

has so wrecked our timber areas in the years that have gone. Such an administration must and will justify its existence in a very short time. The least, if I may say so, important result but one which probably will have the strongest influence with the majority of people will show itself first of all, and that is in the income derived from the forests. Then will follow the better utilisation of our timbers and the initiation of wood working industries. Finally as the working plans come into force and forests are improved the permanent mill sight with its permanent village of timber workers will take the place of the shifting fallers' camp, and the deserted mill cottages of to-day. The department under the Minister of the Crown, who for the time being administers the Act, will have charge of all matters of policy and all matters connected with the forests, their proper utilisation and their sylvicultural treatment. The permanent head—the Conservator of Forests—will be removed so far as it is possible to remove him from political control, from political influence. He will be appointed for a term of seven years and will have the powers of a commissioner, and will have the whole administration of the forest policy in his hands. His staff will consist of men who have been trained in the science of forestry and who have gained their experience in every sphere of the practical work of the forester, sowing the seed, thinning the crop, protecting it from its many enemies and marking the felling sections for the mill. Power is taken to enable the conservator to establish training schools for his foresters and to take youths as apprentices to learn the art and craft of the foresters' profession. And it will be for him to build up his department from the magnificent material that this State possesses in its strong young men, so that the main principles of the forest policy will be established, maintained and carried through in perpetuity, I hope, by West Australians in our own country. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion of Mr. O'Loghlen debate adjourned.

PERENJORI HOTEL LICENSE.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [9.5]: On Thursday of last week the Honorary Minister for Lands, I understand, promised to call for a report from the Under Secretary for Lands about the Perenjori application for license. I understand it was his intention to make a statement to the House to-night. I shall be glad to know if the Minister intends to make that statement now or will give any statement to the House regarding it.

Mr. SPEAKER: With the permission of the House the Honorary Minister may make a statement.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister—Nelson) [9.6]: The facts are these: On 2nd September, that is, after the sale of this block by public auction, Mr. E. B. Johnston and Mr. Connor called to see the Under Secretary for Lands with regard to the Perenjori Lot 9. The Under Secretary knew the

block had been sold to Messrs. Johnston and Connor and believed that Mr. E. B. Johnston was either one of the purchasers or the agent for one of them. He told Messrs. Johnston and Connor that he would advise the Commissioner of Police of the conditions of the sale. After Messrs. Johnston and Connor left, the Under Secretary, as he had not the file before him, and as several other callers were waiting, asked Mr. Morris to get the file and write to the Commissioner of Police giving the conditions under which the land was sold in order that the Commissioner could, if he thought fit, communicate with the inspector in charge of the district. Mr. Morris did not see Messrs. Johnston and Connor and in sending the letter to the Commissioner of Police acted on the instructions of the Under Secretary for Lands. As I stated on Thursday last when speaking in the Assembly, this letter was sent without my knowledge; had I sighted the letter it would not have been sent. I was not aware that any departmental officer had been approached by anyone; no one either in the department or outside mentioned the matter to me in any shape or form. The first knowledge I had that such a letter had been written was eight days afterwards when the file came before me on my calling for it. There is no danger of a recurrence as I have expressed my views very strongly on the matter.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [9.8]: I wish to ask the Honorary Minister whether he will attach any further papers in connection with the matter to the file now on the Table; any reports by Mr. King or Mr. Morris or any papers that passed between the Minister and himself on the matter. Will he attach them to the file to-morrow?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister—Nelson) [9.9]: I have no objection; I have the papers here.

House adjourned at 9.10 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 18th September, 1918.

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

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

QUESTION—PERENJORI HOTEL LICENSE.

Hon. P. COLLIER (without notice) asked the Premier: Will he lay on the Table the Police Department file dealing with the application for the Perenjori hotel license?

The PREMIER replied: I shall be pleased to see that all papers connected with the matter are laid on the Table of the House. I desire that every publicity shall be given to the matter.

QUESTION—KULIN HOTEL LICENSE.

Hon. P. COLLIER (without notice) asked the Premier: Will he lay on the Table all papers connected with the application for an hotel license in the Kulin district, concerning which matter questions were answered yesterday?

The PREMIER replied: Certainly. If the hon. member and the House are anxious to know all particulars of the matter, the papers will be laid on the Table.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

1, Coal Mines Regulation Amendment.

Introduced by the Minister for Mines.

2, Preston Road District Soldiers' Memorial.

Introduced by Mr. Pickering.

MOTION—VERMIN BILL.

Restoration of Measure.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister—Nelson) [442]: I move—

That a Message be forwarded to the Legislative Council, in the terms of Standing Order No. 419, requesting that the consideration of a Bill for "An Act relating to Vermin Fencing, and the Destruction of Vermin, and for other purposes incidental thereto" be resumed.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [443]: I do not quite recall the full circumstances as to this Bill, whether it was in the possession of this House, or of another place, when it lapsed.

The Premier: It was in another place.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The Bill, I think, had passed through this House, and was being dealt with in another place, and lapsed there.

The Premier: It lapsed owing to the close of the session.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Is it permissible under Standing Order 419 for a Minister in this House to move for the restoration of the measure? Paragraph (a) of the Standing Order reads—

If the Bill be in the possession of the House in which it originated, not having been sent to the other House, or, if sent, then returned by Message, it may be proceeded with by resolution of the House in which it is, restoring it to the Notice Paper. Under that paragraph it seems necessary for this motion to be moved in another place.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister—Nelson—in explanation) [444]: The leader of the Opposition read paragraph (a) of Standing Order 419; but paragraph (b) gives the necessary power—

If the Bill be in the possession of the House in which it did not originate, it may be proceeded with by resolution of the House in which it is, restoring it to the Notice Paper; but such resolution shall not

be passed unless a Message be received from the House in which it originated, requesting that its consideration be resumed.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I am satisfied.

Hon. T. WALKER (Kanowna) [445]: I did not agree with that Bill when it left here, and we should not proceed further with it. What we want is a measure that will meet the requirements of the hour, not a Bill which will continue the disaster which is affecting all the agricultural districts. The Bill as it stands does not make provision in any sense for meeting present emergencies. I therefore suggest that it should be dropped and that a new one should be framed; it would be wiser to do that and commence de novo. There is no need to labour the subject; my suggestion must commend itself to hon. members. If we allow the existing Bill to pass, our hope of immediately coping with the pest is gone. The Bill as it stands will bind our hands and not only that, it will create a burden which will be too grievous to be borne.

Mr. Stubbs: Could we not amend it?

Hon. T. WALKER: It is based on wrong principles. A Bill to deal with the pest must start on a national basis. It is the nation's business, not the business of the settlers on the land to deal with the pest. The matter is too formidable to be dealt with in the haphazard way which we have hitherto done. We should act wisely by dropping the measure and substituting one more up to date and more national in its character.

Hon. J. MITCHELL (Northam) [448]: This is an urgent matter, and there is very little time to prepare another Bill. I agree that the measure under discussion is far from being a perfect one. My objection to it when we were dealing with it was that it did not commit the Government to any expenditure, and the Government were not willing to say definitely the nature of the assistance they were prepared to give towards the destruction of the pest which has been rightly called a national menace. It should be possible for Ministers to say what they will do in addition to what this measure will compel other people to do. It is of the utmost importance that we should get to work as soon as the winter rains cease, which will be in about six weeks' time. There is no doubt the proposed boards will cause considerable trouble, and under the Bill we will set up a number of charges against farmers under which those unfortunate people will squirm. I am agreeable to the motion being passed provided the Government state definitely what they propose to do.

Hon. T. Walker: We must have it in the Bill.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Bill could be recast, but I do not think we could get a new Bill through in time. Each year we have missed the season, and we have spent much money without any good being achieved. I hope there will not be a repetition of that. I am disappointed that the Government will not say exactly what they propose to do.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott (Honorary Minister): Give us a chance.

Hon. T. Walker: We have given you too many chances.

Mr. STUBBS (Wagin) [4.52]: The point raised by the member for Kanowna appeals to me, for the reason that during the past few weeks the rabbit pest on the western side of the No. 2 fence has become a considerable menace to the agricultural community, and, as that community will in the future play a very important part in the financial stability of the State, the Government have a clear duty to perform. The average mind has not realised the seriousness of the danger. The member for Kanowna is right in saying that the Bill dealt with last session is not perfect, but the question is how long would it take to prepare a Bill which would deal with the matter from a national standpoint?

Hon. T. Walker: It could be done in a week.

Mr. STUBBS: Then I would welcome such a new Bill, and I trust the Government will do their utmost to assist the community in that direction. It is the duty of the Government to spend money to cope with the pest, and whatever is done will be in the interests of the State and more particularly in the interests of the securities of the Agricultural Bank, which are in serious danger on account of the rapid manner in which the pest has spread.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Williams-Narrogin) [4.55]: All agricultural members hope and expect the Government to do far more to cope with the rabbit pest than it appears to us they are willing to do under the measure which we passed last session. If we are going to deal with the pest at all and prevent rabbits from overrunning the whole of the south-western portion of the State, it is essential that the Crown should take some responsibility for clearing the rabbits from Crown lands, from reserves, and from abandoned farms in the possession of the Agricultural Bank, a responsibility similar to that thrust upon private land holders. This matter has engaged the attention of the Government, and I think I have seen a Ministerial statement to the effect that the Government intend to do more towards coping with the rabbit pest than they have done in the past. In my electorate there is one Government rabbit cart at work, and hon. members will agree that one such vehicle is practically useless in such a big district.

Mr. Maley: How many are being used by the settlers?

Mr. JOHNSTON: I should say eight or ten in that locality. But in the districts where the rabbits are very thick the greater portion of the land is owned by the Crown, and my heart goes out to those settlers who are poisoning a day or two in each week whilst nothing is done on the vacant Crown lands or abandoned farms where the rabbits multiply. The efforts of the settlers at the present time resemble the action of a man attempting to stem the tide with a broom. Unless the pest is dealt with on Crown lands, and particularly on the abandoned selections, whatever might be done by the settlers closer in will prove valueless. Before we agree to the motion we are entitled to a statement of the Government's intentions. I desire to assist the Government to enable them to cope with the pest, but I would like an assurance that the matter will be taken up in real earnest, and that the

burden will not be thrown on the shoulders of the new settlers between the two fences. This should be a national work, and all settlers, even those who are not at the present time troubled by the pest, should be asked to contribute pro rata towards exterminating the rabbits. I hope the Government will make a definite statement with regard to this matter.

