

of interest and shows how the advisers of His Excellency have the interests of the State at heart. I desire to second the adoption of the Address-in-Reply.

On motion by the Hon. A. G. Jenkins, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—SUPPLY.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. D. Connolly): As it is very probable the Legislative Assembly will not meet next week and as a Supply Bill will possibly be before that Chamber to-morrow and as this House cannot receive a Message except when the other House is sitting, it will be necessary for this House to sit to-morrow in order to deal with the Supply Bill. I therefore move:

That the House at its rising do adjourn until 1.30 o'clock to-morrow.

Question passed.

House adjourned at 3.53 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 29th July, 1909.

	PAGE
Opening of Second Session	9
Election Returns (3)	9
Papers presented	9
Bill (Privilege) Sea Carriage of Goods	10
Address-in-Reply, first day	10
Adjournment, Supply, Premiers' Conference	20

OPENING OF SECOND SESSION.

The Legislative Assembly met at 3 p.m. pursuant to Proclamation, which was read by the Clerk (Mr. C. Lee Steere).

In obedience to summons, Mr. Speaker (Hon. T. F. Quinlan) and hon. members proceeded to the Legislative Council Chamber; and having heard His Excellency deliver the opening Speech (*vide* Council report, *ante*) they returned to the Assembly Chamber.

ELECTION RETURNS (3).

The Clerk announced the return of writs for the election of members for Murray, Northam, and Greenough, showing that Mr. W. J. George, Mr. J. Mitchell (Minister for Lands), and Mr. J. L. Nanson (Attorney General) respectively had been duly elected.

Mr. W. J. George and the Hon. J. Mitchell and the Hon. J. L. Nanson took the oath and subscribed the roll.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Premier: 1, Report of Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the construction of the Sewerage and Stormwater Works in the Metropolitan Area; 2, Report of the Government Labour Bureau and its branches for 1908-9; 3, By-laws of the Local Boards of Health of Bayswater, Boulder, Bridgetown, Davyhurst-Mulwarrie, Geraldton, Kalgoorlie, Maylands, and Meekatharra; 4, Aborigines Department—Regulations and Statement of Receipts and Expenditure; 5, Boat Licensing Act, 1878—Extension of Boundaries of Port of Onslow; 6, Jetties Regulation Act, 1878—Regulations for Derby Jetty; 7, Amended Port Regulations; 8, Municipal By-laws of Boulder, Bunbury, Claremont, Coolgardie, Cottesloe, Fremantle, Geraldton, Kookynie, Menzies, Narrogin, North Perth, Perth City, South Perth, Subiaco, Wagin, and Collie; 9, Regulations of the Fremantle Harbour Trust; 10, Rules of the Fremantle Public Hospital; 11, University Endowment Trustees—Financial Statement; 12, Aborigines Department—Report of Chief Protector for 1908-9.

By the Minister for Works: By-laws passed by the Roads Boards of Ashburton, Upper Irwin, Warren, Cue, Peppermint Grove, Irwin, and Jandakot.

By the Minister for Mines and Railways: 1, Report and Returns under Sections 54 and 83 of "The Government Railways Act, 1904"; 2, By-laws under "The Government Railways Acts"; 3, Additional Regulations under "The Mining Act, 1904"; 4, Report of the Department of Mines for 1908.

By the Attorney General: 1, Education Department Report for 1908; 2, Regulations under "The Limited Partnerships Act"; 3, Rules of the Supreme Court, 1909.

THE HON. F. H. PIESSE.

The PREMIER: I have received the following telegram, which will be of interest to members, from the member for Katanning (Hon. F. H. Piesse):—

"Although convalescent, am continuing satisfactorily. Regret unable to attend the House to-day which am absent from for the first occasion since 1890. Please convey my best respects to the hon. the Speaker and accept best wishes kind regards yourself, your colleagues, members and clerks of House."

BILL—SEA CARRIAGE OF GOODS.

The PREMIER (Hon. N. J. Moore): In order to maintain the undoubted rights and privileges of the House, I move, with out notice, for leave to introduce a Bill relating to the Sea Carriage of Goods.

Leave given; the Bill introduced and read a first time.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

First Day.

Mr. GEORGE (Murray): I beg to move the adoption of the following Address-in-Reply to His Excellency's Speech:—

May it please Your Excellency—We, the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of the State of Western Australia in Parliament assembled, beg to express loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign, and to thank your Excellency for the Speech you have been pleased to address to Parliament.

