

Legislative Council.

Wednesday, 4th August, 1915.

	PAGE
Paper presented	92
Motion: War between Britain and Germany,	92
Anniversary of Declaration	92
Committees for the Session	96
Address-in-reply, third day	96

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

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: Report of the Chief Protector of Aborigines for the year ended 30th June, 1915.

MOTION—WAR BETWEEN BRITAIN AND GERMANY, ANNIVERSARY OF DECLARATION.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.36]: I move—

That on this anniversary of the declaration of a righteous war the Legislative Council of Western Australia, in conjunction with the rest of the Empire, records its inflexible determination to continue to a victorious end the struggle in maintenance of those ideals of liberty and justice which are the common and sacred cause of the Allies.

The Government have recognised the suggestion made by Mr. Kirwan yesterday as one worthy of adoption. It will be unanimously agreed that the day is a fitting one to submit to Parliament a resolution which will reflect the feeling of the Australian people on this, the anniversary of the terrible war in which the Empire is engaged. It is not necessary to lay stress on our loyalty, or to dwell on our patriotism. Australia's loyalty is not in question, Australia's patriotism is not in doubt. The Australian blood which has been shed at the Dardanelles, and the thousands of Australians who are leaving every sphere of life to take a place in the firing line under the British standard, afford the most eloquent proof that we have not forgotten our responsibilities

or overlooked our obligations. In a word our actions give a complete answer to any question which might be asked by neutral nations as to how Australia feels in regard to this war. More than that, I think I am expressing the true Australian sentiment when I say that, despite all the horrors associated with it, this war must go on until a fell blow has been struck at Prussian militarism, and the welfare of generations to come has been placed beyond peril from its sinister machinations. To repeat the memorable word of the Prime Minister, uttered soon after the declaration of war, and which crystallised the sentiments of the Australian people, "We shall be prepared to give our last man and our last shilling to help the Mother Country in her present struggle."

Hon. W. KINGSMILL (Metropolitan) [4.40]: Perhaps one of the most pleasing features of the motion which the leaders of the House has proposed with a great deal of eloquence is the fact that the war of which the anniversary is to-day, is alluded to as a righteous war; and the righteousness of the war is, I think I may say, becoming more apparent with every hour that the war lasts. The righteousness of the war is making itself apparent in two directions. Firstly, in its being revealed to us of what a long-laid plot this war is the culmination, and secondly in its being revealed to us to what an extent a scientific nation, a nation which should be in the van of progress, which has been in the van of progress, so far as scientific attainment is concerned, can fall into the depths of malevolence; to what extent purposes its scientific attainments can be put. And let me say here—it is not my intention to make many remarks, because I did not know of this motion until a few minutes ago—that there is another reason, perhaps, why, without any undue vainglory, we as Australians may celebrate this anniversary with whatever pride we may be permitted to attach to so mournful an occasion. I say, a mournful occasion, because many hoped when the war was first declared that the first anniversary of it

would never occur. However, the anniversary has occurred; and let me say that I think we may look with pride on the fact that Australia has at last made its entry into a full measure of nationhood, that she has proved that, so far as Australia as a nation is concerned, she is fit to take her place, and that her sons are worthy to take their places, amongst the best in the world. This, I think, cannot but be a source of pride to all members—a source of pride, not of vainglory. It is a source of legitimate pride that we have been tried and not found wanting. Those who have gone have responded nobly to the call of duty, and those who have died will live, I think I may say in no figure of speech, in the hearts of all of us who have stayed behind. And let me say, too, that I think even those who have stayed behind have on the occasions when they have been called upon, proved, whether in high positions or in low positions, that they are heart and soul in this cause with the great Empire of which we are so proud to form a part. If I spoke for hours I could add nothing to the feelings which hon. members, I know, experience on this day. I have the greatest pleasure and pride in seconding the motion which has been so eloquently proposed by the leader of the House.

Hon. J. CORNELL (South) [4.43]: Before the motion is put I desire to say a few words in support. I agree with all that has been uttered by the two hon. members who have preceded me, in respect of what has been done by the Commonwealth and by the Empire as a whole. But I do desire to deprecate the want of publicity that is in evidence as regards one of our Allies, the Ally that has stemmed the onward march of our enemies on the western frontier. Much has been said in the Press of this State regarding our Allies on the eastern frontier, the Russians. Much has been said, also, regarding the last nation to enter into the war, the Italians. But very little indeed has been said of that nation which stands as a landmark of liberty, of heart, and of all those factors that contribute to make a civilisation. I refer to France. That is my reason for adding

my tribute of praise to that nation to whom we all owe so much. It seems almost a satire on our statesmen, our diplomats, and indeed our civilisation, to find that a century ago we were overthrowing the one man who stood out in the opinion of the people of that time as a menace to civilisation and posterity; but after 100 years of the progress of civilisation we find to-day, when we compare the two, that so far as humane treatment and the observance of the laws of nations are concerned, there is as much difference between the Kaiser and the great Napoleon as there is between night and day. As Britishers we owe an obligation to the British Empire, and in the interests of that great nation, in the interests of the future, I hope that wherever due publicity and recognition can be given to France it will be given in this State as it has not been given in the past. We have a gigantic task before us, namely to preserve our Empire and the glorious institutions under which we live; but it must be recognised that despite what has been said about our enemies, all statistics and information available go to prove that never before in the history of the civilised world has a nation been so organised and marshalled as has Germany. Its organisation is wonderful, as we see when we learn that at the very outbreak of hostilities the German Government had every man in the German Empire card-indexed from Berlin, and knew where to place the finger on each man. After all, war is not a game of love. War to-day, as we have seen, is as bitter as it was in the days of barbarism. We have an enormous task before us, in the prosecution of which we should sink all our differences and unite in the one common object. When I say sink our differences, I mean that those in a position to give should give their all, with those who have only their lives to give. I have been termed a pessimist as regards the logical outcome of the gigantic struggle now before us, but I do not care. We can take any person who is a student of social evolution and of history, and we will find that he cannot but be appalled with the task

before us. That task is to win, and I say that we can win only by placing our whole hearts and thoughts and wealth at the disposal of the Empire.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM (North) [4.50]: Since the present position has been placed so seriously before us by the last speaker, I would like to add a few words, not only in support of the resolution, but in voicing an earnest appeal that everybody throughout the State and the Commonwealth should lend his best possible aid in assisting the Empire. It is just 12 months to-day since we were informed by cable that the Imperial Government were compelled to declare war against the German Empire. I say compelled, because if ever a nation was reluctant to enter into war it was the British Empire. No nation, however, with the slightest respect for itself and for its self-preservation could possibly, in similar circumstances, have stood out. The information we have received lately, while not perhaps of a discouraging nature, has not been at all hopeful. For 12 months this struggle has been carried on with varying success and losses, until at last we find ourselves in a very difficult position, a position brought about by the fact that both opposing forces seem to be of almost equal strength. I do not for one moment consider that the Germans are superior either in actual fighting or in generalship. But I do say that they have made such magnificent preparations and have got such a wealth and quantity of far-reaching guns and munitions that they have an advantage over the Allies. I do not, however, think there are any grounds for despair. It is a question entirely of endurance, and therefore I feel confident that the Allies will win. But they can win only on one condition, and that is that every man and woman does his or her utmost to assist the British Empire. And surely it is worth while, not only for us as members to do what we can, but also to try to induce everyone else to give assistance. Surely this great Empire of ours is worth fighting for, fighting till the last! We have

only to look at the map of the world and see what our forefathers have done. They have coloured the most desirable parts of it with pink. Almost the pick of it is in pink. I remember a remark once made by a German, who declared "Wherever we want to go we find the map coloured pink, and find the British there." Let us remember what the Commonwealth owes to the British Empire. For nearly 100 years we have been allowed to pursue our avocations without the slightest disturbance from any foe. No hostile shot has been fired against Australia, and so we have been able to carry out our work and improve our conditions without the slightest interference. Even further than that, we owe a debt of gratitude. Australia I claim to be the freest country in the world. It has the freest institutions. Every man and every woman has a vote to say under what laws they shall live and what taxes they shall pay, and the highest positions in the State are open to the meanest individuals. Indeed so good and liberal was the mother country in giving us home rule that there is not a single tie existing between us and the mother country to-day, except that represented by His Excellency the Governor. We have to be thankful. And I think we appreciate the liberality with which our applications for loan money have always been met. Those applications have been many and frequent, but they have been liberally responded to. Even in our own little State we are indebted to the British Empire to the extent of some 33 million pounds. These are important matters, and surely these institutions and this country is worth fighting for till the last. If, perhaps, it does not appeal to those who do not understand what the institutions are, or what an Imperial country is, let them remember that they have homes in Australia, that they live here. It is my opinion that, if the Germans win, the first indemnity they will ask for, after gold, is this continent of Australia. They will not take Canada, for the reason they would never know the day they might come into conflict with the United States. They will not want