Mr. MALEY (Greenough) [4.58]: I would like to know whether we are ever likely to reach finality in regard to this matter. Last session a Rabbit Bill and a Vermin Bill were introduced, and at the wish of the House both were rejected and a select committee appointed to draft a Bill to consolidate both. That Bill was passed by this House after a long debate, and it is now in the hands of the Legislative Council. It is competent for hon. members in another place to move amendments to that measure, and I am sure if they are approached they will do so. The matter is absolutely urgent, and it should be finalised as quickly as possible.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [5.0]: Fortunately the measure under discussion is not a Government one, and therefore we on this side of the House can speak without being accused of opposing the Government. The Bill was the result of the work of a select committee appointed by members of this Chamber. I took an active interest in this Bill last session, but I considered that the provisions of it were such as to throw too great a responsibility on the farmer. On the various reserves and Government lands throughout the State nothing was done to destroy the vermin which was overflowing on to the adjoining farms. Unfortunately, we got very little support from representatives of the farmers. Since then deputations have waited on the Minister, and, if my memory serves me aright, the Government have agreed to assist the farmers by an endeavour to destroy the vermin on the various reserves and Crown lands. If that is so, why can we not have it definitely set out in the legislation? I agree with my colleague that it would take at most only a week to deal with a new Bill, which will not be a party measure nor even a Government measure. The member for Greenough (Mr. Maley) last session endeavoured to have amendments made to the Bill, and what has since taken place distinctly shows the necessity for amending that Bill. I certainly think the Government should introduce a new Bill right away and have it put through. This course would actually save time, for, as I have said, the passage of the Bill would not occupy more than a week. What has taken place since the Bill was before us might induce hon. members to amend the measure. But a point to be remembered is that we in this House have no power to amend any clause in the Bill of last session except such clauses as may be amended by the Legislative Council. In other words, if the Legislative Council does not amend the Bill, we shall not be able to deal with it at all when it comes back to us. I hope the Government will re-introduce the Bill in this House.

Mr. PICKERING (Sussex) [5.4]: In view of the very urgent business confronting the House, I think that if we can get an assurance from the Minister that the Bill shall be

amended in the other House, we should agree to that course. When the Bill was before us I expressed a desire that it should take the broadest possible national view of the question. I then said that although the roads boards in my district were not vitally interested in the question, yet in view of the menace they would be prepared to fall into line with other boards. I trust the Minister will give effect to the wishes of the House.

Mr. HICKMOTT (Pingelly) [5.5]: The Bill has been discussed for over six months, and this is the third attempt to get it passed. We have complaints every day from settlers in the rabbit-infested areas declaring that it is the apathy of other settlers, who are not compelled to eradicate rabbits, which is causing all the trouble. We know that if something definite is not done the question of getting the Bill on the statute-book will be again hung up. The Bill should be dealt with straightway and should be passed, so as to make it compulsory on all persons to take a part in eradicating the pest. Settlers in my district have asked me to endeavour to make arrangements for a supply of wire netting, even at its present high cost, so anxious are they to check the destruction caused by the rabbits. They say that if the Bill was passed and it became compulsory on all land holders to deal with the pest, something might be done, but that until all are compelled to share in the work it is an impossible task. If it is desired not to go on with the Bill of last session, I urge the Government to immediately bring forward another measure framed on broader lines. I hope something will be done at once. I was present when a deputation told the Premier that everybody in the southern portion of the State should bear a share of the cost of eradicating the rabbits now advancing towards the southern districts. That question was not dealt with in the Bill which passed this House. I hope something will be done immediately, because time is the essence of the contract.

Mr. HARRISON (Avon) [5.7]: Long ago I drew the attention of the House to the necessity for coping with the rabbit pest. It appears to me it would be better for members on this side to support the Government by agreeing to the motion. Even if we get a new Bill down and pass it, and get it into operation, we are bound to find it is not a perfect measure. Let us get to work on the present Bill, and if when it is passed and put into operation it is found to be unworkable, and if the Minister does not keep his promise to destroy the pest on Crown lands, then let us deal with the Minister. As time goes on the pest in its various locations will alter materially and the Bill will require amending to meet the altered conditions. Certainly if a new Bill is brought down it will not be a perfect measure; some amendment is bound to be required in any Bill brought down. In my view we should get the present Bill enacted so that something might be done.

Mr. LAMBERT (Coolgardie) [5.9]: As a member of the select committee which consolidated the two Bills I was very much impressed with the importance of dealing with the rabbit pest. I think the Government should take the gravest possible view of the menace

to the farmers, particularly those in the eastern belt, and do something immediately. As was suggested by the member for Avon (Mr. Harrison), if the Bill is restored in the Council and passed and afterwards found to be imperfect, it can be amended. A serious attempt was made by the member for Toodyay (Mr. Piesse), the member for York (Mr. Griffiths), and others having an intimate knowledge of the question, to frame a Bill that would be once acceptable and workable. I think members will be well advised to support the Honorary Minister in his desire.

Hon. T. Walker: Are you running a poison factory?

Mr. LAMBERT: No, I am not, but I would like the Minister to tell us whether it is possible to secure the necessary poison. The chief inspector of rabbits told the select committee that he could give them no assurance that the necessary poison would be available. He said that an order for 50,000 cases had been placed but that he could not get from Elder, Shenton the people handling the stuff, any promise that the order would be filled.

Mr. Green: Is there no possibility of getting the poison manufactured locally?

Mr. LAMBERT: Long ago the Government should have told some of their officers with the necessary scientific knowledge to go and manufacture this poison instead of theorising about still whisky and other rubbish. I think it became the chief chemist of our Analytical Department to mislead the committee which investigated the matter. I do not know whether the misleading was intentional, but the information which that officer gave to the select committee was certainly misleading, as all events to a layman. I am referring to Mr. Mann, the Government Analyst. Seeing that he is an employee of the Government and that he was well aware of the seriousness of the position, I think he should have been in a position to give the committee some estimate of the cost of manufacturing the poison, particularly as he had been informed that it was impossible to secure sufficient supplies of the article. The Government should ask Mr. Mann his reasons for tendering such evidence as he did to the select committee. I am quite in accord with the desire of the Honorary Minister to have the Bill proceeded with. The matter is of very great urgency.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister—Nelson—in reply) [5.14]: I trust members will not allow a question which we all agree is vital to be again shelved.

Hon. T. Walker: There is no desire to shelve it. What we want is that the matter shall be dealt with speedily and well.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): If the motion is defeated, nobody can say when we are to get a Bill through, and I very much doubt if the new Bill which will have to be brought down will prove one which is better than the present Bill. The present Bill was considered by a select committee, and although it is not a perfect Bill it will enable the department dealing with the pest to go ahead. If the motion is defeated, what will be the result? The work of the department for the last nine months will be nullified. Regarding the poison mentioned by the member for

Coolgardie (Mr. Lambert), there has been very great difficulty. I have every reason to believe that during this month sufficient poison will arrive here for six months' use. The Minister for Industries is investigating this matter now to ascertain if poison can be manufactured in Western Australia. I hope the result will be successful, and that we shall be able to make it here of a suitable quality and at a reasonable price.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Are you going to start the factory with State assistance?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): Time will tell. The member for Pingelly (Mr. Hickmott) and the member for Sussex (Mr. Pickering) touched upon a very vital point when they said that time was the essence of the contract. They also said that at present if a man does nothing he cannot be made to do anything. There are many men in the State who will sit back and allow others to poison both rabbits and dingoes. Dingoes also are a great pest, more especially in the South-West. Such people allow others to bear the heat and burden of the day. The Bill, however, gives power to the Government to come down on these people, who are not prepared to do their duty, and make them fall into line. If the Bill only does this it will be doing a great thing to help in the destruction, not only of rabbits, but of dingoes. The member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. Johnston) also dealt with the point. The Government are fully seized of the vital necessity for combating the pest.

Hon. P. Collier: Every member of it?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): Yes. They have issued instructions that rabbits are to be dealt with on all abandoned farms by the Agricultural Department. That surely does away with a good many of the arguments of the member for Kanowna (Hon. T. Walker), who claims that we are not prepared to do this. The Government are not only prepared to do it, but are doing it.

Hon. T. Walker: Not in my district. I know it for a fact.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): So far as Crown lands are concerned—

Hon. T. Walker: On Crown lands and abandoned areas.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): At present the Government are dealing with breeding grounds on Crown lands. As soon as a report reaches the office, that rabbits have been seen and breeding grounds are likely to be established, men are sent out to the locality, irrespective of the cost. We know that by getting there in time and combating the pest as soon as it makes its appearance, and spending a few pounds without delay, it will mean the saving of thousands of pounds later on.

Hon. T. Walker: Will you send men to Trayning next week?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): Already complimentary letters have been received upon the work of the department during the last two or three months. I did not bring them with me to-day, because I did not expect that there would be the slightest hesitation on the part of members to fall in with

the terms of the motion. I thought the House would be only too anxious to get the Bill through so that they could deal with the pest. We are doing now what we can, but when the Bill becomes law it will enable us to do in a legal manner what we are doing now in the hope that the Bill will go through. Anything that can be added to the Bill that will improve it and be of benefit to the State as a whole I am sure will be approved of by members.

Mr. Lambert: What about Crown Lands?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): I have already dealt with these. A large amount of money has already been spent, something like £20,000. If the work is to cost £40,000 next year, hon. members may be quite sure that it will be spent. We know what a grave risk the country is running to-day through the alarming progress made by the pest. Unfortunately, there are many farmers who will not do what they can to protect themselves, but the Bill will bring them into line with others. I think we are only beating the wind to argue the question any further.

Question put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	32
Noes	6

Majority for 26

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Brown	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Davies	Mr. Nairn
Mr. Draper	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Duff	Mr. Pilkington
Mr. Money	Mr. R. T. Robinson
Mr. Foley	Mr. Roche
Mr. Green	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Troy
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Varyard
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. Willmott
Mr. Lutey	Mr. Hardwick
Mr. Maley	(Teller.)
Mr. Mitchell	

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Walker
Mr. Collier	Mr. O'Loughlin
Mr. Holman	(Teller.)
Mr. Jones	

Question thus passed.

