

fit of the whole State; for the benefit not only of the fruitgrowers, but also of the consumers. One reason rendering the establishment of a uniform case essential is the provision of the timber, which will have to be cut for the manufacture of cases. The provision that the standard size shall not become operative until a future date to be specified, is a wise one. It will enable those affected by the Bill to get into line by that date. I am not prepared to argue against the other objections taken by those who, I admit, are intimately connected with the industry; but I consider the Bill is justified if only in order that it may settle the question of the uniform case. Mr. Sanderson, in referring to the study and investigation already devoted to that question, had to admit that the fruitgrowers' associations have not been able to give us a lead. They do not know themselves what they require.

Hon. A. Sanderson: And you propose to teach them?

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: No. But the fruitgrowers have not any consideration for the consumers of the State, for the general population; and as the fruitgrowers have not been able to make up their minds on the subject, it is time the Government took a hand and settled this question, just as Governments have settled many other questions about which experts have haggled for years. Possibly the trouble in such cases is that there are too many experts. As regards the branding of the cases and the kind of timber to be used, I candidly admit I am not prepared to offer an opinion. If the opponents of the Bill had given even one reason why a uniform case should not be established by means of this measure, I might be prepared to vote with them. But they have not done so. They have not come forward with any counter proposals. They have simply said that the experts cannot make up their minds on the question. The matter should not be allowed to drift longer in a haphazard manner, and therefore the proposal of the Government is worth consideration. Possibly there may be a good deal of reason behind the objections which have been raised on other aspects of the measure, but I want the objectors to give me a sufficient reason why the uniform case should not be established now. Perhaps the clauses dealing with contentious matters might be postponed. However, the main principle of the Bill is the establishment of a uniform fruit case in this State, and for that one reason I shall support the second reading, of course reserving to myself the right to vote in committee against any clause other than that which embodies the main principle.

On motion by Hon. C. F. Baxter (Honorary Minister), debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 5.58 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 27th November, 1918.

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

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

QUESTION—"ULYSSES" STRANDING INQUIRIES.

Hon. T. WALKER (without notice) asked the Honorary Minister: Has a reply yet been received from Melbourne in regard to the placing on the Table, in compliance with the order of the House, of all the papers in connection with the stranding of the "Ulysses"?

The HONORARY MINISTER replied: A reply has not yet been received, although we have telegraphed again. I will consult the Premier later on in the evening, and if we cannot get a reply in the course of a day or two we will take a chance and lay the papers on the Table of the House.

QUESTION—RAILWAY APPEAL BOARD, CASE OF PORTER OAKES.

Hon. T. WALKER (without notice) asked the Minister for Railways: Has a reply yet been given to the official who waited upon him in reference to the case of Porter Oakes, who was fined by the Railway appeal board?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: Yes, to-day.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. HARDWICK, leave of absence for two weeks granted to the member for Kimberley (Mr. Durack) on the ground of urgent private business.

MOTION — FREMANTLE HARBOUR TRUST, HANDLING GOODS AND WHEAT STORAGE CHARGES.

Mr. GRIFFITHS (York) [4.43]: I move—

That in the opinion of this House, the practice of the Fremantle Harbour Trust in handling all goods on the Fremantle wharves should be discontinued, and such service should be optional with shippers; also, the charges for storage of wheat at Fremantle wharves are unwarrantably high and should be in conformity with the rates charged for similar accommodation in the Eastern States of the Commonwealth.

Some little time ago, when I rose to my feet in this Chamber, the leader of the Opposition, in a somewhat humorous vein, twitted me with bringing certain things forward as the first fruits of my trip. That may have been so, and the information I have to give to the House to-day may be regarded as the second fruits of my trip. I have been to the Eastern States, and found out that what I stated in this Chamber was correct.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Not on the wharves.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I have also found out certain information of which the Fremantle Harbour Trust said they were not in possession, whereas I was in possession of it, and can verify it and give it to the House, if necessary, for the benefit of the Fremantle Harbour Trust. I would direct the attention of members to the Harbour Trust report for 1916-17, which shows an increased expenditure of nearly £10,000, with a falling revenue of something over £10,000, making a total of £20,612. This is the loss which the Harbour Trust incurred through their foolish policy of increasing expenditure in the face of a falling revenue. Amongst the losses I would mention a sum of £7,278 on the handling, that was at the old rate of 1s. 9d. The Minister for Industries, in reply to certain questions I asked in this Chamber, stated that the heavy charges for storage of wheat were made to enable the Harbour Trust to handle goods at as low a price as possible.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: If you confine it to wheat I will support you.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: So far as the handling charges are concerned, that loss necessitated an increase in the charge to 2s. This is the way that the charge is reduced, or made as low as possible. They charge 2s. per ton for general cargo and 7d. for coal, whereas in the Eastern States 1s. 1½d. is charged for general cargo and 4d. for coal.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They have other charges there and they are higher than they are here.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: As regards the policy of the Fremantle Harbour Trust it satisfies no one. It was decided some 14 or 15 months ago by the Trust Commissioners that the Secretary should furnish a report showing the net result of the working and handling charges on a given number of steamers. Those figures showed a loss and the Commissioners then carried a resolution that the Secretary be instructed to prepare a regulation by which the work on the wharf could be ascertained, the object being to prevent further losses and so that they might be able at the same time by regulation to farm out the handling of the cargo at a certain set charge. This can be verified by reference to the minutes of the Harbour Trust. Hon. members may be aware that the Fremantle Chamber of Commerce at about the same time referred to the matter, and a convention was called of all the interested parties to consider the handling charges and the difficulties in connection with the control of cargo from ships slings to the sheds. A lot of evidence was taken but the lumpers' strike happened and nipped the proceedings in the bud. Nothing more was then done. I have had a conversation with certain leading mercantile men at Fremantle and they are convinced that the work could be done cheaper by the shippers. I saw a statement some time ago by Mr. W. W. Leslie who was then Chairman of the Perth Chamber of Commerce, who stated that the services at Fremantle were satisfactory. That statement is considerably discounted by the fact that Mr. Leslie is an ex-employee of the Fremantle Harbour Trust.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is not right; he never has been.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: The conditions which apply to the Fremantle merchants do not apply to the people in Perth. Perth receives about nine-tenths of its cargo by river. Take a cargo of general produce which may land at Fremantle. If it is put into sheds and ulaged, the Fremantle Harbour Trust has by regulation relieved itself of responsibility.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is not true.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: If that cargo is broached in the sheds and there is not someone actually there to see it broached and the fact of it having been broached cannot be proved, the Fremantle Harbour Trust will not recognise any claim. On the other hand, the Perth merchant who gets his stuff by lighter has his remedy because he can claim from the lighter-man, provided that man has given a clean receipt to the ship. I feel sure that the mercantile community would welcome an investigation into this by any body that would go thoroughly into the matter to prove the assertions which I have made and which also have been made by responsible business men in Fremantle. I may be told that these assertions are not correct.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Up to 5 o'clock at night the Harbour Trust take full responsibility.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: On November 21st last when replying to my question with reference to wheat storage the Minister for Industries made a great deal out of the fact that there had been expended at Fremantle a sum of £71,000 on the sheds, wharves, etc. When I asked particulars about the handling charges I was told certain things that the handling charges provided for, and I was also told that they did not provide interest and sinking fund on the handling facilities. It appears to me that the interest and sinking fund on these facilities should be on the handling charges, but when I asked what the £12,000 that was charged for storage was for, I was informed that it was to provide interest and sinking fund. Take the £71,000 that it is stated was expended up to a certain period, interest at 4½ per cent. on that gives £3,200 per annum, leaving £8,800 charged to storage to go towards paying interest and sinking fund and other charges. My argument is that the £12,000—even though at that time there was supposed to have been 77,000 tons of wheat there—runs out at 3s. 1d. per ton. If we take the Victorian charges we find that the charge there is 2½d.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: For what?

Mr. GRIFFITHS: For storage. I can give a list of these places and can tell hon. members the whole of the charges if they desire to have the information. The wharfage is 9d. a ton.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister). It is nothing here.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: If the hon. member will keep quiet I will blow him to ribbons. I find on reference to my notes that I was in error in saying that 9d. a ton is charged in Victoria. There is not a wharfage charge

there. In New South Wales 6d. per ton is charged and at the outports of South Australia 9d. Is the Honorary Minister satisfied?

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): I am satisfied that there is no charge here.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: My contention is that the 3s. 1d. which is charged here is out of all proportion. It has also been stated that certain of these charges were for protection from fire. I took the trouble to inquire what was done in the other States and I find that in the Williamstown goods yard fire breaks are established between stacks and sheds by the Railway Department to protect the grain sheds and stacks as well as departmental properties. Similar provision is made by the Wheat Commission in regard to sites at other places. The Wheat Commission does not insure its stacks but carries its own risk. In New South Wales there was no question so far as fire was concerned. I have also heard it said so far as shunting charges are concerned that these are imposed. I would like to point out that there is no charge made in New South Wales for placing trucks at the shed or ships' side. So that when hon. members tell me there are greater facilities provided here than in other parts, those statements are not borne out by facts.

The Minister for Works: They do not charge for shunting in Victoria.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Yes, but there are other things besides shunting. The hon. member can go through the catalogue I have here and he will be convinced. On the question of storage I saw the Darling Island sheds loaded up with wheat, and even at those sheds they only charge a matter of £6,000. We here, with the small quantity of wheat which we have here, are charging £12,000 per annum, which I claim is altogether wrong. Whether it is the fault of the Wheat Scheme for not making better arrangements I am not prepared to say, but the fact remains that we are being charged £12,000 every year for storage, which runs out at 3s. 1d. per ton, as against 3d. at Bunbury and Geraldton. Here we have the excuse brought forward by the Minister when he answered my questions that so far as the mole was concerned there was accommodation there for two million bags of wheat if we wanted so much accommodation. Why pay 3s. 1d. per ton, as against the equivalent in pence in the Eastern States. There is a certain amount of space there that is not occupied and which cannot be used. A great deal has been made about the extra facilities. The Darling Island facilities are just as good as those at Fremantle, and so far as the handling at that port is concerned, I have seen greater care shown elsewhere in the handling of the wheat and the saving of grain. A great deal has also been said about the facilities provided at Fremantle, but the only thing I can see of the expenditure of £71,000 is the shed which I am told is worth about £14,000. In view of the increased expenditure and the loss in revenue shown in the 1917 report, totalling together £20,612, I ask, will the Government give early consideration

to the advisability of abolishing the Fremantle Harbour Trust and placing all port dues under (a) one harbour board, with a reduced membership and reduced fees; or, (b) the proposed new railway management as regards all harbours connected with the State railway system, the purely marine responsibilities being undertaken by the Harbour Department? I commend these proposals to the consideration of the House. Whatever is provided in the Eastern States—

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): The Eastern States can teach us nothing, unless it be South Australia.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: South Australia had to come here to learn, and they say that our harbour is the best managed in Australia.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: There is something radically wrong, either with the management of the board or with the people handling the wheat. A sum of £12,000 is out of all proportion. Here we have 3s. 1d. a ton as against 2½d. in the Eastern States, and at Geraldton and Bunbury.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is not so.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: It is all very well to say that, but I have here the figures, and I will stand by what I have said. This position requires looking into. The sum of £12,000 was charged for 77,000 tons of wheat. It works out at 3s. 1d. per ton, as against 2½d. in the Eastern States.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): They are losing money on it.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: At Darling Harbour dock there was vastly more wheat stored when I was there than was stored here. They had four boats loading. The charges there for the sheds, including all appliances and attendance, amounted to £6,000, as against our £12,000. I ask the Honorary Minister to take that into consideration. And there was vastly more wheat there than we have here. They do not charge any wharfage in Victoria. Ninepence per ton is charged at outports in South Australia, and, I think, 6d. per ton in New South Wales. The amount per ton charged here is twelve times what it is in the Eastern States. Something should be done in regard to the storage question, and something should be done to make the Harbour Trust realise their responsibilities in regard to ullaged goods.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister—Pilbara) [5.5]: It would have been better if the hon. member had made two motions of this, as he did last year. In regard to the proposition that the present system of handling should be abolished, I desire to say we have the most advanced system in Australia. It obtains in many parts of the world, and will be brought into operation in South Australia very shortly. When the hon. member refers to the shippers, he opens up a new proposition. The only shippers I can imagine are the wheat shippers, the Farmers and Settlers' Association. He wants the Farmers and Settlers' Association to take charge of the wharves. As a matter of fact, the present position was brought about by the commercial people of Western Australia, as a protest against the shipowners. It is the shipowners

who want to get this work. In the past they did not give the commercial people a fair deal. I am pleased indeed that the war is over, for I shall be able, later on, in the proper place, to make a few remarks about shipowners. If we were to carry the motion it would be to the advantage of shipowners and not of the shippers, either consignees or consignors. As a matter of fact the Harbour Trust has all the facilities, all the organisation, required for carrying their own stuff on the wharves. On those wharves served by the railways we have the organisation, the men, everything necessary to do the work at the cheapest possible rate, and I trust the House is going to retain that system. In regard to the position of the wharves generally, a considerable alteration is required. We have various systems, but on consideration of this question, and on consideration of the position in the Eastern States, I find that, after all, Western Australia is a long way ahead of any of them.

Mr. Griffiths: Nonsense!

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): I tried to get hold of the position in Queensland. They have there a Harbour Trust, a Harbour and Light Department, and a Marine Department, and, so far as one can read, one cannot learn where the one ends and another comes in.

