

National party to remove or reduce the duty on all agricultural implements and requirements.

Seeing that the acting Premier sent that telegram, I think that even if they have no sympathisers in the Governments in the Eastern States, if there is anything the Government can do to help our Federal members to combat this position in regard to the tariff on supplies, tools and machinery, used in the primary industries, they should leave no stone unturned to do it and achieve the object of securing an amelioration in that direction. In reading in the "Banking Record," the leading Australian financial journal, the review of the "economic consequences of peace," written by J. M. Keynes, I was struck by the great contrast between us in Australia and the people in European countries and the enormously inflated currencies of these European countries. France, by no means the worst off of the European countries, is to-day faced with an annual expenditure of something like 800 millions sterling, and from her various sources of taxation she cannot receive half of that amount to meet the position. We can therefore hardly wonder that the French say, "We must have an indemnity from Germany. What else can we do." France is not able within more than about 50 per cent of her resources to meet her expenditure of 800 million pounds. In view of this fact we have much to be thankful for. Although we have a deficit I have absolute confidence in the future of Western Australia, because of the people that are in it. I rejoice that we are in our present position, and although it is so favourable I still contend that the Government should introduce what economies they can.

On motion by Hon. T. Moore, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 8.35 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly.

*Wednesday, 25th August, 1920.*

	PAGE
Questions: Mining requisites	274
Hoe printing machine	274
Loyal citizens meeting	274
Oil, prospecting regulations	275
Workers' Compensation Act	275
State Children and Charities Department	275
Temporary Chairmen of Committees	275
Address-in-reply, eighth day	275

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

### QUESTION—MINING REQUISITES.

Mr. HUDSON asked the Premier: 1, Has application been made to him to have mining requisites declared "necessary commodities" under the Prices Regulation Act? 2, If so, when? 3, Have such requisites been declared "necessary commodities" under the Act? 4, If not, why not?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, 15th January, 1920. 3, Yes. "Tools of trade," gazetted 8th January, 1920; "Explosives," gazetted 26th March, 1920.

### QUESTION—HOE PRINTING MACHINE.

Mr. CHESON asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Was the Hoe rotary printing machine advertised for sale in the "Government Gazette"? 2, What other papers and journals was the machine advertised for sale in, and date of advertisements?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, No, as the "Government Gazette" is not considered a good medium for such advertisements. 2, "West Australian," 17th to 23rd September, 1912, inclusive; "Sunday Times," 23rd September, 1912; "Kalgoorlie Miner," 19th to 25th September, 1912, inclusive; "Adelaide Register," 24th, 25th, and 26th, September, 1912; "Adelaide Advertiser," 25th, 26th, and 27th September, 1912; "Melbourne Age," 24th, 25th, and 26th September, 1912; "Melbourne Argus," 23rd, 24th, and 25th September, 1912; "Melbourne Mining Standard," 26th September, 1912; "Sydney Morning Herald," 24th, 26th, and 28th September, 1912; "Sydney Daily Telegraph," 24th, 25th, and 28th September, 1912; "Brisbane Courier," 26th, 27th, and 28th September, 1912.

Mr. Jones: All 1912.

### QUESTION—LOYAL CITIZENS' MEETING.

Mr. VERYARD asked the Premier: 1, Is he aware that one Michael O'Dea, undertaker and a justice of the peace for Perth, did organise and lead a party of disloyal citizens, last Sunday afternoon, into a meeting being held in the Queen's Hall, consisting of loyal citizens of Perth, with the object of disturbing the peace and harmony of such meeting; Cr. J. T. Franklin, acting Mayor, presiding? 2, If not, will he cause full inquiries to be made into the question? 3, When Mr. O'Dea accepted the commission of the Peace, did he subscribe to the oath of allegiance to His Majesty the King? 4, If the facts are as alleged, is it not necessary that holders of such commissions, acting in such a manner, should be requested to forfeit same? 5, If not, what would be the conditions necessary to request the forfeiture of same?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, Yes. 3, Yes. 4, Yes. 5, Answered by No. 4.

### QUESTION—OIL, PROSPECTING REGULATIONS.

Mr. SMITH asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Have any regulations been formulated specifying the conditions for prospecting for and working mineral oil deposits in Western Australia? 2, If so, when will such regulations be gazetted, so that holders of areas may be justified in spending money in prospecting?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, No. But permits are issued with conditions attaching which the holder is required to fulfil. 2, The difficulty has been that permit holders have not in the past known what title they would eventually acquire, and in this direction a Bill is being drafted making full provision for a title and will be introduced this session.

### QUESTION—WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT.

Mr. MUNSIE asked the Premier: 1, What amount was in the fund established by the Government in connection with the Workers' Compensation Act at the 30th June, 1920? 2, Are the Government still paying the percentage into the fund as when established?

The PREMIER replied: 1, £38,264 2s. 9d. 2, Each department is paying a premium into the fund based on the scale laid down by the Government Actuary.

### QUESTION—STATE CHILDREN AND CHARITIES DEPARTMENT.

Hon. W. C. ANGIN (without notice) asked the Premier: 1, Have the Government received the final report of the Royal Commission on State Children and Charities Department? 2, If not, will the Government request the Commissioners to forward their final report at an early date?

The PREMIER replied: 1, No. 2, Yes.

### TEMPORARY CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SPEAKER: I desire to inform the House that I have appointed as temporary Chairmen of Committees the hon. member for Hannans (Mr. Munsie) and the hon. member for Leonora (Mr. Foley).

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Eighth Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Mr. CHESSON (Que) [4.43]: I do not intend to take up much of the time of the House in dealing with the Address-in-reply. The only subject in the Governor's Speech to which I wish to refer is that relating to mining. I notice that there are pessimistic remarks with reference to the decrease in the gold output, but I realise that there comes a

time in the life of every mine when it will not pay to work it, especially if development has not been kept well ahead when the mine was on the dividend-paying list. As mines get deeper, so the handling charges increase, especially if the main shafts have not been kept well ahead of the shoot of gold. We all realise what has happened in the gold-mining industry in all the Eastern States. The output has decreased, due in many instances to bad management, and in other instances to the fact that development has not been kept well ahead. We all know that in Western Australia we have an auriferous belt of greater extent than any other State of the Commonwealth. We know that there will come a time when the deep mines at present working will no longer pay to work, and it behoves the Government to do everything possible to assist the prospector to go out and open up new fields and fresh mines. We have already had experience in the Eastern States of what is now occurring in the gold-mining districts of Western Australia. When a deep mine becomes very deep, and the main shaft has not been kept well ahead, a stage is reached when it no longer pays to work the mine. Therefore every encouragement should be given to prospectors to find and develop new mines, which mean new fields and in all probability the maintenance of the gold output of Western Australia. There is something that can be done to help the prospector in connection with the State battery system. Better terms could be given for the treatment of ore. In the case of cyanide sands the present practice is to deduct three pennyweights from the assay. I contend that deduction is too great. I have had experience of cyanide sands, and I know that in dealing with them, or with non-refractory ore, one has only half a pennyweight, or 2s., left in the sands treated. Now, 1s. 6d. will cover all charges, and 3s. 6d. will pay the cost of labour. That is to say, 5s. will cover the whole cost of cyanide treatment and leave a fair margin. Two pennyweights, therefore, will allow the Government a fair margin, and enable them to pay the men employed in the cyanide works £1 per day. Tailings are being treated on the Murchison now at a cost of 6s. 6d. per ton, so that the deduction of two pennyweights which I suggest would be ample. I admit that refractory ore is a different proposition. But the ores of Que and of the greater portion of the Murchison district are not refractory. Then there is the 25 per cent. deduction for moisture. That is too much. On a quartz proposition 10 per cent. would be quite enough, though in a sliming proposition the deduction might be 20 per cent. The matter should be left entirely in the hands of the manager.

The Minister for Mines: Do you mean, in the hands of the manager of each State battery?

Mr. CHESSON: Yes.

The Minister for Mines: And the charges should be based on the cost of the particular battery?

Mr. CHESSON: The manager is in a position to tell by looking at ore whether it is a cyaniding proposition or is the ordinary non-refractory ore. He can tell at a glance whether he should deduct 10 per cent. for moisture, or 20 per cent. The question of deduction for moisture should be left entirely in the hands of each battery manager. Another matter in which help should be given by the Government is the supply of explosives. Either explosives should be manufactured in this State, or the Government should take on their importation and sell to the mines at cost price. We know what happens in outback places in this connection. The prospector cannot buy in a big way like the big company, and therefore he cannot buy so cheaply. In pre-war days the cost of dynamite was £2 5s. per case; now it is £3 10s. Detonators, previously costing 4s. 6d., now cost 9s. 6d. Fuse, which formerly cost 4½d., now costs 1s. 3d. As regards dynamite, the small man buys not by the case, but by the packet, and he has to pay 9s. a packet. The Government should handle the supply of dynamite. If they are not in a position to manufacture it, they should import it and give the same treatment to the small man as to the big man. Assistance should also be given to the prospector by providing him with turnouts, that is to say camels, horses, and so forth. I give the Mines Department credit for doing a good deal to assist the prospector, but further assistance is urgently needed, especially as regards explosives. When a prospector finds a payable lode, the Government should be prepared to assist him. They should sample the lode, and should be prepared to advance up to 50 per cent. of the value in the same way as they do with regard to copper. That would give the prospector an opportunity to develop his lode until such time as the erection of a mill was warranted. The prospector is not being assisted with regard to metaliferous mines. On this subject I desire to read a quotation from the "Murchison Times." The article is headed "Departmental callousness," and reads as follows:—

Some years ago a parcel of wolfram was taken from a show in the Coodardy district by H. Paton and his mate, which paid them well for the quantity broken. But the lode did not continue with payable values and work was stopped. Later on tin, molybdenite, sheelite, etc., were located but not in permanent payable quantities. About two months ago Messrs. S. Holden, Crawford and party commenced prospecting again in this locality—Collins' Soak, near Coodardy, about 20 miles west of Cuddingwarra and 30 miles from Cue. The party has found wolfram and other minerals and are now on a lode of what appears to be very good wolfram and a quantity of the ore has been broken. To obtain the commercial value of this ore several samples were sent to the Government Geologist through Mr. H. O. Al-

lum, and the following reply has been received:—"Sir,—Your letter of the 26th ult. addressed to the Mines Department, together with samples of minerals for assay has been transmitted to this office. A copy of the regulations governing Departmental assays is enclosed herewith for your information and guidance. The necessary fees under the regulations for the assays required by you will be:—Six samples of Tungstic acid at 35s. each, £10 10s.; six samples molybdenite at 35s. each, £10 10s.; total £21; less 20 per cent. for five samples or over, £4 4s.; total £16 16s. I shall be glad to receive your cheque for the above amount, ON RECEIPT OF WHICH THE WORK WILL BE PUT IN HAND and a report forwarded to you in due course.—Yours, etc., A. GIBB MAITLAND, Government Geologist."—The capitals are ours just to emphasise the fact that until the charges of the Department have been met very little assistance will be given to the battling prospector by the Government—and how many of these diggers can find several guineas in order to have their discoveries assayed? For the Government it is a "heads you lose, tails I win" proposition, and under this system it is a wonder that the Government has accumulated such a big deficit, leading one to think that the debt has grown in other parts than the goldfields. If the prospectors' samples are top value the Government reaps the benefit accruing from new mines and fields, but if the samples prove failures then the prospector bears the burden, and, what is more, has to produce his cash before he can even get a hearing. Under the above scale of charges how is it possible for the prospector without capital (and if he had capital he would not be prospecting) to pay? Most of them are prepared to pay a reasonable charge for sampling, but cannot look at 35s. a time. The Government has often stated its eagerness and willingness to assist and encourage prospecting in the State. Such instances as the above, which is only one of a few, do not help the battlers very much and will not assist the mining industry or encourage men to open up the back country. The Department should treat the samples free of charge and the geologist give the men as much knowledge as possible to help in their search for the minerals which will again bring prosperity to the State. The newly-formed local Prospectors' Association could take this matter in hand and put the case (and possibly other similar ones) before the Minister for Mines, who, by the way, is on another trip to the Eastern fields. There is much advice waiting to be given to the Minister when he visits the Murchison and if he is genuinely sympathetic towards the prospectors of this district he will come at once and accept it instead of dancing attendance on men who are much

more able to look after their own interests than we are.

This is a matter which certainly should receive consideration. In dealing with metaliferous propositions the prospector should at least get free assays. Assuredly such prices as I have quoted should not be put on him. I am in a position to say that the men referred to are good, genuine prospectors, and that they have prospected not only the Murchison, but also other parts of the State. They are entitled to every consideration. They are the kind of men whom we want to keep prospecting if possible. The young man now growing up is mostly a wages man, and it is the old prospector to whom we have to look for the opening of the new fields. I do not think that the treatment meted out by the Mines Department in this instance is fair. I agree with the leader of the Opposition that the interests of labour and those of capital are diametrically opposed, and that there is a class war now in progress. The workers have to fight, either by direct action or by putting up a case in the Arbitration Court, for everything they receive. We men who have had experience of mining and outback know that the mine owner, like the factory proprietor, is not prepared to give better conditions to the worker unless he is compelled to do so. Even when legislation for the benefit of the miners has been placed on the statute book, the secretaries of the miners' unions have to bring that legislation to the notice of the inspectors of mines in order to secure its observance. Everything that we receive we have to fight for. We know that a number of men have been stricken down in mines through miner's phthisis. Have we ever received any assistance for these men or their dependants from the mine owners? No. The assistance has always come from the workers. I agree that there is at the present time a class war and with what the leader of the Opposition says that labour and capital are diametrically opposed. I remember in New South Wales in the eighties, when the big coal mining strikes were taking place, the workers at that time were endeavouring to get a little more for what they produced, and the companies who had big contracts with the steamship owners were out to cut down the men in every instance. When their contracts expired they put up a notice that on or about a certain date a reduction would take place in the hewing price of coal. When the companies secured the contracts, however, the men turned the scale and they demanded the price that they were receiving before, and when the companies had big contracts they were fairly successful. I took part in the great strike in the southern collieries in New South Wales in 1886. That was a nine months' strike. It was brought about by the companies putting up a notice that they intended to reduce the hewing price of coal. When the companies brought about a reduc-

tion in the hewing price of coal, whom did it affect? It affected the workers in that particular industry. A notice of reduction was put up on a board and the workers had to put up with it every time, or else they were bludgeoned. Everything the worker gets he has to fight for. Take at the present time the Murchison award. The Murchison miners went to the Arbitration Court. Perhaps that court was not legally constituted, but there were present Mr. Justice Rooth, Mr. Somerville and the late Mr. Daglish. The Murchison miners got a rise. What happened? Judge Rooth met with an accident and the award was signed by a majority of the members of the court, Mr. Somerville and Mr. Good, in the absence of Mr. Daglish who at that time was ill. The wages were fixed but the mere fact of the award not being signed by the president has led to complications and we find now that the Chamber of Mines are appealing against the award. That proves that the employer is out in every case to fight the employee. I am not blaming the employer. I am content to admit that it is a class war at the present time and that the worker is out to get as much as he can for what he produces just as much as the capitalist is out to get the biggest dividends he can. The member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson) said that the arbitration award is only binding on one party, namely the employer.

Mr. Thomson: Is not that statement perfectly correct?

Mr. CHESSON: No, it is not.

Mr. Thomson: You cannot make a man work against his will.

Mr. CHESSON: The employee in an industry, of course, is an individual and he can leave at any time if he is not satisfied with the conditions. But a body of men cannot do so. If they do so, they are liable to be prosecuted. I can give an instance where this applied so far as the employer was concerned. Some years ago an award was given at Broken Hill. Justice Higgins was the president of the court at the time. An increase was given to the men. The small companies at Broken Hill were prepared and did pay the advance, but the Proprietary, which was the big company, did not. They said they could not pay the award and they closed down. Was any action taken? None at all. They shut down for four or five months but they reopened and not only paid the award but an increase under an agreement with the miners' union in that district. The price of lead did not increase, and that proved conclusively that the company could have paid it before. If an employer says that he cannot pay an award that has been given and run his concern at a profit, there is nothing to prevent him from closing down. The thing cuts both ways. It does not cut with the employee any more than it does with the employer. No one can compel a factory to work at a loss.