He said: I think before I proceed with the few remarks I intend to make for the consideration of members it would not be out of place if I were to say that after an absence from this Chamber of something like seven years, I am pleased indeed to find that there are still left in it some of those who worked with me in years gone

by, who rendered special services to the State, and who, I hope, will long continue to do so. I am exceedingly sorry that my friend the member for Katanning is not able to be present to-day, I should have been pleased indeed if he had been here, because I had it in my mind that he would have introduced me to you, Mr. Speaker. The Speech which has been placed before the House and before this country by His Excellency the Governor commences with a reference to the gentleman who has left us lately, Admiral Sir Frederick Bedford, a sympathetic, kindly-hearted gentleman whose main aim was that of duty to the flag under which he has served. Sir Frederick Bedford has left behind him a memory which I make bold to say will take a long time to efface. The gentleman who has succeeded him comes here with a reputation which we feel and hope he will fully justify, and if I in my humble position were permitted to say anything to that gentleman, it would be this, that in the hearts of the people there is a niche for himself and his family which is his if he asks for it and will be his for the time to come. People in the State recognise that the Governor for the time being is the one who represents the great Ruler of the British Empire, and we are loyal people despite anything that may have been said to the contrary. Passing on from that we come to the question of the financial arrangements with the Commonwealth. It seems to me that at the present time it is not at all out of place that something more than a passing reference might be made to that most important subject. I have figures before me which show that since the inception of the Commonwealth, something over two millions sterling has been lost to this State which we otherwise would have received and should have received if we had not entered the Federation. I do not wish to be misunderstood as being desirous of attempting to do away with Federation, or say anything that would indicate to the people that it was desired that we should do away with it; but I do say this, that having entered into that bond and partnership, a marriage without a divorce—and to those of us who voted against Federation let it clearly be put before them

that it was a marriage without a divorce—it is idle indeed to think as many do think that there is a possibility of getting out of it. We are in for it and it is for us, irrespective of parties, to make the best for the State in which we live. The reason I wish to refer to the subject of the finances is simply because there is a proposal in the air for a conference of Premiers to be held in one of the other States for the purpose of discussing the conditions of the various States, and meeting the Federal Ministry and endeavouring to settle sundry vexed questions in dispute between the States and the Commonwealth. It would in my opinion be wrong if this State through any obstacle or through any little trouble were not represented at that Conference. It has been stated, I know, by some persons that the effect of the last Conference, when I think Mr. Fisher was Prime Minister—I am not well up in some of these things—was that proposals were made that some special consideration should be shown to Western Australia and that special consideration had been so fixed that it was unnecessary to adduce any further argument. That might be the case; if it be the case I may say that for Western Australia to be absent would be fatal indeed to the conditions we have put forward for further consideration. To my mind it would simply imply that we were getting indifferent and supine to matters affecting the vital interests of the State. If there is any time when there should be necessity for activity and united strength that time is the present. From what I can understand from the public Press, it is proposed that the Leader of the Opposition should accompany the Premier to the Conference. That, however, is dependent on the other Premiers being willing that such should be the case. It is to be hoped that the Premier's request will be granted, and that that course will be taken so that the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Government may go together and show to the people of the Eastern States that we are at one on this important subject. There are times in connection with the policy of a country when party

differences should disappear—there will always be parties and it is right that that should be so—when comparatively trivial items upon which we debate and sometimes quarrel should be put on one side and sunk under pressure of the great principle and emergency that might be before us. We all know in our family lives how binding is the effect of blood relationship. We know how brothers may fight like cats and dogs and do all manner of tilting when together, but let a stranger come in and see how they will unite and how their own kinship tie will tell.

Mr. Taylor: But they are not strangers.

Mr. GEORGE: I am only pointing out to my friend, who I see retains his pristine health, that whereas we may quarrel among ourselves, as far as the outer world is concerned it is necessary to show that the kinship of brotherhood is something more than words, and carries something more than words with it. If it can possibly be carried out I desire to see the Leader of the Opposition accompany the Leader of the Government to the Conference and say that we are united and determined to have our rights. I have said that it is necessary we should have party government. I remember some years gone by when I led a distinct party myself and I believe I led that party fairly well. There were never any differences in my party and never any trouble; it consisted of a unit, but that unit was a big one. Now we have parties in the House, and it is necessary that we should have them, so long as there are matters of importance to debate; but on the Federal question we cannot have two parties in this State if we are to be true to our pledges to Western Australia and true to what we know are the expectations of the people of Western Australia. I came here about twenty years ago and the great complaint was that all the industrial concerns were governed from Melbourne. The Jarrahdale Timber Company, of which I was the manager, came from Melbourne. They tried to govern me, as they did others, but did not succeed in that. Another was a Ballarat com-

pany and in that case an effort was made to govern it from Melbourne, this place to do nothing but provide the dollars. Western Australia under Federation seems to me to have now got into the position of being looked upon simply to provide the dollars and be made a dumping ground for the things the other States can manufacture. We have no quarrel with the other States, we have no desire that they should not prosper, but we should take a proper stand and show them that we are a portion of the Commonwealth and intend to be treated as such, and that on such matters as finance we are a united body irrespective of what side we may take on local politics. I have told members I have prepared a few figures regarding the financial position and I shall now give them. From 1901 to 1909 the balance of revenue returned to the State, the actual loss to Western Australia, was over £2,000,000. In other words, had not this State entered Federation we should have had two millions of our own money expended here instead of elsewhere.