Hon. P. Collier: But the hon. member for York has inspected them all on the spot quite recently.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): The member for York was not entirely engaged in getting information while over there. The hon. member mentioned the question of ullage. It is quite foreign to his motion, and therefore I do not intend to deal with it.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They do pay on all cargo.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): Of course they do. The hon. member suggested that we should have a select committee. I do not mind the appointment of a select committee. If it does no more than the Royal Commission on Agriculture, it will cost only about £5,000. The hon. member says that certain charges are made for interest and sinking fund. He has tried to make the House believe that those charges are set aside for the purpose. As a matter of fact, all the revenue obtained from the Fremantle harbour is put into one fund. If there is sufficient to pay interest and sinking fund, it is paid; if there is a surplus, it is paid into Consolidated Revenue, while if there is a deficiency it is paid out of Consolidated Revenue. Both this year and last year there have been pretty solid deficiencies. The original arrangement in regard to the stacking of wheat was a fair proposition, but at the present time the quantity of wheat is not being stored there, nor will it be stored, and therefore the Harbour Trust are not justified in charging anything approaching £12,000 per annum for the work they are doing now. I am consulting with the Honorary Minister for Agriculture on this question. But I wish to point out to those hon. members who hold that we should remove

these things from political influence and establish boards, who think that Parliamentarians are not fit to handle propositions such as the Fremantle harbour, that we should hand all these over to a non-political board—to those members let me say we have done precisely that, and this is what we are getting. If it were in connection with the Bunbury harbour I could deal with this, because the Act so provides. But, in regard to the Fremantle harbour, the Harbour Trust have absolute control. The Governor may revise harbour dues, rates, tolls, fees, and charges, etc., in connection with Bunbury, but in regard to Fremantle it cannot be done. I should like to tell the hon. member that, so far as his motion deals with wheat, it has nothing to do with the House. Parliament has no control over the question, except of course that it can amend or even repeal the Fremantle Harbour Trust Act. If the hon. member requires relief, I advise him to go to Basil Murray, a member of the board, one of those who have inflicted these charges.

Mr. Griffiths: He has been endeavouring to afford some relief.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): I can tell the hon. member that Basil Murray, as a member of the board, has more power to secure a reduction than have I as Minister controlling the department. Apparently the hon. member has not read the Act, yet he comes along and thinks the Minister can do all these things. We have heard about the bishop who looked fore and aft, but did not look around him. The hon. member goes to the Eastern States looking for things which he can learn right here. Now as regards the position of wheat. I want to call hon. members' attention to the fact that on wheat and flour and fruit there is no wharfage charge whatever.

Mr. Griffiths: Nobody said there was.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): That is a distinct gain. But when it comes to stacking wheat in huge quantities on the wharves, surely something should be paid.

Mr. Griffiths: Of course; but not the present charge.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): I accept the hon. member's statement with regard to Victoria. If we are to store the wheat on the wharves free of charge, let him and his friends go to the Treasurer and say, "Give us a bonus of £50,000 for the assistance of agriculture," and in return for that bonus wheat will be stored for nothing.

Mr. Griffiths: That is rubbish.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): If the facilities are there, everybody using them should pay for them. As regards wharfage, nothing is charged against wheat. I think before the hon. member moved his motion he should have considered the fact that wheat and flour and fruit, and indeed all agricultural products, go across our wharves free of wharfage charges altogether. It is the consumers who have to make up the money to pay interest

and sinking fund on those wharves. Coming now to the suggestion of the hon member that we should abolish the Fremantle Harbour Trust, my own opinion is that the system of having Harbour Trusts and Harbour Boards ought to be abolished. We ought to have one department of the State managing the whole of our wharves, just as we have one department of the State managing our railways. Each little section or town should not have the management of its wharf. Perhaps in a year or two I may bring along a proposition to abolish both the Fremantle Harbour Trust and the Bunbury Harbour Board and place the wharves under State control.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [5.19]: I do not know whether the mover is satisfied as to the correctness of the information which he has laid before the House. I regret I was not aware that this was private members' day, or I could have furnished the hon. member with the exact charges made by all Harbour Trusts throughout Australia, when he would have found that the Fremantle charges are the lowest of the lot. The hon. member said that according to the Fremantle Harbour Trust report there was a loss of about £10,000 on handling cargo last year. I do not know the date of the report from which the hon. member quoted.

Mr. Griffiths: The report for 1916-17.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am quoting from the report of the Trust for that financial year, when handling charges brought in £51,778 and the amount paid in wages was £46,851. I do not see how the £10,000 loss comes in there. Of course, the other charges to be added are wharf expenses, maintenance of plant, and so forth. As a matter of fact, however, the Fremantle charges for handling cargo are just barely sufficient to pay the cost of handling on the rates of wages fixed by the Federal Arbitration Court. With regard to the handling of wheat in the past—I am not dealing with storage now—the charge has been hardly sufficient to pay the cost incurred by the Harbour Trust. As the Minister has just stated, the system adopted at Fremantle has been brought into force at the request of the mercantile community of this State, and from the time it has been introduced up to now the ship owners and their agents have been continually endeavouring to get it altered.

Mr. Griffiths: But it is the mercantile people who are now complaining.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: They have never complained. Their complaints were made while the ship owners had the control.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): That is right.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Again, the hon. member asserted that the Fremantle Harbour Trust will not pay damages in respect of damaged cargo. I told him that he was wrong, but he persisted that he was right. Now, I myself had the pleasure of introducing into this House a Bill providing that the Fremantle Harbour Trust should not pay

damages in respect of cargo worked at night. As regards cargo damaged during the day time, they pay for all damages. The reason for the difference I will explain. A large quantity of cargo arrives at the port damaged, and if the ship owners for the advantage of their ships choose to work at night time, when there cannot be the same close supervision of the cargo as it is taken into the slings which obtains during the day time, it is only fair that the ship owners should bear the responsibility of damaged cargo, and not the State. Let it be remembered, too, that all moneys paid by the Fremantle Harbour Trust come out of the coffers of the State. I know the shippers kicked against the arrangement at the time; but that is the position. If cargo is not marked "damaged on receipt" and becomes damaged during unloading, the Fremantle Harbour Trust pay; otherwise the ship owners pay. I am rather in accord with the hon. member as to the matter of wheat storage. If he refers to the Wheat Commission's report, he will find the matter dealt with there. I maintain that the Harbour Trust have charged, ever since the wheat has been stacked at Fremantle, too high a rate for storage outside the sheds. The wheat is stowed away from the wharf itself. The Trust found that the amount they were charging was too high, and they reduced it from £1,000 per month to £500. The Harbour Trust state that they can obtain no correspondence from the Wheat Commission in regard to this matter. I think they are anticipating that a reduction will be made. But I wish to remind the hon. member that while the £12,000 per annum is being charged, nothing at all is being paid. No money at all is being paid by the Wheat Scheme to the Fremantle Harbour Trust. That is the difficulty. Except for the handling charges, that is for stacking and storing the wheat, for which the Harbour Trust pay the men, the Wheat Scheme make no payments whatever to the Trust. So far as I can gather—I suggest to hon. members that they should read the evidence of the secretary of the Fremantle Harbour Trust on this matter—the Trust have taken into consideration the amount for which they are liable in the way of interest and sinking fund and depreciation on the north wharf, and have also taken into consideration the charges for sidings put in to provide for the storage of wheat. A charge has been made on the lot for interest, sinking fund, and depreciation, and not only on a total of about £70,000, I think. However, the wheat is not using the wharves at all. The wheat is stored away from the wharves. It has nothing to do with the wharves. Consequently, the wheat is being charged interest and sinking fund in respect of works with which it has no connection. As soon as a ship comes in to take the wheat, the ship has to pay harbour dues, which include wharfage charges. Thus the wheat is paid for again, a second time, through the shipping dues. Moreover, charges are made for the use of the

machinery on the wharf for loading. The ship is charged for the use of that machinery, because the ship is supposed to provide her own machinery. However, all the time storage is going on, interest and sinking fund and depreciation are being charged in respect of all the plant—cranes, elevators, and so forth. The secretary told us definitely and distinctly that he had to get the money from somewhere. I suppose the Harbour Trust thought this was the easiest place. Everybody who has dealings with the Wheat Scheme adopts the same attitude. I do not know but that the Royal Commission have done a bit of the same thing also. The charge, however, as the Minister has admitted, is too high; and I believe that when the Wheat Scheme come forward with a definite understanding and make arrangements the Treasurer will be only too pleased to take their cheque for £2,000 instead of letting the amount stand on the books as it is now doing.

Mr. Thomson: I thought you said the Trust were charging the Scheme £500 per month.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Trust reduced the charge from £1,000 to £500 per month, but they have put it up again to the £1,000. Since the Trust put the charge back to the £1,000, the Wheat Scheme have paid nothing.

Mr. Griffiths: But the Government have got the cockies' wheat.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I like that interjection. I hope the State will get the money it has guaranteed for the cockies' wheat.

Mr. Munsie: The State never will.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The State has practically paid for the wheat. The wheat is the State's wheat. I greatly regret the introduction of this motion. The hon. member has not discussed the matter with the mercantile community. There are huge files of complaints from the mercantile community referring to the control of the wharves by the ship owners.

Mr. Griffiths: I tell the hon. member he is wrong. I have consulted with the mercantile community.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It all depends on whom the hon. member consulted on the matter. The hon. member said he was quite sure that Mr. Leslie is a servant of the Harbour Trust. Let me tell the hon. member that Mr. Leslie was never a servant of the Harbour Trust. Mr. Leslie was an engineer of the Public Works Department at the time of the construction of the wharves.

The Minister for Works: He is a member of the Chamber of Commerce now.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes. But he was then employed by the Government as an engineer—in which statement the Minister for Works can bear me out. Mr. Leslie was employed by the Government like many other engineers. However, on the occasion to which the member for York refers, Mr. Leslie was speaking on behalf of the Chamber of Commerce; and the Chamber of Commerce is against control of the wharves by the ship owners. Merchants now receive better consideration; they have their cargo handled more cheaply and with greater care by the Harbour Trust than by the ship owners.

Mr. Griffiths: These people in Perth were speaking for the Fremantle people.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: With all due respect to Chambers of Commerce, on a question of this kind I would rather hear the views of the Perth Chamber of Commerce than those of the Fremantle Chamber, because the latter is controlled by the ship owners while the former is controlled by the mercantile community. The Perth Chamber of Commerce is representative of the merchants, but an overwhelming majority of the members of the Fremantle Chamber of Commerce are agents for ship owners. In Perth we have the genuine article so far as the merchants are concerned, while in Fremantle we have the shipping interests represented. I notice that the north wharf is now open to the general public. If hon. members want to see the wheat and the cleaning machines there is no necessity for them to get a pass to do so. They will now have an opportunity of seeing what has been done, and seeing whether the charges which were made were too high or not. Yesterday members of the wheat commission went on to the wharf without a ticket. The south wharf, however, is still closed. This is the property of the public, and a large number of the public visit these wharves on Sundays and at other times. I hope the public will have an opportunity of availing themselves of their own property if they desire to do so.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): I will do what I can.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The shippers are putting their finger into the pie, and saying "This belongs to us." I hope the time will not arrive again when shippers will have control of the Fremantle wharf.

Mr. THOMSON (Katanning) [5.31]: I move an amendment—

That the words "the practice of the Fremantle Harbour Trust in the handling of goods on the Fremantle wharves should be discontinued and such services should be optional with shippers also" be struck out.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): Drop the last words and put in "unwarrantably high."

Mr. THOMSON: I am afraid if the motion is put to the House as it has been moved, most members will vote against it. After having heard the explanation of the Honorary Minister, and the speech of the member for North-East Fremantle, who has a thorough knowledge of the subject, I believe it is in the interests of the community that no change should be made so far as the handing of goods is concerned. I also believe it will strengthen the hands of the Minister in representing to the Harbour Trust that the charges are unreasonably high. I have no reason to doubt the sincerity or the figures of the member for York, when he states that the storage charges are 2½d. in the Eastern States as compared with 3s. 1d. here. We have also had the statement of the member for North-East Fremantle that the Fremantle Harbour Trust were charging £500 a month for the storage of wheat. At the beginning of 1916-17, according to the Fremantle Harbour Trust report, they had

2,940,324 bags of wheat, and to-day we have 925,848 bags of wheat. I think that the charges are certainly excessive, and notwithstanding the fact that no amount has yet been paid, there is no getting away from the fact that the Harbour Trust, if these charges are adhered to, are creditors to the present wheat marketing scheme, and can collect the whole amount of money which is due. The member for York is to be commended for having gone into the matter. I trust the House will, however, accept the amendment.

Mr. ROCKE (South Fremantle) [5.35]: I am sorry I was unable to follow the figures supplied by the member for York in moving his motion. When it comes to a comparison between Fremantle and the accommodation afforded in the Eastern ports, I must say I am under the impression that Fremantle compares more than favourably, from the point of view of facilities and management of the works connected with the harbour, with any Eastern States port.

Mr. Thomson: Not the charges for the storage of wheat.

Mr. ROCKE: I am talking about the handling of cargo in general.

Mr. Thomson: We are not dealing with that.

Mr. ROCKE: It is a pity that the mover of the motion did not distinctly state what he meant by shippers, but I think the House understands that he meant ship-owners. Not only have these people desired to acquire the handling of cargoes from their ships, but they have also desired to obtain a lease of the wharves, as has been granted to them in the Eastern States ports. A movement was on foot some time ago to bring this about, and I hope the Government will set their faces strongly against any such proposition. We have sufficient burdens to bear from the shipping combine, really unnecessary burdens which are enriching the combines at the expense of the general public. It has been suggested that the Harbour Trust should be abolished and a Government commission formed. In the matter of outports I am quite agreeable to the harbour boards being abolished, because I do not think they are necessary. The case of the Bunbury harbour board has been mentioned, and there we find a body of men being paid for services which they do not render. The Railway Department does a portion of the work which these people should do, and the Fremantle Harbour and Light Department undertakes other work. I think that one central body can well control the outports. I am prepared to support the amendment which has just been moved. On the showing of the member for York, also of the member for North-East Fremantle, and the Honorary Minister, the charges for wheat storage at Fremantle seem to be rather excessive. If, however, the Government are receiving no money at all, and there is no chance of their receiving any, the charges cannot be excessive. I suppose we are going on the assumption that these charges will eventu-

ally be paid. We hope so, at all events. The matter of ullaged cargo is one which the Harbour Trust does take responsibility for. The member for York is not well informed on that point. As to the taking over of the responsibility of the shipping people after a certain hour in the evening, I think they are quite right in refusing to do so. If cargo is handled at night it is solely in the interests of the shipping companies, and not in the interests of the community.

