

they must necessarily make mistakes, yet their policy has brought Western Australia from a condition of insecurity and depression to one of a very high degree of prosperity. The member for Brown Hill when speaking early in this debate advanced the argument that although the country had gone ahead the working man had not participated in the general prosperity, but still earlier in the debate the member for Fremantle brought forward unmistakable evidence in the figures of the Savings Bank deposits which showed that the deposits per head had very largely increased. One has also only to go into the city and see the large number of places of amusement which are being supported, and one has only to get the evidence of business men to obtain unmistakable proof that the great body of the people are prospering. I do not say that we should merely look towards accumulating wealth but it is a great satisfaction indeed to feel that the community are doing well because I very much doubt if you can have any very great social uplifting of the people if you have not a fair degree of material prosperity upon which to build. It has been said that the policy of the Government deals only with public works and the building of railways; it goes further. In the past year or two, owing to the financial difficulties we have not been able to spend on education as much as we would like, but this year with brighter conditions, the vote for primary education probably will show an increase of not less than £15,000. In the proposals of the Government with regard to education, are proposals for continuation classes, which will allow children after reaching the age of fourteen years to continue their education in the day time if they wish, up to the age of sixteen years and classes will be provided in the evening for those who prefer evening instruction. The Government are taking the first step towards extending the period of education for the youth of the community, because they believe that a highly educated community makes an even better investment for Western Australia than a large policy of public works, necessary as the latter is. I am sanguine enough

to believe if we have here a highly educated class emerging from school we will have fewer exhibitions of the crude theories which often emanate from the opposite side of the House, and we will have a juster view of the relations of the individual to the State and society. We on this side of the House are not afraid of education; we believe in education, and we believe the more intelligent a community the greater will be the support for the party to which we belong. Therefore I say the two main lines in our policy are the material development of the wealth of the country and the development of the intelligence of the community, and giving it every possible opportunity to benefit by the great advantages this country offers. While we may make mistakes in detail, if we can carry out that policy, if the general effect is as I have stated, to help forward the material prosperity and social uplifting of the people, then I believe that if the facts are only adequately put before the electors, this Government will not fail to obtain a continuing lease of power.

On motion by Mr. Keenan, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.27 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 11th August, 1910.

	PAGE.
Questions: Agricultural Department, Rabbit-proof fence employees	279
Abattoirs, Kalgoorlie	280
Lambs for export	280
Agricultural Bank, Advances on machinery	280
Address-in-Reply, seventh day	281

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

QUESTION — AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT, RABBIT-PROOF FENCE EMPLOYEES.

Mr. COLLIER (for Mr. Price) asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Has a

circular been issued by the Agricultural Department stipulating that employees on the rabbit-proof fence absenting themselves from duty on account of sickness must consider themselves discharged? 2, If so, will he take steps to ensure that such conditions shall apply to all Government employees?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, Yes. The Chief Inspector considered that leave was sometimes applied for unnecessarily and to the great inconvenience of the department, and issued the circular with a view to minimising the trouble. The circular will be withdrawn and other instructions issued. 2, No. The men referred to will be brought into line with others similarly employed.

QUESTION—ABATTOIRS. KALGOORLIE.

Mr. JACOBY asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Referring to the Minister's statement in the House yesterday in answer to a question, that additions are contemplated to the recently erected Kalgoorlie abattoirs to meet increased requirements; will the Minister explain whether, in view of the fact that the population of Kalgoorlie has not increased during recent years, the lack of sufficient accommodation is or is not due to the want of proper knowledge of abattoirs on the part of his official adviser? 2, Will he please explain what alterations or additions are contemplated?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, It is not so considered. When the works were planned there were six firms with slaughterhouses. Fifteen firms are now slaughtering at our works. 2, No material alteration is contemplated. The additions are as follow:—Completion of meat-hanging hall; one new skin-drying shed; fencing block in; salesyards accommodation.

QUESTION—LAMBS FOR EXPORT.

Mr. JACOBY asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, When does he expect the 200,000 lambs which he stated, in answer to a question in the House yesterday, would be available for export will be so available? 2, What proportion of these

would, in his opinion, be shipped from Fremantle? 3, Does the average price of 4 5/6d. per pound stated by him as the average price for the past three years realised in London refer to Australian or New Zealand lambs? 4, If the latter, will he please state the average for Australian lambs for each of the past three years separately? 5, Does his statement "that duplicating freezing facilities at Fremantle will lead to the importation of rams for breeding sheep for export" mean that such rams are not now available in this State? 6, If so, are the problematical 200,000 surplus lambs of a breed not suitable for export? 7, Does his statement referring to the retention of live lambs for further breeding mean that he proposes to prohibit their export? 8, Is it true that there exist at Fremantle freezing works capable of accommodating all the lambs required to be frozen for export for many years? 9, Have the management of the said works offered to contract to freeze and ship lambs at prices similar to those charged at Government Stores in Victoria and South Australia? 10, If these facilities already exist, what are the reasons which induced the Minister to agree to spend £70,000 on these proposed works when money is so urgently needed for numerous other works to promote development?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, In 1912. 2, 70 per cent. 3, Australian. New Zealand average 5 3/8d. 4, Answered by No. 3. 5, There are many rams in the State suitable for the production of lambs for export. The flocks of the State will be drawn upon by breeders and no doubt importation will also be resorted to. 6, The present surplus, not being bred for export, are not fit for export, and no export facilities exist. 7, No. 8, I should say, not. 9, Yes, but the makers of the offer did not possess requisite facilities to enable them to carry out the work of killing and freezing satisfactorily. 10, Answered by No. 9.

QUESTION—AGRICULTURAL BANK, ADVANCES ON MACHINERY.

Mr. COLLIER (for Mr. Bath) asked the Minister for Agriculture:—What

rates of wages and conditions of employment have been agreed upon by the trustees of the Agricultural Bank as the "ruling rate" in the various trades concerned in the manufacture of agricultural implements in compliance with Section 28 (d) of "The Agricultural Bank Act Amendment Act, 1909"?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied:—The trustees have satisfied themselves by examination of the different pay sheets that there is practically uniformity in the rates paid and that such rates are the ruling rates.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Seventh Day.

Resumed from the previous day.

Mr. KEENAN (Kalgoorlie): I take it there is no necessity for offering an apology for joining in this debate. It is the duty of all members of Parliament, no matter on which side of the House they sit, to carefully scrutinise the administrative acts of the Government, to criticise those acts in so far as they consider them deserving of criticism. It should be borne in mind by all members, as it is I believe by most, that after they have been elected to Parliament they no longer represent solely those who returned them, but rather the whole of the electorate for which they have been returned. It has to be remembered that they have a duty imposed upon them, not only by those who supported them and who, perhaps, are in favour of the Government policy, but also those who were not successful in returning a candidate holding opposite views. Before entering upon the subject matter of my remarks I desire to congratulate the member for Fremantle, who was selected to move the Address-in-Reply. He is, I understand, not inexperienced in respect to Parliament although he has been returned for the first time in this State within the past month. It is, I suppose, an experience in any man's life to be returned for Parliament, especially in a new State, under new conditions and new obligations; but I venture to say the experience the hon. member will most bear in

mind is that which preceded his election. It does not often happen to any gentleman standing for Parliament that two Ministers of the Crown go down to the electorate for the express purpose of damning him out of political existence and end up by showering upon him their blessings. We have, so far as I know, only one instance recorded in history, namely when Balaam also came for the purpose of cursing, and remained to bless. However I feel sure the hon. member will not at any future stage of his existence desire to have repeated an experience of that character, nor will the public of the State desire to see Ministers of the Crown repeating a performance of that character. I must also offer my congratulations to the gentleman who has been selected as leader of the Opposition. The post he now fills is one that has been handed down in our constitutional history from the most ancient times. It is really second in importance to that occupied by the head of the Government. He is the chief critic in the House of all that the Government do. In offering my congratulations to that hon. member it is not necessary that I should express the hope that he will realise all that is expected of the office I have portrayed—the office of chief critic, the man who exercises the most careful scrutiny and that he should exercise the functions of that office not merely *de jure* but also *de facto*. It will be necessary, and I think it is a wise necessity, to prove that the watch kept by him is an intelligent one—relevant, alive and truly and properly accurate; something that will tend to rally round him all the critical acumen to be found in the House; something that by forming a rallying centre will enable the acts of the Government to be properly criticised—and that he will discharge his high and onerous duties without descending into personalities that bring with them any reflection upon the honour of the member criticised. I do not for one moment subscribe to the dogma that it is possible or even desirable to eliminate personalities from our debates. It is impossible to criticise an administrator without criticising him personally; and if we were to adopt so false and foolish a rule we

might cease to be critics, might cease to have an Opposition. I say moreover no one imagines that those personalities which are not meant unfairly, but which are of a light and humorous character, calculated to relieve the monotony of debate, are in any sense a departure from the strict path we lay down to ourselves as constituting the procedure of the House. It is true there are regrettable instances sometimes of such quips being resented by hon. members to whom they are addressed; but I have found that those hon. members who resent imputations of the character which reflect not on their credit or honour, but are meant merely to relieve the dread monotony of debate—hon. members who resent such imputations are only those so wrapped up in their own importance, their own self opinion that anything said, however innocent, is an insult to them. I now turn to a consideration of the subject before the House. It is a debate on a very short, properly short answer to an address delivered by His Excellency the Governor on his opening Parliament. It is, indeed, a difficult task to speak on that which is really nothing more than academic discussion, on that in regard to which the general scheme presents no definite goal to be reached, no defined object to be urged, or defence to be made, but is simply a certain number of members saying what they believe to be good for the country—I was about to say “pouring out that which they contained”—but at any rate certain members have their say and at the end there is silence. There is nothing to induce one to readily join in a discussion of that character, because there is an entire absence of that which is real. There is too much of a feeling that the end must come no matter what is said or done—and that end is nothing. However, it seems to be accepted that it is a duty to speak, and therefore I recognise it is incumbent on me to speak on an occasion of this character, difficult as it is to do so, a difficulty which is exemplified by the milk-and-water utterances to which we have listened varied—merely varied—with a

few exceptions by parochial complaints. Now, to turn to this Speech of His Excellency the Governor, the first characteristic—in fact the main, if not the only characteristic it contains—is its verbosity, a verbosity which partakes of that peculiar character that it conceals every possible meaning. It is words really, almost without sense; certainly it is words without intent. In fact, if I may boldly say so, this Speech largely exemplifies that in regard to which the member for Kanowna is unjustly charged when, glorying as he does in a command of words which is wholly and abnormally exceptional, he sometimes converts us by his eloquence to what after all never appeals to our reason. I turn now, and I trust the House will bear with me, to a short analysis of the document which is submitted as the Speech of His Excellency. The first four paragraphs which have never been touched on by any speaker deal, I submit, with a subject in regard to which exaggerated and obviously fictitious phrases have done a lot of harm. I yield to no one in my loyalty to our Constitutional Government, at the head of which we find the King; I yield to no one in my admiration for the character of our late King as a Constitutional Sovereign, and as one who upheld in the highest degree the best traditions of Constitutional Government; but inasmuch as I desire that that very feeling of loyalty to the Constitution and to the person or Sovereign placed at its head should be shared in and participated in by my fellow citizens, I regret that on such an occasion as the lamented demise of our late Sovereign so much has been written which is repugnant almost to our manhood, the first feelings we have of self-respect, and that this has been carried so far that I fear great damage has been done to Constitutional Government throughout the British Empire. I turn to deal with the next matter, the visit of the Premier to London. We are told that the Premier went to London with a view to inquiring into the representation of Western Australia in the capital of the Empire. The representation of Western Australia is only another phrase for the

Agent Generalship, and naturally I may inquire what is the result of the inquiry. Was any inquiry made at all? If so, what was the nature of the finding arrived at as the result of that inquiry? It is within the memory of most members of the House that long ago it was suggested that it was desirable the staff engaged in the Agent General's office should be re-organised. If that has been done, if that is what is meant by this paragraph why not tell us; why has not some Minister who has spoken explained what was meant to be conveyed by these words—that there was some scheme of re-organisation, if not accomplished, at least started? Again, there was another suggestion put forward for a considerable time that the staff should be periodically transferred to Western Australia with the laudable object of keeping that staff in constant touch with developments in this State. I remember that when the suggestion was made it was received in all parts of the House with a great deal of favour. Has that been commenced? Certainly it has not been accomplished. I would like to know if there has been even a start made in the direction of carrying out that admirable step. To go on further with this paragraph, I find that we are told the visit has proved of great advantage to the State owing to the opportunity afforded of disseminating reliable information. Apparently, if there be any doubt in our minds as to the question of the Agent General's office having been re-organised, it would not appear that the colleagues of the Premier were satisfied, inasmuch as the only matter we are told they are satisfied with in regard to the Premier's visit is the giving of reliable information in respect to the resources of Western Australia.

Mr. Walker: It implies they never had it before.

Mr. KEENAN: It does imply that all other information was non-reliable, that whoever acted for this State in London, whatever staff was engaged under that person, has been the means of furnishing not that which could be relied upon

but that which was unreliable. I do not know, in fact I cannot suppose that this is really the intent with which this paragraph was drawn up; but it is an illustration of the careless manner in which some phrases are flung into a document for the purpose merely of occupying space without really caring what their true import may be. The next paragraph occupies four lines of space and the history it conveys is not of ancient order, and in so far as it is not historical, it merely informs us of that which is within the knowledge of every Australian school boy. Then we come to what I regard as the most astounding paragraph that has ever appeared in any Governor's Speech. What are the facts in regard to this paragraph dealing with the delay in the construction of the Trans-Australian railway as they present themselves, not to those who are behind the scenes and have some special source of information, but to the general public? It would appear as if an honourable Minister of the Crown, in a moment of mental aberration committed an act of grave indiscretion. Obviously the only decent thing to be done was to allow the pall of oblivion to descend on that act as quickly and as undemonstratively as possible. The choice remains of acting indecently, of persisting in an attempt to justify it in the hope of winning out, not by any merit, but by mere perseverance. But I submit that a course of conduct of that character, and any statement which has to be made in support of it, should not find space in the Governor's Speech. There should be some line of dignity that should never be transgressed in regard to matters that appear in the Governor's Speech. It should never be made an escape door, or what may be described as a sort of get-out from a difficult or impossible position. But since the course I suggest of dropping this matter has not been adopted, as is seen by its appearance in the Governor's Speech, let me recall what happened. The Minister for Works, possibly carried away by some sentiment which for the time being was more potent than com-

mon sense—I have no intention of referring to anything such as is generally described in the police court as “under the influence”—a sentiment of overweening ambition and possibly self-advertising without considering the enormous price at which the self-advertising is purchased, at a certain public function made a statement to the effect that if the Transcontinental line were not constructed in the immediate future by the Commonwealth it would be undertaken by the two States concerned, or at any rate his Government would favourably consider it. I venture to say that when this statement first appeared in print it caused as much consternation to the followers of the party to which the Minister belonged as it did amusement to his opponents. What is the first and most obvious result of a statement of that character? Can it be doubted that it has furnished a weapon to the opponents of the construction of a line from Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta, a weapon of a most forcible character? For what has been our argument in the past in support of the construction of this line? It has been divided, I submit, roughly into two heads. In the first place, we contended properly and rightly, that the construction of this line was a great national work that should be undertaken by the Commonwealth and not be borne by any State, the benefits to be derived from which were benefits that cannot for a moment be imagined to be confined to any State, beyond which there was the great common scheme of defence which is solely within the province of the Commonwealth. Secondly, we have urged, and properly urged, that if the State were to attempt to construct a work of this character the expense would be more than our resources could be reasonably called upon to bear. Can it be for one moment doubted that both these arguments are weakened, if they are not absolutely dashed to the ground, by making an announcement of the character the Minister made? I have pointed out what is the first effect of that announcement. Let me now point out a second effect.

