Premier (Mr. Scaddan) of the opinion of the Imperial Government on the subject. For the information of hon. members I would like to read to them the opinion of the Imperial Government as given by the Secretary of State for the Colonies at that time. The following question was asked the Premier in the House:—

1, Has he received any official intimation of the transfer of His Excellency Sir Gerald Strickland to New South Wales? 2, If so, in consideration of the view that effective economy could be achieved by combining the functions of His Majesty's representative in this State with those of the Chief Justice, does he intend to request the Imperial authorities to give effect to that view?

The Premier's reply was as follows:—

1, Yes. 2, Representations were previously made to the Imperial authorities by the late Hon. T. Price, when Premier of South Australia. The reply received from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and a copy of which was transmitted to each of the other States, contained, *inter alia*, the following: "The change which is suggested is a very far reaching one—more so than, perhaps, appears at first sight; and it could not, I consider, be entertained in any case unless it is to be applied to all the Australian States, and not to one alone, and until public opinion in Australia is demonstrated to be overwhelmingly in its favour." Also: "There is, no doubt, much to be said in favour of the Canadian system, under which the Central Government appoints provincial governors, and if the people of Australia were to desire to adopt a similar system, His Majesty's Government would in all probability be disposed to advise His Majesty that the necessary steps should be taken to carry out their wishes. So far, I understand, there has been no indication that the States, whose contention is that they remain sovereign States, would desire that their prerogatives should be diminished, and the evidence of such sovereignty is in part secured by making the appointment of Governor in the same manner and on the same terms as prior to Federation."

That closed the question for the time. The question of the appointment of local representatives of the Crown has been on the agenda paper of various Premiers' conferences. But very little has been said on the subject. There is very little sign of unanimity on the subject amongst the States, and until that unanimity is reached, any endeavour to make the change must be futile. The appointment is made, not by the State,

but by the Imperial Government. It is made by the Imperial Government, as I take it, in order to preserve the link between the States as sovereign States, and the Imperial Government.

Mr. Lambert: Would you favour the abolition of the post?

Sir H. B. LEFROY: No; and I cannot support the reduction of the vote as a protest against the appointment of the Governor. I say this while recognising that there is considerable difference of opinion on the subject. Generally speaking, the gentlemen appointed to the high office of State Governor in Australia have been worthy representatives not only of the Imperial Government but of the Empire generally. As an Imperialist I believe in doing nothing that will weaken the last remaining link connecting us with the Motherland. In my opinion, that link has been strengthened, instead of being weakened, by the great war through which we have just passed.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am one of those who believe that a Governor is necessary, but I am not one of those who believe that if we import politicians we must also import Governors. The greatest honour that can be conferred on any man is that of being appointed Governor of the State in which he was born. As a member of the Government of this State, I expressed the opinion that the greatest honour that could have been conferred on Lord Forrest would have been to appoint him Governor of Western Australia. However, I take strong exception to hon. members rising here to use the word "imported," and in the very next breath bragging that we are partners in the British Empire. Undoubtedly imported politicians, like imported Governors, endeavour to the utmost of their ability to carry out the duties assigned to them. With regard to the Governorship, the position is that nothing can be done until the other States make a move. The Premier has said that Western Australia is a sovereign State. I contend, however, that we have lost our sovereignty, and have not been a sovereign State for the last five years. It is necessary that there should be someone as Governor for the purpose of intervening when there is a dispute amongst the politicians, and for the purpose of signing documents. But there is no need to import a man for those purposes. There are in this State hundreds of men who could fill the position of Governor. The flapdoodle about social distinction represents the kind of argument which is used in order to confuse the minds of the people. There will be social distinctions whether we have a Governor or not, and whoever may be Governor. For years this Parliament has been endeavouring to impress upon the Imperial Government the necessity for appointing a local man to the Governorship. During the last three or four years it has been plainly evident that we cannot maintain the office of Governor under existing conditions. That being so, let this Chamber show by its vote

that we desire a change to be effected. Unless some State gives a lead in the matter, the present position is likely to continue for many years. It would surprise me if representations made to the British Government did not find acceptance, in view of what has occurred during the past five years. The British authorities recognise that Australian soldiers and sailors are equal to any in the British Army and Navy. Why should not the British authorities show their confidence in the people of Australia by selecting the State Governors from among them? I would go further and ask, why not the Governor General as well? It is not to say that because a man is born in Australia and spends his lifetime here that he would be less loyal as Governor-General. As a matter of fact the people of Australia are more loyal to the Crown than are the people of the British Isles. Consequently, there is no necessity on that score to bring a man from outside to fill the position of Governor. No one here has anything against the present occupant of the office of State Governor. He carries out his duties in a proper manner, as indeed all our successive Governors have done; but, I repeat, there is no occasion whatever for bringing in from outside a man to fill the post.

Mr. MULLANY: The member for Moore (Sir Henry Lefroy) has reminded us of the position as outlined in 1912 by the then Premier, Mr. Scaddan, who said that the Imperial authorities desired that there should be unanimity among all the Australian States before the request that State Governors should be appointed in Australia could be acceded to. Had Sir Henry Lefroy read a little further he would have found that Mr. Scaddan said also that on behalf of Western Australia further representations were being made to the Imperial authorities in order to ascertain whether they still adhered to their previous decision. At that time there was a desire on the part of members of this House that a change should be made, and it was contended that this State should be regarded as a unit, and that there was no necessity to wait for unanimity upon the point among the other States. It would be interesting to know what reply was received to the representations referred to by Mr. Scaddan. As far as I am aware, no reply has been received. It is unnecessary for me to go into the question of whether we should have an imported Governor. I agree that the position could well be filled by a citizen of Western Australia. I regret that we can do nothing more effective than reduce the vote by a few pounds. I will support the amendment.