Africa, on account of the climate, and India for them is too densely populated. But for an over-populated continental nation the ideal spot in the world is Australia. Here is a sea-girt continent with no neighbours; a small population to deal with, which they can either kill off or use as they think fit; a land that will produce everything that makes life worth living, from gold to fruit and bread; a land indented by magnificent harbours. Surely those who do not appreciate other things will appreciate the value of their homes and what they have in this country, everything worth living for; and if they cannot live in their own way life is hardly worth living, and therefore I say let them go and fight for it, and die rather than be beaten. Under these circumstances, I hope everybody will do the best possible for the Empire, that everyone who is able will go to the front, and that those who are not able to do this will do all they possibly can for those who can go, both before they leave and after they return, and see that they are well supplied with arms and munitions required to carry on the war. I have pleasure in supporting the resolution.

Hon. E. M. GLARKE (South-West) [4.58]: As one vitally interested in the war, I have nothing further to say against our enemies than this: that the barbarous practices carried on by the Germans would have fitted in well with the conditions of 1,000 years ago. I was of opinion that our enemies had the common business knowledge to see what a harmful thing it would be to the world at large to launch such a war. I am not keen to start fighting, but I have no hesitation in saying that this war must be fought to the bitter end. We have always been a free nation. I am proud to find that is not merely what we ourselves consider, but what other nations consider about us. I know we have the moral and practical support of America, though it may not be generally known to what extent they have assisted us with munitions. I do not wish to make any comparisons between our Allies. I believe they are all fighting and doing their best.

The mighty Russia is hampered, of course, for want of munitions. If we are going to make comparisons we must never forget little Belgium who held the giant up in the first stages of the war, and who took the first shock and bore it manfully. I say this is a righteous war and we must carry it to a successful issue. As far as sending men to the war from Australia is concerned, Australia is doing well. I regret there are some who are not fit to go. At the same time I am proud to say that the Australians have justified themselves. They have made for themselves a name that will go down to posterity, and their actions will be regarded as the actions of those of fighting men and will be the pride of Britishers for all time. I feel deeply on the question, and I am absolutely interested in it. I am one of those who want to see this fight fought to a finish. Our enemies must be so beaten that we shall not hear of such a war for ages to come. A lesson and a severe lesson must be administered to them. You may talk about Napoleon; Napoleon at all events fought the game fairly whatever else he was. I say unhesitatingly that the Germans, who have used such means, any barbarous means, against those opposing them, should in their turn have used against them all those machinations which they have used against us. Nothing is too bad for them. They deserve no more consideration than a savage wild beast. I have very much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Hon. F. CONNOR (North) [5.3]: May I be permitted to say that for the last two years I have had the privilege of living amongst the better class of Americans and the better educated men of that country, namely, naval and military officers, commercial men and others, and that I have also an acquaintance with the Americans of the Philippine Island. I have no hesitation in saying, for I know it to be a fact, that at least 80 or 85 per cent. of the Americans are in favour of the Allies. This information is not gleaned second hand; it is gleaned from personal acquaintance with the people. The very best class of them,

the military men, the professional men, the doctors, lawyers, naval officers, all of them practically are in favour of the Allies. Of course one will find in such an immense population supporters of the German-Austrian coalition, but they are very few in number, and with the exception of the Germans living in America, who naturally are loyal to their own people, they are few in number who are not in favour of the Allies. The very best class of the people, not only those living in America, but those living elsewhere in the world, are almost entirely upon our side. As an Irishman myself I want to voice my satisfaction of the fact that at Home and abroad, wherever these men are, the Irishman is found to be not backward in coming forward. He does go to the front and when he gets there God help the other fellow. Sufficient proof of what I am saying is found in the fact that I have only one son in the country old enough to go into training. He was 18 years old a few days ago and he is now in camp as a private.

The PRESIDENT: Perhaps in passing this motion members would wish to show their determination by standing up.

Question put and passed; members standing.

The PRESIDENT: Would it be necessary now to pass a motion that the resolution be transmitted to His Excellency the Governor?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It will be sent on by the Government.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: The House should do that.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: We passed a similar resolution last year, and I do not think it was transmitted by this House to the Governor.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: It is usual for such a resolution to go from the Council, and not to His Excellency through the Government.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central): I move—

That the President be asked to forward a copy of this resolution to His Excellency the Governor, for transmission to the Imperial authorities.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL (Metropolitan): I second the motion.

Question put and passed.

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. F. Connor, Hon. H. P. Colebatch, and the mover.

Library Committee.—The President, Hon. W. Kingsmill, and Hon. H. Millington.

Printing Committee.—The President, Hon. R. G. Ardagh, and Hon. A. Sanderson.

House Committee. — The President, Hon Sir E. H. Wittenoom, Hon. A. G. Jenkins, Hon. J. Cornell, and Hon. R. J. Lynn.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Third Day—Conclusion.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN (South-East) [5.8]: The reference in the Governor's Speech, and the resolution of to-day, are hardly necessary to impress upon hon. members the gravity of the position in which they are situated at the present time. Twelve months have expired to-day since Great Britain and her gallant Allies, all unprepared, entered upon their defence, and the defence of their smaller neighbours, against the enemy which had been preparing for 40 years—an enemy which had perfected such a force as the world had never previously dreamt of, and had even gone into the peaceful territory of their neighbours and built gun emplacements under cover of friendship and placed their spies in their most confidential departments. And yet victory has never been in doubt. I have listened with not the greatest of patience to some of the remarks of my hon. friend, Sir Edward Wittenoom. Victory for the Allies can never be in doubt.

The Colonial Secretary: Hear, hear!

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: And yet every additional day means so much human suffering, and the loss of so much treasure, that all the Overseas Dominions are at one with Great Britain that every nerve must be strained to accomplish at the earliest possible moment an honourable victory. Under these conditions right-thinking people, not only in Parliament, but out of it, will agree that every other form of strife should be suspended, that strikes in industries, on which the issue of the war depends, border upon treason, and that the provokers of strikes, who thought to pocket all the profits arising out of the nation's necessities through their employees, whom they called upon to speed up, are the arch-traitors of all. The Governor's Speech suggests that under these conditions all members of both Houses should be at one, and even my hon. friend who moved the adoption of the Address-in-reply might give himself the pleasure of a non-aggressive speech. Whatever may be said of acceptance of this suggestion in another place, where "party" is hardly escapable, there is no difficulty in the Legislative Council. Here we have nothing to do with the making or dismissing of Administrations. We have the higher duty of helping to perfect all measures that come to us, no matter from what source they emanate.

