

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 3rd August, 1904.

	PAGE
Bills: Public Health, first reading	64
Supply, all stages	64
Chairman of Committees, election	64
Strangers' Gallery, Standing Order Amendment	64
Address-in-Reply, third day of debate	65

THE PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: Report on Rottnest Native Prison for the year 1903.

PUBLIC HEALTH BILL.

Introduced by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, and read a first time.

STRANGERS' GALLERY.

HON. M. L. MOSS (West) moved:

That Standing Order 34 be amended by striking out the words "and each member may issue one ticket of admission to without the Bar of the House," and inserting in lieu thereof "and every member may admit three strangers to the Gallery each day by written orders and two ladies to the Ladies' Gallery." The alteration proposed would place Standing Order 34 on precisely the same footing as that in the Legislative Assembly, and no doubt the Standing Order appeared in its present terms giving permission to a member to issue only one ticket of admission without the Bar of the House at each sitting, owing to the fact of the insufficient amount of accommodation in the Chamber previously used. There was now no reason why the same privilege should not be accorded to the members of this Chamber as was enjoyed by members of another place. He understood from the President that his Honour had the opinion of the Architect on the question, and there was ample accommodation to enable members to have accorded to them the privilege now proposed.

THE PRESIDENT: The mover had communicated with him, and the Clerk in charge stated there was ample room for 200 persons in the Gallery, and at close quarters for another 50. He (the President) thought that, if the motion

was carried, the best plan would be to reserve the side galleries for ladies and the end for the men.

HON. J. W. HACKETT (South-West): Last session or the session before an alteration of a Standing Order was agreed to. At that time he raised a protest against a rash alteration of Standing Orders, and the proper course to pursue seemed to be to refer any alteration proposed to the Standing Orders Committee. We had such committee, and he had the honour of serving on it for very many years; yet except one subject, which was referred to it and dealt with the privileges of this Chamber, no question had been sent before that committee. The committee was not a myth, because it existed, but it seemed to have no place in the working constitution of the House. It was hardly fair to appoint the committee and then to declare that the work which would properly come before it was not to be submitted to it. It was for the committee to say whether the proposed Standing Order would, if carried into execution, entail any difficulty or any alteration of any other Standing Order, and generally to advise on the alteration to be adopted. His friend might move that the matter be referred to the Standing Orders Committee and the question be reported on.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM: How long would that take?

HON. J. W. HACKETT: A day. He moved that the motion be referred to the Standing Orders Committee, with instruction to report upon it at the very earliest date.

HON. G. RANDELL (Metropolitan) seconded the amendment.

Amendment passed without dissent.

SUPPLY BILL.

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and read a first time.

On motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, Standing Orders suspended to enable the Bill to be passed through all stages at one sitting.

On motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, Bill read a second time.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES, ELECTION.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. W. Kingsmill): In view of the

unsettled political conditions existing, it will be understood that the Government do not desire that a Chairman of Committees shall be elected at the present juncture. I would, therefore, ask you, Sir, for the purpose of this Bill only, to take the Chair. I propose to adopt a different course when we come to the consideration of Bills on the Notice Paper. The motion I at present make is "That the President do now leave the Chair."

HON. M. L. MOSS (West): I am going to move an amendment. I see no reason why this Chamber should be regulated by any of the rules of procedure which the Ministry may care to adopt in another place, because this House has no party whatever; and undesirous as I am of opposing my friend, I see no reason why the ordinary Chairman of Committees, who has performed the duties in this House for the last two or three years, should not take his place. I move as an amendment "That the Hon. H. Briggs take the Chair."

HON. J. W. WRIGHT: I second that.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I would point out, Sir, that this is scarcely an amendment. I moved: "That you do now leave the Chair." It is open for any member to move afterwards that any member should take the Chair.

HON. M. L. MOSS: My amendment, Sir, is: "That you do now leave the Chair for the purpose of dealing with this Bill in Committee, and that the Hon. H. Briggs do take the Chair."

HON. J. W. HACKETT (South-West): It will hardly be possible to leave the question until the President is out of the Chair. The usual course is to move, as a preliminary to the President leaving the Chair, that a Chairman of Committees should be appointed. For my part it seems to me largely a question at the discretion of the Minister, who has, no doubt, reasons for what he does. I do not think we should take the control of the House out of the hands of the Minister. In matters of this kind we always follow the Minister.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I do not wish to press it.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: I shall leave the matter in the expectation that it will be, at any rate, dealt with at the next sitting of the House.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I should like to explain. The reason for delay is this. Hon. members may have noticed that for the last three months the Government have been making as few political appointments as possible.

HON. R. F. SHOLL: This is not a political appointment.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Then the Government have been nominating as few persons as possible. In carrying out that policy of the Government, whose fate is in the balance now, I make this suggestion to the House. That is the explanation I have to offer.

HON. R. F. SHOLL: Why should not a private member nominate the Chairman?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I have no objection.

Motion and amendment by leave withdrawn.

HON. M. L. MOSS: I am a private member. I move "That the Hon. H. Briggs be appointed Chairman of Committees."

Question put and passed.

BILL IN COMMITTEE.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted; read a third time and passed.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

THIRD DAY OF DEBATE.

Resumed from the previous day.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Walter Kingsmill): In the circumstances that exist at present, for as hon. members are aware there is an amendment to the Address-in-reply in another place, which is generally accepted as a motion of no-confidence in the Government, the point arises as to whether we should proceed with the debate on the Address-in-reply in this Chamber. No doubt it will be fully pointed out that this Chamber is no party Chamber, and is not in any wise bound by the proceedings of another place.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: We know nothing about the proceedings in another place.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Quite so; but I think I may give some information to the House.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: On a point of order, I do not think the hon. member can give us the information.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I should like the President's ruling as to the constitutional procedure. I notice that in other parts of Australia, when a motion of want of confidence is moved, the business of the Upper Chamber ceases immediately. So far as I am concerned, it does not seem to be a matter of great importance whether at this juncture we should continue the debate on the Address-in-reply or leave it to a future occasion; but I should like to be guided by the wishes and convenience of members. I should be greatly pleased if this Chamber would find some way of expressing its wishes on this question.

THE PRESIDENT: There is no Standing Order dealing with the matter. It is a matter for the House to decide.

