

time. Money is very scarce in all directions. Sir Edward Wittenoom gave an explanation on this subject when speaking the other evening, which I think was reasonable, and that may account to a great extent for the scarcity, but there is no getting away from the question that that is so, and that people are hard pressed. There have been more bankruptcies during the past few months than ever before in the same period, and from what I can learn there are likely to be more. It behoves the Government to endeavour to curtail expenses, and not everlastingly look to a few people to make up the deficiency by piling on them tax upon tax.

On motion by Hon. W. Patrick debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 6.15 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Thursday, 31st July, 1913.*

	PAGE
Questions or Returns .. .. .	182
Questions : Fruit fly in Orchards .. .. .	182
<i>Hansard</i> Appointment .. .. .	182
Railway safeguards .. .. .	183
Workers' Homes .. .. .	183
State Meat supply and Steamship Service .. .. .	183
Powellised sleepers .. .. .	185
Brookton-Kunjin railway .. .. .	185
Land settlement .. .. .	186
Address-in-reply, fourth day .. .. .	186

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

### QUESTIONS OR RETURNS.

Mr. George having given notice of several questions,

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : On a point of order, I would like to point out that hon. members are in the habit of asking by way of questions for what are really returns. I have noticed in the

case of one or two questions submitted this session that they really should have been asking for returns.

Mr. GEORGE : All of this information for which I am asking can be given either by the Railway Department or the Works Department in less than half an hour, for they must have the accounts made up.

The Premier : You ask for returns, the same as we had to do.

Mr. SPEAKER : As to whether information may be obtained by way of a question or by way of moving for a return, if the Speaker thinks such questions should not be admitted they are not admitted, and if Ministers do not desire to reply they need not reply. Ministers may ask that a motion be submitted for a return. In respect to the questions already asked, I went through them carefully. There is one which I thought rather exceeded the limits of a question, but I gave that the benefit of the doubt. It is a question asked by Mr. Monger. However, if the Minister finds he cannot answer a question, and regards it as a return he is, of course, privileged to ask that a motion for a return be moved.

### QUESTION—FRUIT FLY IN ORCHARDS.

Mr. TURVEY asked the Minister for Agriculture : 1, Has his attention been drawn to the prevalence of the fruit fly in many of the orchards of this State. 2, Is it his intention to adopt the system of taxation of orchards as recommended at the recent Fruitgrowers' Conference in a scheme for coping with the pest ?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied : 1, Yes. 2, A further gradation of charges on those suggested by the Fruit Conference is being considered.

### QUESTIONS (2)—"HANSARD" APPOINTMENT.

Mr. FOLEY asked the Chairman of the Printing Committee : 1, Was the vacant position on *Hansard* staff advertised

in the West Australian papers? 2, If so, on what date? 3, If not, does he consider it right to debar qualified men in this State from competing?

Mr. PRICE (for the Chairman of the Printing Committee) replied: 1 and 2, The vacancy on the *Hansard* staff was not advertised. Mr. Weatherston's application for transfer was received on 12th June, and consequently as Parliament was sitting on the 26th June, there was not time to call for applications by advertisement, and enable the selected applicant an opportunity to give notice to his employers of his intention to leave. 3, Ten months previously a similar position was advertised, and the applications then received having been fully inquired into by the Committee, were considered to be from persons unsuitable for the position. To have advertised again within such period, it is considered, would have brought forth only applications from the same persons who had previously applied.

Mr. FOLEY: Most unsatisfactory.

Mr. UNDERWOOD asked the Chairman of the Printing Committee: 1, Did Mr. Wigg go to Adelaide to engage a member of *Hansard* staff? 2, Who paid his expenses?

Mr. PRICE (for the Chairman of the Printing Committee) replied: 1, Mr. Wigg went to Adelaide to inquire whether a qualified reporter could be engaged there if a vacancy on this staff should occur. The difficulty in the matter was due to the fact that while there was every reason to suppose that Mr. Weatherston would resign in June, it was not possible to utilise that knowledge by advertising, as it was obtained from information of a confidential nature. 2, The expenses were paid from the Joint Houses Incidental Vote.

Mr. Underwood: There will be some more questions when we get the Estimate.

#### QUESTION—RAILWAY SAFE-GUARDS.

Mr. A. E. PIESSE asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Has his attention been

drawn to the report that by some means a passenger train and a goods train were allowed a short time ago to get on to the same section of the Great Southern Railway between Mt. Barker and Lake Matilda. 2, Was the mistake due to mechanical failure of the staff? 3, Is it proposed to do away with the present staff and substitute a more safe system? 4, If not, what precautions have been taken to prevent a similar occurrence?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, I am not aware of a passenger train and a goods train being in the section together, but two goods trains were. 2, Yes. 3, The staff instruments are similar to those in use in many parts of the world. The failure which was the cause of the irregularity in question was of an exceptionally rare nature, and steps were immediately taken to render a recurrence impossible. 4, See answer to No. 3.

#### QUESTION—WORKERS' HOMES.

Mr. HARPER asked the Premier: 1, What was the amount of money applied for during the past financial year under the Workers' Homes Act? 2, How much has been approved and for what localities? 3, What amount was expended prior to the 30th June, 1912, and where? 4, Was the same from loan money or revenue?

The PREMIER replied: 1 to 4, As the information asked for by the hon. member necessitates the preparation of a return involving a considerable amount of time and labour, he should move for the production of such return in the usual way.

#### QUESTIONS (4) — STATE MEAT SUPPLY AND STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

##### *Cattle and Steamers.*

Mr. MALE asked the Premier: 1, Have the Government entered into an agreement with the Borril Australian Estates, Limited, for the purchase of cattle from them? 2, If so, does he intend to

lay same upon the Table of the House? 3, Is it a fact that the "Kwinana" was delayed in Fremantle from 4th July till 14th July? 4, If so, why was she so delayed? 5, Have the Government to pay for the cattle which were taken off the "Kwinana" at Wyndham after being put on board, or does the loss fall upon the Bovril Australian Estates, Limited? 6, What has become of these cattle? 7, How many cattle per day are the Government getting slaughtered—(i.) For the supply of the Perth City Market shop (ii.) For the supply of the Fremantle shop? 8, Have the Government purchased the Midland Junction saleyards from the Midland Junction municipality? 9, Are the regular sales of stock discontinued there now? 10, Have the Government started to build abattoirs at Fremantle and Midland Junction yet? 11, If not, why not? 12, Will he lay upon the Table of the House the Government engineer's report upon the condition of the boilers of the "Western Australia," the "Kwinana," and the "Eucla"? 13, Will he lay upon the Table of the House the reports required by the underwriters for the Lloyds agent on the hulls of the "Western Australia," the "Kwinana," and the "Eucla"? 14, Will he lay upon the Table of the House the reports required by the underwriters for the Lloyds engineer on the boilers and machinery of the "Western Australia," the "Kwinana," and the "Eucla"?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, Yes, if the House desires it. 3, Yes. 4, A small boiler leak. The time table was not affected by the delay. 5, No, the Government did not pay for the cattle. 6, They have been under the supervision of the Stock Department. 7, For the Perth shop about 16 a week, for Fremantle about 10 a week. 8, No. 9, There have been no regular sales of stock at these yards for some considerable time. 10, Yes. 11, See answer to No. 10. 12 to 14, The hon. member, if he deems it advisable, should move for the production of the papers in the usual manner.

#### *Waste Products.*

Mr. GEORGE asked the Premier: Seeing that the Government have gone into

the butchering business, do they propose to start works with which to deal with the waste products, so as to supply the farmers of Western Australia with fertilisers at prime cost?

The PREMIER replied: When the abattoirs are constructed the waste products will be dealt with in the most economical way.

#### *Perth Butchery.*

Mr. MONGER asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Has a net profit or loss been made on the Government butchery operating in the Perth Markets? 2, How long have operations been carried on? 3, What is the average number of carcasses per week handled and retailed during the period since the butchery has been opened? 4, What grade or grades of meat have been retailed, and what proportions of same? 5, What is the average cost per lb. of meat handled in the Government butchery for the period of its establishment? 6, Have the rental or rentals charged to private butchering firms prior to the establishment of the Government butchery in the Perth Markets been increased? 7, If so, why?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, A profit of £868 5s. 11d. has been made. 2, 11 months. 3, 16 carcasses of beef, 110 of mutton, and 3 pigs. 4, Good. 5, Owing to the competitive nature of the business it is not desirable that such information should be divulged. 6, Originally the rental for the stalls was £3, but a few years ago, owing to slackness of business, this was reduced on the understanding that, with an improvement in trade, they would be put up again. When business did improve the rental was raised from 30s. to 40s., and this sum is also paid by the Government meat stall. 7, See answer to No. 6.

#### *Extension of the System.*

Mr. GREEN asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Is it true that a State butcher's shop was opened at Subiaco on Tuesday last? 2, Considering the saving effected to the general public by the State shop in Perth, and in view of the further extension of the system in the metropolitan

area, by the one established at Subiaco, will be afford the goldfields people an opportunity of participating in the benefits of the State meat supply, by the establishment of a State butcher's shop in Kalgoorlie at an early date?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, Yes. 2, Inquiries will be made.

### QUESTION — POWELLISED SLEEPERS.

Mr. MONGER asked the Minister for Works: 1, Is it a fact that the powellised sleepers used in the Marble Bar-Port Hedland railway were found to be affected by white ants? 2, Has a sample of these affected sleepers been sent to the department for examination by the Engineer-in-Chief, as stated in the Press? 3, If there has hitherto been any reason for withholding the facts from the public, will he now make them public?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: By way of reply I desire to read for the information of the hon. member and of the House a report we have received, which is as follows:—

Port Hedland-Marble Bar Railway. Treated sleepers. Letter from the Existing Lines to the Commissioner for Railways, 25th July, 1913. In reply to the Hon. Minister for Works' memo. and the Hon. Minister for Railways' minute of 30th ultimo, I have to report that two sleepers were found to be badly eaten by white ants at the 113m. 16c. On reference to the diagram attached hereto, this mileage will be found in the section where the sleepers were powellised. These sleepers were removed from the line and forwarded to Perth. I carefully examined them, but could find no brands on the ends, as they were too much eaten away to distinguish anything. Each sleeper is branded, when treated, with a distinguishing mark. Out of the total number of sleepers put in on this line, 10,000 were sent to Port Hedland without being treated or prepared in any way, but were treated at Port Hedland with three kinds of compound respec-

tively—Taylor's White Ant Destroyer, Jodelite, and Cooper's Sheep Dip. The two sleepers were then analysed for arsenic and sugar, and no trace of either was found in the sleepers. Even to a depth of  $\frac{3}{8}$ ths of an inch was there no trace of arsenic, but on the outside or skin a trace of arsenic of not more than above .002 per cent. was found and also a trace of sugar, which goes to prove that the sleepers were not powellised, but in all probability these sleepers were treated with one or other of the preparations, which were either painted on by means of a brush or dipped in a trough containing the compound, or that they were used for stacking powellised sleepers on. Since the date of discovery of these sleepers in March last, the sleepers in the vicinity have been examined and no further affected ones have been found. It is apparent that these two sleepers have been put in at this mileage by accident. Further to this, the line has been examined right through, and other sleepers have been found eaten with white ants to the number of 33, the mileage being between 64m. 40c. and 65m. 40c. Thirty of these are branded "J," signifying "Jodelite," and three of them "T," signifying "Taylor's" preparation. The position can be seen on reference to the diagram. The three "T" sleepers and three of the "J" sleepers have been forwarded to Perth and are now undergoing the testing, and report will be sent you when testing is completed.

### QUESTION—BROOKTON-KUNJIN RAILWAY.

Mr. HARPER asked the Minister for Works: What is the real cause of the delay in constructing the Brookton-Kunjin railway?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: When the plant to carry out the construction has been sufficiently assembled to enable active operations to be economically proceeded with, then the work will be pushed on on a comprehensive scale.

### QUESTION—LAND SETTLEMENT.

Mr. MONGER asked the Minister for Lands: 1, What was the total number of applications received for conditional purchase, homestead leases and grazing leases lands during the 12 months preceding the date of the issue of certain instructions of the Minister dated 18th October, 1911? 2, How many of each class were received? 3, How many applications of similar nature have been made for the period of 12 months, following on 18th October, 1911, referred to? 4, And of what class?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, 6,855 applications. 2, Conditional purchase, 3,718; grazing leases, 1,292; homestead farms, 1,845. 3, 4,686 applications. 4, Conditional purchase, 2,669; grazing leases, 703; homestead farms, 1,314.

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

#### *Fourth Day.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Mr. DWYER (Perth): In listening to the course which this debate took last night and on the previous night, I could not help but be surprised at the tone that had been imparted into it by members of the Opposition. It seems to me, Sir, that failing to convince, either by argument or reason, the members of the Opposition have resorted to the usual subterfuge of piling abuse on the Government, on this side of the House and on the party we represent generally, showing an entire lack of reason, showing an entire lack of argument, and showing a lack of that class of criticism that might be expected from the people's representatives; and, as a young member of this House, I was struck with amazement and surprise at the depths of degradation into which the debate was sunk by certain responsible members on the Opposition side of the House. It seems to me that these members, instead of being the responsible members of a responsible party in the country, have become the irresponsible members of what at any rate should be a responsible party.

Now, Sir, from the time the member for Northam (Hon. J. Mitchell) started until the time occupied by the leader of the Opposition and by the member for Kimberley (Mr. Male) we were treated to little less than a mass of innuendoes and insinuations of base and sordid motives directed to the members of the Government and I feel sure that these members who directed and hurled these innuendoes and insinuations were sure in their own hearts that there was absolutely no ground for them. It was the greatest and most palpable exhibition of insincerity that I, at any rate, have ever known. If we take, for instance, their criticism of the State steamers; the leader of the Opposition, in order to buttress up a case against them, and he had only a poor case, had to suggest that the management of the service was given to a gentleman for no other reason than that he happened to be a friend or political supporter of the Honorary Minister, the member for East Fremantle.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): I contradicted that.

Mr. DWYER: The Honorary Minister contradicted that and still contradicts it, but the insinuation was not withdrawn. The innuendo still remains, and I question whether there is any manliness of character in carrying on a debate on these lines. Surely the discussion on the success or the failure of the State Steamship Service generally, its position as a financial institution, may be conducted on different lines from insinuations of this base and sordid character. Apparently the members of the Opposition can see nothing that is good in members on the Government side of the House. In their view everything is founded upon sordid motives, and in everything we look to political sections and do not regard the good of the country, but I do say here that I believe the members of the Government and members on the Government side have at heart the best interests of the country and that they are not moved in their actions, in their intentions, or in their aims by the sordid motives attributed to them. We all know, everybody of

experience and business knows that we cannot start a new undertaking and expect success straight away in every instance. In scarcely any instance is it reasonable to expect success from a new undertaking and much less so is this the case when in a new undertaking we are faced with great opposition, with the competition of old-established firms and with established businesses. In this undertaking we are faced with the competition of, perhaps, the keenest business men in Australia, and yet it is expected that the Government should make an absolute financial success of it from the very outset. I want to say that if this had been the case the Government would have been extremely fortunate. I did not expect that for some time at least the State steamers would prove a success financially. I looked upon this department as a public necessity to provide means of communication by water corresponding to the provision that we made for the agricultural and other districts of means of communication by land. I think the Government provided this means of communication not because they thought it would turn out to be a business success, but because the requirements of the country not only warranted it but demanded it, and if the requirements of the country demanded that there should be means of communication by water from distant ports in the North-West down to the capital, then it was the duty of the Government to provide them, and the Government have carried out that duty to provide these means of communication, irrespective of whether or not they make the big profits that our friends on the Opposition tell us we will not make. When an object is an object of public utility and when it is a necessity of the State and of the people, then, even if we are to conduct that object or business at a loss, it is our duty to enter upon the undertaking, and I think it has been proved to the satisfaction of every member of this House that the connection between the North-West ports and the capital of this State by means of the State steamships was an absolutely pressing and convincing necessity. But

who expected that we would reap large profits from the beginning?

