

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Premier. 1, Amendments to Public Service Regulations between 1st January, 1914, and 30th June, 1914. 2, Audit report and balance sheet of the State Steamship Service for year ended 30th June, 1913.

By the Honorary Minister (Hon. W. C. Angwin) : Amendment of By-law 24 of Leederville Municipal Council under "The Health Act, 1911."

House adjourned at 9.52 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 8th July, 1914.

	PAGE
Paper presented	198
Formal Business	198
Address-in-reply, fifth day	198

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

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: Amendments to the public service regulations made and gazetted between the 1st January, 1914, and the 30th June, 1914.

FORMAL BUSINESS.

The PRESIDENT: The Clerk will call on the Orders of the Day.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: Before the Orders of the Day are called on, may I direct attention to a notice of motion standing in my name asking for a return classifying the successful applicants and the advances for homes under the Workers' Homes Act. It is a formal motion.

The PRESIDENT: According to Standing Order 15 it is not formal.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: The Colonial Secretary is agreeable to treat it as a formal matter.

The PRESIDENT: Well, I am not. Standing Order 15 states—

No business beyond what is of a formal character shall be entered upon before the Address-in-reply has been adopted. The formal business which may be entered upon includes the fixing of days and hours of meeting and the appointment of standing committees and the first reading of Bills.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: I took it that the word "includes" would not be exhausted by that list.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Fifth Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. J. DUFFELL (Metropolitan-Suburban): I suppose it is customary for new members rising for the first time to preface their remarks by impressions which were gained on taking their seats in this House, and it is with this object in view that I desire to fall into line with the method adopted by previous speakers prior to commencing their speech on the Address-in-reply, and indulge in some remarks of the nature of a preamble. I, like most hon. members, received certain impressions at the commencement of the session's proceedings. Apart from the pomp and circumstances, one could not fail to be impressed, sitting here as I was for the first time, having just emerged from a serious campaign and being fresh from the field of battle, by being attacked as I was by the hon. Mr. Cornell. I have since learned that, ferocious as was the appearance of the hon. member in making that attack, he is quite harmless. Therefore, under the circumstances, I intend to be very brief in my remarks as applied to the hon. member, chiefly out of respect to the people who sent him to this Chamber to represent

them. The fact remains that, evidently at the back of the hon. member's mind, he considered my pre-election speech of greater importance than the business before the House. If the hon. member had confined himself exclusively to the truth, I might have felt inclined to pass him over altogether, but such was not the case. The hon. member made reference to statements which he supposed I had made when I was before the electors, one of which related to the Mines Regulation Bill. I want to say here and now that I had very little inclined to say in regard to that measure when I was before the electors, for the simple reason that I knew very little about it, but I understand, rightly or wrongly, that a certain measure was brought before the House in connection with the mining industry of this State having for its object the betterment of the conditions of the miners. I also want to say that anything which has for its object the betterment of the conditions of those men will receive my most earnest attention. But no matter how thickly coated with sugar the nostrum may be when it is sent to the analyst it is easily discovered, and, from the information I have received in regard to this proposed enactment, I am led to believe—I am open to correction—that whilst the measure had for its object the betterment of the conditions especially in connection with the health and well-being of the miners, it contained a nostrum which was discovered when the members of this Chamber came to analyse it. I do not know anything whatever about stopes, and I am not going to say anything about them, but I understand that the Bill provided that certain inspectors, who should have unlimited powers, should be appointed from the miners themselves. We can readily understand what a detrimental effect this would have under certain conditions. If these inspectors happened to be men who had a grievance against either the management or the owners of the mine, we can readily understand how far-reaching anything in the way of condemnation emanating from those men would have

been in its effects upon the mining industry. Therefore, as we realise—and I am sure we all realise it—the great importance of the mining industry to Western Australia, anything which has for its object the undoing of that industry, or which may have a detrimental effect upon the conditions of mining to such an extent as to lead possibly to the closing down of the mines owing to the fact that circumstances were such that the owners found it absolutely impossible to continue their working, I say it behoves this House to discover at all times anything in the nature of a nostrum. I have no idea what the Bill contained, but that in itself was quite sufficient to make members pause before passing *holus bolus* a Bill combining such specimens of legislation as were contained in the clauses pertaining to the duties and powers of inspectors.

Hon. J. Cornell: What were they?

Hon. J. DUFFELL: You know more about it than I do, probably. There is another reference made by the hon. Mr. Ardagh to the Esperance railway. I want to say here that up to the present time I have an open mind on that question, notwithstanding the fact that when I was before my electors, amongst other things on which I was expected to give my word in the form of a pledge was the Esperance railway. I received a letter from a gentleman residing in Kalgoorlie asking my opinion on this railway question. I politely acknowledged receipt of his letter and informed him that I had an open mind, that there was certain information which I would seek, and that on obtaining it, if all things were equal, I would give my opinion at the right time and in the right place. I have to acknowledge, with a certain amount of thankfulness the straightforward manner in which the reply came to my letter. Briefly, the reply was this: "We have before met gentlemen with open minds, and our experience of them is such that we have no faith in them. Allow me to tell you that we will not vote for you and that we hope you will not be successful." I consider that frank, and I appreciate anything in the nature of frankness. However, a reply of that kind has not made the slight-

est difference so far as I am concerned. At the proper time, when the Esperance Railway Bill comes before the House, I shall be prepared like other members to give it every consideration, to use my discretion, and to vote without fear or favour one way or the other. Mention has also been made of the Traffic Bill. When I was before the people seeking election to this hon. Chamber, I told them without hesitation that I considered this was a House of review, and that, the Legislative Council being such, I would be prepared, if sent there, to use my very best discretion on all subjects; that no matter what Government might be in power in the other House, I would, without fear or favour, do as I said before, vote according to the best of my knowledge and ability. A great deal has been said in regard to the battle-cry which was raised by the Premier. All of us will remember how a month or two back, when the Premier was in the Eastern States, arrangements were made for the holding of a monster meeting in Perth, when the hon. gentleman was going to deal out to the people his reasons as to why this House should be abolished. What was the result? I went before the people making this the greatest question which I had to place before them, whether they were in favour of this House being abolished or whether they were in favour of the retention of the two Houses. I was opposing a man of whom I can hear nothing but praise on every hand, a man who I feel bound to admit is a gentleman in every sense of the word. I realised this whilst I was conducting my campaign, and I almost felt sorry that it was not possible for us both to be returned. The campaign was a clean fought campaign; but, notwithstanding that, the main issue was whether there should be one House or whether there should be two Houses. And what has been the result? The people in no uncertain manner, and with no uncertain sound, affirmed the necessity for this House of review. I am here, and I can assure hon. members that I shall do all within my power, if need be, to uphold the dignity of this Chamber. I want to say here and now that I do fully appreciate the latitude which you, Mr. Presi-

dent, accorded to me when I was attacked as I said at the commencement, by the hon. Mr. Cornell on first taking my seat. One can only expect that the fighting spirit may be very quickly aroused, and I felt I would have liked to reply. That was the reason why I may have acted somewhat indiscreetly by interjecting. However, as I said earlier, out of respect for the people who have sent Mr. Cornell to this Chamber, I shall not deal as harshly with him as otherwise I might have done. I bear in mind also that Mr. Cornell is not as ferocious as he looks, and, indeed, I have learnt since he is quite harmless. Now, a good deal of capital was made by the Labour party out of the rejection of some measures by this Chamber. I have already referred to the Mines Regulation Bill. I come now to the question of the Traffic Bill. This, of course, I understand was not a party question. The measure came before this Chamber in due course, having passed through the other House; but there was a nostrum also wrapped up, wrapped up very nicely, in Clause 23 of that Bill. That clause, to use the words of the member for Perth, Mr. Dwyer, amounted to constituting the Minister for Works nothing short of a Czar of the metropolitan area. It conferred on the Minister powers under the circumstances, and judging from the powers which have already been usurped by the Minister, sufficient to warrant members of this House in considering very seriously the advisability of placing in the hands of the Minister such further powers as proposed by Clause 23 of the Bill. Generally speaking, and taking the Traffic Bill as a whole, I believe that if all objectionable clauses were eliminated, and especially Clause 23, it would be a measure bound to benefit the metropolitan area; provided, however, that all the license fees and moneys brought into the revenue as the result of the passing of that Bill were retained and spent within the boundaries of the metropolitan area. Next, I come to the state of the finances. The finances, I say without hesitation, are in a most deplorable condition. Notwithstanding all that the Premier said in the other Chamber last evening, I venture to assert that the finances

at present are of such importance that it is high time members left off slangwhanging each other and devoted their combined attention and ability to the squaring-up and the betterment of the financial position. I cannot believe for one moment that the hon. Mr. Kirwan was in earnest when he referred to the finances the other evening. That hon. member spoke in almost a flippant manner when he likened the position of the State to that of a merchant who was doing a turnover of £5,000 on an overdraft of £500. I cannot think for an instant that the hon. member was in a serious mood. What about the 27 millions? What about the deplorable state of affairs throughout the length and breadth of the land? Consider for a moment the fact that during the regime of the present Government no less a sum than nine millions was borrowed by a party which professedly went into power as a non-borrowing party. Consider for a moment what would be the effect under normal conditions of such an expenditure of loan money. When I say normal conditions, I refer to the conditions which would prevail if a Liberal Government were in power. With nine millions sterling flowing into the country inside of three years, I say, under these normal conditions people would be flocking here: they would follow the money from all parts of the civilised world. But what is the fact? Instead of people flocking here immigration has received a check. People have been retarded. Instead of everyone already here being happy and prosperous, instead of there being an absence of any signs of turmoil, what exists to-day? Notwithstanding the fact that nine million pounds sterling has come into this country during the period mentioned, there is more industrial strife in the atmosphere than ever there has been before. I say it is a crying shame. I say without hesitation, or mental reservation either, it is a disgrace to the present Government that such a state of affairs should exist. Mr. Cornell made the statement that this Chamber was responsible for the last strike. Can hon. members think for a moment that Mr. Cornell meant it?