HON. J. W. HACKETT (South West): I am aware that there is a place called the Legislative Assembly, but from what I have read in those useful channels of information, the public Press, I am not aware that there is a motion of want of confidence in the air at all. All I understand, that has been proposed is that certain words should be left out of the Address-in-reply.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM: This is a motion of want of confidence.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It has been accepted as a motion of want of confidence.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: I know nothing of that whatever. Another place has been asked to express its confidence in the Government, and it has been moved, I understand, for I still speak from hearsay, that those words be struck out. I also understand that those who are responsible for that motion disclaim any idea of calling it a motion of want of confidence.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: They are not the arbiters.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: So far as I know there is no motion of want of confidence.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It has been accepted by the Government as a motion of want of confidence.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Members who are moving that proposition entirely disclaim any idea of dealing with it as want of confidence.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: They have no *locus standi*.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Well, the hon. member's colleagues may shortly have no *locus standi* either. This is a matter wholly for this House. This is not a want of confidence matter. The Address-in-reply must be disposed of. We shall have to agree to it or not agree to it, but because it is non-committal we shall have to agree to it. I do not see why we should not continue the debate. Some interesting developments may appear at another stage.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM (North): It seems like discussing a dying lion. What is taking place in another place will end in a vote of confidence or not, a vote as to whether the Government continue in office or not. It is not worth while discussing it, but the point arises as to whether it is worth while discussing the remarks of a practically moribund Government. Whatever we say, whether we discuss what they have done in the past or their proposals for the future, will not matter in the slightest. I am quite willing to go on with the debate if members are of that opinion, but it will be far better to wait and see what comes to pass between the conflicting parties. We should wait to hear what those who are coming into power have to say, and then we shall be pleased to discuss the Address.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: We must adopt the Address-in-reply.

HON. G. RANDELL (Metropolitan): The Colonial Secretary should have taken his objection earlier in the session. It will be a matter of discourtesy to the members who moved and seconded the Address, and it will be an act of discourtesy to his Excellency the Governor, if we fail to carry the Address-in-reply, which is non-committal and only a declaration of loyalty to the Governor and of thanks for his Excellency's Speech. I see no reason why the debate cannot be continued and the Address adopted.

HON. M. L. MOSS (West Province): The adoption of the Address-in-reply is always; so far as this Chamber is concerned, a matter of form; but on the present occasion I quite agree with Sir E. H. Wittenoom, that very little good can be derived from discussing the present Speech of his Excellency the Governor. We know perfectly well that a debate is proceeding in another place;

and instead of this Speech being a retrospection of the actions of the present Government, we may have a new Government outlining an absolutely new policy. Whatever this Chamber does it will be a matter of no importance; but if omission to pass the motion before the House in any way should be regarded as want of respect to the Governor or to hon. members who have moved and seconded the motion, it would be well for the House to go through the empty form of carrying the motion before the House. I join with both the mover and seconder in being prepared to adopt that portion of the Address that offers congratulations generally to members upon being domiciled in this building. I have no excuses whatever to offer, as an old member of Parliament, for the public money used in the building of these premises. In fact I should cheerfully give my vote for farther expenditure to complete this pile. I believe it is in every way desirable that the Parliament of the country should be housed in buildings worthy of such an important institution, and that the deliberations of Parliament, carried on in suitable premises, cannot have other than an elevating effect on members, and particularly on some gentlemen who enter Parliament in the present day with socialistic ideas. Buildings such as these will very likely have a toning effect upon them; and I believe that these buildings, when completed, will be, from an architectural point of view, an ornament to the State. No matter what Government may be in power when a proposal comes down for voting the necessary money to complete these buildings, I say unhesitatingly I shall cheerfully give my vote in its support. I desire to express my unabated confidence in the present Government; and I believe that in the record contained in the Governor's Speech—the retrospective list of works carried out by the Government—there are statistics for members' consideration which clearly indicate, looking back over the two or three years for which the present Administration have held office, that they have done well for the country; and if they go out of office within the next few days, they may fearlessly look back upon the record they leave behind them as one of which they may in future be justly proud, feeling that the country

is and will be largely indebted to them for services rendered. Although it would be invidious to single out any particular Minister, still, looking at the Ministry with a view to their works and their administration, I will say regarding the Premier that while he has occupied office he has been a most honourable and straightforward administrator; that he has undoubtedly made large personal sacrifices in performing the duties which have devolved upon him; and that the country is deeply indebted to him for services rendered. We ought not to forget the state of the political atmosphere when Mr. James took up the reins of office. We were then confronted with political chaos. The late Mr. Leake had held office for a few months; then came another Administration, which was unable to hold office for more than a few days; and at that time we were in almost as great a difficulty as we are in to-day. No party had a majority in Parliament; but owing to the energy and hard work of the present Premier, the last Parliament ended its days leaving the Premier with a considerable majority of members of both Houses, or a large majority at any rate, appreciating the work he had done for the country. And so with regard to those gentlemen who have been co-operating with him; I think the country has every reason to be satisfied with the work done by the Government. I have only one ground of complaint, namely that yesterday, in listening to a speech delivered in a place which I must not specify lest I should commit a breach of Parliamentary rule, I heard that the Labour party in this country had used the Premier—the language was almost as plain as that—that the Premier had been used for the purpose of getting certain legislation on the statute book, while now that he was of no farther use, and that another place had returned a sufficient number of members to enable the party to go on their way as they thought wise and to carry on the Government of this country, they were prepared to drop the Premier; that having made use of him, they had no farther desire to see him in his present position. Well, possibly both the Premier and his Government have gone a little too far in assisting the Labour party to attain the power they at present possess. Last

session I came back from England to find a Constitution Bill, a Redistribution Bill, and an Electoral Bill well advanced; and in the position which I then occupied in the House, in view of the loyalty due by me to those with whom I was associated, it was incumbent on me, if I could not give my open support to those measures, at any rate not to do anything to oppose them. But I am now in a different position. I say it is bad for the country that the Electoral Bill was allowed to pass into law, containing provisions which have enabled Labour to obtain the power it now holds in the country. The retrospect in the Speech makes reference to the Fremantle Harbour. I think this is a work for which the present Government are not entitled to all the credit; but certainly they are entitled to the credit of having established an independent board which has done so much to put that work on a good footing as regards its administration. It must be gratifying indeed to the Government, and highly gratifying to Sir John Forrest and to those associated with him in the initiation of that work, to find that after spending a sum approximating one and a half millions, that work to-day is doing what is required of it, and is practically paying interest and sinking fund on the outlay. However, even at the present time it cannot be maintained that enough has been done in connection with that great work at Fremantle; and Parliament should not rest until an up-to-date dock, whether a floating dock or a permanent dock, has been constructed. I may say in passing that I strongly favour the construction of a permanent dock; but Parliament should not rest until that work is completed and the harbour made second to none in Australia. The retrospect in the Speech makes some observations with reference to the growth of our population. I notice in the ordinary monthly abstract that the population on the 30th of June was 232,162; but I think every member will admit that such a population is a mere handful in view of the great area of territory this country is called on to administer.