RETURN—LEAD ORE FROM NORTH-AMPTON DISTRICT.

Mr. MALEY (Greenough) [5.36]: I move—

That a return be laid upon the Table of the House showing—1, The total tonnage and value of lead ore railed from the Northampton mining district for the period of six months ended 31st July, 1918—(a) by the Fremantle Trading Company's operations, (b) by the operation of others than described in (a). 2, The total tonnage and value of ore treated at the Ravenshorpe smelter for the same period.

I purposely refrained from—

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

Mr. MALEY: I anticipated that, but I purposely refrained from referring to this subject on the Address-in-reply because I had given notice of this motion, and desired to express my reasons for wanting this return. Unfortunately for me the member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Green) has already cut some of the ground from beneath my feet. I should have thought that an old and experienced parliamentarian, such as he is, would have had a little more consideration for a younger member in that respect. At the same time I am glad to have his assistance in bringing this lead mining industry into prominence. My desire is to give publicity to the great handicaps imposed upon those engaged in developing one of the most important industries of the State, and to point out the curse of centralisation and to deal with the necessity for the establishment of a State smelter at Geraldton. One of the principal difficulties, from which the development of lead mining suffers to-day in the Northampton area, is in regard to what is known as the old Imperial freehold grants. On the question of mining on private property, Section 117 of the Mining Act of 1904 says—

Gold, silver and other precious metals on or below the surface of all land in Western Australia, whether alienated or not alienated from the Crown, and if alienated whensoever alienated, are the property of the Crown.

Subsection 2 says—

All other minerals on or below the surface of any land in Western Australia which was not alienated in fee simple from the Crown before the 1st day of January, 1899, are the property of the Crown.

I have before me a report on the Northampton mineral fields by the State Mining Engineer (Mr. Montgomery), issued under the authority of the Hon. H. Gregory, M.L.A., Minister for Mines, on the 3rd March, 1908. I make no apology for quoting extracts from this report, because after a long search the only copy I can find in existence is that which I have borrowed from the State Mining Engineer himself. It points out in admirable fashion the difficulties of mining on private land, and the difficulties of prospectors in the district. I think the report is well worthy of being perpetuated, and I offer no apology to the Colonial Treasurer, who is always complaining about having to pay an extra 11s. a page for "Hansard." It is my desire, therefore, to have this embodied in "Hansard" in order to bring the matter up to date. It is a very interesting report indeed, and points out the difficulties—

Mr. SPEAKER: Does that report deal with the ores treated at Fremantle?

Mr. MALEY: The ores that have been raised to be sent to Fremantle.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member's motion deal with ores treated at Fremantle during the last six months, and by other trading concerns?

Mr. MALEY: Most decidedly. It deals with the very genesis of the ore raising. It says—

Most of the mines of this district which have been at all extensively worked are on freehold land, mostly alienated before 1st January, 1899, and are, therefore, not open for mining purposes except by arrangement with the owners or under the conditions imposed by Part VI. of the Mining Act, 1904. In the case of lands alienated before 1st January, 1899, these conditions require the would-be miner to petition the Minister to have the lands brought under the operation of Part VI. of the Act, and they then have to be examined and reported upon by a Government officer as to their having reasonable probability of containing minerals, after which the Government may give not less than six months' notice to the owner that the land shall be under the operation of the Act. The owner has then a first right to take up such mining leases as he chooses on the land, subject to the ordinary mining regulations as to areas of leases and the usual obligations of mining lessees on Crown lands as to working them, but not subject to payment of any rent or royalty. Should he fail to work the leases they may be forfeited, and the land thrown open to other applicants. Such forfeited leases and such parts of the lands brought under the Act as are not taken up by the owner are then open for mining on the same terms as any other of the private lands to which the Act applies. The person desiring to mine upon any of these must obtain a permit from the warden to enter and prospect upon the land, and he may be required, before doing so, to deposit a sum of money to cover possible damage his operations may cause to the land owner; he must arrange, before any mining is done, the amount of compensation to be paid to the owner, and obtain such way-leaves and other rights through intermediate lands as will enable him to mine upon the lands applied for; he must obtain a mining lease or claim from the Crown, and he is also liable to certain restrictions with respect to mining within 100 feet of the natural surface, use of water and timber on the surface, and protection of the mining tenement from the land-owner's stock.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member is quite in order in dealing with the many operations on private lands. The motion reads as follows:—

That a return be laid upon the Table of the House showing—(1) The total tonnage and value of lead ore raised from the Northampton mining district for the period of six months ended 31st July, 1918—(a) by the Fremantle Trading Company's operations, (b) by the operation of others than described in (a). (2) The total tonnage and value of ore treated at the Ravensthorpe smelter for the same period.

Under that motion the member can only deal with the amount of ore raised and treated, and not the question of raising ore and the general principles of mining on private property.

Mr. MALEY: If these recommendations were given effect to—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member should have made that provision in his motion. I cannot allow the hon. member to proceed fur-

ther on those lines. The hon. member is quite in order in giving reasons why the Minister should lay this information on the Table of the House as far as the treatment of ore at the places mentioned is concerned.

Mr. MALEY: I mentioned in my opening remarks that I wanted this return in consequence of the great handicap imposed on one or the most important—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member should have thought of that when tabling his motion, so that it would have given him ample opportunity of dealing with the matter.

Mr. MALEY: My third reason was the basis of comparison in the establishment of smelters at Geraldton. The amount of ore raised would not have been 10,000 tons but 100,000 tons.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member's motion does not speak of a smelter at Geraldton. The hon. member would be in order in pointing out what could have been saved if there had been a smelter at Geraldton.

Mr. MALEY: I submit, of course, to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but the matter is of importance and I thought I should be allowed to give the information up to date.

Point of Order.

Hon. P. Collier: On a point of order. I think the House is anxious to allow the member every latitude consistent with the Standing Orders. Whilst I think it would not be disputed that to argue that mining on private property is outside the scope of the motion, I think the member would be quite within his rights in arguing that there is need of the erection of a smelter in the Geraldton district. The point which the hon. member desires to make, I understand, if he can show by the tonnage—

Mr. Speaker: What is the hon. member's point of order?

Hon. P. Collier: That the hon. member is in order in referring to the need for the erection of smelters in the Geraldton district.

The Minister for Mines: Does not the hon. member think the motion might go as it is?

Hon. P. Collier: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member is in order in referring to the question of the erection of smelters in the Geraldton district.

Mr. Speaker: In answer to the member for Boulder, however necessary the argument raised in connection with the erection of a smelter at Geraldton may appear, it does not come under the motion. I am bound to conduct the business of the House under the Standing Orders and according to precedent, and there is no word in the motion as to the erection of smelters at Geraldton and no mention of mining on private property. The language of the motion is perfectly clear. It deals with the amount of ore crushed over a given period, and the hon. member desires certain information. If the hon. member desired to urge the necessity of the erection of a smelter at Geraldton he should have mentioned it. If I allow the hon. member to discuss this matter in the manner he desires I cannot prevent other members, in replying, from also referring to these matters. I desire the member to keep to his motion.

Mr. Holman: This is a very important matter and I take it this way. The hon. member desires to know the total tonnage of lead ore raised in the Northampton mining district during the six months—

Mr. Speaker: What is the point of order?

Mr. Holman: That the hon. member be allowed to debate how much ore has been raised to Fremantle.

Mr. Speaker: I have already ruled on that point. Does the hon. member dissent from my ruling?

Mr. Holman: The hon. member desires to point out that when ore is raised to Fremantle that ore has to be picked over so that it may be of a higher grade.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member resume his seat. I desire to point out clearly that I do not know what may be in the hon. member's mind; I can only accept the language of the motion, and under our Standing Orders that only can be discussed. If the member desires to deal with other matters he must take some other opportunity. The hon. member for Greenough may proceed.

Mr. Mahey: Shall I be in order in discussing any of the mines in the Northampton district?

Mr. Speaker: Those mines that have raised ore, the hon. member will be in order in discussing.

Debate resumed.

Mr. MALEY: The next difficulty that presents itself is this: the miners in the district are suffering in regard to carting ore from Geraldine to Ajana. The distance from the mines to Ajana siding, at the railhead, is about nine miles, and I previously asked in the House a question as to whether the Government would put in hand immediately a preliminary survey of the line from the mines to Ajana—only nine miles—to save the cost of cartage which amounts to 18s. to £1 a ton. Amongst the mines being developed in the district at the present time is one owned by Messrs. Green and Morton, and although these people have been under litigation for some time, they have forwarded to the Fremantle smelting works to date no less than 1,500 tons of lead ore. I have seen the ore leaving for the railhead, being pulled by 14 horses, and the wagon, with only seven tons of ore on it, was bogged up to the axles. The Surprise mine is producing 20 tons of ore a day, and in the course of a few months they will be raising over 30 tons. The member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Green) last week, in describing this private mine, gave a good deal of information which I have in my possession. Above the 30 foot level there is blocked out and in sight at present 20,000 tons of lead ore which gives somewhere about 60 to 70 per cent. of lead.

Mr. Holman: Is it payable ore?