Hon. J. Cornell: We put on the varnish.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: I delight to impress this position upon my fellow members. The aim of every member of the second Chamber should be to exclude party feeling to the utmost and work harmoniously in the duty of revision and of perfecting all Acts of Parliament. I hold that there is no difficulty here. The Speech mentions the names of a number of measures that are coming down. These names are all quite friendly. Everything will depend upon the contents of the measures these names are to cover. I submit that it rests with the Government to maintain in the clauses of the Bills the promise of non-party action until the end of the war. Every

hon. member will hope that the Government will fulfil their promise, and that the session will not distract by strife attention from the great battle of all, in which every man here has his share. I should like to submit to Ministers that there will be need for caution under their proposal to submit Bills for the extension and continuance of emergency legislation. It is under that head that I see the greatest risk for contention. I would advise Ministers, if they would take it in the spirit it is offered, to go thoroughly into these measures, and not to content themselves by saying that they were passed and Parliament would be asked to extend the time. In view of all that has happened under the administration of these emergent measures, Ministers will provoke hostilities here, if not in another place, if they simply ask Parliament to continue the powers of the administration of these Boards. I submit without fear of contradiction that the administration of these emergent laws has worked far more mischief than good, and that the country to-day would be in a far better position if those Boards had never been created. All that is required, and I urged this when the Bills came forward, was some Statutory provision for placing the work of the old Seed Wheat Board on a sound basis. This Board had not the necessary Statutory authority. It was necessary that that authority should be given. I would suggest that Ministers should advise the Governor-in-Council to end the existence of all those Boards and by a measure of a couple of clauses clothe the trustees of the Agricultural Bank with any additional powers necessary for all the work of rendering assistance to farmers. The Agricultural Bank has been for many years the channel by which assistance has been given to farmers. All that is needed is to clothe the trustees with power to deal with the work of the old Seed Wheat Board and with any extension of it that has been undertaken by the Assistance to Settlers Board. Then there will be a simple administration without complex-

ity, without one Board running into another, and the Minister will be saved an immensity of trouble. It is a simple solution of the whole difficulty. In this direction I want to refer to a mistake in the Speech on which Mr. Colebatch placed his finger. Anyone reading that Speech would conclude that the whole of the farmers in this State had been at their extremity and that the whole of them had come on Ministers for bounty. What is the position? It is quite true that most of the farmers of this State have had a very hard struggle. In fact the farmer in the early years of his settlement on the land has a terrible struggle, but notwithstanding the almost universality of that struggle, only a fraction of the number of farmers applied to the Government for assistance, and then not as a benefaction. It was a purely business transaction covered by all the securities the settlers possessed and by the payment of adequate interest. It is necessary that this should be made clear so as to counteract the erroneous conclusion that everyone would come to, unless of course he were behind the scenes. There is a grave omission in the Governor's Speech. It ought to have contained a dignified protest against the action of the Commonwealth Government in throwing down the gauge of internal strife by re-submitting the vexed questions of the referenda. Such a protest would have come properly within the powers and duties of the Government of this State.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: What good would it do?

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: That is a matter which concerns not simply the necessary powers of the States but their very existence as separate sovereign States.

Hon. J. Cornell: You want to tell them that outside.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: My contention is that this is a matter which Ministers, as custodians of the rights and powers of this State, should have taken up. But quite apart from the question of the bearing of the matter on the

State's safety, there is the question of the inopportuneness of the re-submission of the referenda when the Governments of all the States are asking their Parliaments not to indulge in party strife but to hold their minds calm for the support of the Empire. Here at this juncture, deliberately, wilfully and inexcusably, the Commonwealth Government say it is quite true that on two previous occasions the whole of the States were divided bitterly into hostile camps, and on those occasions the questions were thrown out, yet now, while the nation is at death grips with its enemy, and with the enemy of the world, the gauge must be thrown down a third time. No Ministry, properly seized of its responsibilities, would have failed to refer to this matter in the Governor's Speech.

Hon. J. Cornell: It is a national question.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: Apart from the inopportuneness of this throwing down of the gauge, it is a fact that practically all the State Governments have in the past opposed nearly all the questions in the referenda. In the past nearly all, even Labour Ministries, have been opposed to this attacking of the powers of the States, but now they have mysteriously turned round. It has been impressed upon them that the Commonwealth has a Constitution in advance of that of any of the States, and that the quickest way to give to the States what they regard as the privileges of that Constitution, is to hasten on unification and to make the condition of the States untenable, and to take away from them the essential powers and thus force on unification and bring the people of the whole Commonwealth under one Constitution. I am sorry that Ministers have imbibed the poison of this advice. I have made my remarks as short as possible. My position to-day is this: I do not think that the Administration is what Western Australia needs. As a citizen and a voter I have not the necessary confidence in the Administration. I regard their plunge into socialistic enterprises as a huge and a costly mistake from which I think Ministers themselves would gladly escape if they saw the op-

portunity of doing so, but they feel bound to go on. Their intentions are good towards the section of the people who are not supporting them, and better still towards those sections of the people who are supporting them, and those people insist that the costly blunders shall be persisted in. Ministers therefore are helpless. To-day they would gladly be relieved if they could. I will not repeat all the sound advice given by Mr. Colebatch on this question, but I will say that the only way of escape will be presently to hand over the responsibilities to other people. How can they look out to-day on the condition of things? Departments which four years ago were hives of business activity are to-day almost deserted. The Government are at their wits' end to know what to do with those buildings. In the town where I live they have taken away all the clerks but one. They have left one officer in charge and have been measuring the building to decide to what use they can put it. The last I heard was that, after practically killing their Savings Bank branch in the town by transferring it to a private bank, with which only a portion of the people deal, and transferring it only on the day when the Commonwealth got to work with their savings bank in the post office, they are going to take the State Savings Bank business into the land office, in order to get the building occupied. Look at the army of surveyors imported at great cost who had more work than they could do! Four years ago we were wanting more surveyors, but to-day numbers of them have been driven out of the State and nearly all the others are practically unemployed. These two instances may be taken as a fair guide to the effect of the policy of the Government. I have not blamed Ministers' intentions. Their intentions are good to some and better to others, but as a result of their dream of State socialism, they are turning what used to be live business of the country into a wilderness. But while I say that, I repeat that this is not the House for making or dismissing Administrations, and I for one will do my share to help to improve such

measures as come before the House, from whatever party they come. As for the war, let hon. members set an example of absolute confidence—and not be afraid to express that confidence—in the nation's great leaders and in the righteousness and certain victory of our cause; and let the people as a whole work, as well as trust in the leaders of the nation, and confidently look forward to a triumphant victory.

Hon. A. SANDERSON (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.33]: First let me express my great pleasure at the return of our friend Dr. Saw as a member for the Metropolitan-Suburban province. I do not think I can say more than that if he can, in this Council Chamber, live up to the high reputation which he brings into it, all his political friends and supporters will have very good reason to be satisfied. I have said all I wish to say about my dear old friend the late Mr. Gawler, and I would also like to rule out, so to speak, the question which was raised at the commencement of the sitting. I do not think there is much to be said about the war; it is a question of action. My opinion is that after we have sent the best of our fighting men to the front, and after we have pledged our word to look after those they have left behind them, probably the best thing Western Australia can do—I do not speak at all dogmatically on the subject—is to put her house in order, so that we may be able to stand the stress and strain which is unquestionably coming upon us. Coming to the affairs with which we are here to deal, we have the dictum of my friend Mr. Kirwan that he has no objection to criticism but that it must be constructive criticism. I wonder what he will think when I have finished!

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Have you any suggestions to make?

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Yes, and one of them is that the hon. member really should not try the patience of hon. members by, I was going to say masquerading as a non-party man. I do not know anyone in this House that is a stronger supporter of the Government than he. That is the impression he has left on my mind, but I do not wish to indulge in

any personalities or recriminations with my hon. friend. How are we to act in the best interests of Western Australia at the present juncture? Mr. Cullen has pointed out that we in this Chamber cannot turn out the Government. Whatever vote we passed here would not turn out the Ministry. Then how are we to act, both for the protection of the people who sent us here and for our own reputation as business men? We should put our views as clearly and strongly as we can, and say that the Government must be carried on by the people in power. I would like to associate myself very strongly with Mr. Colebatch in his criticism of the Government, but I would ask the question, in view of the affairs of the country and the Empire at the present juncture, does he really think it tends to help on matters by telling the Government that if they were directors of a public company—I think I am quoting him correctly—they would be in the criminal dock?