Mr. JONES: The amendment goes too far, or alternatively, it does not go far enough. The idea of cutting down the salary of any man does not appeal to me. In view of the mounting cost of living, I do not see why His Excellency's salary should be reduced. The cost of ginger ale,

champagne and other essentials to the maintenance of the status of the Governor has increased materially, and so, too, has the cost of fashionably cut clothes, without which no Governor could with dignity maintain his connection with the gasolin aristocracy of the community. We have the Governor, and we have to keep him well, because he is performing functions which, while they do not appeal to me or to the farmers, still appeal to the carpe knights of the metropolitan area, to those social caterpillars with the souls of lackeys the mentality of flunkies and the psychology of captive simians. It is the unfortunate position of the Governor in having to associate with these people, having to be connected with all the horrors of a self-created plutocracy which calls for a higher salary than we are paying to-day. I do not know His Excellency; I have never seen him. I do not usually get into the circles which he frequents.

Mr. Green: You will get an invitation to-morrow.

Mr. JONES: Unfortunately I will be unable to accept it. However, I believe he is a decent, kind-hearted, Christian-like old soul. He has my fullest sympathy in that he has to be mixed up in all the fearsome flummery, with all the unspeakable sycophants who persistently importune him.

Mr. Harrison: You said you had not met him.

Mr. JONES: The hon. member has met him, and would accept every invitation he got to go down there. It is because of that I sympathise with the Governor. If the Committee is to deal seriously with this matter, I suggest that we have to consider whether we are adequately paying the holder of the position, or if not whether it would not be better to abolish the position, or alternatively make it an honorary one.

Mr. Mullany: Let His Excellency eat grass!

Mr. JONES: The interjection is now quite out of date. There is no necessity for anyone to eat grass, because the shipping combine did not win. I think the position could be made honorary; indeed, if necessary, we could find business men in the State who would take the job and pay a consideration for it.

Mr. Griffiths: We could let it out by tender.

Mr. JONES: Having regard to the class of people with whom the Governor has to deal, it would be practical and profitable to let him have the dispensing of honours among the people. I do not refer to real honours, such as the Royal Humane Society's medals and distinctions of that sort, because all classes of the community participate in those; but such things as O.B.E., C.B.E., and the like, could be dispensed to the profitable whim of the Governor for a consideration. The Governor could institute new orders of his own. We could have every member of this august

Chamber beribboned from head to foot, covered all over with every colour and size and shape of ribbon and decoration, and every new kind of order. I would not mind suggesting a few myself which could be placed at the disposal of the Governor to sell to augment the revenue of the State. In that way the office of Governor could be made self-supporting. Then, again, Government House could be turned into an institution where weekly dances could be held, but of course returned soldiers would be barred from attending. There are other members of the community, however, who would be allowed to take part in those dances at so much a head. There are many people in the State who at the present time are only on the fringe of the social swirl, who are yet on the lowest rung of the social ladder, who would gladly avail themselves of the opportunity to take part in those weekly dances. Those people, for the consideration of one guinea or even two guineas—some would be prepared to pay even five guineas—would regard it as a great privilege to be able to attend those weekly affairs at Government House and dance with His Excellency the Governor. In that way Government House might be made a paying trading concern. I am surprised that the Government, composed of men of business acumen, have not thought of this before. Here is an opportunity to get rid of the deficit, to square the finances of the State by simply commercialising the snobbery of the people. If we want a Governor, if it is necessary for the tony elite of West Perth and Claremont that we should keep up this establishment where people who wear as few clothes as possible might be able to go, then let them pay for it. That is the solution of the whole matter. I am prepared to support a motion to increase the Governor's salary by £2,000 a year, or even to cut it out altogether, and give him the assistance of a business expert who will help him to commercialise the position he holds.

Mr. PICKERING: After the hon. member's speech I am sure the Government will introduce a Bill to create a new State trading concern on the lines suggested. It seems to me that the whole subject is based on the question of sovereign rights.

Hon. P. Collier: What are sovereign rights; why start and argue the question of sovereign rights if you do not know what they mean?

Mr. PICKERING: From the statement made by the Treasurer—

Hon. P. Collier: The statement made by the Treasurer is no more sensible than the one you are making.

Mr. PICKERING: I gather that sovereign rights refer to dealing directly with the Crown.

Hon. P. Collier: No connection at all.

Mr. PICKERING: Some reflection has been cast upon imported Governors, but we have also imported politicians, and I would draw attention to the fact that there are 20 or 21 imported politicians in this House.

Mr. Jones: But they did not all import their politics.

Mr. PICKERING: They may not, and it is probable that the member for Fremantle knew very little of politics when he came here. The Empire's appreciation of what the State has done has been shown by the Empire making every possible concession and placing us on equal terms with other parts of the British Empire.