Mr. Harper: The Premier did.

Mr. DWYER: It was a pioneering undertaking and even if we thought that profits might be realised we were at any rate prepared to see that the requirements were fulfilled, and we were prepared to have them carried out even at a loss, and I do say that if we take the ordinary course of business undertakings, if we take the ordinary course of business experience, I think it will be agreed on all sides that in an undertaking of this kind we have been extremely fortunate in finding that it has been so well, so efficiently and so ably managed up to the present, and we may confidently look forward to an increase of business and an increase in the credit balance, and to this new arm of State enterprise proving just as successful in the manufacturing and the commercial world, and in the productivity of the State and for the betterment of the North-West, as the railways have been as the means of intercommunication between the farming districts and the capital. We had again another instance of this vituperation and abuse with which our friends on the other side of the House seem to have been filled in their references to the Eucla land grab, as it was termed by them. We had this old fact trotted out and served up once again in vitriolic sauce and surrounded by the noxious vapours emanating from the leader of the Opposition, a savoury dish, surely, to hand before the Government, to hand before the community. To impute motives of the kind imputed in this House last night was very little less than disgraceful. I have no hesitation in saying, at any rate, it reflected no credit on the leader of the Opposition and it reflected no credit upon those members who applauded his views, or his opinions, or his sentiments.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: He was sorry afterwards.

Mr. Harper: No innuendos were cast.

Mr. DWYER: Innuendos were cast and hurled and insinuations and most sordid motives were attributed to the Government. The member for Pingelly (Mr. Harper) might not, perhaps, see

where these innuendos and insinuations lie. That, however, is not my fault; it is the fault of the hon. member.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): He saw that he got the railway close to his farm, at any rate.

Mr. DWYER: I have no doubt and never had any doubt that the hon. member, where his own interests were intimately concerned, could always look out for himself. These insinuations do no credit to the persons who hurled them, and they were hurled in spite of the fact that they had been contradicted inside this House, I think, but at any rate on several occasions outside of the House, they were contradicted and disproved by the persons at whom the insinuations were levelled. Then again we had the perverted report of a statement made at a social given to Mr. McCallum. I myself happened to be at that social and I do say that the report was tortured and twisted, that its context, as it appeared in the papers next day, was misleading, and that the meaning of the Premier's utterance was not that which could be gathered from the Press report.

Mr. George: You should blame the Press.

Mr. DWYER: I do not blame the Press but the persons who take everything that appears in their organs of public opinion for granted and do not go further to find out whether the information is correct or not. They are content and satisfied if a report appears in one of their own party organs. They never go to the fountain head for information; they never dream of asking for information from its source, but take for granted that everything is bad concerning the Government and their supporters, and omit everything good, or conveniently forget it.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Do you say that the Press do that?

Mr. DWYER: I state that the leader of the Opposition does that.

Hon. Frank Wilson: What about the Press report?

Mr. DWYER: The leader of the Opposition seems to take a delight, an unholy, unwholesome and insanitary

delight in going about collecting garbage—I am speaking metaphorically, of course—and hurling it at those members on this side of the House, and I say it is unbecoming of him to do so.

Mr. George: It has evidently stuck.

Mr. DWYER: I am not personally concerned, but as one who happens, although perhaps temporarily, to occupy a public position, I cannot feel but indignant at this sort of thing occurring. Then we have the member for Kimberley waxing wroth and indignant and even eloquent. A cool, calm, settled demeanour is quite characteristic of him, but he waxes wroth and indignant because he alleges some scandal occurred in the delay in the execution of the man Spargo. If the hon. member had intended to be just, either to this side of the House or to the Government, because, after all, the Government are in many respects a committee of this side of the House, if he intended to be just it was his duty to ask how long this delay had occurred, and if there had been any delay at all, when the papers reached Perth, and how long the Government had taken to make up their minds on this matter. But he takes everything for granted that may tell against this side and because he has taken no steps to find out by enquiry what did occur. He waxes wroth and eloquent because of the delay that Spargo was subjected to. When not abusing this side, when not heaping this filth and garbage collected from all quarters the members on the Opposition benches are prophets of evil omen. One would have thought there were many Cassandras among them. Though I believe I am charging them with want of patriotism, I hope I may be wrong, but I believe they hoped the ventures of the Government may have turned out badly. For the sake of the patriotism of the hon. members I hope I may be wrong, but I can hardly come to any other conclusion which I believe every member on this side of the House would also come to. Our implement works are doomed to be a failure. Our saw-mills in connection with the supply of powellised sleepers for the Trans-Australian railway are going to be failures.

Our steamers are going on the shore and making towards the rocks. Our brick works, which are not quite started, are also doomed to failure. There was one echo from member to member, reverberating throughout the benches opposite, and that was that disaster will follow—disaster will follow. One surely naturally asks oneself the question, what grounds are there for asking that this disaster shall follow. If the Opposition had the management they would believe they were heaven-sent or providentially placed here to manage these departments to success. But because it happens the reins are placed in the hands of a Labour Government they believe that nothing good can exist. I listened carefully, and read carefully the speeches of the hon. members opposite to see if there were any grounds for the doleful predictions of theirs, but search as I might, I could scarcely find a single reason stated by them. There may or may not be reasons, but they were not stated why the predictions of theirs should come to pass. I think, as I have stated, unfortunately for them and for their reputations for patriotism and their interests in the destinies of the country, the wish was father to the thought. There is only one reason that one can attribute, and it is the reason that the Opposition are moved by jealousy and small-mindedness; they have not had the initiation and have not the conduct of the enterprises. The country prefers to trust the Government now occupying the Treasury bench with these enterprises than the members opposite.

Mr. George: Only temporarily.

Mr. DWYER: Temporarily will last a long time. May I tell the hon. member for Murray-Wellington the members opposite have shown a lamentable lack of reason in their speeches. I ask members on the opposite side, notwithstanding all the abuse they have heaped and doleful prophecies they have made, I ask them this question, which of these enterprises would they be prepared to abandon if they were placed in power to-morrow?

Mr. Harper: The lot.

Mr. DWYER: The member for Pingelly says "the lot." Is he speaking for the other members on the Opposition benches? I am doubtful. I think he is playing a lone card; then I am sorry for him.

The Minister for Lands: He is acting leader of the Opposition.

Mr. DWYER: I would suggest, then, that he should move up a little and occupy the second chair on the other side, but it is a suggestion that never will be carried into concrete effect. I give members on the other side credit for a little more common sense than that.

Mr. Harper: You show common sense.

Mr. DWYER: The best common-sense I could show to the House is sitting on the opposite side of the House to the hon. member. I can afford to be generous to the hon. member. I ask the members of the Opposition to say which of these enterprises they are prepared to recommend the abandonment of. The construction of implement works whereby the farmers will receive their agricultural machinery at a cheaper rate and a more reasonable price than at present? I am putting these queries. Are they prepared to abandon our saw mills and this much-decried agreement with the Federal Government for the supply of powellised timber? I ask them whether they are prepared to abandon our brickworks which are about to be established? I ask them are they prepared to throw in the scrap-heap, as some have suggested, our trams and our ferries? I think they will be obliged to say, in order to retain their faces before the country, and to retain the little reputation for political ability they have, that they would not abandon one single enterprise that the Government have entered into.

Mr. Male: Only give us the opportunity.

Mr. DWYER: The hon. member says give them the opportunity. I have asked specific questions, and I await the answer of hon. members to them. I await to see if they are prepared to accept the responsibility before the country of these speeches they have made here during the past few days. Are

they prepared to recommend the abandonment of enterprises which the Government of the country are carrying out and which the Government of the country will persevere in and carry out, not only to the betterment of the people, but finally to the assistance of the country at large, and to the confusion of the members of the Opposition? The member for Kimberley quoted some figures last night. Everything he said appeared to be as if he looked through doleful spectacles; his glasses were all dim. This country was marching on to destruction. He was echoing the remarks of his leader, disaster will follow. He took up the *Statistical Register*, and he could see nothing hopeful and encouraging in that paper. The country was marching to political damnation. We were on the verge of destruction. Our ships were driven on the lee shore, as the leader of the Opposition put it, and as somebody else put it, they would soon be driven on the rocks. I have taken the trouble to look through the last publication for the month of June, and I can find nothing there that would endorse in any way the statements made by hon. members opposite, nor can I find, in reading through this report and examining the figures, and even analysing them, that there is anything there that would give the people of the State reason to suppose that we were doing otherwise than marching on in a progressive and continually ascending scale to success.

Mr. Harper: Even you cannot rule the country.

Mr. DWYER: Fortunately for the State there is a party which will not ruin the State, which consults the interests of the people and that is the party in power, which consults the interests of the people, and not as was hitherto the case the interests of a minority termed the upper classes.

Mr. Harper: What do you represent?

Mr. DWYER: What does the hon. member represent? He represents a little of the idiosyncrasies of the people of Pingelly.

Mr. Harper: They are proud of me, more than Perth is proud of you.

Mr. DWYER: I am quite prepared to leave my political destinies at any time in the hands of my constituents. I find that our population has continued to increase, and I find, even notwithstanding the cheap jibes as to the immigration policy, there has been an increase here also, and I believe the increase has been on the right lines. Unfortunately there was a time when the increase in immigration was not and could not be on right lines because it was not directed in the proper channels. But since the Honorary Minister has been in charge of the department the increase has been on right lines, and is making for the permanent good and the permanent settlement of the country.

Mr. Harper: What about the unemployed?

Mr. DWYER: Unfortunately there is no country in the world, and never will be any country where unemployed do not exist, but I do say that the unemployed that the gentleman refers to were figments of his own imagination carried out from their obscurity by the giant Mr. Yarlett to whom, I understand, he gave a subscription of 10s.

Mr. Harper: On a point of order. I said there were unemployed. I was not speaking of the unemployed in Perth at all, but the unemployed on the Brookton-Kunjin railway.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has no business to speak at all.

Mr. DWYER: In taking the estimates of revenue and expenditure, and in looking through the figures, there is really nothing that may be said to depress anyone in the community, if everything is viewed in the proper light; and I do say this, that I do not pretend or presume to be a financial authority, but I can declare that there never has been a Government that has gone so far to provide means of communication and necessities for farmers than has the Government which now occupies these benches.

Mr. Harper: The farmers do not think so.

Mr. DWYER: The Government have done that notwithstanding that they have been reproached time and again

by those hon. members opposite who should be friends of the farmers and who allege that they are the friends of the farmers, and who hold themselves out as representing farming interests. The Government have done all that I have said, they have faced the opprobrium which expenditure sometimes means, and why? For the sake of the whole community, and because they do not believe in spoils to the victors, but because they believe in expending money where the community will get a return. They have expended this money in the face of the criticism of hon. members opposite and perhaps increased the debit balance of the country. But this debit balance when it is analysed will be found to have been spent in directions that no members having the interests of the country at heart would refuse to endorse. What hon. member would say, for instance, that the railway employees should not have been given the minimum wage of 9s.? Hon. members may make innuendoes but they would not go on the hustings and repeat them there. We all know that a man who is in receipt of 9s. a day, in order to make provision for himself and his family, even though his family be small, is put to the pinch of his collar.

Mr. Harper: They are a lot better off than many of the farmers.

Mr. DWYER: The hon. member may be able to make 9s. go further than another man, but the man I am talking about is the average man. The average man is put to hard pressure to make both ends meet, and the increase in the deficit is due, in a great measure, to that principle which has been adopted by the Government of seeing that no person shall be underpaid, a principle which I think every hon. member will endorse. I do not think the hon. members opposite would refuse to endorse such a policy in the course of a speech to their constituents. I notice also that a lot of other increases in the expenditure are due to the fact that the Government have benefited farmers and producers who have not fared too well because of poor seasons. The hon. member for Kimberley quoted figures to show that

there was an increase in the general output, but the hon. member was making a sort of false analogy, and I give the hon. member credit for sufficient ability to know that the comparisons were not fair. The hon. member knows that it is not possible to compare the yield of this year with past yields. If he took all the circumstances into consideration they would alter the deductions that might be made. The hon. member must take the class of country under crop, the total area under crop, and if he is to have truth in his deductions, or reason in his deductions, he must also take into consideration the number of failures that have occurred and similar things.

Mr. Harper: He took the average.

Mr. DWYER: The figures given prove many things, but only when proper analysis and weight are given to surrounding circumstances can they be relied upon. Then I look at the banking returns published in the *Statistical Abstract*. These ought to make my friends opposite more hopeful of the future of the State and of our destinies. I hope that after they have studied these figures they will not hesitate to say that we are still progressing and marching onward, notwithstanding the fact that a Labour Government is in power. The shipping tonnage shows an increase; it is gradual but it is sure. In regard to trade the same thing applies; in fact in every department of business, in every sphere of life, this is the position. I will not weary hon. members by quoting the exact figures—they are published in the *Abstract* from which I am quoting. He who runs may read. I can only commend the publication to their attention, and yet we are told, notwithstanding this proof of our prosperity, notwithstanding these indelible marks of the records of the Government as a progressive and successful Government, we are told that we have stagnation. This is another figment of the imagination of members. There is no stagnation here, there is, on the contrary, orderly, gradual progression without any Bullfinch boom railways; a progression unmarked by any Ravensthorpe smelters;

a progression marked by good, clean and honest administration.

Mr. Monger: Where?

Mr. DWYER: With worth and merit combined. Turning to the criticisms for a moment—

Mr. George: You do not call yours criticisms?

Mr. DWYER: Criticisms of the utterances of the hon. members opposite, who, negligent as regards their facts and who have no arguments, have to resort to abuse and insinuation—turning aside from these, I wish to make a few short references to the Governor's Speech. I find that there is a certain programme of legislation outlined, and I think although this programme is small, it represents the pressing needs of the community. It will be noticed that there are many Bills referred to here in the domain of projected legislation, Bills which have been introduced in previous sessions, and it is intended to re-introduce them in the hope that another place, by the passage of months, may have learned some wisdom and may have gathered some knowledge of the wants and requirements of the country, and pass them into legislative effect.

Mr. George: They know more than you do.

Mr. DWYER: I join issue with the hon. member, but I do not know what he knows, or what he is devoid of in his intellect. One of the measures it is proposed to introduce is that dealing with constitutional and electoral reform. That is in fulfilment of a promise made some time ago by the Premier, made, in fact, before he was Premier. I think that we are sadly lacking in many respects as regards our Constitution and our Electoral Act. We have received both as a legacy from the so-called Liberal Administration, historical descendants of the Tory Government here, and these we have had to put up with for a long time, but we intend to amend and make them applicable to our modern conditions, our modern institutions and modern thought. The hon. member for Kimberley, in referring to our proposed electoral reform, endeavoured to throw discredit on this party by alluding to

the Federal Electoral Act; but though that Act is not perfect, though it possesses many faults, and though it is thought it may have in some instances proved a failure, yet with all its faults and its failures I would far and away prefer it to the existing system of electoral procedure which obtains in this State. There is one thing about that Act, at any rate, which commends it, and that is the abolition for good and aye of the postal vote.

Mr. Male: Shame!

Mr. Mursie: It has done away with corruption.