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Another hon. member said they were all lunatics.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh: And that is helpful criticism.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I do not think the remark about lunatics was quite serious, but I think Mr. Colebatch was serious. The worst of it is, his remark was quite true. That is the trouble, and it makes matters much worse at a time like this.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: Do you think it right to say my remark was true?

Hon. A. SANDERSON: The hon. member will surely see the difference. Look what has been done in the Imperial Parliament, the mother of Parliaments, a model to us all, where we find Sir Edward Carson, Mr. Asquith, Mr. Lloyd George, and Mr. Bonar Law sitting side by side and telling the country that until the war is over they will drop all the political fighting without any sacrifice whatever of their political convictions. They will have one object, and one object only, and that is to push the war through to a successful conclusion. My ideal in Western Australia is that after we have dealt with the war by sending our men to the front, pro-

bably the best thing we can do for ourselves and for the Empire is to put our affairs in order. Now, I ask Mr. Colebatch again, if he considers that the fact of telling Ministers they ought to be in the criminal dock—

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: I did not say anything of the kind.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I am astonished to hear that. I have not a report of the hon. member's speech. He certainly said "criminal dock," and the impression left on my mind, and I believe on the minds of other members, was that that was the position of affairs. But I accept, without the slightest reservation, his disclaimer that mine was an accurate statement of his words.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: Anyway, you think they should have been there.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Certainly, but I go on to a much more pertinent criticism of hon. members, like those who have spoken both this session and last session, with regard to this eternal criticism of what they call socialistic ventures. The whole history of Western Australia, since it has had responsible Government, has been one series of socialistic experiments which came to a crash last year on the 4th August. Take the Agricultural Bank. Is that a socialistic experiment? It was started, I was going to say, with the almost unanimous approval of the whole of the country and has had the support of the country right through the piece. But which was the bank that was the cause of all the trouble in this State last year when the crisis came? We all know it was the Agricultural Bank and the Agricultural Bank only that failed to meet its responsibilities.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: That was not the fault of the bank.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Whose fault was it? It is a State institution.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: Have a go at the Commonwealth Bank whilst you are about it.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I am dealing with the affairs of Western Australia with which we are sent here to deal. What is the use of hon. members dragging up this

question of socialistic experiments and legislation when the whole of the history of this country has been one nightmare of socialistic enterprises since we received responsible Government in 1890?

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Why did not the hon. member oppose the freezing works last session?

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I can only reply to the hon. member that—

The PRESIDENT: I must ask the hon. member not to reply to interjections as they only confuse.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: They will not confuse me, Sir, but I will obey your order and will not reply to it. I am merely trying to point out that surely we should have done with this talking of socialistic enterprises. If it is to be indulged in, I, at any rate, will not take a part in the taunts being flung about this Chamber. I have stated publicly and privately from the beginning my protest against socialistic enterprises, whether the Agricultural Bank, the trams, or the State meat shop. They are all abominations to me from start to finish, and surely the lesson to be learned is that these enterprises, whether paying or non-paying, are a hideous danger and responsibility when we have to face such a crisis as we faced last year and as we are facing now. Now for a little constructive criticism and there one is bound not to go to any length. But I desire to touch on the question raised by Mr. Cullen on the matter of the Federal Government and unification. We are bound in this Chamber, as we cannot put the Government out, to accept them and make the best of them. There is the future to be considered and we can look to the future, although this is not the time to enter into a long argument or dissertation as to what to do or what not to do when the war is finished. But we can give the lead to those outside and make up our minds as to the course we intend to pursue in the public affairs of the State during the war and when the war is over. And my own opinion is that if we are going to abolish one of the Houses of Parliament, which we hear so much about in the country, I agree to it but I want to see the Lower

House abolished. The affairs of Western Australia, if they were confined to the discussion of local matters, would be much more intelligently criticised. There would be less personality and it would be much better for everyone in the country if Western Australia was run by the Legislative Council. There is less party feeling in the Legislative Council, there is no question about that. There is less personal feeling than there is in the Lower House. I do not think anybody who has sat and listened to the debates in the two chambers can come to any other decision than that there is more knowledge and experience of Western Australia among the members of the Legislative Council than among members in another place. I do not say that with any offence to members of another place, but some of them are younger and have not handled the big things that men here have done. They have not had the experience of Western Australia and its industries. Members can see that I am acting as a kind of candid critic, if I may do so, of the two Houses. As far as local interests are concerned this House is far better qualified to manage the affairs of Western Australia than the other Chamber. With regard to unification I want to give, not my own opinion whether it carries much weight with the leader of the Government or Mr. Kirwan, to say nothing of other members; but the opinion of a great and experienced statesman who may be called "the grand old man of Western Australia," Sir John Forrest, and no doubt members have read the report in to-night's *Daily News* of the speech in the Federal Parliament made by Sir John Forrest a few nights ago. He said—

The position to which I have drawn attention must, if it continues, result in the taking over of the State debts by the Commonwealth, and, unless some fairer and better scheme is devised, must eventually mean the unification of Australia. So far as I can judge, the States, within a very short time, will be unable to pay their way, because of the invasion by the Commonwealth of the taxable area which was thought to be reserved to them.

That opinion must carry some weight with members here and with people outside this Chamber. I am hoping that my honourable friend who asked for constructive criticism will admit that this is some attempt to outline construction on which we should proceed with public affairs here. If we are to continue the wrangle on socialistic enterprises—for my part I do not believe it does any good either inside or outside the House because people have made up their minds. The people for good or evil are committed to socialistic enterprises beginning with the Agricultural Bank and ending with the fish-shop. To me when I hear the criticism that these enterprises do not pay—the fish-shop, or the meat-shop or the timber mills do not pay—I say, “Would you be in favour of them if they did pay”? Suppose the fish-shop was returning a profit of £5 a day, or a week, or a month, and at the end of the year there was a revenue from the fish-shop or a revenue from the meat-shop, or a revenue from the timber mills. I ask the question of members who are so destructive in their criticism of the socialistic enterprises—

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: We only want to know what they cost.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: If that is the case I want to take members a step further and ask a pertinent question. Assuming for the moment that any of the enterprises pay does that take members any further? The more they pay from my point of view the worse it is.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Then you ought to be satisfied now.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: When we are losing? If members think we have seen the worst of things they are mistaken. I do not want to pose as a pessimist. The only persons who have reason to have any serious anxiety are our creditors. As far as the people of the country are concerned there is no reason for any pessimism or depression, although there is every reason for care and economy, but we cannot go bankrupt because we are relying upon the Federal Government. They will take very good care we are not allowed to repudiate in any shape or form as far as our public obligations are

concerned. But, I want to avoid seeing Western Australia placed in such a position that we will not be able to discuss on equal terms with the Commonwealth Government the arrangement that is going to be made which is outlined by Sir John Forrest. That is the reason why I want to see the Western Australian Treasurer and Western Australia in a strong position in order that we may negotiate as an equal with the Federal Government. Then, it appears to me, reconstruction will come about. If we are to indulge in retorts, recriminations and criticisms, it is a fair retort on the part of the leader of the House and anyone else to ask, “Why do members who say they are in favour of the State Steamship Company say they are opposed to the meat-shop?” One honourable member has been twitted, and he cannot be counted as a labour supporter, with having supported State steamships to convey the wheat away long before the State Steamship Service was inaugurated, and, as one who has followed pretty closely West Australian affairs since Responsible Government, it seems to be undoubtedly that from the jump we have had these socialistic enterprises and we cannot get rid of them now. I hope I have not indulged in recrimination or undue wrangling?