Mr. Pickering: Would not a mine owner have his mine forfeited if he closed down?

Mr. Green: It is different from an apple crop.

Mr. Pickering: Are there not certain conditions that have to be complied with?

Mr. CHESSON: I am referring to a factory. Of course with regard to a mine, certain conditions have to be complied with.

Mr. Willcock: Has any Government ever shut down under such circumstances?

Mr. CHESSON: In regard to round-table conferences, my experience is that no good results from them. The Arbitration Act provides that before an employer or an employee can approach the court, an effort must be made to bring about a conference between the parties and a dispute must be created before the court can be approached. Then the court can be approached by the dissatisfied party. I do not know of any instance where such conferences have prevented an appeal to the court. I remember an instance in Cue in the early days, when the Arbitration Act first became law. The Act provides for conciliation. An increase was given to cyanide workers in Cue. The employers appealed to the Arbitration Court. In no instance that I know of has conciliation been responsible for effecting a settlement. Either one side or the other has appealed to the court. Therefore, I am absolutely up against round-table conferences or conciliation in any form. In that particular case to which I have referred I acted on behalf of the employees and after all our work it was a failure and the court was appealed to. The Act wants amending so that wages may be increased or reduced according to the cost of living. I believe, however, that better results would come from the creation of boards where both sides would be represented. What is required is a competent chairman, who is qualified for the position by his experience of the particular industry upon which he would be required to adjudicate. Such a man would be in a position to classify an award. I do not say anything about the judges who preside over these matters, but one cannot expect a judge who has spent most of his life as a lawyer to be in a position to classify an award.

Mr. Pickering: Whom would you appoint as chairman?

Mr. CHESSON: A man who is properly qualified, and has practical experience in connection with the particular industry concerned.

Mr. Pickering: How would you appoint him?

Mr. CHESSON: I would leave the appointment in the hands of the representative of the employers and of the employees. I contend that a man in this position should be one who has had practical experience. It is not reasonable when dealing with a big industry, say, the engineering industry, in which is involved fitting and turning and all the other ramifications of it, to expect a judge to be in a position to classify. The

only man who can classify is the practical man who has the necessary knowledge of the industry. I would prefer a wages board of practical men to a tribunal presided over by a man who may be practical as a lawyer, but has no practical knowledge of the particular industry that is being dealt with, and cannot therefore classify the award. I should like to deal with the Workers' Compensation Act. This should be amended so that it is brought into line with the various States of the Commonwealth and with England. I believe that the diseases arising out of the calling of the miner, or those persons engaged in factories, should be provided for. Compensation for an accident should start from the time the accident occurs. At present it is necessary for a man to wait 14 days before he can get any compensation for an accident. We know from experience that there are numbers of miners who meet with minor accidents, and who are out of employment for six, seven or 10 days. It takes many persons all their time to exist on the fields, and during the time a man is out of work for these six or 10 days, he receives nothing. This means that he goes back in his accounts with the storekeeper who has to carry him. We should so amend the Workers' Compensation Act as to provide that compensation shall start from the time of the accident. It should be amended along the lines of the Queensland Act. At present the worker who is permanently disabled, and the widow of the man who meets with a fatal accident, receives £400. What is £400 to a widow who has four or five children to rear? It amounts to nothing. We should fall into line in this matter with the various Acts in existence in other parts of the world. With regard to the Wooroloo sanatorium hall, I contend this should have been provided by the Government. I drew attention to this matter on a previous occasion, and am satisfied that it is necessary that a hall should be provided at the sanatorium. There are patients there from many parts of the State. It must have appealed to the many persons who have visited this institution that the wards, which are open wards, are so situated that the patient has no place to go to in wet weather except his bed. I think that the deputation headed by the member for Swan to the Government recently agreed to give a pound for pound subsidy for the erection of this hall. If the Government were prepared to bring down a Bill for the erection of this hall, I feel sure that there are many members here who would give it their support. For a long time in Day Dawn we have been contributing £2 a month towards the Pastime Club. The Fingal mine at Day Dawn has, I think, contributed more than any other mine in Western Australia, and we realise that it is up to us to do what we can to provide the nucleus of the funds necessary for the erection of this hall. We will certainly do our part in that direction. I am pleased to see that a favourable reply was received by the mem-

ber for Swan in this matter. The Government, however, should build the hall themselves. I do not think they should ask the people of Western Australia to contribute towards it. In connection with the sandalwood industry, I think the royalty of £2 is too much to ask of the cutters. After all, this money comes from them. It does not come from the exporter, the man who sends the sandalwood away from the State. I desire to quote the case of two cutters on the Murchison, who recently received very little as a result of their labour. The Government, of course, get £2 a ton royalty. The road board in the district took the matter up and wrote to the Minister on the matter. I will read the correspondence that passed between the road board and the Conservator of Forests. Here is one letter—

At a meeting of the above board held on Tuesday evening last (that is 10th June, 1920), the question of the royalty on sandalwood was brought under review. This industry is springing up in this district under great difficulties, and the board decided to enter a protest against the excessive royalty of £2 a ton, which is crushing it out of existence. Yours faithfully, Secretary.

The following reply was received from the Forestry Department—

I have to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 10th inst. with reference to the royalty on sandalwood. I should like to point out that the present royalty is really very small when compared with the selling price in China. Several road boards have suggested that the royalty should be on a sliding scale. If a sliding scale be decided upon it would be necessary to use the selling rate in China as a basis, and not the rate that it may please the local merchants to quote from time to time. I have the honour to be, Sir, Your obedient servant. (Sgd.) Deputy Conservator of Forests.

Just imagine a reply of that sort. The man who gets the sandalwood, and finds his own turn-out and horse feed, is asked to work on this basis. The only person he has to deal with is the man who exports.

The Premier: That is the point. The industry ought to be organised; then the cutters would get more.

Mr. CHESSON: What possible chance is there of organising the industry in China?

The Premier: We offered to organise the industry in this State, but they would not have it.

Mr. Jones: For one firm, yes.

Mr. CHESSON: The cutter has no possible chance. It always comes out of the pocket of the unfortunate man who gets the wood.

Mr. Johnston: The bush workers are all working for the Government now. It is socialism by royalties.

The Premier: That is quite wrong.

Mr. CHESSON: The royalty of £2 a ton is excessive. Here is another letter:—

Your letter of the 24th ult. came before the board meeting, and I was directed to reply and to point out that the cutters on the fields are not in a position to export the sandalwood to China and sell to merchants in Perth or Fremantle, yet it is the cutters that have to pay the royalty. If the Government's estimate of the value of the wood is based on the price in China the board consider that the Government should assist the cutters to get the Chinese price. The board consider that the fairest way would be to put an export duty on. Since the meeting two men who have been cutting sandalwood have given me the statement they received from the wholesale house, which shows that they sent down 5 tons 3 cwt. 2 qrs. valued at £41 8s. From this is deducted railage £9 11s. 11d., royalty £10 7s. weighing 6d., or a total of £19 19s. 5d., which leaves them £21 8s. 7d. for about three months' work. You will see from this that the Government take in railage and royalty practically 50 per cent. of the value of the wood, which is certainly excessive and enough to stop them from continuing cutting. Trusting that this matter will have your careful consideration, and that you will devise a fairer means of obtaining the revenue you require. Yours faithfully. (sgd.) G. A. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Green: Whom did they sell to?

Mr. CHESSON: They sold this to Dalgety, Ltd., for £8 per ton.

Mr. Green: The market price was from £11 to £12.

Mr. CHESSON: I am in a position to know that the market price did not go below £12. and that these men were practically fobbed off £4 a ton.

The Premier: The industry requires to be organised and it ought to be organised.

Mr. CHESSON: What chance have they got of doing that?

Mr. Green: Nationalise it. That is the only courageous way of handling it.

Mr. CHESSON: The Government had a chance of nationalising the industry. Here is another letter—

I am instructed by this board to write to you and enter a protest against the royalty of £2 per ton on sandalwood. This royalty is levied on the cutters who do not receive the benefit of the high prices ruling in China, with the result that they do not get an adequate return for the labour involved. I have before me a concrete instance in which two men sent a truck containing 5 tons 3 cwt. 2 qrs. of sandalwood to Perth, and the return from the wholesale house shows value of wood at £8 per ton—£41 8s., from which is deducted railage £9 11s. 11d., royalty £10 7s., weighing 6d., totalling £19 19s. 5d., which means that the Government take 50 per cent. of the value of the wood, and the two men only got £21 8s. 7d. for their work. If these charges are to be imposed it means that the industry in this part of

the State will be killed. Yours faithfully,  
(sgd.) G. A. Wright, Secretary.  
That is all these men get, and they have to provide horse-feed and everything else. I think the royalty is excessive.

Mr. Green: Who was going to give them £8 a ton?

Mr. CHESSON: Dalgety & Company.

Mr. Green: That is the company to which the Government proposed to give a private monopoly.

Mr. CHESSON: That is so.

Mr. Willcock: Are you in favour of a sliding scale?

Mr. CHESSON: On the whole, I believe in it. I think every hon. member should express his opinion on the public service strike. I am entirely in sympathy with the public servants. The Government had every opportunity for averting the strike by appointing a reclassification board. During last session we had a demonstration at the House, which proved conclusively to me that the public servants were prepared to act. The Government should have seen the writing on the wall and been prepared to appoint the desired board, representative of both sides. There has been too much procrastination in respect of this trouble.

Mr. Green: They wrote to the Premier on the 14th November last.

Mr. CHESSON: Yes, but the Government probably thought the Public Service had no backbone. They had a just grievance, which should have been attended to, but the Government let the thing slide until at last it resulted in the strike. I am in a position to know that the Public Service have many grievances. In my own district we have a mining registrar receiving £240 per annum. He is not only mining registrar, but clerk of petty sessions, clerk of the local court, clerk of the licensing court, clerk of quarter sessions, clerk of awards, inspector of mines, agent for the Curator of Intestate Estates, agent for the Government Savings Bank, district registrar, Government land agent, electoral agent, returning officer, postal vote officer, paymaster and cashier, agent for the Minister for Works, and agent for the department of invalid pensions. He is receiving £240 per annum. He took up the position in 1914 from Mr. Lang, who is now mining registrar in Perth. The transference represented a saving of from £70 to £80 to the Government.

The Premier: Who gave you the figures?

Mr. CHESSON: I got them from the Public Service; they are correct. It represented a saving of from £70 to £80. This man, receiving £240 per annum, carried on the whole of the work. He had the Savings Bank tacked on to him, which Mr. Lang had not, and there were also tacked on to him various Federal departments, for which the State Government received some remuneration. In 1919 this officer was notified that he was to get a bonus of £10, retrospective to July of 1918. At about the same time he received notice that a deduction of

£12 was to be made in respect of his district allowance, which meant that he was £2 worse off than before. He carried on till 1920, when he was notified that he was to receive a bonus of £22, and that there would be a deduction in his district allowance of £22. Thus he is actually worse off by £2 than previously. He sent in a protest, and the answer he received was "Under review."

The Premier: Is he on the Public Service list?

Mr. CHESSON: Yes. We have in my electorate a boy who went into the mining registrar's office in Cue a little over three years ago. He was paid 17s. 6d. per week.

Mr. Teesdale: Are there ever any mining transactions there now?

Mr. CHESSON: I will tell the hon. member directly. He received 17s. 6d. per week. A few months later, on reaching his sixteenth year, he, under the provisions of the Act, was paid £1 per week. He is now 19 years of age, and is still receiving £1 per week. I say the Government are not justified in paying a young man 19 years of age £1 per week.

The Premier: Give us his name.

Mr. CHESSON: Frank Coster. His mother is a widow, and his sister, who is working in a draper's shop, has to help provide him with food, for in Cue at present it requires 30s. per week to purchase provisions for a bachelor. This young man is receiving only £1 per week from a Government department.

Mr. O'Loughlin: Yet the Premier talks of prosperity!

Mr. CHESSON: The Mines Department should find out whether this young man is qualified—I say he is qualified, and so, too, do the people of Cue—and if he is found to be qualified he should be paid a living wage. I am sure the Premier would agree to that. In my opinion the time has come when, in the interests of economy, we should abolish State governors. The Imperial interests would be sufficiently safeguarded by the Governor General.

The Premier: Why not abolish the lot of them?

Mr. CHESSON: We could well appoint a judge of the Supreme Court to look after the duties of the Governor's office.

Mr. O'Loughlin: Why not appoint the Minister for Works?

Mr. CHESSON: I would be quite satisfied with even the Minister for Works. From the standpoint of economy, and having regard to our small population, there is no justification for a State Governor, and the upkeep of Government House. The Chief Justice would make an excellent substitute for the State Governor. The time has arrived when the Federal and State Governments should devise means for amalgamating the respective Electoral Departments and the respective Taxation Departments. The difficulty could easily be overcome if both Federal and State Governments were sincere.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: There was no necessity for the Federal staff in the first place.

Mr. CHESSON: Yes, there was in the first instance. I am speaking, not of the Savings Banks, but of the Taxation Departments, although I think the Savings Banks also should be amalgamated. I am a great believer in land values taxation. Through this form of taxation we could reduce railway freights. We have had three increases of railway freights during the war, and these freights press most heavily on the people outback. Under land values taxation 44 per cent. could be raised from the city and suburbs, the whole of which would be placed to the credit of the railways in order to make possible a reduction of freights and render it practicable for the people outback to live on reasonable terms. Every consideration should be given to the man outback. The only way to afford him relief is to reduce railway freights.

The Premier: What about having free railways and imposing the whole of their cost on the land?

Mr. CHESSON: I am advocating, not free railways, but a tax on land values, which would serve to assist the railways. The men who live alongside the railways and do not utilise their land, should be taxed out of existence.

The Premier: I know that is your opinion.

Mr. O'Loghlen: The "West Australian" will make you think it in 12 months, too.

Mr. CHESSON: A graduated land tax would compel those who hold lands for speculative purposes to utilise them so that the railways would pay. I am a great believer in secondary industries and have always advocated their encouragement. I cannot understand why the primary producer should have any objection to them for, after all, what we require is population to consume the produce grown here. The best thing for which the primary producer can wish is a big population, who would create a demand for his produce. What is the use of bringing immigrants here if we cannot place them? We know from experience that we cannot place every man on the land.

Mr. Pickering: That is where you want them.

Mr. CHESSON: If we placed every man on the land, what would happen? We would have a big surplus of produce and values would decline and the primary producers would be working for little or nothing. We require a big home population to consume our produce. This would redound to the interests of primary producers as well as to those on the goldfields, who also are primary producers. We want a big home population and we need to build up secondary industries. What happened when the Pinal closed down? It was one of the biggest mines in the West. It had the biggest workshop. When it closed down, all the workmen and mechanics got word from Broken Hill, Newcastle, and other centres that they could be placed over there. These men, who were good mechanics, went to the East and we lost them. They were men whom we could ill afford to lose. It would be to the interests of farmers working in conjunction with the miners, to foster the

secondary industries, and the two should work hand in hand. The Government, too, should take a hand. We cannot get private concerns to do so on account of the lack of population. There is a big opening here for the woollen industry. I understand there are only 28 woollen factories in Australia and, taking into consideration the number of sheep in Australia and the opening offered in Western Australia, the industry should be established here. The member for Geraldton (Mr. Willcock) pointed out the advantages of gristing our own wheat and exporting it only in the form of flour in order to provide employment for our people. Members should realise what it would mean to the dairying, the bacon and poultry industries, if the whole of the offal were available.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They are killing the poultry industry by putting up the price of wheat.

Mr. CHESSON: I understand that it is impossible to carry on the poultry industry profitably with wheat at present prices. If the whole of the wheat were gristed here, the price of offal would be fairly low. The matters I have placed before the Government are worthy of consideration. We people on the goldfields realise that we are primary producers, and that we should be able to work hand in hand with the farmers to establish secondary industries. I put this before members of the Country party for their consideration.