Either Mr. Cornell is ignorant of the fact or else he was not speaking what was really in his mind. As a matter of fact the strike was the result of a resolution passed in March last by the Builders' Industrial Union. All the unions freely admit this. There is no doubt about it. And if it had not been the carpenters it would have been some other union, for they intended to take the various employers in detail. There was the result of the resolution, which had for its basis compulsory unionism, or the refusal to work with non-unionists. The unions freely admit that the deliberate and unprovoked attack on Millars' was the result of that resolution of March last, and that they would have compelled Millars to submit if it had not been for the Employers' Federation. In face of that, how can the hon. member make such a diabolical charge as he did against this Chamber? I would like to draw attention in passing to the number of State enterprises in which the Government have indulged. I do this for obvious reasons, principally to make a comparison of what has actually taken place with what might have taken place. We heard from Mr. Baxter last evening what can be fairly claimed as the mandate of the Farmers and Settlers' Association, as represented by two members of this House.

Member: He is the deputy leader.

HON. J. DUFFELL: Whether he is the deputy leader or not, I can assure you that there are really more than the deputy leader or the leader, either, who are in sympathy with this movement. I say this without hesitation. We must all more or less take a very keen interest in the welfare of the country. The point I wish to make is that the Premier last evening stated that the cost of living in this State was less now than in 1912, and that the price of meat was lower to-day than at that period. I venture to say the statement is not in accordance with the facts. I contend that if the money which has been spent on some of the State enterprises had been made available for the assistance of people going on the land and to assist the people when upon the land, we would have had a better result

than we have at the present time. The Premier said that the whole of the assistance, including seed wheat, which was afforded to the farmers amounted to something like £240,000. When we take into consideration the fact that they have spent almost that amount on two of the State enterprises it is a very small sum to boast about as having been made available to the farmers. No doubt the present high cost of living must seriously affect the whole of the community, and what affects the community affects us as their representatives in this Chamber. Therefore in anything we can do to lessen the cost of living we will be doing our duty to our people and to the State generally. We cannot reasonably expect very much relief from the State steamers. When the Wilson Government were in office, and just prior to the closing of that Government's term, a scheme was started by the then Premier, and men were sent to Wyndham to locate water and other facilities close to the jetty, with a view to establishing freezing works there. If those freezing works had been established instead of our purchasing State steamers, we would have had not only cheaper meat but better meat than we are getting at the present time. The Premier declared that they had found the means of cheapening meat. Again I say that statement is not in accordance with facts. Furthermore, the high cost of living is also very much affected when we take into consideration the position throughout the world at the present time. Since 1880 the population of America has increased 83 per cent., and during the same period the increase in food production has been only 24 per cent. From these figures we can reasonably infer that in the very near future America, instead of being an exporting country, will be an importing country. What a vista does this open for us in Western Australia! With our climatic conditions second to none in the world, and with the millions of acres we have at our disposal, the money which has been spent on those State enterprises could have been better employed by making it easy for the people to settle on the land instead of indulging in manufacturing enterprises

in all directions. I do not intend to prolong my remarks. I realise that already a great deal has been said, many statements have been repeated, and unnecessary delay in the conclusion of the Address-in-reply debate is, I feel sure, unwarranted. In conclusion I wish to say that I was very much impressed with the decorum of the House at its opening proceedings; and I can only say, in accordance with the prayers with which our proceedings are opened, that I am at all times willing, by Divine wisdom, to be guided and assisted in doing my duty without fear and without favour as one of the members of this Legislative Council of Western Australia.

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH (North-East): According to the list of Bills proposed to be introduced this session, the session promises to be a short one. Apparently the intention of the Government in intimating that only a small number of Bills will be brought down this session was to give this Chamber more time to consider some of those old friends which we have had before.

Hon. F. Connor: Is this a Ministerial statement?

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: No; it is the statement of Ardagh. Mr. Cullen has given us a further illustration of his proclivity for attacking the Government in the first place and the Labour party and trades union movement and workers generally. In fact the hon. member, whenever he has risen to speak, has never had a kind word to say in reference to anything done by the working classes.

Hon. F. Connor: Nonsense.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: I am a worker myself.

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: You might have been at one time, but at all events you do not show it very much in this Chamber towards those who are really workers. The hon. member has on every occasion when speaking in this Chamber attempted to belittle the actions of the present Government and the Labour movement generally, and consequently I think that Mr. Cullen appears to have gathered an excess of hatred against the Labour party and the workers generally.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: He is a non-party man.

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: Yes, he claims to be, but on every occasion he makes most pronounced attacks upon one party, and that is not the party to which he belongs. The first thing in the Speech to which I would refer is the workers' homes scheme. Mr. Colebatch stated that it was not the policy of the workers' Homes Board to advance money on buildings already erected and occupied by intending purchasers. Further, that hon. member said that the board would not cause such buildings to be inspected, or words to that effect. I find in looking through the Governor's Speech that a great number of homes have been inspected and mortgages lifted. In fact, 322 homes have been purchased, completed, or cleared of existing mortgages, at a cost of approximately £100,000.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: We are aware of that. I said the board has only just now announced that new policy.

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: Yes, that goes to show now that the hon. member was not quite correct in his remarks.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: I do not deny that they have done anything in the past. They only issued a statement that they would not do it in the future.

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: We also find that inquiries are being made from the other States, and from as far as America, concerning the operations of the Workers' Homes scheme in this country, showing very clearly that the action which has been taken here is being watched in these places and that it has evidently directed the attention of those other States and other countries towards doing something to better the conditions of the working classes of their particular countries. We find in the report of the Workers' Homes Board recently published and laid before this House that the chairman, Mr. H. F. Johnston, states (in the report ending June 30th, 1913) that—

The financial position as disclosed by the balance-sheet is considered by the Board to be very satisfactory, the loss for the period since the scheme was inaugurated amounting to the sum of

£658, which is a comparatively small amount, in view of the fact that the whole of the expenses of inauguration have been met during the period under review. The Board anticipates that by the expiration of the current financial year the profit and loss account will disclose a materially improved position.

I think that this, being authentic, ought to convince all fair-minded members of this Chamber that the Workers' Homes scheme is proving very satisfactory, that a good deal will come out of it in time to come, and that the people generally who take up these homes will materially benefit by them. The hon. Mr. Colebatch, in connection with the mining industry, said that in the first five months of this year we were not only lower in our gold yield as compared with the corresponding period of last year, but that the yield was lower than for the five months of any other similar period in the history of the goldfields. He did not believe that the position was due to the failure of mines, but to the hampering effect of the industrial conditions imposed and not in the interests of the State. Mr. President, surely one does not want that state of affairs to exist. I do not think that Mr. Colebatch wants it himself or desires that men employed in an unhealthy occupation such as this should not be able to better their conditions. That is purely what is happening on the goldfields of Western Australia. The men are courageous enough to work and try to get better conditions for those working in that particular industry. When one considers the large amount of accidents that have happened in the years gone by and happen in each week and month of the year, as time goes on, and remembers the death roll of those employed in the industry from month to month and from year to year; and remembers the fact that the bread-winners are taken away from their wives and little children, through miners' complaints and through the accidents caused by their working in this particular occupation, one wonders why members of this Chamber continue to refer to the industrial conditions imposed upon

miners by the workers and by their leaders. I notice too that the Government intend to inaugurate a relief fund, particulars of which are set out in the Governor's Speech, to be contributed to by the mine owners, and the Government, and those employed in the industry. When we realise the large amount of gold that has been won during the last 20 years in Western Australia from these mines, it makes one feel that those who have reaped benefits and are deriving that unearned increment should have inaugurated this scheme years ago in the interests of those employed in the industry.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: They are now contributing, are they?

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: I believe they are about to do so. Much has been said both in this Chamber and out of it by some people who are opposed to the present Government, that the Government are not giving the mining industry that assistance which they should give.

Hon. F. Connor: They should give it more.

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: Past governments, when they had their treasury full of gold won from the mines, governments which the hon. member has sat behind in the Parliaments of this country, might have done more in those days.

Hon. F. Connor: They did more comparatively than you are doing.

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: That remains to be proved.

Hon. F. Connor: It has been proved and is being proved.

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: Not on the figures which have been shown.

Hon. F. Connor: He does not understand.

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: I find that at a civic reception held recently in Kalgoorlie, despite the fact that many of those present had voted against the actions of the Labour party, particularly in the mining industry, such a gentleman holding a high position in the mining world as Mr. Richard Hamilton, in speaking at that function given by the Kalgoorlie municipal council to Mr. McLeod, the general manager for Bewick, Moreing & Company, related the fact in connection

with industrial troubles that Kalgoorlie had never been in the throes of a strike, a fact which was largely due to the level-headed men who had led the movement in the eastern goldfields. I think when we hear remarks coming from a gentleman of this description, a man who has been connected with mining all his life, and held high positions in other countries, and held them in this, it makes one think that, after all, the leaders of the labour movement and those connected with it generally, are doing all they can to assist the mining industry and not to hamper it. We find also, despite the remarks of some croakers against the Government that, speaking at a banquet recently given on the goldfields to a prominent manager of one of the mines, a gentleman said that the present Minister for Mines was the best Minister for Mines for the mining industry this country had ever had.