HON. G. RANDELL: It is 238,000.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Well, it is under 240,000—a mere handful of people; and we have not by a very long chalk over-

taken the carrying capacity of this country. We are told that efforts have been made to attract population; but it is perfectly idle to suppose that this can be done without considerable expenditure, liberal advertising, and much effort in the old country. It is perfectly impossible, with the means now at the disposal of the Agent General, for this State to hope for a moment to get any acquisition of population from the old country unless drastic alterations be made in the methods adopted. The population we are now obtaining is largely the overflow population from the Eastern States, and it is just as easy when the wheel turns in the other direction for that population to go back to Eastern Australia as for it to come West. While it is in some respects satisfactory that we are attracting population from the other States, to my mind it would be far more satisfactory could we induce settlers of the right kind to come from Great Britain. Seeing the advantages which the Dominion of Canada offers, bearing in mind that the journey from Great Britain to Canada is made in eight or nine days at a cost as low as £2 or £3 per head, the wages which even a workman may get when he arrives in Canada, and the facilities which capitalists large or small may have for the investment of their money in Canada, we must offer greater inducements than Canada offers if we are to attract population from Great Britain. To reach these shores from England involves a journey of six or seven weeks; £17 or £20 is, I think, the smallest sum for which a passage can be secured; and considerable assistance will have to be offered by this State if we are to induce British settlers to come to Western Australia. I am satisfied that this country offers greater advantages than are offered by Canada, and that we should attract population if the facts were only known to the proper people in Britain. Here people who are anxious to follow agricultural pursuits have a market at their very doors second to none on the face of the globe. The moment the settler enters Canada, even if he be a capitalist, he is obliged to look outside Canada for a market; yet in this country he has a market on the goldfields where he can get, for everything he produces, prices far in excess of those ruling in any other country.

I think the member who moved the Address-in-reply (Mr. McKenzie) said that the increase of population was satisfactory to his mind, and that he did not desire to see that increase continue to any great extent. But I am quite certain this country is capable of absorbing a considerable accession to its population, and of finding ample work for them; and as to the capitalist, he may embark his money here in whatever enterprise he may choose, and I am sure he will get an excellent return.

HON. R. D. MCKENZIE: I objected to pauper immigrants.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners, on page 11 of their latest report, say it is surprising even now to find the large quantity of agricultural and dairy produce this country is obliged to import for the purpose of feeding its population; and while it is eminently satisfactory to know that the wheat yield has gone up from 770,000 bushels in one year to 1,855,000 in the following year, still, at the same time, there is great room for a large number of agriculturists to go on the soil in this country and produce hundreds and thousands of tons of the different kinds of produce set forth in that report, thus finding abundance of work for people who engage in agricultural pursuits only. With regard to our mining industry, it is quite possible that if encouragement is given to the capitalists of this country to farther prospect the auriferous areas, they will find a considerable amount of employment for an abundance of population which may be attracted to these shores. When we come to mention the mining industry, it is a matter for great regret that some scandals have been perpetrated. A Commission is now sitting at the present time whose duty it will be to make recommendations to his Excellency the Governor as to the best way to prevent in the future some of these scandals, but perhaps it is not out of place for members in Parliament to give expression to their opinions as to what has been going on. I have no hesitation in saying that the rigging of the market in connection with the Boulder Deep Levels is a perfect scandal and a great disgrace to those connected with it. If there is anything in the rumours, and I

believe there is a good deal in them, this jobbery has been organised in London by a person who made a considerable amount of money out of it, with the result unfortunately that the lambs who have been bled in this instance are people living in this country, and I suppose this must directly or indirectly have acted detrimentally to every business man in Western Australia. I notice in one of the London papers, a paper of importance, that the latest development in connection with this Boulder Perseverance has been referred to in terms of this character:—

The latest news concerning Boulder Perseverance is calculated to remove any remaining faith there may be in the Westralian market. It is not so much that the ore reserves in the mine have been grossly over-stated, or that their value has been fictitiously enhanced, but the scandal is that the real facts have been known to a certain few for a considerable time past, and that these few have traded upon their knowledge, and reaped large profits by share speculations. While such things are possible, it is not surprising that the whole Westralian market should be under a cloud. Fortunately for the public, the disclosures in the last year or two have resulted in sweeping reforms, and there now remain few properties of any importance which are not under the supervision of mining engineers who have their reputation to study before financial gain.

This is another instance:—

The case of the Peak Hill Goldfield Limited—another Westralian company—is not quite on a par with the Perseverance, but it is bad enough. Shareholders received £30,000 in dividends in the past year, and it now transpires that the money to pay same was derived, in part, from a mortgage effected on the property. To clear off this charge, and provide for development expenses, depreciation of machinery, etc., which, under the exceptional circumstances of this property, should have been met out of funds in hand, the directors now propose to raise £50,000 by an issue of debentures. Shareholders may well complain that they have been living in a fool's paradise through the ignorance or mismanagement of their directors.