Mr. ROBINSON (Canning) [5.52]: Ever since the Commonwealth payment of 25s. per head has obtained, the Government of Western Australia have had a most difficult task to make ends meet, and will have a difficult task until such time as the population of the State bears a reasonable ratio to the area of the State. To-day one-fifteenth of the population of Australia is in Western Australia, to govern, develop, and keep good order in one third of Australia. I therefore welcome the declaration of the Government to introduce suitable immigrants from the Old Land.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You won't get them.

Mr. ROBINSON: We shall see. I think our needs may be comprised under four headings: firstly, more population, secondly, increased production from our primary industries; thirdly, the establishment and encouragement of secondary industries; fourthly, economy in the State administration and in our daily lives. How are we going to attain these objects? The State alone is not able to carry the burden, for the burden, I hold, is national to Australia. Mr. Hedges recently made a public statement suggesting that the Commonwealth Government owed a duty to Western Australia, a duty to assist this State to people its vacant lands. The Commonwealth could readily fulfil that obligation by appropriating one of its loans. It must be a large amount, say, ten millions, spread over a period of years, for the opening up and development of Crown lands in Western Australia. We are



told that in Canada, when the immigrant arrives, he goes straight to a prepared farm, a place made ready for him to go ahead and practice the science of husbandry.

Hon. T. Walker: Of very small area.

Mr. ROBINSON: That might be so. But here our new settler who goes out into the virgin country, spends his all and wears out the best years of his own life and that of his wife in endeavouring to subdue the country. What greater asset can the State have than settlers who are prosperous and happy. I propose that we should exchange our waste lands—I mean our Crown lands—for the settlement of farmers who are prosperous and happy. We have still great areas in the South. We have more in the South-West and we have huge areas lying between the Goldfields railway and the coast, and from the Great Southern railway reaching even unto Esperance, largely unoccupied, and they are areas capable under proper management of producing both wheat and wool. But those areas, however they may be cleared or farmed, cannot be profitable unless the country is opened up. Let us therefore prepare farms there, make roads suitable for motor transport, and also build railways. The experience in England to-day is that motor transport is overtaking the railways and is being very largely availed of in lieu of railways. In order to enable motor traffic to carry its heavy loads, roads must be well made. I quite admit that in many of our areas it will be difficult to find material to make such roads. But in other places, particularly in the areas I have mentioned, there is plenty of material available. Then, too, there are the great possibilities of the country we know as the North-West, and nearer at hand we have the land of the Murchison and the Gascoyne where similar work can be carried out.

Hon. T. Walker: I notice you all leave out Esperance.

Mr. ROBINSON: The hon. member is wrong; I mentioned Esperance. Such works as I have outlined need money. Of course they cannot be carried on without money, and I therefore agree with the suggestion that it is the duty of the Commonwealth Government to assist us to people this western side of Australia. Until it is peopled, it is a menace to the safety of the whole Commonwealth.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Where are the Commonwealth Government to get the money?

Mr. ROBINSON: I will tell the hon. member in a moment. In fact, my next sentence was going to be that just as the Commonwealth Government find to-day money for people attempting to settle the Northern Territory, so they should find money for the settlement of our vacant lands. But I do not want the Commonwealth Government to repeat the Northern Territory experiment in Western Australia. Let us do it; we know better how to do it. Just as the Commonwealth Government have found a million sterling towards the irriga-

tion settlements on the Murray, situated between the prosperous States of Victoria, New South Wales, and South Australia, so let them find money for us. I am told that although the Federal Government have promised a million, the cost is likely to be so great that the Commonwealth contribution may run into two millions. If, therefore, the Federal Government are going to assist those great and prosperous States with two millions of money for the purpose of closer settlement, we in Western Australia have a perfect right to ask for five times that amount to help us settle our own vacant lands, which I say are a menace to the safety of the whole continent.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You have greater confidence in the Commonwealth Government's readiness to assist us than I have.

Mr. ROBINSON: Maybe, but nothing is obtained in this world without asking. I am raising the question in this House in order to bring it before Ministers. It may not have been argued in this way before. I am making a suggestion which I hope will be helpful to the Government, and of which I hope Ministers will avail themselves. I am not saying that the money should be retained by us. The money that is being given by the Commonwealth towards irrigation on the Murray is money that you, Mr. Speaker, and I and every other member of the community are paying towards. Australia is finding that money. Why should not Australia come to the help of Western Australia by finding 10 millions for the development of our lands, which greatly need it?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We shall have to wait a long while before we get it.

Mr. ROBINSON: I have spoken so frequently on the subject of the importance to the Western Australian people of the establishment of secondary industries that I need do no more this evening than again say that we pay away four million pounds annually to people in the Eastern States for goods which we can and should make for ourselves. I believe the people of Western Australia are thoroughly imbued now with the idea of assisting in the establishment of secondary industries, and I hope that in the near future we shall find a number of enterprises in the nature of secondary industries coming to fruition. Several are being discussed now. I am myself taking a hand, with others, in an endeavour to start the woollen industry in Western Australia. The woollen industry is one that everyone agrees should be started here. We cannot, of course, expect to reach in a moment the same scale of production as others have attained, but last year our sheep owners received  $2\frac{1}{2}$  millions sterling for their wool. I think it is a small thing to ask those people to help the State that has helped them. Whilst we might not for the moment be able to start making tweeds, we certainly should have a factory able effectively to scour wool and to produce tops, which have a marketable value in every city of the world. Now, we must practice econo-

my, and economy must be urged not merely on the Government, as most people urge it, but on the whole community.

Hon. P. Collier: Poverty compels economy with most of us.

Mr. ROBINSON: Those people who have least to spend, spend it unwisely, or many of them do.

Hon. P. Collier: I have heard wealthy people say that before.

Mr. ROBINSON: It is a general expression of opinion to-day, and one has only to keep his eyes open in the streets of Perth to know that the statement is true. Our electoral system has needed revision since the year 1912. It could not have been changed earlier, owing to the war, but the war is now over.

Mr. Jones: There is a war on in Russia.

Mr. ROBINSON: The war is over, and our soldiers have come back again. Now is the time. What is our first duty? I submit it is not for this Parliament, which is about to expire, but it will be for the next Parliament, as one of its first functions, to instal a new electoral system. The system I advocate is proportional representation. I believe that system would provide the necessary reorganisation of provinces and electorates, and so bring about the reflection in the House of the views of all sections of the community. That condition will tend to better government, and better government will tend to better administration.

Hon. T. WALKER (Kanowna) [6.9]: I have been listening all through the debate on the Address-in-reply to see if I could learn anything that would tend to lift this Parliament to a higher level, something that would raise it from the low level on which it has been for the last year or two. I was wondering if we had any evidence of genius, of political insight and foresight, that would enable us to create afresh that confidence which we appear to be losing on the part of the general public. In no period in the history of Western Australia since I have been associated with this State, have the public cared less for the word of constituted authority, have they less regarded the alleged status and capacity of the representatives of the people. There is a feeling—I am sure many hon. members experience it—as of a moribund spirit, even in this Assembly. The hon. member who just resumed his seat spoke of this House expiring in a few months. He led us to believe that we were dying, and dying a sort of natural death. There has been nothing in the debate to rouse the confidence of the people, nothing to make the general populace say, "No matter what bad times may roll around the globe, we have in the Parliament that represents us the spirit, the mind, the knowledge, and the determination to rescue us, to lift us out of our position." It is a mournful spectacle—it must be even so to you, Sir—to see how little regard the general citizen has for a member of Parlia-

ment. There must be a reason for that. What is it? Is it that this institution is passing away, losing its usefulness, has served its purpose, is withering like a plant that once was flourishing but has entered into the period of decay and is to be superseded by something else? It was the Prince Consort who said that parliamentary institutions were on their trial. That was in Queen Victoria's reign. Have they had their trial, and has the trial resulted in evidence of their failure? Is it the fault of the people, or is it the fault of the institution, or is it the fault of the components, the parts, the units of the institution? Where does the fault lie? Could we have witnessed any spectacle more humiliating than the course of this debate? An eternal cry of "What are you going to do? The country is drifting on to the rocks of bankruptcy. What are you going to do?" No answer to the question.

Mr. Pickering: There have been some suggestions.

Hon. T. WALKER: Of what kind? By whom?

Mr. Pickering: Drastic taxation and retrenchment.

Hon. T. WALKER: Nothing of a material character has been suggested that the hon. member has not heard ever since he was a boy; nothing that we have not heard in Parliament after Parliament, nothing that was not heard long before ever there was a Labour Government in this State, long before the political power that is rising in the people had a voice. Ages ago there was a cry for retrenchment, economy, and taxation.

The Premier: And reform.

Hon. T. WALKER: If the suggestions I have heard here were to be carried out, it would be like trying to stop the rotation of the earth by dropping down a fly upon the summit of a mountain. The suggestions made are totally inadequate to meet the requirements. There does not seem to be anyone who knows, and has the courage to tell, what the actual facts of the situation are.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Hon. T. WALKER: When the House rose for tea I was saying that we had had a number of what appeared to be futile suggestions for the remedy of the State's present apparent misfortunes. Trite utterances such as "give us population," "knock down the university," "stop the exercise of the functions of the observatory," "economise"—these are trite utterances which have been used from time immemorial, and they mean nothing unless accompanied by the ways and means of carrying them into effect. Population! How can we obtain population unless we have people willing either to multiply or to immigrate, and how are we to induce either method to increase the population? It is left to the imagination as to how this

is to be done. I have been astounded watching the course of the present Government, the Premiers' conferences and the attendances at Melbourne, and yet the failure to recognise that the State of Western Australia is where it is to-day because it is working in bondage, in fetters. It has not the freedom of a State to develop itself. It cannot grow impeded as it is. We are in the hands of that creature which we have set up and which dominates us in every sphere of our public activities. We are not free. Talk about your worship of liberty! The State of Western Australia to-day is, in comparison with what it once was, a slave State. I remember the time when the hearts of the populace thrilled with hope and expectancy at the cry of the glorious marriage of these southern States bound together in the same pact of a just partnership. What has become of that ideal? Where is the partnership, where is the working in co-operation, where is that spirit which was to give us its best zest, its sincerest zeal to watch the growth and development of the feeblest and the most dependent of the States? We have none of it. The whole thing is traceable back to the system that prevails throughout the world to-day, and is exceeded in our midst far away from the busy old European centres, here in the southern seas, isolated by ocean spans, where we might have thought that we could build up for ourselves a destiny that should be the Pharos for benighted people, should be a standard that the world might copy. We are as much under a thrall, as much within the magic of the spell here under the Southern Cross as they are in the very heart of the old world kingdoms. I will put it in a nutshell. This is the age where wealth, not hearts, where money, not minds, governs mankind. Money is the symbol of all power, of all honour, of all that is covetable to mortals. Money! And it is because we are governed by money that we shall never be able in this State, except under trials and difficulties, to achieve anything like the freedom of a noble people. All our money to-day is going not to this Parliament, not from our Government, but to Melbourne. In every direction the tendrils are spreading through our midst and getting hold of all our activities and making it impossible for us to act as unfettered people. One hears repeatedly we are going to the dogs for want of money. Where can we get our money when, to begin with, our powers of taxing income and wealth are taken from us? Every port around Western Australia has its custom house which intercepts a possible inflow of wealth, that money which we require for development, and collects it not for our especial good but for the augmentation of the authority of the governing powers of the East. We can no longer collect from that source. Do we create individual wealth by our own energies and activities? Do we

become possessed of incomes in surplus of our requirements? That surplus is attached not for our good, not for the benefit of Western Australia, but to replete the Treasury of the Commonwealth. We have heard the cry of produce, produce, produce. Beautiful words taken from Carlyle holus bolus, but even the land is not to be left to our care, it is not to be left unfettered, nor is it to be used at our discretion. The holders of that land are to be taxed, not to improve the land, not to give facility of inter-communication with neighbours, but again to give a rich flow of wealth eastward. Even now when the dearly beloved amongst us close their eyes in everlasting slumber, when the death knell sounds, an officer of taxation inquires into the treasures left by the deceased and takes his share, not for us, but again to swell the coffers that exist in Melbourne. Go where we will, the current flows from us. In a limited amount I admit there is a re-flow to the State, but it is extremely limited. And it is not alone in that direction that we are harassed, that all our resources of taxation are filched from us. Our customs and again our excise have gone, our power over currency, legal tender and banking have gone. Not only all our sources of money, but there is the cry, "Let us not duplicate any of the functions of State; let there be one tax-gatherer." What does it mean? Not that there shall be a sovereign State of Western Australia taxing its own people and collecting its own taxes and surplus, giving something for the maintenance of an alleged partnership, but it means that the Commonwealth steps in, takes our avenues of taxation, employs its own officers, takes from the people all their substance, and if in the doing of it there be any irritation or wrong done, the appeal is not to someone on the spot, but to the distant East where correspondence lies neglected for weeks or months as the case may be. Not only in one direction but in all others this is so, even in our Electoral Department. What is the authority that is to control the machinery for this one electoral service? Not the State, but the Commonwealth again has to step in and be supreme.

Mr. Money: Why not one joint department?

Hon. T. WALKER: How can we have a joint department with the other?

Mr. Money: Why not?

Hon. T. WALKER: It is like the lion lying down with the lamb, and the lamb is inside always. Has the hon. member no experience, has he not watched affairs and events, does he not see where the aggression is, and where the encroachments are? In every direction there is that power encroaching over us, getting hold of us hand and foot. More particularly will he understand how they are doing it in our banking. Is it not a fact that we are under a greater struggle, than ever was conceivable in days gone by, to maintain our own Savings Bank

for the deposits of the earnings of the poor? The other bank steps in, and in every possible way, by allurements and facilities and promises and assurances, and, I will say, strict attention to business, tries to get the custom, and this money of our own people which should be used—money which should be got fairly, and cheaply—for the development of the State, is passing into the Commonwealth coffers. It is an open boast with them that they will kill all our State enterprises of that kind, and merge them in the Commonwealth. It is their boast. They intend to do it, not only with the Savings Bank, but with all our banking institutions. That is their aim and purpose. How can the State work under such conditions? It is all very well to talk about being an Australian. I am proud of the fact that I can belong to Australia, but if we are a sovereign State and if the responsibility rests upon us to develop this portion of the globe, if that is our duty and our allotted task, then we must have the freedom to do it, and the means with which to do it. Talk about having ten millions given to us by the Commonwealth!

Hon. W. C. Angwin: As well ask them to cut their throats!

Hon. T. WALKER: Quite as reasonably. The member for Canning (Mr. Robinson) was quite correct in saying that we have only one-fifteenth of the population of the whole of Australia, and we have one-third of Australia to look after, and that therefore we need money and the Commonwealth ought to step in. But to give ten millions to Western Australia when we know how they are cutting down every possible assistance to Western Australians, when we know that every penny is begrudged, when everything is dragged to the East, when we are compelled, those of us who are farmers in this State, to send our wheat will-nilly to States that had an unfortunate season but saved enough to send abroad at high prices and we are able to supply the deficiency by cheap wheat from the farmers of Western Australia! This is only one example. The metal exchange is another example. There are scores of them, but I do not want to weary the House by mentioning them. Where has this been mentioned in one single case at our Premiers' conferences? Where has there been any public agitation? I am not saying one word against Federation. I long for the time when the whole world shall be federated, and the geographical boundaries that make people hate each other shall disappear. We claimed to be partners, we were federated as equals, we came into the compact understanding that we were to have an equal voice, but when we see the policy of the Government, which now is trying by every possible means to crush us out as an identity or as a portion of the Commonwealth having its own autonomy, then I rebel against Federation, the unity of the people on unjust lines. Recognising that the farthest north of this State of ours is as much a portion of Australia as Bourke-street,

Melbourne, recognising that it deserves, therefore, as much attention as the rest of Australia, recognising too what would be done by a true partnership, and that where the greatest need for help is, there shall help be bestowed, recognising these principles I am a federalist. But when I see that faith has been broken with us, that we are not federated, that we are no more than a dependency, that we are the ground to be despoiled, that we are no more than a feeder for the Commonwealth money grabbers, then at the risk of being disloyal and deported I rebel. I am rebellious against that state of affairs. I believe that you, Sir, with others, at one period of our history sang with a full heart "One people, one hope, one destiny."

