

managing the tramways for the company received £1,500 a year, while the accountant in the company received £500.

The Minister for Railways: When you were increasing the salary of the Commissioner for Railways you said that the manager of the company received £2,000 a year.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Very likely, and I also know that there was more than one officer under him getting £500 a year. Yet our superintendent is receiving £375 and the officer next to him gets something like £150. How can we expect to have the service conducted on business lines when we pay such paltry salaries? The crowding is a positive disgrace, not only at holiday times but during the busy hours of the day, in the morning and in the evening. We can often count no fewer than 16 people standing on the back platform while the passage way in the car is also overcrowded with people standing. The result is that there is considerable loss of time by reason of the fact that it takes so long for passengers to alight. There is no other town in the world with the population of Perth that would give its people such a disgraceful service.

Mr. Smith: And we charge the highest fares.

Hon. P. COLLIER: We often see people standing at the town hall corner, who are waiting for trams to take them to the Inglewood terminus or to Walcott-street, having to continue to wait while the trams are crowded with people who perhaps go only half way. There should be special cars for Inglewood and Walcott-street. Instead of that, the passengers who have to go the whole distance are left behind, and others going only a half or a quarter of the way crowd into the trams. I cannot understand why those in control of this service do not make small alterations of this kind. The improvements could easily be effected by some alteration in the fares. Having had the experience we have, I do not know whether it would be wise for the House to take the management of the tramway service away from the Railway Department, and place it under separate control, or hand the service over to the City, where it would no longer be a reflection upon the people of the State, as has been the case for the past few years.

The Minister for Railways: That is justification for the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etcetera.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

#### MOTION—HARBOUR BOARD, BUNBURY, TO DISALLOW REGULATION.

Order read for the resumption of debate from the 16th October on motion by Mr. Money, "That Regulation 104a of the Bunbury Harbour Board laid upon the Table of this House on the 8th October, be disallowed."

On motion by Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister) debate further adjourned.

#### DISCHARGE OF ORDERS.

On motion by the PREMIER the following Orders of the Day were discharged:—

1. Road Districts Bill.
2. Traffic Bill.
3. Land Drainage Bill.
4. Dog Act Amendment Bill.
5. Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs.

#### ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

The PREMIER (Hon. H. B. Lefroy—Moore) [10.59]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 7.30 p.m. on Friday, 6th December.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 11 p.m.

## Legislative Assembly,

Friday, 6th December, 1918.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 7.30 p.m., and read papers.

[For "Questions on Notice" and "Papers Presented" see "Votes and Proceedings."]

#### BILLS (11)—THIRD READING.

- 1, Government Railways Act Amendment.
  - 2, Postponement of Debts Act Continuation.
  - 3, Roads Act Continuation.
  - 4, Industries Assistance Act Continuation.
  - 5, Sale of Liquor Regulation Act Continuation.
  - 6, Licensing Act Amendment Act Continuation.
  - 7, Dividend Duties Act Amendment.
  - 8, Treasury Bonds Deficiency.
  - 9, Income Tax.
  - 10, Government Tramways Act Amendment. Transmitted to the Council.
  - 11, Navigation Act Amendment.
- Passed.

#### BILL—WATER BOARDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. J. George—Murray-Wellington) [7.47] in moving the second reading said: The object of this Bill is to enable water boards, which may have not sufficient revenue to fully meet their expenditure and engagements to raise

their rates beyond 2s., if necessary. Hon. members will notice that no rise in the rates can be made without the approval of the Governor. The special circumstance which has occasioned the introduction of this Bill is in connection with the Broome water board, which was established some years ago by one of the Governments, and has since been carried on by the local authorities in Broome. Since that time there have been various enlargements of the operations of the water board, and at present a fairly large sum of money is required to be spent upon the water supply in connection with a new bore, the original bore being inefficient. The Government recognise that it is quite reasonable, right and necessary that a water supply should be made available for the people of Broome, but they also feel that they should have some opportunity of getting from the community the interest and sinking fund on the moneys that they provide for this purpose. At present, under the Water Boards Act, this particular board cannot obtain sufficient money at the current rate, but are willing when the Bill becomes an Act to raise their rates, and the local ratepayers are also agreeable to this being done.

Mr. Johnston: To what extent is the rate being raised?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is a matter which rests with the Broome water board, but I believe it will not exceed an additional 9d. on the present levy. Without this readiness on the part of the Broome municipality and the ratepayers to increase the rate to the amount necessary to meet the interest and sinking fund on the money furnished by the Government, it would be impossible for the Government to expend any further money on this water supply. There is no other case known of the kind to which this Bill would apply, but it is necessary to have the Act altered so that, with the approval of the Governor, these extraordinary circumstances may be met. I commend the Bill to the House and move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. P. Collier debate adjourned.

## BILL—MIDLAND RAILWAY LANDS.

### Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND RAILWAYS (Hon. C. A. Hudson—Yilgarn [7.51] in moving the second reading said: This Bill is introduced at the desire of the Midland Railway Company for the purpose of establishing their title to the land on which their railways are constructed, to obtain powers to make by-laws to enable them to manage and properly carry on their business as public carriers, and generally in relation to their railway operations. The Bill has been before the Government of Western Australia at various times since 1913, but has from time to time been passed over on account of the pressure of business during the session. The first proposal is that the land upon which the railways are constructed shall be vested in the company in

fee simple, and that the title shall be issued to them from the Titles Office in such form as may be directed. The position in regard to their claim is this: in 1886 an agreement was entered into between the Government of Western Australia and the contractor, Mr. John Waddington, of 35 King William Street, London, under which certain rights were granted to the contractor to construct, equip, maintain, and work a railway between Guildford and the Greenough flats. That railway was carried out in the terms of the contract, one of which terms, Clause 69, provides—

Immediately each and every section of the line shall be completed, equipped in working order, and opened for traffic, the lands taken for the purpose of the construction of the railway under Clause 3 of these presents shall subject to the provisions of Clause 58 vest in and be granted to the contractor in fee simple.

The term "contractor" includes "his heirs and assigns." The contractor can transfer all his interest to the Midland Railway Company, on whose behalf this Bill is presented. The contract, so far as the construction of the line is concerned, having been carried out by the company, it becomes the duty of the Government to do their part, and vest the land upon which the railways are constructed in the owners of the railways. The lands are defined on the plans lodged in the Titles Office, and consist of the railway workshops, Midland Junction, and the strip of land upon which the railways are constructed, which varies in width from one chain to three chains. The plans have been approved by the Lands Department and by the Railway Department. Provision is made to enable the Government to resume any portion of the land for the purpose of road making. If it is thought desirable by a road board, or by the Government, that a road should be made across the line, power is given for resumption without compensation, the company of course, having the right after resumption to keep in repair, and maintain, their railway line across such road. A reservation is made with regard to river beds, that the company shall have power to maintain the bridges across which their railways run. I do not think there is any doubt about the right of the company to obtain their title in the terms of the contract, because, although for some years they have not been able to get it, this was partly due to the survey not having been completed, and also to the fact that for some years past they were under a financial obligation to the Government, which is now discharged. The other part of the Bill relates to giving powers to the company to make by-laws for the management of their railways. Under the agreement to which I have referred, Clause 60 provides—

The Government shall promote at their own cost the passing of any necessary Act or Acts to confirm these presents and either to confer upon the contractor such powers necessary or proper for giving effect to these presents, and not being inconsistent therewith as the Legislative Council may approve, or at the request of the contractor to

provide for the incorporation of the contractor, and all such other persons and corporations as shall become shareholders in the company to be thereby incorporated into a body corporate with perpetual succession and a common seal with such capital and borrowing powers, and all such powers as last aforesaid for the purpose of acquiring from the contractor the benefit of these presents, subject to all the provisions and stipulations herein contained and on the part of the contractor to be observed and performed.

In Clauses 17 and 19 provision is made for the making of by-laws for the fixing of freights and tolls, and that every by-law fixing and regulating tolls shall be subject to revision from time to time by the contractor with the approval of the Government. It is proposed to incorporate certain provisions of Part 3 of the Government Railways Act of 1904 into the principal Act, that is the Act which confirms the agreement to which I have referred, and which was passed in 1886. There may be some difficulty on the part of hon. members on the second reading, or in the Committee stage, in following closely the powers which are proposed to be conferred upon the company by this clause, which provides that Part III. of the Government Railways Act, 1904, shall, with the exception of Sections 16, 17, 18 and of Sections 35 and 36, apply to the company. This will give them the same powers that are now conferred upon the Commissioner of Railways in relation to the Government railways. I therefore propose, on the passing of the second reading, to move that the Bill be referred to a select committee for the purpose of further inquiry, and to give the company an opportunity of establishing their rights to these privileges and powers, and to generally investigate the position now set up by the Bill. Having that intention, it is not my purpose to go fully into the proposed powers of the company, as mentioned in the Government Railways Act. Briefly, the Act will confer upon the company the same powers which the Commissioner of Railways now has of making by-laws in regard to a number of subjects which are set out in Section 23 of the Government Railways Act. It will give them power to make by-laws, to collect and deliver goods, and will protect them from actions in the same way as the Commissioner is protected at present. These are matters which I think might reasonably be referred to a select committee, and I propose to take the course I have suggested. As is known in certain cases the Commissioner has the right to fix fares and freights for the carriage of goods, subject to the approval of the Minister for Railways. He has, however, the right to make special contracts for carrying goods at a lower rate in special circumstances. That power would also be conferred upon the company, but subject to the control of the Minister for Railways or the Government. The powers which it is proposed to confer upon the company are somewhat in the nature of those that are usually conferred on private railway companies in England; and, indeed, it is necessary for the Midland Railway Company to have some such powers in order to carry out

the terms of the agreement into which they entered for the construction, equipment, and management of their railway. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. P. Collier debate adjourned.