Mr. MALEY: Extremely payable. Below the 30-foot level three winzes are being put down to connect with a drive going north and south at the 70-foot level; and when that 70-foot level has been opened up, the mine will have actually in sight fully 50,000 tons of ore. It is impossible for prospectors to mine on the same terms as companies, which sink their

shafts and are able to look well ahead. Prospectors are compelled to live from hand to mouth. Messrs. Gallagher and Phillips are working on tribute on the old Geraldine mine, they have forwarded no less than 245 tons of ore, and are sending ten tons per week. The Three Sisters mine, which is in the Gascoyne constituency, and owned by William Hughes and party, has sent ten tons away, and the lode is big and a large weekly output shortly is assured. Meehan's mine is developing on good ore, and has sent away 30 tons. Jensen's a new show, has about five tons at the surface. Kissack's, another new show, is raising ore and will be sending away ten tons shortly. The Wheal Lily, owned by A. Cheriton, and just taken up, has a good past record. Kennedy's, known as the "new Mt. Lyell," a copper discovery, is sending away seven tons of ore. The South Geraldine mine, under the management of Mr. C. M. Harris of Perth, is being opened up on behalf of English investors. At the Via May mine Messrs. Meyer and Co. have installed an engine and a pump, and have sent away ten tons. They intend to forward 15 to 20 tons per week shortly. The Wheal May, an old mine, recently opened up by Messrs. James Thring & Co., is on good ore. The Mary Spring mine is another old mine just being reopened by Messrs. Gallagher and Miller. The answer to certain questions I asked regarding a railway to Geraldine was that the Esperance railway must take precedence in all future railway construction in this State. But the developments I have described warrant a railway, and that fact should be taken into consideration in connection with the short line of railway required by those wealth-producing mines. The mines which I have mentioned are those being worked in the Geraldine area, approximately 50 miles north of Northampton. Coming now to Northampton, the Fremantle Trading Co. have the Baddera and the Wheal Ellen. Thring and Dwyer have the Kirton mine. The Nooka is being worked by a local syndicate. The Wheal of Fortune North is being worked by a company recently floated here and in Sydney, with a capital of £35,000. Further south again, approximately 15 miles south of Northampton, is the Narra Tarra mine, belonging to the Fremantle Trading Co. There is also a new show, owned by Lauder and party, who are sending away ore. Still further south, Maynard and Saunders have another proposition. These mines, therefore, extend over a length of about 80 miles. Now I come closer to the terms of the motion as regards the smelting works.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was waiting for the hon. member to come to the smelters.

Mr. MALEY: Another factor operating against the industry is the charge made by the Fremantle smelters. I have heard the smelting company described on the platform by my friend the member for Fremantle (Mr. Jones) as a capitalistic combine, without a body to be kicked or a soul to be damned. I think the hon. member was surprised the other day to learn that the capitalistic organisation which he so drastically described has had a continuous struggle, and has only been kept going by the action of the leader of the Opposition, when Minister for Mines, in guaranteeing the

company's bank overdraft. Instead of being a bloated capitalistic organisation, the company serves to keep in employment at least 250 men.

Mr. Jones: And the company is making a profit out of every one of them.

Mr. MALEY: The company cannot be making too much profit, since the overdraft, which at the time it was guaranteed by the leader of the Opposition when holding the Mines portfolio, stood at £18,000, to-day stands at £8,000. In conjunction with the member for Geraldton (Mr. Willcock) and the Minister for Mines, I had the pleasure of making an inspection of the Fremantle smelters. The member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Green) the other day threw out a nasty insinuation, for which I think he is sorry, and to which I therefore will not further refer. Those of us who inspected the smelters came to the conclusion that the Fremantle Trading Co. were giving the prospectors a very fair deal indeed as regards receiving, weighing, sampling, and assaying ore. I think the member for Geraldton is prepared to admit as much.

Mr. Willcock: We did not see any assaying.

Mr. MALEY: I referred to the ordinary method of receiving the ore. The Fremantle smelters are not sufficiently modern for the industry.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot discuss the capacity of the Fremantle smelting works under this motion. He can only discuss the ore that is being treated by those smelters, and whether they are not accomplishing what the hon. member says is necessary.

Mr. MALEY: I was leading up to the charges made for smelting. Would I be in order in discussing the charges?

Mr. SPEAKER: Not under this motion. The motion merely asks for information. When the hon. member gets that information, he can deal with the subject further.

Mr. MALEY: In the circumstances, all the matter I have prepared is practically wasted for the present; and at this stage I must content myself with moving the motion.

Mr. WILLCOCK (Geraldton) [5.56]: I support the motion for one reason. It seems that there is a possibility of increasing the production of the field, and the information asked for by this motion is required in order that we may be able to discuss how much ore has been treated during the six months under review, and how much during the preceding six months. As the Minister for Mines has given an assurance that he will not oppose the motion, it is hardly necessary to labour the question at this stage. Considerably more ore would have been produced by the field during the past six months had a different policy been pursued in the matter of smelting in the district, had a smelter been erected at Geraldton six or eight months ago.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot under this motion discuss the necessity for a smelter at Geraldton.

Mr. WILLCOCK: The wording of the motion does not afford much scope for discussion. When the figures asked for by the motion are available, it may be possible to deal with the matter on the Mines Estimates,

and to suggest some practical method of meeting the requirements of the field.

Question put and passed.

PAPERS—REPATRIATION OF SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

Hon. J. MITCHELL (Northam) [5.59]: I move—

That all papers in connection with the repatriation of soldiers and sailors be laid upon the Table of the House.

I wish it to be clearly understood that what I ask for is the papers connected with the general scheme, as distinct from individual files. I want all the papers dealing with the matter of policy.

Mr. SPEAKER: That being so, it may be well for the hon. member to amend his motion.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: If the Government regard the motion as covering individual papers, then there is reason for amendment. I do not wish to labour the question of repatriation, which has so recently been fully discussed, and which will, I hope, again be fully discussed on the Repatriation Bill. The several Governments representing the several parties of this House have dealt with the matter of repatriation, and it has been customary for the papers connected with it to be presented. The discussion of repatriation with the Federal Government, and the negotiations with the Federal Government in this connection, started when Mr. Scaddan was Premier and Mr. Johnson was Minister for Agriculture. The papers dealing with that phase of the subject ought to be available to hon. members. When the matter was dealt with by the Wilson Administration so far as negotiations went with the Federal Government and afterwards it was passed on to the present Administration. Hon. members will insist that the House should have a perfect understanding of everything that has been done. It is important that the work which has been undertaken should be continued by successive Administrations, and it is important we should know what it is proposed to do. We can only have that knowledge by being supplied with the fullest possible information and that can only come from a perusal of the files. The present Government laid the papers dealing with repatriation on the Table of the House last session, and these showed what the proposals and the various schemes were. It would be well if the Premier indicated that this course would be followed at the beginning of each session, and that would save the moving of a motion. Hon. members should realise in connection with repatriation that the best we can do for the returned men is the least that we should do. I am very anxious that the returned soldiers shall be fairly treated and I feel therefore that I am justified in adopting the course of moving for the papers. I want it to be understood by all concerned, by the soldiers themselves, and also the dependents of soldiers, that there will be no going back on any promise that has been made and that succeeding Governments will honour the decisions arrived at by their predecessors. Of course the proposals may be enlarged or made more liberal and more helpful, but they should

never be refused. It would be wise also for the Government to table these papers annually so that there should be no want of knowledge against hon. members. If Parliament is not informed of what is going on, hon. members will be justified in objecting.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member's motion asks that all papers in connection with the repatriation of all returned soldiers and sailors be laid on the Table of the House. I take it that means all the papers up to date. The hon. member therefore cannot discuss anything that may be done in the future.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: I realise that I cannot ask for papers that do not exist, but hon. members should be informed of what is happening from time to time. I ask now to be allowed to see the papers disclosing all that has happened in connection with this important matter. We heard from the Minister for Works that he did not know what was proposed by the Wilson Administration and apparently he does not know what is being proposed now.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not in order in discussing what is being proposed.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: I think I am in order in pointing out the reasons why these papers should be laid upon the Table.

Mr. Mullany: Is your proposal that all the papers should be sent here as they come in?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: It would be a good idea if that could be done.

Mr. Mullany: Why not bring the whole office up here?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: I only want the papers dealing with repatriation generally.

Hon. P. Collier: There will be very few.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: If hon. members will keep a watchful eye on the Administration it will be a good thing.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott (Honorary Minister): Would you like the papers sent to the House before they go to the office?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: I do not know what the hon. member means.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member can confine his remarks to giving reasons for asking that the papers shall be laid on the Table.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: I have endeavoured to give reasons. Every member should be informed of all that is happening in connection with repatriation. I realise it is inconvenient for papers to be kept out of the office for any length of time, but it would simplify the matter if the Government had copies made of the papers and presented them to Parliament. We are taking a big responsibility in connection with this matter, and we have a perfect right to see what is happening. I am not moving the motion in any captious spirit, but with an honest desire to get information in order that hon. members may know what is being done, and so that they may raise objections if necessary or perhaps offer suggestions if they desire to do so. It is not my desire in any way to embarrass the Government; therefore I hope the Premier will agree to the motion.

Sitting suspended from 6.10 to 7.30 p.m.

The PREMIER (Hon. H. B. Lefroy—Moore) [7.30]: The hon. member for Northam

has moved that all papers in connection with the repatriation of soldiers and sailors be laid on the Table. It is well to repeat the motion, so as to remind hon. members of its meaning. I am at all times ready to please the hon. member for Northam; there is no one whom I should be more pleased to gratify. But it is impossible for me to grant his request without affecting the interests of the returned men themselves, and even though I may desire to gratify the hon. member's wishes, it must be admitted that the interests of the returned soldiers are of more importance than the wishes of the hon. member. The hon. member has asked for all papers in connection with repatriation; not for any specific paper or papers, but for every paper dealing with the subject. Most certainly it would not be in the interests of the returned men to lay all those papers on the Table. In the first place the Table would not hold all the papers, for it would require a wagon to bring them up to the House. Again, the papers are in daily use, not by one department, but by several departments interested in the matter. We have papers in connection with the reservation of leaseholds in the Kimberley district, papers in connection with pearling reservations in Shark Bay, papers in connection with several other reservations, and papers in connection with mining. We have been assisting returned soldiers in pastoral efforts, in viticulture, in all lines of agriculture, and in many other directions, and consequently there is a large number of papers dealing with the general subject. It would not be in the interests of the returned soldiers to bring all these papers here. I am sure the hon. member does not desire to hamper the work of the departments. It would be disastrous to the department if all this material were removed from the use of the many departmental officers engaged in this work. Moreover, if all the papers were laid on the Table they would become the property of the House, and could not be removed without your authority, Sir. If the departmental officers required to go through any of those papers, they would have to come here to peruse them, or alternatively they would require to get an order from you, Sir, for the removal of specific papers, in which case you would inform them that the papers would have to be returned here within a given time. Undoubtedly it would hamper the work of the department tremendously if all those papers were to be laid on the Table. I am desirous of giving the House all possible information. We are doing much in regard to repatriation already, and will do a great deal more when the Bill that has been prepared is placed before hon. members. That Bill will shortly be brought down, and I shall then have an opportunity for submitting to the House all necessary particulars, for giving members all the information they can desire. In the circumstances I trust the hon. member will not press his motion, knowing as he does that the Bill is to come before the House almost immediately, and knowing that we have been discussing this question for a considerable time already and shall have a further opportunity of discussing it in the near future. The hon. member has said that he has no desire to embarrass the Government. I believe the hon.

member. But if the motion is carried it will mean the embarrassment of the returned soldiers. The correspondence that we have in regard to many matters in connection with repatriation is huge, and the department will be considerably hampered if the motion is carried. For that reason I ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion. If the hon. member will indicate any specific papers which he would like to see and which are not daily required in the department, those papers shall be placed on the Table. When we are desirous of getting on with our work of repatriation it is important that all the documents in connection with the matter should remain in the department. I do not desire to conceal anything from the House.

