

really before a land tax; or put them both together; I am perfectly willing to assist in passing both of them. Unfortunately perhaps, I shall have to contribute towards it. I do not mind, so long as I can see reasonable hopes of protecting the struggling settler to a great extent, and of allowing him to overcome the first few years of pioneering without a land tax; but no land tax shall go through this House without my opposition if it is not going to carry with it very liberal exemptions to the struggling settlers. Now I am going to have a tilt at Federation. While I admit that I am a federalist at heart—I have been throughout my life—I cannot say that we can look on Federation, as far as it affects West Australia, as a blessing. Rather the opposite. No only can we say that we have derived no benefit from it, but we can honestly say it has been a distinct disadvantage. We have suffered very heavy loss in the past, and we are likely to suffer very considerably in the future. I consider that we undoubtedly paid very largely for our whistle, and our whistle, in fact, only exists in name. The whole question of Federation is a huge sentimental joke from the commencement, and we have to pay for it. We have lost considerably in our revenue, and we can ill-afford to; and in the future we shall probably lose a great deal more. The only hope we have now is, as far as I can see, to carefully see that we send to represent us in the Federal Parliament men of the very best class who are capable of guarding jealously our interests and fighting strenuously for our rights. Let us look forward to the time, and hope it will soon arrive, when we will receive some of those glorious benefits which we have been promised in the past. I only hope it will come before very soon and that we will prosper under Federation. I have nothing more to speak upon but to accord the Address-in-Reply my heartiest support.

On motion by Mr. BOLTON, debate adjourned.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 9:51 o'clock, until the next day.

## Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 4th July, 1906.

	PAGE
Questions: Personal Reflections, Mr. Daglish ...	218
Fremantle Harbour Property, and Cost ...	218
Collie-Narrogin Railway, Wages ...	219
Commissioner of Railways, Terms and Notice ...	219
Public Battery at Yarri ...	219
Rollers and Machinery Inspection, Exemptions ...	219
Shooting at Fremantle, Compensation ...	219
Bill: Legal Practitioners Act Amendment, 1r. ...	220
Address-in-Reply, debate fifth day ...	220

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock p.m.

#### PRAYERS.

#### QUESTION—PERSONAL REFLECTIONS, MR. DAGLISH.

MR. DAGLISH: I beg to ask the Premier, without notice, if he will afford me an opportunity to-morrow to make motions which appear in Orders 28 and 29 on the Notice Paper for to-day. Those papers are moved for in consequence of certain reflections of a personal nature cast upon me, and my desire is to get the very earliest opportunity to answer questions and have the contents of the files in question made public.

THE PREMIER replied: As these deal with a personal matter, I will give the hon. member an opportunity to move the motions to-morrow.

#### QUESTION—FREMANTLE HARBOUR TRUST PROPERTY, AND COST.

MR. BATH asked the Premier: 1, Has his attention been drawn to the complaint of the Fremantle Harbour Commissioners in their annual report, that the schedule showing value of property vested in the Commissioners has not been supplied by the Government? 2, If so, has he acceded to their wishes? 3, If not, why not?

THE PREMIER replied: 1, 2, and 3, The matter is now under the consideration of the Colonial Secretary. In February, 1904, a statement was supplied to the Harbour Trust showing the figures allocated by the Department against the Trust, but since that date the Department and the Trust have been discussing whether certain of the figures should be included, and eventually a basis has been arrived at, with the exception of a ques-

tion as to whether  $5\frac{1}{2}$  acres that was produced by levelling land on Arthur's Head should be handed over to the Trust, and a question with respect to the Departmental charges settled. The Trust considered these high. The last statement only recently reached the Minister for Works, and is now under consideration.

MR. BATH also asked: 1, What is the capital cost of all property vested in the Fremantle Harbour Trust? 2, The cost of all works, property, etc., connected with the Fremantle Harbour Works not so vested?

THE PREMIER replied: The information, which could be more definitely supplied in the shape of a return, is now being prepared by the Department concerned.