Amendment put and passed.

The PREMIER (Hon. H. B. Lefroy—Moore) [5.40]: I think it would be better if the hon. member would agree to strike out the words "and should be in conformity with the rates charged for similar accommodation in the Eastern States of the Commonwealth."

Mr. O'Loughlen: There would be nothing left then.

The PREMIER: It is generally agreed that the charges are too high, and if the House expresses an opinion in that direction I do not think it is necessary to add these other words. The conditions in the Eastern States may not be similar to those which exist here, and I think it would be well that the House should not commit itself to a definite opinion of this sort without first going fully into the matter. The House has sufficient evidence to show that the charges are too high, but I do not think it has sufficient evidence to satisfy itself that the charges should be similar to those in the Eastern States. The words that I have referred to are unnecessary, and I ask the hon. member not to bind the House to such an expression of opinion. It would be unwise for the House to go too far and to hamper the Government in the matter. It may be that the Harbour Trust will be warranted in making the charges lower than they are in the Eastern States. If the House expresses the opinion that these charges are too high, the wishes of the hon. member should be met. I move an amendment—

That the words "and should be in conformity with the rates charged for similar accommodation in the Eastern States of the Commonwealth" be struck out.

Mr. GRIFFITHS (York—on amendment) [5.45]: I cannot see the sense of the amendment. Something should be added to the words of the motion that are left, which will indicate that in the opinion of the House these charges are not only too high but that they should be reduced.

Mr. SPEAKER: It will be necessary for the House to carry the amendment before other words can be added.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. GRIFFITHS (York) [5.45]: I move a further amendment—

That after "high" in the last line the words "and require a reduction" be added.

Amendment put and passed; the motion as amended agreed to.

MOTION—PARLIAMENTARY ALLOWANCES, TO REDUCE.

Mr. THOMSON (Katanning) [5.48]: I move—

That in the opinion of this House the allowances paid to members of both Houses of Parliament should be reduced by ten per cent. per annum until such time as the finances of the State warrant a reversion to the present payment.

I regret that owing to my absence from the Chamber on Wednesday, 30th October, I was not able to place this motion before the House. His Excellency the Governor was at that time attending two agricultural shows in my electorate and as hon. members know, it is considered necessary when His Excellency is visiting a district that the member for the district should be present. I tender that as an apology for my absence.

Mr. O'Loghlen: We were not broken up over it.

Mr. THOMSON: I also want to assure the House that I took every step possible to see that the motion was placed lower down on the Notice Paper. I interviewed the Premier and he assured me that he would do so. The member for Wagin will also bear me out, when I say the last words I made use of to him were that he should be sure that my motion was not lost. Unfortunately, the Standing Orders would not allow another hon. member to move it, and it lapsed. I do not bring this motion forward with any idea of cheapening the services hon. members are rendering to the State. I know it may be argued that if we offer to reduce our salaries we are stating to the public of Western Australia that we consider that the services we render here are only worth the reduced amount. Just to prove to members that I am quite sincere, I will repeat what I stated in the House in 1914 when on the Address-in-reply I said—

I know of no better place where the Government can start than in the House of Parliament itself. If so be it that the civil servants and employees of the State have to submit to reductions of salary, I maintain that we, as members of Parliament, should set them an example.

An interjection was made by the late Mr. McDowall, the then member for Coolgardie, whose loss we all regret, who said, "What would you propose in the way of a reduction of members' salaries?" I answered, "Anything up to £50." So I do not want hon. members to accuse me, as they often do, of kite-flying. During the last election I made a definite pledge to my constituents that so far as I was concerned, I was in favour of a reduction in the number of members of the Legislature in Western Australia, and I also stated that I was in favour of a reduction of the salaries of members. I do not worry my head very much about what my opponent did or said. It did not trouble me, but I was only endeavouring to be consistent with my actions. We were proud in 1914 when the British Ambassador told the German Ambassador that the British nation considered

that its name on a scrap of paper was a pledge that had to be carried out. I am in the same position. I have made a pledge to my electors that I believe in a reduction of the salaries of members of Parliament. Taking into consideration the expenditure that the country has of recent years been subjected to, and also taking into consideration the existence of the deficit which we have to face, and also the fact that I am aware I am going to be twitted with the remark that the amount of money which is going to be saved will be a mere drop in the ocean, I intend to press my motion forward. Although we will save only £3,000 that sum of money will pay interest on £60,000, and while it is a very small amount, it would be in my opinion a step in the right direction. My motion is very moderate, as hon. members will see if they read it. We know that during the past four and a half years many men have gone from all parts of the State to fight our battles and in doing so they have made great financial sacrifices. Not only that, but they have risked their lives in the defence of their country, and we would not be in any way decrying ourselves as legislators of Western Australia if we were to pass a motion of this description. We would be pointing out that we too are prepared to make some small sacrifice until the finances of the State are again on the high road to stability. I am not going to labour the question. I want hon. members to believe me when I say that I am not in any way attacking the principle of payment of members. I say in all sincerity that members of Parliament are not paid more than they should be. I also want to stress the point that it has been the policy of Governments until just recently that no increments were to be paid to civil servants whose salaries were above the amount of £204 per annum. The members of the service whose salaries do not exceed that amount have not received any increments at all during the past four or five years.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Still, they are better off than we are; they have no elections to fight.

Mr. THOMSON: That may be. At the same time, I hope the House will seriously consider the facts which I have placed before them and pass the motion.

Mr. VERYARD (Leederville) [5.55]: I second the motion.

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

Ayes	9
Noes	26

Majority against .. 17

AYES.

Mr. Broun	Mr. Pilkington
Mr. Brown	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Duff	Mr. Veryard
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Maley
Mr. Plessa	(Teller.)

NOMS.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Angwin	Mr. Nairn
Mr. Chesson	Mr. O'Loughlin
Mr. Collier	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Davies	Mr. R. T. Robinson
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Roche
Mr. George	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Green	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Holman	Mr. Walker
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Hardwick
Mr. Letroy	(Teller.)
Mr. Mullany	

Question thus negatived.

RETURN—NORTH-WEST, PARTICULARS.

Mr. ANGELO (Gascoyne) [G.I.]: I move—

That a Return be laid upon the Table of the House showing—(1) The total State moneys expended on that part of the State comprised in the Kimberley, Pilbara, Roebourne, and Gascoyne districts during the past five years ended 30th June last, including cost of buildings, upkeep, salaries, wages, etc.; (a) from revenue and expenditure account; (b) from loan moneys. (2) The total revenue received from the same area during the same period from all sources including land rents, licenses of all kinds, royalties, harbour dues, fines, fees, etc. (3) The value of all wealth produced in the same area during the same period,—(a) Live stock, minerals, pearl-shell, wool, skins, hides, tallow, kangaroo skins, whale oil, manure, sandalwood, etc., shipped from N.W. ports direct overseas. (b) Live stock, minerals, pearlshell, wool, skins, hides, tallow, kangaroo skins, whale oil, manure, sandalwood, etc., sent down from North-West ports to southern ports and transhipped overseas. (c) Live stock, hides, skins, tallow, etc., sent from the districts named to other portions of the State and either consumed locally or sold in the State.

I am asking for this return so as to be able to convince the House, the Press, and the people of the State that we have a valuable asset in the North-West, and that it has not been developed in the way it should have been. If I can secure this return I am certain it will meet the object I have in view. If the return shows what can be done in the North, I propose later on to move that a commission of business men and men of experience in developing country such as the North-West be sent up to go through the North-West and report to the Government as to its future development. The policy of the present Government is "produce, produce, produce." There is no portion of the State which lends itself to the carrying out of that policy to the same extent as does the North-West. The area of the North-West is about the same as that of Queensland and it has about the same coastline. But when we come to compare the population in the two areas there is a very great difference. In

our North-West we have only some 5,000 people resident, whereas in Queensland there is a population of 680,000. In other words, we have not in our North-West one per cent. of the population of Queensland.

Mr. Green: Do you think it is quite as good a country as Queensland?

Mr. ANGELO: It may not be, although experts tell us it can produce almost anything that can be produced in Queensland. Even if it is not as good a country as Queensland, that in itself does not explain the vast difference in the respective populations. It may be asked, in what direction could the North-West be developed? I contend that there are in the North-West vast areas of pastoral country awaiting development. Between Wyndham and Derby there is a huge coastline with splendid harbours, and I think that if this return is furnished, and if the House is satisfied that the small amount of settlement already up there is not commensurate with the large amount of wealth already produced, the Government will recognise the possibilities of the North and send out an expedition to develop its unsettled portions, which at present are given over to the natives. Only recently a company took up some three million acres of undeveloped pastoral country and were driven out again by the natives. If we could send up sufficient of a population to properly occupy those undeveloped areas, the natives would cease from being a menace, and would eventually become quite useful members of the community. Then there is a great area of mineral country in the North awaiting development, while the fishing possibilities along the coast are highly spoken of. I refer, not merely to pearlshell, but to the whaling industry also.

Mr. Munsie: Is not nearly all that coast taken up by an existing lease in respect of whales?

Mr. ANGELO: Not all of it, and in any case the lessees have done nothing during the past few years. In view of this I think something should be done about granting a lease to somebody else. Then there are other industries which could be developed up there. Let me quote from the report of an expert sent up to the North-West by a previous Government. Mr. Despeissis writes as follows:—

Tropical products imported in 1910 and capable of being produced in the North-West of Western Australia amounted to £4,382,000.

Surely to goodness if Australia is importing tropical products to that value, products which can be grown in the North-West, the development of that vast area should be taken into serious consideration. Then, again, viewing it from a national standpoint, there is the question of defence. For how long are we going to allow that portion of Australia, with densely populated islands at no great distance from the coast, to remain settled by only 5,000 people? Is it not time that the Government realised their responsibility in this direction and did something towards placing a larger white population up

there? I am told the return will involve considerable expense. I cannot say how much, nor does it seem to me that any large expenditure will be necessary. Most of the figures can be obtained from the Statistical Department, and a few letters sent to the Customs and to stock and station agents doing business in Perth and Fremantle would get us very much information. I do not suppose the return would be quite accurate, but it should be sufficient to give us the information required. I wish to prove to the House and the public what a valuable asset we have in the North-West, even in its present undeveloped state. If that can be proved to the House it will help to convince the Government that the development of the North-West should be taken into serious consideration. I do not suppose that the return can be completed this session, but there will be the recess, so the Government should have no difficulty in obtaining the information before next session. If I can be of assistance in getting any of the figures I shall be glad to do anything asked of me. Of course, if the return is going to cost very much money, I will agree to forego it. However, the war is over now, and it is up to us to seriously consider the development of the whole State and particularly of the neglected North.

The COLONIAL TREASURER (Hon. J. Gardiner—Irwin) [6.13]: I am going to oppose the motion, but not from any discourtesy to the hon. member. It has taken about three minutes to read, and it would take at least three years to get the information the hon. member desires. Where is this going to end? We shall have every member calling for a similar return in respect of his own particular district. This House is pledged to economy. I do not think the intention of the hon. member would be served by this return, even if he got it. We have in the House four members representing the North-West, and I venture to say there is not the slightest desire on the part of any member of the House to see the North-West neglected. An obvious duty of hon. members, which they do not shirk, is to put before the House the claims of their electorates for consideration. We have heard the hon. member for Gascoyne wax eloquent on bananas and many other things pertaining to the North-West, and I am sure he has made an impression on the House.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: If I thought this return would be the means of the North-West receiving better consideration at the hands of any Government of this State, I would cheerfully vote for it. There is no disguising the fact, however, that it would require a large number of clerks in almost every department to prepare it. Even then it would be impossible to get a complete return, because I do not know how we are to get the etceteras. It will take many clerks to get it out, and when it is got out how would it benefit anyone, or how would it influence any Government in regard to the North-West? On the ground that to furnish this return would involve a great

deal of unnecessary expense and serve no practical purpose, I must oppose the motion.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister—Pilbara) [7.33]: I appreciate the spirit which animated the hon. member who brought this motion forward. There are 50 members of this Chamber, and only four of us come from the North and have a personal knowledge of the North. The general public of Western Australia has no knowledge of that country. In my opinion it is the most valuable part of Western Australia.