Hon. T. WALKER: I notice there is progress in Australia even on this subject. My mind goes back to the days when David Buchanan was a member of the New South Wales Parliament. One of the first motions he moved in the Assembly of that State was in favour of the abolition of State Governors, and he did me the honour to specially request me to second the motion. I did so. We two were the only ones in Australia who had the courage in a legislative chamber to move for the abolition of State Governors. Now the change is so marvellous that the matter has become commonplace, not only here but in all parts of Australia, and it is now merely a question of intercourse between the Home Office and the State Parliaments and the State Governments and the Governor General. This is a matter of controversial consideration throughout the Empire. I have listened to the arguments put forward chiefly by the Premier and Sir Henry Lefroy for the retention of the present system. The argument of the Premier is chiefly that we must have State sovereignty. If I thought we were getting State sovereignty by retaining the Governor sent to us from England, I would be with him, but what are we doing by our present method of government? We are absolutely losing every shred of sovereignty in this State—the right to govern ourselves. We are governed from Downing-street to-day, almost as much as we were governed in the past before responsible government was established. And we are governed at two ends—we are governed through our own local Governor and through the Governor General. We are between two millstones, the Imperial wire-pulling and the Commonwealth wire-pulling, and through those two centres our vitality is crushed out of us. If we want sovereignty we must be free from outside pressure and impulse. The people themselves must shape their own destinies, and obtain the fulfilment of their own ideals. We cannot do that as we are governed now. It is impossible for us to create a purely Western Australian sentiment. True, we have achieved a certain triumph in a democracy that is purely Australian, but we are losing it to a large extent by the trend of affairs and the events of modern times. We are now in the claws, if I may say it without being offensive, of those powers that are directing our destinies from abroad—I mean without the barriers of our own sovereignty. If the Premier's words have any meaning it is that within the geographical boundaries of Western Australia we have the right to govern ourselves. Now he tells us that we

can govern ourselves with Commonwealth fetters upon us. Can he say that we have a sovereignty under those circumstances? Can he say that we have a sovereignty when, from the central government of London, through the despatches that are sent to our local Governor, we are directed or guided or misguided, as the case may be? Can he say that we are asserting ourselves.

The Premier: Yes.

Hon. T. WALKER: The Premier can say so, but surely what he says has no meaning under those circumstances. We are absolutely incapable of carrying out our highest and most exalted wishes. I guarantee that if the Premier's secret convictions could be probed we would find that he himself believes that Western Australia should have within its own hands the complete direction of its destiny, and that therefore there should be no post in this land that was not open to its own citizens, having made achievements that rendered them worthy of it. I believe this is the absolute conviction of the Premier and yet he is content to go on with a system which takes messages from the Governor General through the mouthpiece of his Ministers, takes directions from them and quietly yields to what is imposed through that source by way of sentiment or by way of legislation, apparently introduced automatically and legally but absolutely directed from abroad, and then, as a double, is directed from abroad by the instructions which come through the Governor of our State. Then he says we are sovereign. We are absolutely in bondage; and we find this out when it is necessary to assert any independence at all. We have just passed through a time when self-made lordlings have directed us how we shall speak, what we shall speak and what we shall publish in our Press and persons, bold in their ideals, have been incarcerated in public gaols for daring to do otherwise. Men who have stood up for their right, who have seen further than they, who have shown in the main far-thinking and far-seeing capabilities, because of their courage, have been thrown into the dungeons, persecuted as we can expect they were persecuted in the days of direct terror and blackest nights of tyranny of mediæval times. Yet he talks of sovereignty. Where is the sovereignty? Where is the independent life of this State, hemmed in as we are by all the forces of Imperialism and the heads of Federation as we have had it displayed to us during the last five years?

The Premier: We make our own laws.

Hon. T. WALKER: Subject to assent and approval, and subject to the superior laws, enacted by the Commonwealth which override ours. We are limited to the merest little thimble circle. We have no room for movement, no room for expansion for great ideals or noble nation-building. We are an appendage, a dependant, a tributary. Our life-blood is sucked from us. We crawl to Downing-street and to the Federal league. Talk about sovereignty! It is a farce; it means nothing; it is a pretence; it has no reality

reacting to the sound of the word. If we want true sovereignty, give it to the people. I recognise no sovereignty but that which rests in the people. One man, one Cabinet, one group, one party to me mean nothing. I dispute their right to despotism. I dispute their right to fetter my mind or dreams or hopes or aims in life. I dispute their right to prevent the people of this young nation growing free as the air, as the light of knowledge, as the free education we give them, or as all the liberties we have inherited and obtained by right and struggle to live and grow and expand and become a real example to the fettered, crawling nations of the world; and I use "crawling" in the sense of being incapable to assert their own manhood and dignity. I see, in this young people of ours, the possibility of reaching the highest summit of true civilisation, a civilisation that recognises the equality of the manhood of every citizen born in it. With men and women on a strict level of equality of right and opportunity, I see this nation then become an example to the whole world, but it cannot be whilst we have our policy shaped in secret by messages sent to this Governor and to that Governor, directing Ministers as the secret diplomacy of the world has directed the fates of nations. I want none of that. I want our people to be the true sign and symbol of genuine sovereignty, with the right to say "Hands off!" to those who would fetter our growth and cripple our aspirations, to say "Hands off!" to those who would make us subservient to the wish and avarice and greed of those commercial despots who have the ear of the sovereigns abroad. I want our nation to grow as a child grows in the sunshine and in the healthy air, not living in fetters and developing under a cloud. That is my aim and, if we are to achieve that end, we must do it free from foreign tyranny or foreign contract, whichever word is the more suitable, even though that word "foreign" is used somewhat in an ambiguous sense, when applied to England itself.

The Premier: I thought so.

Hon. T. WALKER: I am not saying one word against our British people. They have in the past given the impetus to the world's progress more than once. More than once too they have fettered it but, whilst I recognise that fact, I put myself in the position of a son to his father. When my father has stopped his growth and has reached that stage when he lingers back with feeble footsteps which the age of a civilisation has placed upon him, I want to go further than my father, stronger than him, so to speak, and, in the full manhood of my youthful hopes, I want to achieve more than ever he did; and if the glory of England is in the lessons of liberty she has taught and of freedom she has given, let our aim be to give to the world examples of greater liberty and greater justice and greater humanity in the consideration of our people. There is nothing wrong with a sentiment of that kind. If it

is honourable to come from a race that is proud of its achievements in that direction, it is still honourable to go further and to culminate what has been so well commenced, and it is for this reason, knowing how that very England has been misguided, how that very England has been misled by her secret diplomacy and her influences from abroad, how she has been pulled hither and thither and has in consequence done gross injustice to some of her companions and partners in the government of Empire, knowing all this, I want to be free from such influences in Western Australia. I want a true sovereignty of the people and that sovereignty alone, and having that sovereignty, I wish to leave open to her children, her citizens, the highest post, the greatest dignity and the noblest honour we can confer and, for that reason, I do not wish to abolish the screw of the man who does this work, but I do wish to abolish the importation of our Governors.