Mr. O'Loghlen: And also sang "The Red Flag."

Hon. T. WALKER: Was that so? Those were times when the whole of the people were aflame with the ideals of a democracy of brothers, when we thought we were all going to have our equal share and our equal chance and our equal opportunity in life. But no! At the present time we are governed by money and nothing else. The great shipping rings, the great coal vends, the great companies—

Mr. O'Loghlen: Insurance.

Hon. T. WALKER: Insurance companies, and all the rest of them, have their skinny hands in the pockets of the Commonwealth, and Mr. Hughes, for the time being as Treasurer, welcomes the hoards coming around him. That is how we are governed. State it how we like, we are governed by money.

Mr. Underwood: Mr. Hughes is not the Treasurer.

Hon. T. WALKER: I am not saying that Mr. Hughes is actually the Treasurer, but he is the leader of the Government. I do not need the hon. member to put me right. He needs a lot of mending before he is nearly right. That is the cause of our misfortunes. This State is capable of supporting itself and also supporting many hundreds and thousands, if not millions, of people. Think of all we produce that the nation requires. Is it clothing? Where does the bulk of the production go? Not to clothe our own citizens, but to clothe people in foreign or distant lands, to feed people far away over the seas, in France and elsewhere. The millions of bushels of wheat that we export would provide food for a vast population, much larger than we possess. It is not that we are poor. Why is it that some of the people in our sphere of life are lacking? There are people who have difficulty in obtaining bread. There are people, not many I am proud to say, who are wanting meat and cannot get it, and yet meat can be sent to London and sold at a ridiculously low price from Australian States. It is possible to get meat in London at 4½d. a pound.

Mr. Underwood: Where?

Hon. P. Collier: It was sold to the English Government.

Hon. T. WALKER: Yes. That was the price to us. It is what we got for it. Where can the poor get it for that here?

Mr. Underwood interjected.

Hon. T. WALKER: I will ask you, Sir, to keep the garrulous member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) in order. He was allowed full liberty last night, and I trust he will have the manhood and courtesy, if he knows the meaning of those terms, to keep quiet.

Mr. Underwood: I suppose I am lacking in both?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. P. Collier: If you do not understand then you ought to be made to understand them.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. T. WALKER: It is not that we are poor. Our overflowing wealth is enough to build up a glorious State, if we were not under the loadstone power of money all the world over. Our wealth is drawn to the East, drawn to the heart of the Empire, to London itself, and we take what is left. What is remaining? To struggle on and try and do more? We cannot achieve much under these difficulties. It is the system which exists to-day which is cursing Australia and Western Australia in particular. Money draws our real wealth from us, and we are left to make the best use we can of the leavings. That is our position in this State. We cannot, therefore, keep pace, and go ahead as fast as we would, because we are bound by what the East will let us do, and what Downing-street will let us do, what the money-lenders in England will let us do. It is government of money, and not our money but foreign money, that is crippling us, humiliating us, putting us into the bondage of national slavery. There, in short, is the explanation of our deficit. We cannot stop it, cannot alter it. To think that by sacking a few school teachers or dismissing a geologist or even stopping the Observatory gun from firing we are going to remedy this state of affairs, is absurdity itself. Neither whilst that state of affairs exists can we start those glorious secondary industries which we all approve of and desire. Where can we start secondary industries with any possibility of success whilst the money which runs those industries is located in Melbourne? We had secondary industries years ago, and they were more or less flourishing, but the moment we got into this partnership the secondary industries migrated to the East. We could not protect ourselves against the migration, because part of our partnership deed says that whatever one State manufactures every other State shall give it the same chance as it has in its own State. Consequently we cannot compete with the well-established and going concerns of the East; we cannot run in rivalry to them. Shipping is such a small cost between Melbourne and here that it is no handicap, and we can put up no other barriers against them. Consequently we are shorn of the facilities and the means and the chances of starting any secondary industries in this State. And what makes

it still worse is that this worship of money, this feeling of dependence, creates a lethargy in our politicians. They become callous and indifferent. Those of them who are wealthy begin to live within the sphere of luxuries that wealth creates, surrounding themselves with what softens the outlook into the world and puts them into their snug nests of self-satisfaction, and there they remain and do nothing for the outside world. No wonder that we have never seen a period so callous to those reforms that touch humanity at the core as we find to-day. I heard the member for Canning (Mr. Robinson) when he sat on the Treasury benches, glorifying what was to be done in prison reform. Committees were to be appointed, boards established, investigations made, colonies founded for the reform of the unfortunate among our fellow men and women. What has been done? Bills have been passed, Acts of Parliament put upon our statute-book. With what result? None whatever.

Mr. Robinson: It is not my fault.

Hon. T. WALKER: Of course not. It is nobody's fault. It is that smug indifference which comes with surroundings of comfort and cheer. Nothing has been done. Acts have been printed and bound in our statute-book which have no meaning or sense or purpose or execution whatsoever. It makes us callous, thick-chested, so that the heartbeats never reach the exterior. That is the position which this sogginess of wealth creates amongst those who govern. Nothing has been accomplished except a real farce. In respect of the treatment of prisoners by Ministers of the Crown it is worse than ever it has been in our history. There is less chance, less opportunity for reform, for restoration to citizenship, than ever previously in the world's history. We had a stir about the Asylum for the Insane. What has the Colonial Secretary done to really remedy things there? We have had talk of a board, a similar sort of thing to that established at the Fremantle gaol, which is a laughing stock to anybody who understands criminality or the reforms which deal with such subjects. It is a perfectly useless addition to our cumbersome machinery of make pretence, and nothing more. It is because money rules us; and whilst money rules us we have not time to look after those who have no money. In fact it is perfectly true that we have class government, class rule of the worst type, of that kind that looks upon one set of man as creatures born to work for others, born to toil in serfdom, as those become callous who live amongst aborigines and would scarcely hesitate to shoot them down if they did not obey and toil as directed. Just as there were those creatures in days gone by, so there are to-day, even though more refined, more polished, those who look upon the great bulk of mankind as having their place, which is to work contentedly for others that others may get rich however difficult it is for

the workers even to live. It is the order of society in which we are. I would hate to do anything that would stir up unnecessary hot blood, but surely I am in a place where it is expected that I shall not act the hypocrite, but that I shall speak the truth as far as I can see it, whatever consequences may come. I do say that we are actually in a class war which we cannot shut our eyes to. The member for Perth (Mr. Pilkington) the other night, cautioned the leader of the Opposition and said that this unrest, this almost revolutionary tendency, was worldwide, and that there never was a period when such a little spark was needed to set the whole social organisation into combustion. I am slightly altering the hon. member's language, but I think I am rightly interpreting him. We should be cautious, but we should not be cowardly. We should tell the truth as far as we know it and see it; and I declare that I do regret more than I can say that tendency which exists now to check, to curb the free utterances of one's inmost convictions. It has been the glory of the British people, it has been one of the things which has endeared me most to British rule, that we speak and argue, however diverse our thoughts, without being accused of scoundrelism or accosted by a policeman and rushed to gaol or, without a policeman, rushed out of the country. It is true that there are those in the world who do see the signs of the times, who do know how the fires in the volcanoes are smouldering and liable to break forth. They have become nervous, so nervous that they are afraid of the slightest utterance that is not in direct accordance with their policy or views. And they would curb these thoughts, when uttered not by way of argument, not by way of logic, not by way of reason, but by way of insult, misrepresentation and actual coercion. And not only that, but the would-be wise amongst them are anxious that these growing forces shall be divided, that they shall not be united lest they become too powerful. And therefore every kind of subterfuge is used to create dissensions in the ranks of the multitude. I am no worshipper at the shrines which my fellow men set up, but I respect the religious convictions of everyone, and even pity the superstitions of some; but that pity does not become contempt; nor would it lead me to lift my hand to do the slightest turn of injury to them. What do we behold now? We behold a revival of those fierce times, which you, Mr. Speaker, remember better than anyone here can remember, of Sir Henry Parkes, when he subjected New South Wales to all the horrors of bitter hatreds in religious malice by raising what was known for long as the Kiama ghost. It had its effect. It secured him temporary power. It appealed to the blind, vulgar prejudices of bigots. His successor, Sir George Reid, perceiving, the value of such a policy, took with him to every meeting, used on all political hustings, the well

known yellow pup; took the brute with him wherever he went until the "Bulletin" so ridiculed, satirised and pulverised such vile, mean appeals to the lower depths of human ignorance, that he dropped the myth. But now comes another kind, when the ranks of Labour are gathering such force and strength that it is absolutely necessary again to divide them. It was sought to do this during the course of the war. Division did take place, has taken place here in this our very State; and we behold to-night sitting in the laps of the money gods, men whose whole convictions are with the struggling bottom dog, with those who are working for the benefit and the betterment of the human race. But we have it worse now. The yellow dog, the Kiama ghost in another form, but precisely the same thing is introduced amongst us now, and we are set to work to clutch at each other's throats in the name of religion.

Mr. Pickering: That is so.

Hon. T. WALKER: Is this likely to succeed? We can leave the next world to look after itself. This is our world, this is our land, this our country, and our duty is here and now; and he who knows what his duty is will never be driven from it with his eyes blinded through the mists and dust of superstitious bigotry. We must remain brothers first of all. There is no room for these old world quarrels here. We are not of these sections; we are one. I would say to those, who are seeking to set each man at his brother's throat, what came to King Lear after he had served his time of pleasure, with wealth and affluence and power, being bereaved of it all, when he said—

Poor naked wretches, wheresoe'er you are,  
That bide the pelting of this pitiless storm,  
How shall your houseless heads and unfed  
sides,

Your loop'd and window'd raggedness, defend you

From seasons such as these? O, I have ta'en

Too little care of this! Take physic, pomp;

Expose thyself to feel what wretches feel,  
That thou mayst shake the superflux to them

And show the heavens more just.

There is in that very passage the whole key to our present situation. We may disguise it as we will. The leader of the Opposition was perfectly right. There is war, not gore, but a war of ideals existing in our midst. The leader of the Country party, followed up by Mr. Pilkington, would try to make this a heterodox and a dangerous utterance. The member for Perth and the leader of the Country party say, "Why, the employer and the worker are one. They have one purpose; they are not in antagonism; their object is practically the same." It is a beautiful but a very old argument, as old as civilisation itself. Why, Sir, I can imagine in the old days of the Greek democracies the orators saying, "You slaves have the same interests that we masters

have. You do well and I do well and, when I do well, you do well. It is all one. Be good slaves and, I being a good master, we will live in peace together." Was not that the argument thundered from all the pulpits of the southern States of America when Abraham Lincoln had cast the fetters from four million slaves? Did not we hear them say, "You slaves are better off as you are. What will you do without masters to feed you? Keep contented on the cotton plantations and your little lives will pass in dreams of nigger melodies." They believed it. Simon Legree believed it. "It was the best thing for the leaders to be leaders and the slaves to be slaves. The slaves on the plantations had an identity of interests with the masters, the owners of the plantations." Was not it also true, and have not we read of those days of serfdom in England itself when a man could be branded, cut in the ear and in other ways mutilated, if he rambled from his little plot of land where he was the serf of his over-lord? Was not it believed that that was the ideal of a democratic institution? The serfs were cared for. They belonged to one master and he fed and clothed them. They fought for him and he fought for them. Their interests were identical. It was one and the same thing. Thank goodness the days of old Greece with its slavery are past! The days of the slaves of old Rome have passed away. Thank goodness the slavery and serfdom of Europe and America have passed away and better days prevail! The slavery on the plantations in the day of Simon Legree has passed away, but there remains the wage slavery of the world and that, too, must pass away. Our friend the leader of the Country party suggested co-operation, profit sharing. Yes, he is right; but not profit sharing in the paltry little way he conceives it, but profit sharing of all belonging to the nation. The wealth created by all belongs to all. Its distribution is a matter of justice, a matter of apportionment according to means and circumstances. That can be done and will be done. I am here, grown old in watching my fellow men, not long to be of any further service, if I ever have been of service to them. But as I speak to-night, I speak from my sincerest convictions, the time is coming when we shall not attempt to govern people, to rule people, but we shall try to serve people from the highest to the lowest; when the service to the many ensures the service of the many to us, when our care for the welfare of all shall be our claim to the care and consideration of all our fellow mortals. That is where we are going, and that is where we have outgrown the system based upon rule, the rule of the few over the many, based upon the power of wealth over the poor and penniless, the poor naked wretches with their windowed raggedness painted so eloquently by Shakespeare. The day is coming when that state of things must pass as the old serfdom, the rule of the lords as monarchs, has gone and passed. As we have had our Cromwell that marked the day

when the tyranny even of kingcraft was no longer possible among a free people, as the day came when a William gave us our right of independent justice in all our courts and established equity as it was then known amongst men, as we see their interests ascending higher and higher, so we know, as surely as the past can teach us anything, that a change is coming, and that that change means no longer the dominion of money, but the sovereignty of mind and of heart and the genuine brotherhood of a united nation, working through all for the good of all and for the selfish enrichment of none.

Mr. ANGELO (Gascayne) [8.26]: I regret that through ill-health I was not present at the opening of Parliament. Through my absence, I missed the speech on the Address-in-reply delivered by my good friend the member for Kimberley (Mr. Duraack). I have, however, taken an opportunity to peruse the "Hansard" report, and I am of opinion that a very valuable contribution to the debate was made by my colleague. Other members who did not hear it should peruse the speech, because it expressed the opinions of a business man who is personally acquainted with the subject with which he was dealing. I intend to add a few remarks to what has already been said by him and to the remarks of the member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) in connection with the development of the North-West. When the first session of this Parliament assembled, I was asked by the then Premier to move the adoption of the Address-in-reply, and I was told that I had been selected for that task because it was the intention of the Government to give particular interest to the North, and that the development of the North would receive the serious consideration of Cabinet. They did something. They created a North-West Department and appointed a Minister. But how did they assist that Minister to carry out his work? They put him into an office to reach which it was necessary to pass the registrar of brands. They put him into an inside office and did not give him so much as a typewriter.

Hon. P. Collier: Shame!

Mr. ANGELO: It was impossible for the gentleman selected to do what I am convinced is a most important task. The next session came along and we found in the Governor's Speech a further mention of what the Government intended to do.

Hon. P. Collier: All bird-lime.

Mr. ANGELO: The third session arrived and again we had the same kind of sentiments expressed. Now we have a fourth session and fortunately, in this Speech, the reference is two or three times longer than the paragraphs in the previous Speech. That augurs well; we might get something from the present Government. The paragraph winds up thus—

The Government feels that the adoption and prosecution of a comprehensive

and continuous policy for the North is justified and necessary, and steps are being taken in that direction.

As one of the representatives of the North I would like to know who is going to frame the policy for the development of the North? Is it to be the Premier, who has never yet visited the North, who has never been further north than Geraldton? Is it to be the members of his Cabinet, all of whom are ignorant of the capabilities of the North? Is it to be the Minister for the North-West, who has had only one trip through a portion of the North-West? Or is it to be the Minister for Mines, who, when the leader of the primary producing party was advocating the development of the North, interjected to this effect, "We cannot do it for the next half century"?

Hon. P. Collier: Who said that?

Mr. ANGELO: The Minister for Mines. He interjected that when the leader of the primary producing party was suggesting the development of the North-West.

Hon. P. Collier: Not much optimism about that.

Mr. ANGELO: This is the same gentleman who a few years ago, when it was suggested to him that he should visit the North, said, "No. What is the use of going up there to be entertained by Japs?" The North-West has not forgotten that utterance. Unless something is done in the very near future to populate and develop the North, the Minister may yet live to be entertained by Japs. The question is a national one. Members may think that we North-West representatives are suggesting the development and the populating of our part of the State for parochial reasons. But we on the spot, we who are close to the menace that exists in the North, are trying to do all in our power to point out the danger that exists to Australia in the most vulnerable part of the Commonwealth. I should like to suggest to the Government how a North-West policy may be evolved. In the Upper House there are three North-West members. Each of them is a good business man. There is Sir Edward Wittenoom, who is considered to be such a thoroughly good business man that he is chairman of directors of the Western Australian Bank, as well as holding directorships in many companies.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Most of the business men who have been in Parliament proved howling failures.

