

Chamber. We are also told that a consolidating law in connection with the sale of intoxicating liquor will be submitted. If the Government will solve this question then it will be a very great achievement indeed. As the Speech farther says, "As my advisers consider that these important matters can only receive due consideration at the hands of a Parliament coming to its work with a renewed mandate from the people," I think there is no need to discuss matters which we will be able to discuss much more satisfactorily when the actual measures come before us for our consideration. I would only say, I join with the proposer and seconder of the motion, submitted so ably by my friends, Mr. Kirwan and Mr. Stubbs, I join with them in congratulating the leader of the Government in achieving such a splendid victory during the recent campaign, and I am pleased to see so many of our old friends returned to this House. I have much pleasure in supporting the Address-in-Reply.

No other member rising to speak, the question was put and passed, the Address was adopted and ordered to be presented.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY, in moving the adjournment, said: As members know this will be a very short session—it may terminate next week or probably the week after—there will be nothing but formal business to be transacted, but I will ask the House to meet again tomorrow when I may be in a position to say to what day we should adjourn. There is a Supply Bill to be passed, and I want to see how business progresses in another place to-day, and then I will be able to state when the Supply Bill will be brought down.

The House adjourned at five minutes to 5 o'clock, until the next afternoon.

## Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 28th July, 1908.

	PAGE
Questions : Woodcutters' License Fee ... ..	16
Public Service Classification ... ..	16
Printing by Prison Labour ... ..	17
Bail Money Estreated ... ..	17
Land and Income Tax Collection ... ..	17
Railway Regrading, Perth-Fremantle ... ..	17
Sitting Days and Hours ... ..	17
Government Business, Precedence ... ..	18
Committees for the Session ... ..	18
Debate : Address-in-Reply, Speeches by Leader of Opposition and Colonial Treasurer ... ..	18

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 4.30 o'clock p.m.

Prayers.

#### QUESTION—WOOD CUTTERS' LICENSE FEE.

Mr. COLLIER asked the Premier: What amount has been received for wood cutters licensed each month during the half-year ending 30th June last from—  
(a) The Kalgoorlie and Boulder Firewood Company. (b) The West Australian Goldfields Firewood Company, Limited. (c) The Westralia Timber and Firewood Supply Company?

The PREMIER replied: (a) The Kalgoorlie and Boulder Firewood Company: January, £7 8s.; February, £6 10s.; March, £5 11s.; April, £6 3s.; May, £9; June, £9 1s. (b) The West Australian Goldfields Firewood Company, Limited: January, £14 10s.; February, £16 5s.; March, £17 19s.; April, £19 17s.; May, £20 1s.; June, £20. (c) The Westralia Timber and Firewood Supply Company: Nil. Note.—This Company does not employ any woodcutters of its own, but does the work through subcontractors.

#### QUESTION—PUBLIC SERVICE CLASSIFICATION.

Mr. DAGLISH asked the Premier: 1, Is he aware that considerable inconvenience and dissatisfaction prevail in the General Division of the Public Service owing to the delay in publication of the classification of that Division? 2, Will he take steps to have the said classification published without farther delay?

The PREMIER replied: 1, I have not been so advised. 2, The Commissioner proposes to publish the classification next month.

#### QUESTION—PRINTING BY PRISON LABOUR.

Mr. DAGLISH asked the Treasurer: 1, Is he aware that whilst the number of employees at the Government Printing Office has been reduced owing to scarcity of work, a large amount of printing has been done at Fremantle Gaol by prison labour? 2, Does he regard it as desirable to discharge old employees of good character and long service in order that the work may be done by prisoners? 3, If not, will he take suitable action to obviate that course for the future?

The TREASURER replied: 1, I am not aware that the number of employees at the Government Printing Office has been reduced owing to scarcity of work; but, owing to reorganisation, the number has been reduced by about 50 during the past two years, although the work executed has increased by 50 per cent. during the same period. Printing has been done at the Fremantle Gaol since 1904, and the Government, in providing employment for prisoners in this way, has simply continued the policy of its predecessors. The total amount of printing and book-binding done at the Gaol during the past year was only £820, exclusive of material. 2. No. 3. Answered by No. 1.

#### QUESTION—BAIL MONEY ESTREATED.

Mr. SCADDAN asked the Attorney General: 1, Has the bail in the case of Stewart, of Kalgoorlie, been estreated? 2, If so, has the amount been received from Messrs. McAuliffe and Boileau, the bondsmen? 3, Has the whole or any portion of the money been refunded? 4, If so, why?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL replied: 1, If the case of Rex versus Simpson is intended, Yes, it was formally estreated on the non-appearance of accused. 2, No. 3, Answered by No. 2. 4, The payment has not been enforced as the bonds-

men have made, and are making, every effort to bring the accused to trial.

#### QUESTION—LAND AND INCOME TAX COLLECTION.

Mr. H. BROWN asked the Treasurer: 1, What amount was received on account of Land and Income Tax to 30th June last? 2, What are the expenses incurred in connection therewith to same date?

The TREASURER replied: 1, £17,073 to the end of the financial year. 2, The total expenses in connection with the Taxation Department to the 30th June last were £3,911. Of this amount it is estimated that fully £1,700 represents preliminary expenses and expenditure incurred in establishing a new Department and compiling data from official sources.

#### QUESTION—RAILWAY REGRADING, PERTH-FREMANTLE.

Mr. ANGWIN asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Is it the intention of the Railway Department to regrade the railway between Perth and Fremantle? 2, If so, what is the estimated cost of same? 3, Would the Minister take into consideration the advisability of constructing a railway on the south side of the river, as recommended by the Railway Commissioner, before commencing any such regrading?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, The matter has not yet been seriously considered. 2, No reliable estimate has yet been prepared. 3, Any regrading that may be found necessary in connection with the existing line has no bearing on the question of any proposition for the construction of a railway on the south side of the river, the desirability of which, up to the present, has not been considered by the Government.

#### SITTING DAYS AND HOURS.

The PREMIER moved:—

*That the House, unless otherwise ordered, shall meet for the despatch of business on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays at 4.30 p.m., and shall sit*

until 6.15 p.m. if necessary and, if requisite, from 7.30 p.m. onwards.

Mr. T. H. BATH (Brown Hill) asked: Does the Premier think it would be necessary, before the termination of the session, to make any alteration in this sessional order?

The PREMIER replied: That depends on the length of the debates.

Question put and passed.

### GOVERNMENT BUSINESS, PRECEDENCE.

On motion by *the Premier*, ordered: That on Tuesdays, Thursdays, and alternate Wednesdays, Government business shall take precedence of all Motions and Orders of the Day:

### COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION.

On motions by *the Premier*, Sessional Committees were appointed as follow:—

*Standing Orders Committee*—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Foulkes, Mr. Keenan, Mr. Walker, and the Chairman of Committees, with leave to sit during any adjournment, and with authority to confer upon subjects of mutual concernment with any committee appointed for similar purposes by the Legislative Council.

*Printing Committee*—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Brown, and Mr. Bath; to assist Mr. Speaker in all matters which relate to the printing executed by order of the House, and for the purpose of selecting and arranging for printing. Returns and Papers presented in pursuance of motions made by members, and all papers laid upon the table whether in answer to addresses or otherwise.

*Library Committee*—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Male, and Mr. Walker, with leave to sit during any adjournment and during the recess, and with authority to act jointly with the Library Committee of the Legislative Council.

*House Committee*—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Gordon, Mr. A. J. Wilson, and Mr. Taylor; with leave to sit during any adjournment and during the recess, and with authority to act jointly with the House Committee of the Legislative Council.

### DEBATE—ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

*Motion to adopt.*

Debate resumed from the 23rd July.

### *Leader of the Opposition.*

Mr. T. H. BATH (Brown Hill): The Government, in placing this Speech in the mouth of His Excellency the Governor, have gone one better than that famous or notorious Speech submitted by the Reid Government during the short time they occupied the Ministerial benches in the Federal Parliament; for on that occasion they did include one proposal, which was for the amendment of the Standing Orders; but so far as this Speech is concerned, apart perhaps from the Bill providing for the rededicating of a reserve at York, which as a formal measure had to be submitted in order to preserve our privileges, there is no business other than a distinctly electioneering appeal to the people of this State. In my experience as a member of this Parliament—possibly it may be regarded as a comparatively brief one—I have not yet seen a Speech by His Excellency the Governor at the closing session of a Parliament used for the purpose of outlining what the proposals of the Government were for another Parliament. It is usually left to the people themselves to express their verdict as to what legislation they desire, and there is usually that amount of what I may term political decency to avoid making an appeal to the electors through the medium of the Governor's Speech. We are told it is inadvisable to introduce any legislation other than of a formal character during this session of Parliament because the Government feel the necessity for seeking a new and fresh mandate from the people of this State. I am inclined to agree with their opinion that a fresh mandate is required. I do not know that the present Government ever had a mandate from the country, unless we accept them as the direct successors of the Rason Administration, but no action taken by the present Government, no effort put forward by them so far as administration is concerned, can be regarded as any attempt whatever to carry out the mandate given to the Rason Administration at the general elections of

1905. We are given as an excuse for these shortcomings that the Government have been unable to deal with certain important matters awaiting legislative action owing to the exigencies of the financial position of the State, and the lengthy consideration given to devise the best means for providing the revenue necessary for its wants; in fact, to sum up, because of the necessity for dealing with the financial position in which the State had been landed. This is certainly an admission from the Government, because I think even their ardent supporters, those with whom they have been hobnobbing during every recess we have had, at functions such as shows, banquets and dinners—[*The Premier*: Hobnobbing for ten days with you]—and trips throughout the country, will be astonished to learn that during the term in which the Ministerial party have occupied those benches the whole of their energies have been devoted to squaring the finances of the State. It is news to learn that the Ministerial hens have been trying to incubate the financial egg. [*Mr. Walker*: All the hens at one time?] No, taking it in turns; I gather from the Governor's Speech, one at a time. Although we have that well known illustration as to the mountain labouring and bringing forth a mouse, in this case it appears to me that the Ministry have done nothing but addle that financial egg. I do not know that any political mountebank I have ever come in contact with has made a more impudent assertion or has actually shown more impudent assurance than was contained in the remarks of the Treasurer in a recent speech he delivered at Busselton. The speech was made of course after the Treasurer had been dined and wined, and possibly this may account somewhat for the extraordinary nature of the statements made by him; but he assured his audience that at the time the Government took office the finances were not in a sound condition, but he was glad to know he had been able to balance the finances of the State. That is the most extraordinary statement that any gentleman holding Ministerial office has ever made in the political history of Western Australia. As a matter

of fact other financiers outside the realms of Parliament who have balanced their finances and have financed their affairs as the Treasurer has those of the State, have landed in places much less congenial than the House of Parliament. Let us see in what way the Treasurer has balanced the finances. He told that audience that when the Government took office the finances were not in a sound condition. At the end of the financial year 1904-5 the deficit was roundly £46,000; in 1905-6 it was £120,000; in 1906-7, £208,000; in 1907-8, £211,000. The Treasurer balanced the finances by increasing the deficit from £46,000 to £211,000. I am quite satisfied that if he has the assurance to make such a statement as that at Busselton he would if the State were handed over to the official receiver, go to those people and say what a great financial genius he was and how well he had managed affairs. The Government have been unable year after year to do what they promised at the elections of 1905, namely to balance the finances of the State and wipe out the deficit.

*The Treasurer*: You could go on increasing it when you were in power.

*Mr. BATH*: I am telling you what the deficit was when we left office, namely £46,000, and am also telling you what it is now. It has increased fivefold during the administration of the Treasurer and his colleagues. Notwithstanding this, the Treasurer has the presumption to say he has balanced the ledger. It is news to me that a deficit can be wiped out in this fashion.

*The Premier*: It can be funded, as in the other States.

*Mr. BATH*: We do not want to resort to such means as that here, but the mere fact that mention is now made of it gives one the impression that the Ministry have considered the idea.

*The Premier*: If they had there would be nothing novel about it.