Mr. DWYER: I say that the postal vote was made an instrument of more corruption than anything else in the Electoral Act.

Mr. Monger: How?

Mr. DWYER: The hon. member asks, how? A postal vote officer would be a man of a certain political opinion or complexion and he would take a vote, he would call on sick people or people who were about to travel, would visit them in company with others, and I need hardly state what the consequences were.

Mr. Harper: He could not go and see people.

Mr. DWYER: At any rate, the corruption under this system, and the faults were so glaring, that some means had to be devised to remedy them, and the means devised were those contained in the Federal Electoral Act. While I do not intend to defend this Act as a piece of perfect legislation, I reiterate that with all its faults, it is better than our existing Act. We were also told inside and outside the House that it laid open the door to a tremendous lot of corruption, corruption run wild, corruption widely spread through all the electorates. We were told there were multiple votes, that people voted wholesale and not in small numbers. I would here refer hon. members to a paragraph which appeared in to-day's paper. It is a telegram from Melbourne, and reads—

Additional reports in connection with the examination of the certified rolls used at the last Federal election

were received by the Chief Commonwealth Electoral Officer to-day. The report from the divisional returning officer for Perth shows that there were no apparent grounds for the allegations that were made immediately after the close of the polling, to the effect that plural voting had been practised to an alarming extent. The examination showed that out of 29,000 votes recorded only about 100 apparent instances of persons having voted both as absentees and in their own subdivisions had been disclosed. It is stated, however, that there is every likelihood of a large percentage of these cases being explained away on the ground that errors had been made either by the presiding officers or the electors themselves.

Mr. Heitmann: What has Fowler to say to that?

Mr. DWYER: We were told that there were hundreds and even thousands of these cases, but, Mr. Speaker, after all, these statements are only on a par, they are on the same level with the statements which emanated from the members of the Opposition yesterday; spreading reports concerning this side of the House about the objects of the party and about the Government and individual members; levelling insinuations and innuendoes just as baseless as those reports which the Liberal League were spreading in regard to the Perth electors. They are welcome to their insinuations, and I hope the public of Perth will see to it that the men who insult them will pay the penalty that such conduct merits. There is a great deal in the Governor's Speech that we may be thankful for. It reveals a hopeful tone throughout. I would refer in particular to the reference to workers' homes. I do not think there is an ameliorative measure placed on the Statute book that can bear comparison with that grand Act, and I hope shortly that every man in this community will have a house he can call his own independently of the landlord.

Mr. Harper: Filling up empty spaces.

Mr. DWYER: If the hon. member had his way there would be many empty spaces, but I venture to say that it would be no disaster to the country if his chair were vacant; we would survive that misfortune and the country would continue to progress. In dealing with the Workers' Homes Act, I would draw the attention of the Minister to the charges for inspection in connection with the supervision of the work, which perhaps might be reduced. In some cases the charges for inspection by an architect are excessive in my opinion. The people who take advantage of the Act are poor people and to them every pound is a pound.

The Premier: They could have inspection by the board as cheaply as it will be done by any architect in Perth.

Mr. DWYER: I can quite believe that this is so, but there are two or three inspections during the course of building, running, I understand, up to two or three guineas each. I would suggest that it might be possible to come to an arrangement with some architects to supervise these homes for a certain fee, or one man might be employed to do the whole work. In that case the charges would not press so heavily on those who take advantage of the Act. There is another matter which I desire to call attention to before I sit down. I think it would be advisable to introduce legislation to remove the pressure existing in the Arbitration court. It is unnecessary to repeat in this House that when we took from the workers the right to strike and from the employers the right to lock out, we gave them something in return. We gave them a tribunal to which they could take their cases to be heard and determined, and it was never intended by the House or by the country that we should give them something which would turn out to be a mere illusion. We were to give them something real and definite, and not remote or distant, and it is unfair to expect them to wait for an indefinite period, perhaps ten or twelve months before this tribunal can dispose of their cases. I think, therefore, it would be well

to have the Act amended so that the powers of the court may be divided and shared by the other judges, in order that there might be a speedy hearing of the cases listed, because I am convinced by experience that unless justice is speedy it ceases to be justice. Then I think something could be done to relieve this pressure by amending the portion of the Public Service Act by which the President of the Arbitration court is made chairman of appeals. I think it would be easy to select some other gentleman for that position.

The Premier: That is what they asked for. Nothing would suit them but a judge of the Supreme Court.

Mr. DWYER: Whether the chairman is a judge of the Supreme Court or not is a matter of indifference to me, but I do not think he should be also president of the Arbitration court. That has been proved to cause delay and hardship, to be inconvenient, and to give dissatisfaction to all parties. The Government are to be congratulated on the taking over of the Perth tramways. That event marks an era of prosperity to Perth, and not only the City but the whole State will be great gainers eventually. The State has a grand asset in these tramways, and one which will increase as time goes on. I hope, however, that some means will be found in this case also to relieve the present congestion even though those means are only of a temporary character. At certain periods of the day these trams are very crowded, and if it should be possible to increase the power in order to tide over the time until the new power house is in order, it would be a great boon to the community. There is a tremendous lot of overcrowding of the cars between the hours of 8 and 9 a.m., 5 and 6.30 p.m. and about ten o'clock at night, and by employing additional cars, I think that the interest and sinking fund on any expenditure necessary to increase this public facility would be met.

The Premier: With a new power house we could do it.

Mr. DWYER: I would suggest that a new type of car would meet the case,

or the alteration of the present cars by taking out the sides and leaving them open.

Mr. George: You would have accidents then.

Mr. DWYER: But they have cars with open sides in Sydney.

Mr. George: But not that design of car.

Mr. DWYER: Well, further modifications could follow. This is a matter for engineers. I am only talking of some means to overcome the congestion and overcrowding.

Mr. George: There is very little space between the two car lines, and we would have accidents if the sides were open.

Mr. DWYER: Then we must redesign the system. That must come sooner or later, and for the sake of the City I would prefer that it should come sooner rather than later.

The Premier: It is all a matter of power.

Mr. DWYER: But is it not possible to have a temporary remedy, because it will be 18 months before the new power-house is available? I will not take up more time of the House except to conclude by congratulating the Government generally on their acts of Administration. I think that those objects of public utility which they have taken in hand and which are termed by our friends opposite "socialistic enterprises" are all for the good of the community and are all tending to our advancement. I congratulate them on taking these in hand and grappling with them. I congratulate them on endeavouring to cheapen the food supplies of the people; I congratulate them on the Act to give cheap homes to the worker, and also on the proposal to enable those who are building to get their material at cheaper rates. The whole community, even hon. members opposite, little as they deserve it, will reap the benefit and have reason to be thankful if the price of bricks and timber is reduced. I congratulate the Government on their wide view, which goes beyond party and considers the whole country. I look forward to a continued succession of prosperity here, and I believe that

with the helm of State in the hands of the present Administration we are bound to sail our ship, not on to a lee shore as the leader of the Opposition expressed and may be hoped, but into the harbour of success where the people will acclaim this first real Labour Government as the pioneers of a new era of prosperity for this land of ours.

Mr. GEORGE (Murray-Wellington): The hon. member who has just resumed his seat at the conclusion of his speech did a lot of congratulating. Permit me to say, so far as the Liberal party in Western Australia is concerned—not only those in the House, but the great Liberal party throughout this State, people who contribute their share to the cost of Government as well as other people—they are not filled with a desire that disaster should follow the efforts of even the present Government. They are not such poor patriots as to not feel the same flow of congratulation as the hon. member for Perth has shown. But what the Liberal party do feel in connection with this matter is—

Mr. Swan: Loss of place.

Mr. GEORGE: No.

Mr. Dwyer: Loss of prestige.

Mr. GEORGE: No.

Mr. Thomas: Loss of income.

Mr. GEORGE: No, nor even the loss of the hon. member. What they feel is that their representatives in Parliament would be failing in their duty if they were not prepared from their seats in the House to place before the Government the result of such experience as they have; and if they, having taken their part in the government of the State and its development, feel that it is necessary that their criticism should be given with bare blades, who are the people in this State who would cry shame on them in any way? The present Premier of the State is the last man who should squeal or object, and my friend the Attorney General should also be the last last man, if such a term is possible, to complain, because those two gentlemen are accustomed to fighting, and out of any fight that may be given to them they will take something that will help them on their way. The

member for Perth (Mr. Dwyer) at the commencement of his speech delivered lectures to members on this side. He said that they had been guilty of insinuations and innuendoes, and that they were lacking in experience and ability, and yet this Solon who has come to judgment, and who wants to paint the walls of this Chamber so white that they can have no smirch upon them, spoke for 25 minutes and gave the House nothing but the delicate abuse which his training as a lawyer enables him to give. I can imagine, although it does not require much imagination, that the hon. gentleman had just had a brief placed in his hands marked 200 or 300 guineas per year, and, working for that particular brief, he gave the benefit of his experience to this Chamber.

Mr. Heitmann: You have had a brief much larger than that.

Mr. GEORGE: Yes; much larger than that, and I can assure the hon. member he will never have a brief one-thousandth part as large as I have. The member for Perth (Mr. Dwyer) spoke of the difficulties in the starting of businesses, and pleaded with all the skill of a special pleader that consideration should be given to the Government in the various enterprises that they have undertaken. I would not withhold from the Government consideration in that respect, as those of us who have had experience in business know the difficulties of starting businesses, and the difficulties of carrying them on. When the Premier launched out upon the steamship venture he was sanguine enough to predict that he was going to make an enormous profit. He has not made an enormous profit. Although opposed to his party, I am sorry for the sake of the State that he has not made that profit, and I hope that he will mend his ways before long. Because our politics are Liberal we do not necessarily desire that Government undertakings should fail. It might just as well be said that we desire to see the railways fail, the mines peter out, or even the farmers to starve. We feel that no man can suffer in this State in respect of business enterprises without the effect being

felt on the State and those in it. So long as only a few are prosperous, and others are not, the State is in a bad way for everybody. It is playing it very low down to say that because a man is of a certain political belief he can have no charity for his opponents. The hon. member spoke of perverted reports. The report which the leader of the Opposition referred to appeared in the papers of this State. I am prepared to take the Premier's word if it is not true, but that newspaper report was the only thing by which we could judge. The hon. member is connected with a party which believes in the deeds that are done in the darkness and the shadow. We have recently had a good proof of that in connection with the Labour Congress held in Fremantle, where after a long discussion, it was decided, although by only a comparatively small majority, to exclude the Press.

Mr. A. A. Wilson: Were your remarks at the Liberal congress published?

Mr. GEORGE: I was not present at the Liberal congress. I wish to draw the attention of the Premier to this, that if he desires that he should never be misrepresented, he must let the actions of himself and his Ministers be made clear and open to the public of this State.

Mr. Turvey: By our opponents.

Mr. GEORGE: Nothing of the sort. What he does in connection with the State the people of the State have the right to know something about, and for the dignity of his position and the welfare of the country it is undesirable that reports should be given that could be described as perverted or made merely for party or other purposes. The leader of the Opposition occupies a place far above distorting the words of the Premier or misstating his actions, and if the Premier desires that whoever occupies the position in which he (the Premier) is at present shall have the respect of the House and the country, let him do away with this policy of secrecy and he will have nothing to complain about perversion. The hon. member also spoke about the members on this side of the Chamber being prophets of evil omen. We are not prophets of evil omen at all. When the

hon. member re-occupies a seat on this side of the House—and he may before very long—

Mr. Underwood: What position would you hold if you came back to this side?

Mr. GEORGE: I would try to occupy the position of keeping the hon. member in his place. When leader of the Opposition, at the time Sir Newton Moore was Premier of the State, the hon. member (Hon. J. Scaddan) was fairly loud, and so was the present Minister for Lands, in criticism of what was done for the country by the Liberal Government.

The Minister for Lands: I was always fair.

Mr. GEORGE: I have not stated that the hon. member was not, nor do I desire to do so, but he was always outspoken and constant in his criticism.

The Minister for Lands: No; I was not constantly criticising.

Mr. GEORGE: Criticising at times, and there is no doubt that it is a privilege and right of the Opposition to criticise measures and actions of the Government.

The Minister for Lands: Only where they are objectionable.

Mr. GEORGE: But now the criticism that comes from this side is regarded as not against matters that are objectionable, but with the paltry motive of trying to oust the members opposite from their seats. The Premier must know in connection with the criticism last session of a number of Bills that there was not, nor could not be any charge of a personal kind brought forward.

The Premier: That cannot be said of this session.

Mr. GEORGE: We have not got any Bills yet this session. When the Premier leads on this side he will carry out the same tactics. The hon. member also spoke of certain Bills that did not come into law last session. Several of those Bills, I am glad to see, are being again brought forward in this House, and I hope that the advice offered last session, and what has since occurred, have given Ministers an opportunity to see whether a modification of some of these Bills is not desirable in the best interests of the country. I feel sure that the Pre-

mier and his colleagues are too broad-minded to hold that time cannot give them any improvement, and I daresay that when those Bills are brought forward again there will be evidence of modification where necessary. With reference to the Arbitration Court, we have heard from the Attorney General that the Arbitration Bill was the best of its kind that has been brought forward. If it is not actually the best, I am quite satisfied that it is one of the best. Every effort was put forth last year to make it a workable measure, and I regret that the business of the courts has been such as not to allow it so far to be placed in proper operation. If the Attorney General and the Government are satisfied that paucity in the number of judges is the real cause of the position, and that another judge is necessary, I would like to see another judge put into commission to deal with the arbitration cases and that work alone. In all industrial disputes the sooner the men and the employers can come to grips and see what actually is the dispute between them the better it is for the country, because so long as they are staved off bitterness is rankling in the breast. The Premier gave a speech last evening, the greater portion of which could be described as sparring for wind. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, it could be called much else. There were many things in the speech of the leader of the Opposition which called for reply, but the hon. gentleman, possibly through not having full notes, left them alone. He spoke of the leader of the Opposition having given utterance to all kinds of innuendoes and so on. I have heard of Satan reproving sin, and I think he had a very good representative here last night, as much of the Premier's speech was throwing mud and retaliation upon the leader of the Opposition. I think the Premier has forgotten that on the 26th June he threw out what I think is about as nasty an insult to the Liberal party of this State as he possibly could give—I do not know whether he meant it or not, but it is recorded in *Hansard*—when he spoke of the leader of the Opposition as being the leader of “the rabble now called the Liberal party.”

The Premier is welcome to his opinion if he likes, but that is what he said. The Premier when he finds that it is getting home on him goes out of the Chamber.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: It is your cutting sarcasm.

Mr. GEORGE: What happened when the leader of the Opposition was speaking? The very tactics that were employed in the late Federal elections and were also employed in the State elections, were employed in this House—the tactics of trying to prevent an opponent from speaking. The meetings of the Liberal party were disturbed nearly throughout the length and breadth of Western Australia in the last State elections, and the same tactics were pursued in the Federal elections. And the same tactics prevailed in this Chamber last evening when the leader of the Opposition was speaking. Those who cannot bear to hear the truth must try to make a loud noise in order that the sounding of their cymbals may prevent the truth getting to the people, and those gentlemen who speak about freedom of speech and freedom of action come into this Chamber and copy the tactics of their poor tools outside.

Mr. McDowall: Why you were the worst interjector in the room!