I have no hesitation in saying, and I am sure every member will agree with me, that the Boulder Deep Levels scandal, this matter in connection with the Perseverance, and this Peak Hill business—I suppose we could multiply instances if we sought for them—are a great disgrace to this industry, and calculated to do a lot of harm to the State. I think Parliament may well consider whether some-

thing cannot be done in Western Australia to prevent this. [Hon. W. OATS: Hear, hear.] It is fortunate, I think, for the good name of this country that this villany is not the result of operations in Western Australia. We know perfectly well that far more is known of the working of these mines in London than we can possibly hope to know in this country, and I believe that the law which permits directors of these companies to reside outside of this State is responsible to a large extent for what is going on. I believe that the Mining Act could be amended in two particulars. Firstly, the country should insist that these directors should be local residents, and, secondly, the country should insist that inspectors of mines should have free access to all these properties, that the properties should be periodically examined, and the public in this country should know, not second-hand but as soon as the information is available, exactly the position of these various properties. It seems that whenever any swindle is perpetrated this country gets all the blame. An English newspaper makes all these charges upon Western Australia, but always forgets to accompany the statement that the swindle perpetrated is perpetrated outside the boundaries of this country. I think that if legislation can do something for the purpose of preventing a recurrence of these scandals, it is the duty of Parliament to take the matter into consideration and bring these reforms about. By far the most important matter contained in this Speech, in my opinion, is that part of it which states that "the franchise of the electors of the Legislative Council should be broadened and the Council brought more closely into touch with the householders throughout the State." I have never hesitated outside this House to express my opinion very emphatically upon that question. During these recent political contests I took no back seat. I made no secret in saying outside Parliament as I do inside Parliament that I am absolutely opposed to tinkering with that part of the Constitution. I went into the fight at Fremantle supporting every candidate who was put up against members of the political Labour party. I did it because in my opinion the advent of that party to power means a very serious thing to the pro-

gress of this country. Outside Parliament I have put the question repeatedly to crowded audiences whether this Chamber has in any way proved itself to be a barrier against what we call reform. I have been a member of this House and I have been a member of another place, and I know of no reform which the people of the country have called out for which this House has not discussed upon its merits. Broadening the franchise means the abolition of this Chamber. Those who attacked the Legislative Council were never able to do more than indulge in generalities on this question. Reform has been brought about in this country in the space of eight or ten years which in other parts of Australia took 60 years to accomplish. Before I came into the House this afternoon I made a list of a dozen measures on the statute book which without the vote of this Chamber would not have been there. Did this House try to bar the passing of a Conciliation and Arbitration Act to settle industrial disputes? Did it oppose the Workers' Compensation Act, a Truck Act, a Workers' Wages Lien Act, and a larger measure of electoral reform, all compassed in the period of responsible government to the present day, and brought about in perhaps four or five times the period in other parts of Australia? Did it oppose a measure for providing for payment of members, the institution of triennial Parliaments in this country, an Early Closing Act, an Act which legalised the establishment of trades unions, and a measure providing a Factory Act for the country? And we could go on and indefinitely multiply these measures, if we sought to do it. There is ample justification for us to ask the question whether this branch of the Legislature has in any way been a barrier against reform in the country. The present franchise is a liberal franchise. If the franchise in Western Australia were based on anything like it has been in Victoria for half a century, there might be some justification for the people calling out. But what is it? Any person absolutely above a tramp can obtain a vote for this Chamber; a person paying rates to the annual value of £25 a year, or the possessor of £100 worth of freehold property, is entitled to a vote; and the cry to bring the franchise down

to a household suffrage is mere election-eering claptrap. We have had it stated before in this Chamber, and we can read of it if we go to many writers on Parliamentary government, that if a party wants a cheap cry to put before the electors the cry of electoral reform is a very simple one. It is a high-sounding reform, but if we look at the thing honourably from the point of view of this country, if we are to have a second Chamber which is to be anything better than a duplicate of the other House, it is inexpedient in the extreme in my opinion to think of reducing this franchise. At the present juncture the Legislative Council is absolutely a safety valve to this country. We can only use the experience we possess for the purpose of coming to a conclusion as to what would become of this country under a single Chamber system of government with a universal suffrage such as we possess. We know perfectly well, when we look at the Federal Parliament, that the Lower House there has returned three parties: a Government party is returned; an Opposition party, and a Labour party; none with a majority. And what has occurred with regard to the Federal Parliament has practically occurred in the local Parliament. We have a Lower House returned with 19 members supporting one party, 22 another, and 7 or 8 or 10 or 11 Independents. If you have one House elected on this universal suffrage with triennial Parliaments, what kind of legislation are you going to get when you try to get a party together to carry on the government of the country, when the bulk of that legislation will be carried through by one party lending its aid to the more numerous of the other two parties in the House? It is absolutely essential for the well-being of this country that this Legislative Council should be preserved in all its strength at the present time to resist the attempts that will be made. Hasty legislation would be bound to be enacted under the circumstances which exist now, and which I regret to say will continue to exist in the country while we find the bulk of the electors so absolutely indifferent as to what is taking place. To make the Upper Chamber, as undoubtedly you would make it by household suffrage, prac-

tically a duplicate of the other House, would be to make the Upper House the same disappointment as the Federal Senate is to-day. I think the Senate portion of the Federal machine must be a disappointment to everyone in Western Australia who thinks about the question. It is a fact that the Federal Senate is elected upon the same franchise practically as the other House. The Senate in the United States is an independent body of men elected by the various State Parliaments, whilst the Senate in the Dominion of Canada consists of nominees of the Crown, the members being nominated for life, and they give a stability with regard to that Chamber which the Australian Senate to-day does not possess. Whatever the socialist may think, whether he thinks this is bringing nearer the goal to which he aims, or that the country will become a hotbed of socialism, he is entitled to his opinion; but I think we want that steady influence in politics which can only be acquired if we have an Upper House elected at any rate on a franchise somewhat different and with qualifications greater than those represented by the Lower House. Now, while making these observations, I do not want to go back from the position in politics I have taken up. I have supported, I believe both in this House and in the other Chamber, every liberal reform brought about for the benefit of the people; and I am prepared, if placed in Parliament again, to support every liberal reform I think is for the benefit of this country. But there is one thing in doing that, and absolutely another thing in allowing the country to be run riot with by the Labour caucus. We know that in another place, in a House of 50 members, Labour succeeded in getting 22 seats. What is going to occur at the next election? There is a sacred duty imposed on every member of this House. We have no right to tinker with the Constitution. I have pointed out publicly, prior to the last elections for the Legislative Council, that if the feeling of the country were for the abolition of this House or the reduction of its franchise, in two years from that time Labour could return two-thirds of the members of this Chamber pledged to bring about its abolition; that if the temper of the country were in accordance with the