Mr. Harrison: Mr. Despeissis' report gives a good account of it.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): I am not worrying much about Mr. Despeissis. The Scaddan Government appointed him a commissioner for tropical agriculture. He wanted to sit in Perth and build up about him a department. I advised the Government that this was useless. If, however, we could get the right man, not to sit in Perth but to go into the North and stop there, great possibilities would present themselves for a commissioner on tropical agriculture. I do not know what this return would cost to get out, and am not advocating that any excessive expenditure should be incurred in the matter. I wish to point out that we have a wonderful asset in the North. The Federal Government have wasted millions of money upon the Northern Territory, but so far as the north of this State is concerned, it has been a permanent and paying asset all the time. Our pastoral country pays in some £50,000 or £60,000 a year. When our new Pastoral Bill comes in and is passed, we will double that easily, and probably get considerably more. Almost every acre of land in the North is leasehold land, and no one has the freehold of it. The possibilities of the North are absolutely immense. In the Kimberleys we have possibilities which pass my imagination, and I know they pass the imagination of the member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo). That hon. member has grown bananas, and knows how well they can be cultivated. He has seen how well the Gascoyne can grow wool. That part of the country, however, is only some 35 or 40 years old. We should know all that it is possible to know with respect to the North-West. I think I am the only representative of the North who stands for a White Australia. I said long ago, and repeat it to-night, that unless white men occupy that country, coloured men will do so. It is a serious question, not only for this House to consider, but for the whole of Australia to consider. We should all do our utmost to get a white population into that country. I have lived there for many years, and have engaged in almost every class of work there, and I hold the opinion that white men can live there. Once we get a population there, just as it will grow the biggest aborigines we have in Australia, so will it grow the biggest white men in Australia. Notwithstanding that this motion may not do much, and may cost a pound or two, I want to say that we can spend thousands in trying to populate the north of this country.

Hon. T. WALKER (Kanoona) [7.36]: I almost feel that I should apologise for offering any remarks upon a subject only known to four members of this Chamber.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): Only four of us have been there.

Hon. T. WALKER: It is quite possible, though, there are those who, without having a personal and direct knowledge, may, from those who have a direct knowledge, have gained information and formed some opinions on the subject. Since I have been a resident in Western Australia—and I have been here for many years—I have taken a very great interest in the outlying portions of this immense State. I have also endeavoured to observe the sphere of activities proceeding in a business, trade, or productive sense, and to measure as far as practicable, their area. I have come to the conclusion that there are few of us here about the metropolis, and within a very limited radius from here, who have an adequate conception of the immensity of this great part of the Commonwealth. Not only is it immense in area, but immense in possibilities. I have read all I could on the subject, and gathered all I could from those who have been to the North-West and who have come my way, and I am convinced that the statements made by the Honorary Minister and by the member for Gascoyne are substantiated by facts. There is wealth there lying idle awaiting development. We do not know how great this country can be made if we get rid of the narrow parish pump principle of confining all our energies to the circumscribed area in and around the metropolis. If we had the spirit that looked upon the State as a whole, and in that way sought to decentralise and simultaneously develop all portions of this great area, and if we aimed at the extraction from the earth of its wealth of all kinds in every portion of the State, we might indeed become the leading partner in this great Federation.

Mr. Harrison: Quite true.

Hon. T. WALKER: Unfortunately, however, there are vested interests, little narrow grooves of view and vision, old customs of sticking to our little intimate friendships and connections in a business sense, which the fear of rivalry and competition and the introduction of new elements would stir to greater activity. Outside of Perth, Northam, and the goldfields we are indifferent as to the possibilities of Western Australia, though all of it is our own country, our own land, and our own State. We might as well be speaking of a foreign country as far away as the Malay States as to speak of the Kimberleys and the North-West. Even in the far south and the south-west we have possibilities that would constitute an attraction for the whole of Europe, if the people there only knew the potentialities of the soil, its capacity to feed millions and not thousands, and its ability to create wealth beyond the avarice of our present citizens. If we are to believe what scientific men, experts trained in judgment and by experience, tell

us, this State contains everything that mortal man can wish for to build up a nation lacking in nothing. And yet we are absolutely indifferent, or have been until a few years ago, to what the North-West can furnish for us. Its proximity to those portions of the world that have their teeming millions requiring nourishment and comforts and articles of luxury, makes it admirably suitable for a centre of outer trade, and yet we are as indifferent to it as if it were a land governed by some alien peoples. It is a part of our own country. We have not only not spent money upon it, but we have scarcely attended to its government. We have had no purpose, until a very few years ago, in developing its most obvious capacities. In every sense of the word we have treated it as a negligible feature, which might just as well be a desert for all the interest we took in it. Yet, as I say, if our scientific men are fit to be trusted, the soil of the North-West is rich, not only in minerals, but as regards productivity in those things that are necessary for the sustenance of a people and indeed for the arts and industries of nations. It is almost criminal negligence to act as we have done hitherto regarding the North. Much as the Labour Government have been sneered at from time to time, it will everlastingly stand to their credit that, under their administration, for the first time in the history of this country special attention was paid to the North-West and an endeavour made to set that part of our country in the pathway of development. True, all was not done that might have been done. But something has been done that all Governments henceforth will be compelled to follow. My only fear is that we shall follow these tracks and pathways indifferently and callously, without that proper heart and spirit of patriotism necessary to give full life and fruition to endeavour. I welcome what has fallen from the lips of the member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo), because it draws our attention here to the need for alertness, for being awake to the value and the greatness of the country in which we live. It lifts us out of the little parochial area in which all our energies have been centred, into a far wider circle, and makes us feel that we are nation builders, or ought to consider ourselves so, and that when we legislate here, we are legislating for national greatness, and not for the mere commercial advantage of a few with vested interests to serve. We must get wider than that. Our whole State must be developed. It is purely with a view to that development that attention is necessary to make the North-West a component part of Western Australia, and not an isolated section which might well be separated from us without causing a heart's pang to those who live here. It is with a view to that end that this motion has been moved to-night. I regret the view which the Treasurer has taken. The hon. gentleman contends that it will be costly to prepare the details of information necessary for the answering of this motion. I cannot con-

ceive that we have not available upon the books of the State, at the present time, most of this information in one form or another. Possibly a collation of figures may be required, and a little attention to tabulation; but we have, I think, within comparatively easy access, most of the information that is desired. The collection of it may cost a little, but I venture to think that if we get that information it will be worth the little money we shall have spent in obtaining it. The expense is not going to exhaust the Treasury. The information I venture to affirm will be an eye-opener to the whole of our Commonwealth. It will turn to our North-West, to that great country now practically lying idle, or given over to cattle and sheep and the wilderness, the eyes of all those who have an enterprising spirit within them at all. The little we shall spend will attract capital and enterprise and industry, which will create wealth untold for every citizen now living in Australia. There are those who can remember when it was a term of contempt that met every man who came from the Eastern States to help to build up this portion of the Commonwealth. He was a tothersider; he was not looked upon as one of us; he did not belong to the families that had grown up here.

Mr. Roche: But that is many years ago.

Hon. T. WALKER: True, it is a good few years ago; but that was the spirit at one time. And yet what has happened? By the influx from the other States and also from the rest of the world we have built ourselves up considerably, so that we need not be at all ashamed to compare ourselves with the rest of the States as to enterprise and progress. And so it will be when we can attract, with almost as strong a lure as a new rich goldfield, population from the other States and from the rest of the world to the development of that great area, that kingdom in extent at all events, of our North-West. We should by that means be able to build up and strengthen the whole of our country. But just imagine an objection being taken to the use of the word "etcetera," as if that detracted from the value of the motion. The motion asks for information covering the past five years as to the cost of building up the North-West in salaries, wages, etc. Well, that is only a form of expression. We might have there instead of "etcetera" the words, "and all other incidentals." But the meaning is well understood, though I admit that "etcetera" is a vague, general word which does not specify anything. Its meaning is quite clear to any man who wants to be fair to the mover of the motion. The mover does not want to exclude anything.

Mr. Troy: Who is opposing the motion?

Hon. T. WALKER: The Treasurer is opposing it, and one of his grounds of objection is that the word "etcetera" is too vague.

The Colonial Treasurer: If the return would serve to attain the object of the mover, I would be quite willing to agree to it; but do you think it will?

Hon. T. WALKER: I think the return would be extremely valuable to every citizen of this State, and indeed to every citizen of the Commonwealth.

The Colonial Treasurer: My view is that this return would not give the hon. member what he wants, namely an advertisement for the North-West.

Hon. T. WALKER: It might not give everything that is necessary.

The Colonial Treasurer: Do you think a return would do what you and the mover want?

Hon. T. WALKER: Undoubtedly it would be of value to me and to everyone desirous of taking an intelligent view of the country in which he is a legislator.

The Colonial Treasurer: What does "spending of money" mean? Would that be an advertisement?

Hon. T. WALKER: We want to know what the State has actually expended in getting the results already attained in the North-West; what that has cost the people.

The Colonial Treasurer: You say you want an advertisement for the North-West, and I say I am perfectly willing to pay for a good advertisement.

Hon. T. WALKER: It will not be a fair advertisement unless we know costs and returns.

Mr. Angelo: We practically want a balance sheet of the North-West.

The Colonial Treasurer: A balance sheet of what the State has spent and what it has received?

Hon. T. WALKER: Yes.

The Colonial Treasurer: The mover does not say he wants what the member for Kanowna says the mover wants.

Hon. T. WALKER: The wording of the motion may not be all that the Treasurer would like. But I think what is desired and intended is obvious. Clearly, the mover wishes, as he now says, in one phrase, a balance sheet.

The Colonial Treasurer: A balance sheet showing expenditure by the State and receipts by the State?

Mr. Angelo: Yes, and also the wealth produced.

Hon. T. WALKER: And also the wealth existing in the North-West, created by the expenditure of the State—the capital now standing there, in the shape of public and other buildings, for instance.

Mr. Angelo: Fremantle and Geraldton are getting a lot of the credit for the wealth produced by the North-West.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Not Fremantle; Singapore.

Mr. Teesdale: Better ask for the financial position of everybody in the North-West while you are at it.

Hon. T. WALKER: That information would not be disadvantageous. I would like to learn that there were good accounts in the Savings Banks and other banks of the North-West.

Mr. Teesdale: You would not like to have some of the accounts.

Hon. T. WALKER: I daresay not, but some of them I would like very much indeed.

to have. It is part of the life of a nation to know what its citizens possess, either in stable wealth or in wealth that can be liquefied, so to speak, at a moment's notice. That is all valuable information. Comparatively a few years ago, 50 years ago, what wealth of any kind existed in the North-West? Now take the balance sheet, and it will surprise a good many of our citizens in the metropolitan area to learn how really wealthy the North-West is.

The Colonial Treasurer: I am afraid that under this motion you would not get what you desire and what I desire.

Hon. T. WALKER: One can, of course, spoil any motion. Apparently, what is now needed is to make the motion say what is required. Let us make it clear that we want to know the exact state of the North-West to know the actual wealth and what the creation of that wealth has cost.

The Colonial Treasurer: I am perfectly agreeable to that.

Hon. T. WALKER: Then let us amend the motion accordingly. If the Colonial Treasurer will move an amendment in that direction, I will support it. All I require is that the citizens shall know what the North-West is and what it can do.

The Colonial Treasurer: That is the information I am willing to supply.

Hon. T. WALKER: Let the motion be worded in that form. It is clear to me what the hon. member wants and I do not think there should be any objection to it.

The Colonial Treasurer: If that is so, I misunderstood. I thought the hon. member wanted a balance sheet to show what has been spent and what return the State has had.

Hon. T. WALKER: Let us have a correct balance sheet for the past five years to show us what has transpired in the North-West, not only in relation to Government actions, but as the product of Government actions in the public buildings now existing there, the public facilities and outlets created. For instance, it would be absurd to have a return of this kind without the freezing works being taken into consideration. Everything having the semblance of capital value in the North-West should appear in the balance sheet, and I think the request should be granted, because we are not doing ourselves justice as a State if we do not try to develop simultaneously every portion of it in the North-West and in the South.

Mr. TEESDALE (Roebourne) [8.5]: I intend to oppose the motion. I do not see that any good can be gained by it. It will take a great deal of time to prepare the information sought and there are other matters of greater importance that require attention. If the hon. member wants this information, let him go to the different departments where he will get every courtesy and attention shown him. We want to get on with other matters which are more pressing than the number of nuts and bolts which have been distributed along a jetty or the Point Sampson ramp. These are of no importance to the public just

now. The hon. member can get everything he wants without any difficulty. It is not fair at the present time to ask the Government to have returns of this description prepared. A return such as this would involve perhaps a couple of months' work on the part of a dozen officials, and the information which would be supplied would not be of the slightest value. I intend to oppose the motion.

Mr. TROY (Mt. Magnet) [8.8]: I am sorry to see a disagreement between two of the members representing the North-West. I intend to support the motion, because I consider that the information asked for will prove valuable. Not only the hon. member who asked for it, but every hon. member will be interested to learn how that part of the State to which the motion refers has progressed. Would it not be a good thing also if we knew exactly how other localities were faring? Take Kalgoolie, Geraldton, the Murchison, the Great Southern, or in fact, every portion of the State. We should be interested to know exactly how those portions were all progressing. I would like to see the return and I would like to assure the member for Roebourne that the member for Gascoyne would have no opportunity of obtaining this information except by a vote of the House. If he went to the office and asked for this return the officers would tell him that they could not supply the information without the consent of the Minister.

Hon. P. Collier: They would not give him two figures.

Mr. TROY: The North-West is sufficiently important for us to know exactly how it is getting on. I am not particularly concerned just now as to which party spent any money there or whether it was or was not treated badly in the past. The fact remains that it is a very important part of the State, and the hon. member may have good reasons for asking to be supplied with this information. It is quite possible that that portion of the State may yet be separated from the southern part of Western Australia, and the figures asked for may be interesting from that standpoint. I consider the time is coming when its progress will warrant the North-West being governed in some other manner. The information the hon. member asks for will assist us. At any rate, I would like to know what is occurring. The figures should also prove where the expenditure in the North-West has taken place. I am sure the hon. member is asking for the information for bona fide reasons. I am not prepared to split straws because he has included in his motion the word etcetera. That does not make it mandatory that the Government should supply all kinds of information. The hon. member may ask for certain information.

Hon. P. Collier: And it is understood that the information will be given so far as it is possible to supply it.

Mr. TROY: Exactly, and the Minister may not be able to give everything. No one expects him to do so if the information is not available, and in 99 cases out of 100 the information which is supplied is always accepted by the House. I intend to support the motion.