Hon. J. Mitchell: That is not suggested.

The PREMIER: When hon. members desire information it is my duty to furnish it, unless indeed it is not in the interests of the country that I should do so. That question is for the Government to decide. There are cases in which it would be against the interests of the country to divulge certain information at some particular stage of the negotiations.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Is that so in this case?

The PREMIER: No, I am referring to the general question of giving information to the House. It would be detrimental to the interests of the returned soldiers if all the important papers dealing with the many-sided question of repatriation were to be brought here and placed on the Table. Now that the hon. member has had an opportunity of discussing the question I ask him to withdraw the motion. I think the House will agree that it would not be in the interests of the returned soldiers to take the whole of the papers out of the department and lay them on the Table. All possible information will be given on the second reading of the Repatriation Bill.

Mr. TROY (Mt. Magnet) [7.43]: I agree with the Premier that it would be impossible to supply individual papers where applications have been made for assistance under the Repatriation Scheme, or where applications are under consideration. Still, it would help the House very much in considering the Bill which is to be introduced if certain papers were laid on the Table. From those papers members would get information which would enable them to give proper attention to the work of repatriation, and in particular would assist them very much in suitably moulding the Bill. Certain schemes have been under consideration, and, I understand, have been adopted. I am not satisfied with what I have heard regarding the amount provided by the Federal Government. I have said time after time that the State should turn down the proposition of the Federal Government, which only provides that the sum of £500 be lent to the States to be passed on to the soldiers who settle on the land.

The Premier: The House already is in possession of that information.

Mr. TROY: I think that will be a most unworthy and inadequate provision for our soldiers to go upon the land. I want the Government to urge upon the Federal authorities the necessity of now making adequate provision. Once a soldier is repatriated within the State

and once the State Government have taken on the responsibility, the Federal Government will accept no further responsibility themselves, and all the clamouring on the part of the soldier and any discontent which may arise will fall upon the Parliament of this State. The Federal Government are notorious for evading their responsibilities. They have already invaded every source of revenue enjoyed by the States, and further Federal taxation is foreshadowed, which will mean that very little will be left for the States. Before the Bill comes into operation I want to know what has transpired between the Federal and State Governments, and how far the Federal Government have been urged to provide more adequate means than are being provided at present. Now is the time to make provision in this direction, and now is the time when this State, faced as it is with hard times in the future, should compel the Federal Government to put aside and grant to us such a sum of money as will enable any person repatriated to make good. It will not be a fair thing for this country if any agreement is entered into with the Federal Government which is not adequate to deal with the situation. It would not be a fair thing for this country, if the State Government are now endeavouring to get a temporary loan, or temporary relief, to accept from the Federal Government an amount which will carry the soldier on for a year or two and then throw him upon the State, which is already sufficiently burdened with its present responsibilities.

Resolved: that motions be continued.

Mr. Harrison: Do you suggest that only the papers dealing with the Federal question be laid on the Table?

Mr. TROY: I have an amendment to move later. Upon getting the information that I think it desirable should be supplied, I will know how to act when the Bill comes before the House. Without this knowledge no member can intelligently deal with a Bill, which means so much to the future of the State. I hope the Premier will accept my amendment. I want to see these papers, not from a desire to embarrass the Government—I do not think anyone would be justified in embarrassing the Government on a question of this character, which is the common responsibility of members of this House—but in order to be able to intelligently consider the Bill when it comes before us. I am going to be very careful about making this question of repatriation anything but a subject for which the whole of Parliament and this country will be responsible. It would be a dangerous thing to make this matter the plaything of politics. It means too much to the State, and too much to the men who are bearing the heat and burden of the day, and will be returning to us in the future. I want, as far as possible, to protect the future of this country. I have no faith in the Federal Government, and have no occasion to have faith in them. I know that they will impoverish this country if they can. When the soldier-settler has spent the few hundred pounds which they are prepared to loan, a sum which will go nowhere on the land, they will then

throw the whole of the responsibility of the business upon this country, which is not in a position to stand it. The Government which should be responsible for the whole question of repatriation, and whose duty it is to make the greatest possible provision in this direction, is the Federal Government. We are, relatively speaking, too poor in this country to make adequate provision. We have great difficulties ahead of us, and a heavy burden to carry. We ought to insist that the Federal Government take an adequate amount of responsibility, and if we say in this Parliament that we will not take the responsibility unless an adequate provision is made, they must then fall in with our views. We want all the papers, in order that when the Bill is brought before us we can make it as perfect as we can. I move an amendment—

That the words "in connection with" be struck out, and "dealing with the various schemes adopted and the correspondence and agreement with the Federal Government" inserted in lieu.

Mr. ROCKE (South Fremantle) [7.52]: I second the amendment.

Mr. PICKERING (Sussex) [7.55]: I support the amendment. It touches upon a phase of the question which has not hitherto been dealt with in this Chamber. It is a very important phase. This struck me the more forcibly when listening to the arguments advanced by the member for Mt. Magnet (Mr. Troy). The question of financing the repatriation scheme will be one of great moment and concern to this State, confronted as it is with an increasing deficit and a falling revenue. It, therefore, behoves us to see that we get the utmost possible assistance from the Federal Government. All the papers which are comprehended in the amendment should easily be made available to the House; and as hon. members, when considering the Bill that is to come before them, will require to be fully seized of the facts and the relationship between the State and Federal Government in the matter, I do not think the Government can well refuse this moderate request.

The PREMIER (Hon. H. B. Lefroy—Moore—on amendment) [7.57]: I have no objection to the amendment, although I thought that all the information was known to everyone. It has been published throughout the length and breadth of Australia. This is not the only State dealing with the Federal Government upon this question. All the six States of Australia are dealing with the Federal Government, or rather the Federal Government are dealing with them, and the treatment, whatsoever it may be, is the same in all the States. I thought the matter had been so well thrashed out and so frequently dealt with in the various Parliaments of Australia that hon. members already knew all about it. We have nothing to conceal, and I have no objection to the amendment. It will certainly mean bringing up all the papers on the question from the Repatriation Department. I should like the mover of the amendment to insert the words "on the land."

Mr. Troy: I will agree to that.

The PREMIER: We have had a parley in connection with other matters but have never had any financial arrangement.

Mr. TROY: The Federal Government are responsible for all the others.

The PREMIER: Entirely. I am prepared to accept the amendment and am only too pleased to give the House all the information we have on the question.

Hon. J. MITCHELL (Northam—in reply) [8.0]: I assure the Premier that I have no wish whatever to embarrass him. I consider it important that the papers bearing on the general scheme as it affects the land should be laid on the Table. It is not because I entertain any suspicion whatever that I ask for the papers, but because I honestly think the House ought to know what has happened and what is happening. If the amendment means having anything to do with the soldiers individually—

The Premier: No.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: I am glad to have that assurance.

Amendment put and passed.

Question, as amended, agreed to.

MOTION — HOSPITAL FOR INSANE, CLAREMONT. To inquire by Royal Commission.

Mr. JONES (Fremantle) [8.4]: I move—

That in the opinion of this House a Royal Commission should be appointed to inquire into affairs concerning the Hospital for the Insane, Claremont, in general, and the death of Francis Andinach in that institution on the 29th June last, in particular.

In any remarks I shall make I have no desire whatever to attack or to harass the Government. Many questions can be considered party questions, but this is not one of those. All men with humanitarian views are bound to unite upon the question of the proper care and treatment of those of our brethren who are mentally afflicted. During recent months considerable publicity has been given to affairs at the hospital for the insane. In all quarters of the State, and particularly in the metropolitan area, public attention has been directed to those affairs by the Andinach and other cases. I hope it will be agreed that the time has arrived when for the benefit of the public in general and of the unfortunate patients in particular some inquiry should be held into the conduct of the institution. Everyone will acknowledge that a great deal of inconvenience is caused at present by the overcrowded state of the institution, by the fact that the hospital is now accommodating 400 or 500 patients in excess of its holding capacity. But I think all reasonable people will agree that if things are well with the hospital an inquiry will do no harm. If on the other hand things are bad, if even one grievance exists, then this motion is fully justified. A few days ago the Press published a long report which had been gathered by a deputation who had first visited the hospital for the insane, and had then waited upon the Colonial Secretary for the purpose of ventilating grievances which