#### MOTION—HARBOUR BOARD, BUNBURY, TO DISALLOW REGULATION.

Debate resumed from the 16th October on the motion by Mr. Money "That regulation 104a of the Bunbury Harbour Board, laid upon the Table of the House on the 18th October, be disallowed."

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister) [8.3]: I would have preferred it if the mover had withdrawn this motion. Many things have happened, great events have taken place, completely altering the conditions, since notice was given of the motion and it was moved. Considering that we have won the war, that Christmas is pretty close, and that it is going to be a very joyous Christmas, I do not desire to fight the motion unless the member for Bunbury presses it. However, if the hon. member is determined to go on with it I must ask the House to decline to carry it. Hon. members may have forgotten the position, which is that the Bunbury Harbour Board put on a war surtax of 20 per cent. in respect of all wharfage and harbour dues, thus merely bringing Bunbury into line with all other ports of Western Australia. The reason given by the mover in support of his motion is that there is some timber shipped from Bunbury. As a matter of fact, Millars' Co. ship some timber from that port; and they claim that they had no notice of the increase in the charges. But good business men as they are, they ought to have known, and I am prepared to say they did know, that there was a 20 per cent. surtax at every port in the State except Bunbury, and they could not have expected that Bunbury would stand on its own for any considerable length of time. Another point which has been mentioned refers to contracts entered into by Millars before the Bunbury charges were raised. I say Millars would have entered into those contracts in the anticipation, which we all shared, that the war would not be over until next year. But the war is over this year and the finish of that war means many thousands of pounds to Millars and to all timber people. I say, now the war is over, the motion might well be withdrawn.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Heavy contracts are dependent on the shipping.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): Millars would not make the contracts unless they had the tonnage. With the war on, the surtax meant only £300 or £400 per annum at Bunbury. Now, with the war over, what does the surtax mean to Millars? With the war over, Millars can well afford to withdraw their motion, and Millars should withdraw their motion.

Mr. Money: There is no motion of Millars before the House.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): Very nearly.

Hon. T. Walker: But is it not Millars' money?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): Notwithstanding that all the residents of Bunbury and its vicinity are paying this war tax, the only people who have made even one complaint are the timber exporters.

Mr. O'Loughlen: But they are the only ones who are using the harbour.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): But what do the people of the Bunbury district live on? Are not goods imported there?

Mr. O'Loughlen: Very few goods; they go to Fremantle.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): And are not the increased harbour dues paid on those goods? As a fact, the timber pays 1s. 8d. per load, or about 10d. per ton; whereas sugar pays 6s. 6d. per ton, and other stuff also pays 6s. 6d. per ton. The users of sugar have not uttered one word of complaint. The exporters of timber, I repeat, are the only ones who put forward objections.

Mr. O'Loughlen: We tea drinkers are very patient.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): Let me inform the hon. member that there is also a wharfage charge on hops. Next, as regards the statement by Millars, that a letter was written by them on this subject to the Bunbury Harbour Board, I had the file ready to reply on that point, but, unfortunately, I have not brought the file along to-night. Millars wrote a letter to the board asking whether the new improvements to the Bunbury harbour if put into operation would necessitate an increase in wharfage or harbour dues; and the board replied no, that the new improvements would not necessitate an increase in dues. This increase now complained of is necessitated by the lack of shipping. When shipping becomes normal again, the board will be able to run their new harbour without increasing their dues. I am sorry I have not the correspondence here to-night, because the position has been absolutely misrepresented, because the Bunbury Harbour Board have been misrepresented on that question.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Who misrepresented them? The member for Bunbury?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): Yes; and also in another place Mr. Nicholson. I said just now that the surtax is imposed at every Western Australian port. Well, we have had no complaint from any other port. The member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) raised objection to the wording of the regulation, but clearly stated that he did not oppose the increase in rates. Further, it has been argued that wheat and fruit and one or two other products are passed over the wharves of Western Australia free. The timber people on that account want timber passed over the wharves free. This is a continuation of the

old protest against the timber people paying anything at all. In this connection let me point out the difference between timber and wheat. When one cuts a load of timber, one denudes the forest of a tree or two or three trees. But when one has grown a bushel of wheat, one has enriched the land on which that wheat was grown. There are absolutely sound and sufficient reasons for handling wheat free of wharfage charges, and there are absolutely sound and sufficient reasons for charging wharfage on timber. The latter denudes the country of assets; the former increases the country's assets.

Mr. O'Loughlen: To judge from the vigour of your pleading, you must be anticipating that the motion will be carried.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): Although the hon. member interjecting spoke in favour of the motion, I know very well that he is going to vote with me this time. He is not going to bolster up a timber combine to the extent of 2d. per ton. It has been stated, loosely stated, that all products except timber are free. But wool pays a considerably heavier wharfage than timber pays.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Yes; and the 20 per cent. surtax goes on the wool wharfage, too.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): Certainly.

Mr. O'Loughlen: But what is the comparison between the quantity of wool and the quantity of timber shipped?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): I think wool beats timber.

Mr. O'Loughlen: At that port?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): Again, take pearlshell. The wharfage charges on pearlshell are five or six times, or perhaps ten times; as high as those on timber; and pearlshell is a product of Western Australia.

Mr. O'Loughlen: We would not want many ships to carry all the pearlshell Western Australia produced.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): The pearl fishers are the only people in this State who pay light dues, and they are the only people who have complained of increased charges, with the exception of the timber combine. The pearl fishers complained because they were paying £2 per annum light dues, which nobody else was paying, and they objected to the 20 per cent. surtax being put on those light dues. I say again, this is the old protest from the timber combine against paying anything at all. On that aspect of the matter, let me point out that the timber of Western Australia is of very great value, and that those who ship it away from our country should at least pay something to the country for the advantage of exporting the timber. It has been said, "Look what the timber companies have done for the South-West." One of the south-western members has said that the timber companies' lines have opened up the timber. Let me say, however, that the timber country has been opened up by the Government railways. Further let me point out that the timber com-

panies are not responsible for the growth of one single tree in Western Australia.

Mr. O'Loghlen: The pearlers have not grown the shell either.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): No; but the pearlers go down to fish the shell and they never complain. One never hears a pearler squeaking.

Mr. O'Loghlen: The wool growers should not squeak much either.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): Neither are they squeaking.

Mr. O'Loghlen: I should not think they would squeak.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): As a matter of fact, Bunbury is the only port in Western Australia from which complaints have come, and the Bunbury complaints come from one particular section, namely, the timber exporters. I say and I ask the House to say, that the timber exporters are able to pay if the rest of the Western Australian people are able to pay. If we disallow this regulation it will follow that 20 per cent. must come off our wharfage. After all, I do not think this House has any intention of saying that Bunbury shall have a 20 per cent. reduction in wharfage, and that the wharfage at other ports shall remain unaltered. The House must consider whether we are to continue these increased charges or whether they are to be removed. As it refers to Bunbury it is a mere incident. If the charges come off at Bunbury, in justice to the other ports they must come off there as well.

Mr. Teesdale: What would that mean?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): The wharfage dues come to about £200,000. I have pointed out that all the other ports in the State were paying this due for almost twelve months before it was imposed at Bunbury, and if it did not strike the Bunbury people that it would be imposed at that port as well, all I can say is that they are very poor business men down there and they deserve to lose the £300 or £400 through their absence of business acumen. There have been arguments used in regard to the wording of the regulation. I am not enamoured of the wording of the regulation; I am not responsible for it. The regulation sets out that it shall continue until the conclusion of the war and for so long after as in the discretion of the board it may seem advisable. On behalf of the Government I can also say that this tax is necessary until shipping becomes normal. When shipping is once again normal we can remove this tax, and I feel certain that the Government will be prepared to remove it then. Just another word in regard to Bunbury particularly. I have told hon. members that all the other ports are paying this tax. I want to add now that I have just arranged with the Treasurer to advance £5,000 to dredge the Bunbury harbour. This harbour is the most expensive we have in Western Australia. It is a continual dredging proposition, and unless it is continually dredged it will silt up. The revenue derived from the harbour will not meet this expenditure. If there is a port in the State which should not

complain about an increase in the dues it is Bunbury. One must say it, but it is nevertheless a fact, Bunbury is the most costly harbour we have to maintain.