Mr. GEORGE: The leader of the Opposition pointed out a good many weak points in the administration of the Labour Government, and got home on them. He may, perhaps, in the excess of his indignation have used language which might be considered a little too strong, but those who know Mr. Wilson know that he is essentially a courteous gentleman, and that he has no desire to hurt even the feelings of my friends opposite. We in this House are accustomed to fight with bare blades, fairly and squarely, but when those hon. gentlemen did not quite understand the meaning of my friend's remarks they imposed upon us their innane interjections. The Premier twitted the leader of the Opposition with not being trusted by the people and not being trusted by his party. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that so far as the members on this side of the House are concerned, so long as the leader of the Opposition is our leader he will receive

from us the loyalty of men having freedom of opinion, and not the loyalty of slaves bound to the Trades Hall and to Congress. And so far as my leader is concerned, if those hon. gentlemen who stand up in their places and tell out to this country and the world in general that our leader is not trusted—if they have the courage of their opinions let me ask why are they not men enough and game enough to point out the so-called evil deeds which they think have served to forfeit the trust previously reposed in the hon. gentleman by members of his party? If they know anything against that hon. gentleman which is discreditable to him, whether as a man of business or as a gentleman, why do not they make it known and let us turn him out into the wilderness like the scapegoat of old? But so long as they can sow these seeds of distrust inside and out of Parliament they will continue to do so. Let me tell hon. members opposite that when we want to change our leader we shall not ask the advice nor take the advice of any hon. member I see before me. As for this boasted party which stands for pure, clean, honest administration, as we have it from our friend, the member for Perth, there has been no political party in the world's history which have been dragged down individual freedom as have the Labour party of this State. There is no record in history of a man being refused the right to work in order that he may live; notwithstanding which this is all a part of the policy of our friends opposite and their party friends in the Commonwealth Parliament. Preference to unionists! The only preference that can be given by any right in nature is that if a man is capable, if he bears a share of the burden of State, he has an equal right to employment and to live. Yet these hon. gentlemen, if they could get their will, would deny a man the right to work, would let his wife and children starve because he refused to join their union and agree with their twaddle and their so-called policy. Not content with doing that they have actually dragooned the electors of Australia at both Federal and State elections. Men have been marked on account

of their political opinions, marked so that they have been unable to obtain employment, and have been put out of it. Moreover, the leaders of this particular party, this particular clique who are attempting to rule the people of Australia, are levying an unjust tax on the earnings of the people, taking their money and using it for political purposes. I am satisfied that if half the people in the unions could but have their freedom they would be quite prepared to say, "Let the political clique living on the game continue to live on the game, but let our earnings go to the betterment of our own people."

The Premier: You have lived on politics all your life. It was due to your politics that you got the Commissionership of Railways.

Mr. GEORGE: What rot! Nothing of the sort.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that reference to living on the game had better be withdrawn. It is not decent in this Chamber, whether from the one side of the House or the other.

Mr. GEORGE: All right, Sir; it was said in an excess of honest indignation which sometimes brings a phrase on to one's lips which one would prefer to put in other words. But I am justified, I think, in making reference to this particular matter. I do not mean that which I have withdrawn, but the dragooning of the electors and so forth. I think I am justified in referring to this subversion of political freedom. We find that formerly hon. members received their orders from caucus and the Trades Hall, but now that they have blossomed out into a parliament of Labour not open to the people of the State, and barred against representatives of the Press, but who can decide what the gentlemen in possession of the Treasury benches shall do or shall not do. It is recorded in their own paper, *The Worker*.

Mr. Swan: Do you read it?

Mr. GEORGE: Like a lot of other things I have to read it, although I do not particularly care about it, just as the hon. member, when he was in the Railways, had to do a lot of things which he did not care about.

Mr. Swan: I did them very well.

Mr. GEORGE: The hon. member, when he was employed on the Railways, certainly did his work well. I do not remember that he ever had to come before me to be punished when I was Commissioner. If he had not done his work well he would have been sacked, but he was not sacked, therefore he must have done it well.

The Premier: Is it a proof that because one is sacked he does not do his work well—you got the sack once, you know?

Mr. GEORGE: The hon. member ought to be an authority. This particular Labour parliament gives orders to our friends, and we have had four or five weeks adjournment in order that members opposite might receive their orders from this illegal parliament of Labour. The Premier made reference to me last evening. He said I never spoke, but was simply a sort of human echo. Even if what he said was accurate, and it is not, I would prefer to have earned and deserved that appellation than to be a human gramophone playing 'Trades Hall records driven by caucus and the Labour parliament, unrepresentative of the people. The Premier was very cock-a-whoop last evening. But I must say, and I am sure he will admit it, he got a little bit of a scare a few weeks ago in the Forrest electorate. The Liberals of Western Australia said, "We will have a go for this so-certain seat, we will put up a man and see what they are made of." We did put up a man. It was a piece of arrogant cheek I admit.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Who said so?

Mr. GEORGE: But we put him up, and they told us that they were going to have a ten to one majority over him without going near the place.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Who said that?

Mr. GEORGE: What happened the very evening I was at Jarrahdale? I saw a telegram from a gentleman who occupies a position in this House which he has resigned several times.

The Premier: But he always comes back.

Mr. GEORGE: He may resign once too often and not have an opportunity of coming back. I saw a telegram from that gentleman in which he asked a certain other gentleman to take the chair for him

at a meeting, explaining that he was bringing down the Minister for Works for a meeting on the following Friday. A little later on, who should we hear about but the Premier, who, it was reported, was to come down, and who came down and addressed three or four meetings.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Be correct.

Mr. GEORGE: Then we had another gentleman whom I had the pleasure of meeting, and from whom I understood that a great number was with "us"—meaning, of course, the party opposite—out on the warpath. In addition I saw tens of thousands of circulars printed over the signature of Mr. Holman, whom we all know. The circular was more of a sort of piteous cry for sympathy than any circular I have ever seen.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Produce one and let us judge for ourselves.

Mr. GEORGE: Oh, how can I produce one? I did not keep any, although I saw hundreds of them chucked away in the bush. But I want to point out that the Premier got a little scared because we had the temerity to put up a man against the present member for Forrest. Of course, we did not win this time, but we saved our deposit, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that we are not likely to go bankrupt, because the cost of that election was not very much. But what is the matter with the Premier? Why all this business which we had last evening, and all this scare of going to the Forrest election? I will tell the House why it is. It is because the hon. gentleman sees the writing on the wall and knows that he is being weighed in the balance, and is afraid that he will be found wanting. We are sure that he will, but of course he wants to bluff the situation.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Are you satisfied with the Forrest verdict?

Mr. GEORGE: Yes, I am quite satisfied, and I am satisfied, moreover, that had the unionist electors down there been free to give expression to their private views we would have a very different tale to tell. I am satisfied, too, that whereas the invincible gentleman who now occupies the seat scored 2,400 votes against the knight of Bunbury in the Federal

election, he could hardly scramble through against Mr. Tuckfield—and this with the aid of the Premier and the Minister for Works and all my friends opposite, together with the piteous sympathetic circular—he only managed to scramble through with 1,200 votes.

The Premier: What about the difference in the rolls?

Mr. GEORGE: So if anybody has to grow it is not the hon. member who now occupies the Forrest seat.

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

Mr. GEORGE: Before tea I was referring to the various civilities which have been exchanged from one side of the House to the other, and I now desire to deal with a matter which concerns not only the district I have the honour to represent but also the whole of the farming and orchard areas of Western Australia. During the last twelve months a discovery has been made in the Wellington district of immense lime deposits in Lake Clifton. In addition to these deposits in Lake Clifton there are huge deposits not only of this carbonate of lime, which is practically free and in a state which renders it easy of application to the land at once, but also larger deposits than were previously known to exist of lime that can be dealt with in connection with the building trade, and which has to undergo the process of burning to render it ready for use. We feel in the district that whilst we might perhaps be congratulated on having this discovery made in our district, the whole State is to be congratulated on the fact of it being in the hands of the Government to render to the farmers the assistance they require at the least possible cost in getting this lime. I bring the matter before the House for this reason: I know that the Government have been investigating the matter and I have every faith that they have been putting their best efforts into the inquiry to try to arrive at the best possible decision in regard to the deposits, not only as to how they can be best worked, but the way to give railway communication so that the lime can be cheaply placed upon the railway system. It goes almost without saying that

the different parts of the district are desirous that the railway which will require to be built to bring the lime into use should be built from their particular centre, but I have every confidence that the Government in their inquiries will take a broad view of the matter and endeavour to put that line where it will achieve the best result for all concerned.

Mr. O'Loughlen: What route do you favour?

Mr. GEORGE: I personally have no preference. So long as the line is built I will be satisfied, and my constituents can fight out amongst themselves the question of route.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Do you lean to a coastal line or to a spur?

Mr. GEORGE: I will deal with that presently. I would like to tell the Minister for Lands and the other Ministers who are dealing with the matter that if they can hasten the inquiries and the decision they will confer a great benefit not only on my district, but on all the farmers in Western Australia, and we desire that everyone labouring here shall have as fair a show as it is possible to give them. The member for Forrest (Mr. O'Loughlen) asked whether I favoured a spur or a coastal railway. The hon. member knows perfectly well that a large number of people in that district have been agitating and will continue to agitate to get a coastal railway to run from Bunbury and join the South-Western railway at some point or other in its course. We have had deputations, the bona fides of which cannot be questioned, showing what the resources of that district are. Whether the Government experts place the same value on the resources I cannot say, but we in the district say that we have huge deposits of lime—that cannot be disputed—that we have one of the finest tuart forests which Western Australia contains, a timber useful for many purposes, but particularly useful for the construction of railway trucks; and it can be got by means of a line such as has been indicated at a cost to the State much lower than is being paid at the present time: and in addition to that we have thousands of acres of the finest swamp land that man can desire, which has been

proved to produce potatoes in huge crops and will continue to do it at comparatively little expense. I have had the honour and pleasure during the last few days of submitting to the notice of members in the corridor samples of potatoes grown in swamps extending over a line of 24 miles. We feel that we are within our rights in submitting this railway project to the Government and in trying to convince Parliament that such a line should be built. Of course, we cannot expect it to be built in a day any more than the Transcontinental railway can be built in a day, but we ask that fair consideration be given to the proposal and we hope that we will be successful in convincing Ministers at any rate. In regard to the lime deposits, I believe that I am justified in saying that the Government have for a considerable time had under consideration the question as to whether it would be right to grant the discoverer permission to deal with this stuff and to build a railway in order to put the lime on the market, or whether the Government should work it as a State concern. Of course, that is a matter which the Government's policy will no doubt have some bearing upon, but whether that be so or not, the people in the district require the line built and we ask the Government to give the matter their consideration and let us know exactly where we stand. The Speech informs us that the Irrigation Bill is to be re-submitted to Parliament this session, and much as it is to be regretted that it was impossible to get it through last session, still it is to be hoped that the recess has given the Government opportunity to consider a number of points in that Bill which were objectionable to a large number of persons. However much Ministers may be set upon some one particular plan or other for the State to take control of the whole of the waters of the country, the interests of the people down in that district are worthy of more consideration than the delay which has been caused and which may still continue. We therefore hope—whether the hope will be justified or not we do not know—that the Government in submitting the Bill will have taken coun-

sel with themselves and deleted some of the objectionable qualities which the measure contained last session. Of course when the Bill comes before the House will be the time to deal with its provisions, but I am glad that the measure is to be introduced and I am satisfied that if the Government have been able to moderate it in regard to some of the matters I am speaking of the Bill will have no difficulty in passing.

Mr. O'Loughlen: If it is the same Bill, will you stand by it?

Mr. GEORGE: We will see. I may say that the Irrigation Bill is practically the outcome of an agitation on the part of the orange-growers of Harvey. Perhaps Harvey is the most closely settled portion of Western Australia. The areas held by individuals range from 5 to 10 acres as a rule, and the largest is not more than about 30 or 40 acres. There is a large population there and the amount of money spent in connection with the citrus industry in that district amounts to over £100,000. Considerable employment is given in the district, which I think cannot be approached for closer settlement by any other portion of the State. I think this is acknowledged by the different Ministers who have been there, and I rely with full confidence that the Government will view this matter in a broad way and assist those who have done so much to assist themselves, who have never asked for charity, who have asked the Government to build the works for which the settlers would repay them, and who are prepared to-day, if the Government will construct the works, to repay them and take the scheme into their own hands; but they require the water as a means of conducting their operations successfully. Therefore, I hope the matter will be viewed in a broad light and will be subjected to no further delay. There is a complaint I have to make against the Minister for Works in connection with the roads boards estimates. It is usual in every year about May to send to the member for a district a list of forms and a letter asking him to obtain particulars from

each roads board of the requirements for the coming year in order that the estimates may be made up. That is a proper and businesslike course with which no one can disagree, but this year an innovation has been made in that the member for the district has placed upon his shoulders the responsibility of stating the individual works which should be carried out, a responsibility which cannot fairly be placed upon any member of the House. That is a matter which can be dealt with only by the discriminating officers of the State, who, having all the particulars given by the different boards, in addition to their own knowledge of the localities, can advise the Minister what particular thing should be done. To ask any member to take the invidious position of discriminating between one portion of his district and another is hardly a thing that the Minister on second thoughts will consider fair. In connection with the Murray-Wellington electorate, there are four road boards, and how is it possible for the member to decide the claim of each individual road in a district which extends over a direct line 100 miles in one direction and 50 miles in another. It is asking something which is almost impossible of achievement and requiring the member to place himself in a position he should not be asked to occupy. I am sure if this had occurred to the Minister he would have modified his position considerably.

Mr. Underwood: Ought not you to have complained a few years ago? That is not new?

Mr. GEORGE: It is new this year.

Mr. Underwood: I have had it ever since I have been in Parliament.

Mr. GEORGE: It is the first one I have had in that form, but even if I am wrong in that it is not too late to amend the procedure. The matter of State saw-mills was dealt with by the leader of the Opposition. I do not propose at this stage to go into a lot of particulars in connection with them. There will be an opportunity later on, when it will be incumbent upon anyone who has had experience in these matters to offer his opinions, whether they are worth much or little, and I will leave my comments until

then. What I wish to bring before the House is this: I cannot understand the anxiety the Government have shown to see that men should have payable and full employment in this State, and yet, by refusing an extension of an extra quantity of territory to Millar's Company, they have caused one of the oldest, if not the oldest, timber stations in Western Australia to be closed up, and that is Karri-dale. They have caused an expatriation of something like 250 families, many of whom settled there in the early days and the greater proportion of the remainder of whom were born on that ground and have been there all their lives. Whatever the Government may have to say against Millar's Combine, or against any of the timber companies, is a matter for themselves, but they will require a tremendous lot of justification for refusing such a company the necessary extension of ground to enable them to continue an industry and give employment to practically 250 families. By their action the Government have caused these people to shift to seek employment wherever they can find it, to break up their homes and connections and to leave a place which was a thriving township the deserted place it is at the present time.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Why did not the previous Government grant the application?

Mr. GEORGE: If this action on the part of the Government had been general, if it had not been confined to one particular locality, then some extenuation of their conduct could perhaps be looked for, but when we find that in connection with the Co-operative Hewers' Society at Dwellingup, in the electorate of the member for Forrest (Mr. O'Loughlen), the Government—

Mr. Thomas: Be careful; they will be in your electorate next time.

Mr. GEORGE: The hon. member appears to be troubled over the drug regulations. I wish there was a regulation to control him. I was saying, before being interrupted—and I hope I will not be interrupted again—that if the Government had made this refusal of territory general, instead of particular, perhaps there might have been some extenuation for their

action, but when we consider that near Dwellingup they granted to the Co-operative Hewers' Society some 30,000 or 35,000 acres, I believe, of absolutely virgin forest, the best virgin forest in Western Australia—

Mr. O'Loughlen : You are absolutely wrong.