Mr. Scaddan: What has become of it?

Mr. GEORGE: I am not the Commonwealth Treasurer and cannot say. Whereas the cost of the Commonwealth departments in 1901 was only £14,000 it has been gradually mounting up—as in the case of most State departments—until in 1908-9 it was £96,000. That sum is expended in the State but with it we have nothing to do. The sum is growing annually and we should have had it if we had not entered Federation. Perhaps members will say that it does not matter so long as it is spent here and ask why I quote these figures if I am sincere in my views as to Federation. The reason I refer to them is that the people of the State may clearly understand the absolute necessity for Western Australia to have representation, proper representation, at the forthcoming Premiers' Conference. During the course of my remarks there have been certain interjections, and I should like to inform members that I am a little deaf and unless they speak up I shall be unable to hear them. Passing on to the Speech, I find that representations are made with regard to

the agricultural industry. I am not in a position perhaps to speak with very much authority on agricultural matters, but my friend the Minister for Lands is very close to me and he might correct me if I am wrong. I wish, however, to present the view, in connection with the development of agriculture, that I hope, when further literature in connection with the subject and the settlement of the land is being prepared, the Minister will see that those who write it do not make out a case which will deceive the people who read it. The general idea with regard to people who settle on the land is that if they get a few acres of land all that will be necessary is to put on the land a few sheep, which are generously provided, each being said to represent £1 per head income to them as, without trouble, the wool grows, lambs are born, and everything goes on well. One would be led to believe it impossible that the reverse of this picture would be the true one. I will not inflict upon the House my two years and a half of farming experience, for if I did so members would hardly think this House was a deliberative assembly; but the man who reckons on a 90 per cent. lambing and little or no mortality in his flock finds out when he has entered into the industry that his computation is made on a very wrong basis. The reason I have for speaking on this matter is to express the hope that, while the department are fully justified in endeavouring to settle people on the land, they will begin by settling those people from the bottom instead of lifting them up two or three feet at the start merely fall back again in the event of the drawback of a bad season. The land in this State is hardly known, it is good, there is plenty of it, there is room for plenty of the right people—people of stamina; but there is no room for literature and people to merely “boost” it up. If the true state of affairs is not made known, if people who enter into the industry fail, many must try and return to their old avocations. We want to get people on to the land who will work hard and stay on the land permanently; we want people who are prepared to face and overcome the diffi-

culties, who will work hard, who will brace themselves up against adverse conditions and fight through. People should not be deluded by "high-faluting" nonsense about sheep, as to how much can be produced per acre, etcetera, for such people are bound to get a set-back, as have some whose names I will not mention. When this happens those people have to return to other work about which they know a little more. Every effort is being made to open up vacant lands and I am pleased to be able to add my quota of approbation of the principle of surveying the land before people are allowed to select it. The department are doing well, although in one respect they adopt methods after the fashion of Cheap Jacks—which are good at times—by letting would-be selectors know how much money they will be able to borrow on the land if they take it up. They are informed that as the price goes up for the land so much the more will the settler be able to borrow on it. If I were in the position of a settler desiring to borrow money I would always take the highest priced land. The Agricultural Bank is to be assisted further. This institution has done a tremendous amount of good for the State, and I believe its career in the future will be of equal value to its life in the past. Mistakes are made, of course; they are made in all our lives, and I made some, as members know, a little while ago. I notice it is said in the Speech that there is an anxiety to help new settlers. No matter from whence they come, from Home or from abroad, so long as they take up land at 6d. per acre, etcetera, there is an anxiety to help them. Why not help the older settlers of the State, the men who are not taking up land now but are struggling with their freehold land or are toiling to pay for those lands? They should be considered as well as the new settlers. There is the question of taxing the old settlers as compared with the new ones. The income tax does not affect me very much at the present time, for I have only regained an income by coming here, but the incidence of the land tax affects me. As to the latter tax, persons who