The second effect is this: it would undoubtedly strangle the development of our local resources. There are limits to our borrowing powers obviously from two points of view. In the first place, lenders will not give unlimited sums to those who wish to borrow, and in the second place, the taxpayer cannot carry an unlimited load. Therefore, with this limitation placed on our borrowing capacity if we were to pledge the credit of the State for the huge sum that would be necessary to carry out this work, we would strangle the development of purely local industries that otherwise it would be in our power to develop.

Mr. Gordon : The James Government guaranteed interest on the outlay.

Mr. KEENAN : Because that Government committed a senseless act is that a reason why the present Government should do similarly? Surely it is not suggested that we should adopt the unwise acts of those who have gone before. From no point of view can this proposal be commended, and from every point of view, if one is reasonable, it must be deplored. The incident having caused the usual three days' sensation would have died a natural death had it not been that it was referred to again in the Governor's Speech. But for that, members on this side of the House would not have dreamt of, or given one moment's thought to, the project, although they knew the Minister for Works, at one time or other, had voiced the idea. For what purpose does the paragraph appear in the Speech? I submit that the only purpose one can credit it with is to fill in a certain amount of space, to occupy five lines of print. I ask in all seriousness, whether something less harmful, less calculated to do injury, could not have been found for the purpose.

Mr. Collier : How about a couple of lines of poetry?

Mr. KEENAN : There might have been some discussion on the weather, that last resort of people who find themselves incapable of conversation, or there might have been something from the diary of the Premier in London. Surely the whole of that diary cannot have been sent on to the *West Australian*; there

must have been some left out. We might have had that, for it would have filled a good deal more than five lines. But to return to the serious consideration of the matter, I challenge the sincerity of the Government in putting that paragraph into the mouth of His Excellency the Governor, and I challenge them to bring down a resolution to give effect to that paragraph. I cannot help but know that even on this side there would be a majority against a proposal of that kind, and I have no reason to believe that Ministers are tired of their places on the Treasury bench; there has been no indication of that. Further, I challenge the Government as to their sincerity in this paragraph from the point of view of any possibility of agreement between this State and South Australia in the construction of the line, and yet this miserable mistake, riddled with ridicule, covered with contempt, is thought sufficient to fill a place in the Governor's Speech. In the next paragraph we find as much credit as possible taken for the successful development of the agricultural industry. Let me say that I do not object for one moment to the Government taking credit in this direction. Speaking personally, I doubt whether, had it not been for the enthusiasm, sometimes excessive, sometimes overweening, sometimes misdirected, of the Minister for Lands, the Government would have awakened to the possibilities of the industry, and have entered upon the path of exploiting and developing it.

Mr. George: Is that not an excuse for swelled head?

Mr. KEENAN: I do not know why I should follow the line of thought of the member for Murray. If I were prepared to join him I should prefer to do so in that innocent and inexpensive amusement of trying to find out the reason why he is so abnormally honest. I have said, and I say it without hesitation, that personally I give the fullest possible credit for agricultural development to the Minister for Lands, above all; but when that development was once entered into, when it was once placed before the country and adopted, can it be said there

was any lack of enthusiasm in any part of the House in support of it? Least of all can it be said there was any lack of support for any scheme intended to increase or to develop the agricultural industry, from members representing goldfields constituencies. I wish to make myself absolutely clear in this statement. I wish to leave it open to a challenge, if it be possible, as to whether at any time, any member representing a goldfields constituency made any remonstrance against a proposal put before the House—if the merits had been placed before members and warranted the adoption of the scheme—for the purpose of exploiting our agricultural industry. No doubt a few would encourage the cruel belief that there is a spirit of opposition on the goldfields to the development of the agricultural industry, with what object, unless it be the miserable one of obtaining, in the strife and conflict between sections of the people, the support they otherwise would be unworthy of.

Mr. Collier: That was attempted by the Attorney General last night.

Mr. KEENAN: I would go further, and say that even in the case of the railways which, in the opinion of some members, did not have much to commend them, which we had to take entirely on trust, and which on further examination might appear to have been conceived more in the interests of a few influential people than of the State, yet knowing that our capacity to judge on agricultural matters was limited, that opinions we might express on such a subject must be formed rapidly, and that too on insufficient information, there never was on our part more than that a just request for further particulars, which every member is at all times entitled to ask for. It is a habit of all Governments to take credit for everything that has turned out fortunately; all Governments fall into that path, and most Governments require to do so. I may be pardoned for suggesting that it is going a little too far when the dispensation of Providence is, in some measure, brought in as a buttress to the merits of the Government. I pass over the horticultural paragraph and deal with that concerning the first public

work, namely, the erection of grain sheds at North Fremantle which are "to be equipped with the most modern and effective appliances for the rapid despatch of vessels." I was under the impression, but it appears to have been a false one, that the project originated with the Harbour Trust Commissioners for the port of Fremantle, and that they applied for and obtained the necessary authority to raise money to carry the work into execution. However, that is merely a question of properly dividing the credit of work, if it deserves credit. It seems to me, and I speak with hesitation, that we are running too fast in connection with the export trade of agricultural products. I cannot say whether the construction of these sheds, and the provision of appliances will be a foolish step or not, but I am aware that there is an alternative in the form of export in bulk, and why this large expenditure should have been authorised before the determination was arrived at as to whether export of grain in bags or in bulk is the better, is hard to understand. To me the action appears to be premature. There is a delightful addendum to the paragraph. After reciting that these large sheds are to be erected, the following words are added, "and at the other ports commensurate facilities will also be required." I have no doubt they will be required. Certainly they will be required at Albany, which is a port from which grain is despatched: the same applies to Geraldton. No doubt they will be required, but there is not the smallest suggestion that they will be supplied. I shall not go further than again comment on the loose and vague phraseology used without there being any idea as to what is intended. The next public work mentioned is the erection of freezing and canning works at Wyndham. Here, too, we have the same vague, impossible phraseology, for we are told that the Ministers are considering the necessity of making provision for them at Wyndham and elsewhere. I bear in mind that in certain documents in the old country, old formal documents, there is a sort of preamble, relating that certain deeds or laws applied within the Four Seas, and

whenever it is intended to extend the provision beyond, the word "elsewhere" is used. That might mean just across the Channel or away at the South Pole. And so, too, here; it may be that the Ministry contemplate the erection of freezers, at Derby, Broome, Port Hedland, Geraldton, or perhaps, even at Esperance; but it is not for one moment to be understood from the language used that they are in fact going to erect them at any other than the one place named. In regard to this question of the erection of freezers at Wyndham, I hold the opinion that if there is any project, any industrial business, suited for private enterprise it is the erection of these freezers. What is the position there? There are two or three parties only who use the port of Wyndham. If I am wrong, I hope to be corrected. I know of one very large pastoral company that uses the port and two smaller ones. If there are others, they are of microscopical proportions. Therefore, if a freezer is established at Wyndham it will be at the mercy of those few people. They could combine at any time, say they would not pay the terms, and tell the Government that if they did not like to come to their terms, the machinery could lie there and rot.

The Minister for Lands: The stock tax would cover any loss.

Mr. KEENAN: How would that apply? The port is not only for the immediate vicinity but for the great back country. Does the Minister suggest he could shove out the stock tax as far as he liked in order to get in revenue so as to keep the freezer going? The position would be intolerable. At most that system would mean that although the freezer was a failure the Government could get out with a small loss. Under all these circumstances I am strongly in favour of a matter of this kind being left to private enterprise. If it is left to private enterprise, the first thing that will be assured is that before any works are put up a contract will be made for the purpose of supplying cattle for a certain number of years with a penalty to be imposed on the parties undertaking to provide that supply

if they fail to do so. If instead we carry out as suggested a State project we shall be doing something which it appears to me has every possibility of failure and scarcely any chance left of success. I propose to pass over those portions of the Speech which are merely desultory remarks on things in general, and reach that part which deals with the report of the experts on the Goldfields Water Supply Scheme. It is pleasing to learn that the expenditure of a reasonable sum of money, not a sum of any magnitude, will prolong the life of the main for a considerable number of years. I should like to know what the amount, the special sum set apart every year for repairs, amounts to. It has been within the knowledge of all members that it has been the custom of the department to set aside every year a certain sum to meet the cost of repairing the mains, and it would indeed be interesting information to know what that amounts to and also to know what amount it is intended to set apart in the future. In this direction we have to remember that the price of water has been considerably raised, and those who are the purchasers of it for the mining industry are adding considerably to the revenue of the department. The profit I presume will show a corresponding increase, and the department should have an opportunity now, as it has not had in past years, of setting apart a fairly large sum every year to meet the cost of repairing the main. I also would like to know how many years of life it is estimated the present work and the expenditure of the sum proposed, will ensure to the main. These are more important matters than the petty details discussed at such length by Ministers; these are matters which concern the greatest industry still in the country, an industry which is not jealous of the rivalry of the agricultural industry. We would be only too glad to see the agricultural industry over-top it, but the fact remains that the mining industry is still the one great industry of Western Australia, and its life depends upon this main. But, let us leave that out of account. We have the

lives of 10,000 workers and their wives and families depending upon this main, and one might reasonably hope under the circumstances that Ministers, when addressing themselves to the House would have commented upon this paragraph in the Governor's Speech and given some information which would have been of great interest rather than indulging in long answers to matters of petty detail, and in many cases matters which might have been better left without replies. I now turn to another matter also of great importance, and which receives a short and wholly unsatisfactory reference in the succeeding paragraph in the Speech. I refer to the appointment of a board of experts to act as an advisory board in the matter of the construction of agricultural railways. I have pointed out on more than one occasion in this House that it was absolutely a negation of our constitutional duty to allow Ministers to in any way obtain relief from the responsibility which their office casts upon them. When at first it was suggested that a board of some character should be appointed for the purpose of governing expenditure on public works, this was the one objection I saw, that it might, it would, as a matter of course to some extent, deprive the House of the control of public works, a control that must belong to the House which alone has to say whether the works are to be carried out or not, and also the manner in which they are to be carried out. But, in view of the fact that our agricultural railways and other public works were in many cases the result of somewhat haphazard promises made at different functions, and redeemed in honour by Ministers, it seemed necessary to find some governing body, some board, which would be above the vicissitudes of politics, and for that reason, and only for that reason, I became a party to and seconded the efforts of those who advocated the appointment of a board to control the expenditure of moneys on public works. It, however, was a body entirely different from the one which has been constituted, and referred to in a paragraph of the Governor's Speech. In the first place

members of a board such as I would advocate would not be appointed or removed at the will of Ministers ; their appointment or removal would be pursuant to a resolution of the House or an Act of Parliament ; they would moreover have the right to call any evidence they chose, and to make what investigations they pleased, and finally present a report, not to a Minister, but to Parliament. In every one of these important and essential details, the present proposition is entirely deficient. Here we merely have a body of men—I admit, men of the highest character—but they are appointed at the whim of the Ministry of the day. They are told to go and do something and they do it, and if they are not told to do it they dare not do it. After having done something, they report to the Minister, and he in his turn digests the report, and if he does not like it, it can go into the waste-paper basket. Of course it may be said that the report may be produced in the House, but under the circumstances I do not attach any value to that. I find this to apply to men of the highest character and strongest resolution. If you tell them they are entirely independent of influence or control then they devote their whole mind and energy to their work, but if you tell them they are Ministerial tools—I use that phrase not in the nature of abuse, but merely descriptive in some way of their position—if they are told that they are Ministerial tools and must do something, they have no longer that incentive that a man would have under different circumstances. I have no hesitation in saying that this present proposal does nothing more than this ; it affords an easy blind for the purpose of shirking responsibility, which otherwise would properly fall upon the shoulders of Ministers. I reiterate we are entering upon a most dangerous course when we allow ourselves to become parties to a proposal of this character. Where will it end ? If this can be done with regard to one portion of the administration, why cannot it be done with regard to others ? Why not have boards appointed

in every department, and for ever abolish the control of Parliament ; because if once a Ministry is allowed to create these boards they can give a complete answer to the House ; they can always say, as will be said until this board has passed out of existence, that the board has reported on it and that the board having said this, the Government are not responsible. I now turn to the proposal mentioned in the Speech of correcting anomalies in electoral districts. This proposal will involve a great constitutional change, and I venture to say that it could not have been conveyed in more bald language than has been done. Every one agrees that anomalies should be rectified, whether they be electoral or any other, but, to merely put in a paragraph of that kind is to put in something which is indicative of nothing whatever. It merely amounts to this, that that ought to be done which ought to be done. We should have had at least some outline of the scheme of the proposed redistribution, or the form it is intended it should take. We should certainly have been told whether it is intended to proceed on any well known principle, as for instance the principle of having a certain quota for electorates, and whether the electorates having fallen below that quota were to be deprived of the right of representation ; or we might have been told that it was the intention of the Government to bring down a scheme for proportional representation, or in fact in whatever form it was proposed to redress the anomalies. We could well have been told without entering into details, the direction in which we are to be asked to advance. But we have not had the smallest hint either in the document presented to Parliament by the Governor or in the speeches of Ministers as to what the direction is to be. Rumour of course has been busy. I have kept myself wholly free from any knowledge of what the intentions of the Government were as forecasted in these rumours. Is not this the only possible attitude ? What is the alternative ? A gathering of the members of the House takes place, and they there and then

resolve that a certain electorate be deprived of its representation, and some other created, and in that resolution they give consideration, not to the general aspects of the case, but the aspects which alone appeal to them. I submit this is a most dangerous and most vicious proceeding, because if any proposition requires to be considered with an unbiassed mind, and requires that attitude in the House which may be described as entirely non-party, it is the question of redistribution. I cannot believe that hon. members, notwithstanding that they may have put before them some immature scheme which they may have been asked to assent to, that when the question comes before the House in concrete form they will be untrue to the first instincts of justice in a matter of this kind, and will allow themselves to come into the House pledged to a course which the House as a whole knows nothing about. I have prepared a short analysis of the existing electorates and I find — leaving out my own electorate for the time being—that on the Government side there are 27 seats, the total number of electors to those 27 seats being 70,823.

Mr. Jacoby: Why leave your own out?