*Mr. BATH*: Not only have we had this continued increase in the deficit, but we have had devious methods resorted to in order to try and balance the finances, such as remind us of the bad old days of financing in New South Wales and Victoria which brought lean years and

bad years in their train. We have had other instances of bad old practices which were resorted to in times when finances were in a stringent condition, such as the construction of nonproductive works from loan funds. The Treasurer has not been behindhand in resorting to this method. In 1905-6, £59,000 was spent in this manner in roads, bridges, and public buildings, while in 1906-7 the sum of £103,000 was spent. The figures for the financial year just concluded are not yet available, but probably a sum representing £100,000 has been expended in the same fashion. This action of the Treasurer, like that of Autolycus, has been the gathering up of unconsidered trifles, and he has not scrupled to appropriate trust funds, using them as revenue in his frantic effort to try and balance the ledger. For instance what constitutes—and I have expressed this view in the paper—"legalised embezzlement" was committed by the sale of Government property trust account funds to the tune of £73,000 and using the proceeds as revenue for ordinary purposes. It was never contemplated that the money produced by the sale of the property bought, or constructed, from loan funds, should be used as revenue. There is at the present time an indebtedness to the foreign bondholder representing that amount and, if the property is sold, we have not the asset representing the amount of the indebtedness, for it has been appropriated for revenue purposes. Even if the Treasurer had been able by these methods to adjust the finances and to wipe out the deficit, it would not have been justified by any authority on sound finance. It is true the Treasurer, when the illegal nature of the action was pointed out to him, legalised it by passing a Bill through Parliament to authorise the use of the money; but the fact that it was legalised did not make it right from a moral point of view. The Treasurer stands condemned in the eyes of the financial journals for using this money in such a fashion; and I told the Treasurer here, one stormy morning last year, that it was a dishonest practice. He resented it then, but I repeat the statement now, that it is a dishonest practice and not

justified in the interests of the State. [Mr. Lugwin: That was when the closure had been used, was it not?] Then we are told that economies have been effected, and the Government point with pride to the savings they have effected in the railway administration of this State. It is true they have reduced the expenditure on the Government railways; but they have done it by two methods which in my opinion are not justified and cannot be defended. In the first place, they have done it by sweating the railway employees, sweating them in no unmistakeable fashion. Despite the denial of the Premier as to an interview I gave to the Press, there can be no doubt there are a number of railway employees in this State who are sweated by the Government in trying to effect a saving in the expenditure on railways. I say that so far as Government employment is concerned, where we pass legislation for the purpose of securing a fair wage, the Government should be the first to set an example in that direction; should be the first to say to the private employer, "We ask you to pay fair wages and observe fair working conditions."

*The Premier:* Did not the Government allow Sunday time to stand alone?

Mr. BATH: Is it a fair thing, for instance, that casual hands in the carriage-cleaning sheds should be paid 6s. 6d. per day? Is it a fair thing that employees receiving 8s. per day should be retrenched and others taken on at 7s. per day—some of them immigrants brought out and assisted by the State? Some of the old employees have been taken on again at the reduced rate of 7s. per day. The Premier denies this, but I have seen papers showing that application has been made for the payment of 8s. per day to these men, and it has been refused. If to-morrow morning the Premier will express his willingness to pay these men a minimum rate of 8s. per day, he shall have supplied to him the names of men who have been retrenched in this fashion and put on again at the reduced rate. Those methods are undesirable in the interests of the State. If we contemplate effecting economy in the running of our railways and cannot do so without resorting to

these practices, then I say it is not justified. I do say, however, that there is room in the railway service for economy in the administrative staff, room for weeding out men in receipt of high salaries. The administrative staff has been built up year in and year out until to-day it is unnecessarily large, which increases the red-tapeism through which matters have to go and makes it impossible for the railways of this State to be worked as a commercial undertaking. I do say it is entirely wrong for any Government to effect economies by sweating their employees.

*The Minister for Railways:* What about the highly-paid officers whom your Government appointed?

Mr. BATH: I said that the staff had been constantly built up in years past; and if the Minister is really anxious to effect economy and reduce expenditure, let him start first on the administrative staff. The other method by which an apparent saving has been effected is merely that of banking on the wise expenditure in past years. The Minister for Railways knows that in 1904-5 a considerable sum was expended from revenue for the purpose of bringing the permanent way, especially the main lines, up to a decent condition; and the Government, instead of wisely setting aside a fair sum each year to maintain that standard, are letting the permanent way fall into disrepair, and by this they claim they are making a saving to the State. The result will be that in a few years we shall be in precisely the same position as they were formerly in Victoria. There the Government pointed to a saving in this connection of £100,000, but in a year or two they had to pay £250,000 for what they called belated "repairs," to bring the permanent way up to standard again, and had to buy new locomotives and repair others that had been allowed to get out of condition. In connection with the recent terrible railway accident in Victoria, we see how unwise it is, for the purpose of making an apparent saving in one or two years, to allow the permanent way to get into such a condition, or to sweat the staff and work them in such a way that the Government may be landed in

enormous expenditure by having to compensate those who are seriously injured in accidents. It is far better to make an average expenditure each year, keeping the permanent way in good order and giving the people a good service, rather than to starve the railways now and have to provide twofold in a few years to come. Then we are told there has been a saving in administration; but I would ask the Premier to turn to the Colonial Secretary's Department, or to the departments controlled by the Attorney General, which may be termed purely administrative departments, and note if a saving has been effected there. On the contrary there has been an increase in the expenditure of those departments; and it is just in those branches of the public service that the pruning-knife could have been used with effect. I do not say we should not ask those departments to carry out the duties entrusted to them; but I do say we should appoint officers who would carry out those duties in a much better fashion, and perhaps with fewer officers than at the present time. We have only to turn to the Public Health Department as a case in point. We see there a very considerable staff, and the cost of administration is mounting up at such a rate as to be a positive disgrace to the State. We have the Treasurer taking the *Morning Herald* to task, and talking about vindictive criticism, because that paper has dared to criticise some of his methods in estimating the revenue and expenditure of this State.

*The Treasurer:* And for making false statements.

Mr. BATH: He has taken the newspaper to task for criticising him for not expending money Parliament had voted. The Treasurer stated that if he found the revenue was not coming in according to the estimate, it was the first and bounden duty of a Treasurer to look about him for means of reducing expenditure.

*The Treasurer:* They criticised me because I did not get the revenue.

Mr. BATH: That was the point taken by the *Herald*, and that statement of the Treasurer is taken from his reply to the *Herald*, or rather from his speech at Busseton in which he resented the criticism that he had not expended money which

Parliament had voted. Let us see what the Treasurer and his colleagues said in 1905. Mr. Rason, speaking at Midland Junction in September, 1905, said:—

If they asked him to show some cause for the existing depression, he would say it was in a large measure due to the fact that the Labour Government had expended £180,000 less than Parliament had voted.

And the Treasurer (Hon. F. Wilson) backed up Mr. Rason's statement on that occasion. Thus we find that what was a crime on the part of the Labour Government in 1905 becomes a virtue on the part of the Treasurer in 1908; for when he finds the revenue is not coming in as anticipated, he now states it is a proper thing to adjust the expenditure according to the way the revenue comes in. [*Mr. Collier*: And then squirms under criticism.] And then talks about vindictive criticism. But while at Busselton the Treasurer with one breath takes credit to himself that the Government have squared the finances of the State, almost with his next breath, in order to make a case against the Commonwealth Government, he says the way in which the Commonwealth has plundered this State has prevented him from squaring the finances. On the one hand he says he has squared the finances, and with his next breath the Treasurer says that because the Commonwealth robbed the State of £60,000 he has been prevented from squaring the finances. Let us see how the Commonwealth has plundered the State. That argument is used merely to cover up the tracks of the Government; this talk of the Commonwealth having robbed the State of revenue is the redherring drawn across the track to divert attention from the Treasurer's mismanagement of the affairs of the State. To this end he talks of the £60,000 the Federal Government has taken for the purpose of establishing old age pensions. I desire to quote the Treasurer's remarks in 1905, and to point out that in 1905 every Minister of the Rason Cabinet, when asked his opinion on the old age pensions question—with I think the single exception of the Treas-

urer, who said he was not in favour of it—every other Minister said he was in favour of old age pensions, but that he believed they should be introduced by the Commonwealth Government and not by the State Government. That statement was also advanced by the present Attorney General, who was not then in the Ministry, but who when seeking election in 1905 said that while he believed in old age pensions, he believed also that the Commonwealth should undertake them, and not the State.

*The Attorney General*: Did not I say I believed the Commonwealth should administer the old age pensions scheme?

Mr. BATH: You said that any scheme of old age pensions should be undertaken by the Commonwealth.

*The Attorney General*: No.

Mr. BATH: What the newspapers reported was that the Attorney General said he believed in such a scheme, provided old age pensions were undertaken by the Commonwealth Government. I agree with the Attorney General, and it was the proposal of the Labour Government in connection with their scheme for old age pensions that the State should provide the money, but that at the first favourable opportunity we should hand over its administration to the Federal Government. For this reason. There were those who had been the requisite time in the Commonwealth, but who through passing from one State to another would not be eligible under any State scheme which restricted the payment to those resident within the State for a specified period, say 12 or 15 years. The fact that such persons had been resident in one State for ten years, though they might have been resident in the Commonwealth for 30 years, would disqualify them from pensions. We felt that a Commonwealth scheme would get over that difficulty and provide the requisite scheme under which everyone entitled to it within the Commonwealth would secure a pension. At the Conference in Melbourne in 1906, the Treasurer said:—

We would rather, I think, supposing Western Australia indorses the old age pension scheme, make a special appropriation for our proportion, whatever

it might amount to, and hand it over to the Federal Government. We think that would be more equitable, because we pay so much through the Customs and Excise, so much more per head of our population than the other States, that we naturally must pay very much more towards this scheme than our due proportion would be.

You will note, however, the Treasurer said "We would rather, I think, supposing Western Australia endorses the old age pension scheme." There were plenty of limitations and qualifications. What I wish to point out is that the Commonwealth Government was perfectly willing in 1907, and was still willing in 1908, to accept such a proposal as that. Mr. Deakin on that occasion said:—

I do not want to continue the discussion, but may add without hesitation that if the State Governments will undertake the responsibility of finding us the money to pay Federal old age pensions, no one will welcome the proposal with more enthusiasm than the Federal Government.

That statement has been repeated many times, but the State Treasurers, whatever may have been their protestations about their belief in old age pensions, have never been willing to make that provision, though the Commonwealth Government and the people of the State have been emphatically in favour year after year, waiting for it, and waiting for it in vain, for the State Treasurers to undertake the scheme. As the people, whether they are Western Australians or Queenslanders, only have to pay the money once, whether it is provided by the Commonwealth or the State, they are prepared to support that Government which is sincere in its anxiety to carry old age pensions into practical effect. Then, again, while there may be some qualification in regard to their opposition to the Commonwealth taking the money for old age pensions, we are told there is great objection to their taking any money per medium of the Surplus Revenue Bill for defence. In turning up the official record I find the Treasurer in 1906 was perfectly willing that the Federal Govern-

ment should have money for defence, because he voted with me in support of an amendment which was moved by Mr. McGowan, who is Leader of the Opposition in the New South Wales Parliament.

*The Treasurer:* What was the amendment?

Mr. BATH: To restrict the money being taken over for anything else than old age pensions and defence.

*The Treasurer:* That was the specific duties which we opposed, you and I both, because of the unfairness to Western Australia.

Mr. BATH: The hon. member did not oppose it, because I have the record here. I will read it for the hon. member's edification:—

The Conference divided on Mr. McGowan's amendment—Mr. Ashton, Mr. Bath, Mr. McGowan, Mr. Philp, Mr. Waddell, Mr. Wilson. (An extra vote for Western Australia.) Majority against the amendment, 1.

*The Treasurer:* Limiting it. We could not get it thrown out, and we limited it.

Mr. BATH: The Treasurer was quite willing that we should then pay the money for old age pensions and defence. Now the State Treasurers are objecting to the Commonwealth doing what they have expressed their willingness to do time after time, that the Commonwealth should have the necessary money for this purpose. It seems to me all the talk about plundering the State is so much effort to divert public attention from the real issue, that is the administration of the finances of the State. Then we also have some vain-glorious remarks from the Premier that Western Australia is not going to stand any interference whatever from the Federal Government as to its State debts, that we want to have control of our own business, that we do not want the Commonwealth to step in at all. Yet I think in either 1906 or 1907 when there was a proposal put forward, which would have enabled this Government to hand over their debts to the Commonwealth, with the provision for a half per cent. sinking fund, the Treasurer and the Premier both were quite willing that it should have been undertaken, and they put forth



feelers to the people of the State as to the propriety of reducing the sinking fund from one per cent. to half per cent. Although we hear a great deal about preserving our indebtedness, when it was a question in which they thought of reducing the payment to the sinking fund they were quite willing to transfer the debts to the Commonwealth Government. There is one thing in connection with the borrowing powers about which the Premier is so emphatic, that is whether the people of this State, in view of the present indebtedness of the population and the way it has mounted up in recent years, are so anxious that we should have absolutely free control of borrowing in Western Australia—whether that is worth fighting for—seeing they have to pay the piper to the extent they have today. In 1904-5, the net indebtedness per head of the population in Western Australia was £61 19s. 5d., that was the year of the Labour Government, and it was then lower per head of the population than it had been for some years past. Without taking into consideration the loan that has been raised this year, on the 30th December, 1907, our indebtedness per head has increased to £66 18s. 7d., or £5 more per head of the population than it was in 1904-5.

