

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 30th May, 1931.

	PAGE
Questions: North-West, pearling and cattle industries	374
Railways, charges against officers	374
Bills: Secession, 28., etc.	374
Constitution Acts Amendment (Temporary), 28.	400
etc.	411
Adjournment: State of business	411

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

QUESTION—PEARLING AND CATTLE INDUSTRIES.

North-West Committee's Recommendations.

Hon. G. W. MILES asked the Chief Secretary: In view of the continued depopulation of the North-West and Kimberleys, and particularly the parlous condition of the pearling and cattle industries, is it the intention of the Government to give effect to the recommendations made by the North-West Committee appointed by the late Hon. T. A. L. Davy?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: Such recommendations as come within the province of the State Government, and, in the circumstances, are practicable, are receiving consideration.

QUESTION — RAILWAYS, CHARGES AGAINST OFFICERS.

Hon. F. H. H. HALL asked the Chief Secretary: Is it the intention of the Government to take any action that will enable the serious charges levelled against certain highly-placed railway officers by the Hon. C. B. Williams in this Chamber last Wednesday, the 23rd instant, to be inquired into and thus give the officers concerned an opportunity to reply?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: Inquiries are being made into this matter.

BILL—SECESSION.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from previous day.

HON. H. S. W. PARKER (Metropolitan-Suburban) [4.35]: May I be permitted to thank the Chief Secretary for his kind remarks in his opening speech with reference

to my father, and to thank him and other hon. members who so cordially welcomed new members to this Chamber. I trust I may be able to carry on and maintain the dignity of this House. Regarding the Bill before us, in my opinion, the present is a most inopportune time to approach the Imperial Parliament because very grave difficulties have arisen in almost every country of the world, and especially have they been apparent in Great Britain. In my opinion, it is unlikely, under existing conditions, that the Imperial Parliament will interfere much with our domestic affairs. The present conditions throughout the world, and especially in Australia, have been, rightly or wrongly, ascribed to the various Governments and members of Parliaments. It is said that the remedy is in the hands of the electors themselves. The trouble, to my mind, has mainly arisen throughout the civilised world owing to the fact that people look for tokens for goods and not for the goods themselves. We are trying to get more tokens than the goods actually represent. In other words, we are trying to increase prices and to keep them up in an unnatural manner. We are told there is over-production everywhere, and we also hear that there is poverty and want. That seems to be wrong. It should be within our powers to rectify such a position, seeing that it has been developed by human agencies, because Nature has undoubtedly endowed us with plenty. In Australia particularly have we endeavoured to keep up prices in a false way. We have indulged in a system of bounties and high tariffs and so made our products very expensive for our own people and have caused nations to refuse to trade with us. In consequence, we cannot exchange our goods. The net result has been extremely disastrous to this State, where our industries are mainly associated with primary production. As such, we must dispose of our goods overseas in the markets of the world. We know our wheat is shut out of many countries, and in various directions our products are barred. The Case for Secession, in the rather heavy volume that has been placed before us, demonstrates clearly that our main trouble resolves itself into a question of tariffs, which, in turn, has meant inability to trade. The obvious answer by buyers overseas is that the remedy is in our own hands and that we must accept goods in exchange for our goods. In other words, we must alter our tariff so that we can allow the goods of other countries to be admitted

under reasonable conditions. I submit that the Imperial Parliament will say to our delegation, "You must put your own house in order. It is not for the Imperial Parliament to do that work for you." Should we expect the Imperial Parliament to cut off from the Commonwealth, a large portion of its possessions? I will put it in another way. Can we expect them to cut off a comparatively small body of the population of Australia from the rest of the Commonwealth because that small body disapproves of the way in which the Commonwealth has been administered? That is really our trouble: we differ from the Federal Government respecting the way they have conducted the affairs of the Commonwealth. I agree with Mr. Holmes that we should approach the Commonwealth Parliament first, and I contend that had the Dominion League devoted its energies to bringing about the reconstruction of the Commonwealth Constitution, conditions here would have been bettered far more quickly and alterations effected in the Commonwealth Constitution at a much earlier date than will be possible under the roundabout way we propose to adopt. The feeling already exists in the Eastern States that the Commonwealth has grabbed too much of the powers that really belong to the States. It is realised that powers neither the States nor the people at any time intended to surrender to the Commonwealth, have been taken, in a strictly legal and constitutional way, by the Commonwealth. I believe that each of the States is anxious to regain more of its sovereign powers than it possesses at present, and to have returned to it some of the powers that have been filched by the Commonwealth. If all the energy that was put into the secession movement had been devoted to an agitation to get back powers that we have lost, the movement would not have been confined to this State, but would have spread throughout the Commonwealth and each of the other States would have participated. I cannot help thinking that it is not within the realms of practical politics to secure Secession, but I do think it is well within those realms to secure an alteration of the Commonwealth Constitution. I believe it could be materially altered so as to satisfy all the States. I would like to see good feeling existing between all the States and the Commonwealth, not the present-day feeling that the Commonwealth is at enmity with the States. Un-

doubtedly that feeling exists strongly, and we should devote our energies to restoring good feeling between the Commonwealth and the several States. I feel quite sure that by means of conferences, commencing, perhaps, with a Premiers' Conference, we could get back from the Commonwealth some of those powers the States are justly entitled to. I cannot imagine that the Imperial Parliament will tell us we can secede from the rest of Australia, simply because we have sent Home a delegation, and because a majority of the residents of this State indicated at a referendum, that they desired to secede. We all know what happens when general elections are held. We are fully aware of what occurs when people go to the poll to vote on any question. A certain number of the people understand what they are voting for. A certain number are led to believe things that do not, in fact, exist, and a certain number do not worry at all regarding what they are voting for. The Imperial Government know full well how referendums are conducted and how people vote. I am quite sure they will not act merely on the result of the referendum vote. They realise, as we do, that in the heat of a general election people are apt to vote for all sorts of things that afterwards they regret. They will go more deeply and inquire more fully into the question, and I feel sure they will simply refer the matter back to Australia. I do not agree that the Case as presented is one that will do us any good. First of all, I doubt whether any of the people in the Imperial Parliament who could help us will have time to read it. Had it been stated more concisely and backed with solid arguments, I think we would have done better. In the Case, we have laid ourselves open to much that can be said against us. The Case is capable of being pulled to pieces. However, it does not matter whether I agree with the Case or not. Still, I consider it unfortunate that the Case has been compiled in that way. It does not contain the sound argument that I would have liked to see put up and that I think could have been put up to show the disabilities under which we are labouring. Let me draw an analogy. I feel sure that members of this House would not for one moment listen to a petition, say, for Victoria Park to secede from the city of Perth. If such a petition were presented to Parliament, members would immediately ask, "What have the City Council

to say about it?" We would inquire what was behind the movement and ascertain the real facts. Probably some pressure could be brought to bear on the City Council to rectify certain things, but I do not think that on the petition alone, even though backed by a strong delegation, would this House or another place agree to a district seceding from the city of Perth. I think we are entirely wrong in proceeding as we propose to do. However, it is the desire of those who, may I say, managed the Secession movement to send a delegation, and for that reason I agree to the sending of a delegation. Not that I think a delegation will do any good, though in itself it will do good in this way: if we refused to send a delegation, those people who are so anxious to have one sent, and the Dominion League who are virtually sponsoring the Secession movement, will not be satisfied unless and until a delegation is sent. If a delegation be sent and be heard, and the matter is dealt with, I think we shall all be very much wiser. If it bears fruit, well and good. If it does not, the Dominion League will undoubtedly have done everything that it considers necessary to do. I shall not in any way attempt to balk the action that so many people believe to be correct. They may be right and I may be wrong. Time will show who is right. Let the delegation go, let the Case and the petitions be presented, and then we shall be wiser and possibly in a better frame of mind to pull together and get a stronger movement in all the States to rectify injustices within our borders. Surely we have the necessary ability to rectify injustices without appealing to outside statesmen to help us. I believe that we have the necessary ability in Australia to govern ourselves, control our own destinies and ensure that right and justice are done to all the people.

HON. H. SEDDON (North-East) [4.50]: With previous speakers, I wish to extend a welcome to the new members who have been elected to this House. They will find that in this assembly their views will meet with appreciation, and I hope they will be able to do all the good they desire for their constituents. It is not necessary to say that I am bound to oppose the Bill. Like the preceding speaker, I consider the present time peculiarly inopportune to take the steps contemplated by the Bill. There has recently been held in Melbourne a

Premiers' Conference called to discuss such constitutional difficulties as had arisen with a view to finding some way whereby the differences existing between the State and Federal Governments and the overlapping occurring in the various spheres could be remedied in the interests of efficiency and economy. Anyone who followed the discussions at the conference must realise that those problems were being tackled carefully and with a due realisation of all the difficulties associated with them. That being so, I consider it would have been far better had the present Bill been deferred, because possibly the results of those deliberations would have been made effective and the whole system of government in Australia improved. It is peculiar that the same people who elect the Federal Parliament and the State Parliament are apparently at war with themselves. Owing to the system of government obtaining in Australia—an attempt to effect a compromise between the British system and the American system—it is not to be wondered that there exists a considerable amount of difficulty and friction. It is a matter for wonder that there has not been more trouble and dissatisfaction between the two authorities owing to the way in which time has evolved difficulties and to the natural development of the two Governments in accordance with the demands made upon them. We, as the constitutional representatives of the people, are asked to endorse the Bill before us. We are asked to endorse the Case. We are asked to agree to the appointment of a delegation. We are asked to authorise the signing of the petitions that accompany the Case. The Chief Secretary, in moving the second reading, adopted what I regard as a most remarkable line of argument. I understood him to say that we practically had to accept the Bill and the Case as submitted to us, because if any attempt were made to amend it, it would be regarded as the Case of the Legislative Council, and not the Case prepared for the people under instructions from Parliament. If we take that view, the only conclusion I can arrive at is that we are to be regarded more or less as a rubber stamp. We are asked to endorse a Case with which most of us can find serious cause for disagreement. We

are asked to endorse the appointment of a delegation to present the Case and transact the necessary business in presenting the Case to the Imperial authorities. We are asked to sanction the appropriation of money. We are practically asked to sign an open cheque as regards the expenses to be incurred in presenting the Case to the Imperial authorities. As responsible representatives of the people, the adoption of that course would lay us open to very serious criticism. Though the Bill stipulates that no sum exceeding £100 shall be expended without authority, there is no indication as to the limit of expenditure that may be incurred in presenting the Case. If we consider the expense of presenting a case in the ordinary courts, we will realise that the delegation, before they have finished their work, may involve the State in expenditure never contemplated by Parliament, expenditure that would never have been authorised had there been the slightest conception of its proportions. Therefore, members should seriously question the proposal and should at least require some estimate of the expenditure that will be involved in presenting the Case to the Imperial authorities. Much has been said about giving effect to the will of the people. It is one of the strongest cards that has been played in the present movement. The previous speaker directed attention to the various methods by which people were influenced to record their votes—methods that undoubtedly had an important effect on the vote recorded for Secession. I agree with Mr. Parker. The very way in which the question was presented conveyed to many people the impression that, if a substantial majority for Secession were not secured, harm would be done to such claims as we have and such disabilities as we are seeking to have redressed by the Federal Government. In the event of a narrow majority, the Federal authorities would undoubtedly have claimed that a comparatively small number of people were making all the trouble. In my opinion there is not the slightest doubt that many people recorded their votes for Secession without entertaining the slightest intention that the matter should be carried further, or should go so far as it has been carried up to the present time. Reference has been made to the fact

that the minority are entitled to have their case presented. It was a very substantial minority. When no fewer than one-third of the people of the State, in the face of opposition and in the face of the strong feeling associated with the referendum, recorded themselves as opposed to Secession, I maintain it is a minority who cannot be overlooked, a minority whose claims to recognition and whose claims to state their case must not be lightly regarded.

Hon. V. Hamersley: The minority were overlooked at the inauguration of Federation.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I do not know that they were. The question was put to them before the Bill was passed by the Imperial Parliament. Provision was made in the preamble to the Constitution for the expression of the will of the people of Western Australia.

Hon. J. Nicholson: The Federal authorities propose to send delegates to England.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I understand that the Federal authorities are preparing a case in reply to the Case compiled by the special committee. If the minority in this State were allowed to present the facts from their standpoint, I consider that the Case would carry far greater weight. We have practically a dispute between two Governments. The introduction of the views and such a Case as would be presented by the minority, speaking as citizens of the State, would have a very material effect upon whatever decision is arrived at by the Imperial authorities. I have referred briefly to the fact that by Clause 8 of the Bill we are practically giving an open cheque for the expenditure to be incurred in the presentation of the Case. We have a Government which last year recorded a deficit of £850,000, and which this year contemplates a deficit of £700,000. Yet it is proposed that Parliament shall allow that Government to spend money in an enterprise which everyone will admit is a very risky one.

Hon. C. B. Williams: And they are paying some of their workers 30s. a week.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Yes, that is another aspect. Here is a Government which have certain legislation on the statute-book whereby Government servants are deprived of 20 per cent. of their salaries, notwithstanding which the Government are prepared to contemplate the expenditure of an unknown sum of money in presenting this Case to the Im-

perial authorities. These are facts which the Imperial Parliament will consider and in the light of which they will ask, "As responsible people, can we reconcile such a state of affairs: the expenditure of money on the presentation of a case which is entirely a matter between yourselves?" Undoubtedly our financial judgment is going to be called into serious question if we proceed along those lines. The House is asked to endorse the Case. I have read the Case and I admit there is a lot of valuable information contained in it.

Hon. E. H. Hall: Have you read the whole of it?

Hon. H. SEDDON: Yes. In the presenting of the Case we have to remember—which undoubtedly the committee who prepared it did remember—that much information is being given to people who know very little of the internal affairs of Western Australia, or indeed Australia, and very little of the relationship between the States and the Commonwealth Government. From that standpoint I desire to express appreciation of the very thorough work the committee have performed in the collating of so much information. At the same time, I find myself entertaining serious doubts as to many of the statements made and much of the information presented. It will be said that the Case is the case for the secessionists, and naturally, from their own standpoint, they have presented the best case they can. But certain statements contained in the Case will not bring any credit on the Parliament of Western Australia. As an illustration, there is the quotation from a speech by the late Premier, referring to the transfer of the State Savings Bank to the Commonwealth authorities. Here is a Government proposing to cut adrift from the Federal authority and which naturally will be expected to make all necessary arrangements for the effective carrying on of the affairs of the State, especially in regard to banking. A quotation is included in the Case showing that the then Premier admitted that he had to hand over the savings bank to the Federal authorities in order to save the depositors from being prevented from withdrawing their deposits. On such an admission any independent and impartial authority would ask, "In view of that state of affairs, how can you do justice to your people, how can you do any effective work in the financing of the State when you have to admit that you cannot even carry on an ordinary Government savings

bank without having to go crying to the Federal Government for assistance?" When we examine the table showing the position of the assets of that bank, we realise that any proposal to re-introduce a State savings bank in Western Australia will naturally be subject to severe criticism, while that confidence which is essential to the effective carrying on of a bank will certainly be withheld; indeed, such a bank would always be under suspicion as a banking institution. Reference has been made to the use of the printing press for the provision of money. There is in the Case a paragraph referring to certain action taken by the Federal Government in the matter of increasing the note issue, thereby making provision for certain work to be carried out at the time when this country was passing through the unparalleled crisis of the war. Although that step was taken against the expressed views of the financial advisers of the country, it must be admitted there was no option to the taking of that very dangerous step. Yet we find that certain advocates of Secession are now declaring that the establishment of a State savings bank could be successfully carried out, and the question of using the printing press is, by them, considered to be quite in order in view of the circumstances that might arise. The judgment of those people in contemplating such a financial proposal destroys any confidence we might otherwise have in their ability to carry on the financial affairs of the State.