#### QUESTION—COLLIE-NARROGIN RAILWAY, WAGES.

MR. BATH asked the Minister for Works: 1, Were a number of men who were employed on the Collie-Narrogin Railway construction work refused payment for last Good Friday and Easter Monday? 2, Was any discrimination exercised in the direction of paying some men and refusing payment to others? 3, Has it not been the practice in previous years to pay for these holidays? 4, Why has the change been made?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, Yes. 2, Yes. Timekeepers and gangers are paid every working day, whether holidays, or wet or dry. 3, Yes. 4, Cabinet instructions that "no work no pay" was to be the principle after February 1st, 1906, in dealing with wages men—modified by the Hon. the Minister for Works in regard to foremen, gangers, and timekeepers.

#### QUESTION—COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS, TERMS AND NOTICE.

MR. BATH asked the Minister for Railways: Has the Government tendered the requisite notice to the Commissioner of Railways, consonant with the agreement under which his services are rendered, to enable it to have a free hand at the termination of his engagement, either to re-engage him or to call for applications and to consider his claims in conjunction with others?

THE TREASURER (for the Minister) replied: The agreement with the Com-

missioner of Railways was for a special term, and did not require notice for discontinuance.

#### QUESTION—PUBLIC BATTERY AT YARRI.

MR. BATH asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Has he received any offer to lease the Yarri State battery? 2, Has he in contemplation any proposal to lease it? 3, If so, why?

THE TREASURER (for the Minister) replied: 1, No. 2, No. 3, Answered by Nos. 1 and 2.

#### QUESTION—BOILERS AND MACHINERY INSPECTION, EXEMPTIONS.

MR. SCADDAN asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Is it true that the boilers and machinery of either or all of the following, namely (1) Government Refrigerating Works, (2) Royal Mint, and (3) Midland Railway Company, are exempt from inspection under the Machinery Act? 2, If so, why?

THE TREASURER (for the Minister) replied: 1 (a) No. (b) Yes. (c) Only as regards locomotives. 2 (a) Answered by No. 1 (a). (b) The Crown Law Department advises that the provisions of "The Inspection of Machinery Act" do not apply to the Royal Mint. (c) The contract with the Midland Railway Company gives the Commissioner of Railways power to examine locomotive engines belonging to the Company, and they are being inspected by officers of the working railways.

#### QUESTION—SHOOTING AT FREMANTLE, COMPENSATION.

MR. TROY asked the Attorney General: 1, What compensation was paid Mr. Albert, who was shot by Detective Hornsby at his residence, 12 Tuckfield-street, Fremantle? 2, Who authorised the payment, if any? 3, What punishment was inflicted on those responsible for the outrage? 4, Have any of those persons since been promoted?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL replied: 1, £75. 2, Payment approved by Governor-in-Council on the recommendation of the Hon. the Colonial Secretary (27-5-04). 3, Detective Hornsby was dismissed. Detective Condon removed from charge of Detective Office,

Fremantle, to a subordinate position in Perth. Plain-Clothes Constable Hunter was returned to uniform branch. 4. None. 5. Detective Hornsby has been admitted again to the service.

#### PAPER PRESENTED.

By the ATTORNEY GENERAL: Report on the elections held in the Fremantle Electoral Districts at the last general election.

#### BILL—LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT.

Introduced by the ATTORNEY GENERAL, and read a first time.

#### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

##### FIFTH DAY OF DEBATE.

Resumed from the previous sitting.

MR. H. E. BOLTON (North Fremantle): I do not purpose making any lengthy remarks, although I agree with the Premier that it is certainly not a waste of time to speak on the Address-in-Reply. I look on it as absolutely necessary that members having anything to bring before this House should do so during the debate on the Address. The last member who spoke in this debate said he would not follow the preceding speakers by congratulating everybody in the House; and he then proceeded to congratulate the Premier. Like previous speakers, I will start by congratulating the Premier. I do congratulate him, at least, on having attained such a high position with such a short parliamentary experience. I congratulate also the two new Ministers on their having attained to such high positions with their short political experience. And there is another I should like to congratulate, the Honorary Minister, if for no other reason than that I have read some portion of the Auditor General's reports; and for that reason alone I think that the Premier has to be congratulated on his asking that gentleman (Hon. J. Mitchell) to join the Cabinet, in order to put the finances of the Agricultural Department in something like a decent state. And if the new Minister takes that matter in hand, I think it will be more to his credit than running about the country looking after agriculture, and leaving the finances of

this department to take care of themselves. I have no farther congratulations to offer.