*The Attorney General:* What would have been the figure in 1905, including the loan raised that year?

Mr. BATH: The Premier was quoting the rate in 1905, and the hon. member asked me why I did not take the figures from the official returns which were in my possession. I have the official returns, and the figures I have given are taken from the Statistical Abstract. If the Attorney General will tell me how much the Rason Government had to their credit, of loan money, when they took office in September, 1905, then I will tell him the net indebtedness in 1905.

*The Attorney General:* Do the figures you gave include the loan authorised to be raised in 1905?

Mr. BATH: No, they do not, because the money was not available. When Mr. Rason stepped into office he had a balance of £995,000 to credit of General

Loan Fund to carry on public works with. The figures I have given are the official figures taken from the Statistical Abstract. That is the indebtedness to which we reduced it as compared with the indebtedness at the present time, and I defy the Attorney General or the Treasurer to dispute these figures. [Interjection by the Treasurer.] I will tell the Treasurer about the works and the amount expended, and show him where his vigorous policy came in as compared with 1904-5. Despite the fact that we have £5 per head more of the net indebtedness of the State, and that more than half the total indebtedness has been expended on the railways, we find the railways returned last year £108,000 less in revenue than in 1904-5, and £129,000 less than in 1905-6. We are told that the difference in the railway receipts has been due to the encouragement given to the producing interests of Western Australia. It has been due to nothing of the sort. It has been due to the concessions deliberately given to the combines of the State, the concessions which were given to the timber combine, and which enabled them to increase their profits at the expense of the people who were called upon to pay the increased interest and sinking fund charged on the loan indebtedness. It was due to the concession given to the flour-milling combine which the Treasurer knows something about, and it was due to the concession given to the combine connected with the meat industry of which the Minister for Railways knows something, for he boasted about it at Menzies. These are the people who have profited at the expense of the State.

*Hon. F. H. Piessé:* What amount did they profit by it?

Mr. BATH: The timber combine profited to the extent of, I think, £23,000.

*Hon. F. H. Piessé:* We did not make bread out of sawdust.

Mr. BATH: All I want to say is that evidently the member for Katanning wants to impress on us that the concession was no good, but I will say that when the farming community pointed out to the Ministers when along the Great Southern railway that the rebate was no use to them, the members of the flour

milling association were quickly on the heels of the Minister, telling him that the rebate should be retained because it was of use to them.

*Hon. F. H. Piesse*: It may have been to a few of them.

*Mr. BATH*: These are the concessions which have made it necessary to sweat the railway employees; these are the concessions which have made it necessary for the people of the State to pay an increased amount in interest and sinking fund charges in order that the exploiters and combines should pocket increased profits. Then again we are told about the vigorous policy in connection with the construction of railways. It is a remarkable thing that although a considerable sum of money has been expended in railways, with the result that the interest and sinking fund bill has gone up to the tune of £145,000 since 1905-6, the railway revenue, instead of increasing, has decreased, and it seems to me that in connection with some of the agricultural railways the only result has been to put money into the pockets of those speculators, those who have held or secured the land along the railways, and who have pocketed the profits as the result of the expenditure of loan funds on these railway lines. We find as to proposed new railways that those people who get the information, obtain the land, and the only result of the construction of the railways is to enable them to net enhanced profits.

*The Treasurer*: Where did they get the information from?

*Mr. BATH*: If the Treasurer is willing, I would like to see a return of the land-holders along the Preston Valley line, and its proposed extension; a return of the land-holders along the Katanning-Kojonup railway; a return of the land-holders along the Wickpin railway, and a return of those who have taken up land along the proposed extension of the Goomalling line, northward and eastward, and we would have some interesting information. I want to point out what the Attorney General said in this matter in 1905. He said:—

There is one matter I should like to emphasise, and that is that I am

thoroughly in accord with what the Leader of the Opposition said in regard to the lands lying adjacent to our existing lines of railway and in regard to the necessity for having these lands thrown open for selection before we push on with the policy of spur lines. It is a shame, when travelling on these lines, to see on both sides of the railways thousands of acres tied up purely for speculative purposes; and at the same time, are we justified in going in for the construction of railways to make lands at the back of these available for the assistance of the people of the State? The possibility of purchasing these lands along existing railways may be entirely beyond the powers of the Treasurer, especially if he were simply to go into the open market and ask for them to be sold to him at the price the vendors ask; but there are other means of acquiring these lands, and they have already been pointed out to the Treasurer. If those who hold these lands for speculative purposes were made the subject of some taxation on unimproved values, we would find that these estates, which have been locked up waiting for the expansion of the State to give them the unearned increment, would become available for the settlement of the citizens of the State, and we would not be obliged to construct these railways into what are practically the back-blocks of our agricultural districts to find land on which to place settlers.

That opinion was endorsed by the member for Gascoyne (*Mr. Butcher*) the other night, when he said there was room for a million of people to be settled on existing lines of railway without constructing an additional mile. I agree with the opinion expressed by that hon. member, and with that expressed by the Attorney General before he was Attorney General. Had we adopted that policy we could have largely increased the return from our railways without involving one additional penny in expenditure, without increasing interest and sinking fund charges, and the Treasurer would have found that his Budget would have been balanced without having resort to the

many devious methods he has adopted. Of course, while I recognise the value of the information offered by the Attorney General in 1905, he has strayed from the paths of rectitude because of the attraction of the flesh-pots of Egypt. [*The Attorney General*: There is not much attraction about them.] At any rate the Attorney General is very anxious to stick to office. Now we come to the Treasurer's interjection of a short time ago, as to the fact that no works had been carried out in 1904-5. I wish to give a comparison between what was then widely termed the "mark time" policy and the alleged vigorous policy of the present Administration. In 1904-5 the expenditure from revenue and from general loan fund on the three great labour-employing departments, the Railway Department, the Public Works Department, and the Mines Department, was £2,581,941, while in 1905-6 it was £2,240,844 or £340,000 less. Again, in 1906-7 it was £2,389,416, or nearly £200,000 less. I have not the loan figures for 1907-8—I tried to get them yesterday—but the Government will need to have expended considerably over one million pounds from general loan fund in order to equal the combined expenditure in 1904-5. So when the Treasurer talks about no expenditure on works in 1904-5 he is absolutely talking without his book, and has not taken the trouble to look up the financial returns of this State. I think there was more money spent then, more men were employed, more work was found, and more was done to develop the resources of the State than has been done in any year by any Government that has held office since that date. We have heard a great deal about the great encouragement given to the various industries by the present Administration. I want to point out that in the mining industry the Labour Government did more in 1904-5 in a practical way for the encouragement of that industry than has been done since. In 1904-5 we expended from revenue on the erection of new State batteries £33,219, as compared with only £13,174 in 1905-6, and nothing at all in 1906-7. Again, in water supply for mining districts we expended £32,748

in 1904-5; while only £18,795 was expended in 1905-6, and only £15,952 in 1906-7. Also in the mining development vote, from revenue we provided £6,046 in 1904-5, while a sum of £6,841 was provided in 1905-6, and in 1906-7 nothing was provided from revenue for the purpose. Taking the combined expenditure, apart from administration, in direct encouragement of the mining industry in 1904-5 we provided from revenue and general loan fund the sum of £117,553, while in 1905-6 only £94,636 was expended, and £109,748 in 1906-7. The loan figures not being available this year, I am not able to give them; but I feel sure they will not equal our combined expenditure in direct encouragement of the mining industry in 1904-5. Then, in the development of agriculture, the expenditure from general loan fund in 1904-5 was £152,668; in 1905-6 it was £38,359, and in 1906-7 it was £150,026: so that in these two directions when the actual figures are quoted it is seen that in 1904-5 we expended in direct encouragement more than has been done by either the Rason Administration or the present Government. We are also told about the great development in land settlement that has taken place, but in 1904-5 there was a greater amount of land settlement than has taken place since. In fact, the year 1904-5, although we had withdrawn land from being taken up as grazing leases, was a record year for land settlement in this State—not settlement in big areas, but for what might be termed closer settlement.

*Hon. F. H. Piesse*: A great deal of that settlement was under grazing lease conditions, which were not so satisfactory to the State as the present conditional purchase conditions.

*Mr. BATH*: In that year we had withdrawn grazing leases from selection owing to the decision in the Lee Steere case. That decision has since been overruled, but at that time it held good, and we were not desirous of giving pastoral lessees any exclusive privilege to take up that class of land.

*Hon. F. H. Piesse*: My remark was exclusive of that. I referred to the grazing leases which were abandoned

after a time. Now, of course, the conditions are conditional purchase.

Mr. BATH: Even with those excluded, compared with the years since, the year 1905 was a record for land settlement. So while the present Government boast about these matters, it is just as well the public should know the actual figures, and that whatever record the Government may have established in the three years they have held office, that record was exceeded by the Labour Government in the so-called "mark-time" year of 1904-5. To show how far the Treasurer has been astray in all his predictions and statement in regard to what the present Government were going to do and what would be the result of their policy, I have only to point out his prophecies when introducing the Loan Bill of 1906. The Treasurer then stated:—

"The effect of this Bill will be readily seen by members if they follow the figures I am about to quote. The total authorisations of Western Australia to the 30th June, 1906, were £18,273,253. We have redeemed of that amount £214,700, and our accumulated sinking fund is £1,320,603. These latter being deducted leave the net indebtedness of £16,737,950, equaling £64 3s. 8d. per head of our population. If we had to go on the market to-day to raise the sum of money mentioned in this Loan Bill, £2,467,000, our net liability would be increased of course very considerably, to the extent of £9 6s. 8d. per head of our population; but I think we may fairly consider that this loan, which it is proposed shall be spread over the next two and a-half to three years, at any rate two years to two and a-half years—[Interjection]—a good portion, at least one-half, will be raised early next year. I reckon we will have to raise one and a-half millions next year, and the balance, the other million, the following year. I think we may fairly estimate that the population will increase in the same or similar proportion to what it has done during the past few years; and if that takes place, our population at the end of June, 1908, should approximate some-

thing like 283,000 people. I find on turning to the statistics that our population on the 30th June, 1904, was 238,000, and that on the 30th June, 1906, that is two years later, we had increased to 261,000; and it is estimated by the statisticians that at the end of June, 1908, at about the same rate of increase, our population will be equal to 283,000 people. Then if we take into consideration—and I think we are justified in considering this fact in connection with the matter—that during the next two financial years we will have paid to our sinking fund an annual amount of £232,567, in 1906-7, and £245,960 in 1907-8, we will find that our net liability at the end of the financial year 1907-8 will be £18,726,423, or equal to £66 3s. 5d. per head of our estimated population at that date—that is provided that between now and the end of the 1907-8 financial year, we have raised the whole of the loan we are now asking Parliament to authorise us to raise by this Bill. Of course if the whole of the loan is not floated during that period, that is within the next twenty months—and I think it will be—but if it is not, then our indebtedness per head of the population, providing we have this moderate estimated increase going on, will be pretty well the same as it is to-day. That is the effect of the Loan Bill so far as the total indebtedness of the country is concerned."

The Treasurer was reckoning that the State would progress under the Government's beneficent administration at the same ratio that it had been progressing during the year of that Government which they so roundly condemned in 1905. But, as a matter of fact, the population on the 30th June, 1908, was only 269,000, as compared with the Treasurer's estimate of 283,000. In fact, during the tenure of the present Administration, instead of the population increasing, instead of having this great impetus to industry, this confidence restored throughout the length and breadth of the land, we find that population was leaving Western Australia instead of coming to it. In 1904-5, the year of the Labour

Government, we had an increase of 12,490 in the population, or 5.16 per cent. In the next year, 1906, the increase was only 2.73 per cent., or a total of 6,967, while in 1907, when the Treasurer came into office, the increase was 2,100, or 0.80 per cent., and this increase was due to excess of births over deaths. During the year the State lost by excess of departures over arrivals to the number of 2,687. [*The Treasurer*: What is the population to-day, and the increase on last year?] The population now is 269,060. The increase is only given up to the end of the calendar year 1907. The returns of population are given for the calendar and not for the financial year, and we shall have to wait until the end of this year before we know the figures for 1908. The fact remains that the Treasurer, in making a prediction in 1906, reckoned on the population increasing to 283,000. It says a great deal for the depression which has resulted from the methods of the present Government that the population was practically at a standstill between 1905 and 1907.