Mr. ANGELO: That may be the experience of the hon. member. However, Sir Edward Wittenoom knows the North-West thoroughly. Then there is Mr. Holmes, who also is a director of many companies and knows the North thoroughly. Thirdly we have Mr. Miles, who has built up and owns a very flourishing business in the North. In the Lower House there are three North-West members who are all directors of public companies and each of whom has lived fully a quarter of a century in the

North. Further, we have the member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) who knows more about mining and other industries in the North-West than probably any other member of the Assembly. Here is a directorate, a special committee. There is no need to appoint a committee for the development of the North. It already exists. There is a committee of seven men already in Parliament, who could, without a single penny extra cost, be called together by the present Minister for the North-West to frame, under his chairmanship, a policy for the development of the North. I think I can safely say, and I think Parliament should know it now, that the public opinion of the North is asking whether the Premier and the Cabinet generally hold the same opinion regarding the development of the North as the Minister for Mines has expressed.

The Premier: You know very well what the opinion of the Government is.

Mr. ANGELO: If they do, the sooner they tell the North so, the better, and then we of the North can take steps to get that country developed by some other means than by the assistance and under the direction of the Government of Western Australia.

The Premier: Why do you make that statement when you know it is not correct?

Mr. ANGELO: The Minister for Mines said it. It is in "Hansard."

Hon. P. Collier: You had better read it.

Mr. ANGELO: I am not allowed to read "Hansard" of the current session.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member propose to read from "Hansard" of this session?

Mr. ANGELO: I will rely on my memory and quote exactly the words of the Minister for Mines, which I copied from "Hansard":—"We cannot do it for the next half century."

The Premier: The Minister for Mines was only interjecting.

Mr. ANGELO: I am glad that the Premier is in his seat, and I wish to stress a suggestion to him. It is that he should ask the Minister for the North-West to call together a committee of the North-West members. We could sit day after day, if necessary, until a policy for the North has been framed. Then let the Minister for the North-West go to the Premier and say, "This is the policy that the North-West members have agreed upon." I am very pleased indeed that Mr. Colebatch has been appointed Minister for the North-West, because the hon. gentleman has the experience of Cabinet rank and has controlled several departments. What we want is a live North-West department. We want to have it so built up that everything connected with the North-West should go to that department for consideration and administration. It is ridiculous to have an engineer for the North-West attached to the Public Works Department whilst we have a Minister for the North-West and a North-West department. Everything con-



nected with the North-West should be as far as possible centred in the North-West Department.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: To achieve that, you would have to duplicate every department in the State.

Mr. ANGELO: Practically the Minister for the North-West would soon become the administrator of the North-West. Of course it would be no use having a directorate such as I suggest, unless some money was made available for expenditure in the way of development. We are told that the Premier has been offered a loan of two millions sterling. I feel certain that if the London financiers were informed that a special loan was required for the development of the North-West, and if it was pointed out to them that this was a national task, the money would be made available at a cheaper rate than for the general expenditure of the State. It has been suggested to me by men who have had experience in borrowing on the London market that the putting forward of that phase of the matter would assist us. I have had experience of business in the North-West, and also experience of banking in the North-West; and I can safely say that there is hardly a business in the North-West that does not return from 15 to 25 per cent., which seems to be a good augury that any money spent there by the Government should not only return interest and sinking fund, but also bring some revenue to the State. I am not going to weary the House by suggesting methods of development. These should come from the committee I have proposed. But one thing to which I must draw attention, like the member for Pilbara, is the absolute necessity of an adequate State shipping service to the North-West. It has been stated that such a service will never pay. People point to the experience hitherto and say, "You can never get a boat to pay if it is run by the Government." But the service to the North-West has never yet had a fair test. We have never given the officers and crew a decent ship to work. On several occasions I have known the "Bambra" leave Fremantle a day or two ahead of the "Minderoo," and when the "Bambra" has arrived at Carnarvon the officers and crew have urged the local people to give them quick despatch in order that the "Bambra" might keep ahead of the "Minderoo." But the "Minderoo," being a better and faster boat, has passed the "Bambra" and got in ahead of her at one of the tidal ports, which means that the slower boat has had to anchor in the roadstead for 12 hours; or possibly the "Bambra," through drawing more water than the "Minderoo" had to anchor outside Port Hedland, and has been humiliated by seeing the other boat, which arrived some hours after her, get in before her. That is enough to make any crew dissatisfied. Unless we give our seamen of the State Steamship Service as good a boat as the next crew have, we cannot expect them to give us the same results. I know the offi-

cers and I know a good many of the crew of the State steamers trading to the North-West, and I know that they have used their utmost endeavours to give us a good service; but they have been handicapped and discouraged all the time by having to work boats unsuitable for the coast. It is a most exacting coast; and it is no use sending boats there that are not built to meet those exacting conditions. A certain draught is required, and a certain speed is necessary to get from one port to the other between tides. Without those conditions we cannot have a decent service. I am glad that the member for Canning (Mr. Robinson) has reminded me about Mr. Bennett's appointment. I have that appointment on my list; and I intended to do the same as the member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) has done, and put in a strong protest against that appointment. I went to Fremantle a day or two after the appointment had been made, and I found that the appointment was the laughing stock of nearly every person in Fremantle, especially of people connected with shipping. I consider that it is a disgraceful and ridiculous appointment, and that it should be cancelled immediately. Mr. Bennett should be recalled, and a competent man should be sent home to supervise the building of those boats.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The best man we had has gone to the Commonwealth.

Mr. ANGELO: I agree with the member for Pilbara that a captain of one of the boats trading on the coast would be the best man. He cannot of course dictate to the naval architects what sort of boat should be built, but he could inform them of the requirements, and let them know what sort of vessel is required, and what draft and what speed are wanted to enable her to get from port to port between tides. Who would be better for that purpose than a captain with considerable experience of that coast?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Captain Rogers, for instance.

Mr. ANGELO: Captain Rogers would be a most suitable man. Another most suitable man would be Captain Richardson, late of the "Paroo;" he possibly might be available. Captain Richardson knows the coast and knows the ports. In addition, he knows how to give his passengers comfort; and let me say there is a great deal in the superintending of the comforts that should be provided in a ship trading on the North-West coast. Take the "Minderoo." The building of that boat was superintended by the captain of the ship, Capt. Mills, and in consequence she is the most comfortable and suitable vessel we have ever had on the North-West coast. Every advantage is taken of increased accommodation when necessary. For instance, the smoke-room, which is most comfortable, can be converted into a dormitory when there is an extra complement of passengers. So, too, in respect of the saloon. Another boat, the "Gorgon," which was not built under the supervision of a man with a knowledge of the coast, has none of those

advantages, and in consequence she is not half so comfortable as is the "Minderoo." Knowing how necessary it is to have a man at Home superintending the building of these ships, I would ask the Government to recall Mr. Bennett and send along a more suitable man. Yet, I doubt whether it is so necessary to have a man at Home, because we have running on the coast the most suitable ship we have had up there. For 30 or 40 years we have had all sorts of boats from the palatial "Koombana" to the little "Rob Roy." Not one of them has been anything like the success which the "Minderoo" is acknowledged to be. If we had two or three "Minderoos," nothing more would be required. In every way that boat has been a success, for comfort, for despatch, and for passenger accommodation. There is only one thing that would improve her, and that is a fore-castle head, which would have to be provided to give the extra accommodation that a white crew would require. With a fore-castle head she would be able to carry 400 or 500 additional sheep each trip. But what I want to touch upon principally is this: adjacent to the north-west coast, within two or three days' sail of our own shores, we have two of the most promising markets that Australia can ever look to—I refer to Java and Singapore. When I was up there seven or eight years ago, nearly all the Australian trade of those countries came from Sydney and Brisbane. The Government of New South Wales and of Queensland had commercial agents in both Java and Singapore. It takes nearly a fortnight to travel from Sydney to Java and, I think, ten days from Brisbane to Java. There we have two great markets within two or three days of our own coast. I ask the Government to give this matter serious consideration. When they are going in for a policy of State steamships let not their activities be confined to trading on our own coast, but let them go as far as Java and Singapore. It would be a great benefit to the North. We would be able to send meat to those markets. To-day inquiry has been made for freight for sheep to Singapore, but has been declined. These Singapore boats have already created a monopoly by giving the whole of their Singapore space to one man. That is what the State steamers would prevent. Not only would the running of State steamers to Java and Singapore benefit the North by the shipment of cattle and of sheep, but it would benefit the whole of the State. We would then be able to send our flour and wool to Java and Singapore. There is up there a big market for our fruit and many other commodities. I met the other day a Dutch merchant from Java who told me that Java could take 10,000 tons of tinned vegetables in a year. Surely this State, being only two or three days' sail from Java, should be able to supply that country, not with tinned stuff but with fresh vegetables. Some members may not realise what Java is. There we have

within 2½ days' sail of Western Australia a country containing 42 millions of people; and, a day and a half further on, we have the Straits Settlements with five or six millions more. We could not wish for anything better. No other country in the world is better situated for adjacent markets on a scale such as we have up there. When the Government are considering the question of an improved State steamship service for the North-West, I beg and pray of them not to forget the possibilities of those markets. If we had three ships built we could have a regular fortnightly service with Java and Singapore. A regular service is absolutely necessary. At the present time we may have two or three boats leaving for the North-West on the same day, after which will follow a blank of perhaps five or six weeks. How can any country be developed on those lines? If three ships were provided we could run a regular fortnightly service fitting in with the fortnightly tides of the North-West. Any regular service must be either fortnightly or monthly: we cannot have a tri-weekly service. A regular service would make a big difference in the meat supplies of the metropolitan area. Again, steamers trading on our north-west coast have to carry sufficient coal to take them to Wyndham or Derby and bring them back again. Thus nearly one half the space of these ships is taken up with coal supplies; whereas if they went on to Java and Singapore they could there load the coal necessary to bring them back again.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Or the oil.

Mr. ANGELO: Yes, oil would be even better; but in either case the ability to obtain fuel at the other end would mean greatly increased space for cargo. Another phase of this question is this: we are going to lose the Singapore boats before long. The Navigation Act, although passed many years ago, was proclaimed only recently. Why was it proclaimed? I feel confident that it was proclaimed as a sop to the seamen on strike, to induce them to resume work. Is it to be thought that those seamen are going to let in the thin end of the wedge and grant exemption for the north-west coast? I feel confident that we shall lose those Singapore boats before long. Therefore it is necessary that the Government should immediately take steps to see that the loss of those boats is made good by our own fleet. If the Government prefer to give up the service altogether and will agree to invite private companies to take it up, well and good; but it is essential that we should have a proper service. Although others may be of opinion that a private service would be better, I think that having our own service will assure us reasonable freights. In other parts of the world freights have increased by 100 and even 200 per cent., yet because we had the "Bambra" acting as policeman on the north-west coast, the freights on that coast rose only 15 per cent. Through the proclamation of the Navigation Act we on the north-west coast will suffer more than any other part of Australia. If the Navigation Act has been framed for

the good of the whole of Australia it is up to the rest of Australia to assist that portion which is about to be penalised. Take the sugar industry: we in Western Australia have had to pay heavy prices for sugar in order to bolster up the industry in Queensland. In return the Commonwealth should say "Well, if the Navigation Act is for the good of Australia as a whole, and if you on the north-west are to be the only sufferers, we will make it up to you in the form of a big subsidy." It is the duty of the State Government to press that phase of the question home to the Federal Government and try to get as much assistance as they can to carry on the north-west coast trade with State steamers.

Mr. Robinson: Will trade with Java be possible when the Navigation Act is enforced?

Mr. ANGELO: Yes, if white crews are carried. The Singapore boats will be prevented from trading because they carry coloured crews. The trouble is that if the Navigation Act is enforced, and if these Singapore boats remain on our coast, the Act will enable them to go from port to port and take our produce overseas, leaving our own State ships no back loading. Therefore, the Government should endeavour to secure an amendment of the Navigation Act, with a view to preventing this. We have in the Speech a reference to the Wyndham meat works as follows:—"Steps have been taken towards assuring a satisfactory steamer service to the North . . . and also to increase the utility of the Wyndham meat works." That is good news. It is a very necessary work, but I regret that there should be no mention of cold storage facilities to be provided at Fremantle. It may be said that at Fremantle a private company is about to establish its own meat works, and that it will have cold storage facilities; but I should like to see cold storage facilities attached to the port of Fremantle, on the wharf, where the north-west boat bringing frozen mutton can go to the berth alongside the cold storage facilities and transport her meat to the cold storage with the least possible handling. If we have to depend on private works at Fremantle the meat will have to be put into trucks and taken out to those private works.

Mr. Gardiner: Provision has been made for that by the member for Canning and myself.

Mr. ANGELO: I am glad to know that I have two influential supporters. I want the cold storage facilities at Fremantle so placed that when a ship from the north-west comes alongside the wharf all that will be necessary is an overhead traveller taking the meat into cold storage and subsequently bringing it back again to the other ship which is to carry it overseas. This will not affect meat only. We can send more fruit away every year. I hope that shortly we shall be sending butter as well. These cool storage works could be used for those purposes just as well as for meat, and we hope shortly to be sending down a good quantity of fish from Shark Bay. That also could be stored there. The

works should not cost very much. I have a rough estimate of the cost from a gentleman who has had experience of these works, and he thinks that £25,000 would cover all that would be required for a long time. Another point is that we are establishing meat works at Carnarvon. Shortly we may hear of similar works at Geraldton and Port Hedland, and unless there are provided cool storage facilities which should be controlled by the Government, we in Geraldton or at Carnarvon, or wherever we have works, will be in the hands of the Fremantle company. This would not be a State trading concern, because what I suggest is that the storage should be part and parcel of the Fremantle Harbour Trust machinery. If we are going to be dependant on the Fremantle works for our storage, they will have a big handle over us. Suppose we had 10,000 carcasses from Carnarvon and we had to depend on the Fremantle works. They might tell us that they had no room for our produce.

Hon. P. Collier: Traders do not act like that, do they?

Mr. ANGELO: I do not know. It is a most remarkable fact, however, that when we started our company at Carnarvon, the Fremantle people immediately commenced operations and, approached our Gascoyne settlers and pointed out the advantages of Fremantle as against Carnarvon, and actually stole two or three of our shareholders from us. The storage works I suggest will cost about £25,000. Not much machinery will be required, because the power would be supplied by the existing Government power house. I was much surprised to see in an interview with the Minister for the North-West on his return from the North-West, the following paragraph:—

It now seems to be generally conceded that chilled meat from Wyndham cannot successfully compete with fresh meat on the metropolitan markets and that, consequently, the entire produce of the meat works must be exported frozen or canned. I do not know where the Minister got his information. I have talked this matter over with Mr. Allen, a gentleman lately appointed by the Government to go to Wyndham to increase the storage there, and I have also discussed the matter with Mr. Bennett, formerly manager of the Shepparton works, who has leased our works at Carnarvon, and both these gentlemen assured me that chilled meat from Wyndham can be brought to Perth and consumed here. Mr. Allen told me that chilled meat from the Argentine is consumed in England and that it takes four or five weeks to get there. Any prejudice that exists against frozen meat should not apply to chilled meat. They are two different products altogether. Frozen meat is brought down to 15 degrees whereas chilled meat is only chilled to 30 or 40 degrees. Many a time I have gone to my butcher for a bit of beef and he has said, "You can have what is hanging in the shop, but I have some better which has been in cool storage a fortnight." That was chilled meat.

Chilled meat is very different from frozen meat. Freezing breaks the tissues of the meat and when it is thawed it is liable to "weep." That does not apply to chilled meat. If we can only get over the prejudice which exists and if we can have cool storage works erected at Fremantle, it will be a big thing that the Government will do towards bringing down the cost of living, that is, in the direction of meat. At the present time we have advices from home that all we can expect to get for frozen mutton delivered in England next year is 5d. The freight is 2d. and other expenses will run into ½d. That means that all we can look to obtain is 2½d. for our mutton f.o.b. at Carnarvon.