MR. TAYLOR: Why do you not congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address?

MR. BOLTON: Because I have nothing on which to congratulate them; consequently I will leave that. I should like to extend my sympathy to each of the remaining members of the Cabinet, for what may be termed their ill-luck in not having been chosen by the Ministerial caucus to be Premier of Western Australia. After all, the choice appears to have been only a matter of luck; and if any of the remaining members of the Cabinet, who I may say without disrespect are hard-headed politicians, be still ambitious, the only qualification they do not possess for the Premiership is that they were not born at "the birth-place"; and I would suggest that if they be still ambitious they be "born again," and arrange for the next birth to take place at Bunbury. Whilst I have some sympathy for members of the Cabinet, I have none for Ministerial supporters. I remember that during the last Parliament, more especially in its first session, when this (Labour) party was a good deal stronger, the least little disagreement in this party with regard to any part of its policy, or the least disagreement between the members of the party, was at once seized by those who are now Ministerial supporters. They were then always ready to jeer at this party whenever they saw the slightest sign of dissension. I think it only fair that they should now be paid back in their own coin. Now it is our turn to seize on the least sign of dissension in their ranks, as they did when it proved that we were not quite so solid as we tried to make out. The Ministerialists claim to be pretty solid; but if we take the speeches made by those who are not Ministers, we find that there is at least a little dissatisfaction with the policy of the Premier; and surely, if they when in Opposition exhibited a certain amount of bad feeling towards us when in office, and never neglected an opportunity of pointing out any absence of trustfulness amongst the members of our party, we may now use the same weapon against them. So far, one pleasing feature in this debate has been the absence of that parrot cry

of "caucus, caucus," of which we heard so much in the last Parliament. It is easily understood why that word is dropped by the Ministerialists. Few Government supporters who during the last Parliament were in Opposition failed to utter that parrot cry of "caucus, caucus," whenever they stood on their feet. Somehow or other, I cannot help congratulating even the member for Perth (Mr. H. Brown); for since I have been a member of this House it is seldom that he has spoken here without talking of "caucus, caucus." And now, in this debate on the Address, that gentleman has made a fairly long speech; yet I certainly did not hear from him the least reference to the Labour party's caucus.

MR. BATH: Or to the P.L.P.

MR. HARDWICK: Or to congress.

MR. BOLTON: I have no objection to the member for East Perth's reference to congress. If he had any connection with so sensible a body, I think he would be better off. I suppose that the hon. member is somewhat dissatisfied with the action of the Ministerial caucus; or else he has a slightly less bitter feeling against the Labour caucus. Possibly there is a little truth in both these suppositions. At least, I for one can promise him that if ever the caucus of this (Labour) party presumes to appoint the Agent General of this State, or to elect the Premier of this State, I for one will never again attend the caucus meetings. There has been considerable reference during this debate to the Fremantle election; and as one of the unfortunate members for a Fremantle constituency, I suppose that if I altogether neglect the subject, the House will wonder why. Therefore I must refer to it, though I intend to say as little as possible in that connection. I think that the election can be summed up in two words: personalities and parochialism. And although as one of the Fremantle members I am bound to admit those two words—[MR. A. J. WILSON: And "Price"]—no, I leave out the price; but personalities and parochialism did certainly enter very largely into that contest. Many regrettable and reprehensible incidents took place throughout the campaign. To one of them I take great exception; namely, to the police being