*The Treasurer*: Has there not been an increase in the last 12 months?

Mr. BATH: During the last six months there has been, but we have to balance that by the movements of the population at the end of each year.

*The Treasurer*: Is not the increase to be put to our credit?

Mr. Walker: The people are returning from trips to the East.

Mr. BATH: The Treasurer cannot take the six-monthly returns, for the question must be viewed from the returns at the end of the calendar year, and until the end of this year we shall not know what the rate of increase for 1908 has been. I am taking the complete year in each case, and have shown that, were it not for an excess of births over deaths, the State would have lost instead of gained population as the result of the methods of the present Government. We have had it said by the Press and on the public platform, at banquets and other functions given to the Minister for Mines in the course of his motor ride through the Menzies and North Coolgardie districts, that the

Mines Department is administered in what might be termed a superior fashion, and we are told that the State batteries have been placed on a proper administrative basis. The Minister for Mines has not been very ready in making known the report of the State Batteries Inquiry Board, for that report places an altogether different complexion on this boast of splendid administration by the Minister. What is more, while the State was involved in a considerable amount of expense to secure that report, the recommendations made in it and the actual information gleaned by members of the Board have not been availed of by the Minister. We have had the statement made that the Government intend to erect unit stamps consisting of two-head mills in certain mining districts in order to encourage the development of mining, and this in spite of the reports which have been received as to the manner in which the two-head mills have worked at Linden and Mount Morgans. These mills have proved absolute failures, and yet, if the information which has been given is correct, the Government intend to establish them in other parts of the fields, and have ordered a number of them from makers in the Eastern States. Let us turn to what the State Batteries Inquiry Board say in regard to these mills. A unit mill was run under their supervision in order that it might be given a fair trial so as to establish whether it would be advantageous to erect them in the various mining districts in Western Australia. After giving particulars of the various trials the members of the Board in their report say:—

"We have received particulars of another pneumatic unit stamp now on the market and we are of the opinion that it has advantages that cannot be claimed by the one now on trial. There is no question but that such a mill as this unit appeared to be when first erected is much required for out-back prospecting, but by the result of the trial it is to be regretted that the entire unsuitableness of this particular mill for the purpose in view has been for the present demonstrated."

In spite of that fact and in spite of the

trial. the Minister persists in establishing this mill at Linden in order, after all the expense of carting it and of erecting it and of providing the necessary oil engine to run it, to have it demonstrated in a practical fashion that it is practically useless for the purpose for which it is needed.

*The Minister for Mines:* It is not the same class of mill at all as the one mentioned in the report of the board, which was a pneumatic unit stamp mill and different entirely.

Mr. BATH: Anyhow, from letters I have received from those interested in mining properties, there is not the slightest doubt that the two-stamp mills are also failures.

*The Minister for Mines:* They did five years' good work at Yalgoo and Black Range.

Mr. BATH: Surely the Minister does not want a better demonstration than the protests from the people at Linden, who have made it known through the Press of the State that the mill has been dismantled at the Mount Margaret Lake View mine, where it was given a trial. Surely this is sufficient to stay the hand of the Minister and force him to see if he can adopt some other means of encouraging the mining industry without involving the State in a loss of this description. I have referred previously to the Public Health Department, and in this connection there is no doubt that the administration of the Department calls for all-round condemnation by all interested in the health of the State—and more especially the health of the infant population of the State. We find that in May of this year certain statements were brought forward by Mr. Lander, an Inspector for the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, that cows suffering from tuberculosis were being milked and that the milk was being distributed not only to consumers in the metropolitan area but also to the Perth Public Hospital. There is not the slightest doubt that he supplied sufficient information on that occasion to justify the Public Health Department taking steps immediately for the purpose of remedying such a scandalous condition of

affairs. What did they do? They practically ignored his statements; and the Colonial Secretary, when interviewed by the Press, said the statements made by the inspector were unreliable and there was no truth in them. As a matter of fact the Government removed Mr. Lander from his position as an honorary inspector under the Central Board of Health. After they had pooh-poohed the statements and Mr. Lander had taken measures in other channels to ventilate what he considered to be a standing disgrace, we find, so late as July, that the Central Board of Health at last awakened to the necessity for making an investigation. This is the result, as was published in the Press:—

"The Central Board of Health have during the past few days been actively engaged in ordering the destruction of a number of cows, which, according to their veterinary experts, have been affected with tuberculosis. The department resolved some time back to apply the tuberculin test to the dairy herds in the metropolitan area, and a veterinary officer was entrusted with the task. The result has greatly exceeded the department's anticipation, for a large percentage were found to be more or less affected, and in every case destruction was ordered. A few figures which were obtained yesterday will give an idea of the wholesale slaughter that is in course of progress. In one dairy out of 26 cows 20 were ordered to be destroyed; in another five out of eight were declared unfit to supply milk for human consumption, and were consequently compelled to share the fate decreed by the department. In a third dairy 12 out of 18 cows were discovered to be similarly affected, and they, too, were condemned. Altogether in four dairies 41 cows were reported by the vet. to be a menace to health, and the department at Saturday morning's meeting resolved on their extermination."

This in spite of the statement by the Colonial Secretary a considerable period antecedent to that date in which he absolutely scouted Mr. Lander's statements and practically said there was no truth

in them. [*The Minister for Mines*: That was in regard to one special case.] It was not in regard to one case, but in regard to half a dozen instances quoted by Mr. Lander, and even now the safeguards provided by the Central Board are not sufficient to protect the public of this State, and especially the consumers in the metropolitan area, from having milk from beasts suffering from tuberculosis. It is a scandalous condition of affairs and unless prompt action is taken—and I cannot see how we can properly protect the people by other than a municipal milk supply—there is not the slightest doubt we will sow the seeds of a chronic disease which will seriously affect the people in the near future. It is not only the fact that the milk has gone into consumption, but we are told that beasts suffering from tuberculosis are bought by butchers at a nominal price, that the bad parts are cut away and that the rest have gone into consumption. Owing to the operation of the meat-ring in this State, many butchers desiring to start business have bought beasts of this kind in order to sell meat at a less price than that charged by members of the ring. There is no doubt that many of these beasts have gone into consumption, have been bought up by the butchers in a small way, and thus have become a menace to the health of the State. This menace exists at the present time, and instead of discouraging men like Mr. Lander, who is anxious to protect the people of the metropolitan area, the Central Board of Health and the Colonial Secretary should have given him every encouragement. What they did was to remove him from the position of an honorary inspector. Then again we have the case of the Chief Inspector of Factories and his removal from the Department. There is no doubt there is something rotten in the state of that particular Department when, instead of removing those officers who have been a bar to the proper administration of these measures, who have allowed their private prejudices to creep in to defeat legislation, they are getting rid of the one man who was honestly trying to carry out his duties, and was honestly desirous of earning the salary the people paid him

for this purpose. It may be news to the Government, but it is well for them to know, that the non-administration of the Factories Act is responsible for the fact that there are work-rooms in this city where young girls and women are employed, which are a disgrace to Western Australia and which provide a menace to the health of the workers. If we had the Factories Department administered properly, this state of affairs would be remedied. In a new community like Western Australia, where we can establish fair conditions, we should have inspectors to see that at least the health of the girls and women, if not that of the men, is protected to the fullest possible extent. Another thing also the Treasurer might attend to. He might take steps to see that Fremantle and Northam, and I believe Kalgoorlie, shall make restitution to this State for the amount of subsidies wrongfully received. If it is right and proper for the Treasurer to make restitution to those municipalities of fines wrongfully grabbed by him, it is certainly right for the municipalities to make restitution to the Treasurer.

*The Attorney General*: How do you know there is any money due by Kalgoorlie to the Treasurer?

Mr. BATH: From the report of the select committee.

*The Attorney General*: There was never any investigation.

Mr. Stuart: There was.

Mr. BATH: The report of the select committee will demonstrate what I have said. At least I think that what is fair from one side should be fair from the other; and if the Treasurer will make application these people will pay back these moneys, and he will be able to make capital of the fact that revenue will be received from them in the shape of restituted subsidies. There is one point which is seriously influencing the minds of the public of this State, and in my opinion it is the rock upon which the present Government have to some extent foundered, that is that in Western Australia, a young community with a population of something under 270,000 people, we are to-day building up a set of conditions rivalling those of America and

Great Britain. I mean that in Western Australia small bodies or combines—[Member : Or speculators]—yes, or speculators, are permitted, in fact encouraged by the Government, to exploit the people of this State, to rob them at every turn. I have only to point to the operations of the meat combine. I know the member for Canning (Mr. Gordon) will say there is no meat ring in Western Australia ; he has said it before. But there is indubitable proof of its existence. It is true that on different occasions outsiders have come in and competed with them for a time, and we have had a temporary reduction in prices, brought about by temporary competition between one set of suppliers and another, but it has only been a matter of time for these people to be included, with the result that they all afterwards carry on their depredations in the same old fashion. If we are to build up a prosperous community the people must be free from the operations of trusts. It is no use enabling the rich to grow richer by exploiting the poor, and making the poor poorer. If we are to build up a prosperous State, we must help the people themselves, for the people make the State powerful and prosperous ; and some means must be devised by the present Government so that the people may be relieved from the depredations of combines of the character I have mentioned. To show that a combine exists in the meat trade, I will give you particulars as to the way it carries on its operations in Kalgoorlie. As a matter of fact, in Kalgoorlie, no man, no matter how much he is possessed of, can establish a butchering business unless he gets the approval of the combine. He might lay out £1,000 in equipping a shop, but until he gets the consent of the combine to supply him with meat, he is not able to carry on his business ; and what is more, he has to supply the meat at prices approved of by the combine. Then, if he desires to dispose of his business, he cannot do so unless he again secures the approval of the combine, so that we see they have an absolute control of the trade in that district. To give you an instance, a man employed in a fairly good position, as

foreman, in a butchering business in the metropolitan area, through some trouble in his employment left or was discharged. He went to Kalgoorlie and was promised a billet by a butchering firm there ; but before he started work the matter was made known to the other members of the ring, and they stated that the man should not be employed. He had then to seek another occupation. That is the way the ring operates in Kalgoorlie. That instance has been brought under my notice by those who had to abide by the decisions of that combine ; and the same also, I am told, is the condition of affairs in the metropolitan area. We are told that the rise in the price of meat is absolutely necessary because there is scarcity of stock. That seems to me absurd in view of the figures given by the Premier with regard to the big increase in flocks and herds of the State. Nay, we have it on the authority of the member for Gascoyne (Mr. Butcher) that we have abundant stock, and freezing works he declares are necessary to enable us to get rid of some of the surplus. If we have to do that, there should be ample to supply consumers at a reasonable price. I believe there is ample ; but the operations of this combine prevent the people of Western Australia from getting meat at reasonable prices. Every Minister must recognise what a serious thing it is for many of our population, who under the best of circumstances live from hand to mouth, whose earnings are just sufficient to provide them with a house to live in and clothing to wear, and who have become suddenly faced with this question. The price of meat has been high enough in the past, and it is a serious blow to the consumers of this State. It means that many will have to go without ; and to a working man dependent on his muscle it becomes a very serious problem indeed. We see in this State to-day not only ostentatious but insulting evidences of the wealth which is the result of this meat business in Western Australia. When they talk of no profit we need only point to these evidences on all sides. This is a serious subject, and I believe that one solution would be in the direction of the Government persevering in the movement



of having their own steamer on the North West coast to bring down supplies. That might give a chance to stock-raisers, who in the past have been dependent on steamers chartered by the members of the meat ring. I hope the Government will persevere in this direction. I think that unless the people who have stock to supply come to a more reasonable view, the Government, who have established abattoirs, should also see that meat is supplied to the public at a fair price, even if it should be necessary for them to open their own shops.

*Mr. Gordon :* How do you know it is not a fair price in comparison with other States ?

*Mr. BATH :* The hon. member may make something out of the business ; but if he has to pay the ruling prices for meat, he will realise that they are not fair. If they can export meat from Western Australia, or any other part of Australia, and retail it in England at from 4d. to 6d. per lb., they ought to be able to sell it at a very much cheaper rate in Western Australia. But these people ask the Government to give them, free of interest, a loan to enable them to establish freezing works to send the surplus away, and continue to sell it at from 4d. to 6d. per lb. so as to maintain the price to the consumer in Western Australia at anything from 8d. to 1s. 3d. per lb.