Mr. Munsie: You cannot get mutton in Perth under 10d. or 11d.

Mr. ANGELO: With the freezing chambers at Fremantle we could get our meat to Fremantle and the freight and other expenses would not be more than 1½d., and therefore the mutton should be handed over from the cool storage works to the retailer at 4d. per lb. That would enable him to sell it to the public at an average of, say, 6d. per lb., 5d. for fore-quarters and 7d. for hind-quarters. The same thing applies to beef. For the last shipment of frozen meat that the Government sent to England they got 4½d. f.o.b. Wyndham. Instead of sending that to England, if they brought it down here, it probably would have cost 6d. by the time it reached the cool storage at Fremantle and it would have been sold to the public at an average of about 8d. So that we would have mutton at 6d. and beef at 8d. a lb. That is what the public should be paying for meat at the present time, but as we know, until just the last week or so, when the price of both beef and mutton has fallen, we were paying an average of 10d. for mutton and 1s. 1d. for beef. That is the average price and if we could bring the price of meat down as I suggest by establishing cool storage at Fremantle, it would mean that the public of the metropolitan area would be able to get three meat meals a day instead of two. I have been along to a butcher's shop and bought a side of mutton for 5½d. per lb. Three days later I was asked 8d. for a similar article. It is the fluctuating prices that cause almost as much trouble as the high prices. The housewife may get a leg of mutton for 4s. to-day and next week she may have to pay 6s. If cool storage works were established at Fremantle they would assist in stabilising the price. We have several good meat people in the State at the present time—Mr. Urquhart, Mr. Allen, Mr. Bennett and Mr. McGhie. I would suggest that the Government call a conference of these gentlemen with the Minister for Agriculture or the Premier himself, if possible, and that conference could go thoroughly into the question and see whether something could not be done in the way of bringing down the price of meat. I do not want to be black-

guarded by my constituents, but what I suggest is that they will not get ½d. less for their produce, and the Kimberley people would not get ½d. less for the meat they sell. It only means that, instead of sending the meat away to be consumed elsewhere, we will be consuming a good portion of it in our own State, where it is so much required. The question of tropical agriculture has been mentioned, and the member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) referred to the work of Mr. Despeissis. He said that Mr. Despeissis was retrenched because he settled down in his office in Perth. I remember the time when Mr. Despeissis was retrenched. The then Government sent this officer around the tropical parts of the world to ascertain the best methods of carrying on tropical agriculture, and I suppose his trip and experience and the knowledge he secured must have cost the State a couple of thousand pounds. Mr. Despeissis wrote a good report, and he was anxious to be allowed to go to the North and start experimental farms. He was at Carnarvon inspecting land when he was actually retrenched. He urged the Government to establish an experimental farm there. It was not his fault that he was not allowed to go on with that experimental farm, and I consider that the State lost a valuable officer when his services were dispensed with.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: How long was he in his office in Perth?

Mr. ANGELO: At the time he was retrenched he was at Carnarvon.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: He was in Perth at the time.

Mr. ANGELO: He was visiting Carnarvon when he received the news of his retrenchment.

Hon. P. Collier: Anyhow, is it not rather an unprofitable discussion after the lapse of eight years?

Mr. ANGELO: The question of tropical agriculture must be seriously considered and I urge the Government, if they cannot get someone else, to avail themselves of Mr. Despeissis's service in an advisory capacity.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You will never learn anything about the North-West from the deck of a steamer.

Mr. ANGELO: I know that Mr. Despeissis went to Carnarvon and spent weeks there inspecting the land, and securing information which he embodied in a report to the Government.

The Premier: He is the best man in Australia to-day.

Mr. ANGELO: If the Government cannot secure his services continuously, they should employ him in an advisory capacity. I hope that when the Government are sending out more prospectors they will not forget the North-West, which is just as likely to produce gold mines as any other part of the State. If some prospecting were done in the North, it might prove very beneficial to the State. We do not know what wealth is hidden in the North. I would like to relate one incident which occurred during the last week.

A pastoralist from the North came down to Perth. From the firm who had purchased his wool, he received a parcel containing some half a dozen bits of quartz together with a letter stating that these bits of quartz had been found embedded in the fleeces of his wool. He was advised to have them inspected. I have seen the specimens and every one of them shows gold plainly.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Our troubles are all over now.

Mr. Munsie: But you have to find out where those sheep slept.

Mr. ANGELO: I do not know whether to give credence to the story or not, but let me tell members that my friend thinks there is something in it. Unlike Jason of old, my friend does not intend to chase any more golden fleeces, but when he returns to Carnarvon he intends to embark on his argosy, which I think in this instance is a six-cylinder Buick, and endeavour to find the locality on which these sheep which carried the golden fleeces reclined, while carrying out their "grow-slow" policy. That is only one instance which goes to show that it might pay to prospect the country. It is said that wool gathering is not always a lucrative employment.

Mr. Munsie: You would not think much of it if the prospectors went looking for gold in your fleeces.

Mr. ANGELO: This might prove a source of untold wealth and might add to the production of the State and assist to liquidate its deficit. I trust the Government will do something to encourage prospecting.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN (Forrest) [9.17]: The hon. member who has just sat down has been speaking about wool gathering. During the progress of the debate on the Address-in-reply, there have been some good solid attempts made at vote gathering. For my part, I feel inclined to move a vote of thanks. We realise that the elections are approaching. It is a time honoured custom in this House to deal with matters affecting one's constituency. If we were here to discuss only the contents of the Governor's Speech, we would not be occupied for many minutes, because the Governor's Speech delivered on the occasion of the opening of this Parliament is the most colourless document presented to the House since I have been a member.

The Premier: You said that on the last occasion.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Oh, no! On the last occasion there was something in the Governor's Speech, although the present Premier did not have the very important part in framing it that he has had on this occasion. However, it is immaterial what sort of a document the Governor's Speech is because any imperfections in it would be excused by that powerful organ which gives such magnificent support to the present Government at all times, no matter whether they are

right or wrong. The Government in a few months will be obliged to go to the country. Some of us may not be returned, but it is a fair proposition to ask what claim for support do the Government present to the electors? We have read and heard on many occasions of the gospel of production. We have been told that the amalgamation of parties and the picking out of the brainiest men on the Government side of the House would enable them to frame a policy which would inspire confidence and tend to lift this State out of its financial difficulties. If we look at the position to-day, what has been the result? There is a growing deficit, a deficit growing ever bigger, and no proposals to reduce it have been put forward in the Governor's Speech. So far as I can ascertain, the only claim which the present Government will have to put before the country is their activity in regard to soldier settlement.

The Premier. Oh, no!

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The Premier is a bit of a fanatic on land settlement, and I must say that I admire him for it. I admire him for his optimism in regard to land settlement, but we ought to realise our limitations in that direction. We ought to ask ourselves whether the policy which has already been carried out in regard to land settlement is going to bring that measure of success which is anticipated. Last session it was pointed out what a paradoxical position this State occupied in regard to its policy of settlement. Prior to that we were advertising in the "British Australasian" that we had millions of acres of Crown lands awaiting settlement. We were telling intending emigrants in the Old land that they had nothing to do when they arrived here but merely to take up land. Yet, if any hon. member walks into the office of the repurchase board and interviews Mr. McLarty, he will learn from that gentleman that he has not a solitary farm to offer to the many soldiers who are clamouring for farms to-day.

The Premier: That is not so.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: That is what Mr. McLarty told me.

The Premier: It is not right.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Then it is a remarkable thing that Mr. McLarty has informed me that the board are prepared to buy an estate in any locality. Many estates have been repurchased by this Board.

The Premier: Of course they have.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: And it does seem rather anomalous to be purchasing estates and, at the same time, to be advertising in England that we have the whole countryside to let. In the South-West portion of the State, three or four estates were purchased, and there was a big outcry against the purchase because local residents believed that the vendors had asked too much for them. Indignation meetings were held and the Premier gave a definite pledge to the people that he would inspect the locality personally. Yet he has never been down there, notwith-

standing a definite pledge to make a personal inspection.

The Premier: I can still keep that promise.

Hon. P. Collier: That is the funeral of the member for Sussex.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I would not like the member for Sussex to suffer for all the promise-breaking proclivities of the Premier.

The Premier: You have kept us busy here in Perth with strikes and other troubles.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: And we shall keep the Premier here longer. In the South-West the soldiers have not rushed the blocks; and those blocks which have been allocated have been taken up by soldiers in Perth who had the land hunger very pronounced in them. They were prepared to go blindly into any proposition without knowing anything of the burdens which they were taking upon upon their shoulders. It is not always the wisest policy to go in for buying up improved farms and thus moving experienced men off the land just to enable inexperienced men to embark on agriculture.

The Premier. In my opinion they were cheap estates.

Mr. Gardiner: Cheap land is the dearest land I know of.

The Premier: And the land was good, too.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: There were other estates which the board purchased. Take for instance the Butcher estate at Bruce Rock. The Premier knows that that estate with a crop growing on it was offered to the board at a certain figure. The board were reluctant to take it at the time because they had not the facilities for harvesting the crop. After the harvest they acquired the property at a small reduction in the price previously quoted but not until the vendor had secured £7,000 for the crop. The vendor had put 2,600 bags of wheat into the pool and had taken off 900 tons of hay. The procrastination of the board in acquiring that property means that this money has gone into the pockets of the vendor and remains an additional handicap to the soldiers who take up that land.

Hon. P. Collier: That is a specific instance.

The Premier: Every figure is wrong.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Then I shall call for the production of the papers.

The Premier: I will give you the papers.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The Premier says that every figure is wrong. I hope I shall not subscribe to the policy of the powerful journal here that everything the Premier does is right. The Premier is in the luckiest position possible in having that paper thundering morning after morning in his favour, magnifying his virtues and hiding his faults. The leader writer of the "West Australian" is a gentleman I have known for many years. I knew him in days when he was not such a power in the land as he is to-day. I admire him for the way in which he has progressed in life, but he has an obsession that the present Premier is the only man who can save Western Australia. In all his leading articles he infers that, after God had made

Mitchell, He broke the mould. To-day we have this peculiar position on the other side of the House that a group of men, elected on various tickets—many of them made their former chief walk the plank, though I give the present Premier credit for having been loyal to his old chief—hold their seats only because of their bitter denunciation of the Premier they now support. They described him as a danger to the country, but apparently he was not such a great danger. We had the spectacle of the present Premier occupying a solitary seat on the cross-benches, and moving a vote of no confidence against all the men who are the colleagues surrounding him to-day. Apart from the votes from this side of the House, he got one supporter to his motion of no-confidence, and through sheer political exigencies he has, thanks to the Press backing he has received, progressed to the position of Premier in a manner never before experienced in the history of this country. The present Premier might be able to go to the Farmers and Settlers' Conference and to the rural settlers and put up a case that he will stick to them and bring them through, but I would point out to him that there are other sections besides the farmers who are entitled to consideration. The leader of the Opposition has pointed out that there has been a callous neglect of other sections of the community. You, Mr. Speaker, have had sufficient experience in the industrial arena to be well aware of the cause of the industrial unrest prevailing to-day. Yet the Government make no effort to get at the root of the cause or to improve existing conditions, because the Governor's Speech does not suggest any attempt of the kind whatsoever. We have a proposition from this side of the House for an amendment to the Arbitration Court, an amendment to the Workers' Compensation Act, and an amendment to the legislation dealing with hut accommodation and the question of tribut- ing. Not a single industrial measure has emanated from the Government side, yet the Government hold up their hands in helplessness and say that industrial unrest is pronounced, that the gospel of discontent is being preached and that right through the country there is chaos. It is any wonder that this is so? Does the Premier think that there has been no change in the world or that men and women will be satisfied with what they had formerly? Is not it a fact that in the Old Country the same discontent prevails in many of the big industries because there has been a great change since the war? The Premier, however, refuses to keep pace with the times. I venture to say we are at least 20 years behind Queensland in the matter of industrial legislation. The member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) the other evening asked whether in the event of an amendment of the Arbitration Act being introduced, the Government would support it or what would they suggest. The leader of the Opposition

has suggested two points, one being that a layman would be better than a judge as President of the Arbitration Court, and the other that awards should be framed on a sliding scale so that the employer supplying commodities shall not be able to take money out of one pocket of the worker and put a little less into the other pocket. The position to-day is such that we must have an amendment of the Arbitration Act. I represent a constituency in which timber workers form a large proportion of the population. These workers, through their organisation went, I regret to say, to the State Arbitration Court. That court in its wisdom after having utilised all its machinery and listened to all the evidence presented, gave an award of £2 17s. per week to married men, some of them having seven and eight children, and the same court gave an award of £3 14s. a week to single girls in Perth. I have no objection to barmaids and barmen getting good wages, but if we are not going to take any notice of Knibb's figures and absorb the alarming evidence of rural decay, how the country is becoming depopulated owing to the fact that there are no attractions in the country, and if we are going to penalise the producers of the country by giving them low wages, imposing high freights, and depriving them of reasonable facilities and social enjoyment, we shall be responsible for bringing about a very bad state of affairs. We have the position to-day that people will not go to the country.

The Premier: They are going as fast as they can.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: They are not going.

Hon. P. Collier: They are coming back too.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The Premier knows that to-day there is work in the country for a fair number of men. There is no work to be secured in the city, but people have a tendency to stay in the city. Men who have come back from the war do not care to go far away from social enjoyments, to work on mills or out on distant farms, or the backblocks of the goldfields, as they did before. This is not applicable alone to Western Australia; it applies elsewhere also. I have a friend in the city, who for the last five or six years has been in the Philippine Islands. There, in order to mollify their employees and keep them contented, they have not only to provide them with ordinary creature comforts but have to erect free and perpetual picture shows for their amusement. I do not advocate such facilities for enjoyment here, but I say there is no desire on the part of this National Government, which cries "Produce" to the settler, to encourage the people who are far removed from the great centres of population to make their life lighter, and help in easing their burdens so that they may get more enjoyment out of life.

The Premier: You have no right to say that; it is not so.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I will give the Premier a striking example. Take the case of Nannup. Nannup is a district which for fertility, and for possessing the advantage of prolific soil, is practically second to none in the State. It is magnificent country but is sparsely populated. Before the war there were three trains a week serving Nannup. There were several thriving industries such as timber, fruit growing, cereal growing and intense culture, and the district was one of magnificent promise. Unfortunately, when transport facilities were curtailed during the war, the train service was knocked out, and the district which gave such promise and appeared to have a greater future than any other district in the State was given one train a week. It is 50 miles away from any medical facilities.

Mr. Pickering: Forty miles!

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Even 40 miles is a long way. The people there cannot possibly get a train so that they may take their stock to market. I witnessed the spectacle of a farmer driving pigs 28 miles to Balingup in order to truck them. How can the settlers, even in Nannup, which is not very far from Perth, get that measure of prosperity of which the Premier boasts the existence to-day?

Mr. Hardwick: Send them a picture show.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Send the hon. member down; then they would not need to send a picture show because they would have the comedy by itself. As the Premier has said, and others have repeated, we are a State depending almost entirely on primary production. We have wheat, gold, wool and timber. Per head of the population we produce more raw material in Australia than any country on God's earth. The time has long since arrived when the people of the Commonwealth, and of Western Australia in particular, should apply themselves to working up this raw material. There was a time when I thought that Eastern competition would prevent us in perpetuity from establishing secondary industries. To-day, however, the wages almost approximate between the East and the West. Seeing that wages are about the same in all the States, all that we require is a strong healthy local patriotism, a patriotism which, backed by Government support, will prompt the people of this State to buy Western Australian made goods. But we do not do that. We should copy the Americans. The Yankee will boost his town against the next town, his State against the next State, and his country against the world. We do not do sufficient of that. My indictment against the Minister for Industries is that he has not applied himself to his department in affording expeditious help when it was sought. I have attended deputations to the Minister for Industries,

once in connection with a new industry at Bridgetown, again in connection with one at Collie, and also in connection with a proposed industry to be started in the hills. I paid visits to the department week in and week out, but I never found the Minister in. This is the greatest joy-riding, jaunting Government that ever held office in Western Australia. For three months there was only the Minister for Works in his office. I am not going to shower eulogies on him, but I will admit that he stuck to his department. The Colonial Secretary was fairly attentive. The Premier, however, the Minister for Mines and Railways, the Minister for Education, and the whole group of the others, were away in different parts of Australia. As soon as one Minister returned another found it necessary to go for a trip.