desires of some of those people of rabid ideas, the House would in two years be reformed absolutely out of existence. Members of this House owe a sacred duty to their constituents. We have a Constitution granted to us by the Imperial Parliament on lines, in my opinion, of freedom and liberality. Perhaps it is inexpedient for the Upper House to have men entitled to come to it on the paltry qualification we have. However, I say nothing in regard to that, because we have this £25 qualification. I am not prepared to decrease it for this reason. Reduce it to £20, then will come a demand for £15, and then a demand for household suffrage; then comes the last cry, "Why should the Upper House in Western Australia want any qualification at all, when the great Upper House of Australia in the Federal Parliament is returned on a manhood suffrage?" The qualification is absolutely bound to go. What after that? The members of the Labour party make no secret of the fact that they want the abolition of this Chamber, which would mean a speedy carrying into execution of all those intangible theories that will mean ruin to this country. I have said this on a public platform, and have been jeered at. The country stands to be ruined, and instead of working out its own destiny, as it will be able to do if capital is allowed to come in and reasonable efforts are made to allow private enterprise to carry on its work, the Labour party will say, "No; we desire the Government to do everything here; we want every work turned out departmentally, and all the intangible theories in our platform put into execution." I am not prepared to see that carried out. I believe the country can do worse than follow on the lines of the mother country which has raised itself to its proud position in the world, not by having people spoon-fed, but by the fact that there has been a great system of liberality and individual effort interfered with as little as possible. Great national works of the country like the railways and the Coolgardie Water Scheme should be controlled by the Government; but we should leave to private enterprise other works, and give every encouragement to get capital into the country. What-ever the Government undertake they

are unable to do as well, by a very long way, as private enterprise. Now, it was because I held this opinion that I took a foremost part in Fremantle in connection with the formation of the National League; and although that National League, as a result of these elections, has not come out of the ordeal as well as we anticipated, we must remember that this political Labour party has been organising for years, and is a complete organisation, and that we started with absolute chaos. It is surprising, under the circumstances, with the franchise of the Lower House, that in a great Labour electorate like Fremantle we came within twenty-seven votes of the Labour candidate. The work of the National League, although not as successful as we desired, is only commencing at present; and we do not propose to relax our efforts at all. I am pleased to see that a great Australian statesman such as Mr. Deakin recognises that there are two parties in Australia which ought to be recognised, and that they have followed us in Victoria by starting an organisation of the same character to fight the same party we have to fight. The time has gone by for men to think one thing and to say another. It is absolutely essential in this country to take sides on political questions. I am prepared now, and when the time comes to face my electors, to say that I am on the side of the National League and against the Labour party. The Labour organisations of this country are entitled to every consideration, but I deny their right, by means of their organisation and caucus, to run the affairs of the country in opposition to a very large majority of people who are outside, and in defiance, to my mind, of what is in the best interests of the country generally. Now, I uphold the National League because I think the duty of any person in the Legislature is to be a representative and not a delegate. What a scandal it is in connection with the institutions of Parliament that in another place there are 22 persons bound and pledged hand-and-foot to vote for a political platform whether they believe in it or not; because that is the position. With our Legislative Council reduced down to manhood and womanhood suffrage, with the abolition of this Chamber, and with

the other House probably later on to be regulated by these caucuses, and legislation going on the statute-book with the facility it will get there, what is to become of this country? Is that kind of thing calculated to inspire confidence in Great Britain? Some members who have recently aspired to and become members of Parliament think that this country can do without being in the good graces of the financier in London. It is a physical impossibility for the country to go on without this. Not only the small State of Western Australia, but the wide world has to do its business through that centre, and we have to inspire every confidence in that centre. I know what I am talking about. With the Labour party in power in this country, with one Chamber running the affairs of this country, it would simply mean and spell absolute ruin to the community; and I sincerely hope that there are members in this Chamber who are going to be absolutely true to the position they occupy. It is a simple matter indeed for us to make ourselves popular with the crowd outside Parliament, to whittle down the qualifications until nothing is left. It is no good crying then that we are sorry we did it, and that we have made a mistake. I ask members who have expressed their views on these qualifications to ponder over the matter and see what it means. It does not rest at £20 or £15. There will be still more agitation for a farther reduction, and I believe that will go on until there is absolutely no qualification left. I have come to the end of what I have to say. So far as the Speech is concerned, I can give my adherence to a large portion of it, leaving out some of the projected legislation, and certainly leaving out that reference to the franchise. While the Government, in which I have expressed my unabated confidence, have put these words in his Excellency's mouth, it does not at all follow that I, standing as a private member, untrammelled altogether by the position I formerly occupied, should hesitate at the first opportunity to express my opinion forcibly on this question; and I have no hesitation in saying now that any attempt that is made by the present or successors of the present Government to interfere with the franchise or impair the efficiency of this Chamber will meet at my hands

with strong opposition. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion before the House.

HON. E. H. WITTENOOM (North): I have very few remarks to make in connection with the motion before the House. Before proceeding to the Speech I should like to say that my idea in speaking just now was that we might as well close the debate by adopting the Address-in-reply. As I said before, it is not much good discussing a dying lion, and how much we can say with regard to the view of the present Government will not have much effect, as in a few days they may vacate their position for another one. In discussing the Address-in-reply I shall not be out of place in reading it. [Address read.] Perhaps, if we were to pass that without comment, it might be taken that we were all agreed with the statements in it. I for one am not altogether agreed with the statements in it; therefore perhaps it will be well to place on record one's particular views. We have heard a good deal about congratulations in connection with the handsome building in which we have now to carry on our deliberations. Unfortunately I am not prepared to endorse the remarks of the last speaker. I think the expenditure is premature and unnecessary; and I am of opinion that for many years we could have carried on the deliberations of Parliament in this country in the Houses we had in their various positions. I am quite prepared to admit that it is a distinct advantage that the two Houses of Parliament should be together, and that members should have an opportunity of assembling together and discussing the various merits of the measures placed before them; but while I admit that, I think the expenditure was unnecessary, and that we could have done our work for many years in the domiciles in which we have hitherto carried it on. I say the money spent on these Houses might have been spent to great advantage on other objects; and one of those objects which has for a long time been near my heart is that of an agricultural college. As to that, I admit the Government have done something; they have started an experimental farm at Geraldton and another in the Southern District, and I am told they are prepared to take something like five or six pupils. I do not