take up land and pay 6d. per year for it, in the first instance are exempt for five years, but if a man takes up freehold land in the back blocks on which nothing has been done he has to pay both land and income tax, and gets no exemption from the former. Such things need adjustment, and I have no doubt when the Minister for Lands gets away from the realm of optimism which benefit him so well he will put these things in proper form. It is the intention of the Government to encourage the establishment of agricultural implement manufactories in this State. That is a very good idea, but I think they might carry the principle a little further. I have in my mind the cases of one or two manufacturers of Perth and Fremantle, who, had they received a little encouragement at the hands of the Government in connection with the manufacture of certain articles, would now be employing a large number of men instead of being either in the hands of the liquidator or very nearly in the grip of that gentleman. I believe the member for Perth has something to say on that question. With regard to the railways already under construction, if I were to start and talk about them I would keep members for a considerable time. On this matter I shall therefore have very little to say at this juncture. I would assert, however, that it is false economy and a wrongdoing to the State to build the lines on the so-called light principle which has been adopted during the last few years. I know from practical working that the idea of scamping construction is wrong, that the idea of putting in short sleepers, light rails, scanty earthworks and inadequate waterways is wrong. As to restricting certain local conveniences until later on, when perhaps money is more plentiful, that is right. I agree with that, but the trouble there is that when conveniences are needed the member for the district tries as I probably shall, to bring pressure on the Minister to give him things that perhaps the district might do without for a little longer. As to the Estimates, when they come along opportunities for criticism will arise and I shall avail my-

self fully of them. It is said that a scheme for a reduction in municipal subsidies has been effected. In this the Government are adopting a wise course, for it is time that municipal councils and their officials should be brought exactly to their bearings. There is a limit with respect to increased rates beyond which it is impossible for rate-payers to go. There are many instances in Perth, Fremantle, and other municipalities where people have to pay rates on houses which have not returned them one penny for the past twelve months. While none should object to contribute through taxation what is required for municipal matters, there should be a provision by which, when it is proved that the property is not returning revenue, the owners should be relieved from the taxation. It may be said that the owners charge too high for their properties, but I know of 50 or 60 owners whose ideas on the question of rent are very low, for the amount they charge would not return them 3 per cent. on their properties, and yet those properties have been vacant for twelve months. All the same there is no reduction in the assessment. I know of instances where municipal taxation, together with the burden of the land and income tax, is taking away that which is necessary for the education and bringing up of the children of the owners. When bad times come along there can be nothing wrong in easing the burden in cases where the property is bringing in nothing to the owner. I therefore trust that if the Government are bringing in anything to do with a Municipal Bill a clause will be inserted as was done a few years ago, to deal with a matter of this sort.

Mr. Scaddan: Strike out half of it.

Mr. GEORGE: I remember one Municipal Act some years ago was passed *en bloc*. The discussion on the measure was so foolish that I refused to waste my time over it. I notice also in the Governor's Speech it is stated that the Public Service Commissioner has been requested to inquire into several Government departments with a view to further economy. I think that is rather an unhappy kind of phrase. If I under-

stand anything about the Public Service Act and the duties of the Commissioner he should not need to be requested to look through the departments to find out where economies can be carried out. The only reason that justified the passing of the Public Service Act and the subsequent appointment of the Commissioner was that he would, while seeing that the officials were properly, considerately, and decently treated, that they should also give decent and considerate attention to their work. It should not require a special mandate to inquire into such matters, and no special mandate to show consideration to those men who may have to be put out of the service. I am assuming that the Public Service Commissioner has powers which I believe he possesses under the Act, and if he has those powers he does not require any further mandate, and if he has not those powers I think the situation requires to be explained. In connection with the public service and those members of it who may have to be retrenched, I notice that the Premier in his pre-session speech made some reference to the fact that it was intended to settle some of them on the land. I would respectfully submit that a great number of those men have never been accustomed to anything of the sort, and to take them from office work and endeavour to put them on the land would be asking them to undertake work for which they were not at all qualified, work which really should be commenced when men are young, if it is desired to make a success of it. I would like to mention here that there is a feeling in the railway service that further retrenchment is about to be carried out there, and there is a feeling that while those who cleared out some two years ago received compensation at the hands of the Government, those who are about to be cleared out now will not receive any consideration from the Government in connection with their services. Let me say in connection with both the public service and the railway service that the men who are there, who often have to bear attacks from members of Parliament in this House—probably in the old days from myself—that these

men properly claim that they were put into the service with the knowledge and consent of responsible Ministers. If these men were not required they should not have been put there. Having been put there and having been led to believe that if they did their work properly they would receive appointments for life, I say those men have practically neglected opportunities for any other employment, and it is almost certain that when a number of them come out of the groove they have been working in, you are practically turning them out into the street without the prospect of getting a livelihood. With regard to the railway service a great many men who have been retrenched have left the State and the State is so much the poorer. They have taken away their money and their families and when the time comes when the railway service will expand, and expansion will come, you will have to get new hands and train them to do the work which others had been taught and the teaching of which cost so much. It would pay the State to use the funds spent in bringing some of the immigrants from other States to keep these men I have referred to in employment in this State. As far as attracting population is concerned, if we are getting the right sort of people well and good. Some of the immigrants I have seen have made me feel that I was not exactly proud of the country which gave me birth. I have known some of the men who would be failures in the old country, and who will assuredly be failures here. If this is the class that the hon. member for Subiaco refers to in connection with the notice of motion he has given, and apparently for whom old hands have been put off so that employment might be found for them, I ask the Government to consider well that when new settlers are induced to come to the State, while they have the moral right to have employment found for them there is the moral right to see that those already here shall receive employment so that they may remain with their wives and families. I notice that the Government propose to continue that forward policy which has marked the administration of