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Certainly not.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I would like to repeat this with regard to socialistic enterprises, and I shall not refer to them again. I am sick and tired of them, but the people of the country are committed to them and we have to make the best out of them until we have the reconstruction scheme brought about. I do not think we shall have many opportunities this session for discussion. We have not a long bill of fare before us, and I pledged myself when the war broke out that I would not trespass on the time of the House in indulging in extraordinary criticisms on extraordinary Bills. But this Address-in-reply, thanks possibly to your kind discrimination, Mr. President, does permit members to deal with one or more subjects, and as far as my time is concerned that

is devoted to public matters. I am trying to work out on paper before I place before the public this question to which Sir John Forrest has referred. And, at present, I have arrived at no definite conclusion. The outline of the scheme seems to be in the direction of unification, but what unification means must be clearly explained both to oneself and one's fellow subjects before we can bring it before them or any other body. The administration of the country is not in our hands but in the hands of members who sit on the Treasury bench. And, I think, even they, as was pointed out by Mr. Kirwan, must have some anxious moments. I will not add to them by indulging in taunts and recriminations. I am very fond myself of party politics. I think it the very essence of sound Government to have party politics, but there are times, and this seems to be one, when we should devote the whole of our energies to the one end, to get through this war with a crushing victory for the Allies; and it is only because I think that we should put our own place in order that I venture to speak this afternoon. I have a few notes here but they all begin and end with socialistic enterprises. Every member who has spoken on other subjects in a very few moments comes back to socialistic enterprises. I can only hope that honourable members will assist the Government in trying to put their affairs in order, but we must always remember that the responsibility of administration is in their hands and not in ours. They do get criticism in this House and sometimes of value, and after all said and done about the non-party House, members, I think Mr. Kirwan himself will admit that in this Chamber there is no undue exhibition of party, and if there has been in the past, I think we might fairly call a truce to-day and have no more of it. As to the responsibility of the Government, if they think they can continue week after week, and month after month, with the financial position—and I am not blaming them as much as some people, the war and the drought have had their effect, but whether there had been no war and no

drought, it was only a matter of time. If they conducted the affairs of State as they have done during the last few years it was only a matter of time before they drifted on the rocks. I began with a reference to Mr. Kirwan, let me end in the same way. I am not going to outline the constructive policy he asked for, but he and others will be advised if they think about the future government of the country—and my idea of the future government of the country is unification and the responsibility of the government of the different localities in Western Australia thrown back on a Chamber such as this is a Chamber composed of men of considerable experience and considerable wisdom in dealing with public affairs, and, as I have already said, without that bitter party and personal feeling which is in evidence elsewhere.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [6.1]: In making my observations on the Address-in-reply I do not wish to be misunderstood. I shall endeavour, as far as possible, to follow on the lines indicated by the previous speaker. It will be necessary probably for me to criticise many of the actions of the Government, but I desire to assure the Colonial Secretary that my criticism will be made with only one object in view, namely to bring about an improved condition of affairs. I am prepared to discuss the actions of the Government from the standpoint that Ministers mean well. I believe that in many of the undertakings on which the Government have embarked they meant well. But, unfortunately, they have been inexperienced men, and they have been either too strong or too weak to consult and confer with those willing and able to advise. As I said yesterday, to me it is immaterial whether the affairs of this country are administered by a Labour Government or by a Liberal Government. My whole personal interest is tied up in this State, and, let any one say what he will, when I speak in this House on behalf of the people I represent I do my best to put their case forward, and in representing them I represent myself. I honestly do not care who administers. Liberal or Labour, so long as we get

some sort of decent administration. During the last four years we have had administration of which no one might be proud. The best that the mover of the Address-in-reply could say was, boiled down, the wheat being separated from the chaff, "I cannot say anything good about the Government, but the Empire is up against an awkward trouble, and the least I can do is to say nothing bad about Ministers." That is what I extracted from the speech of Mr. Kirwan in moving the Address-in-reply; and Mr. Kirwan urged upon other hon. members to adopt the same attitude. For my part I hold utterly different views on the subject. I claim that it is the duty of hon. members to express their opinions. They are here for that purpose. It is their duty to tell this or any other Ministry how they think the affairs of the State and this portion of the British Empire should be carried on during the trying period ahead of us. However, I tried to make myself clear on that point yesterday. It is our duty to see that the affairs of the country are administered in such a way that we may ultimately become of assistance to the Empire and not a drag, as we are likely to be. The affairs of Western Australia ought not to be allowed to drift longer as they have been allowed to drift during the last three or four years. Yesterday I referred to the deficit for the past month. The Press did not seem to catch my point properly, and, therefore, I will touch on the subject again. I will take the Treasury figures for last month. Of course, I cannot take anything else, because we cannot get anything else. Read in conjunction with the Treasurer's explanation yesterday, those figures, which we may take as correct, and which do not give anything but an optimistic view of the situation, seeing that they take no account of interest or sinking fund or anything of that sort, disclose a deficit for the last month of £150,000. That is according to the Treasury figures, which are the only profit and loss account we get, and which are pretty accurate. They take no account of material on hand,

sleepers and so forth; but neither do they include the liabilities of thousands of pounds owing by the Government from one end of the State to the other. Taking the Treasury figures as a profit and loss account, for the past month the State made a loss of £150,000. I reckon that out as a loss of £5,000 a day, or, for an eight-hours day, which represents the policy of the present Government, £600 per hour, or £10 per minute. That is the result of the first month of this financial year. Looking at the matter from another standpoint, every man, woman, and child in this State has been mortgaged to the extent of 10s. per head on last month's transactions. There are about 300,000 people in this State, and the deficit amounts to about £150,000 for last month. Before proceeding I wish to make some reference to the able speech delivered by Mr. Millington in seconding the Address-in-reply. That hon. member evidently agrees that speech was given to us to conceal our thoughts, because, after Mr. Kirwan had concluded, Mr. Millington simply rose and said, "Those are my sentiments: I second the motion." For my part, I have come to the conclusion that Mr. Millington is unable to deliver two opposite speeches on the selfsame subject. I have reason to believe that Mr. Millington has been delivering speeches in caucus somewhat on the lines of the speeches that we deliver here. It will be interesting if Mr. Millington, should he have the opportunity of again speaking to the Address-in-reply, would stand up here and deliver through you, Mr. President, to the electors of this State the speech he ought to have delivered last week and the speech that he does deliver when criticising members of the Ministry in caucus. Next, I would like to touch on the much discussed freezing works at Wyndham. The matter is one I can claim to know something about. I am inclined to give the Government credit for what they have attempted to do in this connection. The Government of this State have at last realised that something should be done for the North, and done

at once. The possibility of freezing works, or the promise of such works, has been in evidence for years past. It is years ago since a Liberal Government made provision on the Estimates for such an undertaking. However, they failed to go on with the works. Then a Labour Ministry came into power, and Mr. Johnson, then Minister for Works, and an authority on everything, condemned the proposal. At last, however, the Government woke up to the fact that something must be done; and the matter being urgent, they started out. I believe, with an honest desire to do what was right. But from a lack of experience and from an objection to consulting with any one who did know and could give advice on the subject, they appear to have made a hopeless mess of the freezing works, for the time being at all events. Let me give one instance of the necessity for freezing works, an instance that occurred this year. A man named Dillon went into the back blocks of East Kimberley, among the natives, practically on his own, five or six years ago. This year he had reached the stage of having 100 four-year old bullocks. Before he could ship them, he had to dip them, and he put them through the dip near Wyndham. The stock inspector was away and the cook was in charge. Well, the cook cooked the bullocks. The shipping people say it was the Stock Department that did the mischief, and the Stock Department say it was the shipping people; but the fact remains that of Mr. Dillon's shipment of 100 bullocks only 31 were landed at Fremantle. Sixty-nine were lost on the voyage. The freight was £3 10s. per head. Thus, after payment of freight and deduction of agent's commission, Mr. Dillon owed his agent £120.