Hon. J. MITCHELL (Northam) [8.12]: I can quite understand the Treasurer questioning the wisdom of incurring expenditure in connection with a motion of this kind, but the suggestion made by the member for Roebourne that the hon. member who moved the motion should go to the department and get the information for himself, is an altogether new departure.

Mr. Teesdale: I know if I want information from a Minister I can always get it.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Let the hon. member go to a department and ask for information such as that which is referred to in the motion and he will find out for himself whether it is possible to get it. If it were possible to get it direct, it would take far more time to supply it to the hon. member than it would to prepare the return. Perhaps a great deal of the information asked for is already tabulated and ready, but I doubt whether it would do justice to the North. If the question of supplying the information sought is merely one of cost, the Treasurer should not consider it in that regard. What we require has been forcibly expressed by the member for Kanoona. I have never listened to a speech with greater pleasure than that delivered by the hon. members, and what he said was absolutely correct. We have territory which is practically unknown to the people of the State. Unfortunately we are too prone not to listen to the representatives of that part of the State who do know something about it. We have four of them here, though apparently they do not agree on all matters. Still, they are amongst us and from time to time we get valuable information from them. If we were to get a balance sheet of the North-West, I venture to say it would surprise hon. members. We have three and a half million sheep there and a million cattle, and a considerable sum of money has been spent by private enterprise on pearling and other industries there. We should do all we can to advertise the possibilities of the North. It is a vast country, sparsely occupied, but offering untold advantages, if only it can be used. We have very few opportunities of discussing the North and its possibilities. The Treasurer says he is with us if we can devise some means of adequately advertising the North-West without undue expense. I welcome any move having for its object the publishing to the people of the possibilities of the North. It is time we turned to the North. We know the value of wool and the possibilities of its production in the North. Then there is the cultivation of tropical products up there. If we can grow bananas and cotton, and hemp in the North, by all means let us do so. I am not in favour of destroying a good station to make a bad farm, but outside the stations altogether a great deal can be done up there in the way of tropical culture. The Honorary Minister said that a previous Government with which he was connected had done something to develop that part of the State. He said they had appointed a special commissioner. I rather think they only dismissed him.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Every expert ever sent up there has been dismissed.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Government should appoint some expert officer to attend to the North and to live up there. I suppose the sea along our northern coast would give us all the revenue required. I think the Colonial Treasurer might reconsider his determination to refuse this return. At the same time the return might be modified in such a way as to reduce its cost, and yet supply necessary information required by the hon. member. But I hope the proposal that the hon. member should go into the departments and get the information for himself will not be seriously considered. If it be a fact that the information will cost more than it is worth, then the attitude of the Colonial Treasurer is perfectly justified. But I doubt whether this return will cost very much although, at the same time, I am not certain that it will effect any useful purpose. If it was regarded as the duty of an hon. member to prove that information asked for is fully warranted, very little information would be forthcoming. If the furnishing of the return will encourage the hon. member to persist in his endeavour to advertise the North, then the return ought to be granted.

Resolved: That motions be continued.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [8.20]: I confess to a great deal of sympathy with the member for Gascoyne in his endeavour to let people know what has been produced in the North-West, but I cannot see how a knowledge of how many times a certain jetty in the North has been burnt down and reconstructed is going to satisfactorily advertise the North, nor can I see what advantage is to be gained by the supplying of detailed information concerning the activities of the police among recalcitrant natives. If we can get information concerning the wealth produced up there, it might be of considerable benefit, but to get a return of what has been expended will merely cost a great deal of money without any compensating advantage. I propose to move a couple of amendments, which will have the effect of reducing the cost of the return without seriously interfering with the value of the information comprised therein. To advertise what has been spent in the North will not be of any value, nor is it of much importance to learn what revenue the Government derive from the North. It is a question, rather, of the private wealth of the North. It is only by increasing that private wealth that the North can be satisfactorily developed. I move an amendment—

That paragraphs (1) and (2) be struck out.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I move a further amendment—

That after "produced," in line one of paragraph (3), the words "in the same area during the same period" be struck out and the following inserted:—"in the north-west portion of the State comprising the electoral districts of Kimberley, Pilbara, Roebourne, and Gascoyne, during the last five years ending 30th June last."

The balance of the motion will remain.

Mr. ANGELO (Gascoyne—in reply) [8.27]: I inserted paragraphs (1) and (2), which have been deleted, because I wanted to get a proper balance sheet in regard to the North-West, desiring, as I did, to show what the production of wealth up there has cost in wages and in State expenditure. However, the unmodified motion as it now reads will have the effect I desire, and, moreover, I understand the Treasurer will now agree to it.

The Colonial Treasurer: Yes, I agree to it now.

Mr. ANGELO: That being so, I have no more to say on the subject. It has been suggested that this return will not do justice to the North-West. But it might help us to get the justice which has been denied us in the past. It is only by securing such a return that we shall be able to induce the Government to give the North greater attention in future. I thank the House for the reception given to the motion.

Amendment put and passed; the motion, as amended, agreed to.

BILL—CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [8.30] in moving the second reading said: This is a small Bill consisting only of three clauses, and its purpose will be easily and quickly grasped. The object of the measure is to amend the provisions of the Constitution Act dealing with the qualifications of persons entitled to be enrolled, and to exercise the franchise for the Legislative Council. I need not waste the time of the House in explaining what these qualifications are. They are well known, inasmuch as they have been under discussion quite recently in this House and out of it. There is the £50 freehold qualification, the £17 a year clear annual value, the householder's qualification, and then there is the leasehold annual value of £17, as well as those who hold a lease or license at a rental of £10 a year. What I propose to do in this measure is to strike out all these property qualifications, and insert in lieu of them what is commonly known as the householder's qualification. If Parliament agrees to that, we shall then have none of the difficulties which have been experienced in defining and interpreting the rights of those who hitherto have been entitled to become enrolled for the Legislative Council. There is a clause dealing with the interpretation of householder, which I need not explain. It is taken almost word for word from the South Australian Act, so that the position will be safeguarded in that respect. The Bill also provides that there shall be one person one vote in each province. At present a person may be enrolled for the whole of the ten provinces of the State, and may exercise his vote in all of them. I propose in this Bill that only those who are occupiers, either as owner or tenant, of a dwelling house shall be entitled to exercise the franchise for the Legislative Council, and then only in the province in which they reside. By this is

meant that the owner of a house situated in two different provinces may only exercise the vote in the province in which he lives. The last amendment in this connection was made in 1910. Some eight years have since passed, and there has not been any reduction in the qualification of electors in connection with the Legislative Council. Western Australia has not been moving with the times. With the exception of possibly one or two of the States of the Commonwealth, Tasmania and Victoria, our franchise for the Legislative Council is the most conservative in Australia. Queensland and New South Wales have what is known as the nominee Chamber. That is a principle which lends itself to the more democratic representation of the people than does the principle of our elective Chamber.

Mr. O'Loughlen: It seems paradoxical, but it is true.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is true. Any Government which gets back to the popular Chamber, with a majority of members sitting behind it, and representing the voices and desires of the people of the country, whether it be a Labour or Liberal Government, is entitled to give effect to its policy or programme upon which it was elected, and which has had the endorsement of the people. In those States in which the nominee Chamber exists, this can be done. The Government of the day can nominate to the Upper House a sufficient number of members to give them a majority in that Chamber, which will enable them to give effect to the wishes of the people. That is the position in Queensland and New South Wales. Although the people of those States have no voice whatever in the personnel of the Upper Chamber, it is in fact more democratic than the elective Chamber upon a restricted franchise. I think the qualifications in Tasmania and Victoria are similar to our own, containing as they do the £17 a year clear annual value qualification, and I believe the £50 a year qualification. South Australia has recently passed an amending Bill reducing the franchise in some respects, and this places the Upper House on a more democratic basis so far as the general voice of the people is concerned than is the case in our own State.

Mr. O'Loughlen: There is dual voting there, too.

Hon. P. COLLIER: They have carried an amendment there during the past few weeks extending the franchise to all soldiers, sailors, and nurses who enlisted in the A.I.F. and served overseas, and have included in that persons of the age of 18 years. It will be recognised that this will add to the number of those who are entitled to exercise the franchise for the Upper House in that State. I have refrained from distinguishing in this Bill between the section of the community which did not enlist in the A.I.F., and that which did. I do not say that I am opposed to this, but it will be a matter for consideration on the part of hon. members as to whether that special privilege should be extended to that section of our people who have served in the overseas forces. I should like to see all restrictions

swept away. This Bill does not go nearly as far as I should like. It will still exclude from the exercise of the franchise for the Legislative Council a large section of the deserving citizens of the community. It will extend and broaden the franchise to the extent that it will bring in a considerable number who are at present excluded, but whilst doing that will still exclude a large section which I should like to see included. The events of the past few years have shown us that these restrictive barriers that stand between the masses of the people and their power to exercise those rights, which should be and are the common inheritance of every citizen, should be wiped away for ever. It would be well, in my opinion, to take a larger view of this and other questions as well as those that will come along in the near future, so that we shall not be confining ourselves to the boundaries of Western Australia or to the Commonwealth either. We have seen the spectacle of kings and emperors, of autocrats and those who were exercising autocratic powers in countries of the Old World, being overturned practically in a night, and of a revolution which has spread over Europe quite recently. It is quite possible that these waves of disturbance may yet reach sections of Great Britain or the British Empire, and if Great Britain and her self-governing Dominions are to be saved from the strife and turmoil and unrest, which we see in other countries of the world, it will be through the wisdom and progressive spirit and the genius for government possessed by the British race practically alone. We shall be saved from this through the wisdom of our British statesmen, or rulers who represent the people, being such that they will grasp the necessity of the occasion, and the significance of what the result will be if they set their face against what are the undoubted rights of the great masses of the people of this and every other country in the world. Australia is practically the only country which has not made immense strides and progress in the way of political and social reform since the outbreak of the war.

Mr. Davies: We were so much ahead of everyone else.

Hon. P. COLLIER: True, but other countries which were previously behind us have come up with us and even passed us. Even conservative old England has passed us by in many respects.

Mr. Davies: That is so.

Hon. P. COLLIER: In America and in other countries they have seen the necessity and wisdom of making such strides. Are we in Australia going to stand where we have stood since the old days?

Mr. Davies: I hope not.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I venture to say we are not. If we only look at the programme which has been put forward by the British Prime Minister during the past week or two we shall be amazed to think that in Great Britain such a policy should have been put forward for the acceptance of the people, especially when we compare it with public opinion upon all

those questions which arose prior to the war. Even the House of Lords has recognised that it can no longer stand up against, or deny, the rights of full citizenship to the men and women who have saved Great Britain and the world in this war. As I have said, I should like to see the Bill go further. It does not take in all the citizens I should wish it to include. But we do know that when the war broke out there was throughout the length and breadth of Australia an insistent call and more than a call, a demand, that the single men of this country should be the first to go overseas and risk their lives in defence of it. Those of the single men who did not volunteer were called slackers and shirkers and wasters. There was a cry that the duty of defending this land fell in the first instance upon the single men. I regret to say that the cry came most loudly and most insistently from those quarters which had hitherto denied those single men the right to a full voice in the making of the laws of their own country. Is there any public man to-day in Western Australia who will dare to assert that the single men who went overseas and played their part in this war, and who were not entitled, before going away, to exercise the franchise for another place, that those single men, having returned maimed and crippled after defending their country overseas, are not entitled to exercise a vote for another place now? Are there many men in this country who will maintain that position? I venture to say that if an analysis could be made of the 31,000 men who went overseas from Western Australia to fight, it would be found that something like 24,000 or 25,000 of them were single men, the great majority of whom, not owning freehold property, were not entitled to be enrolled for or vote for the Legislative Council. Is that a condition of things which ought to obtain in this State any longer? I say, it is not.