the Government during the past four years. With that policy I am not as well acquainted as I shall be as time goes on, and I will leave other hon. members who are familiar with it to deal with it. I notice too that there are many railways that the Government propose to construct. I wish to state that I have no objection to the extension of the railway system providing that the Government do not make the same mistake that was made by the Victorian Government. Some years ago before I came to Western Australia the firm I had the honour to be manager of had several contracts and built among others one railway at a cost of £58,000. There never was a paying passenger on that line nor a ton of paying freight on it, and within two years the rails were pulled up, and the last time I was over there, Mr. Tait, the Commissioner of Railways, told me the remaining fencing and timber had been sold to "cockies." That was all the Government got for their share of the business. I quite agree with the policy of opening up the country, but let us be careful that we are not led into the same mess that Victoria made by getting lines built through political influence and without any real reason to justify their construction. We want railways built to open up the country, and for the purpose of giving employment, to open avenues for merchants and manufacturers, but at the same time we can pay too much for our whistle. Let us see that the railways will pay and for goodness sake do not let us hand them over to the poor unfortunate Commissioner of Railways when he has to spend his maintenance money on them, which would be unnecessary if the lines had been built properly at the start. What is an extra hundred pounds or two hundred pounds a mile if you are able to hand over to the Commissioner a properly constructed line? To build a railway in connection with which the rails are light, on which the ballast is scanty or absent, is the only way of putting off the evil day, and to ask the Commissioner to take over lines built in that way is to my mind unfair to him, unfair to the people of the country, and unfair to the Government themselves. As

I have said, if the House were asked for another £5,000 or £10,000 or even £15,000 for the construction of railways and the Government assured the people that they were going to build a railway of decent strength, no member would dare to throw out such a railway because the Government were willing to spend money to make it safe, sound, and workable. I notice also in the Governor's Speech that there is to be some tinkering with the Legislative Council.

Mr. Taylor: It is the same old tinkering that was going on when you were here before.

Mr. GEORGE: I was going to say that I quite sympathise with the Premier in connection with the matter. It is one of the hardest things one could have to deal with, for, however much the franchise is reduced, people will never be satisfied and not much difference will be made in that august assemblage. Two Chambers are required and will always exist until the Commonwealth Government give us speedy dispatch, doing away with us altogether. Harking back to the question of reductions in the public service, although I acknowledge that every possible economy should be adopted—I only mean by that fair economy, not parsimony—I would ask the Government and members to consider this point: I think it costs about £14,000 a year to pay us and the members of another Chamber for the work we do or attempt to do. I do not know what other costs there may be, but I should imagine the total would be about £20,000. I would ask members, patriotic men as they are, and as I hope I am, would it not be better for them to take no payment—a course which would be very popular throughout the State—and give the money to some of those men who have not the same opportunity as members for adding to their income?

Mr. Taylor: You have opportunities I know nothing about.

Mr. GEORGE: Let the £14,000 go to keep a few of these men who have no other source of income. There is no gainsaying the fact that Western Australia has had a cloud of depression over her, but she will rise through it and will assuredly before long be all right again.

The State is all right, but we have our share to do to make it so. If members are sufficiently patriotic to do away with payment there will be a sum of £14,000 or £16,000 a year for the Treasurer to deal with and the expenditure of which will perhaps do much more good than we can do with that sum.

Mr. Taylor: The Government promised to do away with £200 a year of their salaries two years ago but have not done so.

The Premier: You would not let them.

Mr. GEORGE: I see by the Speech that there is to be a redistribution of seats and when that question comes before the House there will be a good deal to say on it.

Mr. Taylor: It is an interesting subject.

Mr. GEORGE: It is indeed. It was very interesting to me to find a year ago that my old district had been so redistributed that I did not know it; but I found out the changes at last. In all seriousness, I believe that when that question comes along the people of the country will desire that the number of members should be reduced. We have fifty members here and I do not know how many in the other House.

Mr. Taylor: Thirty.

Mr. GEORGE: If members look around and weigh up the respective merits of each individual member, could they not even out of this august Assembly select twenty for the sacrificial knife?

Mr. Scaddan: Easily.

Mr. GEORGE: I am sure, on looking around me, that the sense of unselfishness is so strong in each member that he would offer his own throat to the knife so that that of his neighbour might be spared. I may have too high an opinion of members, but I say in all seriousness that this Assembly might well be reduced to thirty working members.