*Mr. Gordon :* Meat is as cheap here as in any other part of Australia.

*Mr. BATH :* If we have all the stock in the North-West that is mentioned in the returns, we should get fresh meat in Western Australia and not frozen meat ; and if meat were sold at a fair price in this State, the pastoralists in the North-West would find plenty of outlets for their flocks without the necessity of going to the markets of South Africa and the Old Country. Then we have the position in regard to the farmers of this State. It is true that the State assists them to a certain extent ; we have built railways, and we assist the farmers through the agricultural bank ; money is obtained from the savings bank, it passes through the channel of the agricultural bank, and so we give loans to the producers at a

reasonable rate of interest. But we stop there, and practically all the Government assistance we render is merely with a view to handing the farmers over to the tender mercies of the middleman. We have had evidences that private enterprise has stepped in and practically robbed all the producers of this State of all that has been given to them by the agricultural bank.

At 6.15, the Speaker left the Chair.

At 7.30, Chair resumed.

*Mr. BATH (continuing) :* At the adjournment, I was referring to the effect which the operations of combines have in various directions, and I had dealt with the attitude taken up by the middlemen, machinery agents and others of that ilk, in practically robbing the producers, the farmers of the State, of the advantages which are conferred on them by the assistance rendered to farmers up to a certain stage by the Government through the Agricultural Bank. The whole question is one on which the future of Western Australia hinges. It is early in the stage of industrial development for trusts of the nature of those so well-known in America to begin their operations in places like Western Australia. A population of 269,000 is altogether too few to be handed over to the tender mercies of the combines, and we have to recognise that the more assistance we render them the more power we give them to filch the earnings of the wealth producers, the more power do we give them to exploit them in the future. So far as the meat ring, the flour milling combine and timber combines go, we are helping them to build up that power in Western Australia which will enable them for generations to come to exploit the whole of the State, to rob the wealth produced by the workers of the community and bring about that condition of affairs which only ends, in its ultimate result, something the nature of which they are experiencing in America. The obvious remedy is for the Government pledged to carry out administration for the benefit of the whole of the people to step in at the earliest moment and nip

in the bud the exploitation of the people of the State. It has been said by the Treasurer, and I can only wonder at his presumption at saying such a thing, that the Government of the State have not been going round the country making promises and filling the Treasury with unredeemed pledges. It appears to me the Government have done little else than travel round the country making such promises. If the Treasurer said this is true I should say exactly the opposite, and that he would not willingly express such sentiments as were uttered by him at some functions in and round Perth. Let us take for instance the promise repeatedly made by the Government, made by Mr. Rason in 1905 in the country, of local option and repeated by the Premier and other members of the Cabinet at every session of Parliament which we have had since that date. Mr. Rason in his policy speech in 1905 said it was the intention of the Government to introduce a local option Bill. He did not propose to introduce one that would be as satisfactory or go so far as that of the Labour Government—the measure actually introduced in 1905—but he did say they were going to give the people a full measure in regard to increases or reductions of licenses. Now in 1905 the member for Claremont introduced a Bill for the discontinuance of the granting of any farther licenses pending the introduction of a measure of reform so far as the liquor trade was concerned. On that occasion various members of the Ministerial party opposed that measure on the ground that the Government were going to introduce this Bill. They promised to introduce it, therefore there was no need to place such a measure as the restriction of the powers of the licensing bench on the statute book of the State. In 1906 Mr. Illingworth introduced a similar measure providing that no farther licenses should be granted for twelve months, and on that occasion, or prior to that occasion, the Premier (Mr. Moore) replied to a question put by myself in the Assembly. I asked—

“Is it the intention of the Government to introduce during the present

session a Bill to provide for local option in regard to licenses to sell liquor?”

The Treasurer replied—

“No. The intention of the Government is to bring down a comprehensive measure dealing with the whole question, next session.”

I will give the opinion of an hon. member on the Ministerial benches as to the straightforwardness of the Government in continually promising local option and failing to bring it down. Mr. Barnett, who opposed the Bill introduced by Mr. Foulkes in 1905, supported the measure introduced by the then member for West Perth (Mr. Illingworth) for these reasons. He said:—

“I intend to support this measure.

If the Government had carried out the promise made last session, there would be no necessity for this Bill. . . . I differ from the Attorney General. I believe the residents in the locality of a proposed hotel should have a right to say whether the new license should be granted, and not allow the licensing benches to decide as they think fit. It is in the best interests of the State that this measure should pass, and the sooner it is left to the people to say whether additional licenses shall be granted or not, the better. I support the Bill.”

The mover of that Bill, in speaking in reply to the motion, also pointed out that the Government had failed to carry out their promise in regard to local option. I have only to point out the fact that the strongest opposition to the enactment of the measure introduced by Mr. Foulkes and the Bill introduced by Mr. Illingworth came from the Government benches. Now when it is a question of appealing to the electors of the State, now when it is a question of local option being one of the vital issues in the coming election campaign, the Government who opposed the passage of these measures say, “We are going to introduce a Bill providing for no farther issue of licenses for a period of twelve months or until the local option Bill has been introduced.” And they are going to the country with a fine plank in their platform in favour of local option, and attempting to gull

the electors of the State. But if the electors have any knowledge of what has gone before they will know that repeated opportunities have been given to the present Government, for three years with a following of 32 at their back, to introduce that measure if they had been sincerely in favour of it. Then again we have the question of Upper House reform. We are told in the Governor's Speech—

Foremost amongst these matters are Bills for amending the Constitution Act, so as to place the franchise for the Legislative Council on a more liberal basis.

It is just as well to say that in 1905 a precisely similar statement was made by Mr. Rason in his speech at Midland Junction. At that time he declared he was going to introduce a Bill to reduce the franchise from £25 to £15, and he was not a man to go back on his word. For three years the people of this State have waited for that measure of Legislative Council reform and for three years the Government have shelved it, in spite of the fact that the Attorney General before he joined the Ministry said he would support no Ministry that did not make that proposal the first plank in their platform. He has been a member of the Ministry for two years and no attempt has been made to introduce the Bill. The Government have had ample opportunity, and they have had a strong majority behind them; and if they had been honest and earnest in their proposals that measure would have been introduced. Again it is a question of having a good election cry to the people. The Government were more concerned in framing a policy to appeal to the electors of the State upon, than they were concerned in carrying out the promises made to the electors in 1905. We are told about all these legislative proposals and the discussion which has prevented the Government from introducing these two proposals, that is local option and Legislative Council reform, and yet if we look at the list of Bills which has been submitted for the consideration of this House we shall see how many less important proposals, matters of com-

parative unimportance compared to local option and Upper House reform, have been submitted to this House and passed through. We have had proposals for making the lot of the policeman much harder than it is at the present time, in the shape of an amendment of the Police Act. We have had a Police Offences Bill, a Second Hand Dealers Bill, amendments of the Marriage Act and Jury Act, all sorts of measures put before the Assembly, taking up the time of the House, but there has been no time to deal with local option or Upper House reform, matters to which the Ministerial party were honourably pledged through their promise to the electors in 1905. I say the excuse is altogether too thin; and if the electors of this State are to be gulled at this juncture by an attempt to use the Governor's Speech as an electioneering platform for the coming elections, then they have less sense than I give them credit for. I remember that the Premier grew very indignant at a social at Mount Magnet because someone accused the Government of failing to carry out promises, but I have pointed out their failure to carry out promises in regard to these two important legislative proposals. We have only to turn to the request of the police to representation on the Police Benefit Fund. When I brought that matter up under a motion for a select committee, I pointed out that these men having to contribute, as they do, considerable sums each month out of their scanty earnings as their share of the upkeep of the fund, it was only fair that they should have representation on that board. The Premier agreed with me and said it was a just claim, and that it would be conceded; but as a matter of fact, only a few months ago new regulations were printed, and provision was made for the same old board which has administered the Police Benefit Fund in the past, and which the police force desires altered. It is true that a somewhat tardy attempt has been made in the shape of a request, or rather a submission of a ballot paper to the members of the police force on which they are asked to say whether they are in favour of the Commissioner of Police retiring from the

board or not. What chance has a member of the police force, over whom the Commissioner has control, to express his true opinion on a proposal of that kind? Why was not the promise of the Premier carried out straightforwardly? That is, to ask the Commissioner to retire and then give the police force a chance to nominate a man—a chance to ballot for the best man amongst them as their representative on the board.

*The Treasurer* : Was it a secret ballot? What sort of ballot was it?

Mr. BATH : Judging by what is said in the Press, it was, "Are you in favour of the Commissioner retiring?"—something like that; at any rate that was the purport of it. If the police are entitled to a representative, let them have their representation as the railway men have representation on the appeal board. That would be a straightforward method, and there would be no possible chance of any member of the police force being victimised as through the present method of finding out whether they want a representative or not. Now there is one matter to which I wish to refer, and I am sorry that the member for North Perth (Mr. Brebber) attempted to use it in the manner he did the other day. It is altogether objectionable and undesirable that the question of any intervention by a member of this House, on whatever side he sits, in the recent firewood dispute or in the former timber trouble, should be used as a means of securing political kudos. The member for North Perth was altogether incorrect in saying that the Premier had settled both disputes. But I am not going to allot the credit to any individual; I do not think it is necessary or desirable; and if the member for North Perth cannot float into Parliament on any better plank than that the Premier settled both these strikes, he will be like the drowning "Heilan'man," clinging to a whisky bottle in the river Clyde. After all, let us appeal to higher grounds than that. I do not wish to detract in any way whatever from anyone's part in that dispute; but I do not want to see it, in the absence of more effective matter on which to go to the electors, used by the member for North Perth or anyone as a plea to the electors,

or as a justification for support to the Government. As I said before, I do not think it is a matter that it would be wise or decent to quarrel about; but if the member for North Perth is desirous of doing it, then members of the Opposition side of the House will be able to tell the whole truth. One other matter before I conclude, and that is in regard to the general attitude adopted by Ministers of careering around the country on the eve of an election, frantically promising all sorts of concessions in order, apparently, to win the approval of the electors. We have had in the newspapers a great deal of adulation ladled out to various Ministers. We have been told how the Honorary Minister who controls the Agricultural Department wrapped himself in a rug and went to sleep. Well, it seems to me from the way he has been canonised, the Honorary Minister did not need so prosaic an article as a rug to keep himself warm; he should have wrapped himself in the adulation given to him; his halo should have been sufficiently warm to keep him snug without a rug. Then the added particular is given to us, that in the morning he got up and ate some damper. There are many tens of thousands of unfortunates in this State—if they may be called unfortunates—who have to eat damper every day in their lives, but this is not paraded in the Press. One would think there was sufficient provided by the Press in the way of pap for the Honorary Minister to make it unnecessary for him to eat damper on any of his trips. We have Ministers promising a pump here, sheep there, and some other concession somewhere else, until we have reached that stage that a Minister is regarded as some king, travelling in all his pomp, distributing largesse on every side. That is not a method that should commend itself in the interests of the State. It should be sufficient for Ministers to map out for themselves what they think a course in the interests of the State, without making it necessary for them to rely on these petty promises here, there, and everywhere, while careering through the country, in order to make themselves good with the electors. At one time the Minister for Mines says that the sliding scale

in our State batteries is obsolete, that we do not want any more of it. He has a couple of weeks' trip throughout the North Coolgardie and Murchison electorates, and comes back and says that we must again revert to the system of the sliding scale. Where is there finality? Where is there any definite line of action to which this Government is committed? I fail to find it. It seems to me a frantic scramble through the country at the State's expense in order to secure a few votes for Ministers. In the present condition of Western Australia there are heavy responsibilities upon those who for the time being occupy administrative offices. I am not one who wishes in any way to treat lightly the task of the present Government, but when Ministers secure office on the strength of promises made in regard to the finances, administration, and legislation, they should at least make a reasonable effort to fulfil those promises and to carry out the plan of campaign, or fulfil the mandate on which they were elected. It is on that score that I condemn the present Government. Of course it may be said that with the assistance of a powerful Press—and practically with few exceptions the whole of the Press throughout the State are barracking for the Government—it is unnecessary for them to be at all consistent, or to have any regard whatever to promises they have made to the electors. I do not think that the Attorney General imagines that. He will have a difficult task enough at the coming elections. He recognises that a Minister or a politician must make a reasonable attempt to carry out his pledges to the electors. Apart altogether from what the barrackers may say, and from what those who may secure some advantage by the retention of the present Ministry in office may say, there surely is a code of honour on the part of Ministers themselves that should be their guide—apart altogether from what outsiders may say—and it is on that code of honour we should rely if politics are not to be demoralised altogether in Western Australia. It will be on that code of honour that Ministers and their party and members on these benches will have to appeal to the electors in the forth-

coming campaign; and there is this satisfaction at least, that in appealing to the electors we can speak to the electors themselves. I am prepared to accept the verdict which they may give at the forthcoming elections. It may result in the return of the present Administration once again to power, but it should at least teach them that, if returned to power, during the next Parliament they will at least make a decent effort to retrieve the past, to lift politics to a higher standard than they have occupied during the term the Government have occupied the Ministerial bench.