Hon. A. Thomson: Have you not any confidence in your own State?

Hon. H. SEDDON: I have a great deal of confidence in the State, but my experience has led me to have much less confidence in those managing the affairs of the State. Then there is another aspect of financing which I think the House should seriously consider. We have been passing through a crisis which has compelled us to continue to borrow large sums of money. It is openly admitted that we cannot carry on the affairs of the State without continuing to borrow. Although criticism has been directed against the tremendous burden which the State is carrying in the existing debt, there is no suggestion made as to how the people are going to carry the additional burden which will be imposed on them if they take over their fair share of the Commonwealth debt.

Hon. A. Thomson: It will be exactly the same as the Commonwealth did when they took over our debts.

Hon. H. SEDDON: There are to be two parties to that arrangement. I will deal with that presently. There has been no estimate made in this instance as to the amount of liability which will have to be taken over by the new Dominion if it is to accept its fair share of the commitments incurred by the Commonwealth on account of the war, and the necessary expenses in the establishment of capital works in this State. Yet we are asked to present to the Imperial Government this Case under which we shall have to take over an immense debt. We are going to take on a very much larger share of liability. The burden of our interest bill is in itself a very large matter indeed.

Hon. A. Thomson: Are the Federal Government paying our interest to-day?

Hon. H. SEDDON: The Federal Government—

Hon. A. Thomson: They broke their agreement regarding the Customs.

Hon. H. SEDDON: They are paying seven and a half millions to the States.

Hon. A. Thomson: They are not paying much to Western Australia.

Hon. H. SEDDON: They are paying £600,000 to Western Australia by way of special grant. When Secession is accomplished, that grant will no longer be available.

Hon. A. Thomson: But we shall then have the Customs revenue.

Hon. H. SEDDON: The greatest appeal in connection with the Case is made to the farmers. They are assured that the tremendous pressure of the tariff burden will be lifted from their shoulders if Secession becomes an accomplished fact.

Hon. A. Thomson: At all events, it will be very much lighter than it is to-day.

Hon. H. SEDDON: So I cannot see how the advocates of Secession can claim that the Government are going to collect anything like as much money through the tariff as is represented by our share of the tariff to-day. Obviously, to reduce the tariff is to reduce the collections under that tariff. In those circumstances we, as responsible representatives of the people, should seriously consider what we are doing before we give our endorsement to the Case about to be presented to the Imperial authorities and so leave ourselves open to the criticism that will be directed against us.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I think they will question our mentality.

Hon. H. SEDDON: There are in the Bill certain clauses to which I would draw attention. The Bill provides for petitions to be presented to the two Houses of the Imperial Parliament, and it also contains an Act which it is asked shall be passed through the Imperial Parliament. But no formal request has been made to the other party to the existing agreement, regarding their attitude on Secession. Suppose two partners are engaged in business and one seeks to break away. If he were to go into court and ask a judge not only to dissolve the partnership but to lay down conditions under which he would be allowed to withdraw from the partnership, the first thing that would be asked him would be as to what the other partner had to say to it. Yet it is proposed to approach the Imperial Government with a document which sets out that we wish to take certain action, although we have not consulted the other partner at all.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The other partner represents six millions of people while we represent half a million.

Hon. H. SEDDON: And we are asking that the Federal partner shall be bound by the Bill. Anyone will realise that the first step to be taken, even though it be a formal step, is to communicate with the other partner to the agreement the fact that we propose to dissolve the partnership, and ask for that other partner's view upon the matter. As it is we go to the Imperial authorities and present this case, which has to be approved by both Houses of this Parliament, and the Imperial Parliament will undoubtedly say, "Have you consulted the other party?" Our answer to that must be that we have not done so. We have not consulted the Commonwealth authorities even in a formal way concerning their opinion on this question. The step that we propose to take is one that will not be creditable to us as responsible representatives of the people of the State. Certain features of the Secession issue have, unfortunately, been left entirely in the background. I refer to the effect of Secession upon the workers of the State. Should Secession come about, and should the policy which is evidently behind the Case be brought into operation, the workers of the State will call very seriously into question those people who claimed to be their leaders. It will be of no use for those leaders to shelter behind the policy they are advocating, that of carrying out the will of

the people. If ever there was a time when the workers needed sound leadership, it is on the question at issue. The remarkable feature of the referendum was the silence of the leaders of the great Labour Party concerning the effect that Secession would have upon the workers of the State. Those leaders have a responsibility to face. It will be brought seriously home to them should they, by their inactivity, and their passive acceptance of the situation, land the workers in a position that will be thrust upon them if Secession becomes a fact. I wish to refer to the goldfields. I have here a telegram, a copy of which was transmitted by the Kalgoorlie Municipal Council to members representing the goldfields. If representatives in Parliament of the goldfields are going to take the view that has been taken by so many other members of Parliament who claim to represent the people, that they must carry out the will of the people, then surely the will of the people of the goldfields must also be taken into consideration. The telegram reads—

Kalgoorlie municipal council emphatically protests against Secession Bill, and requests that all members of this constituency in both Houses of Parliament will regard the anti-secession majorities of their electorates and carry out the wishes of such.

The telegram is signed by the town clerk. The people of the goldfields are just as much entitled to consideration as are the people of the rest of the State. I am sorry to hear imported into the debate certain very caustic references to the people of the goldfields upon the attitude they have adopted from time to time in their relationship to the rest of the State. In the setting-up of the Case, reference is made in paragraph 376 to what I wish to mention. Certain figures are presented there, which are remarkable not for what they tell but for what they leave out. In this paragraph is set out the capital cost of the goldfields railways. There is also set out the cost of State batteries, and the losses incurred in their operation. No reference is made to the £6,000,000 worth of gold that exists in the dumps associated with the State batteries, nor is any reference made to the enormous contributions which have been made by the goldfields people to the revenue of the railways by means of the high freights that are charged for the conveyance of the commodities used by those people. We know that many unproductive railways

have been foisted upon the State on the plea that they have been constructed for the development of the agricultural industry. We know that many of those lines will remain unproductive for many years. When we realise these things, and the enormous contributions which have been made by the goldfields people in the freights they have paid, to assist in maintaining the railway system so that it may come close to balancing its ledger, we must agree that the Case that has been made out for Secession should have contained some recognition of this important fact. Mention is also made of the water scheme. Mr. Baxter referred in caustic terms to the scheme, and suggested that it had not paid its way. The goldfields people cannot be blamed for that. If the custom of the goldfields people were lost to the scheme, the revenue from it would fall materially, and the loss incurred would greatly increase. There must also be taken into account the capital cost of the various reticulation systems that form adjuncts to the goldfields scheme. The losses which have been incurred can very largely be accounted for by the extensions which have been made from the scheme for the assistance of farmers. This has certainly been a contributing factor to those losses. The original capital cost of the scheme has been increased by the expenditure on the reticulation schemes. The people of the goldfields have to pay 7s. 3d. per 1,000 gallons for the water they use for household purposes, whereas the metropolitan area which is drawing supplies from the Mundaring reservoir, pays at the rate of 3d. per 1,000 gallons. It will, therefore, be realised what a disparity exists between the charges made to these sections of the people. An investigation into the costs of the water schemes will show that a much lower all-round price could have been charged, and the scheme made to show a profit instead of a loss, if we had something like ordinary business management that would have encouraged the use of the water. The remedy is to be found in the management rather than in finding fault with the consumers on the goldfields.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: It has been a reproductive work.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Yes, both directly and indirectly. It has been of great assistance to the State, because of the

manner in which it has been possible to develop the State by means of the scheme.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Indirectly it has been profitable, but directly it has not been so.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Can the hon. member say that?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Yes. Do not forget that it cost the country £100,000 a year.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Exactly. The original cost of the scheme would have been more than made up but for the additional capital expenditure on other schemes, which resulted in heavy additional charges being imposed upon this particular scheme year by year.

Hon. C. G. Elliott: The Scheme made a substantial profit last year over working expenses.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I have something to say to the farmers' representatives. A few years ago the goldmining industry was in a serious position. Indeed, it was said to be almost down and out. To-day the position is reversed in relation to the farming industry. Farmers who were so prosperous then, and apparently had such a rosy future, are to-day facing a very serious financial position: whereas the goldfields are once more coming to the assistance of the people of the State as well as of the people of the Commonwealth. At that time a great deal of criticism was levelled at the gold-mining industry, and against the management of the mines. No doubt the criticism had a certain beneficial effect. After all, the real benefit that accrued to the mining industry came through the valuable work of investigation that was carried on, and the very valuable scientific operations that were conducted at the time. There was first of all the investigations carried out by the Development Commission, which pointed to the possibilities of the Golden Mile in particular, and the good that was likely to be derived from lateral prospecting. The investigations conducted by Dr. Stillwell, who viewed the Kalgoorlie field as a geological whole, instead of a series of watertight mining compartments, revealed such enormous possibilities from the geological point of view that one company, at a time when money was not being invested in the industry, found a considerable amount of capital. This led to what I may call the gradual resurrection of the goldmining industry, which is now of such great benefit to the State.

Hon. A. Thomson: It was the increased price of gold that made the operations so successful.

Hon. H. SEDDON: That, of course, has materially assisted the position. At the time when capital was put into the Kalgoorlie field, there was no suggestion of an increased price of gold. The money was put into the industry when gold was at a normal figure, and when there was no prospect of an improved price. It was by means of improved methods of mining and treatment of ore that the company concerned had to assure itself of a return for its expenditure. At Wiluna the mining company is, in the matter of costs, down to where the costs were in 1919. Operating costs are now 19s. 1d. per ton, and out of that no less than 2s. 6d. per ton is set aside for mining development. This shows that, so far as the actual mining is concerned, the application of science, together with the practice of modern methods, has effected an enormous improvement in the situation apart from the increased price of gold. It appears to me that the restoration of prosperity to the farming industry must have its foundation on the same lines. The man who farms scientifically and applies up-to-date and modern methods to his industry will be the one to achieve a reduction in costs, and be far more able effectively to outlive the storm than the man who continues to follow old and out of date ideas and slipshod methods.

Hon. A. Thomson: He certainly wants a much better price for wheat than he is getting to-day.

Hon. H. SEDDON: That certainly is so, but on the other hand we find that the man who formerly was content to rest his entire fortune upon the production of wheat is now turning his mind to the more scientific methods of mixed farming, and realising that he must have more than one string to his bow if he is to make a success of his calling. I find myself in the position of not by any means being able to endorse the Case which is being sent Home, nor the methods proposed to be adopted. On the financial side of the question, I find myself seriously in opposition to those who advocate the sending Home of a delegation. If we do send a delegation Home, let us first show that we have some sense of responsibility towards the management of our financial affairs. I oppose the Bill.

HON. V. HAMERSLEY (East) [5.31]:

In addressing myself to the Bill before the House, I desire to offer a few words of welcome to the new members who were returned to this Chamber at the recent elections. From the earliest days of the settlement of this continent it was recognised that Australia was too big a country to be governed from one centre. At various times appeals were made from one portion or another of Australia to the Motherland for forms of local government. After we had travelled along those lines for a number of years, the various colonies came to the conclusion, largely at the behest of the Motherland, that it would be well to get together with the idea of seeing whether Australia would not be better off under a Federal system of control, so ensuring a closer connection with the Motherland in matters of trade. As regards Western Australia, from the earliest days, when we were under the direct control of a Governor, there was dissatisfaction with that form of government. Appeals were made to the Governor for direct representation of the people. It was urged that a certain number of elected persons should be joined with the Governor in order to ensure a more direct local control. Quite early in the piece, in fact, Governor Stirling was petitioned to go to the Old Country to further that object. The appeals were not listened to at the inception, but as the years proceeded and the desire of the community was emphasised by constant repetition the Home authorities were induced to grant a measure of local control. In that way we went along for a number of years, making appeals for responsible government. It is pleasing to call to mind that the last delegation sent Home to make an appeal for responsible government to the British Parliament included the father of a gentleman recently returned to this Chamber, and that it was in great measure due to his presentation of the case that responsible government was granted. Responsible government quickly brought in its train the progress that marked the years from 1890 to 1900. During that decade, when we first had control of our own affairs, Western Australia progressed by leaps and bounds. In 1890 we were a small population of 46,000 with a revenue of only £400,000. At the close of the decade our population had risen to 180,000, and our revenue to £3,000,000. Remarkable progress was made as soon as we

had obtained full control of our own affairs. The annual increase of population during those 10 years was 13,341. During the next 14 years, from 1900 to 1914, our annual increase of population was 10,170, representing a considerable diminution of the increase during the previous decade. During the 14 years from 1914 to 1928 the average annual increase was only 5,984, and during the last four years, 1929 to 1933, it has been only 3,415. The slower growth of population has been due largely, I contend, to the fact that we lost control of our own affairs, which control had been handed over to the Commonwealth. And almost from the date of our entering into Federation our prosperity seems to have waned. Under Federation we speedily found that there was a reduction of our revenue due to encroachments of the Commonwealth, and so we were compelled to look around for additional means of financing. We were compelled to embark upon a scheme of direct taxation, and before long this domain also was encroached upon by the Commonwealth. The result was that we experienced the greatest difficulty in maintaining the activities of our various departments of State. Ultimately we found ourselves in the throes of extreme financial difficulty. It was mainly due to the failure of the Commonwealth to carry out the terms of the Financial Agreement which we had entered into that the demand for Secession arose. In the early stages of Federation the minority accepted the decision of the majority, and lived through a period of 34 years on that basis. It is not surprising that during the Secession campaign many people were carried away by the argument that too much credence should not be given to the views enunciated by opponents of Federation. Nevertheless the revulsion of feeling was such that the referendum vote reversed the decision of 1900. My belief is that if another Secession referendum were held, the majority against Federation would be even greater. At the recent referendum many voters were affected by the promise made here by the Prime Minister to grant a Convention, on which ground he urged the people not to vote in favour of Secession. A convention, the Prime Minister said, would be granted to go into the difficulties of this State with a view to some redress being granted. My belief is that many of those who would have voted for Secession were caught by the idea of a conven-

tion. Since then, however, there has been no further mention of the convention. It has not been granted in any form. Therefore I say that those who were influenced by the idea of a convention to remedy the wrongs of the State would, at another referendum, cast their votes in favour of Secession. At the time of the late referendum there was a strong belief in the minds of the whole of the people that in the event of the result being in favour of Secession, the question would be referred to the British Parliament. I congratulate the Government on their ready acceptance of that view, and on their having interpreted correctly the feeling that was behind the vote. They have readily agreed to submit this Bill to Parliament, and in the event of its passing, to send a deputation from this State for the purpose of laying the views of Western Australia before the British Legislature. As regards the financial aspect, which has been raised by several hon. members, and notably by Mr. Seddon, no doubt the British Parliament would do as has been suggested by Mr. Parker—refer the matter to the Federal Government and see what they have to say about it. The Federal Government would have their answer all ready. No doubt the negotiations would occupy more than twenty-four hours. Probably they would extend over some years.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Would the delegation remain there all the time?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Did Governor Stirling remain there all the time when he was sent Home to submit the question of local government to the British Parliament? Did other delegations remain there all the time while the British Parliament was considering the question of altering the system of government here? These matters would have to be thrashed out.