employed—I presume by the Electoral Department—to check what was known as No. 2 Supplement. For the information of members I must explain that in addition to the ordinary roll for this Ministerial election, two supplements were issued. The police had special orders to check No. 2 Supplement, leaving alone No. 1 Supplement and the original roll. I maintain that if there was time, and if it was necessary for the police to cheque No. 2, and if the Government were in earnest in their suggested electoral reform, there would have been an excellent opportunity for the police to check the whole of the roll, together with Supplements Nos. 1 and 2. I believe it is claimed that there was no time for the police to do this work; but I cannot understand why they could not have checked as far as possible the whole roll, instead of picking the supplement which necessarily consisted of additional names enrolled for the purpose of re-electing the present Minister for Works (Hon. J. Price). I am not claiming that either the Minister for Works or his opponent put on most of those names. [THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: They did not.] Well, I do not see how that applies, as I did not blame either side. Somebody must have put on most of them. However, somebody put on a large number of additional names, and when it was found that there was a large difference between the number of the electors on that roll as compared with the number at the previous election at which the Minister for Works was returned, it was evidently thought desirable that these additional names should be carefully inquired into. The police, to my certain knowledge, when inquiring for a man in Henry Street, visited workshops and stores in that street first and last. Possibly the claimant may have been a caretaker in one of the buildings; but caretaker or not, the policeman visited an establishment in Henry Street and asked if there was a man working there of the name of the claimant. Of course there was no one living at this establishment. There were only men working there. The policeman said he had been to two or three places in Henry Street and could not find the man. I asked him if he was told to strike off the name, and he said "No"; he had only to report

the fact that he could not find the man; but that man would necessarily be denied a vote. [THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: No.] I was outside the polling booth on the day of the election and put in a good day's work—[MR. TAYLOR: Supporting the Minister for Works?—No; I was supporting the opponent of the Minister for Works, and I would do so again if they met to-morrow, and with just the same good feeling that I saw evidenced at that election. Many of the men who applied for the right to exercise their franchise were denied the right to vote. [THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Challenged?] No; denied the right to vote. I do not mind a challenge, because each side puts men into the polling booth to challenge voters; but these men were denied the right to vote. I took a list of a good many names of those denied the right to vote, and I took men to the registrar at Fremantle and asked the reason. For instance, in the case of Tom Jones and William Smith, both claims were put in together the day prior to the issue of the writ. Tom Jones happened to secure a vote, but Smith missed it. [THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Why?] I will tell the Minister. He already knows; but I have no objection to repeat the reason. The book from which the printer's list was made up was only completed, I think, to the letter P—[MR. TAYLOR: Price]—and Smith started with the letter S. There was no time to reach S. The order was absolutely authoritative; because I have this from an officer of the department. [THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Well, he did not tell you correctly.] Possibly not. The Minister can get the ear of the Minister in charge of the Electoral Department far better than any elector can, or far better than the officers. These officers would not understand why the order was issued, but only knew that it was issued, and the list was printed to a certain letter. The reason was, the claims that were put into that registrar's office were at once written up in the book, and the officer had reached the letter P when another officer was sent down to stop any more going on the roll. Consequently those who had not the good fortune to have their initial start earlier in the alphabet than the letter P, were omitted. I also make the statement, knowing what I am saying, that a large

number of names entered into the registrar's book were ruled through. In the case of those men who were denied a vote I took the names into the registrar's office at Fremantle. I said to the registrar, "This man's claim was in on such and such a date"; and the registrar said, "Well, we will see." The book was opened and the man's name was found to be ruled through. A great many were ruled through in the same way. We asked what authority there was for ruling them through, and the registrar said it was simply on the authority of the Chief Electoral Officer. That was all the satisfaction we got for those who were denied the right to vote. I take more exception to that, what I term the disgraceful part of the election, than to any other. As an individual I was somewhat surprised at the Minister for Works taking what appears to me to be an unfair advantage in making the statement he did about an ardent supporter of his opponent. I deny that Mr. Barry, whom the Minister termed an unregistered bookmaker, is anything of the sort. He is an enthusiastic supporter of the Minister for Works's opponent, and certainly can bear favourable comparison with some of those who were supporting the Minister, even on his platform. I am satisfied that even if Mr. Barry were an unregistered bookmaker, it would be far preferable that Mr. Needham should have him as his ardent supporter, than it was for the Minister for Works to take one of his own workmen on his platform and ask him to speak on his behalf. The Minister decidedly made a mistake. A workman working in a department under the Minister's control was asked to go on the platform and sit next to his Minister and to address a few remarks to the meeting; and he made such an ass of himself that he was not asked to speak again, but was asked simply to sit on the platform next his boss. I admit that there was a great deal of parochialism at that election; and, notwithstanding that possibly some of my colleagues on this side of the House may not agree with me, I desire to make the statement that a little parochialism was absolutely necessary in Fremantle, though not necessarily in the election campaign. It has been clearly demonstrated, I suppose to members of this House, at least to the