they said they had discovered. I shall not deal with that report in complete detail, because I understand that some of the cases quoted date so far back as to carry very little weight in the discussion of this motion, unless, perhaps, it should be considered that what happened even in years long gone by, when the hospital was much less crowded than it is to-day, may possibly, and more than possibly, happen now, having regard to the overcrowded state of the institution. The first matter dealt with by the deputation in their report was the hospital ward. Hon. members, and there are many of them here, who have visited the asylum, must agree that conditions obtain there which would not be tolerated by the health inspectors in any common lodging house. The beds in which were to sleep men who are deranged, who are liable to break out seriously at any moment, are separated from each other only by distances of six inches. This fact constitutes a danger to the patient and the attendants. I believe the hospital ward contains 50 beds; and there is only one attendant in charge of it during the night. Occasionally as many as 20 or even 30 bed patients are to be found in that hospital ward, all of them in various stages of insanity, and many of them in that stage which may require frequent changing by the one attendant in charge. Other patients may be in such a state of health that they need dressing repeatedly during the night by that same one attendant. It is quite possible that amongst the number there may be suicidal cases, cases under all forms of restraint, patients who have attempted, and are liable again to attempt, to escape, and even cases suffering from advanced stages of contagious disease. On this last point, I believe, some denial has been issued; but I will quote one case, although, unfortunately, I am not in a position to afford such information as would enable the public to know exactly how many cases of that nature are to be found in the institution. The case I refer to is that of a patient suffering from a very advanced stage of cancer in the face, so that his mouth was practically eaten away. I understand that during the past few weeks that patient has died. His condition was such that one attendant, a returned soldier, resigned rather than dress the wounds upon the face; some of which had reached the stage of being absolutely fly-blown. If one such case is known to exist, there may be a dozen concerning which I and other members are unable to obtain information unless inquiry is instituted. Unfortunately, the one attendant who has charge of the hospital ward during the night is not allowed to leave the ward during his hours of duty, even to wash; and if he has to dress a case such as that which I have mentioned it is possible for him to carry dangerous germs about with him during his hours of duty. In the event of a death taking place, it is also the duty of that one attendant to lay out the body of the unfortunate patient. It seems to me that while the one attendant in charge is laying out the body of a deceased patient, screens being drawn around the bed, anything might happen as regards all the rest of the

patients. It is quite possible that they should not merely injure each other, but that they should attack, as in many cases they do attack, and injure attendants engaged in the performance of these duties. It cannot be asserted that the authorities at the hospital have not recognised the necessity for placing two men in the hospital ward. For, in spite of the regulations, which do not allow a patient to be in charge of other patients, there is one particular patient named Hoyr who is placed on duty endeavouring to assist the attendant in charge of the hospital ward beds. I have already mentioned that it is quite possible for the patients not only to injure the attendant but also to injure themselves. The report of the committee of investigation mentions one particular instance—

On account of the overcrowded state of the institution and the lack of sufficient supervision and attendance, many inmates and attendants have been seriously injured. At present there are several patients in the hospital suffering from injuries which would not have occurred had a sufficient number of attendants been on duty or had proper provision been provided.

At present there are to my knowledge at least two patients who are suffering from broken ribs as the result of injuries inflicted upon them in that hospital ward. The matters which call for this inquiry are so numerous that I feel I would weary the House if I went into them at length. Take, for instance, the matter of the restraint of patients. The deputation tells us the forms of restraint which are used on men who are considered dangerous, and we are also told—

The methods adopted in the hospital for placing patients under restraint and absolute, and should be abolished. When visiting the hospital we saw men under restraint, with their ankles tied with a piece of sheeting. It is said that this sheeting has been torn on several occasions by the violent patients. Proper appliances should be provided for placing inmates under restraint.

So far as I can gather, that statement which has been made by eye witnesses has not been denied. Men are placed under restraint by obsolete methods, and those methods call for inquiry. It is also asserted that a further form of restraint is the administering of a noxious medicine known as "Whitehouse" which will keep these unfortunate people docile for the space of a week or ten days. The dangerous work which attendants have to do also calls for inquiry. Although many of the allegations of the deputation have been stated to be of old date, I submit that it is possible that there may be a recurrence of what has taken place in the past. I might quote one instance alone, and this was mentioned to the Colonial Secretary. When Dr. Anderson himself was doing his rounds of inspection one day he was attacked and his head was cut open. This happened too, notwithstanding that he had a body guard of half a dozen attendants. Almost daily these struggles and attacks take place, and it must appeal to every reasonable man that in a colony such as we have at this institution, it is possible that patients will be continually mak-

ing attacks on one another and upon the attendants. I wish it to be understood that I do not think we can reasonably and seriously blame the attendants if some of the patients are injured because we know that the institution is under-staffed. Let me refer for a moment to the gang which goes out cutting wood. There are eight patients, and no doubt they are dangerous men, otherwise it would be asked what they are doing in the Hospital for the Insane? These men go out wood-cutting armed with axes and other appliances necessary for that work, and they are in the charge of only two attendants. I would further submit that at the present time there is little or no mental treatment given to the patients in the hospital, and practically no employment is provided for them so that they may have their minds occupied. The medical treatment of the patients is only enforced on account of some physical illness, and it happens that months will pass without patients being examined by the medical officer in charge. It has been argued that owing to the State's financial difficulty no more attendants can be employed. I submit that that matter is one which will come within the scope of the inquiry. I come now to the case which is responsible for much of the prominence gained by the Hospital for the Insane in recent months, the case of Francis Andinach. This man was a good Australian citizen, though he was born in Spain. He lived in Fremantle for 22 years, and in that town reared six good Australian children. On account of financial trouble he became temporarily mentally deranged and had to be removed to the mental ward of the Perth Public Hospital. This case has had so much publicity that I do not feel justified in going into details too far, but I would like to give the testimony of Dr. Williams at the inquest, which was held on 31st May. Dr. Williams stated—

I held a post mortem examination on the body of Francis Andinach. He had two black eyes, an abrasion and cut on the chin, an abrasion about as big as a shilling on the right elbow and extensive emphysema—meaning he had air under his skin—on the left side. On opening the body I found three ribs fractured, on the left side, and the lower part of one of the broken ribs had perforated the lung. The skin over the lung at the point where the rib had wounded it, was healed, and the lung itself was solid as a result of inflammation. I examined the brain, and it showed a general venous congestion, and there was an extravasation of serous spinal fluid. The injuries to the eye did not affect the brain, nor did the wound on the chin. The right lung was normal. The cause of death was pneumonia which had been set up by the rib penetrating the left lung. I take the injuries to the left lung as being inflicted four or five days before he died, but it is difficult to say for certain. It would require a considerable amount of force to fracture the ribs.

The case of this unfortunate man is well known to hon. members. The evidence of Dr. Williams shows that death was caused primarily and mainly by the fact that the lungs were perforated by a broken rib. In the in-

terests of public safety it is necessary that an inquiry should be held in order to find out definitely who and what was responsible for the death of Francis Andinach. If there were no case against the Hospital for the Insane, if everything there was being done in the way that even the strictest of us would like to see, the case of Andinach alone would call loudly for investigation. I am not prepared to make any allegations and I am not prepared to say that any one man was responsible. We know that attendants, after all, are human beings and that any human being who is attacked by a man violently deranged would feel called upon to defend himself. I do submit, however, and I think hon. members will agree with me, that it should not be left to one man to deal with a violent lunatic as is at present done in the mental ward of the Perth hospital. We have asked that two attendants should be placed there and it is alleged that two attendants are there, but I desire to state that two attendants are not there regularly, and that at the present time if more patients are in the mental ward than one man is able to look after, it is possible for that attendant to get a hospital orderly to assist him until help can be sent from the Claremont Asylum. But whilst the assistance from Claremont is being obtained, Heaven knows what might happen with the dangerous lunatic in charge of only one man. Public safety demands that we should have two attendants in charge at the mental ward of the Perth hospital, and I intend that the fullest inquiry should be made into that matter as well. I do not care what form the inquiry may take, I desire that the inquiry shall be held in the interests of public safety and the welfare of the patients in the Hospital for the Insane. I submit the motion standing in my name.

Mr. LAMBERT (Coolgardie) [8.25]: In seconding the motion moved by the hon. member, one of the main things which prompts me to do so is a case which was brought under my notice only a week or two ago. A young lady in rather a responsible position in one of the departments of the State came to me to make a complaint about an unfortunate sister of hers at the Hospital for the Insane. That girl lost her reason through getting milk fever after the birth of her child and she has since been detained at the institution. I have been informed that clothing and fruit are taken to the patient but that on the next visit the clothing is found to be missing and rags substituted. In making this statement I in no sense desire to discourage the attendants or those in charge of this worthy institution. I am quite prepared to believe that the attendants and professional men connected with it are endeavouring to do the best possible under trying circumstances.

Mr. Teesdale: You cannot believe your informant then if you believe that.

Mr. LAMBERT: I can hardly believe it, but still I do not see that the young lady to whom I have referred would have any reason for telling me a wicked untruth in connection with her sister, and while statements of that kind are being made and a feeling of uneasiness prevails, the Government would be well advised to agree to the motion moved by the

member for Fremantle. I do not say that what I have referred to calls altogether for the appointment of a Royal Commission, but in justice to the professional gentlemen connected with that institution, an inquiry should be held. I too have heard of the cases to which the member for Fremantle has referred and on these it is unnecessary to comment further. I would like to see a searching inquiry made into the conduct of the institution, and that could be done without disparagement to the officials or without implying that they are lacking in their duty. It is undoubtedly a very tricky and difficult institution to deal with, and if the Government have that institution understaffed, Parliament has a right to know of it. I think the members of the Government must desire that if such is the case it should be known. I hope the Government will accept the motion. I am sure the member for Fremantle (Mr. Jones) has no desire to imply that the Government are lacking in their duty, and I think he is to be commended for having moved the motion. If the Government will have the necessary inquiry made, I am convinced that it will steady a good deal of the public uneasiness felt in regard to the Claremont Asylum.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister—Pilbara) [8.31]: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

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

Ayes	23
Noes	13

Majority for 10

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Brown	Mr. Money
Mr. Davies	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Draper	Mr. Pilkington
Mr. Duff	Mr. R. T. Robinson
Mr. Foley	Mr. Smith
Mr. George	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Willmott
Mr. Letroy	Mr. Hardwick
Mr. Maley	

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Collier	Mr. Roocke
Mr. Green	Mr. Troy
Mr. Holman	Mr. Walker
Mr. Jones	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Lambert	Mr. O'Loughlin
Mr. Lutey	

(Teller.)

Motion thus passed.

MOTION—STANDING ORDERS AMENDMENT, LIMITATION OF SPEECHES.

Mr. TEESDALE (Roebourne) [8.36]: I move—

That in order to secure the despatch of business and the good government of the State the Standing Orders of this House should be immediately amended in the direction of placing a time limit on the speeches

delivered by hon. members in the House and in Committee.