Hon. H. Seddon: How many trips do you think the delegation will take?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Probably only one will be sufficient. I look upon the delegation as a most important part of the movement, and the sooner the members of it get away the better.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: And the sooner they get back the better.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: All that they will be required to do will be to put the subject forward and impress the British

Parliament with the importance of the matter to Western Australia. In my opinion the question of cost is immaterial, but once the delegation has submitted its views, there will be no necessity for the members of it to remain in England. The British Parliament will then decide the issue and I have no doubt our Case will be referred back to the Federal Government, and then further negotiations will take place. Our desire is to impress the Motherland that we are not out to gain notoriety, or that we are using this as a means to extract more doles from the Commonwealth. I know it has been advanced by a great many that our action will be the means of squeezing a little more out of the Commonwealth Government. That is not so. The compact we entered into we had to accept. When we were forced into Federation we accepted the verdict because we were in the minority, but owing to the manner in which the contract has been carried out, we have come to the conclusion that to remain federated any longer is a hopeless proposition for Western Australia. We are not, as someone has said, like dogs baying at the moon; we want to fight for our rights and get some redress.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Who forced us into Federation?

Hon. C. B. Williams: The British Government.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: At the time we federated a great many people in Western Australia were newcomers and had secured the franchise. Perhaps Mr. Chamberlain had more to do with our entering the Federation than those newcomers. We were undoubtedly pressed into it by the British Government, whose one idea was Imperial trade. At that time Britain was being badly hit to leg in that respect by Germany and America.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: If we had voted "No," we would never have joined the Federation, no matter what the Imperial Government might have thought.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Undoubtedly the letters and telegrams that came from Mr. Chamberlain impressed those in authority in Western Australia. Although we are in the Federation, we are still a sovereign State, with a right to appeal to the Motherland. It is quite a proper thing that we should have that right, and we are now exercising

it and pointing out the wrongs that we consider we have suffered by being in the Federation. I consider that our appeal will be considerably dealt with, and that we shall get some satisfaction, more even than Mr. Holmes and others think. Mr. Holmes believes that we will be sent back with a flea in our ear, and told to go on putting up with the bad bargain into which we have entered. If that is the treatment that is to be dealt out to us, it is just as well that we should know where we are. We have tried Federation and in my opinion it has proved a failure. I congratulate the Government on their action in the direction of carrying out this appeal to the Motherland, and I sincerely hope that the Bill now before us will be passed. Particularly do I desire to impress this upon the Government, that the present session of the Imperial Parliament will end early in August next. Thus the delegation will have to leave Western Australia not later than the 18th June. That should allow sufficient time for the delegation to make the necessary arrangements in London for the presentation of the petition before the Imperial Parliament rises.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I think the hon. member should reserve those remarks for the Committee stage. They can more appropriately be used in Committee.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Circumstances make it imperative that I should offer these comments on the second reading of the Bill.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The hon. member could move in that direction in Committee, and make his proposal a part of the Bill.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Why cannot I make the statement now? I may extract a reply from the Leader of the House. It must be remembered that more than 12 months have elapsed since the referendum was taken, and a further delay of six months or more may give rise to the belief in the minds of British Ministers that we may really not desire to secede. Moreover, the Commonwealth Government have indicated their intention of putting up a reply to the Case. Therefore it is clear that the Case for Secession should be presented before the reply being prepared by the Federal Government, and to delay action on our part would be bad tactics; it would be playing right into the hands of the Commonwealth. The Government are to be congratulated on the manner in which they have brought down

the Bill, but during the past month much has happened in the ranks of the Labour Party to give rise to certain misgivings. So there should be no further delay, and I hope that before the Premier leaves for Canberra on Thursday week, arrangements will be made for the immediate departure of the delegation. I look upon this question as being of the utmost importance, and I ask the Chief Secretary to give an assurance that the delegation will leave for London without delay. Regarding the personnel of the delegation, I trust that the Government will appoint the best men available, representatives who will be able to put up our Case in a forceful manner. I should like to see the Premier himself accompany the delegation.

Hon. G. W. Miles: But he does not believe in Secession.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I am convinced that he does, judging from his earlier remarks. However, I am satisfied that the Government will choose the best men available for the task of presenting the Case to the Imperial Parliament. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central) [5.55]: I shall not take up very much time in offering a few comments on the Bill. Whether the Premier does or does not believe in the Case for Secession, he has on several occasions expressed strong disapproval of the treatment meted out to Western Australia by the Commonwealth Government. That being so, I want to know what he and others who have been in the State for many years, and also some of those born here, have been doing all these years except to express their strong disapproval of the Commonwealth treatment of the State, which has got us nowhere. Neither have the reports of the Royal Commissions appointed by the Federal Governments got us anywhere. Having voted against Federation in the first place, and later on, as a member of this Chamber, having voted against the Financial Agreement, anything I may say will probably be looked upon as prejudiced. But when we take the report of the Federal Royal Commission that was appointed to inquire into our disabilities, and find that no notice whatever was taken of the recommendations made, we cannot expect very much attention to be paid to anything that might be said here. The members of that Royal Commission came

from the Eastern States and the majority report, in no uncertain way, declared that Western Australia was suffering severe disabilities as the result of having joined Federation, while the minority report suggested that the State should have control of its Customs for a period of years. When these recommendations were totally ignored by the Commonwealth, it seems to me that the only thing that remained for the people to do was to do that which has actually been done, namely, the taking of a vote on the question of seceding from the Commonwealth. Until that vote was taken many people in the Eastern States did not treat this question seriously. I had the privilege of travelling with a business man from Melbourne the other day and he expressed his keen sympathy with the people of Western Australia, and declared that there were many now in the Eastern States who realised that there was justification for West Australians to be keenly dissatisfied with the treatment meted out to the State by the Commonwealth Government. I have looked upon you, Mr. Deputy President, as being rather hard when in the Chair, and if I may say so without offence, I suggest that you followed a bad example when you allowed members so much latitude on this discussion. I mention this in the hope that you will put up with me in a similar way for just a few minutes. We have been forced into taking action to secure severance from the Federal bond. We must proceed with it, because our very existence is at stake. Of what use is it to Australia to have trade representatives in Paris and elsewhere and to send a most estimable gentleman on a costly trip to Japan—I have every respect for the Federal Attorney-General—on what is referred to as a “goodwill mission,” when the people’s representatives in our national Parliament are constantly erecting additional trade barriers and slapping in the face the best customers we have? So long as that sort of thing continues, other nations will not content themselves with turning the other cheek, but will do what we have a right to expect them to do—slap us back. The trouble is that such actions redound to the detriment of the primary producers. We are continually being enjoined to provide money with which to start new industries in this State. Those of us who have been foolish enough to take notice of that suggestion, have simply “got it in the neck.”

Hon. A. Thomson: You were right when you used the word “foolish.”

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I will give members a few particulars of my own experience. I endeavoured to start a new industry at the Abrolhos Islands. Repeated references appear in the “West Australian” to the wonderful possibilities—we know that “potentialities” is a word that is just about worn out—that exist along our coast for the development of the fishing industry. I have invested a few hundred pounds in the industry we have started at the Abrolhos. I admit it is only in a small way but we have gone in for the canning of lobsters. I have been in touch with the Agent-General in London, to whom I sent some samples of our tinned crayfish, and he, in turn, placed them with people connected with the trade, men who understand the business from A to Z. I have had very good reports from those people, who indicated that they desired to handle our product. When Mr. Baxter was Chief Secretary, he had to pay a visit to South Africa in the interests of his health. When he was there, he found that large quantities of canned crayfish were being exported to France. On Mr. Baxter’s return, I harkened to his advice, and also that of the Chief Inspector of Fisheries here, and embarked upon the fish canning business at the Abrolhos. I find, however, that at every turn I am penalised by this great and glorious Commonwealth of ours. In one letter to me the Agent-General, Sir Hal Colebatch, said, “We found the contents excellent.” Mr. Voss, the representative of the Commonwealth in Paris, in a letter to the Department of Commerce, stated that the quality was excellent. In a letter to me, Sir Hal Colebatch wrote—

In regard to the French market, there are two outstanding dangers. The first is the competition of the Japanese crabs, and the second is the inclination of the French people to impose heavy duties against Australian goods in retaliation for our duties on their products.

The same tendency is indicated right through the piece. Here is an extract from a letter from one of the firms to whom our samples were sent by the Agent-General—

We are given to understand that France is on the eve of concluding a trade agreement with Russia. The result of this agreement will be that a quota will be enforced on all crustaceans; that is, crayfish, lobster, crab-meat and shrimps. If this quota is put into

force, it will mean that countries who are prepared to take a certain amount of French goods will benefit with regard to the said quota.

We have a primage duty of 10 per cent. upon tin plate, which is imported from Wales. We endeavour to pack our products in the best tin-plated ware we can obtain, and we have to pay that primage duty on all we purchase.

Hon. G. W. Miles: There is the sales tax, too.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: Yes, I will come to that. This week I purchased from one of the leading firms of Perth, 1 cwt. of solder as a cost of £10 5s. 4d. I also procured two 16oz. solder irons, which represented a cost of 5s. 6d., the total of the bill coming to £10 10s. 10d. On that I had to pay Federal sales tax amounting to 10s. 7d., making the total bill £11 1s. 5d. It is impossible to carry on business under such conditions. It is futile to expect other countries to take our primary products when we, on our part, turn round and extend such treatment to goods imported from overseas.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: If the hon. member will mention the Bill now and then, it will help.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I was merely following the example of previous speakers, and I have just about concluded what I have to say. In fact, had you, Mr. Deputy President, called me to order two minutes later, you would then have been too late! I do not like this business, any more than you do. I feel largely as you do, Mr. Deputy President, although I voted against Federation. Still it is a long lane that has no turning, and we have got to the turning in this instance. We have tried every possible means of attracting the attention of the Federal Government to our disabilities, but they have turned a deaf ear to our complaints. I am hopeful that we will secure some help by the means proposed in the Bill, and I support its second reading.

HON. H. J. YELLAND (East) [6.6]: At the outset I would like to offer a few words of congratulation to the new members who have taken their seats in this Chamber for the first time during the current session. I recognise the difficulties with which they are faced. Before becoming accustomed to their

surroundings, they will be called upon to cast a vote upon such an important matter as the Secession Bill. From the speeches we have heard from them already, it seems to me that we can look forward to much valuable assistance in future debates. I congratulate the Government on the speedy manner in which they have placed the Bill before us this session, and have given us an opportunity to send the decision of the people of Western Australia to the Imperial authorities for their consideration. It seems to me that the Bill is not one on which we should deal at length with Secession or Federation. It is one purely for the purpose of implementing the decision of the people as disclosed at the referendum. That being so, it appears to me that we have been beating the air a good deal. During the course of the debate a few remarks were made that indicated members felt it necessary to go into the merits and demerits of Federation, with the result that it becomes obligatory to follow them to some extent. I do this rather reluctantly, but I desire to answer some of the points that were advanced. At the outset I wish to dissociate myself from the remarks of Mr. Macfarlane. He and I have been working together in politics for some considerable time, and although I have always had the greatest respect for him—

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Surely you have not lost it now!

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: No, but I have opinions different from those the hon. member indicated in his speech.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: We can agree to differ.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: Unfortunately Mr. Macfarlane is president of the Nationalist Party, and the remarks he made have gone forward as the opinion of the Nationalists.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Nonsense! What about the speeches of Mr. Nicholson and Mr. George?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You will bring party politics into this Chamber! It acts like a boomerang.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: In the circumstances, I must dissociate myself from Mr. Macfarlane's remarks, although I am in accord with him in one of his statements in which he referred to the views of the minority. I do not suggest we should prevent the minority report from going forward. Each section of the community has a right to be

represented, although I would remind the House we have yet to be shown that the opinion of the minority was placed prominently before the authorities when Federation was being determined, as it is proposed to deal with the minority on the Secession issue. We must realise that when the vote on Federation was taken in 1900, the decision was largely that of people who had formerly resided in the Eastern States and of those whose views were swayed by vested interests. It seems to me that the minority vote at the Secession referendum was largely representative of vested interests of Australia, not of Western Australia. I have yet to find, in the course of my travels, Western Australian-born people who are wholeheartedly in favour of remaining in the Federation, unless they be those who are associated with financial concerns in the Eastern States.

Hon. G. W. Miles: I am one of them, and I have no such association.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: I am speaking generally. There may be individual instances to which my remarks do not apply, but I think they do apply generally.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I am another, but I am afraid my only association is in respect of the money I owe my bank.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: In the course of his speech, Mr. Macfarlane advanced the theory that the increases in our population and industries represented an indication that Western Australia had not suffered from the effects of Federation. That was practically the basis upon which the early part of his speech was founded. Because our population and our industries have increased, he suggested that was an indication that the Federal bond had not been—

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: The yoke claimed for it.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: Mr. Macfarlane can put it that way if he likes. He suggested that we should continue as at present, and in doing so he advocated a continuation of conditions that to-day—I am speaking especially with reference to wheatgrowing—cost every farmer about £1 a week because of tariff impositions.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: On a point of order. I take exception to the statement that I advocated anything against the interests of the primary producers. I desire to advocate everything that serves the inter-

ests of the primary producers, and no part of my speech indicated otherwise.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: In his remarks, Mr. Macfarlane—

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! Mr. Macfarlane has taken exception to a statement the hon. member made, and I think it should be withdrawn.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: I intend to qualify the statement.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: You must withdraw the statement without qualification.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: I will withdraw the statement, at your suggestion. Mr. Macfarlane has indicated that he is a Federalist, and he suggested that we should continue under the Federal bond. Will he deny that?

Hon. A. Thomson: He does not want that withdrawn.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I suggest to Mr. Yelland that he should not inquire for points of order, but leave that to others.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: I repeat that Mr. Macfarlane said he was in favour of the Federal bond, and that means that he desired Western Australia to remain as an integral part of the Commonwealth.

Hon. G. W. Miles: He did not say we were not suffering from disabilities.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: So long as we continue under existing conditions, every wheat farmer is compelled to pay about £1 a week owing to tariff impositions.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Where do the wheat-growers get their bonuses?

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: We will not deal with that point at the moment.

Hon. A. Thomson: The farmers would like to get a bonus of £1 now.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: Before tea I was dealing with the remarks made by Mr. Macfarlane, who said the increased development in our population and industries was an indication that Western Australia had not suffered under the Federal bond. But in neither case has the hon. member had opportunity to make valid comparisons. It has been the development of the whole State, the community has developed in many ways, and consequently he cannot say that what development there has been was due to our association with the Commonwealth. Although he did not say

that exactly, he said the increase was an indication that Western Australia had not suffered under the Federal bond.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Not unduly suffered.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: I want to dissociate myself from the hon. member's viewpoint. I believe progress has been made despite Federation, not because of it. I want to show how our industries have suffered; and if our industries have suffered, it must necessarily follow that the population which would have been needed to carry on and control those industries must have been reduced; in other words, the loss of industries must mean the loss of population. We can show definitely that the progress of our industries has been held up by virtue of our association with the Federal scheme. Take for instance the industry referred to by Mr. Piesse, namely, the boot trade. Arising out of my association with the public interests of Western Australia, I remember that the bootmaking industry in Western Australia was virtually closed down and the boots were manufactured in the Eastern States.