Hon. F. Connor: Who was the gentleman?

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: I cannot remember.

Hon. F. Connor: Why, I said it myself.

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: I am glad to hear you admit that sometimes a Labour Government is right. At the function to which I referred, however, at which Mr. Hamilton made the remark concerning the progress of the industry under the Labour movement and said that it was doing all it could to see that better conditions were maintained by those who worked in the mines, we find that at least one gentleman, Mr. R. S. Black, a manager of one of the mines, seemed to be up against all and sundry. He said that the chief enemies which the mining industry had were members of Parliament, particularly those members who had been returned for the goldfields constituencies. He went on to say that they knew nothing about the mining industry.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: He was giving it hot.

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: This gentleman asked what the Government had done to assist the mining industry. We find as against this Mr. Hamilton referring

to the good work done by the leaders of the Labour movement in connection with the mining industry. Mr. Black seems to have spoken with a biased mind. He does know from his own experience that Cabinet Ministers to-day were the leaders of the movement on the fields who assisted in the inauguration of better conditions for the workers and also assisted in every way to help along the mining industry, and yet we find Mr. Black making such biased remarks against the Government and against members of Parliament generally. He also went on to relate that the mining industry was on the down grade, particularly from the hampering it had received from the crude industrial conditions imposed upon them by the workers. We find following him, Mr. Larcombe, a geologist. This gentleman was on a different track altogether. He said he believed that Western Australia offered more and better facilities for the investment of capital than any other country in the world. He said that we had country which ran into millions of square miles, two-thirds of which were available for mining purposes. He went on to say that he had absolute confidence in the splendid future which this industry had. He said, we must acknowledge the greatness and magnificence of the industry, the returns from which for a period of 11 years had averaged £400 per head per annum for every man engaged in the industry. They are figures coming from a man, a government geologist, Mr. Larcombe. He said the Government were doing all they could to develop the industry, and that they deserved every credit for their wise and vigorous policy. The remarks coming from Mr. Larcombe certainly, to my mind, are eloquent, and no doubt are a good rejoinder to those croakers who cry down the mining industry simply because the mining industry had a setback a few months ago.

Hon. F. Connor: Who are the croakers?

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: I have not said the hon. member was. In my opinion the mining industry in Western Australia will be flourishing when we have all left this planet. Many valuable lives

which are engaged in it during that time will probably not be there as long as they might have been had they healthy occupations. I listened the other evening with a good deal of interest to Mr. Holmes' speech on the State Steamship Service and the North-West cattle trade. One of Mr. Holmes' chief arguments was that the price of meat would not be cheapened without freezing and chilling works being started at Wyndham. While I listened with a great deal of interest to Mr. Holmes' remarks—and one must listen to him because he is a man who has been in the cattle trade for many years in Western Australia, and knows a good deal about it—I wondered at this: that the hon. member who himself at one time was a member of the ministry of this country and has been a supporter of governments for many years, and a supporter of those who have had an opportunity, if they had so desired, to have freezing and chilling works erected there, I say I wondered that these have not been insisted upon long before this time. Ever since I have been in this Chamber some hon. members have been advocating that these chilling works should be erected at Wyndham. It appeals to me very forcibly that those who have been ruling this country for years have not taken this action when the opportunity presented itself.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: There was not the same shortage of meat as there is now.

Hon. F. Connor: Plans were ready for these works and they were in the departments when the Labour Government came into power.

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: We hear hon. members deprecating the action of the Government in starting a steamship service on the North-West coast, but we find that the leader of the Opposition when he was Premier, advocated the same thing himself. I hope the present Government will continue to carry on this service, because it will give better opportunities to those engaged in cattle raising in the North-West to get their stock to market than has been the case in years gone by.

Hon. F. Connor: Except that meat is dearer now than it was when it was in the hands of the other people.

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: Mr. Holmes said the other evening that, whilst the State steamship service was started for the purpose of assisting the small people, about three owners were monopolising it at the present time, but we find on reference to the public Press that the Government are already making a name for themselves in regard to the carriage of live stock, for an advertisement is appearing in the Press notifying small stock dealers and butchers, etc., that applications must be sent in for the transshipment of live stock from North-West ports to Fremantle for the year 1915. This proves that it is the desire of the Government to assist the small men in the North-West.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: When did that advertisement appear?

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: It has been appearing for some time, and it shows that already arrangements are being made for 1915. Touching again on the mining industry, I hope that the Government will give serious consideration to the question of erecting a sulphide plant in the Kalgoorlie or Boulder district. I am certain that there are many propositions that are held by companies and also by syndicates of working men which have been denied the opportunity of getting their sulphide ores treated at a reasonable cost. Many of these propositions which are now idle would be worked and good results would accrue, or they would be in such a position that they would be able to engage more men than they are employing at the present time. In regard to the construction of new railways, whilst I have on every occasion in this Chamber supported every measure that has come forward for the construction of railways in any portion of Western Australia—and I hope I always shall—there is only one railway which has been referred to here very often that I do not intend to say much about it. It seems to me, however, that one cannot pass it over because to my mind it is a project that has not received fair consideration from a majority of members;

I refer to the Esperance railway. I hope members of this House will view it in a more kindly light this session than they have done in the past. There is not the slightest doubt that in that portion of Western Australia, where it is desired to construct this railway, there are settlers who are second to none in Western Australia, and who have put up with great hardships.

Hon. V. Hamersley: How many are there settled there?

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: A great number, and there would be many more if an idea could be gained that this House intended to give them fair and reasonable conditions to live under. We heard last evening the remarks of Mr. Baxter, who has had many years' experience of farming, practically from boyhood, that he had been through this country, and knew that the land was good, and that the people were deserving of railway communication. Mr. Baxter is prepared to advocate, and he did advocate last evening the construction of this line.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: His selection shows that the Northam farmers favour the construction of this railway despite Mr. Colebatch.

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: In going through a good portion of that electorate I found that the farmers were strong supporters of the Esperance railway, and they believe that every district in Western Australia should get a fair deal. I maintain that the district from Esperance to Norseman, as far as this House is concerned, has not had a fair deal in the past.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: The Northam farmers ought to give us a fair deal.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: The hon. member is not in his seat.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: That is the only reply the hon. member can make.

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: When speaking the other evening, Mr. Holmes told us that the Midland Railway Company had given the State a good service in the past. My opinion is that no private company will build a railway or anything else unless they can foresee good results and good dividends. Consequently, I

think the Midland Company are the same as any other company. If they put their money into a venture they expect to get a good return from it, and I think they have had a pretty good return. Mr. Holmes also contended that the construction of the Wongan Hills-Mullewa railway was detrimental to the interests of the Midland Railway Co. It has been the policy of this Government, and I believe of other Governments to build railways from 25 to 30 miles apart. This line from Wongan Hills to Mullewa travels through some of the best farm land in Western Australia. Yet Mr. Holmes told us that the railway was not an agricultural railway. I sincerely hope that the present Government will make this railway a main trunk line from Mullewa to Northam to couple up with the goldfields line. The country right through is good and in fact there is to be found there some of the best land in Western Australia, and some of the best yields last year were obtained in that district.

Hon. W. Patrick: Did you say a through railway from Mullewa to Norseman?

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: I am speaking about the railway passing through good country. Along that line last year there were many thousands of acres under crop and the area will be doubled this year with the completion of the railway, and farmers will be given the opportunity of sending their produce to market. There is a matter in connection with the railway service on the goldfields which I wish to refer to, the service from Menzies to Laverton. Some time ago it was found necessary by the department to reduce the service there owing to the fact that some of the mines were not employing as many hands as had been the case in the past. Now we find that in Laverton there has been a great revival in mining. The Lancefield mine today is employing about 200 men and in the near future will employ between 300 and 400. Consequently, I think the department might give every consideration to this question. Another thing too, is

the fact that until lately monthly tickets were available in Western Australia for all lines and for any distance. It has come under my notice that monthly tickets have been abolished when the distance exceeds 200 miles. If it is a fair policy to issue monthly tickets for all lines for 200 miles, it should be just as good policy to issue them in excess of that distance. The action of the Railway Department appears to be a step towards centralisation because people living 300 or 400 miles from the metropolis are just as much entitled to monthly tickets as those who are living within 200 miles of it. I noticed also in the Governor's Speech reference is made to the fact that the Inebriates' Act has been brought into operation, and that homes have been established at Cottesloe and Whitby Falls for the treatment of victims to alcohol. It is to be regretted that such institutions have to be established, yet at the same time we find from recent statistics, according to our population, far more alcohol is consumed per head in Western Australia than in any other State. I think the establishment of these homes for men and women who are unable to resist the temptation of indulging in alcohol will be beneficial to them and a great deal of good should accrue from these institutions. I would like to have seen a measure passed last session dealing with the abolition of gallon licenses and matters of that description, which I think would have been of great benefit to Western Australia and at some later date, I hope the measure will again be brought down and receive better consideration than it received in the past. Just a few words in regard to farming. Our friend, Mr. Baxter, last evening said that Governments had done little or nothing to assist the farming industry. We find a statement made by the Premier that the farmers owed altogether for interest to the Seed Wheat Board and for their lands, and to the Agricultural Bank a sum equal to £219,150, all of which was a loss to the revenue account.

Hon. W. Patrick: The bank has nothing to do with the revenue.