Mr. Taylor: There are not that many now.

Mr. GEORGE: I notice that there is mention in the Speech of something to do with liquor law reform. I do not know much about that but if it has something to do with the provision of good whisky for those who drink it,

bring in a Bill, bring in two Bills if necessary. From what I read in the report of the Premier's pre-sessional speech and from leading articles in the newspapers, I think the lines to be followed in connection with the proposed liquor law reform will appeal to reasonable men—not to unreasonable men who think that if a person takes a glass of beer a day he is a drunkard, or that a person who does not drink water only has no claim to righteousness and cannot hope to be allowed to sing in the choirs in the great hereafter. If the new laws will conduce to more temperance throughout the State every member will welcome them. I noticed when I was here before that not much pressure was brought to bear so far as the liquor producers and retailers were concerned, and I hope that those who have pestered me with pamphlets about temperance, teetotalism, and cold water, which I knew all about probably before they were born, will stop doing so and then I shall say the Lord be praised. In conclusion, I would say that I have been in this State for about twenty years and have occupied positions of more or less importance and I feel I can give from my place here my opinion of the State. I have seen the population grow from a very few to about 270,000, and I hope I shall be alive to see it two or three millions. I am thoroughly satisfied that, despite the talk about depression, we have the right sort of people here, people who set their jaws firmly and have grit enough to fight the battle through. I am firmly of opinion that Western Australia has a career before her that the other States cannot hope to attain. We have everything they possess except population and that necessity will be supplied by the natural increase of births over deaths and the arrival from other parts of those who are attracted by the advantages Western Australia so liberally offers. We want more population and have room for it, but we have no room for the man who lets his heart get into his boots and squeals at the slightest reverse. The only place for him is at Kar-rakatta. We want for agriculture the same gritty kind of man who went out

and found the goldfields and did pioneering work. There is a bigger percentage of that stamp of man here than in any other State. All we want is to get more of them, give them opportunities and let them feel that this country, which we know is good, will give them a living and when their children grow up, give them a good living too. As to the question of anything further in connection with that, I have nothing to say. You know the State, and I know it also. The State is a good one, and all that is wanted is good, stable Government with the assistance of both sides of the House. We do not want members tongue-tied on this side and tongue-loosed on that. We want all to help the good work along. Not that I desire any man to sink his individuality; if I were to say that I did you would not believe me. For my part I am here to do my duty by my constituency and by the State, and in my little way to try to help along to its assured prosperity that State which has been good to me ever since I have been in it. I have now to submit to the House for the consideration of members the reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor.

Mr. MALE (Kimberley): It is with very much pleasure that I rise to second the motion so ably put before the House by the member for Murray. In looking through the Speech I cannot see that there is much warrant for long debate, and I have no intention of speaking at any length but will be as brief as possible. The Speech, as usual, appears to me to be more or less an epitome of the pre-sessional speech recently delivered by the Premier at Bunbury. On reading through that speech, what struck me as being the keynote of the whole is contained in the following words:—"Rather than pursue a policy of parsimonious stagnation. . . . I would leave politics altogether." Those words, I think, convey to us the policy of the Government—a policy of progression and of hope; and it lies with us either to assist the Government in carrying out that policy, or to make it futile. In listening to the Speech read by His Excellency—and I listened very carefully—I was rather

struck by the omission of something with which we have been familiar in the Governor's speeches ever since 1905. I refer to the omission of any proposals for new taxation. Since 1905, I believe in almost every Speech, we have been advised that proposals for new taxation would be put before us. Now what deduction are we to draw from this omission? Is it that owing to the economies which our new Treasurer is introducing, and which he outlined in the speech at Bunbury—is it that owing to these economies he thinks he will be able to cheek that ever-increasing deficit, and that we shall be able to do away with further taxation before we turn the corner of the depression which has been upon us? In my opinion we have not yet arrived at that good stage; nor do I think the economies which have been prepared will put us in that position. I think we shall still have to face, as we did before, further taxation before we turn the corner. We are endeavouring to develop all along the line, and we must remember that progress requires capital, capital in the shape of loans. And we must also remember that it requires revenue to pay the interest on those loans. Our assets are good and ample, and provided the money is well spent and is represented by good, reproductive works, then I think we are fully justified in continuing a policy of borrowing; provided also that we are safeguarded, as in the past, with the Sinking Fund. I would like to congratulate the Premier on the additions which he has made to his Ministry, and more especially in regard to the new Minister for Lands. The new Minister served his apprenticeship as Honorary Minister for Agriculture, and I think we can all safely say that the appointment of that Minister as Minister for Lands is fully justified and will be for the benefit of the country. In reading through the Speech we find very much the same wording as we have found in previous Speeches. It is pleasing to note that we have had good rains, prosperous seasons, agricultural development and mining progress and prosperity. And following on that prosperity we are promised that the scope of the Agricultural Bank will be enlarged by an increase of