Hon. A. Thomson: The same thing applies to the tobacco industry.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: Yes, that is so. The fact remains that boot factories were closed down here and the boots were manufactured in the Eastern States. Only the retail section of the industry was continued in Western Australia. But the unfortunate position was that the charge to Western Australia was about equal to the retail price, less the cost of distribution, and consequently the whole of the profits accruing from the trade were retained in the Eastern States, and Western Australia got nothing out of it at all.

Hon. R. G. Moore: What was the matter? Could not the boots be made here?

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: They could be made here, but there were better opportunities afforded in the Eastern States as the result of the advantage of Federation to those States.

Hon. A. Thomson: They cut down their overhead expenses by making boots there.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: I am giving these instances to refute the impression left by Mr. Macfarlane. Then we could

instance the jam industry. Messrs. Raynors founded a jam factory here. I have gone into grocery stores and asked for the local jam, only to be met with the statement that it was unprocurable. On one occasion I gave an order for £5 worth of goods and asked for Western Australian jam. On being told that it was not procurable I cancelled the whole of the order, with the result that the local jam was procured for me. Of course that sort of thing has arisen because the business people of Western Australia to a great extent have turned down their own local products.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Now you are putting your finger on it.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: They have refused to support the local industry.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: I agree with you there.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: If we go back a little we shall discover that largely the wholesale merchants of Western Australia have their headquarters in the Eastern States. That is one of the reasons why the Eastern States products have been foisted on the public of Western Australia, which has had the effect of preventing us from carrying on our own industries. The dairying industry also has suffered as the result of competition by the Eastern States. If only we had retained the right to formulate our own fiscal policy we could have assisted our own primary production, and the dairying industry to-day would have been well to the fore. Everyone will remember that the motor body building industry which was established at Mt. Lawley had to close down as the result of competition from the Eastern States. So, too, with our clothing, and right through our local industries.

Hon. R. G. Moore: We are sending shirts to the Eastern States now.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: Our dried fruit industry also has had to suffer, simply because we have had to fall in line with the quotas of the other States, and export more than our surplus after supplying our own local consumption, the Eastern States having insisted upon our exporting the full Commonwealth quota. To say that the industries of Western Australia have not been prejudicially affected by the Commonwealth bond, is to admit that we do not look the situation squarely in the face.

Hon. G. W. Miles: We have paid £200,000 per annum more for workers' compensation than has been paid in the Eastern States. Has not that had an effect?

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: Mr. Macfarlane referred to employment, but he did not give figures on the Australian basis, as published in the official "Year Book." There we find that the percentage of employment on the Australian basis for the past five years has been as follows:—

New South Wales ..	37.54 to 40.14 per cent.
Victoria ..	34.76 to 38.1
Western Australia ..	3.94 to 4.69 "

That shows that in proportion with the population, New South Wales and Victoria have had eight or nine times as many men employed as have been employed in Western Australia. This also must indicate that we have lacked our share of the manufactures of the Commonwealth. The hon. member, I think, when dealing with the advance of population took only the figures from the establishment of Federation onwards. He said we had advanced in population, but he did not show the proportion of our advance before and after Federation. Let me take the concluding 10 years before Federation and the first and second decade after Federation. From 1891 to 1900 the population of Western Australia increased by 131,465 persons.

Hon. H. Seddon: Due to the discovery of the goldfields.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: Quite likely. But the goldfields are still going strong, 34 years after the establishment of Federation. However, during the first 10 years of Federation, from 1901 to 1910, our population increased by 96,865 persons, while from 1911 to 1919 the increase was only 54,828. I admit there has been slow progress made, but the hon. member said that since we have made progress it indicates that we have not suffered under the Federal bond. Clearly that was the hon. member's implication. Coming to the remarks of Mr. Holmes, I agree with a good deal of what he had to say. Certainly if Secession be granted us we are going to experience great difficulties. Dr. Hackett state in his speech on Federation that nothing in the world could prevent Western Australia from seceding if the people so desire. I am not going to duplicate the matter introduced by Mr. Thomson, although I looked up the remarks of Sir John Forrest

to the effect that the only way for Western Australia to secede would be by the passing of another measure through the Imperial Parliament. That, I understand, is the object of sending a delegation to the Old Country. Mr. Keenan, who is regarded as a very astute lawyer, stated that our difficulties are likely to be very great, even though Secession be granted. Because we advocate Secession, it does not follow that we are ignoring the difficulties that will confront us. There will be legal difficulties, financial difficulties, and administrative difficulties, all of which have to be faced, but I believe that, as we have overcome such difficulties in the past, so will we be able to overcome them again. The matter of defence has been mentioned. I do not know that we need worry much about it, but I would recall that a few years ago when one of the Australian warships was detailed to pursue the "Emden" and was successful, Australians threw their hats in the air, and as a result, some people said, Germany shut up the whole of her navy in her home ports. That, of course, was ridiculous. When we required an escort for our troops being transported to the seat of war, we had to secure the aid of Japanese warships. Who is protecting Australia?

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Not the Japanese, surely!

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: Who is building the naval base at Singapore? Certainly not Australia.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: I hope not the Japanese.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: It has been said that Australia must defend her own shores. With the present population that is quite impossible, and we must therefore depend upon the British Navy. The question of defence, I consider, can be passed over, because ever since the discovery of Australia, we have depended upon the Imperial Navy for protection. I am not a constitutional lawyer, nor do I suggest that I am capable of giving advice on constitutional law, but I wish to refer to the statement that the Federal bond is indissoluble. I had occasion to turn up the work by Quick and Garran on the "Constitution of the Australian Commonwealth," and obtained from it quite a different viewpoint that should be of interest to members. Those two highly qualified men, one a member of the Victorian Bar, and the other a member of the New South

Wales Bar, have pointed out that in the Imperial Act the word "indissoluble" appears only in the preamble. On page 286 it is stated—

Affirmations of the preamble.—It will be noticed that the preamble to this Constitution contains no less than eight separate and distinct affirmations or declarations.

Of this number, four deal with the character of the union, which, according to the preamble, is indissoluble. The work continues—

The remaining four have, therefore, to be regarded as promulgating principles, ideas or sentiments operating, at the time of the formation of the instrument, in the minds of its framers, and by them imparted to and approved of by the people to whom it was submitted.

The authors proceed to say that there is no identifiable section in the Act dealing with that point, and there is nothing in the Act to determine indissolubility. They then give a fairly extensive description of that particular affirmation in the preamble, and refer to the difficulties that confronted the United States in their earliest history, and the break-away from the British throne. They point out that the word "indissoluble" was used to apply not so much to the bond between the several States of Australia and the Commonwealth, as to the bond between the Commonwealth and the Empire.

Why was it placed in the preamble? The only reason which can be suggested is that the Australian Parliament and people have a general power to amend the Constitution; and it may have been considered wise and prudent that, coupled with a right so great and important, there should be a reminder, placed in the forefront of the deed of political partnership between the federating colonies, that the union, sealed by Imperial Parliamentary sanction, was intended by the contracting parties to be a lasting one, and that no alteration should be suggested or attempted inconsistent with the continuity of the Commonwealth as an integral part of the British Empire.

That puts an entirely different construction upon the word "indissoluble." It refers to the association of the Commonwealth with the British Empire. I believe that the Imperial authorities will appreciate that point of view, and will recognise that if Secession be granted to Western Australia, there will be no breaking of the union with the Empire. We shall simply be obtaining freedom from the difficulties we suffer under the Federal bond. I wish to refer to the attitude of the goldfields people. Everyone recognises that the vote of the goldfields at the referendum of 1900 was responsible for

our entering the Federation. A total of 26,330 voters on the goldfields favoured Federation, and only 1,813 voted against it, a majority in favour of Federation of 24,517. The total majority in the whole of the State was 25,109. Thus the majority outside the goldfields who favoured Federation was only 592, so it was a very narrow margin by which Western Australia, excluding the goldfields, entered Federation. If we compare the votes at the Secession referendum the figures become illuminating. Against Secession or in favour of continuing as part of the Federation, there were 9,468 votes, which total may be compared with 24,517 votes in favour of Federation in 1900. Those who voted for Secession or against continuing in the Federation, numbered 8,031, compared with 1,813 who opposed Federation in 1900. Notwithstanding the great effort put forward by goldfields representatives in this House, it is clear from those figures that the opinion of the goldfields people has altered considerably. Reference has been made to the financial position that will confront the State if Secession be granted. I pass over that because time will not permit of entering into details, except to say that the taxation levied by the Commonwealth on Western Australia will practically cover the whole of the responsibilities we would have to assume. Secession would necessitate a continuance of that taxation.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Does that include the full development of the North?

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: What about the Northern Territory which has been under the control of the Federal authorities for many years.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: And we have to pay our share towards the expenditure there.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Eight million pounds wasted.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: It is of no use discussing that. I have every confidence that the presentation of the address and petitions to the Imperial authorities can achieve nothing but good for Western Australia. Even if we do not obtain Secession as we desire, our action must cause the Eastern States to realise that Western Australians are alive to the disabilities under which they are labouring. I trust that there will be a speedy presentation of the address and petitions. A strong delegation is needed; we have a good case to put forward, and I have pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

HON. G. W. MILES (North) [8.0]: I join with other speakers in extending a welcome to new members of the House, and in regretting the defeat of Mr. Franklin. I also regret the accident which has occurred to the Honorary Minister, and am delighted to know that he is on a fair way to recovery. I desire to make my position clear on this measure. I was a Federalist 34 years ago, and I am one to-day. I do not wish to be accused of not realising the difficulties under which this State suffers. I voted for Secession on the occasion of the referendum because I had no alternative. When the vote was put to the people, it was clear that if they had not voted for Secession it would have been tantamount to saying they were satisfied with the treatment meted out to them by the Federal authorities. A number of people who voted for it did so for that reason. The referendum was taken, and the majority of the people decided in favour of Secession. I do not think we can get Secession. The Government have considered the matter from all points of view, and come to the conclusion that this is the best method to adopt. Although I congratulate them, I do not think it is the best method. With other members I think we should first approach the Federal Parliament. As Mr. Parker so ably put it, if the Government had not taken these steps, the secessionists would not have been satisfied. I congratulate the "West Australian" newspaper on having published the Case as it did. That was a means of putting the Case before the people. I think it could have been very much condensed. Members have suggested that the delegation should be sent immediately, and some have expressed regret that the Premier is not going to London. We all recognise the ability of the Leader of the Government. If I were in a dock, and wanted someone to put up a case for me, I would rather have as a defending counsel a man who believed in my innocence than one who believed I was guilty. That would be the position if the Premier put up the case for Secession, when he does not believe in it. It would be a mistake to send a delegation at once to the Old Country. I listened with interest to the Chief Secretary's speech, and that of the Premier in another place. From what I could gather, it will first be necessary to have the petition presented by a member of the House of Com-

mons. It will then go before the Committee on Petitions, an organisation similar to a Royal Commission in this State. That committee will hear the other side of the case. Members have talked about the minority point of view. There is no doubt that will be brought forward by the Commonwealth authorities. I see that a member of the Country Party, Senator Carroll, is to be a member of the committee for the Commonwealth.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: One for the other side.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I refer to the committee that is to put up the case against Secession.

Hon. A. Thomson: But not for the Country Party.

Hon. G. W. MILES: He is a member of the Country Party, and one of the members chosen to serve on the committee.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: There is nothing wrong with that.

Hon. A. Thomson: Are members representing the North-West to put up a case for that part of Australia?

Hon. G. W. MILES: I am a Federalist, but first of all I believe in the British Empire, then in Australia, with Western Australia next, and the province I represent next. If we would only take a broader view of things, the position would not be as bad as it is to-day. I do not want to be brought into a discussion that has been out of order as to the merits or demerits of Secession.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I suggest the hon. member should use the expression "hardly in order."

Hon. G. W. MILES: I do not want to be brought into a discussion as to the pros and cons concerning Federation.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: What about going Home to see the test matches?

Hon. G. W. MILES: I certainly would not like to be one of those who had to put up the Case for Western Australia, nor would I like to go Home at the expense of the State to see the test matches, as some of my friends might like to do.

Hon. A. Thomson: I would not like to give you the chance.

Hon. G. W. MILES: The Premier announced in another place that one of the delegates who would be appointed would be the Agent General. Sir Hal Colebatch is a secessionist and an able man, and is quite competent to put up the Case for the time

being. After the Committee on Petitions has heard the evidence of the Commonwealth and of the minority, and decided to allow a delegation to appear before the House of Commons, it will be time enough for a delegation to go to England. There is no occasion for such a party to go jaunting around the Old Country yet. It will be some time before the delegation is permitted to appear before the House of Commons. I hope that is the procedure that will be adopted. The matter should first be put into the hands of the Agent General, the petition will be received, and when it is decided eventually whether the British Parliament will consider the matter, that will be time enough for the delegation to put up the Case. I do not believe in secession, but the majority of the people have decided in favour of it. I think the Government have gone carefully into the matter, and have adopted the best means in their opinion of stating the views of the majority, and so I support the second reading of the Bill.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central—in reply) [8.7]: With regard to those members who opposed the Bill because they are Federalists, and because they do not feel themselves bound to recognise the decision of the people, I have nothing to say. It is purely a matter for their own concern. Mr. Macfarlane is also a Federalist, but takes up a different stand. He will support the Bill before the House, but he thinks the voice of the minority should be heard. He wants to know what the Government propose to do in the matter. I can assure the hon. member that the Government propose to do nothing in this direction. They feel that their responsibility is confined solely to the faithful fulfilment of pledges given to the electors, and no pledge was given that the views of a defeated minority, either on one side or the other, would be placed before the Imperial authorities.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Thank you for your frankness.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There will, however, be abundant opportunity for representative bodies to submit any rebutting evidence they may have to give to the Standing Committee on Petitions who will investigate the claims of Western Australia to separation from the Commonwealth. But this will not be at the expense of our Government. We shall have discharged our obligations

when we have seen that the Case for Secession has been presented in a satisfactory manner to the tribunal appointed for such purposes. Mr. Parker said that the time was inopportune to approach the Imperial Government. He referred to the world-wide depression, and declared that the world was disturbed. Mr. Hamersley, on the other hand, took a different view. He claimed that we should approach the Imperial authorities at once, and should send a delegation to England to put the Case before the Imperial Parliament prior to its closing down on the 18th August. I fully concur in what Mr. Hamersley has said. It will be the aim of the Government to do what is best in the circumstances. It would be a great mistake if a delegation were sent to England, having only a few days in the Old Country for the preparation of the Case for presentation to the tribunal which is to give it consideration. What is best in the opinion of the Government will be faithfully done in the interests of those who voted for Secession. Mr. Seddon did not concur in my expression of opinion that if we amended the Bill we should make it the Case for the Legislative Council. I still hold that view. If Mr. Seddon succeeded in securing amendments to the Bill, I am sure that other members, who perhaps disagree with certain points in the Case, would also require amendments. I have examined the Case for Secession, and have investigated many of the facts set out therein. I find them perfectly sound. I am sure that if I endeavoured to have amendments effected in this House in accordance with my own views, they would be defeated. And so things would go on, and there would be an interminable debate on the Case for Secession. In the end, if the Bill was adopted, it would in reality be setting out the Case for the Legislative Council.