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: I am quoting what the Premier said. The hon. member can rise in his place and say that I am wrong or that the Premier is wrong if he likes. That statement does not coincide with the remark of Mr. Baxter that nothing had been done for the farmer.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: It certainly does. There will be interest on most of the money.

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: I contend that the Labour Government have done more to assist the farmers than any previous Administration. It is not my intention to say anything further on the Address-in-reply. Quite a number of Bills are to come down this session, and when they come along I shall have an opportunity of voicing my opinions on them.

Hon. J. F. ALLEN (West): It is with a certain amount of diffidence that I rise on this occasion to speak when I think of the hon. gentlemen whose footsteps I followed into this Chamber. When I remember the record which the Hon. M. L. Moss left on the pages of history in this State, I feel that the people of the West province have given me a duty to perform which will be a very onerous one indeed. I have listened to the eulogies that have been uttered by other members of this Chamber in regard to the late representative of the West province, and we who knew Mr. Moss so well as a member of our community realise too well the truth of those utterances. It is therefore, as I said before, a difficult position which the people of the West province have asked me to fill in this Chamber. While Mr. Cornell was speaking on the Address-in-reply he said it was a matter of regret that the West province had returned to this Chamber no representative of the Labour party, and this was a sentiment which was uttered by my late opponent (Mr. Somerville) at the close of his campaign in Fremantle. I am one of those who are of opinion that those utterances were entirely wrong. It is very well for gentlemen to come to this Chamber or to other places and claim that they are the sole representatives of Labour, but there are some of us who do not agree with members in that direction. I claim

that my own business experience, in the everyday affairs of life, give me, in common with other members, the right to call myself a representative of the workers of Western Australia, for in the course of my own business I have to deal with the humblest workers of the State. I have to look after their interests with just as much care as I would after the millions of a Rockefeller, when he places them at my disposal. Therefore, I claim that we who represent the business community of the State are in a better position to look after the interests of the humblest as well as the greatest in our midst. Therefore I resent the attempt on the part of any member to claim that he or his party are the sole representatives of Labour in Western Australia. In regard to the Speech which His Excellency delivered to us, there are two facts that are to be commented on. The first, and it is in common with the utterances of the party to which His Excellency's Advisers form the leaders, that it is full of a great deal of praise for the work which they have done, and of the good which has accrued to the community at large and which they claim is through their efforts. One thing one misses from the Speech, it fails to keep up to the standard, the multitude of promises which we are used to receiving from that party. We are so used to receiving promises from them as to what we are to get in the future, that when we do not see those promises or hear them expressed we are filled with vague suspicions, and we feel that there is something wanting in the Speech which we have been so used to in the past. I would like to suggest to the Government after the eulogy which they have expended on themselves on the benefits derived from their Herculean labours in the past, the creation of a new department. I should think it is only necessary for them to create a new department to control the decrees of the Almighty and we should have the millenium in Western Australia straight away. The Premier has been explaining in another place that the finances of this State are not in such a bad condition as some people think. We have also had Mr. Kirwan in this Chamber giving expression to the same opinion, that although we are over

half a million in arrears this is a mere bagatelle, seeing that we have placed to the credit of the sinking fund a somewhat similar amount. I cannot for the moment imagine that any business man would be satisfied by paying his debts out of his right hand pocket by putting money into his left. Although we have been on a wave of prosperity, which the Premier claims has been greater than any in Western Australia before, we have been drifting backward month by month and year by year, until we have now reached what should be the limit, and if something is not done to stem this disastrous slipway which is taking place, we shall be landed in a very parlous condition indeed. Although I may be critical on this question or on other questions later on it is not because I do not have sympathy with those who occupy the Treasury bench, or that my opinions differ on some occasions or do not coincide with them on other occasions. I should like members to remember the story of a knight in the days of old. A knight who passing through a forest saw hanging from the branches of a tree a shield, and while he was gazing wondering why it was placed there, he saw approaching in the opposite direction another knight. This knight also paused to observe the shield, and a discussion arose between them as to the meaning of that shield. The first knight asked the second what was the meaning of the silver shield in the tree, and the second knight replied that he did not know, but that the shield was of gold and not silver. They had an argument and ultimately settled the question by force of arms. After belabouring one another and after each had suffered many blows and injuries, they were disturbed by the approach of a hermit from the woods and they asked him whether it was a gold or a silver shield, and the hermit replied that it had a silver face on one side and a golden one on the other. This is a story with a moral which all might take to heart. It shows that on all question there are two sides, and when we discuss or criticise any question, it might be viewed from different standpoints, thus arriving at different results. The Government during the last two years or more

have been experimenting, as we have heard, until we are tired of it, with a great number of business ventures, and money has been expended in Western Australia in directions which might very well have been left alone for the time being. We have had money, which has been very difficult to procure, expended in many directions at a time when it is necessary to spend money in other directions for the benefit of the State. We have millions of acres of land awaiting settlement, which all require the agencies of the human hand and mind to develop, and it is only necessary to settle people on the soil and give facilities to cultivate the soil to wring from Nature the riches which it possesses to make the State a great one. If we fritter away the moneys with which we are entrusted and make use of the borrowing powers for purposes of building up industries which might be left to those engaged in them, we are not true to the trust which has been placed in our keeping, and not doing our best for the State which we might. Therefore when the Government undertake the construction of railways in agricultural districts and other places where they are not necessary for the time being the Government are doing something which is not in the interests of the State of Western Australia, and they should be called on to stop at the earliest possible moment. While speaking on land settlement, I would like to suggest to the Government a method which might have been adopted in connection with the land settlement schemes which are carried out by every land syndicate in every part of the world. When land is subdivided the same provisions should be adopted as in municipal and town sub-divisions; the land cut up and classified, and not only the roads surveyed through the districts, but the railways surveyed and made a part and parcel of the survey by the officers, and once these lines are fixed, they should not be altered or amended by any authority, because they have induced people to go on the land by the promise of those railways and roads. I would go further and say that as soon as the lands are settled these railways ought to be constructed for the benefit

of the settlers who have been induced to go on the soil, so that their products might be brought to market immediately they begin to produce them. This is a work in which the moneys raised by the Government and expended in other directions might well have been employed, because it would redound to the benefit of the State. A good deal has been said regarding the Esperance northwards railway. I, like a number of other hon. members, am not pledged one way or another in regard to this question, but I say that unless I am shown that this railway is required in preference to any railway in any other agricultural district equally settled and having equal or superior land, I will not vote for its construction until those already promised are put in hand and built. Notwithstanding what has been said regarding the Esperance railway by a great number of its advocates, it is more or less a goldfields railway. Although we have been told that it is an agricultural line we have heard very conflicting reports from those who know the country which it will traverse. Although some say that the land is equal to any in the State, there are others who tell us that it is not worth the value of the line which it is proposed should be constructed. Therefore, at present, I regard this as a railway more or less in the interests of the goldfields and not in the interests of the agricultural districts which it will traverse. While referring to the goldfields I would like to say in reply to the hon. Mr. Millington, that, with all due respect to the goldfields and to the mining industry, I consider that the greatest industries of this State are the pastoral and agricultural industries, because every ounce of gold taken out of the mines and every ton of coal which is brought to the surface represents so much drained from the capital account and does not represent interest on the moneys invested, whereas every furrow put into the soil in the farming districts is increasing and enriching us for all time. The time will come when the mining industry will fail; when there will be no gold to draw from the earth and no coal will be left to mine, and although hon. members might

say that this will not occur in our time, I would point out that we are here as the custodians of the interests not only of the people of to-day but of the people of the future, and the lines we lay down for the benefit of the State now should not be for our immediate benefit only but should be considered in the light of the future, so that our children shall recognise that we have done our duty to them as well as to ourselves and have not acted in the selfish spirit which is advocated by some. The question of workers homes is another matter upon which I desire to say a few words. I would not have touched upon it if the hon. Mr. Cornell had not associated my name with it. During my election campaign I said, and I say again, that if an opportunity is given to me to vote for any measure which will enable those who have taken up leasehold propositions under this Act to convert them into freehold I shall support it, providing, of course, that the conditions are the same as those under the leasehold provisions of to-day. I took this attitude not because I was looking for votes, as the hon. Mr. Cornell suggested, but because I believed in the principle of every man having the right to own his own home. It is such settlement which has led to the greatness of the nation from which we have sprung; it is the love of home which has taken the Englishman across trackless oceans seeking his fortune in foreign lands, and the lodestone which has brought him back from many a wandering, to the spot from which he sprung, and we who come from the old country and know something of what this feeling is, desire to see it cultivated in the Australian people amongst whom the love of home, I regret to say, is not so great as we desire it should be. I trust that this principle of giving every individual the right to his own home and an interest in the acquiring of it and the holding of it will be fostered in the Australian people, and it is a matter for deep regret to me therefore that this principle of leasehold has been introduced into the workers homes proposition by the Government. I am very sorry

that one hon. member has no more regard for his home and for the future home of his children than to be satisfied to be a tenant all his life in a home which he can never possess or hand to his children as a result of his thrift and industry and the labour of his own hands.

Hon. J. Cornell: That statement is incorrect; I can do so.