Mr. KEENAN: Because if I put it in I am adding it to one or the other side. There is no room for jocularly in a consideration of this kind. I am pointing out how the figures in this list bear on this question. The 27 seats I have dealt with show that the Government average 2,615, as against an average of 2,700 electors in the 22 seats held by the members of the Opposition. If there be any great need for a change it is a need which exists in only a few electorates, which is confined within very narrow bounds; and if, instead of going in for a highly contentious question such as a redistribution of seats, the Government were to bring down a measure for uniting these electorates, for taking three or four and joining them together, it would have been easy, by the addition of the more numerous to those less numerous, to have produced the result of an electorate returning four members and being

possessed of four times the present quota. I might add that that would have been a rough method; but even in a rough way the question could have been dealt with without bringing before the House a highly contentious measure involving bitter warfare. There will be one far-reaching blessing if we adopt proportional representation—it will do away with the advocacy of parish wants which is the curse of politics to-day. It will enable those who compose the House to take a broader and more national view, without caring whether petty little associations pass votes of want of confidence in them. Under such a system hon. members would cease to be, as they are to-day, at the beck and call of every parish official, and I believe the system would work for the welfare and prosperity of Western Australia. But we have not had, nor do I believe we will have, a scheme of that character. It is with me a deep and lasting regret that when the Electoral Bill was before the House, I was foolish enough to allow to be struck out of that measure the machinery which would have had so desirable an effect. If the Government are serious in the attempt to deal with the question on just and equitable lines they will return to the abandoned machinery and take up that which would prove the best scheme of dealing with electoral troubles, by introducing proportional representation. If the other course be adopted they will be forcing on this State a measure depriving some electorate of representation, and the inevitable result will be the death knell of State Government. If there is one thing to which we cannot shut our eyes it is the danger of Unification. I hold strong views in favour of State Government. I believe that only by local government can we develop our country to the fullest extent, that only by local government can we get any immediate attention to local wants, that only by local government can we enable the more easily developed resources of our country to be the first to be put into the foreground. But all this will not weigh if the great mass of the people, of those who have the right to

elect members of this House, become possessed of the idea that they are not being justly ruled, or that they are not getting the full measure of their rights under the Constitution. If it can be said that 2,700 persons in one part of the State are being over-ruled by 500 in another part—if this comes to pass we will have put ourselves in the position of having driven home the first nail in the coffin of State Government. By what means can Unification ever come to any State? I take it, by only two methods or from two causes. In the first place by successful propaganda on the part of those who hold views favourable to Unification. Of that I have no fear; for although at certain junctures they may obtain what, for the time being, appears to be considerable support, yet I do not believe that in the long run the great mass of the people would abandon their rights of government. There is a second compelling cause, namely that those who are the supporters of local government may become parties to acts which will drive away from their side many who, in other circumstances, would support them loyally, but who are driven by these acts into a course they heartily desire to avoid. There is this very case before the House. There is also another case which, with the patience of the House, I will lay before it. There are some in this State foolish enough to talk about partition—to talk about cutting off a certain part of the State. But do those persons ever imagine what would be the result of carrying such proposal into effect? I have seen this proposition advocated in the Metropolitan Press; and, after all, I presume the Metropolitan Press must advocate that which is suitable to its readers. The carrying out of such a proposal would mean that we should ourselves demonstrate in the most effective possible manner the total inability of local government to meet our wants. We should furnish to the Commonwealth the illustration that we are not capable under our own departments, our own powers, to satisfy the wants of our own people; and I have no doubt that if that extraordinary step were given

effect to, it would lead, not in the distant future, but in the almost immediate present, to a total abandonment of local government in Western Australia. Those who advocate this cutting off of a portion of the State do so on certain grounds. They allege that the goldfields—which is the portion it is desired to sever—are not in sympathy with the rest of the State; that they do not share in the hopes and aspirations of the rest of the State; that they desire to shirk the burden of developing the rest of the State and that, in fact, their residents are not fitting partners for those who live in the other parts of the State. Assuming that this was true—I unhesitatingly say there is not a grain of truth in it—but assume for the moment that it was true, would it justify doing that which, in effect, means cutting the throats of our fellow citizens? But I would ask whether in view of a movement of this character, there should not be some expression made, some intention announced on the part of those who have the responsibility of watching all movements of public sentiment? Should they not make an effort to stamp out the curse before it becomes dangerous to deal with? Now, I ask myself, what are the facts upon which this false complexion of hostility on the part of the goldfields is based? The goldfields people are dissatisfied with the Government in power; they are possessed with the idea that there is an entire lack of sympathy on the part of the Executive with the development of that one industry on which they entirely rely. They are possessed of a deep-rooted conviction that the standard by which their wants are tried and determined is very different from that applied to the requirements of those living in more favoured places. Let me show that there is some justification for this belief; that although it is something to be regretted—something that on any and every occasion, if I had the power, I would do everything possible to discontinue—yet there is some reason for its existence. I will take a few examples which illustrate the conduct to which exception has been taken and which is bearing the fruit of discontent in the

minds of the goldfields people. I am going to refer, first of all, to the Goldfields Water Supply Administration. When a mine owner applies to this administration he has to sign a certain form of contract. If this contract contained conditions which by some accident were unduly harsh, we could say at once that the Ministry were wholly free from blame. But I desire to inform the House that those conditions were brought specially under the notice of both the Minister for Mines and the Minister for Works; consequently it is impossible to absolve them from knowledge of the provisions and from having expressed their approval of them in the conduct of the business of the department. I have to refer to a mine in my own electorate; but in doing so I desire to express my regret that my limited knowledge does not allow me to bring an instance beyond the borders of my own electorate; because if there is one thing I wish to avoid at the present juncture it is the making of any complaint which might have special reference to that electorate. The contract which I hold in my hand deals with the supply of water to certain tributers who are carrying on mining operations on the Hannans Reward lease, a proposition of exceedingly low grade, giving barely a margin of profit in the gold return. I am well within the mark if I say that the average value is about 3½dwts., while the recovery is about 2½dwts. Hon. members will therefore see that these men are with great difficulty struggling with a proposition which might be successful if sympathetic support were given to it by the Government of the day. For formal purposes the contract had to be signed by the leaseholder and the Hannans Reward company. But the company has long ago ceased to operate, having handed over its mines to the tributers, and it has no real interest in the subject matter of the agreement. The two conditions I want the House to appreciate, conditions which suggest and in a measure are responsible for the birth of this belief in the minds of the goldfields people of want of sympathy, are, first a condition whereby the company agrees

that it will instal no appliances to materially reduce the consumption of water without the consent of the Minister for Works, and if a breach of this condition is committed it pays a fine of £100. Let me ask the attention of the House to what that means. Water is supplied at a certain price. If a company instals any machinery which enables it to avoid waste of water it has to pay a fine of £100. And that is said by some to be encouragement to the mining industry. Let me for a moment give an illustration applicable to the agricultural industry. Suppose there was some agreement made by one of the services controlled by the State under which if a farmer conveyed a certain quantity of fertilizers by rail he was to obtain a large reduction in freight. I should not for a moment object to a condition of that kind, nor would any member of the House if it could be shown that by a generous application of the power by the State as owner of the service the industry could be encouraged. We would never for a moment object to any such proceeding. But suppose the contract went on to say that if the farmer did not put on so much, some absurd quantity per acre, or if he did anything in the nature of saving a quantity, he would be liable to pay a huge penalty to the Railway Department. Then how would the agricultural members look upon it? Would they think that the Government who knowingly prescribed conditions of that kind were in sympathy with the agricultural industry? Therefore, are hon. members surprised that the goldfields people, seeing these conditions, and how they are enforced, seeing how absolutely and how entirely inequitable they are in their very essence, should come to the conclusion that the present Government are not in sympathy with the development of the mining industry?

The Minister for Mines: Did not the company get assistance?

Mr. KEENAN: The tributers did not.

The Minister for Mines: Is the hon. member aware that their account closed at £1,300 in debt?

Mr. KEENAN: It is true that a writ was issued against the company

as nominal defendants for a sum of money due by these tributers for water, and that the sum mentioned on the writ was largely increased, almost doubled, by the fact that these men, in trying to make ends meet, used some water out of the mine shaft. They were lifting water, but by the contract they were compelled to throw away all the water from the mine.

Mr. Scaddan : It cost them money to lift it and they had to throw it away.

Mr. KEENAN : When they were at the last stage of their difficulties in making ends meet they used some of the water they were lifting and they were immediately billed for double the amount, that being one of the conditions under which they obtained the supply ; and by that means the sum which is endorsed on the writ, over £1,000, is arrived at. But even in that instance we are departing from the consideration of that which I first brought before the House. There is in that case an entire want of sympathy for men who were endeavouring to carry on the industry under most difficult conditions. I defy any examination or report to find anything but that these men worked month after month on stone that was the lowest possible payable in the State, and despite their difficulties they maintained the mine and paid for a considerable amount of labour which came back to the State in indirect profit. When they got into difficulty they were pounced upon only as a Shylock would pounce upon his victim for doing that which they thought was a most excusable act. But I return to the consideration of this condition which is applicable to all who purchase water from the Goldfields Water Supply, and I ask is it possible to defend it ? I put the case from an agricultural point of view, and I say if any agricultural member brought before the House an instance of this character in the treatment of the agricultural industry he would not have to look for support from the representatives of the goldfields, he would get it spontaneously ; and if we point out some reason for this growing distrust, this growing want of belief on the

part of the goldfields public in the administration of the Government, surely we have the like right to ask for sympathy from the agricultural members.

Mr. George : You will get it where the injustice is apparent.

Mr. KEENAN : There is another matter. I like to be wholly fair. We had only seen the Minister for Works on the matter, and I submitted a question in the House, asking the Minister for Mines if he knew of these conditions and if, knowing them, he had approved of them. The reply before the House is very verbose. I do not know that it is actually to the point in any way, but at any rate it shows that the Minister for Mines knows of these conditions, and either actively or unwillingly approves of them. The other condition to which I draw attention is this : for numbers of years those drawing water from the scheme paid four weeks' estimated consumption in advance, and that was found to work admirably, and when we waited on the Minister for Works we were told that all the bad debts incurred by the department in seven years amounted to the ridiculously small sum of £2,500, covering transactions of hundreds of thousands of pounds. It was a fraction so small that any business man would laugh at, but nevertheless the four weeks' advance was changed to a six weeks' advance ; and, again, that increase could not be interpreted in any light but as want of sympathy for the development of the mining industry. If I were to repeat as I did a little while ago, we could imagine some case in the agricultural industry where facilities were afforded on a proper basis of safety, where there was no reason to suppose that the margin of safety was not sufficient yet it was increased by 50 per cent. would not there be considerable indignation on the part of members representing the agricultural industries ? And if they had brought the matter before the consideration of the House, again I say they would not have had to ask for, but would have received, the cordial support of every member representing a goldfields electorate.

Mr. George: Is there any reason given for the increase?

Mr. KEENAN: The only reason came not from the Minister but from the department, and the reason was a wholly imaginary one in view of the past history of the scheme. If there were a large quantity of bad debts being incurred by the scheme, if there were something found wholly abnormal in ordinary business affairs, then it could be said the margin of safety must be increased; but when we find that in the past, in the whole history of the scheme right up to the time this regulation was framed, there had been no loss of any consequence, and that the bad debts incurred were only of infinitesimal proportions, I do not care what the permanent staff think, it has no right equitably to increase the margin of safety that is necessary to protect the department. There is another example I would give showing how this belief has grown up in all minds on the goldfields that the Government are wholly out of sympathy with the mining industry. The example I have already dealt with relates more, perhaps, to the tributaries and the class of men who go tributary. I am now going to speak of a matter which relates more to the investing class, those who have made money in various ways, perhaps in mining, perhaps in business, and who invest it. This relates to the administration of the Dividend Duties Act. I have no complaint whatever to offer as to the proceedings which have been taken against powerful corporations and large mining companies under the Act. The matter in respect of which the Crown has put forward its claim, if its interpretation is right, is one it was bound to urge and to do everything in its power to recover. My remarks have no relation whatever to those proceedings. But the Crown does not stop there. There are other proceedings than those which can be justified being instituted. They are of a most harassing character, and proceedings which, with a moment's consideration or sympathy with the mining industry, would immediately have been closed down

on. There is in Kalgoorlie a local company known as the Golden Ridge company, consisting entirely of local shareholders. That company conceived it wise to multiply its shares by three. But all the shareholders remained the same and their interests in the property remained the same. They simply had three pieces of paper where they had one. If they had divided their property they would have had nothing more. The dividends they received are one-third of that paid on the original share. But the Crown says, "You have made a profit which is to be arrived at by deducting the amount of your original shares from that which three times the shares amount to. In other words, assume it was £30,000 in the first instance and multiply it by three, then you have made a profit of £60,000, come pay up your tax." That would do for opera bouffe; it might do also in Claremont where I think things are topsyturvy; but is it right from the Government? Are our Ministers there for the purpose of harassing the citizens of the State? And if they do these things is there any wonder that it bears fruit, and that those to whom these acts apply have no hesitation in arriving at the conclusion that there is no sympathy whatever on the part of the Government with them in the carrying on of their industries?

The Minister for Mines: These things apply to all industries not only to the mining industry.

Mr. KEENAN: It makes no difference. I know the action brought against this company has been abandoned, but the annoyance remains. It is not that the proceedings are not successful, but it is an illustration that the Government have withdrawn any sympathy for the mining industry. If this was simply strict adherence to the written law we might say that it showed want of discrimination, perhaps, and we could forget it—that is, if it were merely strict adherence to the written law. But that is not the case at all. The origin of this act, and the other act I referred to, the administration of the Goldfields Water Supply, goes back

to the wholly uncontrolled will of the permanent staff. It is the ruling of the permanent staff without any attempt at control by the Ministerial head. I have no words of rebuke to offer to the permanent officials, no word of criticism of their conduct, they are bound by hard and fast rules, bound to do everything in their power to carry out their duties according to some strict formula ; but it is for the Executive, if it be in truth an Executive, something more than a mere make belief, to administer the laws as equity and justice demand, not to be mere tax-gatherers placed on the Treasury bench to see how much, at their entire discretion, their subordinates can collect. It is their duty to bring all the government of the State in harmony and sympathy with the industries of the State, so that each can support the other, and each can be in a measure responsible for the success of the other. What is easier for an Executive that does not possess a spine, and will not attempt to administer the laws, than to leave all to subordinates, and to come here and say when challenged, "the permanent staff, the permanent heads of departments, had the matter referred to them, their advice was so and so, and the action taken was so and so."

Mr. Gordon : It was the same in your day was it not ; you had an opportunity to alter the Act ?

Mr. KEENAN : We never attempted to enforce it in this manner.

Mr. Gordon : You could have repealed it if you had liked.

Mr. KEENAN : One can never deal with any question of this kind until it arises. If it had arisen while I was a Minister I would have had no hesitation in dealing with it ; but as it did not do so it remains for those in power to act as a Minister should when occasion arises. In this matter, as in all these matters of administration, we find one common line of thought, and it is this, that wherever it is possible the administration of Government is handed over to the permanent staff. All that I have dealt with is in accord with the suggestion in the Governor's

Speech of the appointment of a board of advice in connection with the construction of agricultural railways. I protest strongly against that. There is the creation of a cloak behind which the Minister gets and which prevents Parliament from calling on him to be responsible for the acts of his subordinates, and to answer charges levied against his administration. As to the financial position of the State, obviously this is not an occasion properly appropriate for a discussion on the question. It is, of course, recognised that during the last 12 months our finances have been buoyant, and that a much larger return has been received than was estimated early in the financial year. This position is due, I should say, to the returning prosperity which is being experienced not only here but all through Australia. There is a wave of prosperity passing over all the States, as is evinced by the Commonwealth returns, and we have had for once our share of the general prosperity of the Commonwealth. All will recognise that there are ups and downs in trade, that there are waves of depression and prosperity, and that fortunately for all of us, not merely Western Australians, but all of us who live in the Commonwealth, we are at present on the upgrade. I rejoice as much as anyone at the fact, for it admits of happier conditions, larger remuneration for services rendered, and, above all, of the homes of the people being supplied with necessities that might otherwise be denied them. The increase, so far as we are concerned, is due not merely to the larger Commonwealth returns but also to the largely increased quantity of land taken up in the State. I notice by the figures given in the Speech that we have received £35,000 as the first year's instalment of rent on land newly taken up as conditional purchases. Then there is also a large increase in the railway returns, and in Goldfields Water Supply returns, the latter owing to the price having been raised. I have no doubt that we are justified in supposing that this increase will last during the balance of this financial year, but even supposing this

to be accomplished, what is our outlook for the future? Is it one we are entitled to look upon as rosy; can we go to sleep and leave it to look after itself? I submit that the Government have not taken this House and the country fully into their confidence in the matter, for if they had they would have pointed this out, that although the financial agreement was not adopted, did not become part of the Constitution, it is nevertheless the intention of the present Federal Government to give effect to it, and in this way, not by the passing of an Act that the Commonwealth Parliament will after the first of January next year pay 25s. per head to the States with a special allowance to Western Australia, but by waiting until the 1st January, passing an Act and then so adjusting the accounts that in effect we shall never be in the position of having received, in addition to the special consideration, 25s. per head as from the 1st July.