Hon. A. Thomson: Quite right.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Seddon touched upon the question of the expense involved. From my inquiries into that matter, I should say the expense would not be very great. The whole of the delegation would not remain in England for any lengthy time. Only two delegates will be required. No matter, however, what the expenditure is likely to be, the Government intend to incur it so that they may carry out the decision of the people. Mr. Holmes, in his very able speech, told us that he fought against Federation, and that, if he could get a way out of it, he would support it so that Western

Australia could secede. He then proceeded to build up a case which, if it were not an attack on the States and indirectly a defence of the Commonwealth, my ears and my judgment have sadly deceived me. I heard Mr. Holmes on other occasions deliver a crushing indictment of the Commonwealth, but parts of his speech on the second reading of this Bill must give great pleasure to the people of the East, and may lead them to conclude that we have no just grounds for complaint.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I must carry more weight in the Eastern States than I do here.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Up to last week, I had always held the view that Mr. Holmes was rigid—too rigid—in his opinions, that he was either for or against definitely and unchangeably. I am satisfied now that Mr. Holmes can speak either for or against Federation with equal facility. He reminds me of something I heard many years ago. In the late nineties, Cole of Cole's Book Arcade, Melbourne, offered prizes of £1,000 each for the best essays for and against Federation.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I missed the bus then.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There were numerous competitors—brilliant men among them—but, to the surprise of everyone, the judges awarded the prizes to two individuals who had never been heard of in the literary world before. A long time afterwards the truth leaked out. The two successful subscribers were dummies. Both essays had been written by one man—James Edmond—who, later, became one of the famous editors of the "Bulletin." If Mr. Holmes, in his early manhood had been of a less retiring disposition, and if he had recognised the versatility of his own genius, 2,000 golden sovereigns might have found their way to Fremantle instead of to George Street, Sydney. He tells us that the breaking of a contract is nothing less than repudiation. I agree with the hon. member. That is so. But "breaking of contracts" and "repudiation" are not happy phrases to call to one's aid in the course of antagonism to this Bill. The history of the Commonwealth in its relation to the States is a series of acts of moral repudiation which even the most uncompromising opponents of Federation 34 years ago never ventured to predict.

The matters to which I shall refer in support of my statements are not new to members. They have been dealt with, time and again; but that fact does not weaken them from the standpoint from which I shall use them. On the other hand, it adds to their strength. They have stood the test of time. Vital sections of the Commonwealth Constitution Act have been interpreted from time to time in a manner quite different from the way in which the founders of Federation, and the men who drafted the Constitution, intended they should be, if their public statements can be accepted as a safe guide. The intentions of those great men can be gleaned from the extracts from their speeches appearing in the Case for Secession.

The people of Western Australia read in Section 87 of the Bill that was submitted to them in 1900, the following words:—

During a period of ten years after the establishment of the Commonwealth, and thereafter until the Parliament otherwise provides, of the net revenue of the Commonwealth from duties of Customs and of Excise not more than one-fourth shall be applied annually by the Commonwealth towards its expenditure. The balance shall, in accordance with this Constitution, be paid to the several States, or applied towards the payment of interest on debts of the several States taken over by the Commonwealth.

The promoters of Federation, in their propaganda, published in the advertising columns of the Press throughout Western Australia, gave this assurance among numerous others, that "The financial liability will be fairly adjusted. At least three-fourths of your net revenue from Customs and Excise will be returned to you."

We were told, and we believed, that after the expiration of 10 years the same method of distributing revenue among the States would continue, and that if it did not continue, something equivalent would take its place. In short, that the Parliament of the Commonwealth would "otherwise provide"—use a different method, perhaps, but no method that would work out to our disadvantage. We entered Federation, some of us against our will, but all of us confident that our finances were fully protected under the Bill. Just before the expiration of the 10 years mentioned in the Act, namely in 1909, the States entered into an agreement with the Commonwealth under which a departure

from the former method of allocating the revenue was made, and a payment of 25s. annually per head of population was substituted, with the consent of the States. The change was made allegedly in order to save accountancy work and to enable the States to know exactly what they were to receive each year, so that they could adjust their budgets accordingly. At that time the Customs duties amounted to £2 10s. a head; cost of collection had to be deducted; and with the approval of the States a further 2s. a head was retained by reason of the fact that old-age pensions had been introduced and the States would be benefited as a result. So that the 25s. per capita payment could not have been said, at the time, to be an unfair equivalent of the proportion of revenue from Customs and Excise previously received. Looking ahead, and in view of probabilities which later took a concrete shape, the acceptance of the offer was a great mistake. Very soon after the agreement had been made, under a policy of high protection, the revenue from Customs and Excise went up with a bound, and it continued going up until, in 1927, when the Financial Agreement was made, it had reached £7 8s. per head of population as against £2 10s. in 1909. Apparently the Commonwealth Government had this move in contemplation when they proposed the per capita payment.

In 1927 the Commonwealth Government abolished the per capita payments by Act of Parliament, despite the protests of the States. A Financial Agreement was prepared by the Commonwealth for the States to sign, and they were told, in effect, that if they did not accept it they would get nothing. They accepted it under duress. It had many good points, but in principle it was a repudiation of a contract made with the States when they entered Federation; and, as I said when introducing the Bill, the States had no alternative but to take what was offered them. I said in my second reading speech on the Financial Agreement, and repeated it afterwards:—

Mr. Lovekin admits that the per capita payments are gone. They are gone. They are dead, and their doom was sealed by a deliberate act of the Federal Parliament. And if this agreement, which has been endorsed by the Commonwealth and all the other States of Australia, be not accepted, we shall be at the loss of the per capita payments—nearly half a million a year—and have nothing in

their place, which will mean heavily increased taxation and drastic retrenchment in every shape and form.

I did not deceive the House when I introduced the Bill. Then there was the surplus revenue which, under Section 94 of the Constitution Act, had to be distributed monthly among the different States. This part of the agreement was honoured in part for a time, but in the end was repudiated. The surplus revenue, instead of going to the States, was put into a trust account—which at one time was swollen by millions—to meet the future needs of the Commonwealth, which needs, if they did not exist, were soon created.

Section 114 of the Constitution Act says, "The Commonwealth shall not impose any tax on any property of any kind belonging to a State." At an early stage of Federation the Commonwealth imposed Customs duties on materials imported by State Governments. They claimed that Customs duty was not taxation, and the High Court, as in other cases, supported them. If Customs duty is not taxation, I should like to know what taxation is. A Customs duty is certainly not a bonus or a bounty. In my quandary I turned up a copy of the "Year Book of the Commonwealth of Australia" prepared under instructions from the Minister of State for Home Affairs; and I found there "Customs duty" labelled "taxation." In the 1929 issue the Minister goes further and explains that the decline in revenue from taxation is due to a decline in Customs and Excise receipts. So that in spite of the High Court decision the Chief Accountant of the Commonwealth has been unable to find any more suitable term than "taxation" to apply to the impost placed on goods which come from oversea. Here we have, if not repudiation or deceit, a mean, petty, unfriendly action completely out of harmony with the sentiments of the founders of Federation as quoted in the Case for Secession. All of these things received legal backing, but morally they were wrong. They were opposed to the spirit of the Federal Constitution if in keeping with the letter. I did not intend to deal with these matters until Mr. Holmes talked about "breach of contract" and "repudiation." I could not stand here, after listening to that, without expressing the opinion that the Commonwealth should not be at all desirous to be judged by the high standard which the hon.

member has set up for it in the course of his criticisms of the Bill. Again, there is the Interstate Commission. It has ceased to exist for years; yet it is mandatory under the Commonwealth Constitution Act that it function, and it is important that it should do so. Section 101 of the Commonwealth Constitution Act provides—

There shall be an Interstate Commission with such powers of adjudication and administration as the Parliament deems necessary for the execution and maintenance, within the Commonwealth, of the provisions of the Constitution relating to trade and commerce, and of all laws made thereunder.

Its duties are defined under Section 99 which provides—

... the Commonwealth shall not, by any law or regulation of trade, commerce or revenue, give preference to one State or any part thereof over another State or part thereof.

I refer hon. members to Quick and Garran's "Annotated Constitution of the Commonwealth" wherein, on page 899, dealing with the Interstate Commission, its powers of adjudication and administration, there appears the following:—

Adjudication. The power of adjudication is a judicial power. To adjudicate is "to adjudge; to try to determine, as a court; to settle by judicial decree" (Webster's International Dictionary).

Section 102 shows that the Interstate Commission is intended to exercise powers of an essentially judicial nature, and indeed, in one class of subjects, is given exclusive jurisdiction and a final decision on questions of facts. . . . A further index of the judicial nature of these duties is given by the provision for an appeal from the Interstate Commission to the High Court on questions of law (Section 73).

There could be an appeal on questions of law, but not on facts that existed. The Interstate Commission had wide powers of adjudication and administration and, in fact, was to be the watchdog of the States over the Commonwealth. Was not that contract between the Commonwealth and the States broken? I should like Mr. Holmes to answer that question. Not only has it been broken, but it has been trampled underfoot.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: And you want to get even with them by breaking another contract? That is a high standard to set up!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Alfred Deakin spoke of the Interstate Commission as "the eyes and ears of the Constitution." Nevertheless, it was allowed to lapse during

the war-time period, and, in defiance of the law, it has never been reappointed.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: We would be better occupied in forcing the Federal Government to appoint an interstate commission, instead of sending the delegation to the Imperial Parliament.

Hon. A. Thomson: It is useless going to the Federal Parliament as it is constituted at present.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: A Convention, on an acceptable basis, should have provided remedies but a Convention has been promised one year and refused the next. That represents another instance of repudiation. Here is a bunch of false promises made by the promoters of Federation, and I draw Mr. Holmes's attention to them. They were published in the Press of the State and in the "West Australian" of the 30th July, 1900, appeared the following, under the headings of "Federation" "Cost of Nationhood"—

The special expenses of the Federal Government (estimated at about £344,000) being the cost of the new Government and interest on building loan, etc., will be paid for by the whole of Australasia contributing per head of population.

Western Australia's share, according to the Government Actuary's estimate, will be £15,480, or 1s. 10d. per head per annum, less than ½d. per week.

½d. per week will render possible a nation covering a continent.

½d. per week will save us from a line of Customs houses at every frontier and a history made up of eternal wranglings, strife, and jar.

½d. per week will spare us the struggle which invariably develops for the use of common and all-important rivers.

½d. per week will endow us with a higher statesmanship, and with an elevating national dignity.

½d. per week will create the one people with the one law, the one aspiration—namely the advancement of Australia.

½d. per week invested in this manner will be wiped out fivefold by the saving in interest as the public debts are taken over and re-floated not at provincial but at lower Australian rates.

Comment is quite needless. The whole thing speaks for itself.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: There is no reference there to the debts created by the Great War.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No. We would have to take that into consideration and add the expense to the halfpenny per week that Federation was to cost the nation

per head. In the course of his speech Mr. Holmes said—

While Federation has had a good deal to do with our disabilities, a great deal of our trouble has been brought about during the last 20 years by incompetent State Governments. So far did we go that we even depleted the funds of the State Savings Bank, and then we had to rush to the Federal Government to help us to go on with the business.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Do you deny that?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I will give the hon. member the facts. He was not correct in his statement. Since 1912 the funds of the State Savings Bank were not used for Governmental purposes. The funds were let out at interest to local authorities and other bodies on sound security. After making provision for £600,000 to be at call, the balance was invested in Commonwealth bonds. The bank got into difficulties through the depression.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Through not having its own printing machine.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Men, in thousands, were out of work and had to draw out their savings. It was only towards the end, following a telegram that was received from the Eastern States, that there was a rush on the bank. The State Savings Bank at that time held £2,250,000 worth of Commonwealth bonds. One would have thought that the Commonwealth, on the strength of its own security, would have advanced sufficient money to the State Government to save the situation. But the Commonwealth Savings Bank had been endeavouring for years to grab our little State Savings Bank, and the opportunity was too good to be lost. Very little parental or fraternal solicitude was indicated in their attitude on that occasion! I will admit that that did not amount to repudiation. Then we were told by Mr. Holmes that a great blunder was made when Mr. Collier, as Premier of Western Australia, entered into the Financial Agreement. It is true that Mr. Collier did support the Financial Agreement. I supported it, so did the House, and so did the people of Western Australia, because there was no other alternative.

Hon. A. Thomson: That is so.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Commonwealth had already abolished, by Act of Parliament, the per capita payments, which

represented to us an annual loss of 25s. per head of the population, or at that time, something approaching £500,000 a year. We were told, in effect, to take the agreement or leave it, and, if we left it, we would get nothing in its place.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You surely did not believe that; it was only bluff!

Hon. E. H. Angelo: There was too much bluff about those things.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There was no bluff about this matter, seeing that an Act of Parliament was passed, after receiving the sanction of both Houses of Parliament.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: You should not expect bluff from honest politicians.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: But that had reference only to the £7,500,000; the State Premiers had the distribution of the funds.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes. The hon. member will appreciate that so much was dealt with during the course of the debate that I have had perforce to leave out some references that I could have indulged in. I can explain the position regarding the £7,500,000. Mr. Holmes complained that New South Wales had received £3,000,000. It must be remembered that the payment was on a per capita basis, and was taken as the figures stood at the 30th June, 1927, and the amounts then paid had to continue under the agreement as a fixed amount. Consequently the New South Wales Government got what was their due, and the Western Australian Government got what they were entitled to under the Agreement.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Western Australia got what the Premier agreed to accept.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: All the States agreed to take the per capita payments as they were at the 30th June, 1927, and the per capita payments were to remain stationary at that for 58 years. That was the position. I want to do justice to the Commonwealth Government, and I have to admit that the Financial Agreement had some good features, of which Mr. Holmes must be aware, but which he overlooked.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The Financial Agreement prevented us from borrowing wherever we liked. That was one good point.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Holmes forgot to tell us that, under the Financial Agreement, the Commonwealth, by means

of a sinking fund, over a period of 53 years pays one-third of our old debts and by means of the sinking fund over 53 years, one-half of the new loans raised by the State.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You can say I overlooked it, provided you say I was just to the Commonwealth.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I, too, want to be just to the Commonwealth. There was increased interest provided on the transferred properties and there were also savings in the sinking fund payments, and so on. In consequence of those advantages, the State was able to set aside in 1926-27 £150,000 for portion of that year, £350,000 in 1927-28 and a similar amount in 1928-29, to wipe out the unfunded deficit and to provide against losses incurred in connection with group settlement. I want to set myself right in case a wrong impression was created when I introduced the Bill and I do not want it thought that I misled the House. I clearly set out the facts and I repeat them now. I informed the House that these advantages would diminish gradually and at the end of about 30 years, they would disappear when the normal increase of population would make the per capita payments a better proposition. In face of it all, however, it was a departure from the spirit of the Federal Constitution forced upon us by the Commonwealth. Mr. Holmes stated that last year we got £750,000 to finance the deficit and that we borrowed it from the Commonwealth. Nothing of the kind!