That the following be adopted as a Standing Order of the House:—"No member shall speak for more than thirty minutes at a time in any debate in the House, except in the debate on the Address-in-reply, or in a debate on a motion of no-confidence, or in moving the second reading of a Bill, or on the debate on the Appropriation Bill, or on the Financial Statement in Committee, when a member shall be at liberty to speak for one hour. In Committee of the House no member shall speak for more than twenty minutes at any one time, or more than twice on any one question before the Committee: Provided that this rule shall not apply in Committee to a member in charge of a Bill, or to a Minister when delivering the Financial Statement, or, in regard to the number of his speeches, to a Minister in charge of a class of the Estimates in Committee of Supply."

The fact that the last three or four motions have been rushed through with so much despatch is most encouraging to me to bring forward this motion for the curtailment of speeches. On the last occasion when we had this question before the House I was very sorry to find a lot of opposition from the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin). I trust that during the interim he has had a good think about the matter, and has decided to withdraw much of the opposition he previously displayed. While I do not propose to annoy the House by repetition—for to my mind there is nothing more annoying than to have a thing repeated over and over again—I cannot say much more in connection with the motion than I said on the last occasion. Still I have been struck by one or two of the statements made in the course of that debate. For instance, the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) said that any member who had had experience during the last few years could form an opinion as to how Parliament could carry on, but that I had been here only for a few hours, and so had not the necessary experience, that I did not know what had been the practice in the past. I do not claim to have had the lifelong experience of the member for North-East Fremantle, but I do claim to be possessed of a fair amount of common sense, and I consider that one fortnight of debates in this House is quite sufficient to justify a man in coming to a conclusion as to whether or not time is wasted here. The hon. member for North-East Fremantle went on to say that he could not see any grounds for my objection, that no long speeches had been made by hon. members, or at least that on only one occasion since I have been here, had there been any long speeches. I do not know whether the speeches were long, but I do know that many of them have been very, very wearisome.

Mr. Holman: Well, why not move that no wearisome speeches shall be made, instead of moving to curtail the length of speeches?

Mr. TEESDALE: I will deal with the hon. member afterwards, that is, if I have time. The member for North-East Fremantle also went on to refer to the number of electors in

my electorate. I consider that was quite superfluous. My electors claim to be possessed of some degree of intelligence. Although few in number, they have just as much intelligence as the member for North-East Fremantle. And I am quite sure that although they do not have copies of "Hansard" delivered in truck loads, as in the case of the electors of North-East Fremantle, still when I go up among them they are pleased to hear of what has happened. They have such faith and confidence in their member that they do not want to be continually hearing about him.

Mr. Troy: What has that to do with the motion?

Mr. TEESDALE: Possibly the hon. member cannot see what it has to do with the motion. However, I am so well accustomed to the hon. member that I propose to leave him off the landscape. The member for North-East Fremantle said that if members of Parliament were to take notice of the newspapers it would be God help the members of Parliament. Certainly we have had a sufficiency of letters and of comment in our leading newspapers. Only three or four days ago we had the leader in the "Melbourne Age" complaining bitterly of the waste of time by members of Parliament in dealing with matters already referred to by previous speakers. I do not often quote the "Daily News" and the "West Australian" by the yard, as many hon. members do, but I think that for once hon. members will not object to about an inch and a half of quotation. This is headed "Time limit on members' speeches; the latest form of economy. Proposed saving of words as applied to the utterances of members of the Assembly." The quotation continues:

Following the example set by the House of Representatives and the Victoria Legislative Assembly, the Standing Orders Committee of the Legislative Assembly of this State, in a report tabled yesterday, proposes a time limit on speeches.

I have previously called attention to the many occasions on which this House has given illustrations, as in the case of the Health Act Amendment Bill, which have been immediately followed by the other States. Here we have another illustration. We brought this matter on a few weeks ago, and it was immediately copied by the Legislative Assembly of Victoria. It shows that we are not so obsolete and behind-hand as some people think, that we are positively giving examples to the other States. I trust they will derive as much satisfaction from and be as successful in, their motion as I hope to be in mine. There is another point I would like to refer to. The member for North-East Fremantle, in the course of the speech to which I have already drawn attention, said that he had retained his seat by working. That is a direct reflection on every other member of the House. It appears that the only member who retains his seat by working is the member for North-East Fremantle.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I did not say that no other member worked.

Mr. TEESDALE: I claim to be working very hard when I have to sit here for 3½

hours listening to the hon. member's speeches. He went on to say—

It is not by bringing forward nonsensical motions like this for the purpose of gagging members. I never had the remotest idea of gagging anybody. I never had an idea—

Mr. Holman: About anything.

Mr. TEESDALE: That is a fact. It is quite right. I have often told the hon. member that there could be no possible intelligence on this side, because he has it all, and that therefore he could not expect anything of value to emanate from any member on this side. To resume: The member for North-East Fremantle said that he spoke only when motions were brought forward which he considered detrimental to the interests of the people of the State. That is an extraordinary statement, but perhaps the hon. member himself understands it. He said also—

If hon. members were to take notice of letters in the newspaper—

I have already said that I am just about tired of letters in the newspaper. They certainly have a good deal of weight when they refer to this subject. We are quite convinced that at other times there is not much weight to be attached to them, but in this instance I feel guilty, because I can bear that out myself. I sat here so long and so often that I finished up with a very poor idea of what had been going on. I only paid attention to the first speaker, who appeared to me to cover most of the ground, and it seems to me superfluous to listen to the other speakers. I have again to refer to the member for North-East Fremantle, because most of the opposition came from him. He says—

Probably a little extra time was taken up on the Health Bill, but hon. members are aware that there are thousands of people in the State who are so deeply interested in that Bill that they would not care if the whole session had been devoted to it.

Hon. members will see the extraordinary extravagance of this statement, that if the whole session had been devoted to one Bill the public would not have growled. That certainly was an extraordinary statement, and is on a par with the attitude of the rest of the opponents to this motion. I assure the hon. member that I have no other idea in the world than to do my best to allow to Parliament as much time as possible for legislation, without wasting so much time on speeches. We have one paper which refers to us as a talking shop, and another talking about the piffle, or pith, of Parliament. Altogether Parliament has been the subject of ridicule ever since this Ministry came into power. The time has come when we can reasonably curtail speeches. This is no innovation, because already in the previous session I called attention to it. I have no intention of acting as a reformer and do not desire to pose as introducing any new procedure, but I do think it would be conducive to the work of the House if we could arrange to put our ideas before the public a little more concisely than we have done in the past. With that object

in view I have much pleasure in moving the motion standing in my name.

Hon. T. WALKER (Kanowna): I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

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

Ayes	15
Noes	21

Majority against ..	6
---------------------	---

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Munzie
Mr. Collier	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Green	Mr. Locke
Mr. Holman	Mr. Troy
Mr. Jones	Mr. Walker
Mr. Lutey	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Mitchell	Mr. O'Loughlin
Mr. Mullany	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Maley
Mr. Brown	Mr. Money
Mr. Davies	Mr. Pilkington
Mr. Draper	Mr. R. T. Robinson
Mr. Duff	Mr. Smith
Mr. Foley	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. George	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Willmott
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Hardwick
Mr. Lefroy	(Teller.)

Motion thus negatived.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [8.55]: I must express my surprise at the attitude of the Government upon this motion, particularly when contrasting it with their attitude on the previous motion. When the House was discussing a matter, which dealt with the life and death of an individual of the State, it was not thought to be of sufficient importance to engage our attention for the whole evening. The Government forced the postponement of that matter, which is apparently now shelved indefinitely. On a ridiculous proposition of this kind, however, the Government force the House to go on. I could understand that attitude on the part of the Government—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot discuss the decision at which the House has arrived.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I am not discussing the decision of the House.

Mr. Holman: The attitude of the Government.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I will endeavour to keep within the Standing Orders, and I hope I shall not be interrupted in anticipation of what I may be going to say. We have the spectacle to-night of the hon. member submitting this motion and no member of the Government rising to indicate to the House whether the Government are prepared to accept it or not. This motion is essentially one that affects the Government. It affects the conduct of the business of the House, and for that reason is a matter of importance to the Government. Notwithstanding this, members of the Ministry sit down like stuffed individuals, apparently waiting, as has been the case in past sessions, to get a lead from the private members of the House. Having no opinion of their

own regarding this particular matter, they sit down and wait until there is a kind of desultory discussion going on around the Chamber, and they have in that way gathered the views of the majority of the members of the House, and shaped their attitude towards this motion accordingly. If the Government opposed this motion, it was the bounden duty of the Premier, or some Minister, to indicate to the House their attitude towards it.

The Premier: You moved the adjournment from your side before we had an opportunity of doing so.

Mr. Munsie: You were called upon to do so.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Ministers sat like a row of penguins on a rock without giving any indication whatever of what was in their minds until you, Sir, were putting the question. There was, therefore, no alternative but to move the adjournment of the debate from this side of the House. This sort of thing is characteristic of the Government. On important matters of this kind they do not know where they are. The member for Roebourne has come to the House, no doubt, filled up with a measure of reforming zeal, which so many new members bring to the House.

Mr. Troy: You can see it oozing out of every pore.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The hon. member, because he does not feel disposed to take up the time of the House himself with speeches—

Mr. Teesdale: You tell me to shut up so often.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Apparently has the idea that this House should become a kind of dumb institution. I have heard new members who have been about 25 minutes in the House talk about waste of time. That is the kind of cheap gallery talk which goes down with the public. One would imagine that members were elected to the House to cut wood or lay bricks on the floor of the House. We are told that we are wasting time because we indulge in debate. If this is not an institution that is peculiarly and specially elected for the purpose of debate, what has it been elected for? What are we here for? Are we not doing the work that the country elected us to do by debating and thrashing out the various questions which come before the House, affecting the public interest and the welfare of the country? Would we be doing the country's work by sitting down in dumb fashion and allowing Bills to go through, motions to go through, and the business that is brought before us to go through, without proper and adequate debate? It is only by the fullest possible discussion that the weaknesses and the flaws, and the various aspects of the business before the House, are brought out, and that thereby the best possible Bill or Act is obtained. It ill becomes a member, because he has not the mind to talk, to imagine that every other member of the House should be gagged. It would be a sorry day for the people of this country, and for the legislation that is passed, but perhaps a good thing for the courts of the country, which would be busily employed if we adopted the view which apparently is held by the hon. member, and rushed everything through holus bolus without consideration.

Mr. Teesdale: Not his alone.