The Colonial Secretary: Those bullocks were dying when put on board the ship.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It matters not whether the Stock Department cooked the bullocks or the shipping people killed them on the voyage, but the ship that brought those bullocks to Fremantle is

one of the best in the trade, having been built for the Indian horse trade. At all events, the fact remains that 69 bullocks out of 100 were lost on the voyage. Here we have the finest cattle country in Australasia, and men going into the back blocks to try and develop it, with this result—when they reach the stage of having something to sell, they lose their little all. These are facts which should, I think, induce the Government to push on with the freezing works in the manner suggested. Further, let me call attention to the fact that not only did the pastoralist I refer to lose cattle on that voyage, but out of 785 shipped only 596 were landed, 189 being lost on the voyage. Apart from that, I have made it clear to the House on more than one occasion that when a cattle steamer, say the "Kwinana," comes out of Wyndham with 800 bullocks on board, every one of those bullocks loses 100 pounds in weight by the time Fremantle is reached. And this loss is not in bone and sinew, but in flesh. Eight hundred bullocks each losing 100 pounds at 6d. per lb. represent a wastage of £2,000 between the port of shipment and the port of consumption.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: It has taken you a number of years to find that out.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It is always assumed, apparently, that we people who understand the business have some ulterior object in view. We are not listened to, and we are not consulted. The Government prefer to pick up some carpet-bagger or adventurer who corners them with a lovely scheme to save £50,000 on the transaction. When the gentleman gets the Government into the bag, he cannot carry out his promises, and the Government have to buy him out. I plead to the Government to consult members of this Chamber or of the other Chamber who understand the subject. I do not profess to know much, but I do know something about the pastoral industry. The North Province is represented in this House by Sir Edward Wittenoom, Mr. Connor, and myself; and will anyone deny that we have the development of the North at heart and would give hon-

est and reliable advice in connection with a matter like this?

Hon. R. G. Ardagh: Why did you not start the works yourselves?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: That is just the point I have been waiting for. One of the undertakings which the Government should start is freezing works at Wyndham. There are millions of acres of country in the North not yet taken up. Now, if present holders are allowed to establish freezing works, what hope has the man who comes afterwards? How are the millions of acres yet lying idle to be stocked and what would happen if the present holders combined and got control of the freezing works? If there is one enterprise which the Government should take in hand it is freezing works, and that not only at Wyndham, but throughout all the northern parts of Western Australia, in the same way as has been done in Queensland. Queensland was brought out of darkness into light by this means, and the same can be said of New Zealand.

Sitting suspended from 6.17 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I was speaking of what had taken place in New Zealand and Queensland and elsewhere where freezing works have been established, and I think I can predict without fear of contradiction that if freezing works were established on the northern portion of our coast the same result would follow. I can say further that there is no hope whatever of properly developing the northern part of this country unless freezing facilities are provided on the lines I suggest. Mr. Kirwan has asked why private enterprise had not taken up the matter of freezing works. In the days when private enterprise might have taken it up there was the same difference of opinion among members of the pastoral community as there is to-day, namely they could not trust one another as to what share each was to have in the undertaking. That being so I do not think it would be a fair thing for the public to put themselves in the hands of a combination controlling the meat supply of the State. If they do, then the public are bound to suffer. Apart from

that, I do not think private enterprise would take on ventures of this kind in these days when everything likely to be profitable is socialised. I do not think any private capital is available for freezing works up North. If there is, then there is plenty of room for development in the untouched portions of the country up there. But the northern portion of the State will never be developed as it should be, except freezing facilities are provided. When a man has worked himself into the position of owning 100 head of cattle, he finds himself losing on those cattle as in the case of Dillon. With freezing works at Wyndham those bullocks would be worth £1,000, but shipping them under existing conditions resulted in a loss of £120. Hon. members frequently speak in favour of agricultural railways here, there, and everywhere. Unfortunately, some hon. members advocate agricultural railways where there is no possibility of successful agriculture.

Hon. E. McLarty: That is a matter of opinion.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Yes, and I assume that when a member comes here and expresses himself in favour of a railway, I have an equal right to oppose it. I am not opposing any of these railways, beyond saying we should not construct agricultural railways except in agricultural country. Those people up North, with possibilities of pastoral development, cannot get any facilities at all, not even a well, and when it comes to getting their cattle to port there is 50 miles of country to be negotiated without water. Let me read this joint letter which I have received from six pastoralists, whose holdings are in the neighbourhood of Broome—

We beg to draw your attention to the appalling condition of the water supply on the stock route from Beagle Bay to Broome, on the latter portion of which there is no water supply now for watering stock for fifty miles, namely from Wanganut to the Broome Common. Some years ago the Government fixed up some troughing on a disused well (Bone's Well) which belonged to Streeters, but the well and

trough, through want of attention, also age, are quite useless. To enable us to get our stock to Broome for shipment it requires at least two wells between Wanganut and Broome. We would suggest a well and troughing to be put at Barred Creek (25 miles from Wanganut) and another at what is known as the Two Wells, about 10 miles from Barred Creek. (There were once two old wells at this place). This would then leave a distance of 15 miles to Broome Common. At the present time it is almost impossible to get through with our cattle, except in the wet season, and as we are all only small squatters we trust you will bring this before the Minister and have it attended to at once, and oblige.

That is only another indication of the difficulties men have to contend with up there. As to the possibilities of the North, let me refer hon. members to what Mr. Surveyor Canning has said. He is not a man given to making erratic statements. He knows the northern portion of the State, from Wyndham right down to Perth, and it was he, it will be remembered, who established what is known as the Canning stock route. He told me with his own lips that there is lying untouched and unused a strip of country behind Wyndham and Derby capable of carrying 20 million sheep. That country will be unused until facilities are provided for bringing stock to market. When we have such an area of country lying there, surely water supply at least should be available on the track to port. Then, of course, as the country developed freezing facilities would have to be provided at Derby and other ports for the South. I am advocating the pushing on of the works at Wyndham because Wyndham is the furthest away and a most difficult place to handle, owing to the fact that it is in tick infested country. Dipping the cattle up there in the hot season and putting them on the boat, tends to all sorts of complications followed by heavy mortality. That freezing works will have to be established at Derby and other places later on no one will deny. They must and

will come, or the northern portion of the State will never be developed as it should be. What I am concerned about is the holding up of this commendable start which the Government made to have the freezing works established by next year. It was published in the Press in June last that Mr. Nevanas had the contract, and had undertaken to complete the works by next June. Now we have the statement by the Premier in another place that this man had a contract to erect the works for £150,000, and that the officers of the department said it could not be done for less than £200,000. Yet the contract has been cancelled. This man Nevanas, I understand, undertook to complete the works by June next, and now, in consequence of the cancellation, the Government will have to spend an additional £50,000, and the works will not be completed until a year later. The question is, why was the contract cancelled? Having a contract of that description no private employer would have cancelled it. The contractor might have asked to have it cancelled, in which case he would have to pay compensation. But this contract appears to have been cancelled notwithstanding that the Public Works officers stated that it would cost £50,000 more to complete than the contractor had undertaken to complete it for. If the works are to be delayed another year it will mean a serious loss to the people up there. I hope the Minister will give an explanation satisfactory to those concerned, and that the works will be pushed on without unnecessary delay. I believe the Government started out on this work realising the difficulties and with an honourable intention to solve the problem and solve it quickly, and I believe they were on the right track. The matter was urgent, and if they were going to save £50,000 it was a fair thing to slip in quickly and secure the contract. But to let the contract, which their own officers said would cost £200,000, to a man prepared to do it for £150,000, and at the same time save a year, and then to cancel that contract and pay compensation, presents a problem diffi-

cult for me to understand. I hope the Minister will tell us something about this contract. Certainly we are entitled to know all. If we had been consulted at the onset the difficulty would never have arisen. I hope we will have an assurance from the Minister that the work will be proceeded with, even if it is by day labour, as I understand the proposal now is, and I hope no time will be lost in pushing the work to completion. The contractor must have known, and did know when he made the contract, that he could never complete it under the conditions imposed. On the question of freight, the material required for the work was anything from 10,000 to 15,000 tons. There are only two steamers visiting Wyndham, two Government boats. The "Kwinana" visits about every three to five weeks, and the "N 2" visits en route for Port Darwin, about every two months. The "N. 2" is under a mail contract and has to keep to schedule time, and has not half an hour to waste on the way up or down. The "Kwinana" is a cattle boat. She is due at Wyndham at a certain date, at Derby at another date, and so on right through the season to pick up her shipments of cattle that have been driven to port. Someone, however, appears to have undertaken to deliver by these two steamers 10,000 tons or 15,000 tons of material at Wyndham.