Hon. J. J. Holmes: We borrowed it from someone.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Under the Financial Agreement, the Loan Council decides what amount shall be borrowed and when that question is determined, the Commonwealth becomes merely the machinery by which action is taken. The Commonwealth is simply the agent of the Loan Council in securing the necessary funds. The States, in combination at the Loan Council, can overrule the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth has recognised that position and, so far as I have been able to discover, has worked harmoniously with the States, and has been perfectly fair and just. I have no quarrel with Mr. Holmes over the views he has expressed, but I cannot allow the impression to get abroad that Western Australia has not suffered severe disabilities under Federation. I am satisfied that the hon. member had no such intention, but in

his hostility to the Bill, he said some things and left other things unsaid, which most certainly had that effect. There is no one who could present the case for Western Australia with greater force than the hon. member, if he were free from the prejudices that the Bill has generated in his mind.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: If I had not those prejudices, I might have gone Home as a delegate.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Holmes does not believe in the Bill. The vote of the people does not concern him in the least. If he kept within those limits, as all other members have done, he would be entitled to his view, but he has gone much further, and I have felt bound to follow him in the interests of Western Australia.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Nicholson in Chair; The Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 7—agreed to.

Clause 8—Appropriation.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I move an amendment—

That the following be added at the end of the clause:—"provided that no money shall be so appropriated until the Government servants have been relieved from the financial emergency reductions and the State Government shall have balanced its Budget."

We are asked to pass the Bill and support the Government in Clause 8, appropriating certain money for the purpose of carrying out the intentions of the Bill. Our Case will be investigated by the Imperial authorities, and one question that will be asked will be as to the financial obligations of the State Government. At present our public servants are deprived of 20 per cent. of their salaries because of the inability of the Government to pay those salaries in full, and the Government are receiving loans in order to finance the affairs of the State. In those circumstances, before we authorise the spending of money on the presentation of the Case we should at any rate do justice to the public servants, and we should be able to say that we have no longer to borrow to carry on the State's services.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I will second the amendment. The least we might do before starting as a separate entity, would be to honour our obligations to our public servants, and the pensioners, who are under an agreement which has been set aside by the Government. Also we might well show the British Empire that we can live within our revenue. During the debate we have heard many constitutional authorities quoted. In that regard, Dr. Arthur Berriedale Keith to-day stands in the same high esteem as May once enjoyed. Dr. Keith, in his work "Responsible Government in the Dominions," declares that the Australian States can never separate so long as one State objects. Then he goes further and says that Australia can never be unified so long as one State objects.

Hon. A. Thomson: Nonsense! We have unification now.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Of course Mr. Thomson knows more about constitutional problems than does Dr. Keith. Many complaints have been made of the Commonwealth's treatment of Western Australia, but I say that our State Government treats the northern part of Western Australia exactly as the Commonwealth is said to treat Western Australia as a whole—simply because we have no voting strength in the North. Yet we have the audacity to go to the Imperial Parliament and tell them how the Commonwealth Parliament treats this State. If I could afford it I would go to England and tell them how the Parliament of Western Australia treats the great North of this State. The proposal contained in Clause 8 represents a waste of money that we cannot afford. Seemingly the Government are aware of that, for none of them will go to England to support the Bill. The speech of the Chief Secretary will be read before the Imperial authorities, and straightway they will ask, "Why is he not here?" He will not be there because, although he made that speech, he does not believe in it, and neither do his Government. The Minister spoke of the broken promises of the Federal Government, but I say that for every promise made to this State and broken by the Federal Government, the State Government have broken ten

promises to our people in the North. The Minister has taken me to task for my remarks regarding the $7\frac{1}{2}$ millions given to the States over a period of 58 years. I did not complain of that and the Minister knows I did not complain. I complained of the distribution, namely that less than half a million was apportioned to the undeveloped State of Western Australia, while the highly developed State of New South Wales received £3,000,000. Mr. Bruce said that he had found the $7\frac{1}{2}$ millions, but that he did not approve of the distribution and that it was not a distribution he would have made. Every word the Minister has said to-night supports my contention that the Federal Senate has fallen down on its job, due to party politics. Yet we are to go to the Imperial authorities and ask them to rectify it. The Minister forgot to tell us that the Financial Agreement provides that money borrowed by the State for financing the deficit must bear a sinking fund of 4 per cent. per annum, and that the State has never paid a cent into the sinking fund. Probably that will be hurled at the delegates if they reach the Bar of the House. If we wish to become a separate entity, we should be prepared to show ability to pay our way and square the ledger.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: When Mr. Seddon moved his amendment, I concluded that his object was to encourage the Government to set the finances right, but after hearing his speech I felt that there must be some other motive and that his intention was to defeat the aspirations of Mr. Hamersley, who is anxious that the proposals should reach the Imperial authorities before the 18th August next.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Senator Carroll is worrying Mr. Hamersley now.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Holmes, after making careful calculations and exercising all his financial ability, has apparently reached the conclusion that we should delay sending the delegation until the Budget is balanced. The hon. member has greater confidence in the financial capacity of the Government than even I anticipated. His words are a tribute to our ability. It would be pleasant to abolish all the impositions placed upon labour, industry, and civil servants, but this is a matter we cannot delay. We are under an obligation to fulfil our promise to the people and consequently I must oppose the amendment.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I cannot support the amendment. If civil servants have to wait for a restoration of the financial emergency cut until the Budget is balanced, I am afraid that many of them will not be here to collect it. If the view of the secessionists be right, the civil servants will have a better chance of obtaining relief when the State is released from the Federal bond because it is claimed that progress then will be greater.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I shall not accuse members of insincerity, but to submit an amendment of this kind is to treat an important subject rather lightly. Evidently Mr. Holmes and Mr. Seddon have not devoted much time to examining the Case compiled by the special committee. If they had read it, they would have realised that the only hope of the cut being restored to civil servants and of the Budget being balanced is by obtaining Secession.

Hon. H. Seddon: I have read the whole of the Case.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Western Australia would be in a much happier position if we were controlling its destinies.

Hon. H. Seddon: I disagree with that.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You said if we were controlling its destinies.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Under Secession we would be. Mr. Holmes said that the State Government treated the northern part of Western Australia in the same manner as the Federal Government treated the State. We have not been able to develop the North as we would have liked, but should we continue to suffer present disabilities without making an effort to get them remedied?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: If we got out of Federation we would be in the same position.

Hon. A. THOMSON: No State Government would dare impose a duty on rice consumed on the pearling luggers equivalent to £3 per ton of shell fished.

Hon. G. W. Miles: We pointed that out in the North-West Committee's report.

Hon. A. THOMSON: And of what benefit has the report been to the industry?

Hon. G. W. Miles: The Government sent it to the Commonwealth authorities.

Hon. A. THOMSON: And it has had no effect. The State Government have a large sum of money tied up in the Wyndham Meat Works.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Is the hon. member in order in going all around the compass to discuss the amendment? I think we should get on with the business before the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: I have allowed each member considerable latitude.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Too much latitude.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Thomson has travelled wide of the matter under discussion, and I ask members to limit their remarks to the amendment.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I will endeavour to connect my remarks with the amendment. Because of Mr. Holmes's remarks I felt justified in endeavouring to show that, if we were able to control our own affairs, we could quickly remedy two of the serious disabilities under which the North Province is labouring. We would have a better chance of balancing the Budget as a Dominion than under the regime of the Federal authorities. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: If the amendment were carried it would neutralise all that had been done, and we should make a laughing-stock of ourselves. I am astonished that Mr. Seddon should have brought it down. Many years will probably elapse before the State Budget can be balanced, and before the full salaries of civil servants are restored to them.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: I support the amendment, although I think it goes a little too far. The money involved in sending a delegation to England could better be spent in restoring to the civil servants a proportion of the cuts they have suffered.

Hon. G. Fraser: That might mean ½d. per head.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: No one knows what the cost will be. The Case could well be presented by the Agent General, and there should be no necessity to send anyone from this State to assist him. We should consider our own people before we dip into the Treasury for this kind of thing.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Mr. Baxter said that we should be made a laughing-stock if the amendment were carried.

Hon. V. Hamersley: It would be the end of the Bill.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Not at all. The representatives of Western Australia may well be asked how the State can afford to send a delegation to England when it can-

not meet its own internal obligations. Unless it can be shown that the State can finance itself, we shall indeed make a laughing-stock of ourselves. So far we have not done that, but are depending more and more upon assistance from the Loan Council. I have moved the amendment because I consider that, in our existing circumstances, it would be farcical to send a delegation to the British Parliament.

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

Ayes	5
Noes	18
Majority against ..	13

AYES.

Hon. C. G. Elliott	Hon. C. B. Williams
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. R. G. Moore
Hon. H. Seddon	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. E. H. Angelo	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. H. V. Piesse
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. J. George	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. W. J. Mann
	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

First and Second Schedules, Preamble.
Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

Bill read a third time and passed.

BILL—CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT (TEMPORARY).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. J. J. HOLMES (North) [9.43]: Does the Chief Secretary propose to go on with the Bill at this hour of the night?

The Chief Secretary: Yes.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: And this is a special session for one purpose only, namely, to deal with the Secession Bill! Very well; I will proceed. In introducing the Bill now before us, the Chief Secretary set out clearly that in his opinion,

and in the opinion of the Supreme Court, the measure which we passed during last session to amend the Constitution Act did not achieve the object which the House had in view. That straightway raises the question whether the Bill which we have now before us will achieve the object desired. Apparently those who supported the previous measure thought it would achieve the object. Fortunately or unfortunately for me, I was one of the minority who claimed that it would not achieve what was intended. In spite of that, the Chief Secretary when introducing the present Bill passed over members who were here last session, and who he said knew all about the matter; and the hon. gentleman directed his speech towards clarifying and instructing the minds of new members. I hope before sitting down to have a few words to say as to the manner of instructing new members. I have looked through the measure, and find great difficulty in following its far-reaching effects. The original Lotteries Act—not the previous measure to amend the Constitution Act—when introduced into the Assembly contained a provision intended to protect members of Parliament. That protective clause, it is said, was deleted in the Assembly. But when the measure came here, it still contained that clause. There and then I raised a point of order as to whether we could proceed with the Bill, as it was not the Bill which was passed by the Assembly. That was a highly important point. The Bill which came to this Chamber, we were told, was not the Bill passed by the Assembly. However, my point of order was overruled, and I believe an amendment was made and the protective clause struck out.

Hon. G. Fraser: I do not think that is correct.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: That Bill subsequently became an Act, and two members of Parliament were appointed to seats on the Lotteries Commission—a Labour member of Parliament and a Nationalist member of Parliament. The Mayor of Fremantle and, I think, a returned soldier were the other members of the Lotteries Commission. At the general election which followed, Mr. H. W. Mann, who was the Nationalist member of Parliament holding a seat on the Commission, was defeated. The Labour member of Parliament continued to be a member of the Commission, and his position was attacked in the Supreme Court. Subsequently, while that position was being chal-

lenged, a Bill was introduced to protect the Labour member of Parliament who was on the Lotteries Commission. Later on, the court decided in favour of the plaintiff as against the commissioner who was a Labour member of Parliament. The defendant has appealed, and the decision of the court has been reserved. Here, while we have a special session of Parliament for, as we were told, one purpose only, another Bill to amend the Constitution Acts has been placed before us to deal with this important matter. The question that arises straightway in my mind is: What has happened to the former Nationalist member who became qualified to continue on the Lotteries Commission when he lost his seat in Parliament?

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: And he had a tentative promise that he was to be retained on the Commission.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Yes, but we have heard a lot about promises to-night, and we know what they amount to. That Nationalist member of Parliament, having lost his seat was qualified for re-appointment to the Lotteries Commission, but he was not so re-appointed for reasons the Chief Secretary will probably explain to the House. He did not say anything about that matter when he moved the second reading of the Bill. The Labour member was re-appointed in January of this year, notwithstanding the disability under which he was labouring because of the case that was before the courts. His re-appointment became necessary as from the 1st January, 1934, because the old Commission went out of office on the 31st December, 1933. The appointment of the new Commission was not made until some time later in January, but the appointments were made retrospective to the 1st January last. The reason for the delay in the appointments has relation to a little romance, but I will not delay the House regarding that phase just now. The fact remains that when the appointments were made for the new Commission, although the members of the old Commission had done such good work, the only one of their number re-appointed was the Labour member of Parliament.

The Chief Secretary: I rise to a point of order. Is Mr. Holmes in order in discussing appointments under the Lotteries Act when a Bill to amend the Constitution Acts is the subject of the debate?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I presume Mr. Holmes intends to connect his remarks

with the Bill later on, inasmuch as the Bill deals with a member of the Lotteries Commission and his name appears in the measure. I think Mr. Holmes is in order in leading up to what he proposes to say.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Bill seeks to amend the Constitution Acts and I am dealing with an appointment not made in accordance with the Constitution Acts. The Government have attempted to make appointments outside the Constitution, although such appointments really come within the four corners of that measure.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: If the Bill did not specifically mention the Lotteries Control Act of 1932, I would have called Mr. Holmes to order. Seeing that the Bill does mention that Act, it will be hard to pull up Mr. Holmes or any other member.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: When I was so rudely interrupted, Mr. Deputy President, I was about to point out that the only original member of the Lotteries Commission who was re-appointed was the Labour member, Mr. Clydesdale, who was suffering under a disability from the standpoint of litigation before the Court. All the other members, including Mr. Harry Mann, who, by losing his seat in the Legislative Assembly, had become fully qualified for re-appointment, Mr. Gibson and the returned soldier member of the Commission were all pushed out of their jobs.

Hon. G. Fraser: But Mr. Clydesdale was the only member of the Commission who was prosecuted.

Hon. W. J. Mann: That had nothing to do with the Government.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I think Mr. Fraser will agree that there are enough prosecutions pending now, without suggesting any more. When he moved the second reading of the Bill, the Chief Secretary scoffed at any idea of bribery and corruption in connection with the affair. I will not say anything about bribery and corruption; I have already said enough by merely mentioning what has happened. The original Constitution Act makes it very difficult for appointments of this description to be made. What can be more objectionable than for a Government, with a majority of one—it has happened in Australia before to-day—to dangle before the odd member some appointment that has to be made, with the desire to win him over, thereby defeating the very object the Constitution Act was designed

to deal with. No Government should be in a position to do anything of the sort. They should not be able to offer any job to a member of Parliament in order to influence him from one side of the House to the other. That is the very crux of the constitutional position. Irrespective of whether the payment attached to a position be large or small—the remuneration may represent a peppercorn amount: that does not affect the principle—the fact remains that the Constitution Act sets out that no Government shall influence any member of Parliament by offering him any such appointment. The party at present in power claim that they adhere to a policy of one man, one job.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Where did you get that from?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The hon. member has denied so many things that I need not pursue the matter with him. He denied extracting 25s. from the workers but we proved that that did happen. The policy of the Government is one man, one job. A civil servant cannot play an organ in church or a Jew's harp in the synagogue on a Sunday and receive payment for his services, and yet remain a civil servant.