Hon. P. COLLIER: There are others, too, who think it is a kind of cheap method of gaining popularity with an unthinking public, who do not know what the business of the House is, and have no idea of the proper functions of a member of Parliament.

Mr. Teesdale: That more particularly refers to the "West Australian."

Hon. P. COLLIER: The hon. member's authority is the "Daily News." There is no Parliament in Australia against which a charge can be made with less justification of indulging in unnecessary talk and waste of time than the Parliament of Western Australia.

Mr. Teesdale: You did not show much result last session.

Hon. P. COLLIER: What does the hon. member say should be the result?

Mr. Teesdale: Some good legislation.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Good legislation can only be obtained by the fullest measure of debate and discussion, not by dumb acquiescence in everything that is brought into the House, as the hon. member apparently imagines.

Mr. Teesdale: It is not obtained by talk.

Hon. P. COLLIER: If the hon. member cannot talk and has no ideas to give to the House, why should he be jealous of another hon. member?

Mr. Teesdale: Ha, ha!

Hon. P. COLLIER: The hon. member is actuated by a spirit of jealousy. He knows that he is never going to cut any figure by talking in the House, and so he would gag everyone else and prevent them from talking. That is the hon. member's motive, no doubt about it. He says, "We come here to work." Was not the Minister for Industries working last night when he spoke for three hours on the Forests Bill? The hon. member would have cut him off in half an hour. Will he assert that two hours was waste of time?

Mr. Teesdale: Half of it was.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Will he assert that the Minister was not working, doing good and effective work for the country?

Mr. Teesdale: He is doing better work than you are now.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I am engaged in good work, giving the hon. member a little bit of a dressing down for the attitude he has adopted. The Minister for Industries last night gave to the House, and through the House to the country, valuable information regarding one of the greatest assets of Western Australia, yet the hon. member says it was ridiculous waste of time.

Mr. Teesdale: No, no.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes, yes, his motion says so. He would have cut him off with an hour's speech; and what would apply to the Minister for Industries would apply to every other member at different times. To assert that the length of a speech must necessarily mean waste of time, and brief speeches, per contra, means wisdom, is the very acme of foolishness. There may be long speeches which justify every attitude of delivery. There may be five minutes of inconsequential little flutters that have no value whatever, but the value does not consist in brevity; the hon. member considers that it does. There is no need to put the gag on members of the House as the

hon. member seeks to do by his motion. And moreover, if the hon. member had been in the House longer, and had a better idea of the way business is conducted, he would know perfectly well that to carry a motion of this kind would not eventually lead to the saving of time whatsoever. If I by a Standing Order such as he moves, was cut off with half an hour's speech on a matter on which I may have spoken for an hour or an hour and a half, what would be the result? I could put up every one of my colleagues to talk for half an hour each, and instead of an hour, or an hour and a half's speech what would we have? Eight or nine hours' speeches by my colleagues.

Mr. Teesdale: I know you are capable of anything.

Hon. P. COLLIER: What does the hon. member mean? I am capable of seeing that every possible discussion and ventilation takes place in the House, and if I feel I have not sufficient time to ventilate the merits of any matter I am more than justified, in fact I am neglecting my duty if I do not see that my colleagues occupy the necessary time.

Mr. Teesdale: It is not new.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The hon. member probably wandered around the library and fell across a volume in which he saw that the Standing Orders curtailed the speeches of members and he pounced upon it—"This will do for me," and he brings it down to the House, and says, "They have got it somewhere else." What does his speech consist of? Merely that. Had it not been for the opposition of the member for North-East Fremantle last session the hon. member would have been bankrupt of one sentence in support of his motion. He supported his motion to-night by reading extracts from the speech of the member for North-East Fremantle of last session. Did he go into the merits of the case? Did he give the House sufficient argument? Did he give one scrap of argument in support of the motion except a general statement, a parrot cry? A bird in the bush could be taught in a week to say what the hon. member said—they have it somewhere else. The hon. member did not advance one scrap of argument beyond a general statement.

Mr. Teesdale: In the last debate I did.

Hon. P. COLLIER: We cannot retain in our memory the arguments that the hon. member used last session.

Mr. Holman: Here is the last debate—about two minutes.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Out of consideration for the House I will not read the speech. I will simply refer members to the page and the date—10th April, 1918, page 1279 of "Hansard"—about half a column. The hon. member is a past master in the art of condensation, but he must have regard for other members of the House who are not so skilled in that direction, and who of necessity may require an hour or an hour and a half to express their thoughts which the hon. member can express in five minutes. He should have consideration for other members of the House, and not attempt to tie us down to half an hour, which he would do by the motion. I do not want to labour the question, because I believe

the good sense of the House will not agree to it. If it had been the practice for any considerable length of time for a large proportion of members to indulge in long speeches—what the hon. member calls waste of time in talking—the House might have been justified in taking steps to curtail their loquacity. But it has not been so in this House, particularly in recent years, and not in the experience of the hon. member himself, with the exception of a speech now and again of some length which the circumstances of the case called for, such as we listened to last evening, or on the Address-in-reply, or the Budget. Such cases as that call for lengthy speeches on the part of some members. That being so, a great majority of the members might properly be described as silent. The majority speak but rarely and briefly. In view of that fact it is something in the nature of an insult to members to bring forward a motion which by inference declares that they are long-winded, time-wasters. That is the inference to be drawn from the motion. I regret the Government have not indicated their attitude toward the motion, because it certainly concerns them more than private members in the conduct of the business of the House. I hope we shall not have the spectacle of allowing the matter to go round the Chamber until it has advanced far enough to enable the Government to come to some conclusion as to how the majority stands, and then to make up their minds as to what attitude they will adopt towards it. I think the motion might have been shelved for the time being. There is more important business on the Notice Paper, and more important business has been shelved earlier in the evening, yet we waste the time, to use the hon. member's expression. The motion is only brought forward because of the parliamentary youth and inexperience of the hon. member who fathers it.

Mr. FOLEY (Leonora) [9.10]: I wish to move an amendment.

Mr. O'Loughlin: Oh, vote one way or the other.

Mr. FOLEY: I move—

That all the words after "that" be struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—"The matter of the limitation of speeches be referred to the Standing Orders Committee for their consideration and report."

I think all members will agree with me that no matter how long this question is discussed in the Chamber, when the motion is finished with the Standing Orders Committee will then be asked to put it into shape, and we shall have the discussion over again. Although members have different opinions on the question, in the interests of the House generally we would be occupying less time if we allowed the matter to go to the Standing Orders Committee; they in turn to consider it, and if there is to be any limitation or alteration in the mode of addressing the House we could take it into consideration, and any other matter that the committee place before members for the curtailment of speeches. I do not wish to waste the time of the House further, but simply move the amendment.

Mr. HARDWICK (East Perth) [9.11]: I second the amendment.

Mr. O'Loughlen: You seconded the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any seconder?

Mr. BROWN (Subiaco) [9.12]: I second the amendment.

On motion by Hon. T. Walker debate adjourned.

PAPERS—CASE OF MRS. JEFFREY.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [9.12]: I move—

That all papers relating to the prosecution of one Mrs. Jeffrey on a charge of theft in the Police Court, Perth, on June 25, be laid upon the Table.

I understand the Government have no objection to this motion. I am principally actuated in moving for the papers because the case has received a good deal of publicity in the columns of the metropolitan newspapers. I believe the newspapers have had access to the files, and that being the case I think there is no objection to the House having similar information.

Mr. MUNSIE (Haannans) [9.13]: I second the motion.

Question put and passed.

The Attorney General laid the papers on the Table.

House adjourned at 9.16 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 19th September, 1918.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 11 a.m. and read prayers.

[For "Paper Presented" see "Votes and Proceedings."]

BILL—INTERPRETATION.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 17th September.

Hon. T. WALKER (Kanowna) [11.6 a.m.]: I do not think it necessary to discuss this Bill at any length. The measure involves no new principles; and I understand that no startling innovation of any kind is proposed, and that really the only clause calling for attention is that interpreting the words "may" and "shall." The measure really represents a re-enactment of laws already in force, with some slight additions from the laws of the Commonwealth and of other States; but nothing at all departing from principles already

acknowledged here and already upon our statute-book. Perhaps the Bill has the advantage of effecting consolidation of our laws in the matter; and such a reform was needed, but the urgency of it I fail to understand. As the Bill really contains nothing introducing new principles, or any drastic or even partial alteration of our already existing laws, I think the measure might well pass its second reading now and go through Committee, when we can consider the particular points to which I have referred.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; the Attorney General in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1, 2, 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Meanings of certain terms:

Hon. W. C. ANGLWIN: This clause interprets "Minister" as meaning—

the Minister of the Crown or member of the Executive Council to whom the administration of the Act or enactment or the part thereof in which the term is used is for the time being committed by the Governor, and includes any Minister of the Crown or member of the Executive Council for the time being discharging the duties of the office of Minister.

This definition appears to confer on any member of the Executive Council who may be appointed by the Governor legal authority for the administration of any Act of Parliament. That is a new departure in Western Australia. The Governor has power to call in any person to give advice and to make any person a member of the Executive Council. We know, of course, that the Constitutional practice is to appoint members of the Executive Council only upon the advice of the Government. The practice here has been for an Honorary Minister to act for a portfolio'd Minister, the Honorary Minister having himself no legal authority, and the whole of the authority being vested in the portfolio'd Minister. Many of our Acts provide that only a Minister of the Crown can sign documents under them. If this clause is carried as printed, the power to sign will apparently be vested in the Honorary Minister. Personally I see no reason for the change, since it is only right that a portfolio'd Minister should in important matters be the person to sign, and to take the responsibility. I have had more years of experience as Honorary Minister than any other member of this House; and my invariable practice as Honorary Minister was to sign only for the portfolio'd Minister, and any matters of importance I referred to the portfolio'd Minister, and he took the responsibility as the only man responsible to Parliament. On one or two occasions I had the pleasure of acting as deputy Minister, but only during the absence of the portfolio'd Minister. As members who have been sworn in members of the Executive Council well know, the portfolio'd Minister has to make three declarations, while the Honorary Minister has to make only two. Consequently, when an Honorary Minister has been appointed to act as deputy Minister, it has been necessary for him to make the third declaration, in addition to the two made by