Mr. Money: We have paid a considerable sum into the Consolidated Revenue.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): If the Minister for Works were here he would inform the hon. member of the difficulty we have had in getting £5,000 to enable us to dredge the harbour and make it reasonably safe for ships to come into. I think I have put up, even in the opinion of the leader of the Opposition, a reasonably good case for the rejection of the motion. I hope the hon. member will withdraw it.

Mr. MONEY (Bunbury—in reply) [8.20]: The reasons which have been given to the House why the regulation should not be disallowed are altogether beside the question. When I submitted the motion about two months ago, the reasons for the complaint were clearly stated. The fact of no increased dues being imposed at Bunbury for twelve months after they had been increased at other ports, justified the people of Bunbury in believing that they were not going to be increased there. I made it clear that the people using the port of Bunbury expected an increase, and immediately it was decided in July last to improve the harbour, it was naturally thought that increased dues would follow, and the people endeavoured to ascertain whether these higher dues would be imposed. I must refer to this matter again in consequence of the statement which has been made by the Honorary Minister to-night. The reply to the inquiry which was made from Bunbury is dated 17th July, 1918, and it reads—

In reply to yours of the 16th instant regarding improvements to the Bunbury harbour, I desire to state that interest and sinking fund on the capital outlay will be provided for by the board out of revenue without any necessity for increasing the existing port dues and wharfage rates on timber shipped from that port.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): This is a war time tax.

Mr. MONEY: If it had been intended to increase the dues, would not the harbour board have given some intimation to the exporters of timber. We were satisfied in July last that there was no intention of increasing the dues, and naturally contracts were made to deliver timber free on board at Bunbury. It is not the 20 per cent. that we are complaining about, it is the injustice of a regulation acting retrospectively so far as our contracts are concerned. Our contracts having been made ahead, it was only fair that we should have had the opportunity of providing against these increases by an amount, small or great. The amount of the increase has nothing to do with the matter, and the question of a combine or Millars' does not enter into the discussion. It is the sawmilling industry of the south-west that is affected.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): They can afford to pay it.

Mr. MONEY: The Minister has told us that we are going to make profits in the future, but he knows that we cannot pay now, and this action is only increasing the losses which have been piling up during the past five years. I am just as anxious as the Minister that the income of the harbour board at Bunbury shall not be detrimentally influenced. The member for North-East Fremantle, when addressing the House on this particular matter, declared that the regulation was wrongly worded, that it was indefinite, and for that reason he would not support it. The regulation is not definite, on the face of it. It says "in consequence of the war and for the period of the war it shall exist or for such other period as the circumstances of the case may dictate," not however, to the board, but to the members of the board. If it is a matter of revenue and it is only intended that it shall operate for the period of the war, it can be disallowed and it will be possible to-morrow to bring in a legal regulation with proper notice making the increase, if it is wanted, 25 per cent. It is not a matter of revenue, it is a matter of just the difference between right and wrong. If this regulation is disallowed, the increased harbour charges which have already been collected under it will be retained, and it will be possible for a normal regulation to be framed, one that can come into operation on the declaration of peace. It is not necessary for me to go into any further details. When an hon. member is stating what he believes is right, I do not think the House will countenance a threat being made in the nature of the withholding of expenditure. The Bunbury harbour board has paid the State well. In addition to interest and sinking fund, it has paid a surplus into the Consolidated Revenue. Therefore, the people of Bunbury are not asking for any particular favour. They are asking only for what is right. The timber industry must have its outlet and proper facilities. That industry has suffered more than any other in the State, and to ask now that the losses which have been incurred should be further added to without due notice being given is unjust and inequitable, and no member treating it on its merits can support the regulation. Let the regulation be disallowed and a fresh one drafted, and the revenue will not suffer. It will, however, enable those concerned in the timber industry in the south-west to make proper provision for their contracts.

Question put and negatived.

#### BILL—COAL MINES REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT.

##### Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND RAILWAYS (Hon. C. A. Hudson—Yilgarn) [8.31] in moving the second reading said: It was not proposed the other night to go on with this Bill, but after consideration I have decided to ask the House to pass certain of its

provisions which are not contentious, inasmuch as it is desirable that we should have some machinery clauses to enable us to carry on the fund which is referred to as the Coal Mines Accident Relief Fund, in a more satisfactory manner than at present obtains. The first part of the Bill provides for power being given to the Government to make regulations for the installation, regulation and use of electricity in mines. I do not propose to go on with that, because I believe it is a contentious subject, and an undertaking was given that it should not be followed up. The other portion of the Bill relates to the Coal Mines Accident Relief Fund. That fund has been established in connection with the mines at Collie, and is contributed to by the owners, who are compelled under the Act to pay a contribution of one penny per ton on the output of the mines; by the men working in the mines, who pay 1s. per fortnight, and by the boys, who pay 6d. per fortnight. These amounts are deducted from the wages and paid over to a trust consisting of three members, one appointed by the mine owners, one by the employees and the third by the Government, who is usually the clerk of courts at Collie. It is sought to amend Section 72 of the principal Act by the insertion of the word "forthwith" before the word "pay," the object being that when the money is deducted from the men's wages, the company shall be compelled to pay over to the trust forthwith. The next proposed amendment gives the trust the power to sue for this money and for the contribution payable by the mining company. The present method of recovery is a clumsy one. If the company fails to pay the money deducted from the men's wages, or its own contribution, the trust have to lay a complaint in the police court for the purpose of having the company fined for non-compliance with the provisions of the Act. The proposal under consideration is to give them an opportunity of suing in the local court for the amount to which they are entitled. It is further sought to make the trust a continuing body, and to incorporate it. There is a further proposal in relation to the management of the moneys of the trust. At present the position is that the contributions are received by the trust, but have to be expended practically at the direction of an accident committee appointed by the employees. This is found to work unsatisfactorily, because the trust is a nominal body and have merely to formally carry out what is determined by one section of those contributing to the fund. It is therefore desired that certain words should be struck out and the section so altered that the trust shall pay out such moneys as they shall approve of after consideration in each case of a recommendation from the accident committee, to be appointed in the manner prescribed in the regulation. That is to say, the accident committee can recommend to the trust what moneys they shall pay, but the trust have the final say in the distribution of their own funds. A further proposal is made to admit of their expending out of their trust funds such incidental expenses as are neces-

sary to enable them to carry on their business. The trust is also to be given power to pay out of the fund, with the Minister's approval, any expense incurred in the appointment of the trust or the accident committee, or in the performance by the trust of any of its duties. Assuming that the other portion of the Bill is agreed to, enabling the trustees to sue the contributors for their contributions, provision is made—still leaving room for penalty for a breach of the law—for amending the Bill so as to be consistent with the other provisions.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Under the present system the employers must have been the only defaulters, because the contributions from wages are deducted.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes, the contributions of men are deducted from their wages. There have not been many cases of default. All parties are agreed to this measure. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. O'Loughlen, debate adjourned.

#### BILL—DENTISTS.

Order discharged.

Order of the Day for the second reading read.

On motion by the PREMIER, Order of the Day discharged.

#### MOTION—SMELTING WORKS AT GERALDTON.

Debate resumed from the 30th October, on motion by Mr. Willecock—"That in the opinion of this House, in order to encourage the production of base metals in the northern portions of the State, a State smelting works should be erected in Geraldton."

Mr. JOHNSTON (Williams - Narrogin) [8.40]: I intend to support the motion, unless the Minister has any proposal for the erection of other than a State smelting works at Geraldton. Those of us who have had the privilege of looking at those splendid mines at Northampton and Geraldine must agree that it is somewhat rough on the people up there that they should have to send their produce all the way to Fremantle. I recognise that this is a question which mining members and the professional advisers of the Government are best fitted to deal with. At the same time it seems to me that the war conditions and the high prices of base metals offer an excellent opportunity of putting this very valuable industry at Northampton on a permanent basis. If the Minister has any better proposal to put before the House, I shall be prepared to support him in it, but in the absence of such better proposition, and having a desire to assist the people in the industry up there, I intend to support the motion.

Mr. MULLANY (Menzies) [8.42]: I regret that the mover of the motion has not seen fit to withdraw it. To ask the House to vote for the motion is unfair, because the question of whether it would be a payable proposition for the State or for a private company to erect smelting works at Geraldton is a highly technical one which could only be satisfactorily

decided by competent mining engineers. I am desirous of helping the development of any industry in the State, but I cannot vote for the motion. No member of the House, from the case which has been put up here, could say whether or not the proposition is a good one. It could only be decided by experts going thoroughly into the question. While we are here as a deliberative Assembly to bring into operation legislation governing the whole of the State, it is distinctly unfair to ask members to vote on a motion such as this. I think the hon. member, having ventilated the matter in the House, has done his duty to the constituents and should now withdraw the motion. I have no desire to prevent any assistance whatever being given to the district concerned, but I cannot vote for a proposition the merits of which I have no means of judging. By insisting on proceeding with the motion, the hon. member is courting an adverse vote. Without desiring to hamper the development of the industry referred to, I must vote against the motion.