The Minister for Mines: That should be cheering to the other side.

Mr. KEENAN: What I am urging is this, that we have to contemplate a position that will arise, no matter whether it be cheered or boo-hoed. After January the amount the Commonwealth will pay to the State will be, not 25s. per head, but much less. If we look at our finances during the past year, or in any other year, it will be found that the whole recovery was made within the last six months. We have consistently gone back in the first six months. Many reasons account for this, one being that every Treasurer does his best to put off payments until the financial year has closed. Therefore, in the first month many debts are paid that are really incurred in the old year. I need not dilate upon the various other reasons, but the fact remains that the first part of the year consists of lean months, while the period that usually puts the finances right is the second half of the financial year. It is only right to warn the House and the people that we are suffering under a delusion of the most marked character if we hope to accomplish the same excellent results as this year.

In the six months following next Christmas we shall receive very little from the Commonwealth so as to equalise the amount for the whole year to 25s. per head, and allowing for the special contribution; therefore, those months will be excessively lean, and I urge whoever is responsible for the financial picture being placed before the public of this State, for the financial capacity being placed before the heads of departments who have the governing and carrying out of public works, the fullest consideration of a matter that appears to have been almost passed out of consideration and treated as something so far distant that there is no necessity to worry our heads about it. There is one other means, in view of the falling finances by which we can still hope to square the ledger, that is, economy. I have always urged that economy be resorted to, not in works and services that mean so much to the people of the State, particularly those not possessed of much means, but in other directions, where we indulge in what may be properly described as expenditure for no developmental purpose whatever. I have raised my voice so often in this direction that I doubt if it is any use raising it again, but I must call the attention of the House to this, that we can save a great deal of money in more than one direction without in any way altering the business of the State or the amount of accommodation we are offering to the public; in particular we should build our own offices so that all Government departments should be under the one roof. The land is available, and it only means raising a loan for £40,000 or £50,000, and we would save the country approximately £2,000 a year. That alone would pay full interest on the amount borrowed. The change would, I assume, admit of some saving in the cost of the administrative staff, although I am not prepared to say how far that would be accomplished. There is another means: It is scarcely credible but nevertheless true that although for money received in the Savings Bank the depositor is paid by the Government 3 per cent., yet

that money is now going to the associated banks for 1 per cent. In other words, the Government are making a loss of 2 per cent. To-day the associated banks have scattered among them over £200,000, of State money bearing interest at 1 per cent., while we are borrowers at a rate of interest that exceeds $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., roughly speaking $3\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. allowing for discount, expenses of flotation, etcetera. While this is supposed to be good finance it is suggested that we are justified in economising in small sums in country districts, cutting off hospitals, reducing charity grants; in fact, everything that strikes home to the closer sense of the people; while this is being done money is being wasted as I indicate.

The Minister for Mines: What amount of cash would you keep to cover the liabilities of the Savings Bank?

Mr. KEENAN: That is a question I would not like to answer, for having been in a position of trust I know what the reserve was when I was a member of the Government, and I know what my opinions of it were at the time.

Mr. Murphy: I will give the Government three per cent. for all they have over.

Mr. KEENAN: If the Government lent it they would have every reason to believe that if they got 3 per cent. they would be well rewarded.

(Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.)

Mr. KEENAN: I was dealing with the fact that economy could be observed in many ways, in which the results would be larger than those now achieved by cutting off in many cases grants for services. I admit at once it is necessary to keep a floating balance, and that the moneys of the Savings Bank are handed over to the associated banks for the purpose of maintaining that balance. No objection could be taken to that, but, as a matter of fact, if inquiry be made it will be found that this money is not on call at all. The very most that the Government could obtain if it were to exercise its full

rights, would be, I think, £50,000, and for the balance they would have to give notice, and that notice would not be of weeks but of months, and therefore it would be simply in exactly the same position as if it had not made its arrangements. If it became necessary, owing to a run on the Savings Bank, to meet the requirements of depositors, the Government could go to the associated banks, and get as much by borrowing, because under their existing arrangement they would not be entitled to call upon anything more than a fourth or a fifth of the amount deposited excepting on long notice.

Mr. Jacoby: You would dispense with the reserve?

Mr. KEENAN: I would not keep the reserve at such a low figure.

The Minister for Mines: Would you call one month a short term?

Mr. KEENAN: Would the Minister say it is one month?

The Minister for Mines: You said it was.

Mr. KEENAN: I said "months." I wish now to deal shortly with the question of immigration, and land settlement. On both those matters I was most disappointed with the utterances of the Premier. If there be anything of great importance, not only to the present Government, but to any Government, it is the determination of these two questions which go hand in hand. We prescribe in our statutes the conditions for the tenure of land solely for the one purpose of putting people on it. When you find that object defeated, when you find that there is some deficiency in the law or administration which enables individuals to acquire large estates, and consequently enables the object which is to be achieved to be defeated, you expect from any Government that may be in power that they will take on their shoulders the responsibility of dealing with the question and saying that the system of land alienation is not one that achieves the desired result, and then ask for authority and power to change it. No doubt the House then, if they approved of the course proposed, and if they saw that the remedy

was a good one, would grant that authority. What does the Premier do? He suggests that there should be some kind of board appointed partly from the Opposition and partly from the Government side of the House, and that this board should deal with the two questions, immigration and land settlement. The reason I take strong exception to that suggestion is that it is part and parcel of the whole system of getting rid of responsibility, and of trying to retain the seats of Government; in fact it is a mere semblance of power. I would like to add a few words on the university question. Any proposal to spend money in an educational direction is received in every part of the House with equal acclamation, but I wish to say with regard to any expenditure in the direction of a university, that I shall require to be satisfied that this intended University will offer advantages to the people of the State, not merely a section of the people, but to the people wherever they are resident. It is no advantage to the State at large to bring down a most generous measure to establish a university in Perth if it can be only of advantage to those living in Perth. A university can be of many characters. We have not had the least information of what character this proposed university is to be. It may be a mere examining board; it may be merely an institution to issue diplomas on examinations conducted in any part of the State. That form of university is exemplified in the London University which simply conducts examinations in different parts of England where the successful candidates receive their degrees. Such an institution would be a form of university applicable to Western Australia. You may have on the other hand a university where scholars require to attend lectures and at the end of certain terms obtain, on passing examinations, diplomas qualifying them to practice in various learned professions. There may be also a third form of university, the residential university. There can be no possible question about it that the effect of a residential university is far greater in moulding the character of the people than any examining board. After all, all

[11]

examination boards do is to test the knowledge which the student has acquired at home, or at some secondary school, but at a residential university a student meets his fellows, rubs sides with them, and has his rough exterior moulded into proper form in the field of sport, in the school of study, and in the miniature school of life. To establish a university of such a character, however, means the expenditure of a large sum of money. With such a university it should be insisted upon that one-half of the students should be allowed to enter by competition throughout the State, and that the State should furnish funds to pay the necessary expenses and upkeep of one half of the students so that those who lived in the outlying portions of the State, and those to whom it would be otherwise an impossibility to allow their children to attend, might have the opportunity of doing so. This is a matter that we can debate when the measure comes before the House. It will however receive no sympathy from me if it is merely a local proposition, nor however it may appeal to one in the sense that it will provide opportunities for all sections unless those opportunities are also made available to the people to whom I have referred, no matter where they reside. Although it is not a pleasant task to oppose any educational proposition I for one will not pretend that it will receive my sympathy. In conclusion let me say that this country is one that possesses not only great possibilities, but also presents great responsibilities and grave difficulties. It possesses a vast area and its communities are scattered from the far North to the shores of the Great Australian Bight, the consequence of which is that any Government that attempts, or wishes to attempt to govern all those scattered communities can only do so if it grasps with a firm hand its difficulties and responsibilities. It must be a Government strong enough to brush on one side all parochial sentiment and feeling, and to refuse to listen to those promptings which undoubtedly come to those in power to give something to one particular place that they may produce

some sentiment of gratitude. They must be national even though to be national means a sacrifice. Above all they must refuse to trade on the vices of the people they are called upon to govern, and they must appeal to their virtues, and I may remark, although I do not wish to enter into a controversial subject at this stage, that the lesson of the Fremantle election is not such that anyone wishes to see it repeated. I will not refer to it further than to say that when it is made by a Minister of the Crown a reason for electing a man in one constituency that the requests of the people living in another part of the State have been refused, then I say it is entering upon terribly dangerous ground, although for the time it may bring an ill-gotten reward. Let me say in conclusion that I still believe firmly in Western Australia. If there is one thing about which we are all unanimous it is in the belief of the future of this country. And I also believe that the people of the country will see that it is more in their interests to be governed on national lines than to have a desire of the moment gratified by some Government that appeal to them on the mere ground of local patronage for their approbation. I hope to see the occupants of the Treasury bench possessed of this desire to serve the true interests of the country at large and to face the possibility, if there be a possibility, of being for the time forced to retire from political life rather than to remain there, trading on the jealousies and vices of the people.

TROY (Mount Magnet): The Speech put into the mouth of His Excellency by the Government of the day may be described as a tremendous advertising effort in which the Government claim to be the personification of every virtue and the only safe refuge for the people's confidence. With that extraordinary craving for self-advertisement which characterises the present Government the whole of the recess has been spent by Ministers touring the country, appraising their own good qualities and leaving the administration of the more important affairs of State to the departmental heads. It is

well to remember that without the assistance of the Opposition nothing which has been accomplished could have been accomplished in this country, and that anything which conduces to the country's prosperity has been brought about by the assistance of members on this side of the House. That assistance has not been in any way recognised; but of this we should not complain, for has not Providence been robbed of the credit of the bountiful seasons which have contributed largely to any prosperity enjoyed to-day? Amongst other things the Government take credit for special ability in regard to finances, and the Treasurer proudly announces that by sound administration he has been able to reduce the deficit to £102,000. Now let us analyse the finances of the country to-day, and see just what the Government have accomplished, and whether they are justified in accepting that credit which they hold to be theirs and theirs alone. It is well to remember that the deficit began to grow enormously at the advent of the Rason-Moore Government. The Rason Government came into office with a mandate from the country to restore to order the finances which they claimed were in a deplorable state. The Rason Government held on to office for one year, and at the end of that year instead of the deficit having been wiped off, as promised, it was found to have increased to £119,000. Accepting the responsibilities of the Rason Government the Moore Government were elected on the very same platform, and made the same promises to the people. But instead of their reducing the deficit, instead of their putting the finances into a satisfactory state it was found that, as the years rolled on, the deficit grew until, in June 1909, it was £312,000. I will admit there was a small deficit at the time the Labour Government left office—some £46,000. But this deficit could easily have been prevented had that Government not been over scrupulous in regard to financial operations. For instance, in the year in which they held office they expended on railways £79,000 from revenue, which in other years was charged

to capital, or in the carrying out of which work the expenditure was spread over a number of years. Had this money, as in previous years, been expended from loan instead of revenue, and had the Labour Government had recourse to the vicious method of constructing public works from loan, that Government could easily have shown a substantial surplus on the year's transactions. The Rason Government—which, by the way, maliciously attributed the deficit to the incapacity of the Labour Government, and were returned by a foolish and over-confiding country to restore the finances—resorted to the construction of roads and bridges from loan money, and by this means expended a considerable sum. Yet despite the fact that that Government, instead of carrying out a vigorous public works policy as promised, confined their works to a minimum, they increased the debt per head of the population by £3 and brought the deficit up to £119,000. The Moore Government accepted the responsibilities of the Rason Government and undertook to carry out the promises already given by the Rason Government. Later on, the Moore Government were compelled to accept the policy of the Labour Government in regard to the enactment of new taxation for revenue purposes. They compelled their own party to swallow that policy with the result that the land and income tax measure was placed on the statute-book. This Government, in a frantic endeavour to straighten the finances, expended more and more from loan and less from revenue, notwithstanding which the deficit increased until, in June 1909, it reached £312,000. In looking through a speech by the Treasurer of that day, the Hon. Frank Wilson, member for Sussex—I believe the speech was made in introducing his Budget in 1908—I find he proposed a surplus of £942 for that year; only a very small one, he said, but still something to go on with. Yet this great financier, this Solomon of finance, ended up that year £100,000 to the bad. And these are the people who claim to be the only persons capable of administering the finances of the country. For this deficiency the Treasurer and Premier

blamed the Federal Government. This blaming of the Federal Government is a disease that Tory politicians are prone to. In the Eastern States this disease has become so aggravated that the physicians, who are the electors, are giving the patients the happy despatch one by one as they go to the country. The experience of State politicians in the East of Australia should be a warning to politicians of the calibre of the majority of those on the Ministerial side of the House. The history of the Moore Government in regard to finance can be summed up in a few words. The Government have borrowed largely; they have increased the national debt from £61 to £70 per head; they have expended in unproductive works £347,000 from loan, and have made a corresponding decrease in expenditure from revenue of £213,000. Less has been expended also on departments controlling the development of the greatest industries of the State. For instance, on mining development the Moore Government have spent from revenue £100,000 less than was expended by the Labour Government; and yet, although the additional taxation introduced has brought in new revenue to the extent of over £100,000, and the Commonwealth Government last year paid £6,000 in excess of the sum paid in 1909; and despite the fact that we have had good seasons, the deficit for last financial year was £102,000. Add to that deficit the deficit of last month and we have to-day, so far as the Government will give us to understand, a deficit of something like £142,000. But even that deficit is not by any means correct. For instance, if the expenditure on unproductive works charged to loan were properly charged to revenue the deficit to-day would be £490,000. Had sound methods of finance been followed, had the Government expended from revenue the money expended from loan on unproductive work, the deficit to-day would have been £490,000.

Mr. Collier: You mean as compared with 1904.

Mr. TROY: Yes, as compared with the period of the Labour Government. So, after all, we have not a true state of affairs given us in the balance sheet pro-

duced by the Treasurer. It is only a matter of a few years when the effects of this unsound financial administration will come home to us, and the people of Western Australia will be able to see the true state of affairs. A great deal has been said in approval of the Premier's visit to London. Even His Excellency's Speech could not be completed without reference to this visit. We are told that—

During the Parliamentary recess my Ministers deemed it advisable that the Premier of the State should visit London with a view to inquiring into the representation of Western Australia in the capital of the Empire, and directing attention to the many inducements which the State has to offer both to those desirous of securing an outlet for the legitimate investment of capital and to enterprising agriculturists. My Ministers are satisfied that the visit has proved, and is proving, of great advantage to the State, owing to the opportunity which has been afforded of disseminating reliable information regarding the many and varied resources of Western Australia, and the openings which these offer to the surplus industry and energy of the old world.