Mr. Teesdale: You do not call the Premiers' Conference a trip?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Yes. I say it is the greatest political deception ever put over the Australian taxpayer, this same Premiers' conference. No provision is made in the Federal Constitution for the holding of such conferences.

Mr. Teesdale: We should get a poor deal if we were not represented at them.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: What sort of a deal do we get anyhow?

Mr. Teesdale: At least we show a good front.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Premiers' conferences are held year after year, and many pious resolutions are carried. Ministers assemble for three or four days and have a good time. They discuss a number of propositions.

The Premier: You have never been there.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: No, and I am never likely to be there.

The Premier: Then you should not talk like that.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Talk like that! I challenge the Premier to show any utility that has ever been derived from holding them. All the Premier could tell us, after talking for about two hours, was that, after nearly 10 years, steps are being taken to amalgamate certain departments. How many steps have to be taken before anything is done? A Minister will move that another Minister, say in Victoria, should draft a certain Bill for presentation at the next conference, and some other Minister will move that some other representative shall draft some other measure. At the next conference, however, the two Ministers who were to do this are not there, and there are two fresh ones in their place, and so the joke goes on.

The Minister for Works: What about the good time?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: They seem to be pretty keen on going there.

Mr. Teesdale: You talk about a good time. They pay for their own luncheons and dinners.

Hon. P. Collier. No, the State pays for them.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: We have here the unsophisticated man from the North. He has just arrived back from the big smoke, London. He tries to make out that Ministers get nothing for attending these conferences. Fancy the Minister for Railways going there and having some bread and cheese for lunch, and getting nothing! That is not the position. There is an allowance of at least two guineas a day for the lunches, and I do not object to that.

Mr. Gardiner: To be correct, it is three guineas.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: It is getting bigger, like the deficit.

Mr. Gardiner: I attended four conferences in one year, and said I would never go again.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I put it to the hon. member, who is a gentleman and a Christian, has any good ever been derived from his four trips?

Mr. Gardiner: Yes. At one conference they were trying to make us pay up to 5½ per cent. interest on loan, and we succeeded in getting it for 3½ per cent.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: That was the only fruitful result that I know of from any of these conferences. Was it necessary for the Minister for Railways to accompany the Premier on the second trip to Melbourne, which followed hot-foot on the first one? I do not think it was necessary. I do not know if the Premier took the Minister for Railways in order to watch him, and that he thought he might otherwise sow the seeds of dissension in Cabinet, and have a reconstruction by the time he came back. I do not think, however, he was afraid of that. I think both the Premier and the Minister for Railways heard that the Prince was coming and wanted to see him first. At all events they arrived simultaneously with His Royal Highness.

The Premier: It was a very pleasant and enjoyable trip.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The Premier does enjoy life; he enjoys everything.

Hon. P. Collier: Even the deficit.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I hope that when the people have an opportunity of pronouncing judgment they will say definitely whether they desire to lead them a gentleman who enjoys life and who says there is abounding prosperity in this State, or whether they would prefer some other hon. member who will see that we get our house in order by squaring the ledger.

The Premier: You want us to set up a soup kitchen.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I hope the Premier will not delude himself into thinking that everyone is prosperous in this country. This merry-go-round of increasing wages and cost of living that we are so absorbed in is nothing else but a mirage. It is no good to the employer, the worker, or the State. The workers on 12s. a day are worse off now than they were in 1912 with 7s. a day. The Premier says that everyone in the country is



prosperous. I ask him to come with me for a week-end, and I will show him some of the workers' homes. I will point out to him the surroundings and dwellings in which they live; the fare they have to provide for their children, and the furniture and equipment in their homes. I will then ask him if, out of his sympathetic heart, he can say that these people are prosperous.

The Premier: I said the country was prosperous.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: These people do not know how to make ends meet. If the people do not share in the prosperity of the country, what is the good of the country being prosperous?

The Premier: I will go with you.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Then I will fix it. If I can manage to keep the Premier awake I will show him something.

Mr. Gardiner: We cannot expect him to go to sleep while you make all this noise.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: He has not been awake for several hours, but is now taking a keen and intelligent interest in things. In the scheme of things the Premier has been fortunate, inasmuch as largely by his own efforts, aided by the wonderful support of the Press of the country, he has won a hostile group to his side so far as the settlers of this country are concerned. I know now that there are some members of that side of the House, the old Liberal group, men like the Minister for Works who have been in every Government that ever existed—for Governments would come and Governments would go but "Dad" would go on for ever—are marked out for extinction. Some of the farmers and settlers are after their scalps and they mean to get them. I want to remind the representatives of the farmers that, notwithstanding all their gibes and criticisms concerning the Labour party, it was the Labour party who went to the rescue of the struggling settlers, and that in spite of this the Labour party is receiving to-day only black ingratitude for all their bounty.

Mr. Gardiner: Many of us are grateful.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The hon. member, at all events, has always been prepared to give recognition to any party or Government that would give a fair crack of the whip to men who were down and out. Many of the farmers to-day, and their representatives in Parliament, are not prepared to extend even a kind word to the Labour Party. We even have a man who has been jumped into a political party, saying, "God help the country when men on that side of the House ever hold the reins of office again." When men are in public life, no matter to what party they belong, they like to know that if in their administrative career, or if, by their legislative enactments they have helped to frame, they have done good to some of the people, there are people whom they have tried to help who will appreciate and recognise their efforts. I hope if ever the farmers and settlers of this country become the dominant power in the State, and are strong and cour-

ageous enough, and have the numerical strength to form a Government—

Mr. Maley: It will happen all right.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: That they will leave behind them a lot of the narrowness and selfishness and callous conduct which have been prominent features lately in the farming community. They are a particularly selfish group.

Hon. P. Collier: They are young yet.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Yes, that is so. They have not profited much by experience. Time is a wonderful factor in the making of men and countries. I hope that time will come to the aid of that party and give them a broader vision. A good number of our members have been speaking about the growing deficit, but it is remarkable that no one seems to mention it to-day. Even the "West Australian" glossed it over. That paper went so far as to take the member for Irwin (Mr. Gardiner) to task for his mild criticism of the other evening. Before I entered this House—and that is a few years ago—I read in many of the leading journals of Australia praise of the pioneering efforts made by the member for Irwin in the matter of the establishment of a sinking fund. Western Australia can boast to-day that she has the best sinking fund of all the States of the Australian group.

The Premier: Sir John Forrest started the sinking fund.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I believe the member for Irwin is the originator of our sinking fund.

Mr. Gardiner: No, no. Sir Henry Lefroy's father initiated the sinking fund of this State.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: It is true that to-day the sinking fund represents a heavy burden, but it gives the State an increased solvency in the matter of her finances, and no doubt it is instrumental in helping the Government to negotiate loans on better terms than would be obtainable if the sinking fund did not exist. But I do say that it is nothing but arrant hypocrisy for some men to laughingly refer to the deficit—which has reached over four millions—in view of the fact that when they sat on this side of the House they thundered forth denunciations of the incompetent Labour men on the Treasury bench—"men without knowledge of politics, men without knowledge of big business, men who had come from the axe and the saw and the mining pick." They said to us, "You have a deficit; get out, and let us get in." They are business men; and the member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo) has been talking to-night about the utility of business men in Parliament. My experience has been that some of the business men who have entered this Chamber are the most colossal calamities that ever entered the portals of the Legislative Assembly. They are good men in themselves, and I am not going to disparage their business ability. Commercially they may have been pronounced successes. They may have all the personal qualities that one would desire. But when they enter Parliament and try to apply to political life the methods that are

successful in a business emporium, they fail miserably. They seem to have not a particle of conception of human needs. The man who to-day goes into a department to administer it must be a man of big human sympathy if he is going to be a success—a man alive to the struggles of the community. That is the reason why so many business men have failed in Parliament. At any rate so far as I have observed them, they have failed because they never had the germ of an idea of what was wanted in the solving of our great problems, of what was required to help the community along the road of success. No such thought, so far as I am aware, has ever emanated from them up to date. We have this deficit, and the Government plead poverty. They plead it every day in the week. I have been along to the Charities Department trying to get some grants.

The Premier: You are always there.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Not always; but the fact that I am there as frequently as I am is an indication that the prosperity about which the Premier boasts does not exist. I have been to the Charities Department to try and get another 7s. per week for a struggling mother, a widow, with four or five children. This widow has been getting 28s. per week for her four children. I asked for 35s. per week on her behalf, and the Minister generously agreed to pay the increased amount for one month. For one month he paid the 35s. per week, and then the sustenance of the widow was cut off.

The Premier: Was that done by this Government?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: By this Government. There is not a member of this House who is going to attack the present or any other Minister for anything they grant to feed hungry little children, and their struggling mother. Such expenditure will always receive the endorsement of both sides of the House. But I have been along to the Charities Department and have been told, "We cannot do it; the vote is being exceeded; we cannot give the assistance." I venture to say that such a reply is peculiarly unsuitable at a time of national festivity and Royal entertainment. I do not object to things being done in the right style, but I do object to the hypocrisy of refusing sustenance to a mother and her children who have lost their bread-winner, while money is being somewhat lavishly expended in Royal festivities. I object to such a refusal as I received while money is being spent to make a track around Mundaring weir, a track that is not going to assist a single settler or bring one additional bushel of wheat to the port, a track that might well have been left over for a while. To-day a vast sum of money is being expended in that direction. If we have money to spare, let us expend it in the direction of giving the greatest amount of human happiness possible, whether it be expended for the benefit of the farmers or of the artisans or of the people generally. With monotonous regularity the Governor's Speeches refer to the duplication of departments. It is deplorable that after all

the Premiers' conferences which have been held for over a decade, we should have proceeded no further in the matter of linking up departments and thereby saving costs and giving more expeditious service to the people. Look at some of our departments to-day. I wish the Premier would stay for a minute longer; however, it does not matter, because I can tell him later. I think a great deal more efficiency could be shown in the lay-out of our public departments. Take the Agricultural Bank and the soldier settlement scheme. Hon. members will bear me out when I say that if one desires to get to the public counter for the purpose of being enabled to see one of the administrative heads, it sometimes takes forty minutes to overcome the preliminaries. One has to bustle past the clerks at the counter, where probably a long queue of people is waiting. Then one has to explain who one is and what is one's business. Then one is piloted right through the department itself, where an army of clerks is engaged; and then, after climbing a flight of stairs, one has to wait at another counter for some person to find it convenient to come and attend to one's requirements. After about an hour's effort one succeeds in getting an interview. It is a most regrettable state of affairs. Any Minister who cares to go to that department can find out that that is the position.

Mr. Johnston: The main door of the department might be reopened.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I understand that it was ordered to be closed so as to prevent the staff from getting out without being noticed. I have been informed that that is the reason. If the clerks are not under control, I say Ministers are not fit for their jobs.

The Minister for Works: There is no Minister there.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: But there was a Minister there.

The Minister for Works: When?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: No so long ago. But whether a Minister is there or not, the Ministers we have to-day, with one or two honourable exceptions, are not giving their attention to the departments. The departments are running themselves.

The Minister for Works: No, no.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Yes, they are. I venture to say that not so long ago the Minister for Railways for a period of six weeks was not in his department long enough to sign the documents placed before him, let alone peruse them. Minister after Minister has been absent. The Premier went away to Melbourne. He returned, and the next week he had to go back to Melbourne again and take with him another Minister. When the Premier returned once more, the Attorney General had to go away. Then some other Minister had to go north for his health, and another Minister had to go south. North, south, east, and west, Ministers were jockeying, with the result that there is no economy and no expedition in the public service. There are some departments in which one can get to the fountain-head: the Works Depart-

ment, the Lands Titles Office, and the Lands Department are fairly passable. But there are other sections of the public service where, although the officers are doing their utmost, the system is fatal to expedition. Let me say also that when the Government go to the country they will not be able to show that they have achieved any tangible reform in the way of making Parliament an institution that will be more respected. This Parliament has not to-day the respect of the people. Why? Because one branch of it does not represent the people. Three or four months ago we went through the farcical proceeding known as an election for another place; when a few well-meaning old gentlemen submitted themselves to the "free and independent." A couple of them fell by the wayside, and a couple came home. They came home something like "poor old Jeff," on a stick. They came home by the support of the veriest fraction of the electors qualified to vote. The election demonstrated that democracy in this State is nothing but a hypocrisy and a sham.

Mr. Johnston: You won two seats which you have not held before.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: That was owing to the good sense of the fraction of the people who went to the poll. However, we lost one seat that we had held. But even if we had won all the seats that were vacant, that would not justify the existence of a Chamber out of touch with the men and women who are the producers of this State. I know there are several members on the other side of the House who are democratic enough to believe that the political system ought to be changed, and that if it is not changed it will be worse for all of us, because the encroachment of the Commonwealth can only take place owing to mistrust felt by the people for the State Legislature. There is no mention of Constitutional reform in the Governor's Speech. Last session's Bill was rejected by another place, and apparently reform is not going to be attempted again. It seems as though the Government were discouraged because they were defeated once. Ministers are submitting to the dictation of a Chamber that does not represent men and women, but bricks and mortar and sheep and donkeys.

Mr. Maley: The bulwark of the Constitution.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I know that that phrase was applied to another place by Sir Henry Lefroy on one occasion. Are the Government going to submit to dictation by the other Chamber, or will they take the manful course of going to the people and saying, "It is not only the Labour party who are prepared to give men and women the votes they have fought for; we are prepared to give the men and women of this State the full franchise?" What is the Government policy? Have Ministers a policy? There is no policy at all. "Hang on and carry on" seems to be their policy. We have no suggestion for reform. What answer is the member for East Perth going to give his electors when they question him as to why he has not moved in the right direction by getting the franchise for worthy

constituents in his electorate, men and women who have borne the heat and burden of the day?

Mr. Hardwick: They will reply as usual through the ballot box.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Yes, they will reply through the ballot box, and then the hon. member will wake up. He will find himself in a different position from that which he occupied after the last election. On that occasion, after an interesting fight in which every member of this House took a deep interest, the hon. member was returned by a narrow majority. He was then secretary of a Celtic institution, and a nice old lady waved her gamp in his face and said, "Mr. Hardwick, why don't you resign your club secretaryship and let a returned soldier have the billet?" The diplomatic reply of the East Perth genius was, "Madam, the time has gone by for asking questions." But the time for asking questions has come again. The hon. member's electors are going to ask him numerous questions at the first opportunity. A question which will be asked of this Government is when are they going to move so as to give the people just a taste of reform. We are slumbering along just as we were before the war. We have a Government in a hotch-potch, a sort of conglomeration that has no settled policy, no convictions, and no inspiring hope for the people.

Mr. Hardwick: The Government may resign to-morrow, after this speech.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: There is no occasion for the hon. member interjecting to resign; he will be in the cold shades soon enough. I was going to deal with the question of the Government policy regarding timber; but as the Minister who controls that policy did not deal with the subject, I prefer to let it go to the Estimates. I know there is a vast amount of money being spent in the matter of classification. Various inspectors and students are now engaged on that work. The Conservator of Forests has been attending a conference in England. I do not know whether that conference will prove any more successful than the conference of Premiers which we have every year in Australia. But I sincerely hope that the policy which has been advocated by men in the country, men who know the needs of the country, will be followed, and that by a gradual process we shall get the people of the State wedded to genuine reform in forestry matters, and not take precipitate action that will land the country in difficulties and cause vexation to the people earning their livelihood in the industry. The Minister for Works, the other night, dealt with the proceeding at Holyoake, when, although opposed to State enterprise, he went out and bought a sawmill. Could there be a more glaring reversal of form in evidence, unless indeed it be that at Kalgoorlie to-day?