Hon. G. Fraser: He can play a Jew's harp in the synagogue because he would not get payment for that.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The point is that a civil servant cannot do those things and remain in the service. Now we see that there is to be one law for the civil servant and another for members of Parliament. That is a point from which I will not be drawn away.

Hon. E. H. Gray: I do not think you are correct.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Chief Secretary said a lot of complimentary things about Mr. Clydesdale which he deserved and all of which I support. No doubt Mr. Clydesdale has done a lot for the charities of this State. I told Mr. Clydesdale at the outset that he was on the wrong track, and tried to advise him as to the course he should pursue. He had been advised by several King's Counsel and other legal luminaries as to his position, and he placed their opinions before me. I said, "All right, I want you to remember this: Doctors bury their mistakes but lawyers make you pay for them." If Mr. Clydesdale

had accepted my advice, and fixed up the matter there and then by deciding whether he would be a member of Parliament or a member of the Lotteries Commission, he would not be in the position in which he finds himself to-day.

Hon. W. J. Mann: And the lawyers would not have had a chance.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Although Mr. Clydesdale's 16 years of service was quite properly referred to by the Chief Secretary, nothing was said by him regarding Mr. Mann's services that had also extended over 16 years. Not a word from the Chief Secretary as to why Mr. Mann was not reappointed. That was not common justice. If the Chief Secretary could have referred to what Mr. Clydesdale had done, surely it was not too much to expect him to make some reference to Mr. Harry Mann, who had lost his parliamentary position and had then been dropped from the Lotteries Commission. The Chief Secretary did not attempt to publicly thank Mr. Mann for what he had done over the same period as Mr. Clydesdale. I do not think that was quite fair. The reason, presumably, was that if the Chief Secretary had given Mr. Harry Mann credit for what he had done, the question would at once have arisen as to why he had not been reappointed a member of the Lotteries Commission.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Is that where the romance you referred to enters into the matter?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: No, there is a lot more to it than that. It is all very well for the Chief Secretary to put over a little sob stuff as regards Mr. Clydesdale. In common justice, Mr. Harry Mann was entitled to a little sob stuff too for what he had done, particularly as he had not been reappointed to the Commission. The necessity for retaining the Constitution Act intact is more necessary, to my mind, than ever before. Mr. Baxter said that the amendment of the Constitution Act was long overdue. Having regard to the messing about that has been experienced in trying to legalise the position of one member of Parliament to enable him to hold his job, I do not know what sort of a mess we will make of the Constitution Acts as a whole if we attempt to amend them comprehensively.

In my opinion recent appointments have defied any attempt to keep within the four corners of the legislation we are amending. Daily, appointments are made to different positions that may or may not be deemed within the four corners of the Constitution Acts. Quite recently a representative had to be appointed on the Fremantle Harbour Trust. There is a provision in the Harbour Trust Act for members of Parliament to be appointed to the board, but that position has never been challenged. There was a representative of the Primary Producers' Association on the Fremantle Harbour Trust.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I think the hon. member is digressing a little. I do not desire to burke discussion.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I am referring to the Harbour Trust Act, which contains a provision that purports to amend the Constitution Act. Am I in order or am I not?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: If the hon. member can connect his remarks with the Bill, he is perfectly in order.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The connection is that there appears in the Fremantle Harbour Trust Act a provision which attempts to evade the Constitution Act, and that provision has never been challenged. Yet when a vacancy on the board occurred the other day, Mr. Angwin was appointed to the board as the primary producers' representative.

Hon. E. H. Gray: And a very good one, too.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Then I could refer to Mr. Somerville, Mr. Curtin, and all the rest, but that might not be quite in order. Yet I suppose it is in order under the Constitution for an important public servant to accept an appointment to the Commonwealth without consulting his Minister.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. member is going wide of the mark.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I want to know whether it is possible, under the Constitution Act, for a civil servant to do that.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Mr. Somerville is not a civil servant; he is an elected officer.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Constitution aims at preventing "spoils to the victors." Yet if we look back over the trend of legislation and political events during the last 12 months, we shall see that the Constitution has been evaded where possible. I would point out what might happen if we amended the Constitution, even to the extent provided

in the Bill. The Lotteries (Control) Act will expire on the 31st December next, when the appointment of Mr. Clydesdale and others will also expire. I have no hesitation in saying that a Bill will be brought down next session to extend the life of the Lotteries (Control) Act—an attempt was made last session to extend it for another three years—and presumably another Bill will be brought down to protect the Labour member on the commission during the extended period. Then this House will be told, "You did it last year, you cannot refuse to do it again." That is what is being put over this House.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: No, the position will be quite different then.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Government will have the right to say next session, "You extended the protection last session, you must now extend it for another year." If the whole of the commission had been re-appointed, as we were told was intended, there would be no cause for objection, but why the Government should jettison everybody else yet leave one man on the commission and then seek to protect him by Act of Parliament, is beyond my comprehension. It seems to me like the youngster tried for having killed his father and mother, and who set up the plea that he was an orphan and ought to receive consideration. What justification can there be for sticking to one Labour member of the Commission and abandoning his fellow members? Of course, the House can stultify itself if it likes, but there will be no tinkering with the Constitution for me. To say that this House never thought of the appointment to the Lotteries Commission as an office of profit is absurd. The Chief Secretary says the commission is a corporate body, and that no remuneration of its members was to come from the Crown. That is not the point at all. The appointment itself came from the Crown, and so it did not matter whether the remuneration of the members of the commission came from the Treasury or out of the lotteries. The appointment itself was made by the Crown, and that was the constitutional aspect.

The Chief Secretary: I am not disputing that.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I do not wish to delay the House any longer: I merely wanted to make my position clear. If the Bill reaches the Committee stage, it will require some legal brains from outside to tell

me, at all events, what this amendment means, and the far-reaching effects thereof. I have referred the question of its meaning to several people, and they have all given me different opinions. In view of what happened to the last amendment, I tremble to think of what may happen to this amendment of the Constitution if the House passes it in its present form. I will oppose the second reading.

HON E. H. H. HALL (Central) [10.10]:

It should not be necessary to say that I quite agree with the Chief Secretary's remarks about the very fine record Mr. Clydesdale has established for his work in the interests of charity. I have never heard anything to the contrary. When Messrs. Clydesdale and Mann, then both members of Parliament, were appointed to the Lotteries Commission by the previous Government, I objected strongly from my place in Parliament, and I have maintained a consistent attitude throughout. There is nothing personal about my objection. Mr. Holmes has pertinently asked why other members of the original commission were dropped, and why Mr. Clydesdale was retained. For years Mr. Harry Mann was connected with the Ugly Men's Association and with charitable work, and I consider he was just as deserving of consideration as Mr. Clydesdale. It is regrettable that either Government should have run this quite unnecessary risk. I shall oppose the Bill. I agree entirely with what Mr. Holmes has said. We want to keep the name of Parliament clear of any possible stigma. I do not consider that members of Parliament are worse than members of any other section of the community, but there is much sound argument in the remarks that have fallen from Mr. Holmes.

HON. L. CRAIG (South-West) [10.12]:

I greatly regret the necessity for speaking on this Bill. Mr. Holmes has told us many things which I am afraid are true. The Chief Secretary has related for the benefit of new members details of the action taken by the Government, following the appointments made by the previous Government. We are grateful for those details. I regret exceedingly the necessity for the Bill, but to me it appears only just that we should pass it. Mr. Clydesdale, whom I hardly know, accepted the position in good faith. He acted on the best advice available that

his position was secure. He is a man experienced in the control of lotteries, and was appointed by a Nationalist Government, not because he was a member of Parliament, but because he was apparently the best man who could be selected for the job.

HON. C. B. WILLIAMS: And one in whom the people would have faith.

HON. L. CRAIG: He accepted the position in good faith, and has done no wrong.

HON. J. J. HOLMES: Except in accepting the re-appointment.

HON. L. CRAIG: He accepted it in good faith; he had the best advice that the appointment was in order. Therefore, he has done no wrong, and we must protect him whatever the cost may be. I hate to think of altering the Constitution. That I, as a new member, should help to alter the Constitution in this way hurts me greatly, but far greater would it hurt me to see an injustice done to a man who has done nothing to deserve it. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

HON. J. GEORGE (Metropolitan)

[10.15]: Although I am a new member, I realise that Mr. Clydesdale has made a mistake. Had he done what, in my opinion, was the right thing, he would have retired from Parliament. He has accepted an office of profit under the Crown, and a man who does that violates his obligations. I am here to do my duty to the electors, and will do it without fear or favour. The Labour Party, as Mr. Holmes has pointed out, have always advocated the principle of one man one job. Why should they not observe the principle in this instance? I cannot understand why a gentleman of such long Parliamentary experience as Mr. Clydesdale possesses should have accepted re-appointment. My conscience will not allow me to support the Bill.

HON. C. B. WILLIAMS (South)

[10.17]: I was very pleased to hear Mr. Craig speak so straight-forwardly and say he would support the Bill rather than see an injustice done. It is not a question of the Labour Government having appointed Mr. Clydesdale or of having sacked Mr. Mann or anyone else. It is unfair to draw such a red herring across the trail—a bad red herring, rather ripe. We are only asking that the measure of justice that Parliament

agreed to extend to Mr. Clydesdale last session should be granted to him now. Last session only three or four die-hards opposed the proposal. Now, however, a new argument has been advanced as to what might happen at the end of this year. I agree that Mr. Clydesdale should not be a member of the Lotteries Commission if it conflicts with his Parliamentary duty. That, however, is not the point. He was asked to accept the office because he possessed a knowledge of the business. It was a compliment to him, because someone was required who would be able to make the lotteries popular with the people.

Hon. A. Thomson: Also because the people would have confidence that under Mr. Clydesdale the lotteries would be properly conducted.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Yes. I do not consider it fair to refer to the latest appointments to the commission. If the Government did wrong in not re-appointing the original members of the commission, why should that affect Mr. Clydesdale's position. The facts were aptly and concisely stated by Mr. Baxter. The Government of which he was a member appointed Mr. Clydesdale, and assured him that in accepting appointment to the Lotteries Commission, he would be doing no wrong. When five or six of the most eminent lawyers have advised in one way—they are supposed to give advice honestly—and Mr. Holmes advises in another way, whom shall we believe. I have every respect for Mr. Holmes' ability, but I would have to take more notice of a man who had had legal training and was supposed to understand the Constitution from its legal aspects. I trust that justice will be done to Mr. Clydesdale. The whole thing emanated from the first Lotteries Bill that was brought down. Two newspapers were running a 3d.-in show, and the winner took the lot, and Parliament saw fit to interfere with them. I was not opposed to that, nor am I opposed to the Lotteries Commission, but it was from those newspapers that all the venom and personal spite were launched against Mr. Clydesdale. That gentleman has received the blame for the interference with the newspaper tipping competitions. This opposition is coming from the "Sunday Times" and some other gutter snipe paper. I appeal to members to see that justice is done to Mr. Clydesdale, who is now getting the benefit of all the spite

and venom of those two newspapers, when actually, whatever blame is attachable, is attachable to Parliament. I have never been afraid to voice my view that the hon. member's position in this House should be vindicated. On the fields people say, "One man, one job," but I say it should be "One man, one living wage." Mr. Clydesdale would have had no backbone if he had pulled out of the position of chairman of the Lotteries Commission while all the argument was on. He has held the job at the wish of two Governments. I trust members will not allow themselves to vote against the Bill at the behest of the newspapers to which I have referred. They represent the type of newspaper that would always write down the man to whom it is now desired to give a fair deal. I support the second reading.

HON. E. H. ANGELO (North) [10.23]: I was a member of another place when the first Lotteries Bill came down. It contained a provision protecting members of Parliament who might be appointed to the Commission. We definitely understood the reason why that provision was inserted, namely to enable two gentlemen who had done a tremendous amount of work for charity and for returned soldiers, and who thoroughly understood the running of lotteries, to be appointed to that Commission. Unfortunately another place was told by two of its members, both leading legal men, that such a provision was unnecessary as the appointments would not be offices of profit under the Crown. Another place allowed itself to be misled by that advice. The appointments were duly made. It is only fair to members of another place, who were apparently misled by the advice given to them, that they should be in a position to put the matter right on behalf of at least one of the men concerned, who accepted the office in good faith. For that reason I shall support the Bill.

HON. J. M. MACFARLANE (Metropolitan-Suburban) [10.25]: I do not propose to discuss Mr. Clydesdale personally in any way. I well remember the reason why the Lotteries Bill was brought down and approved of. The intention was to organise something that was in a condition of disorganisation, and having a very detrimental effect upon the community. I supported the measure for that reason. The main contention at the time was that, as the

funds of the Commission were drawn from the public, and did not pass through the hands of the Government, the positions connected with the Commission could not be regarded as offices of profit under the Crown. That view was supported by eminent King's Counsel, and we were assured that that was the position by the then Leader of the House. I supported the Bill, feeling sure that the two gentlemen who had been chosen for the first appointments would be appointed in due course. The appointments were made and trouble then arose. As a Parliament we were asked to correct a mistake that had been made by members of both Houses. I therefore gave my support to the second measure, which was to act retrospectively in order to correct the error in the first one. I have been exercising my mind a good deal over the present Bill, because it deals with a re-appointment, and the extension of the appointment for a further term.

The Chief Secretary: Not at all.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Does it not extend the appointment to the end of 1934?

Hon. T. Moore: It is the same Bill as the last one.

The Chief Secretary: It is rectifying what should have been rectified in the other Bill.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Correcting the position up to the end of 1933.

Hon. H. Seddon: No, to the end of 1934.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: That clarifies the position.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It makes it clear that we passed something we did not understand.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Why is it necessary to doublebank the work that has already been done?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Because the Government re-appointed one member of the Commission who was also a member of Parliament.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Seeing that the case is still before the courts, I should prefer that it were not dealt with until the courts had finished with it.

The Chief Secretary: The Bill does not interfere with the courts.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: It does not seem nice to discuss the matter whilst a reserved decision is pending.

The Chief Secretary: The Bill does not affect that situation.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: A good turn would have been done for Parliament

if Mr. Clydesdale had dropped out of one position or the other. I am impressed by the fact that Parliament is obliged to do a fair thing for itself, without consideration for the individual. If I had the slightest idea that next session a Bill would be brought down to extend the Lotteries Act and that we should then be asked to protect a member of Parliament for a further period—

The Chief Secretary: That would mean another amendment of the Constitution.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: In my opinion it would be quite wrong, and I could not support such a proposal. In voting for the present Bill I am helping to preserve the good name of Government and Parliament and to clarify the position, but I recognise the inadvisableness of interfering with the Constitution in any way. I feel a delicacy in voting for the Bill, because my action may be misconstrued. However, I support the measure.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West) [10.31]: I intend to support the Bill, but I wish to say a few words in explanation. I support the measure purely from the aspect that this Chamber has on two occasions endeavoured to make clear the position which the present Bill also endeavours to clarify. The fault is not that of the hon. member concerned. The fault is that of Parliament, and therefore we should use every endeavour to amend the protecting legislation, which has been found faulty. For that reason alone I support the Bill. Further, I wish it clearly to be understood that I disapprove of the idea of members of Parliament accepting positions either under the Crown or under anything akin to the Crown, or where there may be even a breath of suspicion. In this regard I am not blaming Mr. Clydesdale. I agree with other members that when Mr. Clydesdale accepted the position he felt himself to be in the right. This Bill, if enacted, will expire at the end of the year. It will be necessary for the Government to bring down another Bill if lotteries are to be continued. Should any such future Bill contain anything to perpetuate the present position, then, much as I believe in State lotteries, I should strongly oppose it.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! It has already been ruled from the Chair that the position which this Bill seeks to ratify cannot be continued under a Bill for the continuance of lotteries.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I agree with many of the remarks made by Mr. Holmes. I greatly regret that the Government saw fit to jettison the old Lotteries Commission, at all events to the extent of three-fourths of its personnel. I go further and say that if this House had had any idea that such was to take place, the Bill of last session would have got a different reception.