And the member for Fremantle did not allow the occasion to pass without making special reference in his speech to the great work done by the Premier in England and to what he had achieved in regard to bringing immigrants to Western Australia. I do not want to say anything harsh regarding the member for Fremantle. I think that gentleman must feel very keenly his position in the Chamber and the manner in which he came to find himself here. During the Fremantle election I heard it said that the opinions of the member for Fremantle would, for the time being, be the views of any party that would accept him. I do not know how much credence can be attached to that statement, but after the hon. member's utterances I am satisfied that the person who stated that the member for Fremantle possessed the faculty of trimming his sails to every wind was perilously near the truth. Now, what are the facts with regard to immigra-

tion? Let me tell the Attorney General that when he spoke last night with more eloquence than accuracy he did not put forward the true estate of affairs in regard to immigration. He said his Government had been responsible for the introduction of a larger number of immigrants to the State than had been introduced during the time the Labour Government held office. We might expect from an hon. gentleman in the position of the Attorney General some degree of accuracy; but perhaps after all we are asking too much, for where there is such eloquence there cannot be that degree of accuracy looked for in a Minister of the Crown. What are the facts in regard to immigration? Let me give the official records, which prove absolutely that the statements made by the Attorney General last night are not in accordance with the facts. We find on looking up the official records that there has been a gradual decline since 1905. In that year, when the Labour Government were in office, the excess of immigrants over emigrants was 7,617, and there has been a marked decline since until last year had the lowest excess for ten years. In 1905 the excess of immigrants over emigrants was 7,617. In 1906, when the marvellous Rason Government which promised such splendid things came into office, there was a reduction to 2,251. In 1907, when the Moore Government came into office, there was an actual loss by emigration of 2,687. In 1907 the position was a little better; there was a gain of 2,105; but last year, 1909, the number of immigrants who arrived in the State in excess of departures was 1,025. Compare these figures for 1909 with the figures for 1905 the year of the Labour Government. Surely the Attorney General needs no further evidence to convince him that the statements he made to the House were not as correct as they should be? But we must make some latitude for the hon. gentleman. Everybody knows that when he was a private member no one could have been severer in his condemnation of the Government, but our experience also shows that when he secured a Ministerial post the Government had no stronger

supporter. Let us see what the Moore Government have done. The Premier has been in London since the beginning of the year, and let us see the result of his marvellous energetic efforts in Great Britain. For the four months ending April, 1910, during the time the Premier, we understood, was making such herculean efforts in London, the excess of immigrants over emigrants was only 2,056, of which 1,618 were British, while of the remaining 438 there were 275 Asiatics, the balance, by the way, being Italians. And as significant evidence that the Premier could have done very little, of the Britishers referred to 90 per cent. came from the Eastern States; Victoria sent 895, and South Australia 642; Great Britain sent us only 304. What a magnificent result of the labours of the Premier! All this eating and drinking, all this speechifying and advertising, all this putting on and taking off of tissue, all this waste of time and money resulted in capturing 304 immigrants, some of whom have since been captured by our police. And despite all the restrictions, despite our hostility and opposition, nearly as many Asiatics, a few score less, came in.

Mr. Underwood: The Asiatic Government.

Mr. TROY: I suppose you, Mr. Speaker, and others in youthful days have read the story of the mountain in labour. The story goes that one day the people of a certain country noticed that the earth was quaking and that from the mountain top a great burst of smoke came forth, while trees crashed and rocks rolled down the mountain side. The people gathered in alarm and terror, thinking that something terrible was going to happen, and they waited until a still more violent earthquake opened a cleft in the side of the mountain. In alarm they fell on their knees and awaited to see what was going to happen, and at length a tiny wee mouse poked its head and bristles out of the cleft and ran down the side of the mountain. That story reminds me of the Premier's trip to England. For several months at banquets and other gatherings we are told the Premier made violent and frenzied

appeals to recognise the necessities of Western Australia and, incidentally, the motherland. For half a mile square the city of London was thrown into confusion: jingoes rushed from houses in alarm at the discordant sounds, imagining the whole Germany army and navy were pulverising the city to atoms. As the member for Forrest said, cab horses which had stood the wear and tear of a decade took fright and rushed down the side streets, and we were told in the Press that the police force of London was thrown into confusion. What was the result of this discordant babble of sound? A paltry few hundred immigrants! It reminds me of the old fable again—much outcry little outcome. The member for Pilbara says that the policy of the Government in regard to immigration is more in regard to Asiatic immigration than in regard to immigrants of our own colour and nationality. I do not know after all whether that accusation is correct, but no doubt the member for Pilbara has a good deal to go on, because did not the Premier, at the Premier's Conference in the Eastern States, move a resolution urging the Federal Government to remove the restrictions on the introduction of Asiatics to Australia, which we are told was in the interests of the pearling industry? Let us inquire if it is worth while bolstering up this industry, when all the good it is doing to the State is returning a few pounds in revenue, while at the same time it is demoralising our population by the introduction of the worst elements on the face of the earth. Last year I asked for a return. I was opposed by the member for Kimberley. If the hon. member were in the Chamber, I would mete out punishment to him because of that opposition. The return was produced and it showed that the revenue received for the 10 years ending 1908 from the pearl fisheries in the North-West was £6,688. During that 10 years the value of the pearls and shells recovered was £1,782,551, yet the only revenue returned was this paltry £6,000. We might not complain if a number of workers were being

employed in that industry who would be of advantage to the State, and would assist in the development of the country. But what do we find? There are only 131 whites employed in the industry as against 2,105 Asiatics. Is the industry worth having with that result? Is it worth having for the few paltry thousands we get in revenue, when we remember particularly the contaminating and demoralising influence of the Asiatics in the State?

Mr. Underwood: We get a few pounds out of the whisky they drink.

Mr. TROY: Not only have we this demoralising effect, but the Government have been compelled to construct hospitals in the North to remove from the aborigines the diseases which they have largely got from these people; and the inspector of factories points out that he has more trouble with Asiatic factories in Perth than with the whole bulk of the population, and that most of the prosecutions have been against these people who are encouraged in Western Australia by the policy of the present Government. In the Governor's Speech special reference is made to the progress of agriculture and the determination of the Government to foster and extend it. I admit a considerable sum is being spent in this industry, but the best means are not being employed in bringing about its development. There are all sorts of mad schemes the Minister for Agriculture has fathered and dropped as quickly as he has taken them up. From dairying to the introduction of Angora goats he has wasted a great deal of money; and without fear of contradiction, I say that if there is one department in Western Australia controlled by a Minister more incompetent than any other it is the Department of Agriculture. Has the Minister been paid for the dairy cows he purchased in the Eastern States at the cost of considerable money, and which he gave to the farmers in the State? I know for a fact that he has not been paid for a majority of them. The people to whom he sold them refuse to pay because they say they were taken in with

the cows. Undoubtedly they were. A gentleman, a member of the House at the time, was sent to the East; and despite the fact that he was a dairyman, he had no knowledge of dairy cattle. There are members on the Opposition side who have little to say in regard to agriculture but whose knowledge was much greater than that of the then member for Swan. I wish to condemn as emphatically as I am able the purchase of the estate in the Beverley district from Mr. Butcher. Only a few months ago in London the Premier referred to the millions of acres of vacant land awaiting the selector. If we have these millions of acres of vacant land why the need for paying £5 per acre for an estate in the Beverley district, when the people who buy that land from the Government later on will be compelled to pay £7 per acre for it? But it is the same old policy of the Government. The member for Canning (Mr. Gordon) will remember the purchase of the Dudewa estate near Arrino, in which he was concerned and interested. The Minister for Agriculture will remember the purchase of the Narra Tarra and Oakabella estates. The Attorney General will remember the purchase of the Oakabella estate for which the Government paid too much.

Mr. Gordon: On a point of order, I would like to draw attention to the fact that Sir Newton Moore was not Premier when the Dudewa estate was purchased.

Mr. TROY: I made no reference to Sir Newton Moore. I made reference to the policy now being carried out, which is the same as the policy carried out by the Tory crowd in power for the last twenty years, selling the land, building railways to enhance its value, and then buying it back at a value made for it by the people and compelling the farmers to pay a much higher rate than they should reasonably be asked to pay. That is the policy I condemned, and it is now being followed by the present Government. We had the resignation of the virtuous Mr. Butcher, the member for Gascoyne, the gentleman who resigned because he had sold his property to the

Government, but who, in resigning, took special care that his resignation went in too late for any other person to catch a boat and oppose him. He skipped to his district in the last boat and no time was lost in having a poll taken. It was an absolute farce, and if the member for Gascoyne and the Government expect to get off easily by hypocrisy of that character they are very much mistaken. The Government are showing a very marked difference in their treatment of the two great industries, mining and agriculture. There can be no denying the fact that if the mining industry were taken away from the State the position here would be very bad. Despite all talk of the expense of agriculture, which we welcome, and have assisted in bringing about by granting authority to build railways in agricultural districts and by other means, yet it must not be forgotten that if the mining industry is neglected this country will go back to the old days of stagnation. This is what the Government are bringing about. There has been a considerable falling off in expenditure on mining since 1904-5, both from revenue and from loan. During the year the Labour Government were in office the sum spent in mining development from revenue was £230,000, while the Moore Government spent last year only £147,000, or nearly £100,000 less. That shows the difference in the treatment now meted out to the industry. There is also a considerable falling off shown in the expenditure from loan. In 1907 the Government spent from loan in the development of mining £93,000, and in the development of agriculture £158,000. In 1908 they spent £49,000 in the development of mining, and £62,000 in the development of agriculture, while last year they spent £57,000 in the development of mining and £106,000 in the development of agriculture. Despite these things, despite the hostility and the opposition of the Government, despite the fact that Ministerial candidates have denounced it, the mining industry is flourishing in many portions of the State, but not through any assistance from the

Government. The yearly total may show a slight falling off, but a larger number of men are employed. Last year the number employed was 18,356, being an increase of 1,070 as compared with the previous year, while the wages these people earned amounted to over £3,000,000 for the year. The East Murchison district shows a considerable increase, and during the past few years the Black Range district has produced £750,000 worth of gold. The new field at Youanme, and the developments at Meekatharra and Mount Magnet are of a character which gives the lie direct to "Jeremiahs" like N. W. Harper, whom the Government supported as a fit man to represent Western Australia in the Federal Parliament. Any prosperity we enjoy now is due largely to the mining industry, and the prosperity of the State for many years to come will depend upon that industry. A further proof of the stability of the industry is that the mining revenue is not falling off to any appreciable extent, only about £2,000 for the year. The revenue from public battery sources has increased by £9,000. In spite of maladministration, in spite of the unsympathetic attitude of the Government, particularly the Minister controlling the department, who gave the battery system almost its death blow by increasing the charges, and by the new regulations, the industry is still making headway. I had intended to refer at greater length and purpose to the administration, the unsympathetic administration, of the Minister for Mines who, however, is so discourteous as to leave his chair on every occasion when attacked, so that there is little use in making complaints in this Chamber. We must make complaints in the country, and despite the devious methods employed by the Minister to bolster up his seat for the last nine or 10 years, despite the efforts he made to buy back that seat, there is no doubt he is no longer a welcome guest in the Menzies electorate. When the present superintendent of batteries was appointed there was an assurance given that he would make marked changes, would get better results, and would give

the prospector better conditions. The only result is that battery charges have been increased, and that the system has been made less beneficial to the prospectors. This was done because there was a paltry loss of £2,000 during one year. The system has produced nearly £3,000,000 worth of gold to the people of the country. Had it not been for the battery system we should not have the flourishing district of Black Range with a population of 2,000; there would have been no Meekatharra to-day; there would not have been the present great developments at Youanme. I give the Minister full credit for putting a battery at Youanme, despite the opposition and reports of the assistant Government Geologist, but surely this system deserves greater encouragement, especially as it has brought about so much development in so short a period. I would refer, for the Minister's edification, to the increasing habit of giving exemptions. There was a time when the Minister was a strong opponent of the Forrest Government who gave exemptions whenever they were asked for. In those days the number of exemptions granted, the number of leases held by companies who put them to no use whatever, was nothing less than a scandal, and I remember hearing the present Minister strongly denouncing that action on the part of the then Government, but the position to-day is exactly similar to what it was at that time. I have been to Lake Way recently, and found a large number of leases there under almost continuous exemptions, or exemption by concentration of labour. Some of these exemptions have lasted for two years. A large number of promising properties there are under exemption. They are owned largely by Mr. Morgans and Mr. De Bernales. If a company had to get exemption before a warden it would be a different matter, as there might be some good reason for it; but what I strongly object to is this habit of giving exemptions from the office in Perth, before the people in the locality are notified, or without the application being referred to the warden. This causes a scandal in

connection with the administration of the department. If the returns are examined it will be found that, repeatedly, consecutive terms of 14 days exemption are granted without any reference to the warden, or without the knowledge of the people in the locality affected. I can give an example in my own electorate where 14 days exemption was granted by the department without it being warranted in the slightest degree. The Pericles mine at Gullewa, formerly known as the Phoenix, had considerable spells of exemption. The Minister granted exemptions time after time, the excuse offered for the application being that the mine was being sold to the Victory United company which carried on operations at Cuddingwarra. Despite the sworn statements of those people I do not believe the transfer has been made.

The Minister for Mines: It is not under exemption now.

Mr. TROY: I know it is not to-day, but I want to show how exemption can be obtained under false pretences. When the company started the miners worked for four weeks without pay, they then gave the manager a week's notice, saying that if they did not get their wages then they would cease work. They worked five weeks in all, but as there was no pay forthcoming they knocked off. They had to wait another week before getting their money, and in the meantime the manager wired down for 14 days' exemption on the plea that there was no labour available: as a matter of fact, the whole country was swarming with labour. Without any inquiry, without consulting the warden of the Murchison, or the police official who is the acting mining registrar at Yalgoo, exemption for 14 days was granted. When the period had expired, and the men again offered their services they were told they were not wanted. The result to-day is that all persons working in that mine, with the exception of one Swede and one German, are Italians: the only Britishers are the manager, the blacksmith, the engine-driver, and the assayer. I want to ask the Minister who gave the exemption, and what reason was

offered for giving it. Is that the manner in which the Mines Department is being administered? It is nothing but a crying scandal. I believe that the exemption was not given by the Minister, but by the under secretary—an under secretary who is not in touch with the people, and because of that kind of thing we have mining development receiving a check, and an injustice being done. That is a position of affairs which I cannot too strongly condemn. It is due to the fact, as I have pointed out, that the departmental heads are actually the Ministers, and the Ministers are mere mechanical toys. In his speech the other night, the Minister for Mines insinuated that the member for Cue did nothing with regard to assisting the Royal Commission which was inquiring into miners' phthisis. Everybody in this country knows, and the Minister cannot get them to believe otherwise, that the man who is responsible for the appointment of that Commission is the member for Cue. They know, that despite the opposition of the Minister himself who said that miner's phthisis did not exist to any extent, Mr. Heitmann fought the subject for months, and the appointment of the Commission is a standing memorial to his perseverance and pluck. The Minister endeavoured also to make the objections between Mr. Montgomery and the member for Cue a personal one. As one who recently visited Day Dawn, I want to say that the public were dissatisfied with Mr. Montgomery's report, and whilst that officer reported that the disease did not exist to any extent, and whilst he could find no persons there suffering from the disease, since that time at least three persons have been sent to the sanatorium at Coolgardie and one of them has actually died there as the result of the disease. I deprecate the insinuations of the Minister with regard to the attitude adopted, and the work accomplished by the member for Cue. The Minister for Mines is evidently not one of those of whom Butler writes as holding—

"No torture so great as shame,
And to slay was less than to defame."

In the Speech, His Majesty has said, "My advisers regret that the financial

agreement which was the outcome of several inter-State conferences, and ultimately adopted by the Federal Parliament, was rejected. . . The solution of this most important problem now rests with the Federal Parliament," and I say to that, thank God! In this connection I want to condemn the action of the Government, and the Premier, in utilising the people's money to circulate statements among the people of the State during the last Federal elections. This Cabinet leaflet which I have before me was an endeavour to practise on the people a gross deception, and I will prove that by extracts which I shall read from it. I want in the first place to say that the Government are not entitled to utilise the money of the people for party purposes. They are Ministers of the Crown by a majority not of the people, but of the members elected to this House. They are entrusted with the duty of seeing that the moneys of the people are spent in the best possible manner, and their conduct in utilising the people's money in endeavouring to mislead the people is not to my mind an honourable proceeding. What I shall read is what I shall call a deliberate lie to the people of Western Australia. The leaflet states—

Under the agreement we should receive about £600,000 a year, and if those moneys be not received, the Government cannot carry on, since no Government could find means of replacing them.