*The Colonial Treasurer.*

The TREASURER (Hon. Frank Wilson): I am sorry that my colleague, the Premier, is so unwell this evening that he has had to leave the House and retire to his room, because in the natural order of events the Premier would have followed the Leader of the Opposition, and being more conversant than I can possibly be with the details of the policy speech he delivered at Bunbury, which has been commented on by the Leader of the Opposition, could have replied more fully to the hon. member than I can to-night. However, I purpose touching as briefly as possible on the main points that have occurred to me during the deliverance of what has been a lengthy oration, if not a convincing speech, which I can hardly, on many points, congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on having delivered: more especially when he travelled all round the compass to find means for condemning the Government for their actions in the past, but would not give one iota of credit, nor let fall one generous sentiment or expression with regard to those who had the responsibility of office on their shoulders during the past three years. I feel sure the House would be wearied if I were to traverse or retrace the ground which the Leader of the Opposition has thought fit to traverse in connection with his comparisons of the efforts of this Government with those of a previous Administration with which the hon. member was connected. The hon. member found fault with us that nothing fresh is in the Governor's

Speech, that it is more in the shape of an appeal to the electors—I think that was his intention, though I cannot remember the exact wording of his remarks—and that we have been carrying on, I think he said, without a mandate from the people when indeed we are asking them for a fresh mandate. The Leader of the Opposition, in endeavouring to convict us of something wrong, has overstepped the mark entirely. It is true this Government followed on an Administration which was led by Mr. Rason, now the Agent General, and in that respect I am quite prepared to take the responsibility for a continuation, broadly, of the policy which that gentleman enunciated at the general elections some three years ago. Surely the Leader of the Opposition does not expect that every change of Government must have an absolutely direct mandate from the people; surely he must, with his knowledge of political life throughout at any rate the British Empire, know that Governments do pass away and are reconstructed, even as he himself was admitted into a Cabinet some three months before the Premier of that date resigned. Cabinets are reconstructed to carry on mainly, broadly, the policy enunciated by those who went before them. So it was with us; and although we cannot be expected to agree in every detail with the policy of our predecessors, yet broadly there has been continuity of policy, and I am prepared to maintain that we have to the best of our ability carried out the duty we took on our shoulders. That ability may be circumscribed in the opinion of the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues; no doubt it is. We must allow that usually we do not ascribe to our opponents a greater ability than we possess ourselves, but I think that even our opponents can give us credit for having attempted to carry out the policy enunciated, more especially that outlined by the present Premier two years ago at Bunbury. [*Mr. Johnson*: Attempted to carry out, but have not done so.] We have done so to a greater degree than any Government yet has carried out its policy in Western Australia. A great deal has been said within the last few

days on the financial question. The Leader of the Opposition in his remarks has seen fit to use expressions towards me which can only be characterised as offensive, and, I was going to say, contrary to Parliamentary usage, for he called me a mountebank, and inferred—

*Mr. Bath*: I did not call you a mountebank.

The TREASURER: Yes, you described me as a political mountebank.

*Mr. Bath*: The word was not used in that sense.

The TREASURER: It is easy to use expressions which are offensive, and then to say afterwards they were not intended in that sense. Why use such words at all? Is there any necessity for us, in fighting our battles in this Chamber, fighting I hope with honesty of purpose, to impute motives or to apply such terms? Will it help us to settle the difficulties of this country, or those of the Commonwealth? Will it make the financial problem, difficult enough as it is, as the hon. member knows well, less difficult to handle? Will such results as these be achieved by casting slurs and aspersions on me, and by insinuating that if I took a certain course in connection with my private business, such as he alleges I have done in connection with the public finances, I would be dealt with in a different way. What does he mean by that? I think it is to be regretted that a gentleman holding his position should charge me in such a way, or insinuate that I have done anything that cannot bear the open light of day. Every action I have taken in connection with the administration of the Departments under my charge is open to the searchlight of public or parliamentary inquiry. I may be wrong in judgment at times, I may commit errors of memory or statesmanship, but surely that is not sufficient ground to apply to me terms which mean that I am guilty of "cooking" the financial figures in order to show a result which does not really exist. In that respect I take strong exception to the insinuations which were made in the course of the opening remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. In referring to the expenditure of loan moneys, and after

declaring that I had not been able to balance the finances—an aspect of the financial position which I shall deal with later—the Leader of the Opposition said the Government had spent £59,000 out of loan moneys in the year 1905-6 on non-productive works, and £103,000 on similar works in 1906-7. He said he could not get the figures for 1907-8. I may here explain that I heard he had inquired for those figures at the Treasury, and if they had been available he would have been given them. I have not received them myself, however, and cannot quote them as they have not yet been put into print, or checked by the Audit Department or the officers of the Treasury. I want to point out to the Leader of the Opposition, although it is ancient history—but as he has taken the course he has I am bound to follow him—that although it is true we have spent loan moneys on what may be termed nonproductive works, it must not be forgotten that the Labour Government had also to take that course. I have never found fault with the Leader of the Opposition on that score. [Mr. Bath: They did not spend the money on roads, bridges, or public buildings.] That does not matter. They spent £136,000 on the rabbit-proof fence out of loan moneys, and the present Government have since had to continue the same principle owing to the necessity of the work, and as the revenue was not there to spend upon it. In addition, the Labour Government left a liability of £16,000 on the same work, which also had to be provided for out of loan moneys, and this sum helped to swell the total of £59,000 which the hon. member now quotes against us. That is not a fair charge against the Administration. Both Governments were constrained by financial considerations at the time to utilise loan moneys on a work which they would rather have carried out from revenue had the revenue been available. Let me go farther. Mr. Bath has condemned me very strongly for having failed as he says to balance the finances, construing a remark I made at Busselton to that effect. The speech may not have been reported fully, but I referred then to the finances of the past year, and what I said was

that we had balanced the accounts for that period. Mr. Bath construes that into the statement that I implied I had wiped out the deficit as well. None can surely imagine I would be foolish enough to make a statement like that. The deficit is with us, and no statement of mine could put a different construction on that. I maintained I had balanced the accounts for the year, and I maintain it still. I have done it under extreme difficulties, and credit is due to my colleagues, not to me, as I do not administer the details of the expenditure and revenue of the departments. No man can control the revenue, but the Ministers control the expenditure, and the net results of the efforts of my colleagues is that we have been able for the last year to balance our accounts to within a couple of thousand pounds. Let me point out the position of this Government in comparison with Governments that have gone before. In 1904-5, the year which the hon. gentleman is so fond of quoting as being such an excellent one for Western Australia, the Government to which he then belonged was in power, and the year started with a surplus of £83,000.

Mr. Angwin: Spent before they took office.

The TREASURER: The year finished with a deficit of £46,000; so that the then Government went to the bad to the tune of £129,000 during the twelve months.

Mr. Taylor: Not so; for £83,000 was spent before we took office.

The TREASURER: The Labour Government took office about three months, or not quite three months, after the beginning of the financial year, and will the member tell me that the finances went back £83,000 in that time?

Mr. Bath: Yes.

The TREASURER: July always shows a deficit,

Mr. Taylor: Sops were thrown around.

The TREASURER: If the member knew anything about the Treasury or finance—the member for Guildford (Mr. Johnson) knows this well—he would realise that July is always the month of retrogression. Figures prove it year after year.

*Mr. Taylor* : It is a bad system of finance.

The TREASURER : You cannot control it or make it work out otherwise. The fact remains that during the year 1904-5 the finances of the country went astern to the tune of £129,000.

*Mr. Johnson* : Yes; and did they not go back in the previous year £148,000?

The TREASURER : In the financial year 1903-4 there was a surplus of £231,000 to start with, a surplus of £83,000 at the end of the year; so that the finances went back in the twelve months about £150,000.

*Mr. Johnson* : And we improved upon that.

The TREASURER : I will show where I improved upon what you did.

*Mr. Johnson* : We did works out of revenue that you did out of loan.

The TREASURER : Will the member say that his Government did not spend £136,000 on the rabbit-proof fence? In the financial year 1905-6 the deficit was increased, roughly, to £120,000, or (to be accurate) £119,900. Despite all efforts made during that year the deficit went up in that period £74,000. The amount therefore, was still about one-half the shortage for the financial year 1904-5. In the year 1906-7, when the present Premier took office and the first year I was in the Treasury, the deficit increased to £208,000; that is, we went back to the extent of £88,000 in the year. Members will remember full well that the Estimates were based then upon getting a land tax measure through the House; and in the Estimates of that year, if I remember rightly, the sum of £80,000 appeared as to be derived from a land tax. The tax did not come off. Members opposite are always claiming credit for having done so well during their term of office. I admit that my friend opposite (the Leader of the Opposition) had not the opportunity to do much, for he was only in office for three or four months. [*Mr. Bath* : Less than that time.] A man cannot do anything in that time; but he has to bear the sins of those who went with him. and if he will pose as having done something great in that term, he

must make himself responsible for the actions of the Ministry to which he belonged. During the time to which I referred, when the hon. member was in office the revenue went back to a greater extent than ever since, notwithstanding the fact that during the year the then Government had about £230,000 more revenue than I have to-day to deal with. In addition to that the then Government had £144,000 less interest and sinking fund to find. So that they were £374,000 better off than we are, and yet they had to resort to spending some loan moneys on public works. It seems to me absurd, with such figures as those to reply to, for hon. members to get up and condemn this Government for the action they have taken in respect to loan funds. The Leader of the Opposition quotes the *Morning Herald* as his mentor with regard to public finances, and says that I have been reckless and have played with the finances rather than have administered them in a proper and careful spirit. I perhaps may be permitted to state that in regard to this newspaper which has thought fit to direct its attention to me so particularly of late, that it is not altogether accurate in its statements as I have proved already, and that when an hon. member quotes the *Morning Herald* he should bear in mind lest he follow in the example it has set that it even can be mistaken in its criticism. I want to show the broad line of argument this paper takes, the trifles on which it proceeds to condemn a Minister. I want to quote just briefly what it said the other day in connection with the speech the hon. member has taken exception to. It says:—

In the course of a speech at Busselton on Monday night, the Colonial Treasurer referred to an article in the *Herald* of July 11, in which certain comments as to the methods of public bookkeeping were made. There is no such article in the *Herald* of that date. The objection would be fatal in the ordinary course of argument, but as *Mr. Wilson* is an extraordinary politician and more than that an extraordinary financier, the misstatement of fact



may be passed over—what is one misstatement amongst so many? As it is evident from his comments that Mr. Wilson did not read the article which he criticised (and which appeared in the *Herald* of July 13)—it is reproduced on another page that it may be read by all persons. Mr. Wilson is one of the men in politics who must be allowed to speak a second time.

Then the wonderful writer of this article goes on to say:—

It will be remembered that on the occasion of the presentation of his last annual statement of the accounts of the country there was a mistake which he had to explain. The mistake was a trifle of £16,000, an under-estimate of the deficit in the operations for the month of June 1907.

I want to show that the mistake the editor there refers to was not an under-estimate of the deficit in June, but was an error on the part of the clerks in the Treasury in giving information to the Press for the month of May at an early hour of the morning. So that if I am to be condemned as utterly unworthy—and according to the Leader of the Opposition I must be so if this editor says so—utterly unworthy because I mentioned Saturday's issue of the newspaper instead of Monday's, then how much more is the editor unreasonable when he talks about an under-estimate of deficit for the month of June, when it was absolutely a mistake of the clerk, and refers to the month of May? It shows at once that you cannot rely on articles which are written in heat and with some personal dislike or feeling towards the person that is being criticised. That is the sort of feeling if possible I want to steer clear of to-night. It is a feeling that I deprecate, and hon. members opposite I hope will see that a calm judgment is passed on the financial statement as I shall present it. Now it has been said we made no economies, and that has been accentuated to a pretty fair extent by the Leader of the Opposition in the course of his remarks. I want to point out this, that without economies we could not possibly have balanced our finances for the year. I estimated, as hon. members are aware,

last year that we would increase our deficit by some £77,000. I cannot be quite accurate about the figures because I am speaking from memory. I pointed out then that if we got our land and income tax measures through in their entirety we hoped to receive £80,000. That, less the cost of collection, would have squared the ledger as far as the year's operations were concerned. I easily realised in the early portion of the year, indeed before that when the measure was passed through this House, when I found that the whole of the ramifications of a new Department had to be created to get in the revenue, when the amount was cut down by one-half, and when later the office was opened only in February, that we could not hope to get much during the present financial year. Therefore we were in this position, we would arrive at the close of the year with a much enhanced deficit, or we would have to take every measure to economise and not expend as much as we were authorised to do. For this I am now taken to task. I do not mean to say that it took until January or February of this year to find all this out, but I maintain that in the matter of the finances of the country, if Ministers can see that economies can be effected, it is their duty to effect them, no matter whether they have anything in hand. I am pleased that the efforts of my colleagues represented in the few figures I have here have been such as to enable us to end the year as we did.