majority of the inhabitants of this country, that Fremantle has not had its fair share. That being so, members can understand that little undercurrent of parochialism that had been working up long before the election was thought of, because that feeling amongst Fremantle members in both Houses to work together had been for some time in force, prior, I believe, to the Minister for Works ever hoping to be a Minister of the Crown—[THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is so]—and consequently that feeling was very rife before this election started. Though I am member for part of the Fremantles, and although I am termed as one of the parochialists and admit to a little parochialism, I desire to say that I intend to lift up my voice whenever I can in assistance and defence of another part of the State that to my mind has been sadly neglected; and because I am put down as one of the parochialists, perhaps coming from me it is more suitable than coming from some of the hon. members who know nothing about parochialism up to a certain point. I am pleased to notice in the Governor's Speech one thing that appeals to me—that strong representations have from time to time been placed before the Imperial authorities regarding the urgent necessity for a proper survey of the North-West coast of this State. The work is absolutely necessary without a doubt, as is known by the members of this Chamber who travelled to the North-West on what has been termed the famous picnic party, which will favourably compare with even the definition given by the Premier when he said, "If you are in the saddle for a week with only a blanket in front of you." I can assure the Premier that we did even worse than that. [MR. HOBAN: No blankets were needed.] I am glad to see that the Government are taking up the question of the survey of this coast; because, as other members of the party will be able to tell the House, even the oldest skipper travelling on the North-West coast in what may be termed one of the best boats found it necessary to ride at anchor the whole of one night because some parts of the coast, or what are known as passages, are not navigable after dark.

MR. BUTCHER: Where is that?

MR. BOLTON: I think it was Mary Ann Passage.

MR. HOBAN: I do not dispute it.

MR. BOLTON: I regret that no mention has been made in the Speech of the Port Hedland-Nullagine Railway. There are so very few members in the House who know anything of that part of the country, that it is no wonder the mineral resources of that district are not making the headway they should do. Along the proposed route there are immense bodies of ore—gold, tin, copper, tantalite, and asbestos.

MR. DAGLISH: Broken bottles?

MR. BOLTON: Yes; broken bottles, and as we found the broken bottles, they must have been there before we went there; and as I know of no previous parliamentary party having visited that district, that goes to show—although we may not think it—there is a little bit of prosperity there which we do not know of, and it took a parliamentary party to find it out. In addition to the necessity for assistance to the mineral resources of that part of the State, there are magnificent pastoral lands there. The mining centres are suffering most from the want of railway facilities. There seems to be a general feeling and a general outlook of stagnation and abandonment, even in what appear to be such promising centres as Marble Bar, Moolyella, the great tinfield Warrawoona, Nullagine, Mosquito Creek, 20-mile Sandy Creek, Coongelung, Woodgina, and Station Peak. Most of these places are capable of wonderful development; but without railway facilities there does not seem to be much hope for any early development. Members will remember that when the Eastern Goldfields broke out the price of cartage was three or four times what it was in the North. The price of cartage in the North-West by horse team is £10 per ton to Marble Bar, and by camel team £7 per ton.

MR. HUDSON: That is cheap.