capital so that it may continue extending the good work which it has started. Provision is to be made for the better handling of our agricultural products and preparations are being made to cope with the great export trade which we expect in the near future. Proposals for agricultural railways and mining railways are also included in the programme. These matters, or nearly the whole of them, are matters concerning the Southern portion of the State. Perhaps I may be excused if it be found that my remarks dwell rather more on the North than on the South; more especially when we find that fully one-half of the State is represented in this House by only two members. I would like to thank the Premier and the ex-Minister for Works for having taken that trip to the North which they did during the recess. That visit was much appreciated by the people in the North and they are confidently looking forwards to good results from the trip. One of the most important works in the North will be the construction of the Port Hedland-Marble Bar railway, and people in that district are anticipating the starting of that work at a very early date. For unless the construction of that railway is proceeded with it will be useless to endeavour to develop mining in that district. I also find that it is the intention of the Government to look into the matter of tropical cultivation in the North, and on my journey South I had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Despeissis at Carnarvon; and found he was starting thence to make an overland trip to the far North for the purpose of investigating the soil and climate and of considering the other possibilities for growing tropical products in those regions. I believe the intention is to, on his return, start experimental farms at various places in the North. Personally I am not quite sure that experimental farms are the best means of assisting the development of the North. We know already that tropical products can be grown. Cotton is grown; tobacco is grown; I have seen sugar cane grown and many other products; but what we want, and what I think would be more useful, would be for the Government to

assist private enterprise in the growing of these products rather than in the starting of experimental farms. What we require is to be shown how, and assisted if necessary, to produce these products to commercial advantage. The question of dealing with the North has received some attention from myself; and in my opinion the Government would be well advised if they were to establish a department for the North with a responsible Minister at the head of that department. For remember the North, or tropical portion of the State, represents something like half of the State. If it be not possible to appoint a responsible Minister, then I should suggest that a director for that department be appointed, a practical man with some knowledge of the North if possible, and one who could make it convenient to visit that portion of the State at stated and regular intervals. The present Ministry, almost without exception, represent the Southern districts, and it is only natural and, perhaps, it is only right at the present stage of this State that they should lend their energies to the development of the Southern portions of this State; but had we a department with a responsible Minister for the North it would be his duty to initiate a policy for that portion of the State and to assist in devising a policy for the peopling of it and to place suggestions before Cabinet from time to time for their consideration. There would be many things for that department to consider and handle. There would be the great question of land settlement and that of tropical culture. There would probably be the necessity for having the functions of the Agricultural Bank extended to the North as well as to the South. There would be the question of mining in the North, and the question of pearling and the great fishing industries, the question of the disposal of our police, the aborigines question that is always before us, and there would be also minor questions such as the provision of a Supreme Court for the North, and many other things. It would at the same time leave the present Ministers free to go on with the work which they are now doing.

Many suggestions have been made in the past for dealing with the great North Australian problem, and it has on more than one occasion been suggested that it would be advisable and better if a separate State were established in the North, not altogether for reasons of dissatisfaction, but from the knowledge that it was almost impossible for Ministries to give that attention from the South that was required. South Australia we know for many years past has tried to develop its Northern territory. With what result? I understand that the Federal Parliament are asking for permission to take over the responsibility from the South Australian Parliament. The immensity of the problems which have to be faced is also greatly increased by the vastness of this State. Every district from the far South to the far North demands separate and special attention. Do we properly realise our vast areas and the infinite variety of our resources? We have our large agricultural areas; we have our hundreds—I might say our thousands—of square miles of pastoral land; we have our millions of acres suitable and waiting for tropical culture; we have our great fishing industries; we have our timber areas and we have our mining industry which has been the wonder of the world. Many of these industries, I may point out, are covering areas in extent larger than many Old World countries. Do we also realise that many of these industries are situated a thousand, if not more, miles from the centre of government? If we take it from the point of time many of them are at least a fortnight's distance from the centre of government and demand a task sufficient for a special department. Is it altogether unreasonable to suggest that the Minister for Lands, familiar (and successful as we know him to be) with dealing with the Southern districts of the State, is not in a position to cope with the development of the far North, while at the same time he has his other work to carry out in developing the South? Then again I would like to point to another feature which may before long necessitate a department for the North; and that is the duty