Mr. HARRISON: If we had the eloquence of the member for Kanowna on this side of the House, I do not know to what limits the debate might be carried. He spoke of the liberty of Australians and West Australians and then he spoke of the wire-pulling by Downing-street. The development of liberty we enjoy has grown up under the protection of the British Navy and of the Imperial authorities with their Governors in our various States and by direct communication with the Crown through the medium of picked men who have been sent here.

Mr. O'Loghlen: The Governors have had as much to do with that as you have.

Mr. HARRISON: And those men have been our medium of communication not only with Downing-street but with the representatives of financial interests.

Mr. O'Loghlen: After the Lord Mayor's show!

Mr. HARRISON: It would not be well for Australia to change the present methods, and I shall not support the amendment.

Mr. MUNSIE: I am surprised at the brevity of the speech of the leader of the Country party.

The Premier: He set a very good example.

Mr. MUNSIE: I intend to follow it. The member for Avon seemed to infer that, by passing the amendment, we shall upset the whole financial position of Western Australia, the Commonwealth and Great Britain. I do not think there is a financial man in Great Britain who cares whether we have a British Governor or not. All such men care about is whether we have the securities for the money we have borrowed from them. The Governor, they do not regard as any security irrespective of who the occupant of that position might be. The Premier and the member for Moore oppose the amendment on the ground that the various States ought to be unanimous. We should set the ball rolling and endeavour to get the others to join in.

The Premier: We have done it about 14 times.

Mr. MUNSIE: Then try for the fifteenth time. It has been said there has been no

agitation against the importation of Governors. I am satisfied there is no question which if submitted to a referendum would be carried by a bigger majority than that of the abolition of State Governors in every State. The verdict of the people would be 50 to 1 in favour of their abolition. The Premier and the member for Moore said, "Let us wait until something comes from the Eastern States."

The Premier: They are the most affected.

Mr. MUNSIE: I do think a vote on this question will do some good, if the Government will regard it in the light in which it is intended. It would be an instruction to the Government to continue the negotiations, which were started by the Minister for Mines when he was Premier of the State.

The Premier: He did not start them.

The Minister for Mines: We kept them going at pretty long odds in Melbourne once.

Mr. MUNSIE: The matter should be impressed upon every candidate who is standing for election for the Federal Parliament.

The Premier: It would suit the Federal authorities to wipe out State Governors.

Mr. MUNSIE: I do not think there is anything to prevent the Federal Government from taking a referendum in all the States, or that there is one State that would object to a referendum. I do not mean that we should cut away from Great Britain, but I do think that the people of the Commonwealth have been misled. Fully 90 per cent. of the people who voted for Federation believed that they would get rid of many of the members of State Parliaments and that State Governors would be abolished. We have had Federation for 19 years, and imported Governors are still brought to the different States. It is a wilful and criminal waste of money to continue the system, and I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment.

Mr. TROY: The fact that this matter has been discussed year in and year out does not prevent us from endeavouring to bring about a condition of affairs so much desired by the people of the State. Unhappily in the past politicians have stood in the way of the accomplishment of this reform. How will it affect the sovereignty of the State if Governors from overseas are not appointed? If the State enjoys sovereignty it enjoys it only by the Constitution, which says nothing about Governors being imported or otherwise. The Governor is not part of the Constitution or of the sovereignty of the State. To argue otherwise points to ignorance. A good deal has been said about the co-partnership of the Dominions as part of the British Empire. Where is the fairness in a co-partnership when the citizens of one Dominion are not entitled to the advantages enjoyed by those of another? Where are the equal advantages of a partnership which provides that a local resident can only become a Gover-

nor of a country by the consent of Parliament whilst a Governor can be imported from another part of the Empire without the consent of Parliament?

The Premier: What about Sir William MacGregor?

Mr. TROY: He was an Imperial officer at the time of his appointment. Parliament will not be doing its duty if it ignores the right of the citizens of the State to occupy the highest position in it. The British Government only require the matter to be emphasised to acknowledge that right. They do not acknowledge it because they know that the people slavishly follow custom, and that the custom has been for the British Government to send out here people who have been prominent in politics in the Old Country, or have given some party service. I attach no importance to the fact that Downing Street states that it will take no action unless the Australian States act jointly. It has never willingly departed from custom, although we have several instances in Australia in which it has been departed from. The custom in Australia was to pay a subsidy to the British Navy to afford us protection. That custom would never have been departed from but for the decision of the Fisher Government to establish an Australian Navy, in the face of the conservatives in Australia who held that the British Navy was good enough for them. The British Government tried to force upon the people of Queensland a Governor they disliked. The people would not acknowledge him and insisted upon the appointment of another man. They came into conflict with the Imperial Government and gained the day. The British Government wanted to hand over New Guinea to Germany, but the Queensland Government set their faces against it. If it had not been for the action of the Queensland Government the whole of New Guinea would have become German. Downing Street will only depart from custom when the people vigorously assert themselves. All we have to do is to refuse to provide for the Governor's establishment on the Estimates. I would not, of course, insult the present occupant of the position when I suggest that way out of the difficulty. If we took a step like this, the Imperial authorities would not force a Governor upon us. They would allow us to do what they have always allowed the citizens of the Dominions to do, unless there were some flagrant act of disloyalty—have our own way. There is no disloyalty in demanding that the Governor of the State shall be the most deserving citizen of the soil of his own country. The amendment is moved because we want to say that the importation of Governors is not desirable. It is not aimed at the present occupant of the office or any former occupant of it. We have to view the question from the standpoint of expense. We have two retired chief justices, both drawing large pensions. Both are in good health