Mr. GEORGE : I understand that is what they granted and the hon. member knows that a number of hewers outside of that co-operative combine were desirous of obtaining permits to cut upon some 5,000 acres.

Mr. O'Loughlen : Who would they cut for?

Mr. GEORGE : I do not care about that. They were refused an opportunity of getting it, and the hon. member for Forrest knows well that in the eyes of the hewers in that district, whether the refusal was justified or not, he has not emerged scathless.

Mr. O'Loughlen : I will survive it.

Mr. GEORGE : If it was right that Millars should not be granted an extension of land to give employment to 250 families, was it right that the Co-operative Hewers' Society, which already had had a large slice of this virgin forest given them, should receive a large extension of something like 35,000 acres? Such action is making flesh of one and fowl of the other and I am looking forward to an explanation from the Minister as to the reason why this was done.

Mr. O'Loughlen : You will get it too.

Mr. GEORGE : The hon. member is not the Minister; I am looking to the Minister for Lands to give an explanation of this matter. The leader of the Opposition dealt with the question of State sawmills and said a great deal about them, which, I think, covered the question, but there is one point which I wish to lay before the House and before Ministers for consideration. In connection with the sawmills it is known that there will be a large accumulation of scantling to be dealt with. During the debate last year it was stated—I forget by whom—that this scantling would probably be used in connection with the construction of workers' homes. I pointed out that 130,000

loads of scantling would be produced each year if the Government went in for sleeper cutting only, and that would provide a tremendous lot of timber for workers' homes. But the peculiar parody of the whole affair is that we have a railway sawmill, also in the district of Forrest, and it is only within the last few weeks that an advertisement by the Commissioner of Railways, which had been appearing week after week and month after month asking for a price for 50 loads of scantling a week, has been withdrawn from the newspaper. No sawmill can be economically run unless an endeavour is made to get everything possible out of the logs. If the Commissioner of Railways—I am making no charge against him, but am pointing out the difficulty which cannot be contradicted—finds it hard to dispose of 50 loads of scantling a week, what chance will the Minister for Works have of disposing of his scantling when he will be producing some hundreds of loads per week. I understand—I can only give it from hearsay, but if it is not true it can be contradicted—that at the same time as the Commissioner of Railways was advertising 50 loads of scantling a week, an order for some considerable quantity was given to the Co-operative Hewers' Society.

Mr. O'Loughlen : Wrong again.

Mr. GEORGE : I do not say it was wrong to give the order to that society, if all things were equal, but I do say that if the Commissioner of Railways had the scantling, seeing it was produced and paid for out of State money, he should have received the order instead of it going to an outside company, whether it was Millars' or the Co-operative Hewers', or any other company. If the statement is wrong the Minister can deal with it, but that is the statement which is going round.

Mr. O'Loughlen : It is like a lot more statements that are going around.

Mr. GEORGE : This is a business matter and the hon. member does not understand business. If it is true, the Minister should offer an explanation.

The Minister for Works : The Minister happens to know all about it and you are on the wrong track.

Mr. O'Loghlen: It is a good job the public do not take you at your own valuation.

Mr. GEORGE: If the public took the hon. member at his real valuation, they would recognise him as a puppet put up here, there, and everywhere wherever wanted.

Mr. Green: You would not be game to fight outside your own electorate.

Mr. GEORGE: My name is not Green. I think, without trenching too much on the powellising business, that we have a right to be told by the Minister for Railways whether a report from a railway officer of this State quoted in the *Federal Herald* is correct. The report laid on the Table of the Federal Parliament in connection with the matter of karri and jarrah sleepers is signed by Mr. Light, Engineer for Existing Lines in this State, a capable engineer and a man whom his friends cannot understand would give such testimony as I am about to read. Mr. Light's report, as it there appears, states—

Incidentally I would remark that the sleepers in use on the railways in this State are of local timbers, principally karri and jarrah.

Last session it took about six weeks for me to get to know from the Railway Department through the Minister how many karri sleepers had been used in Western Australian Railways. Altogether the number of sleepers in our lines must total between five and six millions, and according to the report of Mr. Light, the sleepers are of local timbers, principally karri and jarrah. From that report it would not be unfair to suppose that one-half of them would be karri and the other half jarrah. But how many karri sleepers do we find have really been used in our railways? The total is 162.

Mr. Underwood: How are they getting on?

Mr. GEORGE: That is not the point. The point is that there are 162 karri sleepers out of a total of about six millions; yet here is a report, presumably by Mr. Light—though I cannot credit that it came from such a cautious man—which states that our sleepers are prin-

cipally karri and jarrah. I say that for the fair fame of this State this report should be corrected.

Mr. Underwood: Are you opposed to karri sleepers?

Mr. GEORGE: I am opposed to a lot of inane and senseless interjections that do not bear on the point.

The Minister for Works: What are you quoting from?

Mr. GEORGE: From *Federal Herald*. Mr. Light is credited with having stated in his report, if it is his report—

Mr. Underwood: That is Hedges' report.

Mr. GEORGE: That our sleepers are principally karri and jarrah, when there are only 162 karri sleepers out of a total of six million sleepers in our railways.

The Minister for Works: Could not it be a printer's error through reversing karri and jarrah?

Mr. GEORGE: If that is so, I have no means of telling. The Minister should get it explained to the House.

The Minister for Works: I am not going to worry about it.

Mr. GEORGE: The Minister evidently does not care. I do not think Mr. Light would explain the matter in the way it is given in that report.

The Minister for Works: You had better come to the conclusion that it is a printer's error.

Mr. Underwood: What is your opinion of karri sleepers?

Mr. GEORGE: My opinion of karri sleepers was given to the House last session and it will be given to the House again when we discuss the powellising agreement, and until then the member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) must possess himself in peace. That will be a very difficult thing for him to do, I know.

Mr. Underwood: What is your opinion?

Mr. GEORGE: My opinion of the hon. member is that he is a bore.

Mr. Underwood: What is your opinion of karri sleepers?

Mr. GEORGE: I would like to make the hon. member a sleeper. We have heard a great deal during this debate of various State enterprises into which the Government are entering. There are State hotels, butcheries, brick works, timber mills, steamers, gas factories, trams

and God knows what else. I am not going into these matters now, but I think I can read through a brick wall as well as most people and I think I can see the object of this socialistic business. I may be wrong, but it seems to me that orders have been issued to supporters of the Government to carry out a portion of a deep-laid plan, the idea of which is to have Government enterprise in every possible walk of life they can. And what is it for? Ostensibly, to make things good for the people of the State but really for the reason that the Government might be able to pay what they please, so far as wages are concerned, and endeavour to make it a common rule by means of the Arbitration Court.

Mr. Lewis: A wonderful discovery.

Mr. GEORGE: There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that that is the reason. The ways of many people are devious and dark but the ways of the Government are transparent and can be seen through by a man even without the aid of his glasses. I now come to deal with another question—that of the Eucla land. For the edification of members I have a plan which they can see, but probably they know all about it. I am not going to make any innuendo or insinuation that Ministers are corrupt. I have not, either inside or outside this Chamber, made any such insinuation, and could not have honestly done so, as only last November I asked the Premier in the corridors of this House whether what I had heard was correct as to the quantity of land he was credited with having taken up. He said it was, and added that there was plenty more land there which I could have if I wanted to select some. The reason I wanted to know was because some hon. gentlemen, who forget what decent courtesy is, had twitted me in the House with being the owner of a large amount of land in the South-western district, which I had paid for with my own hard-earned money. I thought that if it were the right thing to twit me for being the trustee of my family for 5,000 acres that it was a fair thing to twit the Premier in respect of his 300,000. I bought my own land as freehold from a private owner and paid for it. I have no

doubt that Ministers have a different opinion in regard to this matter from what I have, but I feel that they are on the Treasury bench not only in their private capacity, but that their principal position is that of trustees of the whole of the State, and if there is anything in connection with this Eucla land which came under their notice, and which would render the price at which the land could be taken up an absurdly low and ridiculous one, then it would be their manifest duty to stop anybody from taking up that land. It was open to Mr. Scaddan or Mr. Bath to take up the land on conditions which were open to anyone else, but that land was marked on comparatively recent maps in the department as a waterless desert, and the leader of the Opposition has told the House that the reason why the price was reduced was because it was considered to be a waterless desert. In connection, however, with the Trans-Australian railway project, boring operations for water had to be undertaken, and they were made under Mr. H. Chinn—"Brother Chinn," they generally call him. Whether that gentleman had anything to do with the selection of this particular land or not, I do not know. It was open to Mr. Chinn to take the land if he liked.

The Minister for Works: You are on the wrong track again.

The Premier: The land is marked on the charts in the department as the Eucla artesian basin. It was known ten years ago, as a bore was put down.

Mr. GEORGE: If that information is in the department and was not brought before Ministers of the Crown then it ought to have been brought before them.

The Premier: It was known to everybody.

Mr. GEORGE: The proper course would have been to pursue the policy which the South Australian Government adopted.

The Attorney General: I told you in my speech on the Esperance railway that it was not a waterless desert.

Mr. GEORGE: Besides being an ornament to a very honourable profession the Attorney General has his own way of putting things.

The Attorney General: I was telling the truth.

Mr. GEORGE: The hon. member does not always convey to us what he thinks.

The Attorney General: That is your suspicious mind.

Mr. GEORGE: The South Australian Government reserved every inch of land between the route of the Trans-Australian railway and the sea, and the Western Australian Government should have done the same, and I do not see why on earth the Liberal Administration should have not done the same when making the reserves they did make.

The Premier: They did the reverse; with the full knowledge of the fact that an artesian bore had been put down, they reduced the rent.

Mr. GEORGE: Perhaps the leader of the Opposition may have something to say about that matter. We find that Messrs. Bethell and Gordon, the powellising people, took up equivalent to a strip of land about 100 miles long by ten miles wide. What the Premier personally has got I do not know, because we are not exactly aware who are in his syndicate—how many, if any, of the Trades Hall people. When our friends opposite were going up for election they received assistance from one or two Federal members, no doubt great guns who were able to smash our little people up. There was a gentleman whose name I never like to mention because of the memory of my friend, the late Mr. Justice Moorhead. These are some of the remarks which Senator De Largie—

Mr. Foley: You would not say that outside.

Mr. GEORGE: I have said it outside.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Where?

Mr. GEORGE: You ask Senator De Largie, he will tell you. This is what Senator DeLargie stated in a speech on the Land Tax Bill—

It is because the electors of Western Australia recognise that the land monopoly has retarded its progress that at the recent general elections they rose in revolt and returned to this Parliament so many members of the Labour party. Some of the richest lands in the country are being held up and misused.

Is not the question of the taking up of land by Labour members one of the things discussed from time to time by their caucus, and does not the Premier know that some of his stoutest adherents have had their faith in him shaken because he has taken up this Eucla land?

The Premier: No, I do not know it.

Mr. GEORGE: I rejoice that the Premier has fixed himself to the land, because he may now gain some practical knowledge of the country which is giving him his living. In connection with this question of the land, I have a little paper authorised by Mr. Alexander McCallum, secretary of the A.L.F., Trades Hall, Perth, printed by Mr. A. Rex, and bearing the union label. It was put out at the last election. I think the member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Green) knew all about it, because if I remember rightly, when we had the discussion on the salaries grab he referred to the circulars sent up for the purposes of the election. The paper says—

The party proposes to settle all remaining land by leasehold tenure in perpetuity conditionally on use and occupation. No rents will be charged for the first three years. After three years rents will be based on the unimproved capital value; that is, the value of the land in its virgin state.

That is a clear declaration of what the party require, and I may as well give the House the names of the honourable gentlemen who signed it. They are: Fred. W. Burrows, general president of the A.L.F., and J. Scaddan, leader of the Parliamentary Labour party.

The Premier: What is there consistent in that?

Mr. GEORGE: I will tell you if you wait. Last night the leader of the Opposition spoke of a rumour, which the Premier denied, that the Premier could obtain some pecuniary value for the leases if he liked.

The Premier: I did not deny it. I said I was made an offer. He said I had carted it around, but I did not.

Mr. GEORGE: On a recent trip which I made to the Eastern States, I learned from the inquiries put to me that there

is a value on that land. It is absolutely desirable that every member, of this party as well, should take up some of the responsibilities incidental to the land. It is not desirable that the heads of Government should lay themselves open to charges such as have been floating about.

The Premier: You have not shown yet where the consistency of what you have quoted comes in.

Mr. GEORGE: I have proved enough. There will be a debate soon on the powellising contract, and I hope Ministers will reply to the questions that have been raised, as there is considerable feeling throughout the State with reference to this particular contract. There is no insinuation or charge, so far as I know, that people have had their hands greased, nor do I know that there is any cause for it, but let me tell the Premier that the only people to blame for this trouble and uncertainty are the Ministers themselves. Had they seen fit to let the plain facts of this matter be known to the public, as they should have done months and months ago, there would have been none of this trouble. There may be particular State reasons why the facts have been kept back, but it would be difficult to see any valid reason.

The Minister for Works: Why was not the previous agreement published?

Mr. GEORGE: Even if there was a wrong committed in not publishing the other agreement that does not make this particular one right. The trouble made about this agreement in Parliament and out of it and in the newspapers is simply on account of the fact that there seems to be something to hide and that Ministers were afraid to let the whole facts become known.

The Premier: Party purposes.

Mr. GEORGE: If the people think that and you blame them, human frailty causes them to think that there is something more in it than appears on the surface.

The Attorney General: It is not human frailty; it is malice.

Mr. GEORGE: Then the proper thing to do is to be open and frank. I am sorry the hon. gentleman does not occupy

that position which would give him the opportunity of being open and frank.

The Attorney General: My colleague will tell you all about it.

Mr. GEORGE: The excuse has been given that the agreement was not disclosed because it might spoil business with the other States. What business could it spoil? The Victorian Government turned down the process long ago, New South Wales would not have anything to do with it, New Zealand found it no good, and Western Australia has discovered in it a new-born baby, spotless and free from sin, and it is going to help it into active life. The Premier took the leader of the Opposition to task—very wrongfully and heatedly—about the price, which was an unwise thing for him to do. The published agreement stated that 2s. was the price to be paid in the one case, and 9d. in the other.

Mr. O'Loughlen: I thought you were going to defer your remarks on the matter.

Mr. GEORGE: I am dealing with the agreement, not the process. The Premier stated in answer to a question, that the price was reduced to 1s. 3d. If that is so, there must be some subsequent agreement or else there has been something done in order to get this price reduced, and we in this House are entitled to know what that is.

The Premier: You shall know.

The Minister for Works: The Commonwealth agreement has nothing to do with us.

Mr. GEORGE: In connection with this particular agreement there is another thing. There has been a contract given to these people for the supply of a million sleepers and no price has been disclosed.

The Minister for Works: Mr. Colebatch in another place said it was 5s. or 7s. 6d. He is always right.

Mr. GEORGE: I did not hear Mr. Colebatch, and I do not know the price given to the powellising company, but I know that they have been given 15,000 acres of karri land, and that this action will have to be justified.

The Premier: Have we given it to them?

Mr. GEORGE: According to your agreement you have. If that is not so, and if the Premier will state that that is not so, and that the agreement published in the papers was false, then that will knock the stuffing out of the criticisms referred to in the angry and illogical speech the Premier made last evening. For my part I want to take the agreement as being the agreement, and in that it is stated that a contract for a million sleepers has been made. I want the House to know that if royalty had to be paid on those sleepers the amount that would go into the Treasury would be in the neighbourhood of £8,000. I want to know, therefore, what sort of consideration the Government has had in the purchase of the million sleepers to make good to the country for that £8,000 of royalty which has been given away. On the 15,000 acres let under present forestry conditions, the rental to be paid for the right to use the concession would have been £480 per annum, and I want to know, and the State wants to know what right have the Government to give a sort of perpetual pension of £480 a year to a firm who have exploited them in connection with this system.