Mr. LAMBERT (Coolgardie) [8.45]: I desire to amend this motion by adding words to provide that a full report shall be called for with a view to the erection of State smelting works at Geraldton. I can well believe that it is hardly possible that a layman could put up a sufficiently strong case to induce the Government to have a smelter erected at this centre for the smelting of lead ore. At the same time, the Minister, with the knowledge he has of this field, and with the knowledge he has of the improvements in the metalliferous mines of this State, will appreciate the fact that we have a very valuable lead deposit in this district. I think he would be one of the first to welcome the fullest inquiry as to the advisability of erecting a lead smelter in Geraldton, or in some other central position. I must confess that I have not an intimate knowledge of the district, nor do I pose as an expert upon lead ores or lead smelting, but I do say that all the indications lead me to believe that we have in this district a very important deposit of lead ore. It would ill-become members to under-estimate the importance of the large and valuable deposits of lead to Western Australia, and to the general commercial interests of the State. With the departures which are now being made in regard to the utilisation of lead, apart from its utilisation in its metallic state, we may be faced with this position. In New Zealand there is an English company spending a quarter of a million of money in the production of white lead, pigments, and paint, from lead ore by electrical treatment. Seeing that we absorb, and are likely to continue to absorb in this State, white lead in large quantities, it may be possible for the Minister to induce some company, which at present is operating in the Eastern States, to come here and utilise some of our galena ore. The Minister must recognise the fact that when we reach normal conditions, if he wishes to give this field an opportunity of existing at all, he must give it facilities for smelting the ore on the spot. It is inconceivable that even his responsible officers could recommend the

carrying of this native ore hundreds of miles, to be smelted at Fremantle. Possibly, within a short space of time, we shall find that lead will only command £12 or £14 a ton in the open market.

Mr. Teesdale: That is so. Then the trouble will start.

Mr. LAMBERT: It is somewhat difficult to penetrate the mind of the member for Greenough, who definitely assesses the amount at which lead is likely to be sold in a year, or two years, or five years time. It is not so long ago since the great world's war was raging, and since some people said, "We will fight on for ever." It is a great idea to talk of settling international disputes by arbitration or negotiation, or by any other means which should appeal to the common intelligence of man. People have said, "You should discount the idea of international disputes being settled on a basis of common sense." We have heard old men in every country shrieking out to the younger population, "Fight on, fight on."

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member resume his seat? I find on reference to my notes that he has already addressed himself to this subject.

Mr. LAMBERT: I am sorry, Sir, you have discovered the fact.

Mr. JONES (Fremantle) [8.50]: I move an amendment—

That in line 3 after the words "the State" there be inserted "a full report be called for, for the purpose of deciding whether."

From the excellent case which has been put up by members representing that part of the State, I think we have formed some idea that there is a very valuable deposit of ore in the district. At the same time, I am satisfied that further inquiry would be of benefit. It is not that I wish in any way to check the optimism of those who believe in the district, but I think that in the interests of the State, and particularly considering our financial position, members will accept this amendment as being a reasonable way of looking at the matter.

The Minister for Mines: I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. TROY (Mt. Magnet) [8.53]: I support the amendment, and I would also have supported the motion as it stood. The amendment, however, is perhaps preferable in the circumstances. I am sure that no one asks that the State shall go to the expense of erecting a smelter in any locality unless the production of ore warrants such a course. I am convinced that if a report is made regarding the valuable supplies of ore in the Northampton district, particularly so far as lead is concerned, and regarding the prospects of other minerals, as well as the copper supplies in the Murchison and north of Peak Hill there will be found ample justification for the erection of a smelter. There have been discovered north of Peak Hill large quantities of copper ore, which cannot be treated owing to the heavy cost of carriage.

As a result that industry, which should have been a very prosperous one to the State during the time of war when prices were high, has been discouraged, and the State has lost its opportunity. I cannot say definitely whether either lead, copper, or any other of the baser metals will retain their present values.

The Minister for Mines: I wish you could.

Mr. TROY: But I do think that owing to the scarcity of these commodities they may retain their present value for two or three years. If the copper mines of the Murchison and north of the Murchison and the lead mines in the Northampton district, were encouraged by the erection of a smelter, where the owners could get their ore treated cheaply, this might be the means of placing these industries on a permanent basis. The profits they would make during the next few years, would probably put them on such a basis as would enable them to carry on for many years to come. Anyone who has visited the district, particularly the Northampton district, must have been impressed by the large quantity of lead ore available there. Wherever one goes there are indications of lead, and it is in fairly rich quantities, too. If the Phillips River district deserved a smelter in the first place there is no question about the need of Geraldton to-day. If we are going to make the best of these mines, we must give the people an opportunity of developing them by the means that are likely to be the most successful. We can only develop this country by decentralisation. To carry all these products to one centre is not in the best interests of the State. If there is one place more than another which deserves assistance at the hands of the Minister, it is Geraldton. It occupies a central position, the mines are handy to it, and railway communication is provided in a large number of cases. It is in that locality where I think the ore can be most cheaply treated. I support the amendment, because I want to give the Minister time to make the fullest inquiry into the matter. I hope his inquiries will not be confined to lead production, but that he will also inquire into the available copper and other ores, which can be treated at a smelter erected at Geraldton.

The Minister for Mines: I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. MALEY (Greenough—on amendment) [9.0]: I consider it was the duty of the Minister to obtain a report, as now suggested by this amendment, so soon as ever the motion was moved.

The Minister for Mines: Reports have been obtained; and the hon. member knows it.

Mr. MALEY: The statement of the Minister made here in the House should have been accepted, and the argument of the member for Menzies (Mr. Mullany) should not have held good. If the Minister could refute any claims put forward on behalf of the industry, that would be pertinent. But the same sort of argument was used in opposition to the railway. In my opinion, it is incumbent upon any Minister, as soon as notice is given of a motion affecting his department, to institute inquiries into the subject of the motion, so that authoritative information may be laid before the



House. I hope the House will accept the amendment, as the Minister has stated he will do.

Mr. WILLCOCK (Geraldton—in reply) [9.2]: I have no grave objection to the amendment, provided the Minister will give an assurance that, assuming the amendment is carried, if within the next seven or eight months in his opinion a State smelter at Geraldton is shown to be justified, he will immediately proceed with the work of erecting it. What I am particularly anxious about is that the agreement between the Fremantle Trading Company and the Government for the smelting of ores on behalf of private owners will terminate in 10 or 11 months. Unless some means are provided in the interim whereby the products of the field can be smelted, the persons mining there will be at the mercy of the Fremantle Trading Company, so long as only the company pay off their overdraft of £7,000 or £8,000, now guaranteed by the Government. In that event the Government will have no hold on the company, and the producers of lead in the Geraldine district will be at the company's mercy.

The Minister for Mines: Will you undertake that a smelter, if erected, will be supplied with ore?

Mr. WILLCOCK: Certainly, if lead remains anywhere near its present price, there will be no difficulty. The motion, let me point out, refers to the whole of the northern portion of the State. As the agreement with the Fremantle Trading Company expires in about 12 months' time, it is essential, in order to give some confidence in the future to the people of the field, that they should know they will be able to get their ore treated at a reasonable price upon the expiration of this current agreement. I hope the amendment will be carried. I again ask, however, that the Minister, if satisfied by the reports when obtained that the erection of a smelter at Geraldton is justified, will proceed with the work promptly, so as to afford the industry that assistance which a State smelter at Geraldton would undoubtedly represent.

Amendment put and passed; the motion, as amended, agreed to.

## BILL—CONSTITUTION FURTHER AMENDMENT.

### Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 27th November.

The PREMIER (Hon. H. B. Lefroy—Moore) [9.7]: The Bill introduced by the leader of the Opposition is, as the hon. gentleman has stated, of a highly controversial character. It proposes to make two drastic alterations in the Constitution Act. One of these proposed alterations is that the household qualification shall be reduced so that, instead of requiring a certain annual value, it will require merely the occupancy of a house. The other alteration is of a very far-reaching character. At present an elector for the Legislative Council may register his vote in any province where he has the necessary property qualification, and this gives him the right to vote for any province in which he may have

such qualification. The Bill proposes that an elector for the Upper House shall vote only for that province in which he resides and in which he has the property qualification. So far, the British race has not been able to devise any better system than that which exists, and which is called the bicameral system. It is a system which grew up in the Old Country and which has been adopted by all the dominions of the British Empire. Prior to responsible government in Western Australia—and the same system exists in all Crown Colonies—there was only one House of Parliament here. But that House was, as an early Governor of this State once said, neither fish, flesh, fowl, nor good red herring. We then lived under a unicameral system, and the one Chamber consisted of a certain number of members elected on a fairly high qualification, and of Government nominees. In those early days the Government always had a majority, because the nominees gave it to them. Indeed, under the old Crown Colony system, the Governor of the day was virtually Premier as well, although he did not sit in Parliament. His position was something like that of the President of the United States. When we entered upon responsible government, there was no franchise for the Upper House.