think this anything like adequate provision for the country's necessities. We are essentially an agricultural country. We shall have to depend upon agriculture, horticulture, and similar industries when our gold is exhausted; therefore it behoves us to provide every opportunity for young people who desire to engage in such pursuits, so that they may learn their calling in a proper manner. For years I have agitated for an agricultural college where a practical knowledge of farming could be obtained; and I am of opinion that the money wasted on these Parliament Buildings could have been devoted with the greatest advantage to the development of agriculture and the training of our young people as agriculturists. While I was in England, many moneyed men approached me with the idea of sending their sons to Western Australia to engage in farming or gardening operations; and the first question they asked was, "Is there any institution where they can learn the elements of their intended profession?" and I was reluctantly compelled to answer in the negative. I have often thought and still think that some such institution should be started here, in which from 25 to 50 students could learn the elements of farming, so that they might take up farms in different parts of the State. In these circumstances, though I think it was wise to reserve a site for these buildings, which is, I think, an admirable site, and though the buildings themselves are excellent and extremely comfortable, still I think the expenditure on buildings absolutely premature, and that the money could have been devoted with much greater advantage to other objects. I should like to refer to one statement made by Mr. McKenzie in his able speech when moving the Address-in-reply. That was as to the Coolgardie Water Scheme, when he stated that the price of water was much higher than the price originally intended to be charged—3s. 6d. per thousand gallons. As one of those who happened to be a member of the Government when this scheme was started and preliminary arrangements were made, I may point out to the hon. member that when the price of 3s. 6d. was mentioned, it was expected that at least five million gallons of water would be used daily. We know now that five

million gallons per day are not being used; but if a greater quantity were used probably the price could be reduced to something like what the Government expected at the time. Mr. O'Connor's estimate was that if five million gallons were consumed every day he could sell water at 3s. 6d. per 1,000 gallons. Last year, when the Governor's Speech was considered, I criticised it to some extent adversely; and two of the exceptions I took to it were that nothing was said about immigration, and that no suggestions were made for attracting to and keeping capital in the country. I am glad to see that this time the Government have taken the advice tendered to them, and have inserted a paragraph as to immigration; and I hope like Mr. Moss, who placed the details so ably before us, that the Government proposal will be carried out, and numbers of people attracted to the State. But this can never be done without a vote of money to do it. I am sorry to say there is still an absence of any attraction for capital. There is nothing to induce the capitalist to come to the country; nothing to show that he can have any assistance when he does come; but many things to prove he had better stay away. I regret that this portion of my speech of last year has been overlooked—why, I cannot state. I wish to endorse Mr. Moss's remarks with regard to the mining scandals. Beyond doubt, nothing does more harm to this country than these unfortunate scandals; though I am perfectly sure, as Mr. Moss said, that as a rule the Britisher in London is responsible for them. I do not, however, think that Mr. Moss's suggestion could be carried out—that the mining directors should be local residents.

MR. MOSS: They have to be in other countries.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM: I do not think it possible here; because it is not the West Australians who find the money to work our mines, and the men who find the money naturally reserve to themselves the right to conduct mining operations as they think fit.

HON. M. L. MOSS: In the Transvaal the whole of the directors had to be residents.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM: I did not know that such was the rule in the Transvaal; but I am perfectly certain

that any man who invested his money in that country or anywhere else would reserve to himself the right to conduct his own business as he chose.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Naturally he sends his representatives.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM: If business men choose to find the money for carrying on a business in this country, do you think they will be dictated to by anybody else? And if Western Australia cannot find the money to work the mines, but has to call in outsiders, we can hardly blame them for spending their money in their own way. Otherwise, they will take the alternative course, and have nothing to do with local mining.

HON. M. L. MOSS: No; they will not, if they have a good thing.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM: There are not many good things knocking about. However, if the member who is making these suggestions has anything to suggest in the way of legislation that will overcome these scandals, or if the Government can suggest anything, I shall be only too glad to support them from every point of view. One point I think has been omitted from the Speech; that is in reference to my unfortunate constituency in the North-West. No word is said about the development of those splendid mines in that part of the country. We all know that gold is sticking out there at all points. A great many of the shows are good, but unfortunately cannot be developed for want of timber and communication. Not one word in the Speech concerning an important district like that—a district which might have the greatest possible influence upon the financial returns of this country; not one word as to whether the Government intend to give us railway communication. To one other matter I cannot help referring, though at the risk of some repetition. One paragraph in the Speech states that—

The franchise of the electors for the Legislative Council should be broadened, and the Council brought more closely into touch with the householders of the State.

Now I endorse every word that fell from Mr. Moss in that connection. I am entirely opposed to the reduction of the franchise for this House in any way whatever. Every person, male or female, over the age of 21, who has resided for six months in this State, may have a vote

for the Legislative Assembly. It does not matter whether he has any qualification or not, whether he has the slightest interest in Western Australia; whether he can go away or whether he is obliged to stay in the State: at any election, provided he is registered, he or she has a right to vote. Now I quite agree that all men and women of proper age should have votes, and a say as to the laws under which they have to live; but having given that much to them, and having admitted their right to elect members of the Legislative Assembly, I think we have given them a good deal. I go a little farther than that. I say, if it is good enough that the man without any interest in the country, who may have been here for six months working for a living, and who is ready to leave the country at any opportunity, shall have representation in the Legislative Assembly, surely it is good enough to give the man who spends his money in the country, who by his industry and ability manages to acquire a little property, some farther rights than are given to the man with no interest whatever in the country. I think everybody must admit that; and the only way in which such consideration can be given is through the franchise for the Legislative Council. This House is to some extent representative of interests as the Legislative Assembly is of persons; and we should preserve the franchise of the Council in its entirety, for the representation of interests. If, as has already been said, we once admit of a reduction of the franchise, if we agree that the qualification be reduced from £25, we will say, to £20, we admit the righteousness of the argument for a reduction. And then it comes to a question of comparison; and as Mr. Moss pointed out, the qualification will be reduced from £20 to £15, and will ultimately be wholly abolished. If we ever come to that pass, I shall give my vote for doing away altogether with the Upper House; because, if we are to have two classes of electors with the same qualification, that seems to me to reduce the matter to a thorough absurdity. I say that any system which gives to the idle, the drunken, and the incapable person the same political privileges as to the sober, industrious, and clever, is rotten to the core; and in these circum-