and in full possession of their mental faculties. Either gentleman would be capable of carrying out the duties of this position. I hope the Governor at present holding the position will not regard our remarks as hostile to himself, but merely as an indication to the Government that when his present term of office expires they should notify the Imperial authorities that we are not making provision for any further Imperial appointments. We have the opportunity now and should avail themselves of it.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: There is no need to re-echo my opinions regarding the appointment of State Governors. I have never been backward in expressing myself on this point. There is, however, a method of doing things, and this is not the way to gain our ends. We might reduce this vote by £12 and hon. members might go away satisfied that they have abolished State Governors, but they will have succeeded in doing nothing. I suggest they should keep in mind the fact that we are only one State of the Commonwealth, and that unless we can get most of the other States to take the same view we will not be successful in our representations to the Colonial Office to alter the system. The Imperial authorities will only go on repeating the statement they have already made that, until the other States act jointly in this matter the present system of appointments will continue. Sooner or later we will have to remodel our Constitution as it affects the appointment of Governors for Australia, and that time is not far distant. In the meantime we are only wasting time, and instead of saving £12 we are incurring an additional expense of £25 by discussing and re-discussing this matter. If the Federal Government desire that a change should be made, and I believe they do, in the system of appointing State Governors, they will probably take action in that direction. We might go on calling at the gate from now until doomsday without serious notice being taken of our representations. South Australia from the point of view of population and in other respects stands higher in the estimation of the Imperial Government than Western Australia. We are comparatively an insignificant State of the Commonwealth. Victoria and New South Wales, carrying large populations, have never expressed the desire to do away with State Governors.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Victoria has done so.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: If a further protest is desired, let it be done by way of direct motion. A reduction of this vote by £12, if communicated by the Premier to the Imperial Government, would not have much effect. But the carrying of a direct motion would be bound to receive attention at Home. At the same time, if there is to be a remodelling of the Australian Constitution, we would only get the reply that the matter must stand over until the remodelling had been completed. It would be im-

possible to carry on the government of Australia with one system in some of the States, and another system in other States. I do not know how certain members would exist politically were it not for this question. Let us do something that will be effective. The amendment is not a proper method of dealing with the question; in fact, it is a ridiculous method. I am satisfied that a substantive motion on the subject would have the support of practically every member of this Chamber. In this very connection we have previously been obliged to retrace our steps. If I am given the opportunity of recording a vote in this House on the question of the abolition of State Governors, my vote will be in favour of it. The carrying of the amendment can have no effect except that of making the public believe that we object to the expenditure on Government House as being extravagant.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I sincerely hope that the amendment will be carried. At least it would be an intimation to the Premier, when attending the next Premiers' Conference, that this Chamber requires an alteration of the present system. It is true that there may be a more direct method of dealing with the question but the adoption of that method in every instance would only flood our Notice Paper with motions. The institution under discussion has been attacked for the last two decades by every political party in Western Australia, and indeed throughout the Commonwealth. Every political aspirant, and every man who has made his way into Parliament, has made the abolition of State Governors the sheet anchor of his policy, firstly on the ground that the policy of importing Governors was objectionable, and secondly on the ground that the expense could not be borne by the community. It appears to be an accepted principle of all the returned soldiers' associations that the office should be abolished. If the amendment does not represent the best means of attaining the object in view, still, like many other of the Premier's little Bills, it can do no harm. Certainly it will make no appreciable difference in the Governor's income. I believe that the gentleman holding the office to-day is wasted there. I have heard him make speeches on various occasions and I only wish that I could speak like he speaks. When the Liberal party were in power at Home, the practice was to pension off "has-beens" by giving them such offices as Governorships. I think that principle was applied in the case of the last Governor we had. No member who was brought into contact with our last Governor could assert that that gentleman brought any mentality to bear on the position. But the brilliant intellect of the present occupant of the office is wasted on such a position. The office of Governor requires nothing that could not be done by any of the old residents of the State, and no doubt

a number of them would be glad to fill the position in an honorary capacity. I feel perfectly certain that no partisan attitude would be adopted by them, no matter from which side of politics they were selected. Possibly the present occupant of the office was given the position at his own request, but I think it is a loss to the Empire as a whole that he occupies that position.

Hon. P. Collier: Do you argue that such positions should be reserved for imbecile Australians?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: No; that is not my line of argument. I think the present occupant of the office is one of the best of British gentlemen, but I believe that the prevailing opinion is that a change should be made, and therefore I will take every opportunity to bring about that change.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	16
Noes	16
A tie	0

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Lutey
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Collier	Mr. Munste
Mr. Davies	Mr. Troy
Mr. Green	Mr. Walker
Mr. Holman	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Jones	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Lambert	Mr. O'Loghlen
	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Sir H. B. Lefroy
Mr. Broun	Mr. Maley
Mr. Draper	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Duff	Mr. Nairn
Mr. George	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Smith
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Hardwick
	(Teller.)