which we owe to the Empire of which we form a part. We must not forget that the Northern portion of Australia is now demanding as well as commanding the attention, not only of ourselves, but also of the Commonwealth and of the British Empire. The German naval programme has brought us very much to the front during the last few months; and I would like to point out that this State as a State has also a duty to perform to that Empire of which we have the honour to be a portion. Mr. Deakin in a recent speech dealing with the Australian defence question said, "the point of danger was the North of Australia; it required to be peopled so that it might be held." Also in another speech he warns us that "if we have not peopled the North of Australia within the next ten years then we run the risk of losing it." It is true that we as a State have no direct say in the question of labour conditions in the North; that is a matter entirely for Federal politics; but I maintain that it is a duty of the Government of this State to at once set to work to see what they can do towards peopling the North if we wish to retain it and people it. It may be necessary to augment our available labour with other than white, and I think if we had a responsible Minister with a department dealing with that portion of the State it might assist us to solve that most difficult and intricate question. I would commend this idea to the consideration of the Premier, and I trust that he will adopt some lines that will before long make for the development and peopling of our great Northern portion of the State. Now, looking through some of the measures of new legislation which we shall have shortly to consider, in my opinion the most important of them is the one dealing with liquor law reform. This has long been promised, but it is a big question and a difficult question, and for that reason it is only now that it has come to a head. I think every one is in sympathy with the measure that is being brought forward. We shall differ doubtless in details, but on the principle involved we shall be nearly all agreed. All civilised countries in the world at

the present time realise and agree that it is desirable to restrict the consumption of spirituous liquors as much as possible. The question of compensation is one which always looms large in discussions on this subject, but I say it is better a hundred times for the State to tackle the matter straight away than to wait until vested interests are so large that we will be afraid to face it and cope with it. We are also promised a Bill dealing with roads boards, a desirable piece of legislation. The merits of the Bill we cannot discuss or speak on until we have seen it, but we all know of the need to extend the powers and functions of our road boards. Another measure to liberalise the qualifications of electors of the Legislative Council which is also promised has been a standing dish for some time past; I might call it perennial and I trust that it will long remain so. As far as I can see there is neither demand nor need for the liberalisation of the qualification and I have yet to learn that the Legislative Council as at present constituted have ever failed to do their duty to the country. I started by saying that I would make my remarks as brief as possible and I will not detain the House any longer. I have much pleasure in seconding the motion which was moved by the member for Murray.

On motion by Mr. Bath, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—SUPPLY—PREMIERS CONFERENCE.

The PREMIER (Hon. N. J. Moore): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 3 o'clock to-morrow.

I propose to-morrow to give hon. members the reason for asking the indulgence of the House. First of all it will be necessary to secure Supply for the public service and works and at the same time I shall ask for a short adjournment in order to give the opportunity for the State to be represented at the proposed Conference of State Premiers and the Federal Government. In asking that, the Government are adopting the same attitude which has been taken in the various States, including the Federal

Legislature, that is, that the House should adjourn during the period of the Conference. I hope to-morrow to be able to give hon. members reasons why I think the State should be represented at the Conference.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 1.13 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Friday, 30th July, 1909.

	PAGE
Papers presented	21
Committees for the Session	21
Bill, Supply, £979,045, all stages	21
Address-in-Reply, second day	22

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

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: 1, Government Labour Bureau, annual report; 2, University Endowment Trustees, financial statement; 3, Fremantle Public Hospital, rules and regulations; 4, Boat Licensing Act, 1878, Port of Onslow; 5, Jetties Regulation Act, Derby Jetty; 6, Port Regulations, amendment; 7, Fire Brigades Board, abstract of receipts and payments; 8, Audit Act, 1904, Orders in Council; 9, Department of Mines, report for 1908.

COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION.

On motions by the Colonial Secretary, Sessional Committees were appointed as follow:—

Standing Orders Committee:—The President, the Chairman of Committees, Hon. M. L. Moss, Hon. G. Randell, and the mover.

Printing Committee:—The President, Hon. G. Randell, and the mover.

Library Committee:—The President, Hon. W. Kingsmill, and Hon. Dr. Hackett.

House Committee:—The President, Hon. R. F. Sholl, Hon. R. D. McKenzie, Hon. C. Sommers, and Hon. A. G. Jenkins.

BILL — SUPPLY, £979,045.

All Stages.

Received from the Legislative Assembly and read a first time.

Standing Orders Suspension.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. D. Connolly) moved—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as may be necessary to pass the Bill through its remaining stages.

The PRESIDENT: I have to state there is an absolute majority of the Council present.

Question put and passed; the Standing Orders suspended accordingly.

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. D. Connolly), in moving the second reading, said: This Bill needs no explanation, inasmuch as it is an ordinary Bill which has always to be brought down in order to pass supplies to meet the necessary payments for salaries and also any other moneys owing in connection with contracts, or anything of that kind, incurred by the Government. It is usual to bring down this measure—in fact it is unavoidable, because naturally the Estimates cannot be prepared until after the close of the financial year, which is really the 10th July. This amount is simply meant to carry on the services of the State for a little over two months, about 10 weeks. It is anticipated that before this supply is exhausted, the Estimates will be on the Table of the House and there will be no need for further supply. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.