*Mr. Johnson:* You really think reduction of expenditure is economy?

*The TREASURER:* What does the hon. member think it is then.

*Mr. Heilmann:* Sweating!

*The TREASURER:* Sweating? Let the hon. member prove it. No one has been sweated in the reductions that have been made through economy, and there is no one sweated excepting the poor Ministers who have to work night and day. This sweating cry, I am sick and tired of listening to it. Hon. members know full well that our railway system was extravagantly managed. They know full well that the railway system could bear considerable reductions and still be efficiently run. They know also that the

economies that have been effected are proper economies carried out without impairing the efficiency and without sweating the employees who remained in the service. I had exactly the same trouble with the Printing Office some two years ago, and then hon. members said "Yes, go ahead," and now they talk to me about sweating. I maintain hon. members cannot prove that there has been sweating. Where is economy to take place if it is not in decreasing expenditure? If hon. members will glance through the figures published they will find for instance in the Governor's Department, the Premier's Office, and also in the Parliamentary vote, there has been a decrease of £944. This is an amount that has not been expended. Will hon. members say that we are sweating in those departments? In our Lands and Surveys there has been a decrease of £2,799, yet I presume hon. members will talk about sweating in the Lands Department. Notwithstanding that the work has increased considerably, notwithstanding the fact that applications for selection and that the work generally has increased to a very great extent, this decrease in expenditure has been effected through better administration. I do not think we have reached the end of all economies even yet, and even in the Railway Department I hope to see farther economies. [*Member*: Get away from the 7s. a day men.] Then we have the fact that the Treasury has increased its expenditure by £4,000. Hon. members will see at once that the increase was due to the establishment of the Taxation Department, which was not provided for on the Estimates. In the Education Department we did not expend £4,812. of our vote; that is, we were able to carry on the educational system and save £4,812. I admit at once that I would have liked to have seen a good portion of that money expended. There are districts where we have been absolutely unable to get teachers to take on the management of our schools, more especially the small schools in the way-back and sparsely populated districts. [*Member*: Quite a number have left the Department.] There are 900 teachers in the Department and you will always have

them coming and going. I have it from the Inspector General that at least 10 or 12 vacancies would have been filled if teachers had been available. [*Mr. Hudson*: What salaries are offered?] Good salaries, which will bear comparison with any State in the Commonwealth. The next item is an increase in the Mines Department of £800. Then we have a decrease in the Railways and Tramways Department of £54,296. Will hon. members tell me that is not an economy. The member for Guildford will admit it is a decided economy. And economies I am sure will still go on until the Railways are on an equality with the cheapest run railway system in the Commonwealth. Then we have in the Attorney General's Department a slight decrease of £1,433. In the Works Department we have a decrease of £36,000.

*Mr. Johnson*: Works were transferred to Loan Funds.

The TREASURER: Nothing of the sort. The hon. member for Guildford should know it is impossible for a Minister to transfer works from Revenue to Loan Account.

*Mr. Johnson*: No; I mean by doing works out of loan

The TREASURER: The fact is, £36,000 worth of work can be done without this year, and the money was not spent. To show this is so, hon. members can look at the Loan Vote, and they will find that not only the expenditure in connection with revenue has been reduced, but there has been a reduction in loan funds for public buildings, a reduction of £42,000 during the past year. I realised that economies must be effected in both loan and revenue expenditure. This applies to buildings that could be done without, that could stand over, and that I contend is the proper position to take up. It is unfortunate, perhaps, that certain works have to be carried out from loan moneys, works such as this rabbit-proof fence, and buildings also, which we would rather see carried out from revenue; still the fact remains that only one per cent. of the loan flotations of this State have been expended on public buildings, by far and away less than any State of the Commonwealth or New Zealand.

*Mr. Taylor:* They were built out of revenue, in good times.

The TREASURER: If we had the revenue to-day, we should be only too glad to build them, and railways too if it comes to that, out of revenue; but that is an impossibility. The total savings in the year's expenditure vote, after taking the slight increase which totals £9,000—and surely that is a credit to the Government, especially when I have explained the reason for the bulk of it—from the decreases of £101,000, amounts to £91,932. I think I may fairly claim after carrying out the administration of the affairs of this State during the past twelve months, notwithstanding the newspaper criticism and the criticism of others who are always interested in putting the Government in the wrong, we have done fairly well. Indeed, I may say we have done as well as any previous Administration, and our Estimates, fortunately, have come out nearer the mark than those of any previous Administration. When we take the revenue side of the question it is readily seen this is so; because in the revenue estimate of last year I anticipated to get from the State £2,637,000 and I got £2,623,000. I had a shortage of £14,000. From the Commonwealth I estimated—and I took the Federal Treasurer's figures for it, as I explained at the time—to get £755,000 and I got £753,000, showing a shortage of £2,000; and this notwithstanding the fact that the Commonwealth had commandeered the whole of the customs and excise revenue due to the State for the month of June.

*Mr. Bath:* That did not affect the estimate?

The TREASURER: Of course not; but my estimates are right without that. Yet I am charged with the fact of not getting £60,000 for June which the Commonwealth took. I would have got £60,000 more revenue, I admit; because of this it is said that I am unworthy of trust in connection with the finances of the State—a most childish position to take up; £60,000 which no one knew was coming.

*Mr. Scaddan:* We know it has gone.

The TREASURER: Because I did not know it was coming I am to be ac-

cused; because if it had come I should have had £60,000 more revenue. I am sure the Leader of the Opposition will bear with me when I say I am surprised to hear his remarks with regard to my attitude and the attitude of the Government as to old age pensions. It was suggested, as he knows full well, at the conference held in Melbourne in 1906, that old age pensions in Australia should be provided out of a special appropriation by each State and handed to the Commonwealth to administer; and if the other States had accepted the position, we were prepared to put forward the proposal for the consideration of this Parliament. That was the position. My friend says the people have been waiting for the fulfilment of the promise of old age pensions in Western Australia for years, that we have intimated on more than one occasion that it was a question for the Commonwealth to take in hand. We have done so. I have yet to learn that any very extraordinary demand for old age pensions has been made in Western Australia. Certainly there has been no extraordinary movement on the part of the Leader of the Opposition or on the part of any member of the Opposition in regard to old age pensions in this House to my recollection. If there had been such a serious demand, we would have heard something about it; but up to the present the old aged people have been fairly well looked after in Western Australia.

*Mr. Bath:* And deprived of a vote.

The TREASURER: Yes; and I quite agree that those dependent absolutely on the State should not interfere with the administration of the State. There has been no demand, to my knowledge, for old age pensions in this State; but we have endeavoured to secure old age pensions. First of all, we have suggested, as I have pointed out to the Leader of the Opposition, in 1906 that a special appropriation should be made for the purpose; and at the last conference we had included in our financial proposals a basis of settlement. As the member full well knows, a resolution was proposed that the States should enable the Federal Government to make provision for old age pen-

sions, but we were to take less than the statutory amount. That was included in other general resolutions because we felt that the scheme put forth by the Federal Treasurer was of such a nature that not only could we not accept it, but if my friend had been with me on that occasion he would have been one of the strongest to object to the acceptance of that proposition.

*Mr. Bath:* The Federal Government were willing to accept a similar arrangement when the States Conference accepted the Federal Treasurer's proposals; they were willing in 1906-7 for the States to provide the money for old age pensions.

The TREASURER: The States were not willing; but we were not remiss in that respect, as the hon. member proved by his quotation. We could not bind the Parliament, but we intimated that we were prepared to make that suggestion to Parliament, provided the other States would fall into line. But they did not on that occasion, and they are not inclined to at the present time. Because, not only have we Tasmania denouncing the proposal of the recent conference, but we have the Treasurer of South Australia taking exception to it, stating that their finances at this juncture will not stand old age pensions, and that they are not prepared to accept any proposals of the States on the matter until their people decide the question. That is a justifiable attitude to take up. We have not been remiss in the matter; we have done all we could up to the present, and just lately we have made a proposal to the Federal Government, taking the general resolutions into consideration, and have agreed to them. They could have had old age pensions twelve months earlier than they propose to get them now. We opposed the imposition of specific duties on the occasion referred to. We opposed these duties very strongly, and I think we were justified in doing so, because it was evident to us that Western Australia was going to suffer to an enormous extent. We were to provide £147,000 by these specific duties, whilst it would only require probably £44,000—it is more now, it has been increased to £50,000 odd—for the payment of old age pensions within our bor-

ders. To-day the position is this. We have agreed that we, as a State, are prepared to accept, subject to Parliament of course, a reduction of the moneys returned to this State, to cover old age pensions, if the Commonwealth charge us only what is expended in that direction within the State. And that position was strongly supported by my friend at the conference. But now what is the position? We have had the Labour representatives in the Senate and the House of Representatives coming round here and posing as having done something which, I agree, to the best of their judgment is right, but defending their action over this Surplus Revenue Bill in taking moneys for old age pensions from Western Australia which will be utilised to pay old age pensions in other States. That is what we say is the position. They say that is the position, but it is justifiable. I am sorry to say my friend seems to me to-night—I do not know whether he intended it—to support that proposal.

*Mr. Bath:* The States having absolutely failed, it is time the Commonwealth did it.

The TREASURER: Does that justify the Commonwealth in doing it on a revenue basis, the States not having carried out their proposal? The fact is shown that this State has done its utmost in that direction. The State not having provided old age pensions, does that justify the Commonwealth in adopting their scheme?

*Mr. Bath:* They are doing it on the only basis which is open to them. There is nothing in the Constitution preventing them from debiting the amount expended in each State to each State.

The TREASURER: I am sorry the hon. member has taken a complete somersault to the position which he took up two years ago at the conference, when he combatted the specific duties and said they would be detrimental to Western Australia, inasmuch as we would contribute more than our proportion.

*Mr. Bath:* They are not providing old age pensions from specific duties now.

The TREASURER: They are taking from Western Australia more than they return. At that time the hon. member

condemned the Commonwealth in such a proposal, and voted with me against it. The next point I noted here, when the member was speaking, was the fact that he implied that the railway receipts had fallen owing to certain concessions being given to the flour millers and the timber combine.

*Mr. Bath:* And the meat ring.

The TREASURER: And the "meat ring." I want to be clearly understood that these concessions, more especially that granted to the combine, if I am correct was a mutual arrangement made I think with the concurrence of the hon. member.

*Mr. Bath:* No.

*Mr. Holman:* That is absolutely incorrect.

The TREASURER: The hon. member had a conference with his colleagues, and it was a mutual arrangement made to settle the dispute in the timber industry.

*Mr. Bath:* That is not correct; we absolutely refused to be a party to any such proposal.

The TREASURER: I was not at the conference; therefore, for the time being, I must accept the statement.

*Mr. Holman:* There was £17,000 given before ever that trouble took place.

The TREASURER: The only concession I know of was the concession given in order to settle the disastrous dispute of twelve months ago, in order that the mills, which had been idle for some three or four months, should be got to work again. That was not a concession in the ordinary term, but I understand it was a reduction in the train load rates; the train loads carried to the shipping ports at a certain reduction in rate.

*Mr. Holman:* But £17,000 were given before that.