stances, while we have a franchise which gives some little advantage to those who invest their all in the country, who are spending money for the development of the country, it would be suicidal, not only in the interests of this House but in those of some of the best sections of the community, to have that franchise reduced. This House is, as we all know, a House of revision. I do not think this House is for the initiation of legislation; though I am aware that some members do not agree with me on that point. Last year the Colonial Secretary gave us a good deal of initial legislation, with which practice I am quite at variance. I think that this House is elected for the revision of legislation which comes from the direct representatives of the people; and in these circumstances I do not think we should initiate legislation. But if there be any objection to this House, we know well that in four years all those who hold the Council franchise can return enough members to vote effectively for the Council's abolition. In these circumstances, we cannot from any point of view be called exclusive. The only other remark I have to make is in connection with one of the last clauses of the Speech which we all look upon with deep regret, and that is in relation to the probable result of the elections in placing the present Government out of power. I sit here to a large extent in many ways as representative of capital, and I cannot say that looking at the subject from that point of view I can really approve of all the enactments that have been passed by the existing Government. Many statutes have been passed that are not in the best interests of the country and are absolutely hostile and inimical to capital. These Acts cannot be said to have been carried by the Labour party. I could mention them if necessary. There are five or six of them. They cannot, I say, be said to have been done by the Labour party, because the Labour party were in a small minority. That is the only satisfaction I have in connection with this change, because I feel confident, now there is a Labour party, that if they come into power they will see the unwisdom of Acts introduced by the late Government which have had the effect of not only stopping capital from coming into the country but of

almost driving it out, and therefore causing a very large number of unemployed. The Labour party will see that I am certain they will cancel a good many of the statutes so that capital will again come into the country with freedom and confidence, and they will make it attractive for capitalists with a view of finding employment for the numerous unemployed who, I understand, exist in several parts of the country. That is the only satisfaction I feel in connection with this change, because I know there are several of these Acts they will repeal, and they will take steps. I am certain, to make the position satisfactory for capital to be distributed throughout the State, to find employment for their numerous partisans and those who placed them in power, that I expect to see this obnoxious legislation repealed at a very early date. I do not think I need take up any more time of the House. I listened with great satisfaction to the speech delivered by his Excellency, and having urged the objections I entertained to that Speech, I have much pleasure in endorsing the proposal that has been made for the Address-in-reply.

HON. J. M. DREW (Central): It is no easy matter to deal with a Speech submitted to the House in the form of the present Address. There is so little to go upon. Legislation is promised, but we have no indication whatever of the nature of that legislation. Allowances must be made, however, for the peculiar circumstances of the case, although I suppose we are not allowed under the forms of this House to investigate those peculiar circumstances. With regard to the proposal to broaden the franchise, I thoroughly agree with it. I think that the franchise for the Legislative Assembly may very well be liberalised, without any danger to the interests of this Chamber. So long as the settled interests of the State are represented in this Chamber we may, I think, have no reason whatever to fear the consequences. By the settled interests I mean the interests of every person in the community who has shown sufficient confidence in the country and sufficient energy and industry to build a home for himself, and has given other evidence that he intends to be permanently resident here. The franchise at the present time is very liberal, but that

liberality is not intended in any way to affect the interests in this Chamber. It is, I think, ten years since the Legislative Council became an elective Chamber, and during the whole of that period there has been and there is at the present time only one member of the Council in favour of its abolition. I do not say we should reduce the franchise by a very large amount, but I believe that if we reduce it to a small extent we should admit to voting power a large number of worthy persons who would have sufficient regard for the interests of this Chamber to do everything to preserve its life and at the same time show interest in the legislation of the country. With regard to State hotels, a question which is mentioned in his Excellency's Speech, I think this is a matter which should be approached with some caution. I do not object to experiments, because I think there is every reason why there should be experiments in the sphere of politics as there is in the sphere of science. Reform can do no injury, provided it be reform in the true sense of the word, and I think there is every reason why the Government should endeavour to try the effect of nationalising the liquor traffic, provided they have State hotels in those localities where those hotels do not conflict with private enterprise. In all new localities where hotels are required the Government might very well try the experiment, but at the same time I realise that those hotels are not going to do the whole of the good in the community which many of their advocates think. A good deal would depend upon the managers of these hotels. If they have honest managers all may go well. We are told that what may follow from the extension of this principle is that good liquor will be supplied, and that there will be no inducement to excessive drinking; but if you have a dishonest manager there is every reason to believe the liquor will be adulterated, and that he will encourage drinking in a great degree, because by that means he can increase the emoluments to a certain extent. I should like to touch on the electoral law. I am sorry the Government have made no provision for the amendment of that Act. It was only passed last year, but the practical working of it shows, in my opinion, that it is

sadly in need of amendment. With regard to the provision respecting postal voting, that provision was inserted in the Bill in response to agitation by, I think, the more liberal sections of the community. If the spirit of the Act were adhered to, there would be no reason to complain, but from my experience, from what I have seen, I say the measure has been abused. In our district, to my knowledge, scores of persons voted by post who were under no political necessity of doing so, and the Act gives them this power. The Act states that any person who has reason to believe he will be five miles from the polling place on polling day may exercise the franchise through the post. That in effect is what the Act says. Under that provision every person on the roll for a constituency can exercise his vote by post. One of the effects of this section has been to bring into existence a number of political canvassers who are not only political canvassers but who very often are postal officers also. I know a postal officer in my district who did not resign his appointment, and he took a prominent part in the election. He travelled round with one candidate, taking votes openly on behalf of that candidate, and he never took the trouble to get votes for anybody else. He accompanied the candidate and he wrote letters to the Press on behalf of him. On polling day he drove ladies to the poll.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Was he reported at the time?

HON. J. M. DREW: The Minister for Works is quite aware of the whole of the circumstances.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: But by anybody else?