Mr. Davies: But many married men were denied the vote too.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Of course they were. And not only that, but married men rearing children on the goldfields and elsewhere in this State, rearing future citizens and future defenders of this country, were ignominiously dragged into our courts, as during the past few months I have shown here, and prosecuted for endeavouring to exercise the rights of citizenship. That is a condition of things which, I say, constitutes a danger to this country. It is not the advanced industrialist, not the man who stands up for the one big union and insists upon having in future a greater share of the wealth of the world—and insists rightly, too—who is a danger to the social and civil life of this community, as some people in our midst would have us believe. The danger to the future of this country is the political troglodyte, the weary Willie of the public stage, who wants to-day to stand where he stood before the war, where he stood 20 years ago, in the matter of social and economic reform. Those are the men who will prove a danger not only to this State,

but to every other part of the British Empire, in my opinion. Because, make no mistake about it, the men who have fought in this war will not be content to accept such a position. Whilst I have never claimed that one section of the community has played a greater part in this war than another, whilst I admit that all sections have rallied to the defence of the Empire, the squatter and the wealthy man in the same way as the poorest, still, by reason of the fact that the population of this and of every other country is made up to the extent of 90 per cent. of workers—I do not mean manual workers only, but workers in the general sense—it follows that the overwhelming majority of the men who went to the trenches and actually fought the fight, and of the men who carried on all the work that was needed in order to enable the soldiers to fight, were drawn from the ranks of the toiling multitude. Had not the men who worked in fields and mines and factories and workshops played their part, the war could not have gone on for 24 hours. That was made evident on more than one occasion, when there were comparatively small industrial disputes in isolated parts of the country. Is anyone going to maintain that the men who carried on the work of the war and so helped to save the world from destruction are to go back into the condition of things which existed prior to the war? Does anyone believe they are going to be content with the same restrictions upon their rights in this matter as obtained before the war? Those who think so make the greatest mistake of their lives. The position has been recognised in the Old Country. Reverting to what I have said concerning reform in other countries, we have seen the enfranchisement of about 5,000,000 women in Great Britain. The part those women played in the national crisis has been recognised by the most conservative elements in the public life of Great Britain. The same thing has taken place in other countries. Many of the States of the American Union have conceded great advances in that direction. Yet to-day we have here the same old reactionary view of this question as we had in the days long gone by. But the time has come for a change here. In this State there are roughly 150,000 men and women qualified to exercise the franchise for this Chamber. But there are only 50,000 of those same 150,000 qualified to exercise the franchise for the Legislative Council. That is to say, 100,000 of the men and women of this country have no real voice, no final, determining voice, in making the laws of this country. Because, no matter what may be done by this Chamber, another place has the final voice, has the veto. Another place may agree to, or may reject, anything and everything. So that, in the final analysis, there are 100,000 of those 150,000 electors without any real say in the making of the laws of Western Australia. Let me give an instance; the timber areas of this State. I can take hon. members to the office of the Timber Workers' Union and show them an honour board there containing the names of 1,500

members of that one union only; 1,500 members of one single union; an honour board bearing 1,500 names, with, I think, one or two Victoria Crosses among them. Those members range in rank from colonels to privates; they all went as privates. Of those 1,500 men who went oversea and played their part in the war, about eight or 10 have a vote for the Legislative Council. If the thousands of men who are good enough to elect the member for Forrest to this Chamber, only a fractional percentage are good enough to exercise a vote for any candidate for election to another place. That is the condition of things existing in this country to-day. I have made these remarks somewhat extending the subject because they have a bearing upon it. I hope the Government are alive to the matters I have mentioned. Not only should not the privilege but the right of voting for the Legislative Council be extended to those to whom this motion seeks to extend it; but we should go further and sweep away altogether the property qualification. The Government should also consider the question of removing the disabilities of our women folk, who should have the same rights of citizenship which men have, seeing that our women have proved themselves worthy of those rights a thousand times during the past few years. And that, too, has been recognised in other countries. It is no wonder that during the past few years we have had creeping upon us this question of unification, the taking away the powers of the States and transferring them to the central national Parliament. If we examine for a moment the power and influence exercised by the Federal Parliament to-day, as compared with those granted to it 18 years ago, when it came into existence—we shall see that the Federal Parliament has been taking to itself all the things that count in the way of power and influence in the public life of Australia. And that is because the great majority of the Australian people are of democratic leanings and of a progressive turn. If they find their wishes thwarted in the State Parliaments by reason of restrictions upon the franchise for the Legislative Councils, they inevitably turn to some other source for the satisfaction of their desires. That is why they have taken to the Federal Parliament. If two Houses can be elected without any property qualification at all to constitute the Federal Parliament, if the people may be trusted to exercise the full rights of voting for that Parliament which deals with all the bigger questions of our national life, who shall say that they are not to be trusted to elect a Parliament to deal with the infinitely smaller questions, important though in themselves they may be, which have to be decided by State Parliaments? That argument is, to my mind, unanswerable. Is there one person who would refuse to broaden the franchise for the Legislative Council, or who would attempt to narrow the franchise for the Federal Parliament, who would attempt to impose the same qualifications for the voter for the Federal Senate as obtain in connection with our Legislative Council? Through all the Federal elections I have never heard a

candidate advance such a proposition. No candidate would be game to do it. But the electors for our Legislative Council, having the powers they possess, are loth to give them up. It is the fear to trust the people that has been at the bottom of it. Surely, however, the events and deeds of the past four years have dispelled that fear. Surely the people have shown that in the mass they may be trusted. If that lesson has not been learned, then there is going to be trouble some time ahead; trouble in Australia just as well as in Great Britain. The Australian people will not allow themselves to be governed indefinitely by a body of men elected on a narrow, exclusive franchise, such as we have here for our Legislative Council. And therefore I bring forward this Bill, which I again say is not as I would have it. The measure still has something in the nature of a property qualification; or, at least, it does not throw open the door of the polling booth for Legislative Council elections to the manhood and womanhood of this country over the age of 21 years.

Mr. Davies: Why not go the whole way?

Hon. P. COLLIER: I am one of those who always believe that if I cannot get all I want, it is wisdom to take half. Whilst I think the people of the country would go the whole way, I do not believe that in the constitution of the present Parliament the members are prepared to go the whole way with me. I shall welcome an amendment to the Bill in that direction and I shall be agreeably surprised if it secures the sanction of the majority of the members of this and another place.

Mr. Roche: Does not the word "inhabitant" make it go the whole way?

Hon. P. COLLIER: The hon. member need not worry his head about that. The principle I have explained, he will find to be right.

The Attorney General: It does not apply to lodging-houses.

Hon. P. COLLIER: For instance, a single man living in a lodging-house or living with his parents would not be entitled to vote under the Bill. It is only the owner or occupier inhabitant who would be entitled to vote. That is a restriction which I do not like, but it will go some way along the road, and if we can judge by the reception the Bill receives in this and another place this session, then I shall welcome the assistance of the Government or any other member of this House in taking the final step next session. I hope there will be no attempt made on the part of members to shirk facing the issue on this Bill. We are nearing the end of the session, but I hope no attempt will be made to shelve the Bill. The Premier has promised me that he will afford the House an opportunity for discussing it, but again I say I want hon. members of this House and another place to take the responsibility of coming to a decision on it. I do not ask for the debate to be continued to-night.

Mr. O'Loughlin: If you do not you will never get it again.

Hon. P. COLLIER: There is an important principle at stake in that connection. I am not unreasonable in the matter, but I am asking

that the Government will give an assurance that the opportunity will be afforded of resuming the debate before the session closes. We have four weeks to go and I ask the Government to give an undertaking that we shall have an opportunity of voting on the Bill and sending it to another place. The war is over now and the question of controversial legislation does not come in. All countries in the world are engaged in dealing with Constitutional reform and social and economic reform, and as a friend of peace and Constitutional Government, and sanity and moderation in the conduct of our affairs, I am bringing this Bill forward because I think that form can best be preserved by our moving along with the tide of public opinion. If we stand with our backs to public opinion too long, as the autocrats of Germany did, we may find that public opinion will sweep us away. Parliamentarians of this and every other State of the Commonwealth will be wise if they recognise the necessity for keeping step with public thought, realising that it is not broad acres altogether, that it is not bricks and mortar which constitute the real nobility of manhood, but that it is something contained within the men and women themselves. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The PREMIER (Hon. H. B. Lefroy—Moore) [9.5]: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

I desire to inform the hon. member that I will give him an opportunity, so far as it lies in my power to do so, to further discuss this measure.

Motion put and passed.

BILL—CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT. MENT.

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

BILL—PRISONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Message from the Legislative Council received notifying that it did not insist upon amendment No. 1.

MOTION—HOSPITAL FOR INSANE, CLAREMONT.

To inquire by Royal Commission.

Debate resumed from the 2nd October on motion by the member for Fremantle (Mr. Jones), "That in the opinion of this House a Royal Commission should be appointed to inquire into affairs concerning the Hospital for the Insane, Claremont, in general, and the death of Francis Audinaeh in that institution on 29th June, in particular.

Mr. PICKERING (Sussex) [9.10]: Since the debate was adjourned on this motion, I have taken the trouble to go through the files dealing with the subject. So far as the coronial inquiry was concerned, the whole of

the blame, if there is any blame, in connection with the death of the man Andinach, does not to my mind rest with the Claremont Asylum. The evidence at the inquiry went to show that. The other matters which are of importance and which have been referred to in connection with the request for the appointment of a Royal Commission, have been very fully answered by the Inspector General for the Insane, and I think I might read to hon. members a short passage from that officer's statement as being worthy of consideration by hon. members.

Before writing this report I called together the head attendant, the deputy-head attendant, all the charge attendants, and twelve senior officers on the male side. I read to them the whole of the report and called on them to comment on it, as well as to assist me in tracing the various alleged dangerous attacks on the staff. Except in the first and last instances not one of them could call to mind any of the instances referred to and it is their unanimous opinion as well as my own and that of the superintendent, that this report is practically throughout untrue, and where there is some element of truth in any of the statements it is most grossly exaggerated. It will be noted that the whole trend of this report presses the grave dangers which the nursing staff of this institution are subjected to, and if the statements are correct, it cannot be said that either the medical officers or the nursing staff of the institution have failed to go to the front because of cold feet. Further, it is striking that when vacancies occur we have no difficulty in filling them, and if a man thinks there is a chance of his being dismissed it is striking how hard he fights to retain his billet. In common fairness to the majority of my staff, I wish to point out to you that this "committee" was not appointed by the union. I have an assurance that this matter was never discussed at any union meeting, also that the majority of the staff, whose opinion is worth anything in this institution, are highly indignant at the whole report.

Replies are given to the various charges and to my mind they are entirely satisfactory. There is another point, and that is in connection with a charge of inadequate provision for attendants. I note on the file that comparisons are given. In the State of Western Australia the number of attendants to the males is 1 to 6.09, and females 1 to 5.98, whilst in New South Wales the proportion is 1 to 8.5 and 1 to 6.9. In Victoria the figures are 1 to 6.5 and 1 to 6. There is nothing said about Queensland. There is a point which impresses me forcibly and upon which there seems to be no difference of opinion, and that is the inadequate accommodation provided at the asylum. To my mind if this is conceded to be true, it devolves upon the Government to take immediate steps to provide adequate accommodation. It is not necessary that a huge sum of money

be expended at the moment, but it should be necessary for the Government to make provision of a temporary nature to remove the inconvenience. The Government will be well advised to make immediate provision for improvement in the accommodation. Apart from anything else I can see on the files, I am at a loss to find any ground for the provision of a commission such as is asked for, but I hope the Government will take immediate steps to make provision for the adequate accommodation of the large number of patients in the asylum.

Mr. PILKINGTON (Perth) [9.16]: It appears to me that a case has not been made out for the inquiry asked for. In the course of the debate reference has been made to the death of the unfortunate man Andinach. I have perused the file in reference to that matter and it does appear that there should be an inquiry; I do not say by Royal Commission, but there should be more inquiry than there has been in reference to that man's death. From a reading of the file it would appear to be quite clear that an investigation into the affairs of the Hospital for the Insane will throw no light on that subject. I gather from the file that the cause of his death was something entirely apart from the Hospital for the Insane, and occurred before he reached that hospital. It appears to me that if the inquiry asked for was made, it would not result in ascertaining the true facts in regard to this very important matter. Anyone who peruses the file must realise that it would appear, I do not say for a moment that it is proved, but it would appear that Andinach died by reason of an assault made upon him. I do not say it is proved that there was an assault, but *prima facie*, on the evidence which appears on the file, the man was assaulted and the result of that assault was his death. Up to the present there has been no inquiry which has resulted either in proving that he was assaulted, or in furnishing any explanation for the condition in which he undoubtedly was. It must be perfectly plain that the man suffered from some violence. It is, I believe, possible, though it does not seem probable, that the violence might have been self-inflicted. I am not saying that there may not be some explanation, but it appears to me essential that an inquiry should be held which will show how those injuries did occur. If the undoubted injuries were due to an assault, then an offence has been committed against the criminal law, which has resulted in this man's death. These things have not been so investigated as to be cleared up, and I think the Government would do well to see that such investigation takes place. It would be an investigation, I take it, mainly carried out by the Criminal Investigation Department, and would be of a much more effective kind than any which could be carried out by a Royal Commission. The Royal Commission asked for is limited to the Hospital for the Insane, and really has little reference to the important matter of Andinach's death. I most earnestly hope the Government will see fit to have a

proper investigation made to clear up the extremely unsatisfactory state of affairs which exists at present. The facts are quite clear that violence, whether by himself or by another, was inflicted on this man, and the result of that violence was his death. Those facts require to be cleared up, and I hope the Government will take steps to have them cleared up.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. R. T. Robinson—Canning) [9.20]: The position which the Government take up in this matter is that, as they do not wish to force their particular views on the House, they will leave the question to the House for decision. But they do wish to place before hon. members some of the comments on the file, and some comments on and answers to the statements made by some hon. members. First of all, the reasons put forward by hon. members for an inquiry are, generally, (1) lack of accommodation; (2) shortage of staff; and, (3) the death of Andinach. I would make answer to those that lack of accommodation has been regularly and steadily admitted by the Government, and by everybody who knows anything about the institution. And if the House, by some wave of the wand, can produce a couple of hundred thousand pounds for the purpose, the Government will be delighted to increase the accommodation at Claremont. Everybody knows of the stringency of funds since the beginning of the war, and even before the war, and knows that no money has been available for a large enterprise such as this would be. In Western Australia, no matter which Government were in power, we have been in the habit of doing work of this description very thoroughly. There is no question that the buildings, equipment, plant, and administration at Claremont are much greater than one would expect to find in a State with a small population such as we have. In this regard we have always been in advance of others. Some people think we have spent a lot of money at Wooroloo; but there is scarcely a member of the community to be found who is not in favour of spending money in the alleviation of suffering. Consequently, the Government say that when funds are available—and that they hope will be soon—one of the first expenditures must be in respect of increased accommodation at Claremont. But, to give that defect as a reason for the appointment of a Royal Commission carries no weight with me, and I hope will carry no weight with other members. As for the shortage of staff, the union itself, the attendants say, they do not want this inquiry.