Mr. O'Loghlen: The Upper House was more democratic in those days.

The PREMIER: One of the conditions laid down by the Home Government was that until the population of Western Australia reached 50,000—or the number may have been 45,000—the Upper House should be nominated by the Governor, but that upon the population reaching 45,000 or 50,000 the Upper House was to become an elective Chamber. Accordingly, in 1893, when the population reached the required number, the Constitution Act was amended so as to provide that the franchise for the Upper House should be a household qualification of £25 or a property qualification of £100. As time went on, this was again altered. In 1911 the Constitution Act was amended so as to provide that the franchise for the Upper House should be a household qualification of the value of £17 per annum, or a property qualification of £50. Thus, the Constitution Act, under which we are now living, provides that any man who holds freehold property to the value of £50 in any province may register as a voter for that province. The bicameral system, as I have said, is the best that the ingenuity of the British race has so far discovered. Still, there is no doubt that the world is now in the melting pot. When it comes out of that melting pot—it has not come out yet—there is every justification for believing that it will be found to have been very largely remodelled. At the same time, I hope hon. members will not be led to believe that I propose to support this Bill of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. O'Loghlen: I am surprised to hear that.

The PREMIER: Hon. members will not be surprised when I say that I have always looked upon the second Chamber as one of the great bulwarks of our Constitution.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Bulwark?

The PREMIER: Yes, bulwark; and I am not ashamed to say so in this House.

Mr. Troy: You are only 100 years behind the times; you should have lived 100 years ago.

The PREMIER: Possibly I may be 100 years behind the times; but, still, all the British dominions have second Chambers.

Mr. Troy: Not all.

The PREMIER: I do not know of any that have not.

Hon. T. Walker: What about Ontario?

Mr. Troy: And Saskatchewan?

The PREMIER: I have not gone so far as that.

Hon. T. Walker: There is any number of them.

The PREMIER: Oh no!

Hon. T. Walker: Under the Dominion of Canada there are several.

The PREMIER: The Dominion Parliament consists of two Houses.

Mr. Troy: So does the Commonwealth Parliament.

The PREMIER: I look upon our Upper House as an integral part of our Constitution.

Hon. P. Collier: This Bill does not propose to do away with the Upper House, but leaves that bulwark where it is.

The PREMIER: But the Bill certainly is an attempt at whittling away our Constitution.

Hon. P. Collier: No. It strengthens the Upper House by giving that House the backing of the people.

The PREMIER: Undoubtedly the Bill represents a whittling away of the Constitution. The Upper House should represent those who have some stake in the country, and unless we can devise some better proposal than that suggested by the hon. member, I intend to oppose the Bill. There may be sections of the community who have expressed an opinion in favour of an amendment of the Constitution in the direction suggested, but the people as a whole have never done so.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Will you give the country the opportunity?

The PREMIER: I do not object so much to giving those people who have a stake in the country, and who are living in it, some representation if proper and sufficient means can be devised. We have a second Chamber and we have a number of provinces, each of which returns members to represent those who own property. The hon. members in introducing the Bill, told us that he was modest in his demands.

Hon. P. Collier: So I was.

The PREMIER: And he added that he would have gone further, but that he did not think at the present time he would be justified in doing so. The hon. member has a perfect right to move in the manner he has done, and he has a perfect right to state his reasons for introducing the Bill. From his point of view, I have no doubt the reasons he advanced are sound, but when others look at them from a different point of view they do not appear sound. I know that hon. members have very frequently taken exception to the second

Chamber interfering with measures that have gone forward from this House. I have frequently taken umbrage at the manner in which proposals from this Chamber have been treated by another place. Still, one cannot expect that any House of Parliament will be perfect. At the same time the sins of commission of another place are not so great. The leader of the Opposition does not propose to eliminate the Upper House. He merely wishes to widen the Constitution. But there appears to me to be a nigger in the tree, and although the Bill does not propose to entirely destroy the constitution of the Upper House, to my mind it will whittle down the Constitution and endanger the existence of another place. I have already stated that the time is coming when the world will be remodelled.

Hon. P. Collier: You are remodelling it as you are going on now.

Mr. Troy: You are standing timidly on the brink.

The PREMIER: As the world is being remodelled I would prefer to wait a little while so as to see how we issue from the melting pot.

Mr. Jones: Will you not help us to lift the lid a little bit?

The PREMIER: For the reasons I have given, I intend to oppose the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN (Forrest) [9.22]: There is an old saying that if you scratch a Russian you get a Tartar. Here we may say that if we scratch a Nationalist we get a true-blue merino Tory. I am disappointed and every democratic member must be disappointed with the speech of the Premier. He has told us that the world is in the melting pot, and that he wants to see what is going to happen. He is afraid to move with the times. He admitted that the reasons which actuated the leader of the Opposition in submitting the Bill were sound.

The Premier: From his point of view.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I will go so far as to say that they are sound from the point of view of every democrat in Australia. I am not enamoured of the efficacy of the Upper Chambers in Australia. The Senate should be abolished, because it is a mere recording machine of what takes place in another House. Here we have the extraordinary anomaly of a comparative handful of people moulding the destinies of a country in opposition to the popular will. Interesting figures were given by the leader of the Opposition. They demonstrated that the producers of this country, scattered all over the State to the tune of thousands, were denied a vote in the House that matters. The Legislative Council has sufficient veto to thwart democratic legislation. It has been pointed out by the leader of the Opposition that only 50,000 people have the right to vote for the Upper Chamber, and that owing to plural voting, at the election before last, three gentlemen in this State cast eight votes each. That is to say, they voted in eight provinces in which there were contests, simply because

they had property in all those provinces. While those people cast eight votes each there were 100,000 men and women who were denied the right to vote at all. I have demonstrated in regard to my own particular electorate—every hon. member knows the vicissitudes of the timber industry—that it is impossible for the people engaged in that industry to establish permanent homes carrying the rental value required by the Electoral Act to enable them to exercise the franchise. Only eight out of a total of 1,500 who served their country were qualified to vote at a recent election. Men and women who are producing wealth in that electorate, rightly or wrongly, sent me to Parliament, and no matter what efforts I put forward, eight people in that electorate are entitled to vote for a representative in the Legislative Council who can, in that Chamber, nullify the efforts of the voice of the people who elected me to this Chamber. At Jarrahdale to-day there are 15 parents who have lost their sons at the war. Those people have been there for between 22 and 30 years, and in the whole of that time they have never had the opportunity to vote for the Upper House, because the houses they are renting from their employers do not come up to the standard required by the Act. They can produce wealth for 30 years, they can give their blood for their country, but when it comes to having a voice in the moulding of legislation, the Premier, the head of the Nationalist Government, says they are not worthy. What can we hope for out of this melting pot that has been referred to? Is there any country to-day that will stand still? We are told that the Upper House has been guilty of sins of commission. I have a vivid recollection of trying to pilot a small and insignificant measure through Parliament. My constituents asked me to do so. I secured a unanimous vote in this Chamber. The Bill in question was the Timber Lines Traffic Bill, giving the power to the Government to regulate fares and freights on timber railways. It went through this House without a division; 50 members agreed to it. But when it went to the Upper Chamber one of the members there, elected not by the people of the country but by the people who own bricks and mortar and broad acres—Sir Edward Wittenoom, the head of Millars' timber combine—moved that the Bill be read that day six months and that motion was carried. It was defeated in another place without getting a hearing, although the men and women producing the wealth in this country demanded the measure. How long are we going to stand still? How long will the people tolerate broad acres and bricks and mortar dominating over the brain and brawn of the country? How can any democrat follow the speech made by the Premier to-night? No one in Parliament or out of it can subscribe to the sentiments expressed by the Premier. I am astounded that such a moderate Bill as that introduced by the leader of the Opposition should meet with so much opposition. The Bill does not suit me, but I prefer to take

half a loaf than no bread. I will be interested to learn whether the Premier's colleagues on the front bench or even on the back bench will support the proposal to kill this Bill. I have yet to learn also whether the country will approve of that attitude. The time has arrived when the common people will demand a voice in the management of the affairs of the country. Hon. members may say it is due to lack of thrift. Nothing of the kind. The best houses established on the timber settlement in the South-West are at Dwellingup, the highest rent charged being 16s. 6d. per week, which does not qualify the householder as an elector of the upper House. Thousands more of them living in the bush have to move on as the forest is devoured, and in those circumstances it is impossible for them to qualify as electors of the Council. Yet 15 of them have lost their sons at the other side of the world, notwithstanding which the Premier says they are not entitled to vote. They are represented in this House, it is true, but there is no one to make articulate their aspirations within the walls of another place. It is deplorable to think that we as a branch of Parliament are not prepared to move with the times. The time is rapidly coming when the people of Western Australia will demand this reform. If they do not get it from this Government, they will create another Government that will bring about the desired reform. I think the Premier to-night in refusing to agree to these reasonable proposals has signed the death warrant of his own party. Why should we deny to thousands of good, upright citizens who have contributed to the prosperity of the State a vote for the Council, while to others we give the right of casting such votes? We call on the people to stand up to their responsibilities, but we are not prepared to accept the advice of the leader of the Opposition when he says, "Trust the people, for generally they do right, even though sometimes they may do wrong." I regret exceedingly the attitude adopted by the Premier. If he has spoken for every member on that side, it will come as a shock to the community to learn of it. The Premier is only delaying the day when the vengeance of the democracy will be given full effect.