Mr. O'Loughlen: What license or royalty do you get from those forests to-day?

Mr. GEORGE: I get nothing from them.

Mr. O'Loughlen: No, you regard them as valueless.

Mr. GEORGE: If my friend thinks it is a just transaction to give these people 15,000 acres of land, would it have been an unjust transaction to have given Millars' Company sufficient land to keep the 250 families going?

Mr. O'Loughlen: Why did your Government for six years refuse their application?

Mr. GEORGE: You can tell us that later on. I promise the hon. member that I shall listen to him, but what I want to know now is why these people have been allowed to come in to exploit the country and why they should be given a perpetual pension of £480 a year. Another thing

in connection with this matter is that our friends opposite are the party who are always decrying monopolies, who are always saying, "down with monopolies, vote for the referenda and give power to the Federal Parliament so that they may come down on monopolies," and instead of sticking to the working man, these gentlemen who went to the hustings with that hysterical cry and balderdash are fostering and building up one of the greatest monopolies that the State has seen, without any knowledge of their process excepting for the testing of 162 sleepers. The Government have given these people a contract which is a gold mine, made them a present of £8,000 in royalties and a pension of £480 a year. If the Liberal party could do worse than that, then I would say, God help the country.

The Premier: How do you arrive at that?

Mr. GEORGE: I have told you that already.

The Minister for Works: Is there a forestry royalty?

Mr. GEORGE: It is a forest, is it not?

The Minister for Works: I do not know.

Mr. GEORGE: The hon. member does not know, and yet he signed a contract to give away a thing he does not know anything about. Coming to financial questions, the leader of the Opposition who is best able to deal with these things, dealt with them last night, but not as fully as he will do later on. I want to make a complaint against the Government. The estimates last year ran to about 4½ millions of money, a rather large sum for a population of about 300,000 people to provide. I suppose the male workers of this State, and you can put in the capitalists as well if you like, do not number more than 90,000, and there is taxation to be provided which works out close upon £50 per head per annum.

The Premier: You want to go to school again.

Mr. GEORGE: The revenue has to come somehow. Divide that revenue amongst the different men who have to work for their living, and that is how it will come out. It is true that we get ser-

vices. For instance, there is the railway service, we get a little out of the land, and we get some law, but take away salaries and wages, and necessary materials for the railways the amount needed for interest and sinking fund out of the total and there is very little left for additions to the State's improvement. But in order to deal with the Estimates it has been the custom in this Parliament and other Parliaments to present the Auditor General's report to members before the submission of the Estimates. I received the last Auditor General's report about four weeks after the Estimates were passed and this report dealt with most important matters in the Estimates. What is the use of giving us the report after the Estimates have been dealt with? That report should have been given to us last session to enable us to make inquiries in regard to the expenditure proposed, but we did not get it. If it is claimed that previously it has not been brought down any earlier, let the Government try and bring it down earlier in the future so that members may have the opportunity of criticising the expenditure.

**The Premier:** The Auditor General has my concurrence in bringing down the report as soon as he likes. He used to rub you up the wrong way sometimes.

**Mr. GEORGE:** I might say that I had some pleasant skirmishes with the gentleman and I do not think I always got the worst of it. I do not think that I need say any more; I have said all I want to say just now on behalf of myself and of my friends here. We yield to no man, no matter what his political belief, in our faith in this country that we are in.

**Mr. Price:** You say that you want to get out.

**Mr. GEORGE:** I want to get my money so that you chaps shall not have it. Men on this side have been longer in this State and have had more to do with the early pioneering stages than the hon. gentlemen who are sitting opposite. We have borne our part equally as well as they would have done if they had had the opportunity, and we repudiate accusations such as the hon. member for Perth had the courage—I will put it that way—

allied with something else, to utter this evening. Patriotism does not lie alone with one particular party in politics or any one section in religion; it is a part of man's thought, a part of himself. It is that which has built up the British Empire and it is that which will help to build up Australia. Let us build on that and let the other side see that we all have that one thing in unison.

**The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. T. H. Bath):** The hon. member for Murray-Wellington, in spite of the fact that at intervals in the course of his very long and laboured utterances, worked himself up into a fine frenzy, I must say, for the greater part of his remarks, and in view of the imaginative character of them, he is, what Artemus Ward would call, "an amusing cuss." During the whole course of this debate we have heard the most lugubrious wails and melancholy predictions as to the future of this unfortunate State, and one is almost tempted to ask members of the Opposition "why do the heathen rage, and imagine a vain thing?" Then, too, there is inconsistency in all their utterances. Last night we had what might be termed a discordant duet, the leader of the Opposition, probably parodying Kingsley's melancholy song, told us in plaintive voice we should not bring the cattle down from the North, while the member for Kimberley in an equally plaintive voice said we ought to bring the cattle down. Then, during last session the objection of hon. members on the other side of the House was that we had only started one stall. They said, "Why do you not deal in this business on a bigger scale than you are doing? You cannot have any influence with it." This session we hear them complaining bitterly because we have extended the business. We had the member for Northam. in the first part of his speech, declaring that we had not given Agricultural Bank facilities to the settler; and when I very pertinently pointed out how much more we had done, he grudgingly said that was entirely apart from our own volition because we could not prevent it. So we have this mass of contradiction, and it seems to me hopeless to expect from hon. members opposite any connected vein of

criticism. Then we have the member for Kimberley, who I am somewhat surprised to see in his place this evening after his melancholy tale last night. Although what one might term a little man, he worked himself into a big passion last night, and his speech bristled with queries and warnings like a fretful porcupine. I propose to illuminate that hon. member's mind to-night and give him an opportunity of showing in a practical way his alleged sympathy for the small growers of the Kimberley district. When we embarked on the proposal to establish a steamship service for providing transit facilities for the people of the North-West in the same way as we do for other people of the State, and also to take a hand in connection with the meat supply of the big consuming population, we had two objects in view, namely, first and primarily to cheapen the cost of meat to the consumer, and, secondly, so far as in our power lay and so far as we could secure fair co-operation, to provide an outlet for the small growers, an outlet which they themselves complained had been denied to them in the past. Naturally, in undertaking a proposal of that kind we recognised that there were big difficulties to face. The difficulties were so great that they had frightened hon. members opposite for all the years that they occupied place and power in the House. They always talked about doing these things, but at no time did they make any effort to accomplish anything, and they were still talking when a tired public kicked them out through the back door. We felt that even if only in a small way we could demonstrate to the public that the cattle could be brought down and a fair price paid to the grower, if the cattle could be brought down by steamer, retailed at cheaper rates than were ruling in retail establishments—that even if that were only demonstrated on a small scale it ought to be sufficient to prove the contention of this Government, after which it would rest with the public to decide whether they were going to acquiesce in the further continuation of the high prices then ruling. At the outset we were not desirous of competing with the retail traders. If they

had been willing to co-operate there would have been no reason for the intervention of this Government. We sought at the outset to supply them with meat on a wholesale basis, but they refused to buy, and the Government thereupon decided to establish a retail stall. That stall has been successfully conducted and is as strongly supported to-day as when first established. That demonstrated that fact, which was one step in the direction of accomplishing what we sought. We have given retail traders 11 months in which to give a fair deal to the consumer, and, no move having been made, we are extending that retail store and extending the facilities in other large centres of population; and, finding that they are being so greatly appreciated, we propose to still further extend it.

Mr. Green : I hope we will have one at Kalgoorlie pretty soon.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS : And of course, if we still find that our efforts are not being appreciated, or if there is no move on the part of those who ought to move, then the Government, in the interests of the public whose interests we are here to serve, will find it necessary to extend the system still further. Now the contention of the member for Kimberley that the price to the consumer has not been reduced by us is, of course, absolutely absurd. I would like that gentleman to go to the Perth market, or to Subiaco and Fremantle, and to tell that fable to the public who patronise the stalls. I am sure he would be greeted with the universal, unanimous and derisive cry of "rats"! We have, as a matter of fact, reduced the retail price that was previously ruling by between 20 and 33 per cent.

Mr. Male : Nonsense.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS : We have, and the hon. member has only to do as I have done: obtain from the various parts of the metropolitan area details of prices that were charged, and compare them with the prices at the Government stall, when he will find my statement absolutely correct. And, of course, his contention that no reduction was effected is just as incorrect as his

statement of the scale of rates ruling on the State steamers, which I propose to deal with presently. Then we find on the part of the hon. member a newly developed solicitude for the small growers, whom he declares he is willing to help in every way. Our object is to help them, but we cannot force them to utilise the space in our boats.

Mr. Male : You cannot even give it to some who apply for it.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS : And we cannot force them to sell us the cattle at reasonable rates. But if the hon. member is really anxious to help them, and if, apart altogether from any commercial connection which he has, he as the member for Kimberley is willing to go amongst these growers and co-operate with us in securing them space, I can guarantee to him that during the next season space will be available for them and we will only be too glad to give them an opportunity of bringing down stock and having it slaughtered in the Government abattoirs. If he is anxious to help them I invite him to get to work and bring this opportunity under their notice.

Mr. Male : You must be anxious to help them when you buy your stock from outside.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS : Of course it would have suited the hon. gentleman and those of his class if we had not done what he is now complaining of our doing. When we found we were not meeting with that response which we had expected from those we were desirous of helping, we determined that the space should be utilised, and determined also that we would have the cattle available for the consumers here. In accordance with this we purchased these cattle in order that these two objects might be met, purchased them at a satisfactory rate. And let me tell the hon. member that the other party to the agreement would like to terminate it tomorrow if we were willing; and, as a matter of fact, if we can fill our steamers with the cattle which the hon. member says the growers are anxious to send, well, we will fill our steamers with the

cattle of the small growers, because we can dispose of these other cattle on the spot where they are delivered to us. So the hon. member need not worry. The deal is a good one, and it was made in order that we might obtain our supplies and fill the steamer space. We are anxious that the small growers should have the advantage, and when they are willing to come forward and avail themselves of it they will find this Government ready and anxious to assist them. Then the hon. gentleman referred to the fact that we had not brought cattle down during the summer season, and implored us to get the service going throughout the summer. But it is a very risky business and we have to be very wary in connection with any proposal to bring down cattle during the summer. I want to confess that we had one experience which I am not anxious to repeat. As the hon. member knows, one shipment was brought down, and the cattle which were purchased afterwards developed pleuro. So far as that particular shipment was concerned, owing to the fact that our difficulty was hailed with glee by the previous controllers of the trade, and owing to the fact that the retail butchers held aloof, we had to face that difficulty alone, and to meet also the loss consequent upon the discovery of pleuro pneumonia amongst these cattle. I want to point out, further, that the Government dealt with it in the strictest possible fashion. But we were further hampered by the fact that the Sunday newspaper, which had all along professed to be anxious to assist in the proposals for a reduction in the price of meat, joined with our opponents in creating difficulties, and created a scare amongst the public by publishing a faked photograph prepared for the purpose. As soon as the Government had sold these cattle, of course at a sacrifice, the agitation was absolutely dropped, and those who purchased the cattle from us kept them in the same paddock where we were alleged to be starving them, for weeks and weeks after they had purchased them from us.

Mr. A. E. Piesse : Was that loss charged up to the butchering account?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It was charged up to the stock-dealing account, and the hon. member knows that the particulars will be published under the provisions of the Trading Accounts Act. The recommendation also of the hon. member that we should regulate shipments is, of course, a suggestion which may be misinterpreted. I want to point out that it was impossible for us to take the other people in the business into our confidence, seeing that it was very likely that they would attempt to make it warm for us.

Mr. Male: You know exactly what supplies they have.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: But I certainly do agree that it is not advisable to have a big fluctuation in the price of cattle. Therefore, the supply ought to be brought down with some regard to the regular consumption of the southern districts, so that this great fluctuation in price could be avoided, a fluctuation which is not to the advantage of either the producer or the consumer. When we are in a position with our own abattoirs and more complete arrangements as time progresses to accomplish these things it will be possible to regulate the supply in the manner I have indicated, but there should be no regulation with a view to increasing the price to the disadvantage of the consuming public of the State.

Mr. Male: But you want a consistent price.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Then the member for Kimberley launched into financial criticism, and in spite of the aid of the *Statistical Abstract*, he found himself very much at sea. He also echoed the complaint of other hon. members on the Opposition side that the Government were constantly parading the fact that they had rendered assistance to the farmers. Now, what has been said at any time by Ministers has been said in order to correct the inaccurate statements which are so frequently uttered by the member for Northam. Hon. members know the term applied by the member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) to those frequent utterances of the member for Northam, "Mitchellisms." That hon. gentleman

shows as much distaste for facts as a wild Kimberley aboriginal has for clothes, and when, as he so frequently does, he states that we have done nothing for the farmers, and that we have lent no money from the Agricultural Bank, it is necessary that these misstatements and inaccuracies should be corrected. We find the hon. member also doubting our statements in regard to this particular, and I want to point out, in connection with the Speech of His Excellency the Governor, we stated the position as accurately as it could possibly be done, and I do not think there is any hon. member in the House who can deny the truth of the position as stated by us in the utterances placed in the mouth of His Excellency. The Speech read—

During the past year the harvest in the older settled districts was of a very satisfactory character, and resulted in a largely increased production of cereals. In the newer wheat-growing areas, the earlier promise of the winter of 1912 was not fulfilled, and following on the adverse circumstances experienced in 1911, it became necessary to extend further consideration to the settlers in these areas by temporarily relieving them of the whole or portion of the payments due to Government departments.

That is an absolutely accurate statement of fact, but we find the member for Kimberley stating—and his remark was applauded by other hon. members representing agricultural constituencies on the Opposition cross benches—that the farmers did not need his assistance, that so good was the season they were able to pay, and that they ought to have paid. I want to point out the different song sung by hon. members in this House compared with that which they sing in the country and that which they sing to me as Minister for Lands, when they ask me to reduce rents and to remit payments because of the experience of the farmers in their districts; and it is because I have believed the statements which the farmers themselves have submitted to us when making these requests, that we have stood out of revenue to the extent we have, justifying

the Premier is saying that if that revenue were in hand we could show an altogether different financial position. Let me point out what this meant in the way of denying ourselves of revenue. The gross total outstanding at the 30th June was £84,792, less cancellations £14,065, or a nett total outstanding of £70,727.