Mr. Jones: When did they say that?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: They have said so. They do not want this inquiry. The attendants themselves do not think they are under-staffed. Unless we are going to introduce the one man one vote principle at Claremont, and have one patient one warder—which would be an indication that those who passed such a law would be fit to be on one side or the other—unless we wish to arrive at that stage, we need not consider the question. The hon. member for Sussex put the

case well in quoting from the file itself. But since the file has been here an extract has come along from the official visitors' report, dated the 29th September, 1918. Addressed to the Colonial Secretary, it has been sent on to me to move in due course that it be added to the file. I should like hon. members to listen to this extract from the official visitors' book, which not only goes into the whole question, but very largely answers this particular question of the shortage of staff. The official visitors are Mr. B. H. Derbyshire, Mrs. S. A. Casson, and Dr. W. P. Birmingham. The extract is as follows:—

Some of the patients were mentally disturbed as the result of the prominence recently given to the affairs of the hospital in the Press, and the proposed Royal Commission to investigate certain matters in regard to its management. We feel called upon to make some remarks in regard to the Royal Commission, bearing in mind the matters suggested as proper for its scope fall normally within the province of the official visitors. The following seem to be the main subjects alleged to require investigation:—(a) The circumstances surrounding the illness and death of Francis Andinach; (b) overcrowding in the hospital; (c) insufficiency of nursing staff; (d) insufficiency of medical staff, and (e) obsolete methods of restraint. Take (a) first. This matter has been fully dealt with in the June report, to which we refer. (b) For years past we have repeatedly called attention to the necessity for increased accommodation for the patients. (c) The nursing staff is in excess of the requirements of the hospital. One of us (W.P.B.) some few years ago examined into the conditions existing in over 20 of the principal mental hospitals of the United States and England, and found that in none of those hospitals was the proportion of attendants to patients greater than one to ten, and in the Colorado State hospital No. 1 at Pueblo it is one to 18. I interject here that in Western Australia it is one to six.

Mr. Jones: With no classification.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The extract continues—

It must be further borne in mind that in the American State hospitals the airing court, as we know it, does not exist. The patients take their exercise in the grounds, and in some cases doors are open for patients to pass in and out at will. It will be obvious that Claremont has the full allowance of mental nurses that it is entitled to. (d) We have in former reports pointed out the necessity for an increased medical staff. The minimum staff this hospital ought to carry is a superintendent, with four assistants, each of whom should be an expert pathologist.

It is within the knowledge of the House that we used to have more medical men on the staff. But owing to the war, and in particular to the death of that great man, Dr. Montgomery, we have only two medical men there now, whereas there should be four, or as this

report says, five. It is the intention of the Government to see that at the very first opportunity the hospital gets its full complement. The extract continues—

(c) The methods for restraint used in this hospital are the ones usually employed in mental hospitals and I (W. P. B.) after a pretty wide experience do not know of any other method, except possibly handcuffs, which would not be suitable for mental hospital use.

This has reference to the comments made, I think, by the member for Fremantle, who said that the method of tying down patients with sheets was an obsolete one. The Honorary Minister has shown that this is the most humane method that can be used. This is the report of that date, and will be available upon the file. I have dealt with the question of lack of accommodation and the shortage of staff. There are also the general answers. The first answer is that a commission is not necessary, because it cannot deal with the question of accommodation or the shortage of staff. It would in itself only unsettle the inmates of the hospital for the insane, as Dr. Birmingham has pointed out, and set agog all those who are mentally deranged in the hospital, but who are fully cognisant of all that goes on in the outer world, who know many of the things that are happening from day to day, who follow all the discussions that take place in the House, and many of whom would like to join in them, and who also would like to give evidence before the Commission. That must have a disturbing effect upon the institution. A Royal Commission into such a wide subject as the Claremont Hospital for the Insane would surely be a costly one, and the State has yet to consider such things. Although the armistice has been signed, we have not yet arrived at the stage, and will not do so for many a day, when we can afford not to take notice of the cost of our luxuries, for a Royal Commission is a luxury. I would point out, further, that there are no definite charges of any kind made. A mere groping or fishing commission is asked for. The member for Perth, in his usual careful way, has narrowed down the issue, so far as he is concerned, to that of the death of Andinach. If that was all I was called upon to answer, it might be shortly disposed of, but there are besides general charges of a very vague and uncertain character lodged against this institution, one of the admirable institutions of the country, by people who know very little about it. I propose to deal with those who made the charges, one after the other. Their statements have been hurled throughout Western Australia, and many people are apt to believe what is said by a member of Parliament, and in that way receive a wrong impression of what really obtains at Claremont. One of the first statements that was made was put forward by a comparatively new member, namely, the member for Claremont. I noted carefully his ground for saying that there should be a Royal Commission, and the ground that he gave was that a shake-up occasionally does these Government institutions good. For an

hon. member to say that the Claremont Hospital for the Insane should be shaken up occasionally, and that this is ground for a Royal Commission being appointed, amazes me. I do not think I need do more than refer to such a statement. The second reason given by the hon. member was on account of the lack of accommodation at the institution. I have already said that this is due to lack of funds, and that it is hoped soon to deal with the matter. The leader of the Opposition particularly referred to the death of Andinach. He stated that a doctor was called in at Fremantle, but that before he arrived the police had intervened. I will read from page 44 of the file what took place. Here is the statement by Dr. Martell, the Fremantle doctor who was called in. He says—

Owing to electrical troubles I could not get my car to start, and after wasting some time I proceeded on foot to the Madrid Coffee Palace, and on making inquiries I found that the patient had been removed by the police to the lock-up, and on asking for the reason for this sudden action when they had sent for me, I was told by a young lad (who I was given to understand was his son), and another man apparently about 30 years of age, that Mr. Andinach had become so violent that they were afraid that he would seriously harm himself, that in order to protect him against himself they had sent for the police to remove him. I was also informed that they had had trouble with him all night, and that for some hours he had been "knocking himself about," and that they had sent for me because he had become so violent. When I heard this I passed the remark that under the circumstances, and especially as the people had sent for a medical practitioner, the police, for their own protection, should have waited and had the patient examined.

I am inclined to believe that had the doctor waited he might have found that Andinach's ribs were broken then. It is impossible to say now whether such was the case. All the inquiries in the world will not tell us whether his ribs were broken then, or at Claremont, or at the Perth Public Hospital, or whether on the way thither or at some other place.

Hon. T. Walker: I am not sure about that; there might be some evidence.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It is impossible now, owing to there not having been a medical examination at Fremantle, to say whether the ribs were or were not broken at the time, but the doctor's report indicates that it would have been possible for the ribs to have been broken there. The next point made by the leader of the Opposition was that Andinach was detained at the Perth hospital in the mental ward for three days, that this was too long a time, and that he should not have been detained there but should have been sent on the Claremont, where he could have had proper treatment. The answer to that is that Andinach was detained there at the request of his wife. There seems to be always a feeling about this mental ward and the going to Claremont. The general feeling appears to be

that to be sent to Claremont casts a stigma upon the person concerned, or his family, for evermore. No doubt there is something in that. Surely, therefore, we must all agree that if there is a possibility of finding out by observation in the Perth public hospital, in a ward specially equipped for the purpose, that a man is or is not a fit subject for Claremont, the fullest advantage should be taken of these facilities before this everlasting stigma is placed upon the individual. I think the authorities would have been open to much stronger comment than that made by the leader of the Opposition if they had sent this man direct to Claremont. At all events, he was detained at the Perth hospital with the idea of avoiding this stigma upon the family, and at the express request of the wife. So far, the leader of the Opposition makes no point at all as to why there should be an inquiry into the Claremont hospital. It is a little difficult to answer a case after so many adjournments, such as have taken place on this matter. I should have liked to have spoken in answer to the leader of the Opposition almost straight away. Those members who are lawyers will appreciate my difficulty. One makes notes, but after the lapse of time it is difficult to fill in the other points which have not been written down. My note here is that the leader of the Opposition gave no reason for the inquiry other than those I have indicated, which all go to show that if there was an inquiry at all there should be one into the Perth Public Hospital and not into the Claremont hospital. He next asks why was it that this man was allowed to remain at Claremont for three days without examination. The answer to that is given by Dr. Birmingham, Mr. Darbyshire and Mrs. S. A. Casson, on page 38 of the file, the report of the general visitors stating—

In this case adverse comment has been made by persons unacquainted with all the facts, or unfit to judge those facts correctly with reference to the three days' delay in making a complete examination of the patient. When the patient arrived he was suffering from exhaustion, the result of maniacal excitement and restlessness. The patient was still maniacal, and any attempt at a complete physical examination would certainly have provoked resistance with more or less struggling. This would have increased the exhaustion present, and gravely prejudiced the patient's chances. The one indication for the management of this patient that stood out clearly was to counteract the physical exhaustion. To do this rationally one had to avoid the risk of provoking a struggle, and bearing this in mind we are convinced that the course followed was a wise one and judicious.

This is an expression of opinion not by the hospital authorities but by the visiting committee, appointed under statute for the purpose of criticising the hospital and its management, three independent persons absolutely dissociated with the institution. I think that is a complete answer to the leader of the Opposition. When all is said and done, we find that the hospital is merely accused of giving a wrong death certificate. It is not the Claremont Hospital for the Insane that is wrong,

and the opinion of the doctors of that institution has been confirmed by Andinach's doctor. Only one medical man says that Andinach died as the result of injuries. The other medical men both reported that he had died as the result of acute mania. At the post mortem examination, although the Hospital for the Insane was not represented there as it ought to have been, the Andinach family was represented by their medical man, Dr. Birmingham, and from Dr. Birmingham's statement and certificate it appears that the man came to his death as the result of acute mania, thus confirming the hospital doctors, who were not called. The only doctor who has said that he died from injuries is Dr. Williams, and his word goes against three other medical men. I am not going to discuss the merits or demerits of these medical men, but we have three saying one thing and one saying another.

Hon. T. Walker: Were not the three connected with the institution?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: No. Dr. Birmingham is not connected with it.

Hon. T. Walker: Is he not a visitor?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: He was the doctor chosen by Mrs. Andinach to represent the family. He is a Fremantle doctor.

Hon. T. Walker: Is he not a visitor?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: He is a visitor from the outside world for the purpose of criticising the institution. He is a man for whom every member of the community has the greatest respect, and is not one against whom any reproach is cast. He is generally looked up to and respected, and was very properly chosen by Mrs. Andinach as her adviser. He attended the inquest at her request and that is his statement. I think that that statement, if given more publicity, will end the whole business.

Hon. T. Walker: How do all these three doctors account for the broken rib?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: They do not choose to account for that. Nobody dies of a broken rib; or it is very rarely that a man would die of a broken rib. From the proceedings at the Coroner's inquest it is quite evident that those who were examined on the subject were very much more concerned about the dreadful complaint of acute mania, and that the broken rib was a matter that did not occasion them concern at all. Now I come to the member for Pingelly (Mr. Hickmott). What have we from him? He asked that a Royal Commission should be appointed to inquire into the Hospital for the Insane on account of evidence he has had from the patients. He referred to—I do not wish to mention the name here—a well-known case that everybody knows about. He said that that case was a disgrace to the Master in Lunacy. On the contrary, however, it appears from inquiries that the Master in Lunacy has acted as a very wise and capable administrator. This case was inquired into first of all by the Crown Law Department, secondly it was specially inquired into by the person who is now addressing the Chamber, thirdly it was inquired into by representatives of the Trades Hall, and finally it was inquired into by His Honour Judge Burnside sitting in open court.

And each one of the inquiries, including that by the institution with which my friends opposite are connected, entirely vindicated the department in its treatment, and came to the conclusion that nothing better could be done. When it came to a question whether the man was or was not mentally afflicted, the Judge committed him again to the Claremont hospital. It was said, too, that the property of this patient was not properly looked after.

Mr. Hickmott: It is a fact.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: There again the hon. member is wrong.

Mr. Hickmott: It is an absolute fact.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: That matter also was inquired into by the Trades Hall Committee, and by a committee of the Women's Labour Organisation, a body of very capable and painstaking women, who came to me and told me the whole story of this business and of the way the estate had been mismanaged. They saw me at my office, and they brought with them this patient's wife. I in the meantime had inquired particulars from the master, and I had the office files there, and I satisfied each one of those earnest women that the very best thing to be done was prevented by the wife of this patient from being done. An offer had come in to lease the farm for a period of three years at about £125 a year. The lady refused absolutely to have the farm let.

Mr. Hickmott: Seven per cent. on £1,500.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: That is a rate which anybody should be delighted to get when the husband is mentally afflicted and the wife is unable to work. What are they getting to-day?

Mr. Hickmott: That is not the argument.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: That is the result. It is the result of past stupidity. To come to this House and ask, because a couple of people down in the country are stupid, ignorant, and foolish—

Mr. Hickmott: That is no reason why the property should be neglected.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: That we should grant a Royal Commission, after all these organisations of earnest people have inquired into the matter, is utterly unreasonable. At a subsequent deputation Mr. Driver himself told me that he was quite satisfied with the treatment that had been meted out in the case and that he was only sorry that the estate of these poor people had been wasted through their own fault. My friend the Honorary Minister tells me that he also has gone into the question. I also have inquired into it. The persons who have wasted the estate are the relatives of the patient—namely, the wife and the daughter. Another reason advanced in support of the holding of an inquiry was that returned soldiers are associated with the institution. I do not know which hon. member mentioned that, but I have a note of it. However, there are no returned soldiers at the institution; and returned soldiers do not enter into the argument at all. Returned soldiers have nothing in the world to do with this case for inquiry. I have shown hon. members the reasons against holding an inquiry, and also the reasons why, if there were grounds for

pursuing the matter further, the institution should not be upset by the holding of an inquiry. We have only two medical men there, and the number of patients is large. There are at the institution many mentally afflicted who are still sufficiently sane to become further mentally afflicted through being shaken up, as the member for Claremont (Mr. Duff) would have done to the institution. I feel sure none of us wishes to inflict greater hardship on those patients. No one wishes to increase the worries of the two medical men there, who are giving their lives to the work, and who are doing their best to run the institution under most difficult circumstances. Further, as my friend the Honorary Minister points out to me, the Perth Public Hospital is involved in the matter; and that hospital is short of doctors.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): Short of four doctors.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The proposed inquiry will mean unrest throughout the community. There has been no sufficient reason given for re-opening the case. I am glad the motion has been moved. I am glad hon. members have spoken what is in their minds. We have been afforded an opportunity of replying to the leader of the Opposition, and of replying to other members who have made statements from limited knowledge.