Mr. PIESSE (Toodyay) [9.34]: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and negatived.

Hon. T. WALKER (Kanoona) [9.34]: I should rather have heard somebody from the other side. I am astonished at the silence along the Government benches. Of course we have heard the Premier, and I presume he speaks for all sitting behind him.

Mr. Nairn: Not any more than you do.

Hon. T. WALKER: He is speaking as head of the Government, as a Nationalist, and he is undoubtedly the leader of the party sitting behind him.

Mr. Troy: Their elected leader.

Hon. T. WALKER: It is no longer a matter of winning the war, it is a question of supporting a Ministry that has a definite line of action in regard to what the war was fought for. The whole strength of the British Em-

pire, in conjunction with her democratic Allies, has been waged for democracy, for the freedom of man. Well has the Premier said that the world is in the melting pot. It truly is. The old feudal developments of Governments are incompatible with the progress of the world. They cannot exist; they have been put into the melting pot, and humanity will emerge therefrom free from the fetters and the shackles of the by-gone. To hear the Premier of an advanced democracy—let me say the most advanced democracy in the world; for I know of no other country that can compare with Australia in its progress, no other country with higher ideals, no other country that has led the world, as Australia has, in every measure of reform—to hear the Premier defend in this democratic Assembly the old type of Government that has just perished in the old world, that is now only defended with apologies in Great Britain itself, is most disheartening. During the progress of the war, and just prior to its outbreak, the present Prime Minister of England threatened the abolition of the House of Lords itself. In the course of one Prime Minister's career we have seen the time-honoured House of Lords weakened, and members of that very Chamber issuing forth and going upon the platforms of democracy, men who are advocating the increment of the political power of the working multitude at the cost of the sacrifice of the power of the nobility of the British Empire. It seems to me therefore an anachronism for the Premier here to talk about a second Chamber being the bulwark of the British Constitution. If he has read his history he knows that there never has come a measure of reform from the House of Lords.

Mr. Davies: Do you mean our House of Lords?

Hon. T. WALKER: I refer to the British House of Lords.

Mr. Mullany: You can apply the same to the Federal Senate.

Hon. T. WALKER: There never has come from the House of Lords a single measure of reform uplifting the people of England. There is not a Bill of which we boast, not a measure for which we are thankful, not a single Act of Parliament for the purpose of making the people of England freer, nobler, stronger, that has not been opposed, and oft-times defeated by that Chamber. Every measure for humanity, the lessening of the severities of the criminal law, the abolition of the death penalty for 200 classes of crimes, has been opposed strenuously by the House of Lords. And even in America, our sister democracy, the Senate was the bulwark of slavery until Abraham Lincoln caused the chains to fall from the wrists of the slaves. Every measure proposed in Congress as giving more liberty, greater freedom and stability to what has been called the lower classes was resisted, opposed and delayed by the Senate of the United States. And in similar ways in every part of the world a second House has been for the binding of the popular will. It was all right enough when it was believed that the only thing in life

worth defending was property, when life itself was counted as nothing in comparison with property, when wealth was the great ideal. It was right enough then to defend a second Chamber. One can understand what it meant in the days gone by when the whole of the land of England was in the hands of the Lords of England, and when it was practically impossible for persons born of the poorer people to better their lot or to save themselves from being a mere repetition of their parents. It was right enough then to talk of the whole of government being vested in those who had the vested interests in the soil. But those ideas are becoming exploded. There has been one great march since the time that society was constituted in social order, from the time when one man's word, spoken as of divine right, commanded the will and the submission of all his subjects, to the time when his peers claimed a voice in counsel, to the time when his peers put a limit upon his authority. The next step was when the wealthier amongst the commoners began to put a limit on the power of the peers, and upon him who was guided by divine right, equally, and then came the period when movable wealth, the wealth represented by our trade and commerce, became the dominant factor in the government of the world. There comes now another change when there is a demand for an equal voice, not only with the commercial and wealthy classes, not only with the peers and the kingly orders, but with every governing power that we talk of as constituted in our present order. It is the day of the rising of the toilers, and thank goodness it is a day when they are qualified to rise. The right of education governs all, and the worker's home is flooded with as much information as the peer had 200 years ago. The schoolboy of the navy knows more than the British legislator did of the facts of the world, of the utilities of the world, 200 years ago. Knowledge has gone into every home, and has found its response in healthy, vigorous minds, and the workers are now found as capable of thought as ever the commercial classes of England were. The consequence is that they have become conscious of that power which knowledge always gives and awakens in the mind. Knowledge always adds dignity to the individual and makes him feel that he is a power amongst his fellows. He is demanding the right to live, to express his manhood, and it is in that sense that the molten metal, which has gone into the melting pot, will come out when all is over. It means that the stratum of society rises from the foundations. Those who have created the whole of the wealth of the world shall have some voice in its sharing and its distribution. This will be the result of the melting pot. To say that these people shall have no voice in the government of the country, to make mere poverty, not because of incapacity and not because of any faults, but because of these bulwarks which have prevented the people from having their fair share of the wealth of the world, a disqualification is to commit a crime against society. It is the

robber's arm, however politely it may be swayed. It is the old sword of barbarism flashing over the multitude with whatever eloquence it may be scabbarded. It is against sentiment of that kind that I am objecting.

Mr. Nairn: They are trying these experiments in Russia to-day.

Mr. O'Loughlen: We really do not know anything about Russia.

Hon. T. WALKER: What experiments? The hon. member the other day was with that body of noble representatives which constituted the Mission from France. That sword more than ever is exhibited in Petrograd, whose fathers suffered more than any of those who are participating in the present scene.

Mr. Troy: And were equally condemned.

Hon. T. WALKER: Of course they were condemned. It is not very long ago that all Britishers were tabooing France and exalting Germany. Let hon. members not forget that. It is only necessary for them to read their literature to find that in the Franco-Prussian war of 1870 the sympathies of Britain were not with France. France went through the throes of that terrible September, went through the horrors of the reign of terror, went through those scenes which made men's blood run cold. And yet, what came of it? That noble and valiant people, that liberty loving people has helped to overthrow the very throne of the Kaiser, and to bring about the triumph of democracy even in Germany herself. It is a terrible penalty that there is nothing born in this world that is of permanent value but has its birth in the travail of suffering and anguish. All great movements have come through sorrows and tribulations, consequently we are not surprised that Russia should be in that state. Why is Russia where she is to-day? It is because during these long centuries she has been under these very bulwarks which have kept the peasantry in serfdom and ignorance. To this very hour the Russians are serfs and slaves, mere brute beasts in human form, driven to labour and starved to work. Ignorance rules and prevails from the wilds of Siberia to the Palaces of St. Petersburg. These people, kept in subjection, are let loose for the first time. We do not wonder that they do not know how to behave in the hour of victory and of liberty. They have lost their heads, as I have seen others do, by temporary triumphs, and by coming into an atmosphere to which they are not accustomed. They have had no training for this liberty. They will suffer, there will be anarchy and chaos, but out of all this dire misfortune there will spring a new order on a higher plane, minus these bulwarks, these whips of the peasantry, minus these flashing swords of terror which were ever before the eyes of the multitude. They will come out of this chaos formed in the shape of man, companions in the brotherhood of human liberty. That is what will happen. It is growing everywhere, and there is need of it to grow even within our own Empire. Those who attempt to stop it, or put up these bulwarks, will only make it dangerous for the people who are struggling, yearning, and hoping for liberty, and also make it dangerous for themselves. Now let us

look at one or two of the arguments. There have been ever two Houses in all British Constitutions, so it is said. That is not correct.

Mr. Troy: Of course it is not.