Hon. J. Duffell: Not necessarily by these steamers. He was going to charter other steamers.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: There were 10,000 to 15,000 tons of material to be landed at Wyndham.

The Colonial Secretary: Ten thousand tons.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: They could only land 15 tons per day at Wyndham. If one of the steamers went into Wyndham and had 1,500 tons of cargo she has to lie there for 30 days to discharge it. What is going to happen to fat stock that would be waiting for shipment for that length of time? It would take seven months of continuous landing to land all that material at Wyndham. How, then, in the name of

common sense, is a man going to erect works in ten months? Probably he would get the roof first and the foundation last, or vice versa. He would not know how he would get the material. Yet knowing this Mr. Nevanas published in the *Sunday Times* on the 13th June last the fact that he was going to build these works and have them completed by June next. He must have known, and he did know, and if the Government did not know they should have known, that it was a physical impossibility, and that it could never be done. It would take seven months alone to land the material at Wyndham.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Did they not pay him a big sum to inspect and report?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I do not know anything about that; I am merely seeking information.

The Colonial Secretary: You have already had that information.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: We have not had the information that it would take seven months to land the material, and that the works were to be put up in ten months. Reference was made this afternoon by one hon. member to the support I have given to the State steamship service in this State. I have supported this service from the outset. When the Wilson Government suggested the State steamship service on the North-west coast it was supported by myself, and when the Labour people come along with a similar proposal, I again support it.

Hon. J. Cornell: I do not think anybody opposes it now.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Given proper steamships, and having got rid of the "Western Australia," and under the present management, if this management is left alone, I am quite satisfied that it will become a profitable undertaking in the near future. The mystery of those who know anything about the business is how the Government have been able to do anything at all with the "Western Australia." When they wanted to send her to Port Darwin she had to take 1,500 tons of coal, and that coal cost her 30s. a ton. Then that only left 250 tons of space for cargo. If they had used Collie

coal as suggested, there would have been no room for any cargo at all. She would never have carried enough coal to take her to Wyndham. Having got rid of the "Western Australia," and having the possibilities of a better boat, there is plenty of good work for the Government to do with these State steamers, not only in taking up material for the development of the North-West, but in taking back live stock to the metropolitan area. We are told that this is a socialistic enterprise. Are not the railways through the agricultural areas, in regard to which the hon. Mr. McLarty interjected this evening, socialistic proposals? These men up north cannot get railways by which to send their stock to the market. Why are not these people entitled to shipping facilities, as well as the agriculturists down here are entitled to railway facilities? That is a logical view of the position to take. I sat behind the Government in their venture from the onset. In the early stages I saw that the State steamship service was going on the rocks and I tackled the position. The result has been that it has now been placed on a business footing, and is, I think, going to give good results. The same may be said of other socialistic enterprises. If the agricultural people have been paying too much for their machinery, and there is any truth in the statement that there was a combine amongst the machinery people, and if the Government thought they could produce machinery better and cheaper than this combine, and thought they could defeat the ends of this combine, they had a perfect right to take this on. But the question is, are these works likely to bring about this result?

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Are they run properly?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: We heard some months ago that this was just the one place where everything was run properly and where the Government stroke was never heard of. We have heard that they were a happy family there, and that the manager was a masterpiece, and the right man in the right place. Now what hap-

pens? We hear Ministers telling another story altogether. We hear the Hon. Mr. Angwin on Mr. Davies, the late manager, and Mr. Davies on the Hon. Mr. Angwin. I claim that we have a Public Service Commissioner here, and that he is the gentleman who should have to deal with Mr. Davies.

The Colonial Secretary: He does not come under the Public Service Act.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It does not matter. When I had something to say about the State Steamship service, the Government appointed four Royal Commissions to inquire as to whether what I said was true or not. When they found that what I said was true, they shut up the inquiry, and I never got a verdict of the court which they created. Now, we have Mr. Davies on the State Implement Works. Why cannot Mr. Davies have four Royal Commissions, and why cannot there be an inquiry into the State Implement Works?

Hon. J. Cornell: Is a Royal Commission appointed when the manager of a mine is sacked?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: He is not the manager of a mine. These are our affairs.

Hon. J. Cornell: It is the shareholders' affair in connection with a mine.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I feel inclined to say—

Do what one may.

Dogs will bark and asses will bray.

But that of course is not Parliamentary. Mining ventures are private ventures, and you can leave the shareholders to deal with them. But these are our enterprises, we are all shareholders. If what Mr. Angwin said about Mr. Davies is correct, then Mr. Angwin has failed in his duty to the State. If what Mr. Davies says about Mr. Angwin is correct, the only inference to be drawn is that Mr. Angwin is not fit to occupy his present position. I do not know Mr. Davies in any way, but I say he should be given an opportunity to clear his character, or he should have been dealt with more severely than he has been. Unless the Government tackle these propositions, and put it upon some sort of satisfactory basis, they will be tackled by somebody on behalf of the State sooner or later.

These propositions have to be tackled. The difficulties into which they have been allowed to drift necessitate their being tackled, and tackled right here and now. One of the principal charges in connection with the matter is, I understand, the question of costs and the keeping of accounts. I gather from the Press, having no other source of information, that the Public Works Department keeps the accounts, that the management run the works, and the Public Works Department runs the business part of them.

The Colonial Secretary: Only recently.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Implements have been sold from these works during the last twelve months. The Minister now says in the Press that they did not even know the cost of the articles they were selling. Could anything be more monstrous? The first thing that a business man does, if he has anything to sell, is to find out the cost of his goods, and what it would cost to sell them, and what profits he wants to make, and he then fixes his price.

The Colonial Secretary: That was the duty of the manager.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Not if that particular portion of his work was taken away from him and handed to the Public Works Department. We are told that machinery went out of the works twelve months ago without being debited to the customers, or the customers having been asked for payment. Probably they never will be asked for payment. If this is tackling the machinery works, and if this is the way the machinery combine is being tackled, there can be only one result—namely that the combine will be justified in charging the prices they have been charging. The State can never hope to compete against them, no matter what the prices are, under conditions of this sort. I am not condemning the State Implement Works. It may be they were justified. But if they are necessary, for goodness sake let the Government run them on such lines that they will become a useful adjunct to the State, instead of a drain upon the Treasury, as they are at the present time. There is one other matter I have to deal with, and that is in re-

gard to State importations. The Government have been attempting to do what the merchants of the State should have been doing, and what the merchants of the State would have done if they had been satisfied that they would have been left alone when they got their supplies here. There are just as keen business men in this State as there are elsewhere. They would have brought flour, wheat and all the other necessities to this State from the Argentine, India, or other parts of the world, if they had been satisfied that they could place them on the market on good terms. What did the Government do? They imported wheat, bran, pollard and maize. During the last week or two, to our astonishment, we read in the Press that the Government were calling for tenders for the purchase of not less than 500 tons of wheat, not less than 500 tons of bran, not less than 500 tons of pollard, and not less than 500 tons of maize. They, therefore, brought a lot of stuff into the country which evidently is not wanted now.