Hon. T. Walker: Nothing else?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The motion has given us an opportunity of having the file laid bare, having its various points discussed, and understanding exactly what is the position. Hon. members, realising all this, will, I hope, see that an inquiry is unnecessary, although the Government are quite willing that a Royal Commission should be appointed. The matter is not one of party or of policy, but purely one of administration, and therefore one which may well be left to the House. The Government do not choose to interfere at all. The Government are willing to carry out what hon. members may desire. But let hon. members bear in mind the reasons I have given against the holding of an inquiry. I ask hon. members to consider those reasons before they vote in favour of the appointment of a Royal Commission, which will last for months, which will be very expensive, which cannot arrive at any conclusion other than that which we know already. We already know that the institution is short of room; we know there have to be additional buildings at Claremont; we know the existing accommodation is overcrowded; and no man in the world can say more definitely than we now know how Andinach met his death.

Hon. T. Walker: That we are not sure of. I believe that point is still open to inquiry!

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: For these various reasons I ask the House not to agree to the appointment of a Royal Commission.

Mr. ROCKE (Fremantle) [9.55]: Direct charges certainly have been made to show why the inquiry which is asked for should be granted. Irrespective of whether or not those charges in themselves are sufficient to warrant an inquiry, the public, I think, are desirous

of having their doubts set at rest. An inquiry, I consider, if held, will be in the interests of all concerned. It will be in the interests of the inmates, in the interests of the staff, in the interests of the Inspector General of the Insane and his assistants, and in the interests of the general public. The position of an inmate of a hospital for insane is one which evokes our sympathy. It is a most unfortunate position for any human being to occupy. Therefore it is necessary that the very best that the State is able to do for him should be done. Perfection, I presume, will for various reasons never be attained in the treatment of these unfortunate people; but we should aim at giving them the very best treatment that the State is able to give, even if that is done at the expense of some other service.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): Are we not giving them that now?

Mr. ROCKE: I do not say we are not.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): Why throw out the hint?

Mr. ROCKE: It is possible that an inquiry may bring to light something that we do not know of. I am not making any insinuation against the management of the institution. I repeat, I believe the inquiry will be in the interests of the Inspector General of the Insane.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): You are wrong.

Mr. ROCKE: I believe it will be. The question of cost in connection with such an institution must not weigh too heavily with us, because the matter is one of such urgent importance that, even if it means the curtailment of some other public service, the Hospital for the Insane should be kept as near to perfection as we can get it.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): Is it not now?

Mr. ROCKE: I do not know. I am not in a position to judge.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): Well, what are you talking about?

Mr. ROCKE: We hope that the inquiry will elude evidence to show whether the institution is kept as close as possible to perfection.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): If you do not know that anything is wrong, what are you talking about?

Mr. ROCKE: I take it the mover's intention is to get evidence which will prove whether or not the institution is conducted in the best interests of the patients confined there. A question has been raised concerning the deceased man Andinach. We must not lose sight of the fact that Andinach died in the Claremont Hospital for the Insane. The question whether the injuries which he received, and which resulted in his death, were received at his home in Fremantle or at Perth does matter very much. The fact remains that he died in the Claremont institution, and that fact in itself I consider a sufficient reason for the granting of this inquiry. The public have been deeply stirred by the case, and from what I have gathered from various sections of the community it is most desirable

that the proposed inquiry should be held. For that reason I shall vote for the motion.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [10.0]: There is not the least doubt that it has been known for many years that the asylum at Claremont is overcrowded. The last time that I had the honour of dealing with the preparation of the Estimates I was asked to provide a sum of £60,000 for the purpose of erecting additional buildings. It was impossible, however, for the Treasurer to grant that sum of money. I do not think that hon. members desire that a general inquiry should be conducted into the administration of the asylum. The officers of the asylum are not to blame for the overcrowded state of the institution. I have visited the institution on several occasions, and the officers have pointed out to me the number of beds they had in the rooms which were built to accommodate many less than were actually there. There is no doubt that the officers at the institution have a very difficult task to carry out and perhaps many members will contend that there are inmates in that asylum who should not be there. Of course, the only person who can determine that question is a medical man. It is impossible for a layman to express an opinion on that point. It is my intention to move an amendment, the object of it being to confine the inquiry solely to the death of Francis Andinach. The proposal then will, I think, give satisfaction to hon. members and to the public. Many complaints have been made to the effect that the case of that unfortunate individual was not thoroughly inquired into, and if the amendment I intend to move is carried, the investigation will be confined to that one matter. The investigation will not upset the institution and the inquiry will not take any length of time, and it will have the effect of removing any misapprehension which may exist in the minds of the public as to the cause of the death of Andinach. I move an amendment—

That the words "affairs concerning the hospital for the insane, Claremont, in general and" be struck out.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [10.5]: 1 second the amendment.

Mr. JONES (Fremantle—on amendment) [10.6]: If I agree to accept the amendment it will not mean that I shall in any way be convinced that there is no longer any necessity for the greater inquiry. I realise, however, that first and foremost in the subject matter dealt with in the motion is the fact that a man lost his life under circumstances of which the public have never been fully apprised. I believe that the future will convince hon. members that there is a necessity for the other inquiry as well, because, under circumstances of which at present we are not aware, Francis Andinach had his ribs broken in the course of his removal from Fremantle. I suggest also that at the present time there are still in that institution several other men who are suffering from injuries. The Attorney General has accused those who supported the original motion of not bringing forward sufficient evidence. How can we bring forward the full

evidence until the Royal Commission has given us the actual facts? If the larger question is again debated I will be prepared, if the Attorney General requires them, to give specific names and instances of those cases. At the present time I am prepared to accept the amendment which has been moved by the member for North-East Fremantle because of the delay which has occurred in dealing with the motion and because of the urgency of the necessity for a decision being arrived at in the Andinach case.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [10.9]: I move a further amendment—

That the words "in that institution in particular" be struck out and "Claremont asylum" inserted.

The motion as amended will then read, "That in the opinion of this House a Royal Commission should be appointed to inquire into the death of Francis Andinach in the Claremont asylum on the 29th June."

Amendment put and passed; the motion as amended agreed to.

MOTION—RAILWAY PROJECT, AJANA TO GERALDINE.

Debate resumed from the 16th October on motion (as amended) moved by the member for Greenough (Mr. Maley), "That in the opinion of this House, the construction of a railway line from Ajana to the Geraldine mines is warranted in order to encourage profitable development and production."

Mr. PIESSE (Katanning) [10.10]: I wish to support the motion because I am convinced that the hon. member had every justification in bringing it before the House. I hope that the Government will see their way clear to give an undertaking that this very necessary railway will be constructed. The value of the output of lead is considerable, and I understand employment is found in that industry for over 100 men. There is a big future for the lead mining industry, and we noticed only to-day that there has been an advance in the price by something like £11 per ton. That shows clearly that there is an increased demand for lead. I therefore submit that the industry is worth developing and it should be fostered by the Government agreeing to construct this railway. If money were readily obtainable I am sure the Government would not hesitate to give an undertaking to construct the line which, I believe, they recognise is fully justified. It is surprising to find that so much energy is shown by the owners of these mining properties under difficult circumstances. The cartage of ore even for a distance of 12 miles involves a tremendous amount of wear and tear, and I feel sure that no progressive Government would for a moment deny that the industry now being established at that centre does not justify the building of this railway. I fully expect the Minister will tell us that rails are not procurable, but I would point out that it is only a very short length of line.

The Minister for Mines: We have already decided that the line to be first constructed is that to Esperance.

Mr. PIESSE: That motion which was carried some time ago was a rather unfortunate one. I am certain it was never intended that the Esperance line should stand in the way of an urgent work of this character. The size of this work is insignificant compared with the work that was particularly stressed in that motion.

The Minister for Mines: How many mines will the line serve?

Mr. PIESSE: Three good payable mines, and others no doubt will, by means of the railway, be developed into payable propositions.

The Minister for Mines: Just now it is a one railway, one mine proposition.

Mr. PIESSE: The railway would be justifiable even though it served only one mine if we consider the assistance given to Ravenshorpe and other places. However, I am sure that, if it were not that it is so difficult to procure rails, the Government have not any sound reason for objecting to the construction of this line. Seeing that it is for the development of one of our principal industries, I maintain that it is in the interests of the State as a whole that the line should be constructed.

The Minister for Mines: What interests would it serve other than those of the one mine?

Mr. PIESSE: I have it on excellent authority that two or three other mines would become payable propositions if the line were built. I hope the Government will favourably view the motion.

Mr. MALEY (Greenough—in reply) [10.17]: The question has been fairly well thrashed out, and I hope the House will pass the motion. The Minister for Mines has said that the railway will serve only one mine; but he should know that there are in the area at least half a dozen mines which have reached the productive stage. Of course the definition of "mine" is a little elastic. One would not call a prospecting show a mine; yet such a show might, in time reach the status of quite a good mine. We were all very pleased to see in this morning's newspaper the notification of a sensational rise in the price of lead.

The Minister for Mines: You have not gone back on your request for a 16 weeks' price, have you?

Mr. MALEY: I have not gone back on anything I have said in that regard. Naturally, we all desire to get as much as we can.

The Minister for Mines: When the price comes down you want the Government to sustain you, but when it is up you want to take it all.

Mr. MALEY: It is reasonable to assume that the price of lead will not remain at the dizzy height announced in the paper this morning. When it again comes down to normal, only the higher grade mines in the Geraldine area will be able to pull through. In view of this, every facility should be given by the Government to bring down costs. The proposed extension of the railway will bring down costs

by 15s. per ton. In these circumstances the Government should see clearly that the construction of the line is fully justified. I hope members will pass the motion.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 10.22 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Thursday, 28th November, 1918.

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 3.0 p.m., and read prayers.

[For "Papers Presented" see "Minutes of Proceedings."]

MOTION—HONORARY MINISTERS AND DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION.

Debate resumed from 29th October, on motion by Hon. A. Sanderson—"That in the opinion of this House the present system of entrusting the administration and control of important departments of State to Honorary Ministers is undesirable."

HON. C. F. BAXTER (Honorary Minister—East) [3.3]: I do not know that hon. members will regard my action as one transgressing the canons of good taste if I attempt to reply to what appears to be a direct personal attack, an attack either on myself as a representative of the Government in this Chamber or on my administration as Honorary Minister in charge of the Agricultural Department and the Wheat Marketing Scheme. Mr. Sanderson gives his assurance that nothing personal is intended in his remarks. If I were sure of that I would not be replying to what, after all, should be a more or less academic point of discussion, that is as to whether under our present form of government it is wise or advisable that Honorary Ministers should be appointed, and that they should be in charge of responsible operations of the Government. Any defence of the action of the Government in this respect can well be left to the leader of the House. I ask myself this question, "Am I justified in assuming that the object of Mr. Sanderson's motion is a direct slap at me personally and my administration?" He first of all gives notice to move a direct vote of censure on the Honorary Minister in this House. He is ruled out of order. Why? Surely not because it is in proper form, but because it is in bad form! I venture to think that your object, Sir, and the intention of the Standing Orders, is that personal attacks such as that then contemplated by the hon. member, should not be allowed in this honourable House. Not being satisfied to accept your

friendly hint, Sir, that he should desist from such a course of procedure, the hon. member attempts to camouflage this House with a motion in such terms as would lead one to expect that he had given up his original intention, and desired to confine himself to the question of whether it is right or wrong to appoint Honorary Ministers to assist in Government administration. In the course of his remarks he excused himself for bringing forward the motion on the plea that he had pledged himself to his electors to do so. Did he pledge himself to his electors to bring forward this academic discussion on the appointment of Honorary Ministers? Certainly not! He pledged himself to attack the Honorary Minister, Mr. Baxter. Why did he pledge himself in this manner? Was it because his constituents demanded it, or because he of his own initiative, in view of his persistent attacks upon me ever since I became an Honorary Minister in this House, sought to justify his obstructionist opposition in the eyes of his electors by saying that he would not rest until he had done all he could to have me removed from the position?

The PRESIDENT: The Honorary Minister must not impute motives.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (Honorary Minister): I am not the only Honorary Minister in this Government. There are two others, although they occupy seats in another place. Has one word been said against either of those two Honorary Ministers or their administration? In the course of his remarks the hon. member stated—

I am going to brush aside almost in a sentence the reference or charge or suggestion which has been made outside this Chamber, that there is any personal matter in this motion at all.

Notwithstanding this statement he apparently bases the whole of his arguments against the appointment of Honorary Ministers on the assumption that one of the Honorary Ministers either has too much important work for his capacity, or that in the work he has undertaken he has miserably failed from the administrative point of view. I am constrained to ask myself whether, if the manner of my selection to the post had been different, or some member other than myself had been appointed, the hon. member would ever have thought of bringing forward this motion. Mr. Sanderson has attacked me mainly on the administration of the Wheat Scheme. I am sorry that his attack in this direction should have rendered it necessary for me to anticipate in my reply to his motion that which I had hoped to confine to the consideration of the Wheat Marketing Bill, which I hope will be before members in the course of the next fortnight. If, however, any remarks that I may make in connection with the Wheat Scheme to-day tend to help the early passage of that measure without the trouble and inconvenience that were caused last session I shall be amply rewarded. I should first of all like to say—and I do not know that it is necessary for me to say it as far as most hon. members are concerned, though perhaps it is just as well that Mr. Sanderson should hear