The CHAIRMAN: I give my casting vote with the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. HOLMAN: Apparently members believe that to reduce the vote by £12 on so short a notice would put too great a strain upon the resources of the Governor's establishment. Perhaps they will be ready to support a smaller reduction. In view of the necessity for economy we should lose no opportunity for effecting reform. We have no desire to attack the occupant of the office, but we must make our protest against the bringing in of Governors from outside the State. I believe that given a second chance members will realise the expediency of falling into line with the popular agitation for the appointment of a local man as State Governor. Personally I am inclined to think that the Governor devotes too little time to his official duties and rather too much to gratifying the desires of a certain section of the community. I do not think His Ex-

cellency should allow his private affairs to interfere with his official functions.

Mr. Smith: He must have a little recreation.

Mr. HOLMAN: I agree with that, but just the same he should not run counter to the wishes of a large section of the people.

Mr. Smith: He may be an eight hour day man.

Mr. HOLMAN: Much less than eight hours a day would suffice for the discharge of the official duties of the Governor. The amount by which I suggest the vote should be reduced could well be taken from the item of £251 allowed to the Governor in lieu of staff, and the amendment should be carried to show that we are sincere in our desire to curtail the expenditure in the Governor's establishment and to if possible prevent any other imported Governors from occupying the position. I move an amendment—

That the vote be reduced by £5

Mr. GREEN: The member for Murchison has covered ground not touched by other speakers. I wish to refer to a report of a grand ball and pageant at Government House recently. The report, from the pen of "Adrienne," appeared in the "West Australian" on the 7th October, and reads:—

Lady Ellison-Macartney and her co-workers are to be most heartily congratulated upon the conspicuous success which characterised the grand ball and pageant of the League of Nations, held last evening in the ballroom at Government House. The scene, possessing all the beauty and romance of stately ceremonial, will long be remembered by the very large gathering present. The episodes presented were in every sense of the word an artistic triumph and there will always be happy memories of Lady Ellison-Macartney's splendid effort to bring help to the Children's Protection Society, and the Baden Powell Girl Guides. The minutest details had received most thoughtful consideration, and no note was missing in the whole chord of beautifully picturesque ceremony, with its thrilling keynote of peace. The ballroom was brilliantly lighted, the galleries filled to overflowing with spectators, the sets of the nations grouped on either side of the great room, the atmosphere alive with expectant excitement, when the words announcing through the megaphone the arrival of "The King of England and his suite" were sounded. Instantly the heralds, in their old-time scarlet costumes, with the Royal Coat of Arms, stepped forward and blew a fanfare with their trumpets, the band played the National Anthem, the curtains were pulled aside, and His Excellency the Governor, as Harold the King, in robes of scarlet brocade and ivory velvet, wearing the cap of green with white feathers, stepped into the room, followed by his Lord Chief Justice (Mr. Ernest Chase), in robes of scarlet and ermine; his Chief Verderer (Mr. Brinkley), his Chief Huntsman (Captain Callendar Brodie), leading

his Majesty's pet greyhound, and the Court Jester in orange and emerald (Captain North). The Royal party were escorted to the dais by the Master of Ceremony (Mr. Arthur Hardwick), with grave dignity of bearing, and wearing an old-world courtier's dress of lavender satin and primrose.

Mr. Munsie: That is what we pay £1,812 a year for!

Mr. GREEN: The report continues—A thrill of excitement passed over the huge gathering as the announcement was made of the arrival of the Queen of the Pageant with the Mistress of the Robes, her six Maids of Honour, and four pages. Again the heralds stepped forward to welcome her Majesty's approach with a fanfare of silver trumpets, and the band sounded forth the joyful news, as Lady Ellison-Macartney, as the beautiful Queen of the Pageant, looking regal, entered the ballroom, preceded by three pages in white walking backwards to the music, and followed by her six Maids of Honour, carrying her train (three on either side), which was held also by the Mistress of the Robes (Miss Ellison-Macartney), whose train was again held by another page in white. The procession made its way, led by the Master of Ceremonies, to the dais where her Majesty made obeisance to the King, and then took her place by his side.

The Premier: Let us take the rest as read.

Mr. GREEN: No; this is good stuff. The report continues—

The Queen's exquisite frock was of draped ivory silk, adorned with rich ivory silk embroideries and deep fringes of ivory silk. The order in ciel blue across the corsage was held by a diamond buckle, and the gorgeous train of gold brocade, showing embroidered on its graceful length the Royal symbols of the crown, and coat of arms, in harmonious colours, was also ornamented with the black swans, to bring a remembrance of a loyal portion of the King's dominions under the Southern Cross. Her Majesty wore a beautiful crown of jewels on erise velvet, and carried a bouquet of golden flowers. The six Maids of Honour looked charming in their white satin and lace frocks, and white tulle veils flowing from the white triple feathers in their hair; as did the little pages in their white Court costumes, braided with silk. The Mistress of the Robes looked very striking in a beautiful frock of white tulle diamante over white satin-de-soie, and long softly flowing train.

The Minister for Works: That is not paid for by the State.

Mr. GREEN: This is one of the functions paid for out of the State funds which the Government want us to pass without discussion to-night. I am reading this by way of protest against the absurd trappings at Government House which have caused a

division among the people. The report goes on to state—

When the King and Queen of the Pageant, with their attendants, were seated on the dais, with the four pages, with their gold sticks, standing in a line at intervals before them, the third interesting episode was announced, and the trumpets heralded the entrance of Britannia—Britannia magnificent in her robes of flowing white, her corselet of gold, her shield, the Union Jack, the gold trident bearing the laurel wreath of victory, and her gleaming helmet, flashing to scarlet—so she pictured as it were for all to see the great symbolic Mother of the Empire, glorious in her mission to the world and was followed with dignity by those devoted servants of hers who have ever proved themselves as true as steel and faithful unto death:—Representatives of the Navy, the Army, the Air Service, the military nurses, the Red Cross Society, Trench Comforts, V.A.D.s, Boy Scouts, and Girl Guides. After bowing before the throne, and slowly passing round the ball-room, Britannia and her suite occupied the gallery above the dais. Then the heralds, after the announcement, triumphantly sounded the sweet approach of the Spirit of Peace, with the Peace Thoughts, and she entered the room, a young fair girlish presence, with gold hair, laurel crowned, and lit by the light of peace, the bright star of hope to the coming age, wearing flowing robes of white, her arms outstretched with diaphanous draperies, merging from the white wings of peace.