The Colonial Secretary: The Government could not foresee what the state of the market would be.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: This was a business risk that some merchant should have undertaken, some man who could foresee things and who would be prepared to take a business risk if left alone. On the question of distribution, it is common talk—I may be wrong and the Minister will correct me if I am—that there are some 300 or 400 tons of bran missing which cannot be accounted for. I give the statement for what it is worth, but judging from the reports we receive from the country I should not be surprised if it turned out to be true. I am told that one man sent down for a quantity of maize. The Government, however, wanted to get rid of their bran, and accordingly sent a truck of bran along to this man. The man replied that he did not want bran, that he had asked for maize. The Government then said, "Can you sell it?" and the man replied that he thought he could. He thereupon sold and distributed the bran, and sent

down a schedule of the prices he had received. The next thing he knew was that he got a cheque for the full amount of the bran. He got the bran in the first place, but did not want it. He then asked what he was to do with it, and was told to distribute it if he could. He distributed it and sent down particulars of the sale, and much to his astonishment the next thing he got was a cheque for the bran. If the Minister inquires he will find that there is a good deal in what I have said. The same thing applies to my reference to machinery. It is my duty to tell the Minister where I think he can find some machinery that has not been paid for. I want to assist the Minister, and the only way to assist him is to expose such fallacies. With regard to the famous contract with the millers, particulars of which were published this morning, that is a contract which never should have been made. It is forecasted in the Governor's Speech that we are to be asked to re-enact some of the emergency measures. The Minister told us that we were a party to the passing of this legislation. So far as I am concerned, there is not going to be a re-enactment of the boards which are running the country, some members of which are getting big pay and doing nothing for it. Those boards were brought into existence to fix the price of food, the product of this State principally, the prices of which were likely to be affected, not because of the war, but because of the drought. Now the drought has come to an end there is no necessity for the members of the boards to wander about the country interfering with the legitimate business of private enterprise. There is another matter I would refer to, and that is the control of the pearling industry at Broome. That is a matter that has not yet been done with. We know that Broome holds the best percentage of any town in Australia in regard to the men it has sent to the front. We admit that the industry is paralysed because there is no sale for shell, and that may be the reason why such a big majority of the white population there enlisted. There was a considerable

number of white men engaged in pearling at Broome and a fairly large white population exists there. Before going to the war the men who enlisted had permits from the Federal Government to employ coloured labour and they had licenses from the State Government to pearl in certain areas. Now that these men have gone, much to our surprise, a combination has appeared in Broome with 30 or 40 boats, and they are monopolising the trade. That may be all right just now, but what I am concerned about is that when the men who have gone to the war return to Broome, will they be in the position to again get the permits which they previously held. We must remember also that only a limited number of permits is issued. I hold that on the return of the men who have enlisted, the existing licenses to the combination who are working now will have to be cancelled. That is a reasonable request to make, but it is difficult to arrive at that this is much more a Federal than a State matter. In these days when we hear so much from the Federal people of trusts and combines, it is astounding to find that they have been a party to handing the pearling industry to a combine, but we know that the Federal Labour people do not like the pearling industry because of the employment it provides for coloured men. It may be that in allowing the combine to come in an opportunity will be created to abolish the industry altogether. A special point in favour of the pearling industry at Broome is that so many white men are dependent on it. The white population is fairly large and the town of Broome is one of the best along the coast north of Geraldton, and people there have lived on the industry. But if the Federal Government can squeeze all the white people out and make it a black industry, then the opportunity will present itself to abolish it. I hope that that is not the case. I hope that the licenses have been granted to the combination only to enable the town to tide over the existing difficulties while the men who were for-

merly engaged in it are away at the war. Living on our energies as we will have to do we cannot afford to lose any industry, let it be pearly at Broome or any other. All industries are wanted to keep this portion of the Empire together during the times that we are going through. Reference is made in the Speech to the disease among miners, and we are promised an amendment of the Mining Act. If this measure has for its object the saving of the lives of men engaged in the mining industry, and it contains any reasonable proposal in that direction, it should certainly have the support of every hon. member in this House.

Hon. J. Cornell: That is all you will be asked to do.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The lives of men are too valuable in these times to spare any one of them, and any measure that has for its object the minimising of risk or of disease attendant on any industry will have my support. Reference is also made in the Speech to the inebriates' home, the drink question and the closing of hotels. On the liquor question and on the closing of hotels I hold pronounced views, and when the Bill comes along, as I hope it will in due course, I shall express my views fully on this subject. The tendency is to look upon the wholesale consumption of intoxicating liquor as a disease, but I look upon it as a crime. I consider it is a crime for men to absorb enormous quantities of alcohol as they are absorbing it in these days. If I had my way on this question, I would make it a punishable offence for a man to "shout" for another, and if later on a referendum is taken on the matter, I shall ask that the question of "shouting" shall be put before the public. I think the matter only wants to be discussed on the public platform throughout the State and the public will realise what an enemy intoxicating drink has become in our midst, an enemy even as great as Germany. It is eating the lives out of the young men and they do not seem to find it out until it is too late. By the pernicious system of "shouting" young

men get the desire for alcohol and they soon become wrecks. We can see that in all directions. When the question comes before the House I shall have a good deal to say upon it. There is one more matter to which I desire to refer, and it is in regard to the Bread Act. I shall ask the Colonial Secretary to drop this because if ever there was a conspiracy between journeymen employed in this business and the big bakers to get all the business and work into their own hands, it is here. That was the object of the Bill of last session, and if it comes up again I will tackle it. I regret I have taken up the time of the House for so long, but really, like Tennyson's brook, one could go on taking for ever on the misdeeds of the Government. The question is what to leave alone. Everywhere we look we see difficulties facing us and no way out of them and no desire on the part of the Government to find a way out of them, so far as one can see. My object in making these remarks is to bring about an improvement, and in one or two instances that I know something about if there is any assistance that I can give to any Government, be it Liberal or Labour, that assistance will be freely and frankly given. The Colonial Secretary knows what I have done for some of the departments. Ministers seem to be surrounded by one political atmosphere and they seem to think that we are surrounded by another political atmosphere, and that no good can come out of what we may suggest. I hope that suggestions that may be made will be considered and that criticism will be accepted, not that one wants to get the present Government out of office, but one wants to see the affairs of the country conducted as they should be. Money controls everything and the finances of this country will soon be making their effect felt upon the destinies of the State and upon the people of the State as well. I have been dreaming about that £150,000 loss of last month; no less than £5,000 a day, £600 an hour, or £10 a minute. That is the result of the Treasurer working eight hours a day last month. In addition to that, every man, woman, and child

in this State is saddled as a result of that month's deficit with a mortgage of 10s.

Question put and passed: the Address adopted.

House adjourned at 8.16 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 4th August, 1915.

	PAGE
Questions: Cornsacks, Importation	113
State Brickworks, cost	117
Yandanooka Estate and Crown tenants ..	117
Expeditionary Forces and Members of Parliament	113
Motion: War between Britain and Germany, Anniversary of declaration	113
Address-in-reply, third day	117
BILL: Supply, £1,400,300, returned	158

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

QUESTION—CORNSACKS, IMPORTATION.

Hon. J. MITCHELL (without notice) asked the Minister for Agriculture: Is it the intention of the Government to import cornsacks?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: I might explain the position in regard to cornsacks. There has been a misunderstanding in the minds of many settlers due to the fact that there were some Press statements that it was the intention of some of the Governments of Australia to import cornsacks, but that is not so. Throughout Australia sacks are being supplied by the merchants in the usual manner. At the beginning of the season, or some months back, I had a conference with members of the Chamber of Commerce, and particularly those merchants who deal in jute goods, and they pointed out that there was a fairly large carry over from last year and that they

had made arrangements to get sufficient for our estimated crop this year; consequently there was no need for the Government to do anything.

EXPEDITIONARY FORCES AND MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan—Brownhill-Ivanhoe) [4.35]: May I explain for the information of members that we propose to submit a motion to Parliament which will have the object of granting leave of absence to members of Parliament who are attached to the Expeditionary Forces. The motion will cover the whole period that those members are away from the State. It will be submitted to-morrow.

MOTION—WAR BETWEEN BRITAIN AND GERMANY, ANNIVERSARY OF DECLARATION.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan—Brown Hill-Ivanhoe) [4.37]: With your permission, Mr. Speaker, and with the indulgence of the House, before we proceed with the business on the notice paper I desire to submit a motion. To-day is the first anniversary of one of the greatest if not the greatest event, recorded in the history of the world, when the great nations of Europe are at death grips. I take this opportunity of referring to the matter because I think we all realise after 12 months, that the position to-day is such that it requires the united effort of everyone in the Empire and their sympathy and support for the purpose of bringing the war to a successful issue from the point of view of the British Empire, and by submitting a motion, I want to give the House the opportunity of expressing their sympathy and determination to see it to a successful end. I might explain the reasons why we are to-day at death grips with one of the greatest military nations of the world. We are all aware of the fact that the war was not of our seeking. We were compelled for our own protection and the protection of other nations to declare war upon Ger-