MR. BOLTON: I do not deny that it appears to be cheap, but when the prices of some of the provisions and necessities are given, hon. members will not think the prices are so cheap. The ground is of a very treacherous nature and requires a good deal of timbering; and what makes it worse, there is very little timber of any kind in the district suitable for

mining purposes. When members consider that the price paid for timber ranges from 2s. 3d. per running foot at Nullagine, it will give them some idea of what it costs to use timber there. Although cartage is but £10 per ton, it is difficult to get timber carted at all, as there is not much inducement for teamsters to take a load from Port Hedland to Marble Bar at any time. They prefer not to take timber. At 2s. 3d. per foot it does not pay to do much timbering; consequently there is not much development. The cost of provisions is just as high. I do not intend to go into details, but I will mention one item, which can be verified by the gentlemen who made that trip with me. Potatoes are usually taken or sent to that district in 10lb. parcels by parcels post, and the price of a 10lb. parcel of potatoes is 7s. There must be an enormous profit somewhere, or why the great difficulty in getting provisions, timber, or what is necessary to any one of these centres. At the Mons Cupri copper mine experiments have been made, and although the experiments have not been largely successful, they have been satisfactory. Operations have had to be discontinued there because of the heavy price of flux. Flux is procurable at Spanish ports at 13s. per ton; but when it arrives at the mine the cost is £6 15s. per ton, and at a place that is decidedly nearer the coast than either Marble Bar, Nullagine, or Mosquito Creek, and other places. When there is such a difference between 13s. per ton and £6 15s. per ton, we see what the people up there have to put up with. Operations have had to be discontinued at the mine in consequence of the high price of flux. Perhaps it is as well here to mention that, not exactly adjoining but close to the Mons Cupri is the famous Whim Creek mine. It will repay the Government to inquire into the Whim Creek copper mine, which is held on fee-simple and entirely exempt from the mining laws and free from all labour conditions. The owners can work the mine how they like and when they like; they can cease working it how and when they like. I think the Government should take some action to alter this state of affairs. A magnificent property it must have been, and a good property it must be yet; but while held in fee-

simple, there is no satisfaction to the State or to the Government of the State. I advise the Government to make inquiries into this matter, and see if something cannot be done to rectify what was evidently a cruel injustice or wrong to the State in years gone by. I saw no reason in my travels there to hope that there would be any increase of population except in Asiatics and Afghans. Under present conditions it would take a working man at least twelve months to save his bare passage money to get to any one of the ports in the Nor-West; and then the usual practice in that part of the State is not to work for wages. Men usually go prospecting or working for themselves, working their own claims until they get to a certain depth, when they can go no farther for want of timber or for want of facilities to get rid of the water. Under the present conditions there is no room for a big population, because it costs far too much to get to the district, and there is no immediate prospect of an income when a man does get there. I do not think I shall dwell too much on this subject, for there are at least five or six members of the House who were members of the party to the Nor-West, all of whom no doubt will like to say something on this question. As the Government have not seen fit to mention the Port Hedland-Nullagine Railway, perhaps I may mention one or two matters which were brought under our notice; especially as I am not taking any other member's place, for there does not happen to be a member for that district in this Chamber. I will mention one or two things that seemed necessary in the district, and which will assist the district greatly until such time as the Government can deal with the railway. At Port Hedland, on entering the harbour there is a jutting point or bar. This necessitates a very short swing on the part of vessels entering or leaving the harbour. If some part of the point were removed, it would be safer and easier to navigate; and this could be done at very little cost. There is a head-piece to the jetty, or T piece, which really abuts on to the land. The jetty seems to go over a morass or swamp that sometimes is dry and sometimes is covered by deep water. This jetty head is half the length of a coasting