Hon. J. F. ALLEN. The hon. Mr. Cornell also mentioned that some people were of opinion that some of the homes being erected under the Act were too good for the workers, and the hon. member went on to say that nothing was too good for the workers. I agree with the hon. member. I agree with the framers of this proposition that if we are to provide workers with homes, we should give them good homes, we should give them plenty of room and we should not sacrifice comfort and convenience to appearance but should give them the best we can for the money we are investing, and something of which they will be proud and in which they will take an interest. I am speaking of the leasehold propositions. The freehold propositions are the outcome of the desire of the people themselves and an outcome of their own opinions. They can build on acre blocks or they can build on one-eighth of an acre providing that the money is advanced and the rooms can be large or small as the occupants think fit, provided the money is advanced by the board; but with regard to leasehold propositions, the tenants are bound to the conditions which the board have laid down, and I am sorry that a number of these homes are erected on pocket handkerchief blocks of land scarcely large enough to swing a cat in. Some time ago the municipal council to which I belong received a communication from one of the bodies connected with the Labour movement of this State advising us to see in future that all sub-divisions in our municipality provided for blocks of land of not less than one chain frontage and a quarter of an acre in area. If this proposition was a good one for the members of the party to advocate for the landhold-

ers in the case of sub-division, surely the Government themselves when they have undertaken to settle the workers in homes might have taken care to see that the conditions they thought fit to impose on other people should be inculcated into the workers by those so solicitous for their interests. In building these houses on such small blocks, the Government have made a serious mistake which they will regret in years to come. Another thing which I have noticed is that very often no consideration is given to the levels of the streets to which the houses front. In one place a row of houses were erected under the Act on the leasehold conditions and the floors were something like 4 feet below the street level. When we know the size of the blocks on which they are erected and the small distance which intervenes between the footpaths of the future and the houses, we can realise that the workers will be put to considerable expense when the municipalities desire to construct footpaths in order to build retaining walls to prevent the footpaths from falling into their front gardens or on to their front verandahs. Another matter which has been laboured to a certain extent is the question of the cost of living and cheap meat. The Government claim that they have brought down the cost of living during the last two or three years and that the cost of meat also has been reduced. We have heard about the State butcher shops which have been established by the Government and about the good which the shops have done in the metropolitan area. All they have done, as far as I know is to enter into competition with the small man who is earning his living by the sweat of his brow and the labour of his hands. They have forced him to sell out at a loss in a great number of cases and have done no good for the great mass of the people among whom they have been established, and have not in any shape or form hurt those who are in a wholesale way of business. But above all there is one conclusive proof that the Government are not sincere in their contention that the price of meat has been reduced as a result of their efforts and that is to be found in the price which they are paying for the supply of meat to the

institutions which they control. Even the State steamers up to the beginning of this year were purchasing their meat from contractors who supplied the retail shops in the metropolitan area, and they were paying a higher price last year than at the end of the preceding year, and I believe that the price they are to-day paying for the meat they require is greater than they were paying the contractors last year. I admit that this is a very difficult statement to prove because it will be a difficult matter for hon. members to ascertain what amount is being charged to State steamers and what credit is being given to the State butcheries, but outside of the State steamers I have a thermometer which indicates the differences in the price of meat and that is the public hospital. For a number of years I have been associated with the Fremantle Public Hospital, and year by year during the last three or four years the cost of meat has been slowly rising. On one occasion the hospital board wrote to the representative of the Government who controls this department asking if something could not be done, seeing that the Government were entering into the arena as purveyors of meat, to supply State institutions at a cheaper rate than that charged by contractors in the past. In reply we were advised to call for tenders in the old way and to place our contracts with the lowest tenderers. That was done and this year we are paying more for the meat for the hospital than under the previous contract, and we were paying more under that contract than under the one which preceded it. If the Government have reduced the price of meat to any material degree, the institutions which are maintained out of the public purse should first feel the benefit of the reduced price. Another question I would like to touch upon is that of the powellising contract. Much has been said about this contract and it is very difficult for the layman to understand the actual position. I am not a layman in this connection; I know something of the seasoning of timbers, and of the various materials used for this purpose. I do not intend on this occasion to criticise the system, the right to use which the Government have purchased, but there are

other specifics in the market which I claim are equal to the system which the Government have purchased and specifics which are definite in their action, and which we know will do certain things or will not do certain things. The process on which the Government have spent so much money and in connection with which they have entered into such a disastrous agreement is one which I claim is unproved, and I say it is unproved because at the present time the Government are experimenting with this specific to show what it will do and what it will not do. During a recent visit to the saw-mills some of us were informed by the Minister for Works that a chemist was employed continuously by the Government to experiment with the material in order to ascertain what it would accomplish and that the chemist had not made up his mind as to the length of time required to submit the sleepers to the powellising process or what the result would be. I claim that any body of men, who purchase the rights of any system when the system is not defined and is not absolutely proved, and pledge the public funds in this direction, are guilty of gross irregularity and are not conserving the interests of the people who have entrusted them with the control of the finances.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. J. F. ALLEN: I should like to add something to what has already been said by the Hon. R. J. Lynn on the question of the Fremantle harbour extension. We hear from the Governor's Speech that progress is being made with work in connection with the Fremantle harbour extension, and we know from the remarks of the Premier in another place that something like £200,000 has already been spent on that work. This we know is out of a sum of something like £640,000, which was voted for the work some two and a-half years ago. We were assured at the time this vote was granted that it would enable the Government to place Fremantle harbour in such a condition that it would cope with all requirements for the next five years to come; that was, for five years from that time.

Some two and a-half years have already elapsed, and something like a third of the money has been spent. Now, we claim that this is not getting on with the work as expeditiously as the port of Fremantle requires. We are not of opinion that Fremantle harbour is the only harbour in Western Australia. I do not think that any of us in Fremantle are of opinion that the other ports should be starved for the benefit of our own; but we do claim that this is the port of Western Australia, and that in the future, when the trans-Australian line is completed and we are connected by the iron road with the Eastern States, the importance of Fremantle will be very much enhanced, and a great deal more business will be done at that port than is being done at present, or has been done in the past. When we take into consideration the immense strides which have occurred in shipping, when we read in the papers that vessels of 50,000 tons burthen are being constructed for the Atlantic trade, and when we remember that ten or fifteen years ago the vessels which were coming over-sea to Fremantle were not as large as the inter-State steamers of to-day, we can realise that there is only a short time before us when we shall be seeing large ships like those trading to the West Australian coast. We are also of the opinion that the port of Fremantle at that time is destined, if the Government of to-day seize the opportunity, to become the greatest port in the Commonwealth. When the Navigation Bill, which has passed through the Federal Houses and has received the Royal assent, is gazetted, and placed in operation, then there will have to be one port in Australia as a distributing centre for the rest of the Commonwealth; and it is for us to-day to say whether Fremantle shall have the opportunity, or whether that opportunity shall pass to our Eastern competitors. If the Government only realise this, and fix their eyes on the future in such a way that they will see that adequate provision can be made from time to time as the requirements arise, then we shall feel that something like justice is being done to this port, which is destined to have so great a

future. We know that the port of Sydney has gained its prestige because of the immense coal fields which surround it; no other port in the Commonwealth has the same favourable conditions. But those of us who know something of the movements in the engineering world, know that the time has come when coal as a fuel for ships will probably take second place to oil. We know that the new period of internal combustion engines has set in, and we realise from this that there is no limit to the size to which ships can be constructed, other than the limits which the ports and harbours and canals of the world impose. We know also that as cargo carriers the larger vessels are the most economical that can be used; large vessels are much more economical than smaller craft, especially when the fact is taken into consideration that these huge vessels, which will ultimately come to our shores, will make one terminal port a depôt from which the Australian Commonwealth will be supplied. Another thing we know is that for years to come the Cape route will be the route to Australia. We know that the canal dues through Panama and through Suez will prevent any of the big liners trading in this concern, for the purpose of carrying cargo, from using those canals; the rates would be prohibitive. These liners will still come round the Cape, and we shall be the first port in the Commonwealth for large vessels coming here. If the Government only realise this, they will see the necessity of making up their minds now to a progressive policy in connection with this port of Fremantle, and lay down the foundation of a future scheme, which can be added to from time to time as necessity arises so as to make it a completed whole when the plans are carried to consummation. As one who some years ago was associated with the engineering department of Western Australia, and was on the engineering staff of the Fremantle harbour works—although I do not profess to be an expert in harbour extension and harbour work—I know something of the subject on which I am now expressing an opinion. One thing which struck me in connection with the

Government work in those days, and which has also struck me in connection with Government work now, is that the policy of past Governments and the policy of the present Government show a tendency to tinker with great questions, and to deal with things just from day to day as the requirements press, rather than lay down comprehensive schemes for future development, so that each item as it is constructed may become a portion of the final whole. I claim that in connection with the Fremantle harbour works the time has come, and indeed has passed, when the scheme should be considered from this point of view, and a comprehensive scheme evolved. Although I do not wish to disparage any of the engineering advisers whom the Government have in this State, my knowledge of the profession teaches me that if you require anything out of the common, anything out of the ordinary routine of business, you must get someone with experience beyond the ordinary routine work to advise you. I contend that the engineering staff of the Western Australian Government is purely an executive staff, a staff which carries out the work placed in its hands from time to time, and which has neither the time nor the experience to study these larger questions and to advise the Government on the future developments of a port like Fremantle. Therefore I claim that the Government should years ago have got the opinion of someone of world-wide repute, with a knowledge of these questions gained at the different ports of the world, to advise them as to what should be done at Fremantle. There are many questions in connection with the extension of a harbour, and the development of a harbour, like Fremantle, which the layman never realises or dreams of. Even under present circumstances the Government are expending a large sum of money in connection with the extension of the Fremantle harbour on lines which I believe are not sound, and which have not been thoroughly thought out. We know that they are developing the depth of water in the port to something like 40 feet, from 36 to 40 feet below low-water mark:

and this will necessitate the extension of the present channel far out to sea beyond the end of the present north mole. We know that a former Engineer-in-Chief, the late Mr. C. Y. O'Connor, when constructing that harbour, found it necessary to increase the length of the North Mole so that it should project seawards sufficiently far to protect that channel. Therefore, if it is necessary for the Government of the present day to extend the channel out to the ocean something like another three-quarters of a mile or a mile it will be just as necessary for them to-day to extend that mole to the same distance as was considered necessary in the days when Mr. O'Connor laid down his scheme. I do not know whether or not provision has been made in the estimate for that, but if such a provision has been made for the future development of the port of Fremantle, I contend that, before the expense is incurred of extending this mole seawards for that distance the question of an external extension of the harbour should be taken into consideration in connection with it, so that before incurring this enormous expenditure in connection with breakwaters, which I am of opinion are necessary for the protection of that channel, the Government should obtain the opinion of experts as to whether the breakwaters could not be utilised in connection with the extension seawards of the harbour itself. This is necessary because of the fact, as I said before, that large vessels are going to trade to our ports. We cannot forget that fact; we cannot overlook that fact, or shut our eyes to the fact that these vessels are coming into the Australian trade. When the Premier told a deputation a few weeks ago that he thought it possible that from 18,000 to 20,000 tons burthen was the maximum size steamer we should see here for many years to come, he was making a statement in entire conflict with the opinion of the engineers and the ship masters of the world. If these vessels are coming to Fremantle in the immediate future, there is no place inside the entrance to the harbour in which those vessels could be handled. It is necessary that a port should be so easily entered and left that a vessel

can come in and go out under her own powers of propulsion. If you introduce tugs into the question, you are loading up your expenses, and those vessels will go to other ports where they can enter under their own control. If that is the case with the present harbour, I venture to say it would not in any shape or form facilitate the berthing of such vessels. The present distance between the wharves of the harbour is 1,400 feet, and if a vessel 800 or 900 feet in length came inside the entrance to the harbour she could not turn round in it. Consequently it is necessary for us to have broader waters to manipulate these vessels than we have inside the harbour to-day. When we realise that twenty years ago the scheme which was introduced into Parliament for the construction of the Fremantle harbour by Mr. O'Connor only provided for a harbour 800 feet wide between the wharves, and that it was only at the last moment that Parliament decided to increase the width, we can see to what extent the shipping of the world has developed in the last twenty years, more especially when we find that a man like Mr. O'Connor failed to realise the extent to which this development would take place in the space of one generation. And if that has taken place during the last twenty years, we cannot be blind to the prospect that the next twenty years will bring equal or greater development. When we realise that in other parts of the world, where harbours are being constructed inside the entrance, the people are put to enormous expense at the present time to maintain those harbours, the question of opening up the inner river for traffic is seen to be one which requires very careful consideration indeed. In the Mersey, which is the entrance to the port of Liverpool, in the Old Country, members may be astonished to learn, last year the dredges removed from the entrance to the port 16½ millions of tons of sand which had silted up during the previous year in the channel which entered that harbour. Just imagine any such thing occurring in connection with the harbour at Fremantle. Just imagine the enormous expense. It would cost as much in one year to remove the sand as it would to construct the

outer harbour straight away. When we have factors like this, and when we realise that at the present time our engineering staff, whether from lack of funds or lack of knowledge I do not know, have not been collecting the data which would have enabled them to grapple with the problems lying at our doors to-day, it shows that this is a question the carrying into effect of which they should not be entrusted with. Take the Swan river. What do we know of the changes in the nature of the bed, the erosion of the banks, or the silting which has taken place between here and Fremantle? When hon. members speak of having the shipping brought up to Perth, they are expressing an opinion on a question the solution of which will take the widest knowledge the world possesses. Another thing, we have been troubled with the teredo at Fremantle for years past. What study have the Government or their officers made of the habits of these creatures? Do they know how they breed, or when, or where; how they attack the piles, or when, or why? Have they kept records of the piles driven, when cut, and where, when driven, and why some were attacked by the teredo, and some not? These are questions which the engineers should have been keeping records of, and if they have not they have shown by this their inability to grapple with great questions like that of the Fremantle harbour works, and the necessity of getting advice from abroad. If the teredo had been studied 15 or 16 years ago, the insect might have been annihilated ere this, and we might have been saved the expenditure of many thousands of pounds. Another question I should like much to touch upon is that of constitutional reform. This, I take it, is an attack upon this Chamber. I consider that as long as legislation is for the purpose of promoting the health, happiness and prosperity of the people, it is necessary that this Chamber should exist. As long as statutes are enacted for the benefit and in the interest of all parties concerned, it is necessary that the interests of all parties should be considered. It is necessary that legislation when introduced should be open to amendment in the interests of

all concerned, and when any party attempts to thrust upon the people legislation which has not been so considered and thrown open to amendment in the interests of all parties, then they are attempting to do something not in the interests of the people, but in the interests of a particular section which they happen for the time being to represent. We have in Parliament a party claiming to be the representatives of the workers of the State. But they are not the representatives of those whom they call the workers; because when selection ballots are taken and nominations received we find candidates selected by a small number of members of the union who take the trouble to vote, and only a small percentage of the actual members of the unions in this State have voted for the selection of those candidates. Nevertheless, those candidates, with the hall-mark of the Trades Hall upon them, are held up as representatives of labour, and are elected to the Chambers on that basis. We can see, therefore, that those men do not represent the workers, not even in the limited sense which they themselves claim. I am of opinion that this Chamber, which stands for the homes and the home life and thrift and industry of the people, for those who have made their homes permanently in the State, and who would have to carry the burden in the event of hard times coming over the people—I claim that this Chamber has a right to consideration at the hands of the people, and that it would be a disaster if anything happened this Chamber, or if it neglected to act as it has done in the past. This brings me also to the question of trades unions. I am myself a member of a union; but my union says that every one of its members shall be an honest and an honourable man, and shall be a qualified artisan in the trade or calling of life in which he is engaged. Until a union establishes those two high principles, and throws its doors open for the reception of every person qualified for membership under those two heads, it cannot claim to have any preference whatever. That does not exist to-day.

We have to-day a union with its membership limited to a certain number. I admit its rules do not limit it, but it has the power to ballot, and this enables it at any time to close its door against any person, no matter how well qualified for membership. Only a few months ago one of the artisans of that calling came from Geraldton, having in his pocket a clearance from the local union, and he attempted to enter the branch of that union in Fremantle. He stayed here for months, but could not get into the union. He was allowed to work side by side with the members of the union when work was at high pressure, but at the end of a period he had to retire whence he had come, unable to get permanent employment in Fremantle. If the House had given an opportunity to any Judge to say that preference should be given to unionists we should have given that Judge the power to say that thousands should not work at all, because, while the union has power to exclude from its ranks any one whom it chooses, the power is in the hands of that union to say that persons whom it desires to cut out shall be starved. Not until a union bars from its membership only on the grounds of dishonesty, dishonourable conduct, or some other moral blemish, can reasonably ask for that preference which it so much desires. Personally I claim that the question of honesty stands above all. Yet we find unions with members who have been convicted of crime and who have been received back by that union and placed again in the employment in which they were engaged prior to the action which led to their conviction. And the employers have been unable to object to these unionists being employed, although they knew they had paid the penalty for their misdeeds in the past. When unions remove these blots from their esentcheons, there will be no necessity to ask for courts to have power to deal with this question of preference to unionists, for the employer himself in his own interests will employ unionists in preference to non-unionists, because he will have a guarantee of honesty in the men

whom he employs. Until that time arrives I would not vote for preference to unionists. While speaking of crime, I should like to refer to an incident which occurred the other day. I am going to speak of the action of the Attorney General in releasing the man Bennett who was convicted of a fearful crime at Midland Junction a few years ago. When that man was convicted and sentenced it was said by the Judge that he was a person unfit to live. Yet in the short space of a year or two this monster in human form is released to prey upon society a second time. I claim that this action on the part of the Attorney General shows that he is unfit for the position he occupies, and that any party which supports an action of that kind is not worthy of sitting on the Treasury benches of the State. I have one more remark to make, namely, I believe, notwithstanding all our friends of the Labour party may say, that the people ultimately will arrive at a just estimate of what they may be in regard to this; I believe the good sense of the people will ultimately prevail, and I believe their judgment on those who claim to represent them will be right. I claim that the will of the people, when it is expressed intelligently, will show who are the people's friends and who are not, and I believe the time is not far distant when those who at present claim to be the friends of Labour will be weighed in the scales of public estimation and will be taught by the people that the only basis upon which national greatness can be built is that of justice and equity.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL (Metropolitan): I think I may be excused for saying I feel, as the hon. member who has just sat down said when he arose, a certain amount of diffidence in following so carefully thought out a speech, and one so eloquently put as that of the hon. member. The hon. member referred to changes in this Council. He referred to his predecessor of the West Province; and while I deplore the loss of Mr. Moss, with his intimate knowledge of Parliamentary procedure, and Western Australia statute law, and with his wonderfully

quick grasp of circumstances, may I be allowed to say that if we have lost in one direction, we have gained in another; that the hon. member is no mean successor to the gentleman who occupied the seat for the West Province which he now occupies.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: It is characteristic of Fremantle.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: The observation of Mr. Lynn is quite correct; it is characteristic of Fremantle that it should send to these halls gentlemen who have been for years, and who I hope will be for many years to come, ornaments to the Parliament of Western Australia. As I have already said, we have had a great many changes in this Chamber. I condole with some members, who have disappeared involuntarily, and I congratulate those who have taken their places. I listened with great interest to the speech made by Mr. Millington in moving the Address-in-reply. I have been in this Chamber a few years, and have listened to several speeches of the same sort. The hon. member reminded me of the month of March.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: A March hare?