The TREASURER: Does the hon. member take exception to that arrangement? Does he mean to infer that that was the only concession? When he refers to the flour millers I suppose the hon. member means the wheat rates. Does he mean to say that the rebate is going into the pockets of the flour millers, and that the consumers are not getting every penny of it? The consumers get every penny of it. That

is the experience of the farmers, and that of my friend the member for Katanning, who will bear me out that during the past six years the millers have lost money, and they are going to have a bad time of it in the future. It shows that they got no benefit from that rebate and that whatever benefit was obtained was gained, I suppose, by those who got cheaper bread, or by those who bought the flour and baked the bread. They got the benefit of the rebate and not the millers. It comes to this that in all trades there is an equalising tendency—I do not care whether it is a question of rebate on a customs tariff or on railrage charges—although it may not be apparent immediately, although it may be there is no reduction in the article of consumption for the time being, sooner or later, if there are no rings, if there is clear competition, the laws of competition will bring the rebate into the hands of those who are entitled to receive it, that is the consumers. That is bound to be the effect sooner or later, and no argument can prove to the contrary. [*Mr. Bath:* It has not been the case in Western Australia.] Another matter the hon. member referred to was that of agricultural railways, and I think he practically condemned the policy of this Government in constructing these railways, or at any rate the methods of construction. The hon. member implied that the fall in the railway revenue showed conclusively that the agricultural railways had not served their purpose, and that they were not as beneficial as we have made out; and he went on farther to make a charge, which certainly was extraordinary to me, that the only use they had been was for speculators. He also implied that information had been given so that land could be taken up on the routes of these railways. Now I can assure the hon. member, and I think he ought to know, that there is no truth whatever in such an insinuation. Information may have leaked out, I do not know, from perhaps subordinates in the office, but there is no truth whatever that any responsible officer in the Government departments has given information to anyone. On the contrary, my colleague the Minister for Lands has taken every precaution to lock

up lands wherever he possibly could on every new route projected in order that no one should get priority of selection of the land along the route projected.

*Mr. Taylor:* Are you prepared to submit a return?

The TREASURER: Certainly, any return the member likes. I have heard one or two names of members in this House who happen to hold land near a proposed railway; but I do not credit any insinuation that hon. members who happen to have land where railways are to be constructed have taken it up for speculative purposes, or have done it through any knowledge obtained from departmental officers or Ministers. That is not confined to one side of the House.

*Mr. Taylor:* You need not look at me.

The TREASURER: Has not the hon. member got any land? I know of several on the Opposition side of the House who have.

*Mr. Bath:* Do you know of members who took up land on the route of a projected railway?

The TREASURER: I am quite aware of one member who has land on a projected route of railway, but it is land which he has taken up honestly; and I am quite sure there is no member in this House who would take up land on a projected railway route, in order to speculate with it.

*Mr. Bath:* You said there were two or three.

The TREASURER: I have heard of several, but I could name one hon. member. I want to point out briefly it cannot be construed into an admission of guilt if a member does own land as I have just shown. With regard to the allegation of unfairness towards Mr. Lander and Mr. Vincent, which the Leader of the Opposition dwelt on to some extent, without being fully conversant with all the details in this connection, let me say that Mr. Lander, who has been relieved of his honorary position as health inspector, has made many reckless charges against members of the police force. In many instances he has been asked to prove his charges and has refrained from doing so.

In one case I believe a charge was made by him against a man who was not in the town at all but was in the country. That is the position. The gentleman is one known to hon. members, and I am quite sure that if the Leader of the Opposition calls to see the papers at the Colonial Secretary's office he will find that there is ample justification so far as the action taken regarding Mr. Lander is concerned.

*Mr. Bath:* The allegations were not reckless concerning alleged tuberculous cows, because they were proved to the hilt.

The TREASURER: When was that?

*Mr. Bath:* Within the last two or three months.

The TREASURER: Tuberculous cows have been in the State for the last few years; and the Department recognise the seriousness of the position with regard to dairy cows being affected, and have taken the ordinary precautions and every precaution to isolate them and try if possible to stamp out the disease.

*Mr. Scaddan:* What opportunity did the Department give Mr. Lander to prove his charges?

The TREASURER: I am given to understand by my colleague that they gave him every opportunity. He was asked to prove his charge.

*Mr. Scaddan:* He asked for a Royal Commission, but you were not game to take it on.

The TREASURER: If an inspector makes a charge against any officer he should go up before the proper tribunal to prove it. We cannot have Royal Commissions for every charge made, or else there would be no finishing with that sort of thing. With regard to Inspector Vincent, this matter was threshed out in the House last year. It will be remembered that he was first given notice of retirement, and then he was suspended for insubordination and fined by the Public Service Commissioner. I admit, as I said last year, that Mr. Vincent was an excellent officer, as good an officer as we have had in any of the Departments of this State, but he was a man who could not be controlled; and after having been

fined by the Public Service Commissioner for insubordination, he appealed; and the appeal board, after hearing the case, upheld the decision of the Public Service Commissioner. It is idle to trot out Mr. Vincent's case again. We went into it fully last year, and every care has been taken to see that he had fair play and every facility given to him to upset the decision of the Public Service Commissioner. We cannot go beyond that. With regard to the matter of police court fines, which the hon. member referred to as another ground of complaint, let me say that the Government are pledged to pay these fines.

*Mr. Bath:* I did not complain about that, but I said the Government ought to see about a return of the municipal subsidies wrongfully paid.

The TREASURER: The Government are pledged to pay these fines in accordance with the decision of the Supreme Court.

*Mr. H. Brown:* But you have a contra with regard to these subsidies.

The TREASURER: How can we stop it as a contra against these police court fines? The other thing has to be proved first. It will cost something like £1,000 to make the investigation suggested by the select committee last session.

*Mr. H. Brown:* From Fremantle alone there is £7,000 owing.

The TREASURER: The select committee showed a lump sum of £30,000. They thought £30,000 would be about the total, and they recommended that a Royal Commission should be appointed.

*Mr. Taylor:* The select committee decided £30,000. They did not suggest it; they decided it on the evidence.

The TREASURER: If the hon. member reads the report he will find that it was an approximate figure; because the select committee did not go into details—they could not. It was impossible to inquire into these matters for the past six or seven years. It would take an army of special auditors at least twelve months. But the sum of money necessary to pay for this audit will be provided on the next Estimates, if we are here to present them, in order that the audit may be under-

taken and the exact amount due from each municipality discovered. In the meantime an audit has been made during the past twelve months, and money has been deducted. The hon. member knows we have not paid subsidy on moneys utilised for other than general-rate purposes. [Interjection by *Mr. H. Brown.*] The hon. member will not listen when I tell him that the order of the Supreme Court must be obeyed, that the money must be paid or we will be mulcted in much greater costs.

*Mr. H. Brown:* Why do you not summon the municipalities? You are afraid to do it.

The TREASURER: The hon. member knows that I am not afraid to do anything I consider right; but I am not going to be bullied by him into taking action that I think will land the country in a bad position financially, so far as the claims are concerned. When the amounts are proved to have been wrongfully obtained by municipal councils, then this Parliament in its wisdom if it thinks proper can instruct me to claim the amounts through the Court, or by other means if possible to get them back again from the councils.

*Mr. Bath:* Surely you do not need instructions to do your duty?

The TREASURER: Will the hon. member tell me that I am responsible because six years ago some Government overpaid municipal subsidies? I stopped it as soon as I came in, as the hon. member knows. It is my duty to find out—I am finding out—and report to this House, and it is for this House to say what action shall be taken in connection with the matter. The hon. member took great exception to combines in connection with the sale of meat in Western Australia, and said that the people were being robbed by the neglect of the Government in this respect. At least that is what I understood the member to say. I want to point out that the Government are taking every step they possibly can in order to protect the interests of the consumers of Western Australia.

*Mr. Holman:* By lending the squatters £35,000 for instance.

The TREASURER: Yes; with the very object of bringing the small producers directly into contact with the consumers in the city markets. But the hon. member does not understand the process of commercial activity.

Mr. Holman: I understand your process.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The TREASURER: Now we are descending again to these personal recriminations, to this method of mud-slinging. The hon. member "understands my process"! [Mr. Holman: Certainly.] The hon. member absolutely understands nothing about the commercial activities of Western Australia. He does not understand what the "meat ring" is, nor how it has operated—I wish he did—and he does not understand, he cannot grasp, he has not the capacity, he does not understand that the establishment of freezing works in the far North-West, with conditions that will enable the smallest producer to put his meat on the local market at the same price as the largest producer, will be the main factor in breaking up any alleged ring of this description. Our efforts, the efforts of the Honorary Minister in establishing and assisting farmers throughout the country to open up the stock routes in order that stock might be brought direct to the goldfields, the establishment of abattoirs on the fields, do all these not tend in the direction of obtaining competition which must have the result we wish for, namely, the reduction in the price of meat? The Leader of the Opposition, if he has any money to invest in this industry, can buy as much meat as he likes in the North-West, at Wyndham and other ports, for twopence a pound. There is great scope there for him, and he would be enabled to enter into competition with the present dealers and make a fortune if he is able to manage the business.

Mr. Walker: What about getting the cattle down?

The TREASURER: That can be done by chartering steamers, as other producers have to do.

Mr. Walker: They are all owned by the meat ring.

The TREASURER: There are plenty outside of the vessels owned by the ring which the member would be able to obtain. We provide in this agreement for the freezing works, that not only shall there be proper conditions of treatment so far as freezing is concerned, but also that there shall be provided better facilities with regard to space in the steamers so as to bring the meat to market.

Mr. Holman: The agreement will only stand good until the money is paid back.

The TREASURER: There is in the agreement, which the member with all his acumen does not understand, a clause providing that the full amount shall not be paid up for a good number of years, so that the Government may still control the operations of the manager of the freezing works establishment. I have shown, I think sufficiently clearly to-night, that the complaints of the Leader of the Opposition are absolutely of very little account, notwithstanding that he considers it his duty to take the Government to task very severely, and more especially he considers it his duty to take me to task; and I do not blame him for it so long as he keeps within reason and uses reasonable language in doing so. The finances of the country are in a sound condition, and none can deny it. The complaints made from time to time with regard to the administration cannot be substantiated. The programme of the Government, as put before the people of this State two years ago, has been carried out, for industries have been established, the lands have been peopled, our latent wealth has been developed, and the results have been most beneficial. Then there is the fact of people settling on the lands right and left, and although, as the Leader of the Opposition has said, so much acreage has not been applied for during the last year as in the year he referred to, 1904-5; yet the efforts of the Government in settling the people have resulted in an enormous increase in the area of cultivation, and in the export of the products of this country to the far markets of the world, such as has never been heard of before in the history of this State. Under the present law settlers are restricted very considerably in the quantity of land they



can take up, the area available for them has been reduced to something like two-thirds of what it was, and this, together with the fact that there is now a very considerable area under cultivation, tends to prove that the efforts of this Government are for closer settlement, more intense cultivation and the export of products. These prove emphatically that we are advancing in the direction of fulfilling the policy which we enunciated. The works policy carried out by the Moore Government is surely one of which we can pardonably be proud. Since we went into power we have constructed some 307 miles of railways in this State. We have at the present time 159 miles under construction, and we have at least 288 miles of railways authorised and prepared for construction. We have carried out railway construction impartially in the agricultural areas as well as in the great mineral country. We have given impartial consideration to all the main industries of this our country. We have not kept our attention solely confined to the South-Western portion of this State, but we have done what no other Government has ever attempted to do, namely, we have worked to develop the far North-West, and to give the people struggling there against great disabilities those facilities which we have obtained for ourselves in this South-Western portion of the State. [*Mr. Johnson*: What have you done besides talking?] What have we done? The member surely does not read the papers. He surely does not listen to the figures quoted. We have built altogether some 307 miles of railway, which the member never thought of attempting in his time. [*Mr. Walker*: Whereabouts?] In Western Australia. We have constructed tramways in the North-West, and are still busy doing so. We have ordered material for the Port Hedland-Marble Bar railway, and are building a jetty to cost £10,000, so that vessels may be berthed freely alongside. What have we done? We have established those freezing works which the member objects to. We cannot do anything without certain members finding fault with it. They quibble at what we do, and try to

put obstacles in our way instead of assisting us in the operations we are undertaking for the welfare of this State. We have carried out works, increased harbour facilities, and opened up stock routes, and we are busy opening up one of the biggest stock routes in the country. I think the member objects to that, but the object of it is that the goldfields people may obtain a better and cheaper supply of food. Artesian bores have been put down here and there in the North-West. Of these things the member apparently has no knowledge. In addition, many other works have been completed, and some others of a similar description are in our programme for the future. We do not intend, notwithstanding the criticism based on an erroneous impression of our intentions or on personal animosities, as some criticisms are, that such criticisms shall prevent us from carrying out our policy, so that prosperity may come to the shores of this our adopted country.

A pause ensued.

On motion by *Mr. Johnson*, debate adjourned.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at ten minutes past nine o'clock, until the next day.

---