Mr. Monger: That £70,000 would have wiped off the deficit.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The member for York is always ready to rush in where angels fear to tread. Then, in connection with the Agricultural Bank, apart from the interest due for the half-year ended 30th June, the arrears carried over from the 31st December, 1912, amounted to £24,740. In the Agricultural Department the outstanding accounts are £8,509, and these amounts with the addition of the sum outstanding to the Water Supply Department represent, roughly speaking, from £120,000 to £130,000. That is not all. In spite of the fact that these difficulties were encountered, and that in the districts affected practically all our railway construction was being carried out, we did not waver in our policy of railway construction. We speeded up with railway construction, and whilst hon. members opposite boast of their faith in the country and their patriotism, we gave practical proof of ours by carrying on these works vigorously in spite of the difficulties we had to encounter, so far as our financial administration was concerned. As a matter of fact all the railways under construction, and recently constructed, being in those areas, are showing a loss on their operations, and, in addition to that loss, the fact that there has been increased speed in railway construction has meant that we had to find interest and sinking fund, an increase of £110,000 for the past financial year over that preceding. Then again, we did not waver in the policy of providing educational facilities, even though we were not receiving revenue from those districts. They had their schools constructed and the staffs provided at an increased cost of £40,000. Further than that there was the money spent in the erection of schools, involving another £30,000, also the money found in connec-

tion with the upkeep of the University, and the increased funds which the Government provided for the construction of roads and bridges throughout the agricultural portions of the State. These were evidences of our faith in the country and of faith in its recuperative powers, but they involved an expenditure of money which we could have saved if we had been concerned merely in preventing the deficit, and in squaring the ledger; and when we take into consideration the revenue of which we deprived ourselves, by a policy of faith in the future rather than a policy of over-precaution, revenue which we could have asked Parliament to save for a year or two, even the perception of the member for York (Mr. Monger) will grasp that we could have avoided the deficit, and avoided it with credit to ourselves. Now I come to the leader of the Opposition, and in referring to that hon. gentleman one might well remark, "How have the mighty fallen!" when one finds a gentleman in that responsible position, once Premier and for years a Minister of the Crown, descending to the methods of attack which characterised the speech of so-called criticism by the leader of the Opposition. His inaccuracies, and his distortion of statement, indicate that his controversial methods are characteristic of a tenth-rate attorney. For instance, in regard to railway construction, in attempting to refute our statement that we had increased the rate under the auspices of my colleague the Minister for Works, what does the hon. member quote? The statistics given in the monthly *Statistical Abstract*, and what does that table represent? It is the record of the Railway Department and deals only with those railways taken over by the working railways, but if the hon. member had desired to be fair, or to give a truthful statement of the case he would have remembered that there are two particularly long railways at present under construction, the Merredin-Wickepin and the Wongan Hills-Mullewa, both standard lines, and lines, of course, which, not having been handed over to the working railways, are not included in this record of railway construction. The hon. member must have

known it or one would need to give him credit for a low degree of intelligence, and, knowing it, what do hon. members think of the controversial methods pursued by a gentleman who can use figures in the manner in which the leader of the Opposition did? The details of railway construction show that in 1900 the mileage was 110; in 1910-11 232; in 1911-12 222; and in 1912-13, 256. Then, too, one must take exception to the statement of the leader of the Opposition in regard to the purchase of machinery for the State implement works. In this case again I do not want to accuse the hon. member of a low degree of intelligence, and I am forced to say that, in order to try to point a cheap sneer, and secure a temporary laugh, he deliberately misstated the position. The hon. member put it in this way—"These works have been going for 12 or 15 years, so that hon. members can tell, of course, what kind of second-hand machinery was bought by the manager of the State implement works for erection in Western Australia." But the hon. member knew, because he referred to my statement, that the machinery we purchased is new; some of it was diverted from the Port of Adelaide and the ships unloaded at Fremantle after we purchased it; some of it is lying in the stores at Fremantle now in the boxes in which it was originally placed by the manufacturers in the Old Country and America.

Mr. Allen: Is any of it second-hand?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: We got rid of most of the second-hand stuff.

The Premier: Go and have a look at it.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: As a matter of fact with the material we sold, the patent rights we sold and a low valuation on the bar iron and steel, and new parts such as discs, etcetera, that we purchased, if sold at a low valuation, we could realise the total price we paid for the plant, and have all the machinery necessary for the construction of implements to the good. If the leader of the Opposition or any other member wants to know the facts and wants to deal justly with this matter, I will be very glad to arrange for him to accompany the manager of the State implement works and see

for himself the machinery purchased. As to those works, I wish also to take exception to his insinuation that the selection of a site was due to some undue influence exercised by the Honorary Minister, the member for East Fremantle. When the manager was selected after the most careful perusal of credentials, and a personal interview, and when he came to Western Australia, I stated that it was my desire that the best site should be selected, having in view the cheapest and most economical construction of the implements, and that I did not want him to rush the work, but to take sufficient time to examine all the eligible sites, to go into all the questions and all the information that could be brought to bear, and on that to select a site which would secure the aim I desired, that is, the cheapest construction. The selection was made by the manager of the implement works and concurred in by Cabinet because of the careful survey of the different sites submitted to the manager of the implement factory. Mr. Davies, and the wisdom of the selection of that site is confirmed by the fact that instead of the Works Department erecting new and independent workshops apart from our implement works, the responsible officers concerned have agreed that very great advantage can be secured by amalgamation, and we are now erecting amalgamated workshops, which will carry on the work of implement manufacture and the ordinary engineering work now being carried on at the north side of the harbour under the one roof and under one control, and the site of Rocky Bay will ultimately be the site of these amalgamated workshops.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: Are you adopting Mr. Davies's report right through in regard to distributing depôts as well?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: These are matters which will be dealt with later on. My first concern is to get the main works erected, to get the work of manufacturing implements actually started, and the work is proceeding satisfactorily. This week, the manager tells me, he is having his first steel-casting made. Now that the work of constructing the steel furnace is completed, he will go on with the erection

of the foundry and the other buildings will be proceeded with, and we fully expect to fulfil our promise to have our implements on exhibition at the Royal Show in November next. But this kind of criticism is characteristic of the leader of the Opposition, who poses as a great commercial genius. He has been telling my friend, the Minister for Works, how he ought to run his sawmills, and warning him about the pitfalls that are sure to befall him. He has been telling my friend, the Premier, how to buy steamers; in fact, there is no subject under the sun on which the leader of the Opposition does not claim to be an authority, and yet we all know that his path through life appears to have been strewn with failure.

The Minister for Works: Hear, hear!

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: And so this gentleman who claims to be a prince of commercialism is like a forlorn and shipwrecked brother on the ocean of commercial life and is now indulging in the hope that a favourable wind will waft him into the safe and placid haven of a State Commissionership. Now let me come to our friend, the member for Northam (Hon. J. Mitchell), and make some reference to the wild, wandering harangue of the Sancho Panza who so nobly filled the breach when his worthy chief was evidently unable to toe the mark. It is pitiful to see the way in which the member for Northam still embraces the fond delusion that he is a heaven-born administrator. If there is one thing in the midst of the hon. member's gyrations and his backings and fillings to which he is true, his first and only love, his bed and board companion, it is his colossal vanity. He tells us that while he was Minister for Lands everything in the garden was lovely; selection went on apace, the banks were lending money, and there was nothing but the most beatific conditions prevailing throughout the length and breadth of the State. Now, Sir, I am going to tell hon. members something of the kind of selection that went on while that hon. gentleman was presiding over the destinies of the Lands Department. It is true that there was selection; it is true also that

there are many men reaping a rich harvest from that selection—

Mr. Lander: He did all right.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: But it was a harvest reaped without a stroke of the axe or without putting a hand to plough, reaper, binder, or any other implement. It was the harvest which the benevolent hon. gentleman handed out to those people in the most gracious fashion and enabled them to pluck the pigeons who came so freely in response to their call. The selection was made by those who never intended to go on the land, but who availed themselves of that provision of Section 56 which enabled them to take up land and for two years to hold it without doing a stroke of work upon it. They were right at the Minister's door; it was impossible to go anywhere in the vicinity of the Lands Department without finding these bucket-shop land agents sailing to and fro in the department, waiting for the man who genuinely desired to settle on the land in order to sell him blocks at a premium, and this traffic went gaily on, and no wonder, when they were reaping this harvest by taking the money from those who did want to go on the land. No wonder these agents regarded the member for Northam as a deity, and every day of their lives "thanked their lucky stars that they were littered under Mercury." Then we have the hon. gentleman telling us that at that time the banks were lending money. I want to say that the member for Northam, while Minister for Lands, was responsible for creating many of the difficulties which the present Government have had to encounter. The hon. member spoke in a sneering vein about feather-bed farmers when we mentioned the assistance which the Government have had to render to the farmers, but I say there is more honour in being what the hon. member calls a feather-bed farmer than there is in being a bank-parlour farmer, which the member for Northam has always been. He told these unsuspecting individuals, "You can go on the land without capital, and all you have to do is to tickle the soil with a cultivator, and the sovereigns will fall into your lap," and thus he boomed the land. His officers used to go

out and value the land, and estimate the production of wheat, and the estimate would be gone over more fully by the responsible officers of his department, and after that had been done the then Minister, with his all-seeing providential eye, used to put a few more bushels on the estimate of production and a few more shillings on the price of the land.

Mr. Green: And fake railways.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: In some instances four or five railways were indicated on the plan, when it was obvious that only one could be constructed. No fewer than five routes were marked out in connection with the Wickepin-Merredin line, and this hon. gentleman tells us he was the one who promoted land settlement in Western Australia. Accepting his statement at his own valuation, we had the banks lending money, we have people going away out on the land without the capital, believing his statements that they could do it without capital simply by tickling the soil, as he said, with a cultivator, and then two adverse seasons followed and the cultivator proved to be a very rotten reed indeed to rely upon. Then the other night the member for Northam, in his speech, said that these people would have been all right and would have secured good crops if they had only farmed properly, and he was the one who had told them simply to tickle the soil with a cultivator and they would be all right.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: Professor Lowrie contradicted him pretty effectively.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: As a matter of fact, only the other day, a man in the country whom I know very well, and who has battled hard against adverse circumstances, put the position very plainly and pertinently when he said that the member for Northam could only be cured and could only be made a reasonably useful citizen if he was sent out without capital in a suit of dungarees 20 miles from a railway, where he had to cart water two or three times a week, and after three years of that he would come back a much more chastened and wiser individual than he went out, and that treatment would be the best possible treatment to extend to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Heitmann: He would not be a credit to dungarees.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member told us that he thought it would be advisable to reclassify the land. He finds that there are very few settlers to do him reverence, and he is trying to rehabilitate himself with the farming community of Western Australia. With that end in view, he thinks it will be advisable to reclassify. Let us see what he said when he was Minister for Lands. I will read his minute—

The land is worth 21s. per acre, and must be sold at that price. Reclassification is unnecessary under our present system of survey before selection. Unless applicants can show that the classification is wrong in detail, we should refuse to accept their fees.

Mr. Monger: To what district does that refer?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: To Western Australia. That was accepted as his dictum.

Mr. A. E. Piesse: Values of land have decreased since then.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Immediately following that instead of securing 20 or 25 bushels of wheat, settlers got 10 or 12, and that was off land which he valued at 28s. an acre. In some instances they did not get any crop, but turned their horses into the fields. Naturally his estimates and statements were altogether discounted. I wish to say that I have refused to reclassify on the result of a bad season, but I am certainly not going to say that on an average result these people should not be entitled to have their requests for reclassification considered, and I think it is only reasonable that there should be a general review after this season, if it proves as good as I hope it will be, in the light of this and previous ones, with experienced men having knowledge of the district to go there and see if we are charging too much, and if we are we, as a Government, ought to be prepared to reduce it to a fair thing; and I can speak for myself, and for my colleagues in saying that we will do a fair thing for the settlers of Western Australia. In connection with the Agricultural

Bank there is also, of course, the usual misrepresentation indulged in by the hon. member for Northam. He says we are not doing what we ought to do in connection with the Agricultural Bank. I deny once and for all that we have ever implied, or stated in our legislation, that any man who comes along, even if he has the security, is entitled to the maximum of £2,000. We did not make that Act for one year, but for all time, but the discretion is with the trustees to utilise the funds placed at their disposal to the best possible advantage, and while not interfering with the trustees, I have laid down this general policy, that the first consideration is that the bank should do the work that no other institution will do, that is, take the man on from the virgin condition of the home, and the second consideration is that which I claimed throughout the election campaign should be done, and immediately gave effect to, namely, that the men who were clients of the bank should have an opportunity to secure further accommodation without having to leave the Agricultural Bank, and go to other institutions; and apart from that, that consideration should then be given to those who wished to come from other institutions to the Agricultural Bank. And so far as the funds would permit it that policy has been carried out, and this year we have transferred liabilities to the Agricultural Bank from private institutions, chartered banks, merchants, and others, to the tune of, I think, £250,000. Let me give a comparison of the results of the bank's transactions during different periods, Liberal *versus* Labour. First let me deal with three years when the Liberals were in power. During the financial year 1908-9 the total advances amounted to £261,077, and the net amount of the advances, after deducting repayments for the year, was £225,037. In 1909-10 the total advances aggregated £252,407, and the net amount of advances, after deducting repayment for the year, was £100,719. In 1910-11 the total advances were £283,159, and the net amount of advances, after deducting repayments for the year, were £365,608.

Mr. A. E. Piesse: Were those approvals?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Those are the actual advances. Now let us see what has been done under Labour administration. In 1911-12 the total advances amounted to £405,942, and the net amount of advances, after deducting repayments for the year, came to £303,919. In 1912-13 the total advances aggregated £636,723, and the net amount of advances, after deducting repayments for the year, to £603,196; total advances £1,042,665; total net amount of advances, after deducting repayments, £907,115.

Mr. A. E. Piesse: In your figures for the Labour administration are you not including a good many of those advances approved in the previous year?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No, that is the money found. After deducting the amount of repayments in order to show the amounts which the respective Governments had to find to finance the Agricultural Bank, it is seen that the Liberal Government found a net amount of £365,608 in three years, and average of £121,869 per year; whereas the Labour Government have found a net amount of £907,115 in two years, or an average of £453,557 per year. In regard to Avondale I wish to say that I have not declined to accept selection on right lines on that estate; what I do object to was the fact that although this estate was repurchased for closer settlement there was a desire on the part of some individuals to secure too large quantities of it. There are several purposes for which Avondale may have to be used. It is certain that there needs to be an agricultural college in Western Australia, and we hope during this current financial year to have 12,000 bushels of pure seed wheat to supply to the farmers in small quantities, and it may be necessary, in order to further this scheme, that we should use Avondale to grow this pure seed wheat. I think hon. members pretty well recognise that the boastful member for Northam is about a burst bubble in Western Australia, and that he has just about reached his proper level and congenial sphere by his feat of memory which landed Ockerby, Lehmann & Co. to the tune of £300.

Mr. Monger: That is rot, dirty rot.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I ask the member for York would he do it? I say it is out of this atmosphere that we get the dark and murky insinuations that characterised the speech of the hon. member for Northam the other night. I wish to say this in connection with the Opposition, and more particularly, the occupants of the front bench, the leaders—the co-leaders—the deputy leaders—and the leaderettes; these one time optimists have developed into the greatest calamity howlers and disgruntled individuals that this State possesses throughout its whole length and breadth—that if they were scientifically classified in their proper class they would be classed as a loose array of incongruous atoms with no force or motive power for good either now or in the future, and with less capacity to harm, injure, or delay this Government in its progressive scheme of administration and legislation for the development and progress of this State of Western Australia.

Mr. A. E. PIESSE (Katanning): moved—

*That the debate be adjourned.*

Mr. MONGER: I second the motion. Motion negatived.

Mr. HARPER (Pingelly): In speaking on the Address-in-reply to the Speech delivered by His Excellency, Sir Harry Barron, the Governor of this State, I may say that I was present on the occasion when it was read, and I came to the conclusion that it was a very dull and uninteresting speech. That was not the fault of the Governor, but the fault of the material which was placed at his disposal by the present Government. I do not want to indulge in anything in the way of personalities, and I have never done so. I always take exception to the introduction of personal matters that are beside the questions before the House. I do not care what brand the Government may be, so long as this State advances and progresses, but I do take a great deal of exception to some of the remarks made by some speakers on the Government side of this House. For instance, the hon. member for

Perth classed us all as having sordid opinions about the Government.

Mr. Dwyer: So you have.