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: I thought some hon. member would refer to March hares. However, I am not referring to hares at all, but to the month of March, which in England, if not here, is reputed to come in like a lion, even if it goes out like a lamb. The lamb-like demeanour of Mr. Millington has yet to be seen, but certainly it may be said that he came in like a lion. It might not be considered courteous of me, but I hope the hon. member will take the remark in the spirit in which it is made, if I remind him that none of us knows everything, not even the youngest of us.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: How can I determine the spirit in which the remark is made?

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: If the hon. member has any doubt he can ask any hon. member sitting near him. I have to refer to the utterances of Ministers going around the country like another personage going to and fro upon the earth, and repeating libels and slanders on this Chamber. It is true those utter-

ances have had altogether the opposite effect to what was contemplated. Let us take the Premier, for instance. In the contest for the Metropolitan-Suburban Province he irresistibly reminded me of that beautiful poem, *The Jackdaw of Rheims*. We have the Premier as cardinal—and what a wonderful cardinal he would make! How well the red hat would adorn him!—uttering curses throughout the land, the like of which has never been heard before, against this unfortunate Chamber.

Never was heard such a terrible curse !

But, what gave rise

To no little surprise,

Nobody seemed one penny the worse.

Only after the turmoil and clash and battle was over, at last the poor little jackdaw is desecrated personified, in this connection, in our politically late and lamented friend, Mr. Davis—and the Premier must feel some pang of punctation at finding that the only result of his action has been to curse all the political feathers off his little pet. I am sorry for Mr. Davis. I am sorry because I esteem him politically and personally. I feel that he has fallen a victim to the evil companionship with which he was found. In this connection let me point out to what an extent the policy which was adopted in this Chamber during last session has been endorsed by the result of the late Council elections. Let us take what the hon. Mr. Duffell says was one of the main planks upon which he fought the contest, namely the fate of the Traffic Bill in this House. And yet Mr. Duffell was one of the metropolitan-suburban members—he was not even a metropolitan member. We find that the opinions of those people who were particularly affected by the Bill—

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Bribed by it.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: I did not propose to put it that way. I will still keep my own phraseology. As I was saying, those very people who were particularly affected by the provisions of the Bill, or rather the provisions which were excised from the Bill, we find now enthusiastically returning the very gentleman who had declared himself as unequivocally against that provision. Let us turn to the case

of the hon. Mr. Clarke. When he opposed certain clauses of the Irrigation Bill, his fate was taken as sealed by that action. I understand that the particular Minister, who was allegorically characterised by Mr. Cullen as "Uncle Bill," went to Bunbury to see if by that eloquence and persuasive power, and dogged determination, which are so characteristic of that particular uncle, he could defeat Mr. Clarke. And yet we have the pleasure this session of welcoming Mr. Clarke again amongst us. We have the pleasure too of finding that this particular action of the Legislative Council was endorsed by those people who were most likely to be affected by those particular provisions of the Irrigation Bill. I venture to say that to-day the Legislative Council stands higher in the opinion of all its electors than it has ever stood before. I might have some few more words to say upon this question when I have to speak upon the proposed constitutional reform. Now, one of the particular objections which I have to the utterances of Ministers who have been going to and fro on the earth, is the phraseology which they have adopted. They always speak of the "rejection" of certain measures in this House. Mr. Cornnell spoke of the rejection of 32 Bills. What does that mean? Let us take the three Bills which formed the greater part of the Government policy during last session. Two of them I have already mentioned, the Irrigation Bill and the Traffic Bill. What does the rejection by this Chamber amount to? Because this Chamber has opinions of its own, opinions which have been since endorsed by those electors, and expressed those opinions in the amendments to the Bills which were brought down, we are told that, because another place would not accept these amendments, we have rejected these Bills. It is palpably and obviously absurd. With the amendments which we proposed should be inserted, and by which it was made a more workable measure, it was more likely to suit those particular districts concerned than the Bill did as prepared by the Government. With regard to the Traffic Bill, with the excision of the objectionable Clause 23 and the consequential amendments which

would follow thereon, the Bill was undoubtedly better suited to the Metropolitan and Metropolitan-Suburban areas in which the Minister proposed to exercise his powers, than the Bill which he introduced into the Legislative Assembly. This is called the rejection of a Bill. It is more than unfair. It is untrue, for these Ministers to go round the country and say that the House has rejected Bills, which the House, under the circumstances, has every right to amend in the direction in which it might think fit. I would now like to say a few words in connection with the Governor's Speech. First of all, it gives me a very great deal of pleasure to be able to congratulate the Government upon something, and I do so with the utmost sincerity. I sincerely congratulate the Government upon the two appointments which they have made to the judicial bench. It was admirably devised that the two appointments, that of the Chief Justice, his honour Mr. Justice MacMillan, and that of my old friend and schoolmate Mr. Justice Northmore, were amongst the most popular things that the Government has done since it has been in office. Not only is this act the most popular but amongst the best and most judicious they have ever enacted. Now, a word or two about the Bills which it is proposed to introduce. I will take them in the order in which they occur in the Governor's Speech. First of all, I suppose, because it has, in the opinion of the Government, the most important bearing upon the affairs of the State in general, comes the Constitution Reform Bill, which was referred to with, perhaps, some inner knowledge of the situation, by the hon. Mr. Millington, as being of "ominous import." I do not know what he meant by that because I do not know the contents of the Bill. It is to me a matter of curiosity, if not of apprehension, to see what the contents of this Bill are. Whatever the contents of the Bill are, there are one or two things which undoubtedly should appear in the Bill, if the Government wish—I do not know whether they do wish it or not—to put an end to the state of tension and unrest that exists between the two Chambers of the Legislature of this State. There are one or

two matters which they might try to bring in between the four corners of the Bill in question. All the trouble which has occurred between the two Houses has occurred on account of the lack of definition in the Constitution and, therefore, in the Standing Orders, as to what are known as Money Bills. A great deal of trouble has arisen on account of the fact that financial clauses and administrative clauses have found place side by side in the same measure. Let me entreat the Government—if there is going to be any Legislative Council, after the Constitution reform measure is carried—to very seriously look into the matter, and adopt a course which is not a new course, but which will tend to lessen the friction which exists between the two Houses, and make the passing of properly defined money Bills easy, and indeed pleasant. If hon. members will refer to the Federal Constitution they will find there some valuable hints which may be taken advantage of by the Government. Our Standing Orders, the Standing Orders of this House at all events, are founded on and are practically word for word a replica of the Standing Orders of the Senate. Therefore I think that, working on that assumption, it would be a good thing in this case to work backwards and adopt in our Constitution the provisions which I propose now to read to the House. In the first place, dealing with an Appropriation Bill, Section 54 of the Commonwealth Constitution is as follows:—

The proposed law which appropriates revenue or moneys for the ordinary services of the Government shall deal only with such appropriation.

Section 55 is a more important section and that is the one to which I particularly wish to draw the attention of the Government. Section 55 is as follows:—

Laws imposing taxation shall deal only with the imposition of taxation and any provision therein dealing with any other matter shall be of no effect. Laws imposing taxation, except laws imposing duties of customs, and of excise, shall deal with one subject of taxation only; but laws imposing duties of customs shall deal with duties and cus-

toms only, and laws imposing duties of excise shall deal with duties of excise only.

That is a very explicit section under which it would be impossible for a Bill, the subject of so much discussion and argument as the Irrigation Bill, to be introduced into the Assembly or into this House. If the Government are in earnest this time in regard to the Bill even if they do not adopt the constitutional reform that I speak of, I hope they will at least subdivide the Bill into two measures and will treat all that which has to do with administration in one part and that which has to do with finance and the imposition of rates, and so on, in another part. If they put this latter part into a small Bill I venture to say that this Chamber will not in the least degree interfere. But why this Chamber should be curtailed as regards its right to deal with the administrative clauses of a Bill, when dealing with what in my opinion is wrongly called a money Bill, passes my comprehension. The same thing has occurred in a minor degree in connection with other Bills. The reason why this alteration should be made is that a deadlock is otherwise arrived at, owing to the attitude taken up by another place, particularly in connection with money Bills, which could be avoided in cases where Bills are not labelled as money Bills. If the Government, therefore, is desirous of making peace between the two Chambers—as I have already said, if this Chamber is allowed to exist after the passage of the proposed constitution reform—I hope it will turn a kindly ear to the suggestions which I have to make. I have already alluded to the Traffic Bill. Let me say that if that Traffic Bill is the same Traffic Bill as we had last time, then, so far as I am concerned, I am quite ready to take up precisely the same attitude that I took up then. If the Government, with the experience they have had of the attitude of this House during last session, and with the lesson which they should have learned from the metropolitan and metropolitan-suburban elections, still persist in taking-up that attitude, and keeping this pernicious Clause 23 in the Bill, they will have only themselves to blame if that Clause 23 again makes a disappearance.