Hon. T. WALKER: Even in Great Britain itself, the House that produced the greatest of our reforms in the period of the Commonwealth of Cromwell was a single Chamber. Our courts, our laws protect the liberties of the people, our triennial powers were modelled and expressed not in a two Chamber Parliament, but in a single Chamber. In France, whose example we have been following, it was the National Assembly which swept away the serfdom of the nation. They established something like equality and fraternity, and root and branch swept away all feudalism. It is her example we have followed in our English legislation ever since. The most democratic republic in the world, Switzerland, has single Chamber legislation. It is not a *sine qua non* of legislation that there must be two Chambers. Moncure D. Conway in his excellent work, "Republican Superstitions," has shown clearly that America had made a great mistake in copying the British Constitution in the adoption of the bi-cameral system. They get along well without two Chambers in Ontario, a part of the British Empire quite as important as Western Australia. There have been no ill effects, no dire results, no sinking back into savagery or barbarism because of that fact in Ontario. In Saskatchewan the position is similar, and there are more in the dominion of Canada. Why then make such a fetish of this double Chamber legislation? What purpose does it serve? How can it be anything like a bulwark? Is the bulwark of the people its property? Is that the golden calf of these modern children of Israel? Is it property alone that needs brains or representation to protect it? What is the wealth of any nation but its sons, its people, its flesh and blood, its throbbing human hearts? These constitute the wealth and the only wealth of any country in the world. Let us ship from Western Australia every toiler. Let us take the men from the plough. Let us take every wealth producer.

Hon. J. Mitchell: That would include every one.

Hon. T. WALKER: Not necessarily; there would be a few left. Let us take all these and leave the bulwark, the property men. I will take only those men who work for wages, and who live from week to week.

Hon. P. Collier: Take away those who have no vote for the Legislative Council.

Hon. T. WALKER: Let us take away all the people from this country who are deprived of a vote in the Legislative Council, and what will become of the others? Is it not transparent that we have greatly suffered by the very absence of our toilers at the Front? Has not this country languished to a certain degree? True, we have endeavoured to keep the wheels of industry going. But we have not been able to do that so effectively as to keep abreast of the march of events, because of the absence of our sons abroad. Take away our wage earners, our men who are disqualified from voting for another place; leave only the

property holders; what is going to become of the country then? What is the aim of all our friends, those who protect the bulwarks? What do they expect? What does the member for Northam (Hon. J. Mitchell) desire?

Mr. Nairn: But you would still be with us. You are a property holder.

Hon. T. WALKER: But there is this difference, that I know my property is merely adventitious. Whatever I may hold, is only an event of the moment. I do not claim that my property represents my merit. I do not claim that that gives me one fraction of superiority over my fellow men. I do not claim that that gives me a right to exercise authority over the people at large. That is the difference. But what is the aim now of the member for Northam except to bring from Europe, if possible to bring from Great Britain, the men who cannot toil and find a subsistence there, to bring them to this country and settle them here and let them work in this community to build up the wealth of this great State? What will constitute this State a great State? A large population. Let us fill our spaces, let us settle multitudes, let us get hamlets and towns and cities scattered throughout his broad land; and then we shall become truly a great State. But our friends opposing this Bill want those people to come and be governed and directed by those who have got what our friends call a stake in the country. A stake on which they will crucify the newcomers! The newcomers are to be governed by those who base their claim to speak solely on banking accounts and landed property. It is outrageous. The men who build up a nation should have a say as to the course the nation should take. Those men have, in their aggregate, the brain force as well as the physical force of the whole community. It is the consensus of mind of the toiling multitude that shapes the policy of a great country, and the toiling multitude object to having their aims and aspirations, their high hopes, chilled and frustrated by a mere arrogant section of the community who claim all the God-like attributes of humanity as being possessed by themselves. The toilers are no longer willing to be checked and chilled by an outside power. It is a perfect absurdity to dismiss the members of this Chamber to what is called their masters—that is, the people—dismiss them to ask for the suffrages of the people, to ask the people what policy is to be pursued. To the people we say, "What is your will?" And this House, when it comes back from a general election, is an expression of the will of the people. The people have spoken their will, and have put their representatives here to carry out that will. We put the people's will into legislative form, which form is borne away by a velvet-breeched carrier a few steps, and then it gets into a place where the people's will as expressed in that piece of legislation is torn up and thrown into the wastepaper basket. Is it not an absurdity for the people to have here the representatives of their will, while just a few paces away there are men who shall say to the people, "You shall not have your

will; we will stop it and block it and destroy it the moment it is expressed." It is inconsistent it is suicidal, to put us up to say yes, and to put up another place to say no. And the no always carries the day. We cannot carry out the people's will, because we come here in fetters. We may express the people's will in the best possible legislation, but still effect will not be given to the people's will. We have an instance of it in this measure to-night. The mover of the measure tells us openly that it does not express his wish or will, or the people's wish or will, but that he is content to have half a loaf as being better than no bread. I agree with him. But why should we have to cringe, to be content with half the loaf, to stop at emasculated rights? All because of another place, which will not let the people have their will. It is inconsistent. It is outrageous. If we are going to let the molten metal out of the melting pot, it cannot mould again a form of legislature like that. We cannot have yes and no standing side by side, yes speaking first, and the negative chilling and killing immediately afterwards. Another place may be called a bulwark. There is only one way in which that Chamber can be moved—by popular indignation, at a time when the multitude speak too loudly for another place to dare to defy them. When the cry of the populace is in deadly earnest, that other place will rush to obey the people's will. Another place is supposed to be a cooling chamber, which can stop agitation, which can be independent of agitation. True, another place does stop all legislation of a progressive nature during calm times; but in times of excitement it is as delirious and as hysterical as any other body, and yields immediately. When its value is to be tested, it fails, miserably fails. How, then, can we in any sense defend it? The problem is rapidly coming forward for us to solve, how we can save the expense of legislation in a country like Australia. What is the good of duplication? We have an elective Chamber on a limited franchise; those people claim they are elected. And we have an elective Chamber here. At the very best, what is it but duplication? And that is saying the most for it. We could obtain equal results if we cut this Chamber itself just in two halves. What need is there for this duplication? If both Chambers represent the will of the people, why have the will of the people expressed in two divisions, and in two voices—and those voices absolutely contradictory? The duplication is unnecessary. The expense is unnecessary. There was wisdom, which it would be well to follow, in the advice suggestively tendered by the leader of the Opposition. If we put up these bulwarks as some people put impediments to the flood, the flood will come all the stronger for the impediments placed in its way. To stop it for a moment will increase its force. The damage that will be done, will result from the stoppage by the interruption of the current's natural flow. If we are wise, we will keep pace with the natural flow, and not attempt to dam or stop it; we will move with the spirit

of the times and keep pace with it, thus avoiding all those disasters which we find in the countries where the tide has been stemmed for centuries. It is necessary to move with events, and it is most unwise to try to oppose them. And this measure only lightly, only gently, moves with the times. To stop this measure and oppose this measure on the ground that it represents a whittling away of the Constitution why, it is a child's argument! The Premier himself in the course of his speech on this Bill told us how, in the old days, Western Australia had only a Council, and how then we averted the old form and got the constitutional method of government and how in 1911 we obtained the franchise for the Legislative Council. The Premier told us those things, and apparently approvingly. According to him, we have been whittling away ever since this State started as a colony. All to the benefit of the State. We have grown great while we have done that whittling of which the Premier complains; we have given greater dignity to government; we have given a greater sense of manhood to the people by that whittling away. Yet, when we want to go one little step further, he becomes nervous, and the old Tory instincts rise within him. Then he stands like Ajax defying the lightning. After that, he says, "I am going to wait till the melting pot gets cool before I do any more." But he must not forget that he himself is in the melting pot with all else of the political institutions of the world. This very Government of Western Australia is in the melting pot. Ministers have done very well up to the present in the nice, warming fire of national fanaticism and perversion. But they will come out by and by. That part of government will be melted with the rest. The destinies of this State will be governed by the dynamic forces in society which are sweeping round the world. We cannot escape them. All I ask is that we shall have wisdom, that we shall not imitate the follies of the Kaisers and Czars in human history, that we shall not follow in the footsteps of the Charles's and the James's, but that we shall imitate the honourable examples set to us by a Queen Victoria and by a King Edward. That we shall rather do as they did, move with the people, as part of them and not stand defiant in front of them claiming the protection of the bulwarks of feudalism and the old strong iron-bound fetters of a dead and ignominious past.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. R. T. Robinson—Canning) [10.15]: I do not know that the rhetorical display we have had from the member for Kanowna has shed any light on the subject. It has rather tended to obscure the issue. Talk in this House as introduced by the leader of the Opposition appeals to my reason; talk such as that of the member for Kanowna rouses me up. I prefer that this House shall be a deliberative Assembly, and that members shall talk and argue on reasonable grounds, and when we are talking about such a thing as the constitution of the country and the franchise of our people, it demands all our wits and our ability without the intro-

duction of theatrical display. Sound argument is all that is going to appeal to me.

Hon. T. Walker: Don't you talk about theatrical display; you are nothing but an actor yourself. All through, your life has been a sham.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must keep order.

Hon. T. Walker: I will not listen to his insults. I will demand a withdrawal if need be, although I can protect myself.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: There are some people in this House who claim and who think they are the only democrats in the world, and that everybody who differs from them is a Tory. There are some people who are continually suspicious of others, and who think that they are the only people who can suggest remedies or advancements for the workers. The greatest advantages that the workers of this State have ever received have been from men of my way of thinking.