Mr. JONES: That sounds like a bit of the abode of love.

Mr. GREEN: The report proceeds—A tiny peace thought—a curly headed little child in rosebud pink, carrying the olive branch with two white doves, preceded the Spirit of Peace, who was followed by four little peace thoughts, little girls in white wreathed with flowers, and holding the strands of pink roses of happiness which reached again from the Spirit of Peace. They slowly came up the great room to do homage to the King and Queen, and then the Spirit of Peace took her place overshadowing the Royal group. The episode that followed was that of the symbolic figures of the muses, the arts, the crafts, the sciences, and those influences in all departments of national life that flourish and make noble the periods when peace reigns on earth. Their entry was announced and heralded, and they walked to the sound of appropriate music, led by a charmingly artistic group, the oldest of the arts—Architecture, comprising a herald in an old-time dress of vivid cerise and ivory satin, and two stately figures in deep blue and violet, with silver laurel over their silken hoods, and carrying the emblems of their art. They were followed by Sculpture, Painting, Music, Song, Poetry, Tragedy,

Comedy, Dancing, Literature, History, Astronomy, Law, and Medicine. The last-named was a most picturesque figure, as the Greek Esculapius. Science was delightfully represented by an old professor, with robes of scarlet and grey, having a long grey beard, and carrying a banner of paper, with his motto in a chemical which burnt but did not blaze; and by a lady, shrouded in black filmy draperies, typifying the hidden mysteries, with a bright light—the light of science—burning in her hair. One and all of these symbolic representations were carried out with delicate and artistic effect, each adding a picture of beauty to the throng. The last striking episode sounded again one of the great keynotes of a new age of peace, as after the usual ceremonial announcements and fanfare of trumpets, Industry entered the room, a tall young girl in scarlet and gold, leading the two great forces of life, capital and labour, both bright young girls, absolutely alike in scarlet, with the gold head-dress bearing the inscription of their representation. Following in their train were interesting interpretations of science, commerce, forestry, agriculture, and fisheries.

We find industry represented in this pageant, but not a single son of toil was there. There are several columns of this humbug in the morning paper, which claims to be the representative of thought in the State. It is considered necessary, with this flim-flam, this old world, out of date ceremonial, to waste the time of the people in reading it, to waste the time of the printer in setting it up, and waste the time of the reporter in writing it. It is time we did away with all this nonsense, which no one believes in, but which apparently no one has the courage to decry. I trust that the amendment will be supported by hon. members. Such humbug as this finds no place in any country in the world but England and Australia. It is time this Vote was cut down, and that we were rid of this sort of thing.

Mr. JONES: I, too, must support the amendment. Amongst the items appearing in this Vote is one providing for a caretaker for the Governor's residence at Albany. What does this man do? This residence was once set apart for returned soldiers as a place in which they might recuperate. This office of Governor seems always to be conflicting with returned soldiers. When they wanted the use of the Government House ballroom they were refused, and yet it can be used for the kind of flummery mentioned by the member for Kalgoorlie. In the case of the Albany residence, the late Governor had the returned soldiers turned out in order that he might occupy the dwelling himself for a week or two once in a year, notwithstanding the fact that the Government had expended nearly £1,500 in fixing it up. It seems to me a sheer waste of money to pay a caretaker more than £100 a year to look

after a place which is so rarely used. There are plenty of hotels in Albany which could be utilised in connection with the visit of the Governor to that town, if the necessity arose for so doing.

Mr. ANGELO: I regret the tone that the debate has taken. The present occupant of the position of Governor is one of the most courteous gentlemen we have ever had in the State, and takes a deep interest in its welfare. I strongly object to the remarks of the member for Kalgoorlie, especially as they affect one of the most courteous ladies we have ever had the privilege of having in the State. In order to do good in a charitable way, and to assist in raising money for the children of the working classes of the State, she assisted in this burlesque, and it is wrong that fun should be made of her action.

Mr. Jones: Was it not held for the benefit of the dressmakers in the State?

Mr. ANGELO: It was held for the benefit of the Children's Protection Society. If the member for Geraldton had moved in a proper direction to alter the present system of appointing Governors, I would have voted with him.

Mr. GREEN: I must entirely repudiate the intention, ascribed to me by the last speaker, of ridiculing a function held at Government House for charitable purposes. I may point out, however, that had the very large amount of money spent on dresses in that connection been paid direct to charity, the purpose of the function would have been much more adequately served.

Amendment put and negatived.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Executive Council, £10—agreed to.

Vote—London Agency, £7,526:

Item, Secretary and Immigration Agent, £400.

Mr. PICKERING: To-day's "West Australian" announces the appointment, and details the qualifications, of Mr. E. Y. Taylor as Secretary and Immigration Agent in the London Agency. In view of the fact that among the applications received there were many from public servants, why was not the appointment filled from the Public Service?

The PREMIER: Mr. Taylor, a returned soldier, was considered the most suitable applicant, and for that reason was appointed. Hon. members know that the Public Service Commissioner recommends an appointment after going through the applications. I believe that Mr. Taylor is a first-class man and will prove a first-class immigration agent.

Item, Special Child Emigration Officer, £150.