Mr. Hardwick: It was a good deal.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I am not going to attack the deal, but I ask the hon. member to recollect a certain meeting which he was

addressing—he certainly had not much time for clear thinking, because an excited female was asking him about the price of butter—and at which I heard him denouncing my colleagues for having gone in for State enterprise.

Mr. Hardwick: And he will do so again.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Will the hon. member have the hardihood to denounce State enterprise after his Government has bought a sawmill? The hypocrisy of it all! The Minister for Works, when in his seat, used to lean half across that table in thundering his opposition to State enterprise. He went so far as to infer that certain Ministers were dishonest. According to him, State enterprise was wrong, and when he and his party got into power they would sell the State enterprises lock, stock, and barrel. Certain sections of the community took it up, the "Sunday Times" took it up, and all over the country there could be heard ringing a general approval of the doctrine of "Sell the State enterprises which are pulling us down into a financial quagmire." But did they try to sell the sawmills? Certainly they closed up one or two fish shops, but they have not sold the brickworks or the sawmills or the steamers or the State Imple- ment Works. Instead of selling those State enterprises they are buying more. It may be said that they made an attempt to sell the State Sawmills. The hon. member nods his head in approval.

The Minister for Works: And it was a good attempt that we made.

Hon. P. Collier: Why did not you bring it before the House?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I think the hon. member is capable of much better attempts than he then made. A proposal was made to sell, for nearly half a million of money, the State Sawmills to a French syndicate. The Frenchmen came out here; the deal was negotiated. Everything was ready, except the ratification by Parliament. In this House the Government had a majority of 35 to our 15. How, then, could our protest be effective if the Government meant business? The Minister received shoals of resolutions from everywhere.

The Minister for Works: You engineered them very well.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: It matters not who engineered them. What were they worth? They emanated from men who, at the polls a little previously, could not succeed in returning more than 15 members. The Minister did not want to sell the sawmills. He knew that right down in the minds of the people of this State there was a deep-seated approval of the policy of State Sawmills. With 35 supporters in a House of 50, the Minister was not game to bring the matter before Parliament.

The Minister for Works: That is all you know.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Why did he drop the project? He said the French Government would not let the money come out of France,

that this State Government would have to take bonds. He did not like to take bonds. This Government hand out bonds to the returned soldiers, but they do not like to take bonds from the French.

The Minister for Works: Had I taken bonds, you would have been the first to condemn me.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I am not going to condemn the Minister for the form of currency he traffics in, whether it is bonds or old pig iron, so long as it is of value. But I condemned the Minister long before he got to the bonds' stage.

The Minister for Works: You are always doing that.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The very fact that the Minister has bought this additional sawmill is a justification of our policy, which now gets the seal of approval from Tory quarters, and, in consequence, Labour representatives to-day are not so strongly condemned because of the policy they initiated. During the war Great Britain took control of the great national utilities. If that is a good policy in wartime, it is an equally good policy in times of peace. All I did at Holyoake was to put my hands together and applaud the Minister for carrying out the Labour policy.

The Minister for Works: You did it very well; you were a gentleman on that occasion.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I am never anything else. A couple of days ago the Minister for Works was enjoying himself at a little dinner or banquet at Rockingham, when the announcement was made that the Peel estate had been purchased. That may be a wise move, but I venture to think that before we purchase on any large scale land of the quality of the Peel estate, our Agricultural Department should be brought up to date. Knowing the South-West as I do, I have for long thought that we have down there a problem pressing for solution. We have there, wedded to the soil, men who are not making headway because certain constituents are lacking in that soil. The Minister, although he too knows the South-West, cannot say what it is that is lacking, nor can I. We have a vast territory from here to Bunbury, but apart from little stretches of river banks, the soil cannot be said to be satisfactory. We have there hundreds of thousands of acres of seemingly good land, and if only the agricultural chemist could find out what it will grow, we could get some satisfactory production from it. We have a State gridironed with railways on which we have to pay interest and sinking fund, but we have no production along those railways. Throughout Western Australia—north, south, east and west—occurs second-class, inferior country capable of being put to some good use if only we knew what. The Government could well afford to spend some thousands of pounds in getting the best brains the world can produce for the solution of

this problem. Great progress has been made in agricultural science of late years, and if the Government would seriously consider it—I believe they are wedded to land settlement, and I applaud them for it—I think they might go in for research in this direction, and employ the best brains among the agricultural chemists of the world to discover whether that soil, blessed with abundant rainfall and capable of growing vegetation of many descriptions, is not able to produce something fruitful which will help us to pay off the interest and sinking fund on the railways we have constructed. Many members on the Government side deplore the industrial unrest and say that there should be co-operation, that we should join together, put our shoulders to the wheel and help the State out of her difficulties. But there are many occasions when those members have opportunities for exercising some control, but do not do it. The cost of living to-day is the big burning question among all sections of the community. We endeavoured last session to pass a Bill with the object of alleviating the situation. The Bill was full of limitations, because it is a Federal matter entirely. The Federal Parliament control the imports that percolate from one State to another. If the State price-fixing authority ever fixes the price of imports too low, those imports will not be brought here. Therefore the Federal tribunal should be clothed with full power. But even our State tribunal was robbed of power. It was our own Bill, designed to throw open to the public gaze trade wherever there was an element of profiteering. I attended the Governor General's conference, and I there heard one representative refer to 22 firms who, out of the misery of the consumers, were building up huge bank balances. He challenged Mr. Hughes to deal with those firms. Mr. Hughes admitted that profiteering was rampant, and he quoted instances which had come under the notice of his own household. Yet no move was made by the Nationalist party, although it was tacitly agreed that certain firms were piling up wealth as the result of profiteering. Why was not a move made? Because the supporters of Mr. Hughes draw their sustenance from that very crowd which controls the money power. I did think the Country party would be sufficiently strong to compel Mr. Hughes to take drastic action in the direction of protecting the consuming public. Mr. Hughes says, "Damn the Bolshevik, and damn the profiteer." I would hang them both." He curses them in public, but I am inclined to think that he must bless them in private, because he has never lifted his little finger to curb their greed. Yet he can do anything under the War Precautions Act. He can throw into the dungeons of Australia 34 members of the working class. Jack Wilson and Tom Barker were deported without a trial, were dragged out of the Goulburn gaol and

shanghaied off. They are accredited organisers in England to-day, although they were never given a trial in Australia. The War Precautions Act is very convenient for dealing with the working classes, but it is apparently quite ineffectual to deal with wealthy men. Mr. Hughes is then helpless, and all the Nationalist gang behind him are helpless also. Is that a fair thing? I am not a revolutionary extremist, I am not even a militant, but I heard the facts put up before the Governor General's conference. I know that the machinery was there to deal with the position, notwithstanding which Mr. Hughes made no endeavour to lighten the burdens pressing on the people. Here we have a country teeming with production. No other country on God's earth is so lavishly blessed by nature. Gifts have been showered down on Australia, but they are all beyond the reach of the consumer. The consumer gets no benefit, the average employer gets no benefit, the working man gets no benefit, the State gets no benefit. It is a period of industrial unrest, which is a problem perplexing the best brains of the people of our community. I hope that before the Government go to the country again they will endeavour to utilise the limited power they have to make brighter and better and easier the lot of those people who, on wages and salary, have to work for a living. We recently had a public service strike, a strike by the last body of people in the world that we thought would strike. They had no militancy in their composition, but they were goaded to desperation over the many defects and defalcations on the part of the Government. I do not know in detail the ultimate result of the strike, but I know that many public servants are honestly of opinion that they are not to be asked to refund the amount of money advanced to them.

The Minister for Works: They will have to refund it.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: If they have to refund it, it will mean that we shall have a discontented service, a service not likely to put forward its best efforts at a time when those best efforts are most required.

The Minister for Works: I believe that the great bulk of them intend to repay, and never had any other idea in their minds.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: There is an impression that in the final negotiations, when Mr. Jackson was so mysteriously brought in, some little arrangement was made under the lap, such as "Go back to work and this money will be granted to you." We are going to have this industrial unrest, and I hope the industries of the country will not be unduly disorganised by it. I, like others on this side, am prepared to co-operate in the direction of minimising the risk of unrest, but when we get a broad policy in the Governor's Speech which does not mention industrial legislation, notwithstanding that our industrial legislation has not been amended for many years past, how can we co-operate? The co-operation we want is in the di-

reaction of making things better, not the sort of forced co-operation, something like an Irish friend of mine, a leading tailor in the city, who when Brearley was in the air the other day was asked how he would like to be there with him. He replied, "I would rather be there with him than be there without him." That applies to co-operation advanced largely by the leader of the Country party and others. We do not see the gloved hand put out. It is the mailed fist that is extended when the workers seek redress for their grievances. There is no fun in going out on strike and putting up with disadvantages and inconvenience. It is no pleasure trip for those who go on strike, but the cost of commodities keep soaring and there is no attempt being made to regulate the prices. I believe the hon. members sitting behind the Government would like to do something, but the Government themselves have not seriously gripped the position. I am glad that the Premier is taking advantage of my offer. I will take him next weekend to my electorate and I will show him budgets of domestic expenditure which have been kept for the last two years, quarter against quarter, and I venture to say that a fair-minded man like the Premier will be convinced that it is impossible to live and to bring up children and put clothing on their backs on the money those people are getting. Wages have gone up by leaps and bounds, but that is no indication of prosperity amongst the working classes. I was struck the other day by the pleading which was put up by the "West Australian" on behalf of the Government, and I had a talk with the gentleman who was responsible for that production. I was struck by the fact that the Minister for Mines was left out of the group. In an appeal to 400 or 500 delegates assembled at the Farmers and Settlers' Conference the "West Australian" asked where would it be possible to get four men to equal Mitchell, George, Colebatch, and Draper. They left out the most mentally alert of the whole group, but whether they had reason for doing that I do not know.

Hon. P. Collier: That is not saying much.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: It may not be, but I venture to think if they start bestowing praise on one and depreciating another, that policy will have a kind of boomerang effect. I regret that the member for Perth is leaving this Parliament. We will miss his cultured lecturettes from time to time. We shall also miss his imposing form from this House and his efforts to chastise Ministers over their derelictions. The other evening, however, the hon. member got a little off the rails. I am not going to follow him, because some of the quotations he used regarding the industrial system in America will not stand probing. Anyone reading the industrial position of America to-day will be convinced that the member for Perth was not on the right track. I do not wish to keep this discussion any longer. I only desire to say that I compliment the Minister for Works on the activity he is showing in regard to the push-

ing on of State enterprises. If the thing is right, it is proper that it should be pushed on ahead. He has established a big yard at Victoria Park and he claims that he will have a couple of hundred men employed there at no distant date. I do not know, however, what is holding him up at the present time. Is it because there is a shortage of money? When the hon. gentleman took over the mill there was a certain output and he asked the men there to continue to give him a fair deal, and I heard him say in front of a dozen members of this House that the results had exceeded his expectations.

The Minister for Works: They are giving me a fair deal.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: There has been an increased output and I think that is generally applicable to the whole of Western Australia. I do not think that the can-can or the goshlow doctrine is here. We know, of course, that there are unscrupulous men in the world and they have even been known to get on the Treasury Bench, but we have to take them by and large. There are other members who desire to speak, and the sooner I give them a chance, the better they will be pleased. I only desire to point out that in the discussion so far, Ministers are not likely to take any notice of the observations of members. We cannot do any good until we get to the Estimates. We can then debate items and move for their reduction if necessary, but on the Address-in-reply we can wander over the whole face of the continent without any result. Members have travelled over the South-West and North-West, the East and over every locality and have dealt with a wide range of subjects. The member for Pilbara last night spoke for about two hours and in that period covered a lot of ground. He seemed to ridicule the efforts of statesmanship that have been put forward by the Government and by members on this side of the House. Everything had gone wrong. He declared that the milk of human kindness had gone sour. I do not know whether he has been drinking milk himself lately or not. The position is this, that when dealing last night with the defects of party politics he declared that party politics were all wrong. There was a time when party politics were all right with the hon. member. The hon. member was speaking from a splendid isolation. He joined all parties but was an acquisition to none. He is not in any Government to-day. I do not know why. Perhaps that has done a good deal to sour him. He speaks a lot of common sense and logic at times, but last night he was a creature of environment. He is one of those men who puts country before party. He joined the Nationalist Government and got a job as a Minister. To-day he is like a lonely pelican sitting on a lighthouse in the middle of a desert. He is prepared to prevent others carrying into effect a policy that may have some progressive features about it. I hope the Government with the few months of life they have before them—it will be only a few months before the wrath of the electors will overtake them—

Mr. Pickering: Oh, no.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The hon. member must not forget that he only scraped in by two votes.

Mr. Pickering: Four.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: And those two voters have now left the district. The district left them so impoverished that they had to get out, and the hon. member now, like every other member, will scratch gravel for his political existence and put up a fight. But before that fight takes place I hope the Government Whip will get busy and urge Ministers to do something. I hope he will give them some idea as to how to improve conditions so that people will not be prepared to rend them to pieces when the time comes.

Mr. Hardwick: I will give you my ideas from the front bench.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Then it will not be a bench in Parliament House. The Government will go before their electors with a barren record. One of the most brilliant men was made to walk the plank. He was put out of existence by the Lefroy Government who were succeeded by the Mitchell-Colebatch Government, and 24 hours later by the Mitchell Government. With all these Governments the people have not had the goods delivered. The deficit has not been reduced, the trading concerns have not been scrapped. The promises were not made by Mr. Mitchell because he did not go to the hustings. It was Sir Henry Lefroy who made the promises on behalf of the National party, which promises have not been redeemed. I only hope we will have a change next year. No change can be for the worse. It certainly must be for the better. I will conclude by quoting a few lines from Ella Wheeler Wilcox.

The Premier: Why quote a lady?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: She was the finest lady God ever put into this world. She is dead now. She wrote—

Then we'll see no children's faces at  
the spindle or the loom;  
They'll be out in sunny places where the  
other sweet things bloom.  
God will purify the alleys; He will set  
the white slaves free,  
And they'll own the hills and valleys in  
the government to be.

On motion by Mr. Maley debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.27 p.m.

## Legislative Council,

Thursday, 26th August, 1920.

	Page
Questions: State steamer "Bambra" ...	304
Bulk handling, costs ...	304
Bills: Friendly Societies Act Amendment, 1s. ...	305
Rottnest Island, 1s. ...	305
Address-in-reply, eighth day ...	305

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

### QUESTION—STATE STEAMSHIP "BAMBRA."

Hon. A. H. PANTON asked the Minister for Education: 1. Has his attention been drawn to the report in the Fremantle "Herald" of 20th August, as to the condition of the s.s. "Bambra"? 2. Will he inform the House how much truth (if any) there is in the report?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, Yes. 2, The article in question is a great exaggeration of the facts of the case. The s.s. "Bambra's" steering gear has given trouble on one or two occasions, as has happened to many a better ship, and on the other hand the gear has run for months without failing. The gear is not unique in any way and is perfectly understood by the engineers of the steamer. In the event of failure of the steering gear from the bridge there is ample provision made for the safety of the vessel by the auxiliary steam steering gear, in addition to the hand steering gear. There is no doubt as to the seaworthiness of the vessel.

### QUESTION—BULK HANDLING, COSTS.

Hon. H. STEWART asked the Honorary Minister: In order to provide a wheat storage or bulk handling scheme suitable for this State, can he give the following information:—1, What was the estimated cost of construction per bushel capacity in 1918 for the silos built of reinforced concrete and Western Australian hardwood respectively? 2, What would be the cost of these respectively at the present time? 3, What would be the cost of the machinery requisite for the different types of silos mentioned in (1) respectively, and what would be the cost at the present time?

The HONORARY MINISTER replied: 1, It was estimated, in 1918, that approximately terminal silo at Fremantle, built of reinforced concrete, would cost, with machinery, 4s. per bushel. Construction in timber for this installation was not considered. Estimated approximate cost of country silo, in timber, 1s. 8d. per bushel, and in reinforced concrete 2s. 6d. per bushel. 2, These