They told the people of Western Australia unless they got this money, and unless the people voted for the agreement the Government could not carry on. We find the Government to-day in defiance of this statement hanging on like leeches to their seats on the Treasury bench.

The Minister for Mines: Does it say anything after "carrying on"?

Mr. TROY: It says—

Since no Government could find means of replacing it.

Is that not another deliberate lie? The Government of this country have a poor

opinion of the intelligence of the electors of Western Australia. It goes on—

Unification would follow—Government of the State not by our own Parliament, which would be swept away, but by the Federal Parliament.

Is not that a deliberate lie? Has Unification followed? Did the Government really think Unification would follow? Were they justified in utilising the people's money in telling that deliberate lie? The member for Murray has something to answer for in this direction. The hon. member who toured this country in the interests of his party got away into the far back towns where he could not be reported and denounced the members on this side of the House.

Mr. George: I shall be glad if the hon. member will give the names of the places, and what was said.

Mr. TROY: I will give them. The hon. member said in connection with the election for the Swan that Mr. O'Loughlen was a fairly good man, but he was mixed up with a very bad crowd.

Mr. George: Whoever told you that told you an absolute and deliberate lie.

Mr. TROY: Is the hon. member in order in saying that I told a lie?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not in order.

Mr. George: I said that those who told him that, told him a deliberate lie. The words I used at Bunbury were—

Mr. TROY: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member in order in making this explanation? If he is in order I will sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the member for Murray rose to a point of order he has the prior right to speak. I would like to know what the point of order is.

Mr. George: The member for Mount Magnet charged the member for Murray with having stated certain things in connection with the party to which the member for Mt. Magnet belongs.

Mr. Bath: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. What the member for Murray is endeavouring to do is to make a personal explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER: The member for Murray must confine himself to the point of order.

Mr. Bath: A personal explanation can only be made at this stage with the permission of the member speaking.

Mr. George: I am sorry if I have contravened the rules of the House, but I thought that I should correct the hon. member before he made any more of these extravagant statements.

Mr. Troy: I must appeal, Mr. Speaker to you who preside over this House, to tell me whether I am in order or not. If I am not in order I shall sit down, and allow the member for Murray to continue.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understood the member for Murray was rising to a point of order, but I cannot allow him to make an explanation at this stage.

Mr. George: Is the member for Mt. Magnet in order in making a statement about myself which is not correct? I am prepared to say what I actually said, and surely no one can object to that.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the member for Murray has raised a point of order, or has stated that what another hon. member has said with regard to himself is not correct, then that hon. member must accept the contradiction and withdraw. I do not know whether the member for Mt. Magnet was correct or not, but he must accept the contradiction.

Mr. TROY: In conformity with the rules of the House I shall withdraw, but I feel that the Standing Order is exceedingly stupid which makes an hon. member withdraw that which he feels to be absolutely correct. I have always recognised this Standing Order as a most ridiculous one, and it is not one which will conduce to the higher morality of this Chamber, or encourage members here to bluntly speak the truth, and shame the devil. Continuing my remarks may I still further refer to this leaflet which was printed by the Government at the people's expense, and utilised for party purposes? The people are told in conclusion—

Be assured, rejection of the agreement will inevitably involve early Unification.

Could there be a more deliberate lie?

The Minister for Mines: That is hardly Parliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has not been stating that the Government have told deliberate lies; he is using a printed document from outside, and he is entitled to say what he thinks about it. I do not however consider that he is altogether respectful in continually using the same expression. If he had charged the Government with telling a deliberate lie, I would have made him withdraw and apologise.

Mr. TROY: I am referring to the leaflet, and I can understand that hon. members sitting on the Treasury bench and those members who supported them are very diffident about anything that is brought prominently forward in such a way.

The Minister for Mines: Not a bit.

Mr. TROY: I will withdraw my remarks with regard to the Minister for Mines, because I know nothing which would bring the blush of shame to his cheeks. Departing from the leaflet, I want to make a few remarks with regard to the attitude of the Government through the Acting Premier in connection with the Transcontinental railway. I cannot sufficiently condemn the indiscretion of the Acting Premier in leading the public of Australia to believe that the Government of Western Australia were prepared to carry out that work. I personally was not misled by the speeches of the Acting Premier; I felt it was hypocrisy for the Government, which cannot find sufficient money to meet the immediate necessities of their own community, to talk about building the Transcontinental railway. I cannot help believing that behind the Acting Premier's words there was a sinister motive, that his words were intended to have no other effect than to alienate support from the representatives in the Federal Parliament. Those in the Eastern States who believe that we desire this railway, and who would vote for the railway will find the responsibility removed from their shoulders when they are told that the Western Australian Government is prepared to build it right off.

Now I am perfectly sure myself that the Government and the Acting Premier are afraid that the Federal Labour Government will themselves build this railway, and so prove that they can do in a few years what Forrest and his crowd have talked about for the last twelve years. Forrest and his party have talked about building this railway for the past twelve years, but that has been the sum total of their achievement. I am amazed that such hypocrisy should be put in the Governor's mouth; because this Parliament has no intention of building the railway, and the Government have even less. In connection with the appointing of the Railway advisory Board the Government say the board will prove valuable; but naturally their reports must depend largely upon the instructions given them by the Government. For instance, if the Government tell this board to furnish a report on a purely agricultural railway the board cannot go beyond these instructions, although, perhaps, that railway should serve pastoral and mining interests as well as agricultural. Take the extension of the Wongan Hills line: This board have instructions that that is to be regarded as an agricultural railway, and therefore their report must be based on the possibilities of agriculture in the district through which the line will pass. Thus restricted the board can give no report other than one treating the project as an agricultural railway, although that railway should be designed for the purpose of developing all three of the mining, pastoral, and agricultural industries. Unless the board have such comprehensive instructions they cannot return a report satisfactory to the House. Again, where does the board come in when the Minister for Agriculture has already announced that the junction of the line is to be Mullewa? What power have the board when the Minister for Agriculture has already announced where the junction is to be made? And, if I remember rightly, the Attorney General is not altogether a stranger to that secret, if secret it can be called. This railway should serve the agricultural industry just so far as agri-

culture extends North, after which it should serve the mining industry by providing facilities for the cheaper transportation of mining material. Last evening the Attorney General eloquently denounced the Labour Government in regard to their railway policy. He stated emphatically that that Government had announced no policy and were responsible for no policy in regard to railway construction to assist either agricultural or mining development. Now, if I said that was a lie I would be compelled to withdraw it; so I propose to prove that what he said is not correct by reading the speech made by the then Labour Premier, Mr. Daglish, on May 20th, 1905, at Subiaco. On that occasion Mr. Daglish said—

In regard to other works the Government are determined to pursue a policy of encouraging agricultural settlement by every means at their disposal and particularly by recommending and urging on the construction of railway lines in our agricultural districts. Everyone knows it is impossible for us to get settlers to go much outside the 15 or 20-mile limit of the railways, or if they do go outside that district the cost they have to incur for carriage is so great as to render it almost impossible to operate successfully. In order to encourage land settlement we recognise it is necessary for us to construct light lines of railways in these promising agricultural districts.

That was the policy of the Daglish Government as announced at Subiaco in May, 1905. Then Mr. Daglish proposed certain railways, and I find that all the railways announced by the then leader of the Labour party and which were included in the policy of the Labour party have since been adopted by the gentlemen now occupying the Ministerial benches. There was the Norseman-Coolgardie railway, the Port Hedland-Nulagine railway, and the Black Range railway. The Jandakot railway was constructed by the Labour Government, as was also the Collie-Narrogin railway. And again, even such important works

as the Fremantle dock and the erection of grain sheds at Fremantle for the storage of wheat were initiated by the Labour Government. Now what did the party of which the present Minister for Mines was a member do when Mr. Daglish brought forward his policy? Mr. Rason denounced it as a "reckless gallop policy," and in opposition to that policy he moved in this House a vote of no-confidence. That motion was supported by every member sitting at that time on the Opposition side. Every member who supported the Rason party opposed this policy initiated by the Labour Government. The present Minister for Mines, the Attorney General, the Minister for Works, the Government whip and every member who, to-day, sits on that side of the House and who was then in Parliament opposed this policy and supported the motion of no-confidence. Every one of them voted against this policy, and yet through the Attorney General the Government to-day claim to have been the initiators of that policy. The official records prove beyond all question that the Labour party first gave birth to the idea of extending the development of agricultural and goldfields railways; and, moreover, they left £2,000,000 to their successors to carry on that policy. These ideas were first put forward as proposals by the Labour Government, and were denounced by the party who now occupy the Ministerial benches and who were then a party of carping critics with, apparently, only one aim in life, namely, the vilifying of the Labour Government. If this policy initiated by the Labour Government has since been adopted by our opponents we are justified in asserting that the light which gradually filtered into the minds of the members opposite was shed by the Labour party. It was the light shed by the Labour party which illumined and dispelled the darkness from the musty recesses of the minds of members opposite; and has not this been the case right through Australian politics during the last 20 years? Last evening the Attorney General endeavoured, not too successfully, to make much capital out of the evidence given by the member for

Brown Hill, speaking as he then did on behalf of the Goldfields Trades and Labour Council. To compel the utilisation of the lands along existing railways that council advocated the imposition of a land tax. Such a measure was then opposed by every member now sitting on the Ministerial side of the House. The Ministry have since been compelled to adopt the progressive policy of the Labour party in regard to the enactment of a land and income tax; and they have been compelled to drum their supporters into the adoption of that policy even against their principles and their promises to the electors. It is recognised throughout Australia by all writers of political economy, by all advanced thinkers, that the Labour party is the advanced and progressive political party. The party represented by those opposite have never yet made an advance in politics, except by necessity of compulsion, in which case they have always been kicked forward by the heavy boot of public opinion. Now in regard to policy and ideas the party opposite are the plagiarists of politics; and that characteristic is conspicuously represented in the Attorney General who himself, bankrupt of ideas and principles, has appropriated those of a dead man, and not only appropriated the ideas and principles of a dead man, but the very language in which to express them. Now may I be allowed to say a word and particularly in regard to the much debated Esperance railway. In this connection I want to commend my remarks to hon. members supporting that railway. I believe in the principle that every port should have the trade of its own hinterland, that no port should be denied that justice. Esperance is one of those ports, and I say to the advocates of the Esperance railway that example is always better than precept and that while they ask for justice to be done to Esperance they should remember also the Lawlers-Black Range railway and agree that similar justice should be done to Geraldton. Let them do that and they will receive the support of all broad-minded men who hold the opinion that every district should be given facilities for transport

to its own natural port. Seeing that they urge this in regard to Norseman, surely they will not deny the right to other parts of the State. I want to say a few words in regard to the proposed legislation. An amendment of the Constitution is again announced. The Government are going to make another effort to reduce the franchise for the election of members to the other House. The Government have been going to do this for the last seven years to my knowledge, but have never succeeded. Strange to say, whenever an election occurs to the other place we find that the conservative candidates standing always announce themselves supporters of the present Government. But how can they be supporters of the Government and still be opposed to the policy of the Government in regard to the reduction of the franchise to the other House? It is neither logical nor reasonable to expect that any intelligent body of persons will believe such a statement. The declining influence of the State Parliament is due to the fact that the Government is not sincere, and that the other House dominates legislation. And this other House is representative of a mere handful of people. In the Metropolitan Province where there are 8,000 Legislative Council electors and 19,000 Assembly electors, only 6 per cent. of the Assembly electors and 14 per cent. of the Council electors voted at the last Council election. Yet Mr. Kingsmill, representing that province in the other House, and thus representing only 14 per cent. of the electors, has a larger say in respect to legislation than have five members in this Chamber. Hon. members in that place have always opposed progressive legislation. Is it any wonder that the people are turning their faces to the Federal Parliament, where there is some possibility that their ideals will be accomplished? In the Federal Parliament we find that much of the law and much of the politics entrusted to the States are being carried out. There would have been no Federal land tax if it were not for the opposition of the Upper Houses in the other States, and of this State also, to land taxation, and the States would not have been deprived of the revenue.

Again with industrial legislation, the Federal Parliament representing all the people is being entrusted with those powers formerly belonging to the States; also with regard to State banking the Federal Government are carrying out the policy and will receive the revenue which would have gone to the States had it not been for the reactionary attitude of the Upper Houses of the States. I do not intend to say much in regard to the redistribution of seats; I shall wait until the measure is introduced; but knowing that the present Government by hook or crook will hang on to their places, I have not the slightest doubt it will be a measure for the purpose of dishing the Labour party. The Ministerial party have now more representation than they are entitled to. They hold 28 seats elected on a smaller population than the 22 Opposition members represent. There are at least 10 Ministerial seats for electorates in which the population is lower than 2,000, while there are only five seats held by the Labour party for electorates where the electors are less than 2,000 in number. Let me conclude by a reference to something the Government have made no mention of, that is in regard to industrial legislation. For the last four years I have done my utmost in the House to compel the Government to adopt some measures to alleviate the condition of our industrial workers in the City, and to remove the sweating which exists in our midst. I notice that the National Political League have established a tearoom where they give these unfortunate workers tea for a penny a cup, while their employers compel them to work for sweating wages. By this means they hope to induce these unfortunate people to vote for the league. But they are mistaken, because the people who belong to the league are the employers who ask these women to work for 10s. a week.

Mr. Brown: Those are the people you are bleeding for subscriptions each week.

Mr. TROY: I can excuse the interruption of the representative for Perth because he has never represented these unfortunate people whose votes he asks for at the general

election. He comes here year after year, and if his voice is ever heard it is heard in defence of the party that keep those unfortunate people on sweating wages. Be it to his eternal shame that he has never said one word in the House in an endeavour to alleviate their conditions and sufferings. The report issued by Dr. Hope, the Principal Medical Officer, is interesting and must be edifying reading for members supporting the Government. He points out that he is unable to attend to the administration of the Factories Act and the Early Closing Act because he has not sufficient inspectors. The Premier promised last year that a female inspector would be appointed, but that promise has not been kept. According to Dr. Hope there are 7,000 women engaged in factories and shops in Perth and no effort is made to superintend their work or look after their conditions.

Mr. Scaddan: Who is their representative?

Mr. TROY: While these people remain in ignorance and accept a cup of tea and do not fight for their rights they will be represented by the member for Perth. I spent weeks in going round the City trying to get information in order to present a report to the House so as to improve the condition of these workers. I and other members of a select committee recommended certain means by which their conditions could be alleviated; but the Government supported by the hon. member have never given our report any consideration, though two members of the Government side were members of the committee and unanimously endorsed the recommendations of the committee. In conclusion, let me commend the member for Kalgoorlie for his speech. I shall always have a high respect and esteem for the member who, no matter on what side of the House he sits, will speak his honest opinions with regard to any Government or any party. The member for Kalgoorlie has criticised the policy of the Government though he is one of their supporters. As an ex-member of the Moore Government he is in a position to know the faults of the Government, and I commend his

attitude to other members on the Government side. Despite the fact that the Attorney General says they are not tied I hope they will give some evidence of the fact. Let them not be like dumb, driven cattle, let them get up and speak their opinions and fight for them in the best interests of the country and they cannot go wrong. Why should the Government, a Government of this character, be kept in office receiving the vote of the member for Canning because he is Government Whip? Do I not remember that when the hon. member was rejected from the post of Whip he said he was going to leave the party and he denounced the Government? Now he sits in abject support of the Government because he is Ministerial Whip. Let members on the Government side utilise their freedom and not keep the Government in power if the Government are not deserving of their confidence. I have heard members on the Government side say the Government do not enjoy their confidence, and that the Government do not act in the best interests of the country; while members who come into the House like the member for Murray, and are going to play the dickens—well, now the lamb sits down with the lion.