Mr. MUNSIE: This item, I believe, is provided to meet the expenses of Mr. Fairbridge on his six months' trip Home in connection with child immigration. I have never seen the Fairbridge farm, though I have heard a good deal about it. At present I happen to be a member of the select committee on the State Children and Charities

Department, and I am totally opposed to the spending of any Government money on child immigration, as I believe that the money could be better spent on our own children, who after all are the best immigrants. What is the object of Mr. Fairbridge's appointment, and how will the State benefit by this expenditure of £150?

The PREMIER: Hon. members know that Mr. Fairbridge started his child immigration scheme years ago, that he has brought out a great many children, and that a good deal of money has been subscribed by British people for the purpose. True, when the war broke out, the British subscriptions fell off.

Mr. Munsie: And Western Australia has had to keep the children.

The PREMIER: Mr. Fairbridge has gone Home to raise further funds, and with those funds he will establish himself here, and it is hoped that he will bring a number of lads out. I do not think we can have any better form of immigration than child immigration under proper control. As the result of Mr. Fairbridge's efforts thousands of pounds have already been brought to this State, and if he continues to secure subscriptions and to introduce children as before, pretty good work will be done. He is attached to the London Agency for a period of six months.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Whenever I speak on this subject some hon. members conclude that I have something against Mr. Fairbridge or the children he brings out here. My view is, simply, that while we are paying such large amounts for the maintenance of children here, we cannot afford to pay for the introduction of children from outside. At present the maintenance of fatherless children in this State is costing £50,000 or £60,000 per annum.

The Premier: We do not undertake to maintain the children brought out.

Hon. P. Collier: But the Government cannot escape that responsibility once the children are here.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The children were brought here on the understanding that they would be maintained by certain persons in England. They had not been here very long when subscriptions fell off very materially, and on the outbreak of war contributions almost ceased. The maintenance of the children had to be borne by the State.

The Premier: Not entirely.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: A great part of it. Differential treatment has been shown to this institution as against less favoured institutions. The children came out here under a distinct agreement. The Government had to contribute £6 towards each fare, but the maintenance of the children was to be borne by the society in England. I have no objection to children coming here in their thousands, provided they are properly maintained until self-supporting. But while we have to pay £60,000 per annum for the maintenance of destitute children born in the State we cannot afford to import destitute children unconditionally. If this institution is to be assisted by the Govern-

ment, it should be placed on a footing with other Government institutions.

Mr. MULLANY: I am not in any way antagonistic to Mr. Fairbridge. But some years ago he arrived here from England in charge of a number of children for whose maintenance, he said, certain persons in England would be responsible; and within a short time after arrival those children became a charge upon the Charities Department. Now we find on the Estimates a sum of £150 to enable Mr. Fairbridge to bring more destitute children into the State. If the people at Home fail in their undertaking to maintain those children, the Charities Department must inevitably come to the rescue. We require immigrants, but we cannot afford to accept destitute children without some reliable guarantee of their maintenance. I move an amendment—

That the item be struck out.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 23rd October, 1919.

	PAGE.
Obituary: Hon. H. J. Saunders, letter in reply ...	1009
Leave of Absence	1009
Bills: Slaughter of Calves Restriction, 3R. ...	1009
Traffic, 2R. ...	1010
Wheat Marketing, Com. ...	1015
Merchant Shipping Act Application Act Amend- ment, 2R. ...	1016
Midland Railway, 2R. ...	1017

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

OBITUARY—HON. H. J. SAUNDERS.

Letter in Reply.

The PRESIDENT: I have to announce that I have received the following letter—

The President of the Legislative Council.
Dear Sir, I and my family wish to tender our sincerest thanks to the members of the Legislative Council for the resolution passed expressing their deepest sympathy to us in our recent bereavement. (Sgd.)
Julia Saunders.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. J. Duffell (for Hon. J. Cornell), leave of absence for six consecutive sittings of the House granted to Hon. J. E. Dodd (South) on the ground of ill-health.

BILL—SLAUGHTER OF CALVES RESTRICTION.

Third Reading.

The HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. C. F. Baxter—East) [4.34]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

Hon. J. MILLS (Central) [4.35]: In Committee I did not desire to infringe upon the Standing Orders, and bowed to the ruling of the Chairman in the matter of a clause I wished to insert in the Bill. I realise that the clause was not within the scope of the Bill, but would like to point out that the Bill only provides for the preservation of calves for six months and that, during that time, they would have to be artificially fed, and would be in fair condition. The small butcher in the metropolitan area would, therefore, probably give a better price for them than people in the country would give, unless some restrictions are placed upon the sale of them, or their preservation by other means. I trust that something of the kind will be done. I should like to have an assurance from the Honorary Minister that he will bring down a Bill to regulate the breeding of dairy cows within the defined areas, and preserve these calves so that they may not be used for any other purpose than for dairying. Then those who are operating in the country, who wish to get well bred calves, will have the assurance that these will have come from well bred dairy cows which have been under the supervision of Government officials. They will thus know that they are getting a good article for their purpose. I should like some assurance from the Honorary Minister that the Government will bring in a measure to provide for what I have suggested.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON (North-East) [4.37]: I have pleasure in supporting the remarks of Mr. Mills. Clause 4, which provides a penalty for the slaughter of any female calf of the age of six months, is the main clause of the Bill, and I presume the object is that dairy stock should be bred within the State. It appears to me that this Bill does not ensure this being done. Mr. Mills' remarks will, therefore, bring the matter under the notice of the Government. I suggest that the object desired in the Bill could be obtained in another way by a further measure. This is a question of great importance to our dairying industry. Those who wish to launch out in dairy farms will find it most difficult to get suitable stock. As time goes on this difficulty will be enhanced. If anyone has to do with such a