steamer, and it is not possible for the jetty to accommodate all the cargo which has to be taken on board. If this accommodation were doubled, it could accommodate the cargo and make the shipping far more secure, and the cargo easier to work. This could be done at a very little cost, as there is plenty of deep water under the decking of the jetty already there. The decking can be continued into deep water, and there would be no necessity for any dredging; all that would be required being a few piles and some decking. There was a request from the residents of Whim Creek for a State battery. It may appear somewhat hard to say it, but if a few State batteries were removed from some electorates and sent to the Nor'-West they could do really good work. Some electorates are well served. I may mention Menzies. [MEMBER: KANOWNA.] My information is only in regard to Menzies; but if the Government can find work for all the batteries in the Menzies and other electorates, then the Government might send one or two batteries to the Nor'-West. They are asking for a battery for Whim Creek, and another is asked for for Station Peak. A resident at Station Peak is willing to give the Government five per cent. on their outlay, or else to take the battery and pay a rental for it. Although there is a battery at Station Peak, one of the oldest in that part, for it has been working since 1894, the owner absolutely refuses to crush ore from any private mine. Consequently people cannot get their stuff treated. At one time persons could cart their stuff two miles and have it treated; but that is now denied them. The battery has been removed; consequently several claims that are at least thought to be payable are idle at Station Peak. If this offer is accepted, it will get over the difficulty. I expect the offer has already been made to the Government, either to pay five per cent. on the Government outlay or to lease the battery at a rental. This should at least let the Government see there is something genuine in the district, and that it would pay them to send a battery to the place. There are many other things urgently required in the Nor'-West. If the Treasurer (Hon. F. Wilson) had visited the district when he was Minister for Works, he would have

wanted the "Black Maria" or some other vehicle to bring back the notes collected during the trip. Dealing now with some remarks that have fallen from the mover and seconder of the Address-in-Reply and other speakers, some reference has been made to Federation, and in one or two instances I regret to say they have advocated secession. Let me say that I voted for Federation. I would vote again for Federation, if I were asked, and I maintain that the way to get out of a tight place is not to talk secession. It is absolutely wrong to talk secession. I believe it would be far better for this Government as a Government, or for this Parliament as a Parliament and the voice of the people, to object to anything that is dangerous to this State. If they feel they are losing any State right, it would, I believe, be well for this Parliament to enter its emphatic protest. Even minor matters sometimes so work on the minds of the people that they feel not only disgusted, but simply tired of being tied to the Federation. I know of a few cases that possibly help to bring on this discontent. Since the Federal authorities have taken over the Postal Department, they have seen fit to bring officers from the Eastern States to take leading positions in this State. I think they have absolutely removed the incentive to promotion. If, as vacancies occur, the Federal postal authorities are to send officers to take charge of the departments here, what incentive is there to the employees in this State to work for the highest things? I think the Government would not be overstepping its duty by protesting against such a thing; and I would like to see this Parliament protest; because, while I admit it is not a State matter but a Federal one, it still follows that if the Postal Department is carried on badly in this State, the Cabinet of this State and the people of this State suffer. If, instead of complaints having to be hurled at the Commonwealth Postal Department, a strong protest were to go from this Cabinet or this House, it would have some weight; and I would very much like to see that. I would far rather see it than have this balderdash about secession. I do not believe in secession, and I do not think half those who talk it believe in it. They only talk



it for talking's sake. Some reference has been made to immigration. I interjected during some member's remarks that employment had been found for immigrants at the Government workshops. I repeat that statement. Immigrants have been met and taken to the Government workshops at Midland Junction, blacksmiths, and have been given work. Within a few days of their put being on, men were retrenched, as there was no work for them to do. That is an absolutely wrong principle to go on. Surely to goodness, if they are talking as they do in the Governor's Speech, saying that immigrants have been largely settled on the land, they should have something to show for it. I am informed by a member of the House that, about a fortnight ago a batch of immigrants came to this State. They were met on their arrival by Mr. Longmore, and after a conversation, he advised them to look for work. They said that was what they had come for, and asked where they were to look for it. They were told they would have to look round the city of Perth and Fremantle, and see if they could find work. I know that some of those men were absolutely destitute and they were told to look for work; and this is what the Government pride themselves upon as their immigration scheme. Men are to be met by Mr. Longmore or anybody else and told to look for work. Unless they are ready to receive the people—and they are not ready to receive them—of what use is it to go in for an immigration scheme and to keep pushing it all the time, knowing, too, that more than half of them are mechanics and are not brought here to take up land at all? If they are brought here to take up land, I emphatically say that not 25 per cent. of them go on the land or take up land at all. They seek other channels of employment. And then there are many foreigners who come here. Surely we do not expect them to take up land: surely it is not the Government's idea, that foreigners take up land. As soon as they arrive, they are so well treated in comparison with the way in which the residents of the State are treated that it would be far better for residents who desire assistance from the Government to go away, get passage money to come here paid, then go into the the Agricultural College, and