Mr. Jones: Forced on them.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: No, voluntary, and if we are going to extend the franchise in the case of the Legislative Council, as I hope it will be extended, it is not going to be by threats and by talk such as we have listened to.

Hon. T. Walker: It certainly will not be by what you talk about.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Speaking for myself I am in favour of extending the franchise of the Legislative Council to the householder. In the Bill that is before the Chamber the franchise is limited. We have to look at it critically, and whilst I say I am in favour of extending that franchise, I wish those words to have their proper meaning. The Bill before us restricts the franchise to one householder from each establishment, and as householders have been included and still continue to be the head of the house, it means that this Bill will debar all women, unless they are widows, from having a vote in the Upper House.

Mr. O'Loughlen: We can amend it on the lines of the South Australian Act.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am drawing attention to the matter, and I think I am doing so in a reasonable and proper fashion, without shouting and raising the roof.

Hon. T. Walker: Take the whole lot in.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Again speaking for myself I am with the leader of the Opposition in that it has been peculiar for a long time that men or women who exercise the franchise in connection with the Upper House should have votes in many electorates of the State. That is one of the things we might deal with also. To adopt the principle just as it is in this Bill will have a very far-reaching effect, in that it will not only debar the women of the State from voting, but it will debar many others who are entitled by another qualification, and who are not house-

holders, from voting. I know of many persons in this State who are not householders, and who have property and who are otherwise qualified to vote for the Legislative Council, who would be debarred under this Bill from exercising a vote. Take the simple case of an ordinary household consisting of a man and his wife and two sons or two daughters, in each case above the age of 21 years. Each would be qualified, by reason of a property qualification, or other qualification, to vote under the existing law. Under the Bill before us the husband only would be entitled to vote. The daughters of the family, unless they went away and got married and got establishments of their own, would have no vote.

Hon. P. Collier: This is a most reactionary measure.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The sons also, unless they went out and secured establishments of their own, would have no vote. I feel perfectly sure the leader of the Opposition does not intend the Bill to have the effect I have indicated. It is only by looking at the Bill in the way that I am doing that we can intelligently approach the subject, and eventually cast some kind of a vote on the question that will be accepted by the community as being reasonable. This is a Bill which every member of the Legislative Assembly should approach from his own standpoint. It is not a party Bill, it is not a Bill of factions, but the speech of the member for Kanowna will create factions. He is that type of man, a demagogue, who will drive people against voting for a measure of this sort which has everything to be said in its favour, and which, if sufficiently criticised, publicly thought about, and carefully considered, I venture to say has a very good chance of becoming part of the statute laws of our State. That much which I have said has been said for myself. In listening to the speech of my leader, the Premier, I venture to say he expressed the same sentiments. I ascertained from his speech that he is in favour of that qualification.

Hon. P. Collier: Now, now. The Premier said he opposed the Bill.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: He said a good deal before he made that statement.

Hon. P. Collier: Of course you must make explanations for him.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am not doing so.

Hon. P. Collier: You cannot bamboozle me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I do not intend to bamboozle anyone. The Premier is capable of speaking for himself, but I gathered from his speech that he was in favour of the extension of the franchise.

Hon. P. Collier: The Attorney General could not have gathered any such thing. The Premier never uttered a word from which the hon. member could gather such an impression.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. P. Collier: I have not been interrupting as much as other hon. members, and

I am going to get in a contradiction of that kind if I have to interrupt a dozen times.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It is essential that in a discussion on a matter of this character, of vital importance to each one of us, and of vital importance to the State, proper consideration should be given to it. Members should look at it reasonably, and discuss it dispassionately as far as they can on the floor of the House, address one another in courteous terms, listening to what each has to say. I am only expressing my own views, and when the Bill reaches the Committee stage I will be prepared to submit amendments in the directions I have indicated. I cannot do that to-night. As a matter of fact I did not know the Bill was going to be discussed to-night.

Mr. Jones: Are you going to help it or murder it?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am perfectly sure the leader of the Opposition appreciates what I say if the member for Fremantle does not. The amendments I will suggest I think will be helpful. There are very few men in Western Australia who have studied the question and who are not in favour of what is known as household qualification. We have had many disputes and wrangles about what is known as the £17 qualification. Those who do know, affect not to know. Those who should know, always say they do not understand. To me it is quite plain. I have made up my mind, even if the hon. member opposite had not brought down a Bill of this character, to attempt in the months that will pass before we meet again, to frame such a Bill as would get over, or attempt to get over the difficulties which have been existing, and the leader of the Opposition will do me the credit of admitting that some months ago I asked him for suggestions on the same subject, so that a Bill might be brought forward to clear up the doubts and difficulties that have existed in connection with the franchise of the Legislative Council.

Mr. THOMSON (Katanning) [10.30]: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	..	..	..	25
Noes	..	..	..	13

Majority for	..	..	12
--------------	----	----	----

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Money
Mr. Brown	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Draper	Mr. Nairn
Mr. Duff	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Durack	Mr. Pilkington
Mr. Foley	Mr. R. T. Robinson
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. George	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Willmott
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. Hardwick
Mr. Maley	

(Teller.)



## NOMS.

Mr. Angwin  
Mr. Collier  
Mr. Davies  
Mr. Holman  
Mr. Jones  
Mr. Lambert  
Mr. Mitchell

Mr. Munsie  
Mr. Rocks  
Mr. Troy  
Mr. Walker  
Mr. Willcock  
Mr. O'Loughlin  
(Teller.)

Motion thus passed.

House adjourned at 10.33 p.m.

## Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 10th December, 1918.

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

### OBITUARY—HON. FRANK WILSON, C.M.G.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [4.33]: A few weeks ago it was my painful duty to acquaint the House with the death of Lord Forrest. To-day members are called upon to express their appreciation of the public services of one who, next to the late Lord Forrest, may fairly be regarded as the foremost Liberal politician Western Australian has produced. I have little doubt that the services of the Hon. Frank Wilson to this State will be better understood and more deeply appreciated when, after the lapse of time, they can be viewed in a true perspective. It is perhaps true that luck and merit still go hand in hand, and that your wise man is ever Fortune's favourite. There can be no question that some people enjoy wider opportunities than do others. Much of the political success of the late Lord Forrest was due to the unerring instinct and the lofty courage with which he "took the current when it served." The late Hon. Frank Wilson, by contrast, was faced with pinched opportunities. The period 1905 to 1911, during which he occupied important offices in different Administrations, culminating with the holding of the dual portfolio of Premier and Colonial Treasurer, was a period of acute financial difficulty, resulting from the termination of the period during which Western Australia received revenues from the special Western Australian sliding scale of duties. And again, his period of office as Premier and Colonial Treasurer from July, 1916, to June, 1917, was overshadowed by the war, and the disturbance of all our industries. I am sure that in the future it will be recognised, not only that the late Hon. Frank Wilson rendered invaluable services

to the State in exceptionally trying circumstances, but also that had he been more favoured by opportunity he would have won in unequalled measure that immediate popular applause which is bestowed rather upon success than upon endeavour. Whilst there are members of the House who hold somewhat different views from those of the late Hon. Frank Wilson on political matters, there are none that did not admire his sterling character, none that did not value his unswerving and always loyal friendship. Most of us feel a sense of personal loss by his death. Personally, having had the honour of serving as one of his Ministers for a period of nearly twelve months, I can only say that the very intimate association resulting from that connection served to deepen my admiration of his qualities and to cement the friendship that had existed between us for so many years. It was not only in the political arena that the late Hon. Frank Wilson rendered exceptional services to Western Australia. No man had greater faith in the resources of the country, and no man gave more practical evidence of that faith. Two of our most important industries, the timber industry and the coal mining industry, owe much to his confidence, to his enterprise, to his sound business judgment, and to the determination he always showed to carry to a successful issue anything he took in hand. The commercial and industrial interests of our State are the poorer for his death. Whilst we are so conscious of the great public and personal loss we have sustained by the death of the late Hon. Frank Wilson, our deepest sympathies will be extended to his widow and family, to his family who are here, and also to those two soldier sons whose homecoming, so ardently looked forward to, will be so saddened by this event. We can only hope that the appreciation of their late husband and father, expressed so widely throughout the State and emphasised so emphatically by the conspicuous honour paid yesterday to his remains by all sections of the community, will in some measure assuage their grief. I move—

That this House desires to place on record its appreciation of the public services rendered to the State by the late Hon. Frank Wilson, C.M.G., and to express its deepest sympathy with his family in the irreparable loss which they have sustained; and that the President be requested to forward the foregoing resolution to the relatives of the deceased gentleman.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL (Metropolitan) [4.39]: I feel that but few words are required from me in seconding the motion moved by the leader of the House. Indeed, no words could add anything to the magnificent tribute of public feeling and affection paid to the late Hon. Frank Wilson by the attendance at his funeral obsequies yesterday. I do not think that in the history of the State there has been another occasion when all classes and all creeds of political and private opinion met to do unanimous honour to a deceased statesman, as was the case yesterday. For myself I have had very long experience of and long friendship with the deceased gentleman. We