HON. G. W. MILES (North) [10.34]: I oppose the second reading of the Bill, as I opposed last year's measure. In my opinion it is wrong to amend the Constitution in the manner proposed. The Constitution is there, and it distinctly states that no member of Parliament shall accept an office of profit under the Crown. There was another way out: the Government could have compensated Mr. Clydesdale, and that gentleman could have resigned his seat. I feel that if Mr. Clydesdale had adopted this course, he would have been re-elected unopposed. It is no use flogging the question. I expressed my views on the previous Bill. In my opinion it is wrong to amend the Constitution in this way. Further, it is regrettable that the Government have thought fit to bring down the present Bill, the introduction of which could have been avoided. I oppose the second reading.

HON. R. G. MOORE (North-East) [10.35]: I find myself in an awkward position as to this Bill. I want the Chief Secretary to confirm or correct my view that the present measure is designed merely to do something which the previously-enacted Bill failed to do.

The Chief Secretary: It tries merely to do half as much. It tries to preserve Mr. Clydesdale's seat in Parliament. It protects him, not in connection with the pending action but only to the end of the year in that respect.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It protects the re-appointment.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: My view is that whether the hon. member was re-appointed or not, unless there was an Act to protect him he could still be sued and lose his seat in Parliament.

Members: That is so.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: If the object of the measure was merely to protect Mr. Clydesdale in respect of re-appointment, I would certainly oppose the Bill. When the previous

measure was before the Chamber I said that I totally disapproved of members of Parliament being appointed to seats on the Lotteries Commission. I realise, however, that when Mr. Clydesdale accepted the position he had been assured that his doing so did not in any way jeopardise his seat in Parliament. For that reason I supported the previous measure. At the same time, I moved an amendment under which the clause amending the Constitution would have expired at the end of 1933, and I did my utmost to induce the Chamber to carry the amendment. I pointed out that Parliament and the Government had got themselves into enough disrepute already, and that the sooner they got out of that disrepute the better. I suggested that it would be well to make the protective clause terminate in 1933, and then to appoint a Lotteries Commission from men who were not members of Parliament. I still think that the Government would have been well advised to accept my amendment. Certainly I would vote for the present Bill with a great deal more heart if the hon. member concerned had not been re-appointed to the position over which all the trouble has arisen. However, seeing that the Bill is simply a measure to do what the previous measure failed to do, I do not see how I can depart from my previous attitude. Let me say that in my opinion happenings of this description do neither the Government nor Parliament any good in the eyes of the people. Such actions are liable to be misconstrued. People like to make a mouthful of anything they can get hold of, for the purpose of bringing persons or things into disrepute. To some people it seems to be a joy to fasten something on a person for the purpose of doing him an injury.

Hon. G. Fraser: It is a habit with some people.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: It seems to be a joy to some. Personally, I like to look for the good in others, and to gloss over their faults as far as possible. I repeat that I have not much heart in supporting the Bill, because I regret that a member of Parliament has been re-appointed to the Lotteries Commission after the difficulty that arose last year. Still, as the Bill is simply designed to do what a previous measure failed to do, I shall support it. I am very much concerned, as Mr. Holmes indicated, whether the Bill will be any more satisfactory than the previous one. However, we cannot help

that, and so I intend to support the second reading of the Bill, for the reasons I indicated on the previous occasion. I emphatically protest against members of Parliament being appointed to the Lotteries Commission.

HON. H. V. PIESSE (South-East) [10.41]: I support the second reading of the Bill. Mr. Clydesdale was appointed to his position by the Mitchell Government, and he accepted it in all good faith. I agree with a good deal of what Mr. Holmes said this evening, and I agree with his contention that members of the Lotteries Commission, who have done such excellent work, should have been re-appointed to their positions. There can be no argument about it: if Mr. Clydesdale could be re-appointed, Mr. Harry Mann should have been re-appointed as well. Two wrongs do not make a right, and this evening, as Mr. Craig so ably put it, we must decide whether we shall alter the Constitution Acts to protect a man who was appointed originally by the Mitchell Government and re-appointed by the Labour Government, both being under the impression that he could safely hold the position. Mr. Clydesdale is to be commended for the splendid manner in which the consultations have been conducted. It has established confidence in them, and Mr. Clydesdale has helped to make the consultations a great success.

HON. H. SEDDON (North-East) [10.43]: I feel I must take the same stand as I adopted when the previous Bill to achieve the same object was before the House. There has been a great deal of confusion of thought indicated in the discussion because of members' personal feelings regarding Mr. Clydesdale, and the unfortunate position he has been placed in, through the advice he received and through the action of Governments. If we deal with the matter first from the standpoint of Mr. Clydesdale's position, and secondly regarding the Constitutional amendment, we should secure clearer thought with reference to the Bill than has been exhibited by some members. As regards Mr. Clydesdale personally, I agree with the suggestion made by Mr. Holmes. Having placed Mr. Clydesdale in a certain position, it was the duty of the Government to compensate him on account of any injury he had sustained through his oc-

cupancy of a seat on the Lotteries Commission. The Government should have adopted that course instead of sidetracking their duty and foisting it on to Parliament. To amend the Constitution was to approach the matter along entirely wrong lines. Since the previous Bill was introduced to amend the Constitution Acts to deal with this matter, the Supreme Court has arrived at a decision, and to date the decision is that Mr. Clydesdale has been occupying an office of profit under the Crown. This Chamber should be particularly careful as to its attitude regarding the amendment of the Constitution Acts. Those sections of the Constitution that deal with appointments under the Crown have been included in the British Constitution for many years for very solid reasons based on bitter experience of the past. It would be unwise for us to take any steps that would tend to lower the standard maintained by the Constitution so that Parliament, as far as possible, shall be free from any suspicion of undue interference with members, owing to the fact that they may occupy positions that are at the disposal of the Crown.

HON. W. J. MANN: There is no perpetuity about this position.

HON. H. SEDDON: No, but the Bill has been construed wrongly.

HON. T. MOORE: The position has seven months to run.

HON. H. SEDDON: In my opinion the Government should recompense Mr. Clydesdale for any disability he has suffered, but I consider the proposed amendment of the Constitution Acts must be considered as entirely separate and apart from that consideration, and should be so regarded. That is why I adopted the attitude I did when the previous Bill was under discussion, and I supported Mr. R. G. Moore's amendment to limit its operations to the 31st December, 1933. My object was to give Mr. Clydesdale an opportunity to consider his position before the end of the year, and to decide what course he would pursue. It is a false position for any member of Parliament to find himself in, particularly having regard to the fact that the Lotteries Commission is entrusted with the responsibility of disbursing moneys raised as a result of consultations. It is a false position for a member of Parlia-

ment, because, however fairly the members of the Commission do their work, they cannot escape from the criticism that the result of their work favours one section at the expense of another. That is not a position in which any member of Parliament should be placed. I have absolutely no fault to find with the work of the Lotteries Commission. Mr. Clydesdale and his fellow commissioners have shown their capacity in the manner in which they have conducted the consultations, but Mr. Clydesdale, as a member of Parliament, is in a false position when he is called upon to distribute funds, and thereby throw himself open to criticism, to which any person occupying a position in the Legislature should not be liable. I reiterate that we should be particularly careful about interfering with the provisions of the Constitution, because they were embodied in that Act as a result of bitter experience in the past, when members strove to place the British Constitution on a pedestal that would be recognised, and would demand the respect of the general public because of its integrity. Once we lower that standard and open the door to the possibility of abuse, we do not know how far it will lead us in the future. For that reason, I intend to oppose the second reading of the Bill.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Brew—Central—in reply) [10.48]: It has been said often that the lawyer who has a bad case, sets out to abuse the other side. I have had a good deal of professional experience in law courts, but that has not been my impression. Rather has it been the occasion for the exhibition of plausibility. Mr. Holmes, instead of employing abuse in the course of his speech on the Bill, made a deliberate attempt to stir up political prejudices.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Rightly so, too.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: He deliberately attempted to stir up not only political prejudice but bias as well, in order to achieve his objective. How would I stand in this Chamber, if that attempt succeeded? Here, where I have a small minority, he raises the flag of Nationalist against Labourite.

Hon. G. Fraser: And this is a non-party House.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Holmes referred to appointments to the Lotteries Commission, and to Mr. Angwin's appointment on the Fremantle Harbour Trust. They have nothing whatever to do with the Bill. His remarks represented the red-berring drawn across the trail to lead members astray. However, I am very pleased indeed that those who have expressed their opinions regarding the Bill, showed that Mr. Holmes' remarks had had no effect. Our duty is within very narrow confines; we are here to rectify an error made last December in the amending of the Constitution Act. And by whom was that amendment made? By a member of this House, in all good faith. Several members came to the conclusion that Clause 2 was not very clear and should be rendered explicit. That clause, if it had been allowed to stand, would have stayed proceedings. The Parliamentary Draftsman was called in and he drafted the amendment, which was moved by a private member of the House. The House passed the Bill, 20 members voting for the second reading and 18 for the third. The Council cannot well go back on what it did last December. We hear talk of repudiation. There is repudiation or non-repudiation here. The Government had nothing to do with the appointment of Mr. Clydesdale in the first instance. He was given a definite assurance by the Minister of the day, and also by other members of the late Government, that he was not liable to disqualification. The Bill before us does not attempt to interfere in any way with the proceedings now in the law courts, but seeks simply to preserve Mr. Clydesdale's seat in this House. The previous Bill went a long way farther for it meant, or was thought to mean, that a penalty could not be imposed or disqualification incurred. This House was quite willing that an amendment should be framed in that direction. But the amendment did not achieve its object, and apparently did not have a retrospective effect, although there occurred in the amendment the phrase "Before or after the passing of this Act." However, that has been decided, and although eventually Mr. Clydesdale may come out all right—the law is very peculiar

—yet he may not, and the Government, in order to do what the previous Government would do if still in power, wish to preserve Mr. Clydesdale's seat in Parliament. I was pleased with the remarks of Mr. Craig, who

spoke to the point and with some force. He is on the right track, but Mr. Holmes has no case at all. He referred to other matters which I feel sure will not appeal to members.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Tell us why you re-appointed one man while the case was pending.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That has nothing to do with the matter. Whether the Government appointed a Labour man or a returned soldier to the Commission, whether they did right or did wrong, has nothing to do with the case and should not be allowed to prejudice Mr. Clydesdale. It matters not what the relative position, or the political opinions of a prisoner may be, the jury give an honest verdict; politics are never allowed to intrude. And when a question of moment such as this before the House is involved, members of Parliament also cast aside all party prejudice. No matter whether they are Labour, Nationalist or Country Party members, they cast aside all prejudice and do justice to the subject of debate. Consider the work Mr. Clydesdale has done in the cause of charity for the past 16 years.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: And what about Mr. Mann?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Clydesdale is unpopular. Why? Because the art unions were suppressed when he was appointed. A scandalous position obtained, but Mr. Clydesdale and his fellow Commissioners suppressed that. Subsequently, after the Lotteries Control Act was passed, things became worse than ever and even black fellows were selling lottery tickets. However, Mr. Clydesdale, with the authority of the Act, stepped in and suppressed it and so made himself unpopular with the people who had been buying those tickets, and also with the promoters of the art unions. There is less gambling in Western Australia to-day than there was before the Lotteries Control Act was passed. That is undeniable. There is now only one channel for speculation and all those disgraceful scandals which we experienced for years have disappeared. Mr. Clydesdale has incurred considerable odium for doing his duty. His remuneration in that post is £5 per week and he is in his office practically from daylight to dark. However that has nothing to do with the case, but I want the Council to preserve its integrity and fulfil its obligation to make right what it attempted to make right last session.

Personal Explanation.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I wish to make a personal explanation. Last week I agreed with the Chief Secretary that, in the event of a division being taken on either of the two Bills, I would pair with the Honorary Minister. I must honour that obligation.

Question put and, under Standing Order 243, a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	19
Noes	5

Majority for 14

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. J. Craig	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. H. V. Piesse
Hon. C. G. Elliott	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. C. B. Williams
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. W. J. Mann	Hon. H. J. Yolland
Hon. R. G. Moore	Hon. E. H. Angelo
Hon. T. Moore	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. J. George
Hon. G. W. Miles	(Teller.)

PAIR.

Aye.	No.
Hon. W. H. Kitchin	Hon. H. Seddon

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I declare the second reading passed by the necessary constitutional majority.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—No disqualification incurred by acceptance of the office of a member of the Lotteries Commission:

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I move an amendment—

That in Subclause 2 the words "during its continuance" be struck out.

If those words are not excised, their use might be deemed to extend the provisions of the subclause.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I consider it unwise to interfere with the drafting of the Bill. The subclause appears to be correctly worded.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 3, 4, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move—
That the Bill be now read a third time.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Standing Order 243 applies again, and a division must be taken.

The division resulted as follows:—

Ayes	19
Noes	5
					—
Majority for	14
					—

AYES.

Hon. E. H. Angelo	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. H. V. Piesse
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. C. G. Elliott	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. C. B. Williams
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. W. J. Mann	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. R. G. Moore	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. J. George	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. J. J. Holmes	(Teller.)

PAIR.

AVE.	NO.
Hon. W. H. Kitson	Hon. H. Seddon

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I declare the question carried in the affirmative by more than the necessary constitutional majority.

Bill read a third time, and *passed*.

ADJOURNMENT—STATE OF BUSINESS.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [11.13]: Before the House adjourns, I should like to state for the information of country members that there will be only a very brief sitting of this House to-morrow. I hope there will be a quorum present, but we shall meet solely for the purpose of sending and receiving messages, and nothing more. There will be no legislation to consider, and only an ordinary majority will be required. So far as I can see, there will be no business to do except the formal business to which I have referred.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I take it the “noes” will be exempt from attendance to-morrow. You have a big enough majority without us.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: We shall give them a holiday to enable them to recover from the effects of this sitting.

House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 30th May, 1934.

	PAGE
Question: Education, medical inspection ...	411

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

QUESTION—EDUCATION, MEDICAL INSPECTION.

Mr. **LATHAM** asked the Minister for Health: 1, What schools in the North-West were inspected by Dr. Wood in 1932? 2, What schools in the North-West were inspected by Dr. Stang in 1932-33? 3, Did Dr. Stang inspect school children away from schools during her inspection tour in 1932-33? 4, If so, what was the number of children examined?

The **MINISTER FOR WORKS** (for the Minister for Health) replied: 1, Broome, Derby and Port Hedland. 2, None. 3, No. 4, Answered by 3.

House adjourned at 4.33 p.m.