HON. J. M. DREW: I should think the members of the Government could do all that was necessary. If the Minister has information, that should be quite sufficient, and the Minister was in a proper position to act. The officer to whom I refer drove round the district on polling day, and when not engaged in driving electors to the poll he placed himself at the polling booth and button-holed voters on behalf of the particular candidate he favored. Whilst this sort of work is allowed I think there can be no such thing as purity of election. The

Electoral Act seems to be imperfect in one respect: there is no punishment, so far as I can see, for voting more than once at the same election. The Chief Electoral Officer advertised a warning from one end of the State to the other that people would be punished if they voted in more than one constituency at the same election; but to my knowledge people did so, and they were perfectly aware that it was impossible for them to be punished for so doing. The Act was read very carefully and legal opinion obtained, and that opinion was that so long as a person does not vote more than once in the same constituency it is impossible to prosecute him. The Act distinctly states that every person on the roll has a perfect right to vote. Of course, supposing there were an election in Perth, if one voted at two polling booths in the electorate of Perth he could be punished, but supposing he were on the rolls at Perth and Fremantle he could vote both at Perth and Fremantle, and there would be no possible hope of prosecuting him for the offence, if offence it were. In the Perth electorate he could not be asked if he voted in the Fremantle electorate. I may be wrong, but that is the conclusion arrived at.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Voting more than once would render one liable to a penalty of £50.

HON. J. M. DREW: Is the Perth election the same as the Fremantle election? That is the point. I notice that the Government intend to bring in an amendment of the Land Act. That reminds me that the Government recently declared their intention to abolish the grazing lease portion, Part VI., of the Act. This portion of the Act was introduced as far back as 1883, and for many years, owing to the fact that the pastoral lessee had a prior right for all lands applied for, the section proved practically valueless to the person whom it was intended to serve, namely the *bona fide* selector. If a farmer or any other person applied for land under this portion of the Act, the pastoral lessee had to be notified, and he had the first opportunity of taking the land. The position he took up was generally to say he would take the land himself, and he would pay the smallest acceptable portion of the first year's rent and keep himself perpetually qualified to ward off others. The Gov-

ernment have recently taken steps in the direction to which I refer. Applications have been made for grazing leases in various portions of the State, and the Government refuse those applications. Now it is announced that they intend to bring in a Bill to do away altogether with the grazing leases—not exactly the grazing leases. I should like to know where it is possible the Government will offer land for selection. Will this land be offered for selection from pastoral leases? Nearly all the land in Western Australia worth selecting is either taken up by the conditional purchaser or it is freehold, or is held by the pastoral lessees. Where is the land available? Only in pastoral leases. Do the Government propose to grant pastoral leases to the people who apply for grazing leases under the legislation they intend to introduce? Can they grant a second pastoral lease over lands already held as pastoral land? Say a squatter holds 20,000 acres of pastoral lease, and a farmer comes along and says "I want 5,000 acres of pastoral lease." Will the Government grant him that? Can they do it? I do not think they can. Documents have been signed with the squatter, and the squatter enters into possession. There is no possibility, as far as I can see, that the Government can grant that land to any other person, and outside pastoral leases there is no land available, as far as I know. Therefore, the object of the Government appears to me to do an injury to the selector. What the Government propose to do is, I dare say to let land on say a 15-years lease. Then they can make a fresh valuation, and if it be shown that the land has improved in value, that the man who has held the lease has improved it to some extent, the rent will be raised. I contend that such a system will be simply to penalise industry and encourage indolence. Some time ago it was announced that the Government intended to withdraw the reward for the destruction of wild dogs, but I am led to believe that they have recently changed their opinion, and I am glad to hear it. In our district and in the Murchison district the dingo is proving a serious menace to the prosperity of the farmer. I met a pastoralist a short time ago, and he informed me that in 12 months he had lost a thousand

sheep through the dingo, and also a large number of cattle. I hope the Government will consider this matter, and decide not only not to withdraw the reward, but to increase it to a substantial extent. For this purpose I think it would be advisable to impose a tax on all sheep throughout the State, a very substantial tax, and supplement this with a very heavy subsidy from the Treasury. This would enable the reward to be increased to something like £2 per dog. Nothing less would be of any avail. The effect of this would be to bring into existence a large number of hunters to deal with the extermination of dingoes. The same principle which justifies steps being taken with regard to the rabbit invasion justifies steps being taken for the extermination of dingoes. There is another matter in connection with the Speech which I prefer to leave until a Bill dealing with the subject comes forward. A subject I should like to refer to is that of adjournments. I hope that if there is not likely to be any important business before the Legislative Council, we shall from time to time adjourn for a day or two. Last year myself and others had to come hundreds of miles for half an hour's business. It is all very well for people living in the city of Perth or in Fremantle, but it is a very serious matter to members who have to come and go something like 600 miles.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I think you did very well last session.

HON. J. M. DREW: It was not so bad last session as the session before, and I hope there will be a still farther improvement. I have much pleasure in supporting the Address-in-reply.

On motion by HON. E. M. CLARKE, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 6:23 o'clock, until the next day.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 3rd August, 1904.

	PAGE
Question (postponed)	79
Supply Bill, all stages	79
Chairman of Committees, election	80
Address-in-Reply, third day of debate	82

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 3:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

QUESTION (POSTPONED).

MR. MORAN asked the Premier question No. 1 standing in his name on the Notice Paper.

THE PREMIER requested that the question be postponed, as he had not had the question placed before him yet.

MR. MORAN: It was rather extraordinary that a question of which notice had been given had not been placed before a Minister before now.

THE SPEAKER: The matter could not be debated.

THE PREMIER: Things were a bit congested at present.

SUPPLY—MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR.

Message from the Governor received and read, recommending the appropriation out of Consolidated Revenue and General Loan Fund of £1,000,000 for the services of the year ending 30th June, 1905.

THE TREASURER moved that the House resolve into Committee to consider the Message, and that the Standing Orders be suspended to allow the passage of a Supply Bill through all stages.

MR. MORAN (West Perth): The House and the country would not fail to take notice of this extraordinary request. The amount asked for was extraordinary, and the conditions under which it was asked for were still more extraordinary. He would not oppose the motion; nevertheless, pending a vote of want of confidence which had not the worst chance in the world of being carried, we were now entrusting to the Government a million of money. For three years past it had been our misfortune to have to vote large sums of money in a manner