Mr. George: I have never made a statement that I was going to play the dickens with the Government, or anyone else. It is another misstatement the hon. member has made, and I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to call on him to withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must withdraw.

Mr. TROY: It does not matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must withdraw.

Mr. TROY: I withdraw; but it is only another evidence of the stupidity of the Standing Order which compels me to do so. I hope that whatever legislation is introduced this session due consideration will be given to it, and that it will not be approached with the opinions of members already fixed, as unfortunately too much legislation has been approached in the past by members on the Government side of the House. Let us discuss important measures without party prejudices and let us do our best for the country as a whole.

Mr. Underwood: Mr. Speaker, let me call attention to the fact that the mace is not on the Table. I presume the whole debate is out of order.

[The Sergeant-at-Arms replaced the mace on the Table.]

Mr. BATH (in explanation): Before any other speaker addresses himself to the motion, I desire, under the rule by which a member is entitled to make a personal explanation, to make what is not an explanation so much as it is a statement. During the course of the speech of the Attorney General last night he proceeded to read extracts from evidence which I gave before the Royal Commission on Immigration, and he said, preliminary to reading that extract, these words—

That gentleman was called as a witness on behalf of the Trades and Labour Council of the Eastern Goldfields, and he was invited to give a statement as to the views of those he represented. This is what he said: "They also," that is, the Trades and Labour Council, for I presume their views were his and the views of members opposite—

I combated that statement, and the Attorney General further remarked—

I am not aware of any sentence in this statement in which the hon. member pointed out that the views he expressed were not his own views; but if he can guide me to such a sentence I shall be very glad to read it.

I said that if the Attorney General had read all the evidence he would have found it, for it was contained in the statement. The Attorney General further said—

I have read the whole of the statement, but not the whole of the evidence, and that remark may have been elicited from any cross-examination. I have only read the opening statement. The opening statement I gave before the Royal Commission was as follows:—

By the Chairman: You are representative. I understand, of the Trades and Labour Council of the Eastern Goldfields?—I have been asked by them to give evidence in their behalf.

Have you read what has been published with regard to the evidence taken by this Commission?—I have not read all of it. I have read some of it that has appeared at different times.

We should be glad if you could give to the Commission the views that you are delegated to give from the Trades and Labour Council; the view they take of the question of immigration as evidenced by the work of the Commission so far?—

I proceeded to give their statement and gave certain of their views, and as there was more than one view I said, "They also" as the statement of the Trades and Labour Council. At the conclusion of the statement, and before any examination, I said, "Those are practically the views which the Trades and Labour Council asked me to place before you." At the conclusion of the evidence I was asked by Mr. Watts—

Would your council not prefer that instead of the clearing being done beforehand, for which work others would be paid, a man should be able to get assistance from the Agricultural Bank and do the work himself, thereby being kept on his own land?

I replied—

I could not say exactly what would be the council's opinion on that matter, because I am merely giving their statement in regard to the proposed experiment of clearing land, that they think it would be advantageous. You must understand that I have not discussed with them all the possible questions that would arise out of a relief of that kind. So far as my own individual opinions are concerned, I would rather reserve them for any practical discussion of the question in Parliament.

I cannot find terms strong enough to characterise the deception practised by the Attorney General last night in his attempt to misrepresent me and other members of the party.

Mr. Gordon: On a point of order. Is the member right in addressing the House as well as giving an explanation?

Mr. SPEAKER: He must be allowed a little latitude if he thinks he has suffered an injustice.

Mr. BATH: The Attorney General quoted from the statement without reference to the context. He knew to the contrary, because he had read the opening statement. The opinions therein were those of the Trades and Labour Council, but he endeavoured to mislead the House by suggesting they were my views. Further, if he had not read the whole of the evidence he should never have attempted to use in this House the statements I made without first having acquainted himself with all I said on that occasion. If he had done so he would have read the sentence in which I said I would prefer to reserve my own opinions for a practical discussion of the question in Parliament.

Mr. DAGLISH (Subiaco): Unlike the member for Kalgoorlie who spoke this afternoon, I am one of those who doubt the advantage to the public or the advantage to members of having a discussion on the Address-in-Reply, and I think the time will soon come when members will realise that the adoption of the Address-in-Reply to the Governor's Speech may well be considered as purely a formal matter, to be moved, seconded, and carried, without discussion, unless the Opposition of the day desire to make that occasion one on which to challenge the existence of the Government by a no-confidence motion. The opportunity is now taken on the Address-in-Reply to discuss administration which will later on be discussed on the Estimates again, when we will get a rehash of part of the Address-in-Reply speeches. Advantage is also taken of the opportunity to discuss legislation of which we have no details before us, and which, therefore, we are only able to discuss on bare assumption, and I think a great deal of valuable time is lost that might be given to the adequate consideration of measures which are rushed through, perhaps, at a late stage of the session, because of the weeks we spend at the opening on a discussion that leads to nothing at all. Holding this opinion I would not have ventured to rise on this occasion but for the fact that the Attorney General, when speaking last night, choose to bring in, quite unnecessarily, in my opinion, certain references to the Labour Government of 1904

5, of which I happened to be the head, and made a comparison between the work of that Government and the result of its work, and the work and the result thereof of those Governments which have followed. The words of the member to which I more particularly object were these—

Had the Labour Government displayed the same political courage as the Moore Government, had they launched out upon a bold policy of public works, had they shown the people they had confidence in the country, the people would have shown confidence in them.

Of course, the usual interjection was made in regard to "mark-time," and there was the usual insinuation that the Government had been cowardly and had been incompetent. It is some years since I had the pleasures of sitting with those who were associated with me in that Ministry, and although we are now divided by the gangway of the House, I want to say that on any charges made against the Ministry of which we were joint members I am willing to accept my fair share of responsibility, and I am ready to stand shoulder to shoulder and side by side with them just as if I were now on the same side of the House. As a matter of fact, our difference is mainly that of party methods and management, and the principles I enunciated while at the head of that Ministry and a member of the Labour party, before and afterwards, are, with very small exceptions, the principles I hold and advocate at the present time. The allegation was made that our lack of spirited public works and development policy at that time was the cause of our going down as a Government, the cause of our failure to obtain the support of the people. As a matter of fact, I think if we had gone to the people as a Government we would have obtained their support. Whether that be so or not it is impossible to say, but I know we suffered from a somewhat uncommon complaint in politics—modesty, and however becoming that complaint may be, it does not make political success. Perhaps if some of our successors had

suffered from the same complaint they would never have achieved some of the successes they have accomplished. With regard, however, to this "mark-time" policy, which is being so often dragged forward unnecessarily as a means of making party capital either by one side or the other, I may say that I am very tired of it. I want to tell members that the "mark-time" policy was the only possible policy that could have been adopted at the time, although it would have been possible to keep back the fact upon which it was based and to avoid using the phrase, which after all is the cause of the attack, when speaking to the public. The whole cause of complaint made against this "mark-time" policy is due to a certain paragraph which I will now read to the House. It appeared in the speech delivered by me at Subiaco on the 24th August, 1904, and is as follows;—

At the moment party politics are less important, and a recognition of the need for economy and a courage to insist upon it are vital requirements you have a right to expect from your Ministers. This Ministry is prepared to handle firmly this financial problem. We recognise at present that a spirited public works policy so advantageous in former years, so popular at all times, must be abandoned. A period of financial rest and recuperation is required by the State. It is hoped we shall require only to mark time for a short period, and that a forward march may then be resumed. . . . It is natural to anticipate that a delay in carrying out those public works which are needed—some already authorised by Parliament—will not add to the popularity of the Ministry. That section of the public directly affected by a policy of economy will always dislike those who inaugurate it. Our satisfaction will be in the reflection that we are in power to serve the public and not to gratify them, and our vindication in the future we regard as assured.

That policy was adopted, and followed on a remark made a little earlier by Sir

Walter James, when he was Premier, and said—

During the course of the last year or two the position has been by no means free from anxiety. We have been adding to our loan expenditure. Works have had to be carried out, and on more than one occasion we have had great difficulty in knowing how money was to be obtained.

That was while he was in office. When he went out of office the position was that there was a deficiency on loan account of £142,000, and that the surplus of £83,000 on Consolidated Revenue which existed a month before he went out had been reduced in that month to £12,000 or £13,000. Therefore, the Consolidated Revenue Fund at the time I took office amounted to something near £12,000, and against that there was a deficiency of £142,000 on the other account. The Government that preceded the Labour Government had obviously been unable to borrow on satisfactory terms, otherwise the deficiency of £142,000 would not have existed on that account. A Labour Government had then taken office for the first time in the history of Western Australia. I may in passing say that the Government were composed entirely of members comparatively young in the House, and not one of whom had had any Ministerial experience. They were faced with a very difficult financial position, and they decided not to make promises of public works when there was no certainty of their being able in the immediate future to fulfil those promises. They decided to see where the money was to come from before they made promises. It had been said to them by their opponents on the public platform and in the public Press that capital would go out of Western Australia instead of coming in so soon as they took office. If their accession to office drove capital out, and as their predecessors had been unable to draw it in, necessarily they would have been acting a very peculiar part if they had promised to do works which their predecessors had been unable to obtain the money for. As a matter of fact loan works had

been very materially reduced. However, the Government took office and proceeded with certain public works, as many as they could possibly carry out. They had no lack of faith in this country and its resources, no lack of faith in its inhabitants, but they had some degree of lack of faith in the money lender in London. The experience of their predecessors fully justified them in the possession of that lack of faith. It must be remembered that in regard to the difficulties of borrowing, at that time war was being waged between Russia and Japan, and both nations were borrowing money at a rate far more profitable to the lender than an Australian government was prepared to offer; there was consequently a considerable drain on the money market of the world. In spite of this the Government carried on for a considerable term. They stopped certain works regarded as unnecessary and to which they were opposed, while they went on with those works they thought would be advantageous to the country, so far as the funds would allow. It has been suggested that no public works were carried out. This is either an entire mistake or an entire misrepresentation. The "mark-time" policy represented caution, represented reason. In finance there should be neither optimism nor pessimism. The optimism of a Micawber cannot turn three and two into six; the greatest optimism of a Treasurer will not allow him to spend money he cannot obtain from the lender nor by taxation. Therefore we were justified, and it was demanded of us, that we should state clearly the position, and not deceive or humbug the people; but, at the same time, the works went on in that year to a much greater extent than they went on while the glorious optimism of Sir Hector Rason was controlling the Treasury bench, and a fact that wants to be borne in mind is, that although we were working under the "mark-time" policy, we were not marking time as slowly as Sir Hector Rason, who pretended to be carrying out a great policy of public works development later on. I will give figures in that respect, and

they are somewhat startling. Our year of office is almost coincident with the financial year 1904-5. I shall give the general headings under loan expenditure, and not the details, so that members may pick out for themselves exactly what represents public works development policy and what represents administrative expenditure. In 1904-5 salaries and incidentals totalled £45,175. In the following year, under the Rason Government, they fell to £36,237. In the first term the railway figures were £337,141, and under the Rason Government they fell to £209,491. That may be termed a development vote. Harbours and rivers in 1904-5 totalled £93,691, and in 1905-6 £32,985; water supply and sewerage in 1904-5 totalled £26,331, and in 1905-6 the figures fell to £21,017. For the development of mining in 1904-5 the total was £45,376, and in 1905-6 £55,869. That increase is largely represented by transfer from Consolidated Revenue expenditure to loan expenditure. There was more spent on public batteries in 1904-5 than in 1905-6 from Consolidated Revenue. On development of agriculture in 1904-5 there was spent £150,302, and in 1905-6 £36,540. This shows the total Loan expenditure in the "mark-time" year 1904-5 of £898,019 as against, in 1905-6, when the "mark-time" policy had given way to a policy of progress and development and optimism of £392,196, or something less than half the amount spent during the "mark-time" year. When the Attorney General delves into a question like this, he only proves the truth of the saying of the poet that a "little knowledge is a dangerous thing." If the Attorney General had never heard that phrase "mark time" or had never heard the other phrase about the development policy, he would never have fallen into the sad blunder which he made when he said that the Labour Government went out and lost the support of the public and of this House because of the fact that it refrained and had not the courage to spend money on development works in this State. Perhaps it may be urged that the mere expenditure of Loan votes is not evidence of development and

progress, and someone, I think it was the Premier, quoted during this discussion Savings Bank figures as having something to do with the indication of the prosperity of the community. The average amount to the credit of each depositor in the Savings Bank in 1904-5 was £37 18s.; in 1905 it was £36 18s. 8d.; in 1906, £36 8s., and at the same time the number of depositors had fallen. In fact the average value of the deposits per head in the Savings Bank did not again rise to the 1904 level until the amending Savings Bank Act had been passed by this House, and that Act of course gave the Savings Bank a lot of new business—business of a larger character than that represented by private depositors.

Mr. Bath: It drew depositors from the private banks.

Mr. DAGLISH: That is so; it drew depositors from the joint stock banks. That is an indication of the fact that the mark time policy did not spell want of prosperity, if we can take the figures of the Government Savings Bank as an indication. I have quoted figures to show that the "mark-time" policy was a fairly liberal policy of development, and I want to say further, if as another indication of prosperity we take the figures with regard to immigration and emigration, again during the period in which those gentlemen who were associated with me held office, we find it was a period of greater prosperity than that which succeeded it. Let me quote figures from the *Statistical Abstract* for the years from 1904 onwards. In 1904, only part of which year I was in office, the excess of immigration over emigration was 10,976; in 1905 it was 7,617; in 1906 the year succeeding that in which we left office it had fallen to 2,251. In 1907 the emigrants exceeded the immigrants in number by 2,687, absolutely an excess of departures over arrivals. In 1908 the excess of arrivals over departures was 2,105, and in 1909, 1,025. That brings me to the question of immigration, in which the Attorney General stated that the Government, of which I was a member took up a hostile position. I desire to trespass upon the

good nature of the House while I read a few lines from my remarks upon that question made in 1904—

There is a very strong impression that this is one of those matters which the Labour Government will not like to face—that the Labour party is altogether opposed to immigration. I want to give that a distinct, straight-out contradiction. We are not opposed to immigration at all. We are as much in favour of immigration as any other section of the community can be. We recognise the desirability of increasing our population by the encouragement of immigrants of the proper type. Each individual entering the State who can find useful occupation adds to the wealth of the community, and bears his share of our common burden. We shall neglect no opportunity of introducing such new citizens. We shall resist any proposal to bring hither those whose failure in other countries renders them unlikely to succeed here, or to lure to this country, by false promises and pretences, workers who come to follow occupations in which our own people already find insufficient avenues of employment. We want no more men and women seeking in our town the precarious livelihood obtained with difficulty already by many of those who are here. Those who have the energy, the knowledge, the capability and the courage to face a settler's life will be assisted. Our ideal is a population of men and women, sturdy, independent, fearless, and strong, physically, mentally, and morally. We shall do all we can to build up such a population here, and to draw from any land from which they can be drawn a class of men and women who shall add to the numbers of that description in the State.

I am not here as an apologist for the Labour party, but I am here to state the opinions which I now hold with regard to this important question of immigration. The member for Geraldton last night, when speaking on the Address-in-Reply advocated the introduction of town workers to Western Australia.