Mr. HARPER: Nothing of the kind; we do not cast innuendoes or dishonest motives upon the Government, but we say they have not shown the administrative ability which they themselves expected. I feel certain that they are not the success that they anticipated they would be. I pointed out, when I first addressed this House on the policy then enunciated, that I considered if they did half of what they said they would do, they would do well. I do not perhaps think the same as my friends opposite think, but I say that two luxuries which the State of Western Australia cannot stand are a Labour Government and our Federation with the Eastern States. Those two luxuries are too expensive, and are making this a very difficult State to govern. The members of the Government, and those supporting them, are practically responsible for us having entered into Federation on the unfair terms we did. I have no personal animosity against the members occupying the Treasury bench, but there are some Ministers in the Government who if properly elected might become careful administrators, but I say that their system of election is wrong. The system they are elected under is that of the Trades and Labour Council, and they are elected and dominated by unionists in the State. There are some 25,000 trades unionists in Western Australia and I notice that within the last year or two they have rapidly increased, but I want to say there are many members belonging to trades unions who are coerced into these unions and they are not free. They have never volunteered to join, but for the sake of peace they have done so.

Mr. Foley: Your side voted for them last session.

Mr. HARPER: Some of the Ministers are quite capable of carrying out their duties, and I think the Minister for Works if he had his way, that is to say, if he were free and untrammelled by caucus and trades and labour councils,

would show that he was a very capable man. But there is the mock parliament which exists and which met in congress at Fremantle the other day, and I understand the Minister advocated there that he should have the power to either call tenders for the carrying out of public works or to let them departmentally. Personally I do not care whether the works are carried out departmentally or by contract so long as they are carried out economically, and so long as the State gets good value for the money spent. I think that would only be a fair proposition for the Labour Congress to accede to.

Mr. Heitmann: Is that not the Minister's privilege now?

Mr. HARPER: There are no contracts of any importance let at the present time, and hon. members know that the Trades and Labour Council are opposed to contract work. Last year in this House the present Government tried to abolish contracts. I repeat, if the Minister for Works were free and untrammelled from labour conditions such as exist at the present time, he no doubt would be a very capable man to carry out the work entrusted to him.

Mr. Dwyer: A pity he is not here to hear you throw bouquets at him.

Mr. HARPER: I do not want to flatter him, because I know there are other members in the Cabinet who would do equally as well if they were free from the Labour Congress. I would like to refer to what was said by Dr. White, one of the directors of Millars' Trading Company, and which was published in yesterday's paper. This was to the effect that there was an increasing deficiency of labour in Western Australia. Everyone knows that labour in Western Australia in the last few years has been inferior, and that value has not been given for the money which has been paid. We know that to be an absolute fact.

Mr. Foley: Nonsense.

Mr. HARPER: Take the building trade. Mr. Lakey erected Forrest and Emanuel's building a few years ago and the laying of bricks per thousand

cost at that time 22s. 6d. Not long ago, the cost of similar work was £3 2s. 6d.

Mr. Heitmann: That does not include the cost of bricks.

Mr. HARPER: It includes the laying of bricks, hod carrying and the laying of mortar.

Mr. Green: It cost nothing of the kind; it shows you know nothing about building when you say that.

Mr. HARPER: I know that three years ago a house could have been erected for £500, and the cost to-day to erect a house from the same plans and specifications would be £830, an increase of 30 per cent. In regard to workmen's cottages, we in this State are rushing along building them and at a time too when there is a great dearth of labour and when material is expensive. This is a wrong time to build these houses; we are buying in the dearest market and selling in the cheapest. There is no necessity to rush on with this work at the present time. The country districts are suffering by the carrying out of these works in the State; they are suffering from the want of railways which should be built, and the Premier knows that full well, for he himself about two years ago promised that the railway from Brookton to Kunjin should be built and he told the people that they could reasonably expect the railway for the next harvest.

The Premier: I never made any reference to that railway.

Mr. HARPER: A deputation waited on the Premier in his office in the absence of the Minister for Works.

The Premier: You know well the cause of the delay in the first instance.

Mr. HARPER: But there is no reason why it should be delayed now.

The Premier: It is not being delayed now.

Mr. HARPER: There is no work being done there now. I want to point out that there are a large number of people unemployed there and some of them are destitute. These people are waiting for the construction of that line to be put in hand, and I think it would be a fair thing to put it in hand without delay.

Mr. Heitmann: How many people are out of work at Brookton?

Mr. HARPER: About one hundred.

Mr. Heitmann: I do not believe you; there are not so many people in the town.

Mr. HARPER: The hon. member knows nothing about it. He can refer to the engineer in charge of the work who will bear out what I say. That brings me to the point that agricultural labour is cheaper than it was three years ago. For instance, clearing cost 5s. an acre more three years ago than it does to-day, so that the Labour Government has had some effect in assisting us in that direction.

Mr. Green: I suppose you promptly reduced the price.

Mr. HARPER: I let the work by contract at the amount which was put in. With regard to the increased wages which were given to the railway employees, I think the Government did a wrong thing. The amount of £107,000 which was given in this direction is huge for a small State like this to bear at one fell swoop.

Mr. Lewis: Are the men not worth it?

Mr. HARPER: I noticed in the State of Victoria which has five times our population the increase of £70,000 which it was proposed to distribute amongst railway employees was looked upon there as being very large.

Mr. Heitmann: But there is not a Labour Government there.

Mr. HARPER: The Press made a great song about it. The greatest fault I find in this regard is that, according to the Commissioner of Railways, there is no appreciative improvement in the class or the quantity of work of the railway employees.

Mr. Lewis: That is an old conservative gag.

Mr. HARPER: That is a serious matter for the State, because the £107,000 which the increase represents is an imposition which the farmers and the producers of the State will have to pay. I am a keen supporter and a strong advocate of the farming industry and also of the mining industry, but I am

certain this Government stands for the employees of the goldfields. The Government have shown good judgment in their reappointment of Sir Newton Moore to the position of Agent General. That is one thing that redounds to their credit. The Premier is cute enough to know that there is no one in Western Australia or out of it who could borrow money as successfully, or who knows the ropes so well as Sir Newton Moore, and he knows full well too that the existence of his Government and the welfare of the State at the present time depend very largely on borrowed money. I want to mention the fact also that we have heard a great deal about the banking institutions and the "St. George's-terrace push" as they have been termed by members of the Government and their supporters, and the withdrawal of support from farmers. We know that two or three years ago land values in the State were in an inflated condition. Land was more popular and everyone expected a great deal more from the land at that time than we find is the case to-day, and the banks like everyone else, when they see the farmer is making progress and can pay his way, will assist him, but when he cannot he will soon know of it. On inquiry I find that the banks in this State have lent £2,100,000 more than they have deposits in this State and that means that they have exceeded their deposits by that amount, and therefore there is no support given to this argument that because the Labour party is in power the financial institutions have withdrawn their support.

Mr. Heitmann: The member for Northam (Mr. Mitchell) made that assertion.

Mr. HARPER: Well, I am not seeing eye to eye in all things with every member of our party. There are one or two things which I disapprove of, for instance the purchase of the trams. I say the purchase was made at the wrong time. Another thing was that the Government made a very bad deal, inasmuch as they gave the shareholders in London £200,000 more than the tramways were worth, for they could

have bought the shares for half the price prior to entering on the negotiations. What I protest so strongly against is the fact that we are on the wrong track in respect to our Labour politics. I think the Liberal party should be democratic enough for the electors, and when we have the Trades Hall endeavouring to coerce all the workers into unions, there to contribute to the Trades Hall funds and assist them against the rest of the community, I think the public of Western Australia should have sufficient good sense to oppose it, for it means that the trades unionists are practically at war with the rest of the community. They want to have advantages that other people are not to have; they want a short cut to exclusive advantages which should be for all.

The Premier: Any man can go out and work for 9s. a day.

Mr. HARPER: It is not a matter of 9s. a day, but of the worker earning his money. Another bad system is that all men are paid alike. That is one of the great weaknesses of departmental construction of public works, and is an encouragement for the good workman to fall back to the level of of his inferior comrade. The Esperance railway has been before the public of Western Australia for the last 15 years. I lived on the goldfields before the Esperance railway was ever thought of.

Mr. Heitmann: To the sorrow of the fields.

Mr. McDowall: But to his own benefit.

Mr. HARPER: That railway has been the bugbear of Western Australia.

The Premier: So has the Golden Pole.

Mr. HARPER: I will tell you all about the Golden Pole later on. That railway has had many different colours flying. First of all it was a railway for the benefit of the goldfields; then it was a railway for sanatorium purposes, to take the people from the fields to the coast; and now it is an agricultural railway. That is the latest. However, I think it is a railway for the benefit of the supporters of the *Kalgoorlie Miner*. Mr. Kirwan is the man that

railway is specially for, and it should be named the Kirwan railway. There are other railways in the State which require to be built before that one. We badly want a railway from Armadale to the Great Southern. It would shorten the route and its benefits would be felt from York to Albany, and enjoyed by every farmer in the country. When we get people on the land we require to induce them to stay there; we should regard them as the apple of our eye, and encourage them in every possible way, because it is to the farming industry that we must look for the permanency of the progress of the State. It is not only now that I have come to that conclusion, for I have had those convictions firmly impressed on my mind for the last 15 years. I have absolute proof that I held those convictions long before I left the fields, for I invested my money in Perth because of my faith in the agricultural districts.

Mr. Heitmann: You only thought of that since you fouled your nest.

Mr. HARPER: I ask the hon. member to withdraw that, because he it is who would be the first to do that sort of thing. However, that is the reason why we require that railway, namely, because it will certainly benefit the whole of the Eastern and South-Western districts of the State. It will shorten the distance by some 40 miles, and will do a great deal of good, cheapening the cost of bringing wheat from the agricultural districts by a penny a bushel. We require to keep the people on the land and to encourage them, rather than exploit new experimental areas which we do not know very much about. The Esperance line is purely an experimental railway, and there are too many such in Western Australia, as, for instance the Coolgardie-Norseman, the Sandstone line, and the Marble Bar railway.

The Premier: And the Bullfinch.

Mr. HARPER: The Bullfinch railway is not so much a failure as those I have mentioned, because I believe the Bullfinch mine will warrant the construction of that line. Now I do not intend to say much more, but I desire to refer

to some remarks made last session. by the member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Green). When speaking on the mining industry on the 12th December of last year, he referred to the sampling of mines by the Government and said—

I might mention; for instance, that a repetition of what occurred at the Golden Pole at Davyhurst would cease under a Labour Government's administration. Under this it would not be possible for a repetition of the Golden Pole swindle, in which the manager of that mine sent out an optimistic report when he knew that a fault had cut off the lode.

Mr. Green: Hear, hear.

Mr. HARPER: I would ask the member for Kalgoorlie to whom was he referring. I defy him to bring a tittle of evidence showing that there was anything of the kind sent out by me as the manager of that mine.

Mr. Green: Are you prepared to make that statement in Davyhurst?

Mr. HARPER: In Davyhurst or anywhere else.

Mr. Green: I challenge the hon. member to make the statement in Davyhurst. He would be lynched.

Mr. HARPER: It is not worth my while to go to Davyhurst merely to make that statement, but I challenge the hon. member to repeat his statement outside. Then the hon. member went on to say—

What I wanted to point out was that under this system, whereby the State Mining Engineer will be able to enter and inspect and sample a mine; if it had been possible for this officer to sample the Golden Pole, a swindle such as that which I have mentioned would not have happened.

I want to say the most optimistic report ever made on that mine was made by myself when I said that there were 60,000 ounces of gold in the mine, 30,000 tons of 2oz. ore. That report was more than borne out, for 75,000 ounces of gold was won. Unfortunately the Golden Pole was one of those mines which did not go much below the 300ft. level.

Mr. Green: Why did you not explain all this in London? They were asking for it.

Mr. HARPER: They never asked me a question about it. That mine, right through its career, was honestly and squarely and fairly worked.

Mr. Green: To the advantage of the manager.

Mr. HARPER: I ask that that statement be withdrawn. This is a serious matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not yet know whether it is a statement that should be withdrawn. If the member for Kalgoorlie is making a reflection inferring that the mine was worked to the advantage of the manager, and the disadvantage of the shareholders, then, of course, it must be withdrawn. If the member for Kalgoorlie infers that the mine was worked to the advantage of the manager and the disadvantage of the shareholders it is wrong; but he has not made that statement.

Mr. HARPER: It is a very serious matter to me. It has been bruited far and wide, and circulated in the Press, and has done me incalculable injury. If there is any member of the House who can say one word against what I have done I would like him to speak out.

Mr. Heitmann: The hon. member referred to the management of the mine, not to you.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member can make his position clear by giving the facts as he knows them himself.

Mr. Heitmann: That would not do.

Mr. George: I notice that Green went white.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the member for Kalgoorlie makes a reflection I will ask him to withdraw.

Mr. HARPER: I can assure you it is a reflection.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the member for Kalgoorlie if he intended the remark to be a reflection on the honesty or integrity of the member for Pingelly.

Mr. Green: No; I meant precisely what I said and no more. If any hon. member has a guilty conscience—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I do not want that explanation. I want yes or no as to whether the member for Kalgoorlie intended to reflect on the honour or integrity of the member for Pingelly. Yes or no. No explanation.

Mr. Green: I had no such intention.

Mr. HARPER: I am satisfied.

Mr. Heitmann: The shareholders are not satisfied.

Mr. HARPER: They are perfectly satisfied. Of course, they are never satisfied when they buy shares which happen to do down.

Mr. Heitmann: And when the bottom is out of the mine when they buy them.

Mr. HARPER: There was no bottom out of the mine.

Mr. Heitmann: Of course there was, and you know it.

Mr. HARPER: I do not know it. The mine petered out below the 300-foot level as many other mines have done. That happened with the Lady Shenton at Menzies, and with the Cosmopolitan at Niagara, and in hundreds of cases.

Mr. Heitmann: Is it not a fact that the management were selling the shares when they were rising?

Mr. HARPER: I sold some at 4s., some at 12s., and some at 25s., to Lionel Robinson and Co. They took 25,000 on option, and after having the mine sampled bought 20,000, some at 22s. 6d., and some at 25s. That is a business transaction that has nothing of a derogatory character to any of the directors or myself. There was something a bit wrong when some of the old directors handed over the staff to the new concern, and the latter thought they would change the staff, and so made the position much worse for themselves. Reverting to the debate last year the Minister for Mines interjected—

“And the person who made so much money out of the Golden Pole might have been imprisoned if the mine had been sampled by the Government.”

I wrote to the Minister asking to whom he referred in that case, and I received no reply, so I would like to ask the Minister for Mines now whom he meant on that

occasion. It is unfair to make these remarks unless one has proof of them, and if anyone has proof I would like him to come out. Throughout the career of the Golden Pole it was honestly and squarely managed by every manager, not only by myself but by every other manager as far as I know, and no exaggerated statements were made with the object of boosting the shares. I hope this matter will be cleared up now and finished with, and I again ask the Minister whom he referred to. If he referred to me and made the remark carelessly, and is ready to apologise, I will be satisfied, but I will not be satisfied with anything else.

Mr. Heitmann: You got the sack for sleeping in a “cousin Jack” barrow.

On motion by Mr. A. E. Piesse debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 10.15 p.m.*

## Legislative Council,

*Tuesday, 5th August, 1913.*

	Page
Ministerial statement, Food and Drugs regulations	223
Questions: Workers' Homes, Eastern Goldfields	224
Secondary school, Eastern Goldfields	224
Secondary and Technical school fees	225
Leave of absence	225
Address-in-reply, fifth day	225

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

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT—FOOD AND DRUGS REGULATIONS.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew): I promised the House at its last sitting that I would to-day make a statement as to the Government's intentions in regard to the Food and Drugs Regulations, concerning which the Hon.