Even if it does make a disappearance the Government are absolutely unjustified in withdrawing the Bill on that account. The Bill is a good Bill outside the metropolitan area, good for the country districts, because the provisions which relate to the country districts do not propose to take away from these country districts the right of local self-government, which has been given to them by the Constitution of the State, and the various Acts under which self-government is administered. I would like to know why the metropolitan and metropolitan-suburban areas are attacked. There a blow is struck at the very root of local self-government, which should exist in a more perfect form in the more thickly than in the more sparsely populated centres of the State. For some occult reason it is proposed to supplant government by the municipalities of Perth and Fremantle—the leading municipalities of the State—by government by an autocracy of the Minister for Works. As I have said, the Minister for Works is a very estimable gentleman. I have seen him quite lately, and I am sorry my eyes cannot rest on him now. We admire him, if for nothing else, for his pertinacity and assiduity, but I do not admire him to so great an extent that I would be willing to place the control of the financial part of the municipal government of this State in his hands. I think that is a responsibility which he should not have. As a rule certain Ministers endeavour to evade responsibility. I have never known a gentleman—except one—so anxious to court it as the hon. gentleman who now occupies the chair of Minister for Works. That other gentleman, who is a namesake of his, occupies an imperial position in Europe. I venture to say that they would make a good pair in their desire for responsibility. Just a few remarks now about the railways it is proposed to introduce. Again, what is, I suppose, the most important railway from the point of view of a test case, is the proposal for a line from Esperance northwards. I wonder how it will fare this time? I regret that Mr. Cullen will persist in endeavouring to drag this railway around

a quarter of a circle and to make it run in an easterly and westerly direction. I can assure that hon. gentleman, and I can assure Mr. Baxter, that from a knowledge of the country through which it is proposed the line shall run, it will be a forlorn proposition. I know the country, and I have travelled through it. There is plenty of poor country between Esperance and Ravensthorpe, and beyond the bank of the Phillips River there is a tremendous amount of poor country until you get level with Bremmer Bay.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: You have been along the coast fishing.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: The surveyors differ from you.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: I am sorry to hear that, for the sake of the surveyors. I have travelled that country not once but several times. It is dry country, consisting to a great extent of what is known as hard sandplain. You are running across ranges and across rivers and traversing in one place a large area of what is known as desert sandstone.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: That is on the coast line.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: The hon. member seems to know all about this country on paper. I, on the other hand, have traversed it not once but several times, and not on paper but in reality. In the first place it is an obvious absurdity to construct a railway to run in competition with the broad, blue ocean. That must be obvious to anyone, and with regard to these independent railway systems, no country with an immense coast line like that of Western Australia can hope to avoid them. Let us take the instance of Queensland. It has half a dozen different systems running inland from the ports, and Queensland has a very much smaller coast line than this State. It is inevitable that we must make use of the coast line with which nature has endowed us, and we must abandon the idea of having a trunk system throughout the State. We must run lines inland from the various ports. I was reading a speech wherein the construction of a line was advocated from Meekatharra to Nullagine.

The Colonial Secretary: That has been advocated here.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: Who was the culprit?

The Colonial Secretary: Mr. Holmes.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: Mr. President, words fail me. That again is country which I know personally, and anyone who has travelled through it will recognise that the suggestion for the construction of a railway through it is absurd in the highest degree. In the first place it is only second class pastoral country, and in the second place the engineering difficulties are so great that the proposal is not to be thought of on the score of expense. With a huge coast line like ours, with the best of our country lying in close contiguity to the coast, we must abandon the idea of having one gigantic trunk system. It is impossible to carry out. It is true that one cannot be encouraged by the doleful accounts of the recent harvests which have been quoted here, but from what I know of the country that the proposed line from Esperance northwards would serve, it has at least as much claim to the facilities which a railway will give it as any other part of the State. It has more from a sentimental point of view, because it has been a case of hope so long deferred, and so far as I am concerned, I am prepared to give my vote in the direction I gave it last session. That brings me to another point, and that is, that I know I will get no thanks from those who are always talking about party spirit in this House. When I object to Clause 23 of the Traffic Bill, I will be accused by those who are always talking about party spirit in this House, of being animated by that party spirit. It is discourteous to hon. members, and it is no encouragement to them to find these things said about one's actions. So far as I am concerned, I am always willing to put the best construction on the action, not only of Parliament, but of members of Parliament, and why that same courtesy cannot be extended by others towards their opponents on certain questions passes my comprehension. I hope that with the influx of new blood which is representative

apparently of several shades of political thought, that this House will merit more than ever the name which I still persist in giving it—the House of individual opinion. I am sick of hearing of party spirit. I do not believe it exists. I know it does not exist in my instance. If I believe in a thing I am prepared to support it without referring it to any party or anybody outside Parliament. I think the domination of bodies outside over members of Parliament is the curse of modern politics. A member of Parliament is sent by his electors, not as a delegate, but as a man in whose discretion they can trust, who may be depended upon to use his common sense, his sense of fairness, and his sense of honour in any emergency which may arise, without asking the opinion of anybody outside. Take my own case. I know I owe my election to this House in no sense whatever to any political body and I hope I never shall. Can those hon. members who are always brooding about party spirit in politics say the same thing? I shall say no more on what, after all, is a disagreeable subject, except this: if what must be the most reliable criterion is taken in this connection, if any hon. member will take the trouble that I have taken to analyse the division lists of last session or the session before, or indeed any previous session, he will find himself puzzled to divide the sitting members into any party. They are so inextricably mixed up that the lack of party spirit in this House must be apparent to any but the most biassed observer. Passing away from this unpleasant subject, I have to congratulate one member of the Government upon being one of the most fortunate men in the country—I allude to Mr. Bath, who has been appointed as Commissioner to the Panama Exposition. I have already said that I consider him a most fortunate man, and he is indeed fortunate to be asked by the Government to accept this position of high honour and high responsibility, to travel to this Exposition where he will mix up with the brightest and most prominent men, I suppose, in the world. The only thing I

would like Mr. Bath to do is to shake from his shoulders that cloak of apparently incurable melancholy which nearly always surrounds him, and to remember that the prominent people from other parts of the world with whom he comes into contact will, to a great extent, be guided as to their opinion of the country he comes from by his demeanour. Therefore, I ask him to appear more cheerful than he usually does. It is a pity that Mr. Bath assumes an aspect of cheerfulness only when contemplating the position of those unfortunate tradesmen whom he, with the assistance of the unlimited funds of the country, has been the means of ruining. In olden times they had a skeleton to appear at a feast, and in moments of excessive mirth it would bring to the minds of the people present what they might expect hereafter. This was a reminder to check the excessive mirth. May I be allowed to suggest that Mr. Bath should take with him one of the most dejected of the retail butchers in order that he may be on a fitting occasion, stimulated with that mirth which seems so foreign to his character. This seems to be the time for allegories. Hon. members have got into the habit of talking in parables. Mr. Allen gave us a beautiful little allegory and it was most charmingly told, but when you examine it it breaks down in certain directions. The hon. member alluded to a shield representing the Government hung in wood, one face of which was silver and the other gold. As I have already said, when we examined that allegory, it breaks down. It is true that the Government is in the wood, and a long way from being out of it, but the Government is not hung yet, and although I have heard people accuse the Government of being two-faced let me point out at once that neither face have I ever heard called silver or gold, but as being of brazen appearance. I have little more to say on the subject of the Speech, but let me again congratulate those new members upon their accession to this House, and let me condole with those members who have not survived the last election, and more particularly do my sympathies go out to Mr. Davis, who

has apparently fallen in his late campaign through being a victim of bad companionship.

On motion by Hon. J. E. Dodd (Honorary Minister) debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 8.30 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 8th July, 1914.

	PAGE
Question: Boya Quarry	223
Leave of absence	223
Bills: Osborne Park Tramways Purchase, 1R. ..	223
Bills of Sale Act Amendment, 1R. ..	223
Address-in-reply, fourth day	223

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

QUESTION: BOYA QUARRY.

Mr. WISDOM asked the Minister for Works: What is the price charged for blue metal to Government departments, supplied by the Boya quarry for—(1) dust, (2) $\frac{3}{4}$ -in. metal, (3) 1-in. metal, (4) $1\frac{1}{2}$ -in. metal, (5) 2-in. metal?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: The charges made to Government departments are sufficient to cover working expenses, interest, depreciation, sinking fund, etc.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. LAYMAN leave of absence for two weeks granted to the hon. member for West Perth (Mr. Allen) and the hon. member for Katanning (Mr. A. E. Piesse) on the grounds of ill-health.

On motion by Mr. LAYMAN leave of absence for four weeks granted to the hon. member for Greenough (Mr. Nanson) on the grounds of urgent private business.

On motion by Mr. UNDERWOOD leave of absence granted to the hon. member for Roebourne (Mr. Gardiner) for three weeks on the grounds of urgent private business.

On motion by Mr. UNDERWOOD leave of absence granted to the hon. member for Gascoyne (Mr. McDonald) for three weeks on the grounds of urgent private business.

BILLS—FIRST READING.

1. Osborne Park Tramways Purchase (introduced by the Premier).

2. Bills of Sale Act Amendment (introduced by the Attorney General).

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Fourth Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS (Subiaco): After the very lucid and comprehensive speech of the hon. the Premier last evening, it does not seem as if there is need for anything further to be said in defence of what the Government have done, especially in view of the very weak nature of the criticism which has been levelled against us. But one marvels that even such weak criticism should be levelled by the Opposition in view of the unbounded prosperity which prevails in the State at the present time.

Hon. Frank Wilson: What about the unemployed?

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: The Premier last evening pointed out the directions in which this prosperity was to be seen. I venture to say that never in the history of the State since the great boom days of the goldfields has such prosperity existed as we are able to see now in the building trade in Perth, which prosperity has existed during the last three years.

Mr. Harper: Wake up.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: We have seen some of the most magnificent buildings—buildings that would undoubtedly be a credit to any city in the world—springing up, as it were, in the night, and not only has this building prosperity existed