I hope the Government will never consent to entertain such a proposal. The trouble in Western Australia, and even in the old world, is to get people to go to the country and prevent the towns from becoming overcrowded. Here in Western Australia we have over one-third of our population within the metropolitan radius, and we have again a big metropolitan population on the goldfields to add to that. There is no fear of our lacking town workers. If we have a temporary shortage in the supply they readily drift here from the Eastern States as soon as that shortage is known, and that shortage is quickly known indeed. There never yet has been any difficulty in obtaining town workers, and it would be nothing short of a crime if any Government agreed to assist to this State any class of workers of which we already have quite sufficient for all purposes. I am dealing as briefly as possible with the attack made on my colleagues and myself when I was in office with regard to our want of courage and with regard to our marking time, and want of energy and confidence, and I desire to point out that the Attorney General unfortunately was sick during the last stage of our immortal career. During that period, had he not been sick, he would have known that the charge levelled against us was not of marking time but of showing too much courage, and that he, his leader, and his friends, and those associated with him in the Ministry actually complained that we had too much courage, that we were absolutely reckless, and that we had an overweening confidence in the future of the State and its resources. I presume it was because of that fact, in order to show their want of recklessness immediately after, that they reduced the expenditure in development works to an enormous extent. They attacked us for marking time at the outset, and as soon as we got a move on they got into office and marked time themselves. Although I sit behind, and intend to sit behind the present Ministry, I say that in a lot of respects they are still marking time. What can you call it but marking time when

you find the Municipal subsidies reduced. That after all is development expenditure. The roads and bridges vote has been reduced—another development vote, although the development work is carried on by local bodies. We have had marking time with regard to the public buildings vote. Let the Attorney General compare the £337,000 spent on public works from revenue in 1904–5 with the amount spent in any year since, and he will find that the sum has been growing smaller and beautifully less.

Mr. Holman: Yes, in many directions. Rub it in.

Mr. DAGLISH: I am concerned at present with justifying my attitude on a former occasion and with saying that the criticism of the Attorney General last night was uncalled for and was based on a want of sufficient knowledge of the true circumstances of the case. And I add that Ministers have been marking time in respect to their railway retrenchment and the public service—their stoppage of increments and one or two reductions of expenditure of a similar character. Therefore what it is they complained of on the part of my colleagues and myself they ultimately regard as the acme of wisdom. But it may be asked, what caused the change of policy on the part of the Ministry of 1904–5? That is, perhaps, a question which will arise in the minds of some hon. members, and I am anxious to give the answer. After the Ministry had established confidence in the London money market on the part of the investors there, having passed a Loan Bill they were enabled to obtain an adequate loan of somewhat similar size to that obtained by the present Government a few months ago. They floated a loan of £1,400,000 at a price which they were informed was most deplorably low. They were told they should not have accepted the money at such a price, that they had made a very bad financial deal. Bear in mind the Japanese-Russian War had just closed, and the money market was not too good. We were condemned wholesale for taking the price we took, namely £96 10s. at 3½ per cent.; yet in the Premier's

speech the other night he took credit to the present Government for the fact that very recently, after all the advertisement the State got in England from his visit—and I agree that the State got a very good advertisement from the visit—he had been able to float a loan at a price of £96 10s. at 3½ per cent. And the Labour Government as I have shown, despite the disadvantage of being a Labour Government—which was urged with some force against them—succeeded in 1905 in obtaining £1,400,000 at £96 10s. at 3½ per cent. Then, going back to this question of immigration, I desire to point out that the Attorney General objected to the fact that sometimes it was alleged that the present Government had adopted the policy of those who preceded them. I want to say it is because they have done so I am here to support them. And in regard to that very immigration policy, while previous Governments had talked immigration, the Government of 1904–5 were the first to provide any funds for the purpose. They provided those funds at the Agent General's office in London. Immediately Sir Walter James took the position of Agent General, or at least very soon afterwards, he was provided with a certain vote for the purpose of carrying on the work of immigration from that end. And Mr. Lefroy, the previous Agent General, when he came back to the State complained bitterly of the fact that, during the term he held the office of Agent General, he could never obtain the funds necessary to encourage an immigration policy or carry out the work successfully in England. The very agreement with the Orient Company by which our immigrants are brought here to-day is the agreement entered into during my term of office as Treasurer. These are facts which, I think, speak louder than any mere expressions of opinion. These are facts which are on record in the different departmental offices, and I am therefore surprised at the charge at this time being raised against us that we did nothing in regard to immigration. We set forward and started the policy that the present Government,

to the best of their ability, are endeavouring to carry out; and that policy had actually been initiated before we left office.

Mr. Bath: The Attorney General got a reckless gallop on his tongue.

Mr. DAGLISH: A reference was made by the Attorney General on this question, to our action in appointing a Royal Commission to inquire into the subjects of agriculture and immigration. That Royal Commission did splendid work, and was worth a good many times the amount it cost the country. Their report, if used in England or in the Eastern States—if excerpts were made from the evidence given by a large number of witnesses before that body it would serve to help a very great deal the propaganda work being conducted in the old country and in the Eastern States. I know of very few Royal Commissions that have done better work than was done by that body. It submitted also a good programme of agricultural railways. Coming to that question I want to say that the Government of 1904-5 inaugurated the agricultural railway policy of the Moore Government. One of the grounds of attack made upon the Government of 1905 was that very proposition to build agricultural railways. Particularly was this the attitude of Sir Hector Rason in moving the no-confidence motion. I am not going to give you the words of his speech but I will give you part of his introduction, He said—

In the recent policy speech which I may, without impertinence, class as a "reckless gallop" speech . . . we find reference to the Pilbara Railway, the Coolgardie-Norseman Railway, an extension of the Jandakot Railway to junction with the South-Western Railway, the completion of the Collier-Narrogin Railway as far as the Williams, and an extension from the Williams to the Darkan area; light railways—three or four or half-a-dozen, it does not matter very much—light railways in agricultural districts. Then there were the Mount Magnet-Lawlers Railway, the Fremantle dock,

the sewerage of Perth and Fremantle, immigration, State batteries, Bunbury Harbour Works—I should like to know which one of these public works the present Government have not adopted?

Mr. Gordon: Which of the railways was to have been built by private enterprise?

Mr. DAGLISH: Tenders had been called for the construction by private enterprise of the Pilbara Railway. That is no secret; every hon member knows it. Where has the hon. member been sleeping for the last few years? I wish to say that every one of these railways has either been completed or been commenced. Every one of them has since been adopted by our successors. So far from alleging we had no public works policy they complained that it was too extravagant a policy, and that it was absolutely impossible that all these railways should be constructed. It was said they would cost 3½ million pounds, that it was impossible to make them—it was a reckless gallop, a mad gallop. And yet, within the short space of five years, a number of them have been completed, and even a fair number of new railway lines commenced or projected. Where, then, is the complaint about the "mark-time" policy? The 1904-5 Government was the only Government in the history of this State who have taken office when there was a deficit on the loan account. Every other Government have had funds left to them by their predecessors. And, whilst I told you a little while ago that we took office with a deficit of £142,000 on loan account, I want to tell you that we left it with a surplus of somewhere about £900,000 for our successors.

Mr. Bath: £960,000.

Mr. DAGLISH: And it was because they had that splendid fund of £960,000 that they were able to spend between three and four hundred thousand pounds in the whole twelve months on public works of developmental character. If we had left them a deficit I do not know what they would have done, seeing that with that glorious surplus they spent so much less than we did in a similar period. But, departing from this public works question, even in regard to legislation the bulk of

the measures initiated at that time by my colleagues and myself have since been adopted by the present Ministry. They even took up our poor little totalisator tax. When we were in office we were condemned almost as criminals because we proposed to impose extra taxation. We were told there would not have been a deficit but for our incompetent administration; yet our seats on the Ministerial benches were hardly cold before a land tax had been proposed and, in fact, introduced. So while, apparently, it was incompetence that brought about our deficit, the very highest administrative ability only led to that deficit being increased over a certain term of years. It seems, therefore, that incompetence and efficiency both lead to the same end; and under these circumstances, it must indeed be difficult for the country to know whether they prefer to be ruled by incompetency or efficiency. Following on that a Consolidated Land Bill—and this should interest the Minister for Lands—was a measure we projected. A Local Option Bill was introduced by us, and would have been re-introduced had we remained in office. Five years later that Local Option Bill is in exactly the same stage as it was when we left office.

Mr. Bath: And there is the Savings Bank Bill.

Mr. DAGLISH: I have them all on the list. The Health Bill is in the same position as it was when we left office. The Municipalities Bill we projected, as the Governor's Speech will show, and we would have carried it had we had time. The same may be said of the Fire Brigades Bill; and, of course, I need hardly add, it would have been a Fire Brigades Bill causing much less outcry than the present one. The Agricultural Bank Bill was another, and the Savings Bank Bill, which has since become an Act, was likewise one of our measures. It will be found, therefore, that there is something in the remarks of the Attorney General, who said it had been claimed that we laid down a policy for him and his associates to carry out. I want to say that if the Attorney General meant that as a joke it was one of those

instances where absolute truth was spoken in jest. The policy was laid down by us. The agricultural railways policy was laid down; and the unfortunate thing was that those who had—I do not like to use a flattering term—the capacity to propose it had not the opportunity to carry it out. I would rather the Attorney General and his colleagues had done as I proposed with my colleagues to do. We proposed at the outset to appoint an advisory board. By the way, I think I have heard something of that advisory board recently. We brought down a Bill in order to enable us to get legislative sanction for that advisory board and to give it statutory existence, but we had no opportunity of carrying that Bill through. However, just as the present Government have copied us, we appointed an expert board of inquiry into the Norseman railway, and immediately their report was completed we laid it on the Table of the House. I hope the Government will follow that idea. But before we set out on the work of constructing railways, our proposal was to have a scheme and a system of agricultural railways drawn up. It was one of our objects in appointing the Immigration Commission, to have a definite scheme of agricultural railways. We appointed a Commission first of all to get data, and then we proposed to appoint the advisory board for the purpose of drawing up a complete scheme in order that the surveys might then be made so that before people were asked to settle they might be supplied with the knowledge that a railway would go there within the next two years, and that they might go there knowing exactly the route a railway would take, knowing its exact destination, and the exact route taken in order to reach it, so that a man in taking up land would not take a leap in the dark, and one that might mean a heavy financial loss to him. I contend that, while it is fairly late now to deal with the matter, it is better to do it late than never, and it would be wise now for the Government in regard to their policy in respect to future agricultural railways to see that the complete scheme

is brought before Parliament and that surveys are made so that settlers before they settle 40 or 50 miles from a railway may know exactly how far they will be from a railway when constructed.

Mr. Gordon : What a chance for the land speculator !

Mr. DAGLISH : There will be no chance for the land speculator, there will be no chance of getting inside information early. I want to see a board constituted as the present one is, a board of officers in preference to members of Parliament, a board that knows sand from soil, and knows the carrying capacity of the country. I want to make the responsible officers responsible to Parliament in this particular connection, instead of being solely responsible to Ministers ; and I believe we will get better results by making these officers directly responsible to us than by making them responsible to a Parliamentary committee, which afterwards shall be responsible to Parliament. Because, after all, if we appointed a Parliamentary body, that Parliamentary body must rely on the expert knowledge of the officers of the department. Why not let Parliament get the expert knowledge direct instead of having it filtered through any body, whether it be a Cabinet or a committee? So I would advocate that this board, a board similar to that already appointed, should be instructed to draw up a complete scheme of agricultural railways, so that the report may be laid on the table for Parliament to discuss and agree upon before any surveys are made.

The Minister for Lands : The board is making that inquiry.

Mr. DAGLISH : I am glad to hear it, and I hope Parliament will discuss that matter as a whole instead of piecemeal. I do not like piecemeal discussions on those railways which must form part of a complete scheme, because I do not think Parliament can exercise proper judgment on any railway without having the complete scheme before it.

Mr. Bath : There is one item you have omitted, that is in regard to land settlement.

Mr. DAGLISH : I was not going to take any particular regard to that, although land settlement was vigorously pushed ahead in our term and we showed figures far ahead of those who preceded us.

Mr. Gordon : You have put up a good defence.

Mr. DAGLISH : I am not putting up a defence, I am putting up a justification. There is no need for defence, for there is no indictment yet. I desire, however, to say that I speak not in defence of those gentlemen as members of the Labour party—I am not prepared to answer for the Labour platform now—but I am prepared to answer for the deeds my colleagues and I did conjointly, and I object very strongly to this ancient history being unfairly or inaccurately quoted. I would not have had a word to say had the references last night been accurate, but I think I have said enough to convince even the most biassed that the references of the Attorney General last night were not only uncalled for but were absolutely incorrect. I do not propose to deal with the whole of His Excellency's Speech. I desire, however, to express my satisfaction at the good work done by the Premier in England. I do not think that there can be any doubt that the advertisement he has given the State must result in advantage to us as a community. The only other subject I want briefly to mention before I sit down is one of local interest to my constituents and to the constituents of certain other metropolitan members. I want to urge upon the Government the desirability of considering if there is not some way by which they can interfere in order to put a stop to the present tramway strike. The public are considerably inconvenienced ; they are suffering grave inconvenience. I do not intend to discuss the merits of the dispute.

Mr. Holman : Then do you call it a strike ?

Mr. DAGLISH : The hon. member can apply any word he likes, but I desire to draw attention to the fact that it seems entirely ridiculous that the whole

metropolitan community should be inconvenienced as it is by the hanging up of the tramway system. I can understand there are perhaps difficulties in the way of settlement, but these difficulties ought not to be so great as to have kept this dispute going for so long. I do not know the merits as to the original dispute, except by hearsay and from what I have seen in the papers. I know that men working on the trams have told me that they have to work a certain number of hours on the trams and to spend a large number of hours each day going to and from the car barn to report themselves even when they are not needed. I have been told that it is necessary for men to be engaged 12 or 14 hours in one way and another to put in eight hours' work at 1s. an hour under the latest offer. I believe, of the tramway company. It appears to me the tramway company is showing just as much consideration to the men as it has shown to the public, and the public have never had the slightest consideration from the company, because cars very often carry to Subiaco about three times as many people as they can properly accommodate. Men, women, and children are forced to hang on almost by their eyebrows. They are not supplied with seats. The greatest possible inconvenience is caused by lack of rolling stock. The tramway company has entirely failed to fulfil its agreement with the different municipal bodies. I do not intend to go into the merits of the dispute, but I have a suspicion that a company that will treat its patrons and customers with such little consideration is not likely to have shown much consideration for its employees. In any case, whether the employees or the company be to blame for the existing deadlock, the public all the time suffer, and I would like the Ministry to find some way out of the difficulty.

Mr. Johnson: The men offered to leave it absolutely to the Premier to settle the difference, and the company refused.

Mr. DAGLISH: I do not know of any legal method—I do not think there is any—of compelling the company to run

trams in view of the application already made to the Court; but I think it is a grave wrong to the public that they should suffer this long-continued inconvenience through stiff-neckedness on the part of this tramway company. I hope that the present session of Parliament will be peaceful and a happy one for members on both sides of the House, and that good feeling will prevail right through the session despite the differences of political opinion that may separate the rival parties.

On motion by Mr. Holman, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.13 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 16th August, 1910.

	PAGE
Papers presented	321
Questions: Asiatics, marriage with white women ...	321
Loan money, credits in London	322
Bill: Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, 1a ...	323
Personal Explanation: Mr. Heitmann and Com-	
mission on Miners' Lung Diseases	323
Address-in-Reply, eighth day	323

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

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Minister for Mines: Statement of expenditure under the Mining Development Act for year ended 30th June, 1910.

By the Premier: By-laws of the Boulder and York Local Boards of Health.

By the Minister for Works: Amended By-law No. 4 of the Marble Bar Roads Board.

QUESTION—ASIATICS, MARRIAGE WITH WHITE WOMEN.

Mr. LAYMAN (for Mr. Murphy) asked the Attorney General: 1. Has his