so forth, for a term and learn their trade, and then be given land on better conditions than the Government are offering to the people in this State. [Interjection.] The hon. member who interjects has only been five minutes in office. Possibly it has not been so since he has been in office; but it was so prior to that. I hope there will be an improvement, and that what has occurred in the past will never happen again. That at least is some cause for thankfulness, not only to members on this side of the House, but members on both sides. The Government refer to the recommendations of the Public Service Commissioner and say very vaguely that they are under consideration. I am inclined to think that the Government have had time to come to some decision in the matter. I would far rather the Government had given the House their decision as to whether they intend to adopt that officer's recommendations or otherwise. There are some features in that recommendation which I disagree with. I do not claim to be an authority, but I happen to have had some little connection with an Appeal Board. Following on the 1900 strike in this State, when the drivers, firemen, and cleaners were having a little holiday, a classification took place. This classification was promised by the present member for Katanning (Hon. F. H. Piesse), who was then Minister for Railways, or rather was termed Commissioner of Railways. The classification was to date back so many years, that it was not possible to get sufficient data for them to work out anything like a satisfactory classification. All the information they could get was got together, and a classification list was issued to every driver, fireman, and cleaner, showing his position, his rate of pay, and the date on which increments would be due. At the top of this list was an invite to all those who felt themselves aggrieved to enter an appeal, not only against their own position, but against the position of any other member on that list. I think there were, by means of the appeals, 680 members classified, and there were 99 or 97 appeals lodged. By means of one man appealing against another man's position, one was removed from possibly No. 27 in the first class to No. 31 in the first class; not necessarily the man who

appealed to be removed, but one man had got credit for more service than he was entitled to. By means of appeals going in as soon as the classification list was issued, a nearly perfect classification was issued to the staff and unanimously adopted by that staff. Under the present arrangement, according to the Public Service Commissioner the appeals cannot be received until such time as the Governor adopts the recommendations. I think it is a pity that provision was not made for appeals to go in prior to that; and then some reasonable classification could have been brought about by means of appeals before a properly constituted board, at which the public service should be represented by at least one in three. I am not going to criticise the Public Service Commissioner, but I am going to criticise the Government for not coming to a conclusion. I wish to refer to what is perhaps the most recent appointment. Some month or six weeks ago, and a good deal before that, public applications were invited for the position of Chief Electoral Officer. Several times during every session reference has been made to the mismanagement of the Electoral Department. Complaints have been hurled from both sides of this Chamber, and certainly there have been more vigorous complaints outside the Chamber than in it, of the mismanagement of that department. When the Government considered it expedient, or, to be at least as kind as I can, when it was thought wise for the Chief Electoral Officer to retire, applications were invited for the position. A stipulation appeared in the *Government Gazette*, and in all the newspapers in which it was advertised, that the applicants must have a thorough knowledge of the electoral laws and of the compilation of rolls. That debarred gentlemen from applying for that position because they had not that knowledge. Men having that knowledge naturally applied for the position, and it seems very peculiar that a gentleman was appointed who has never had any connection with the electoral laws or compilation of rolls; not the least connection. [Interjection] It was known long ago, but it does not follow that this is not the proper place to bring it up, even if it was known long ago. If through such a stipulation the

applicants were limited to one man who had no knowledge of these matters, I say it looks suspicious. If, on the other hand, such was not the case, why did the gentleman who is already appointed to that position apply for it? After the stipulation that applicants must be thoroughly versed in these matters, how came the gentleman who now occupies that position to put in an application, and how came it that the stipulation was put in to keep other people from applying? In my opinion, and from what I have heard—I have no personal knowledge of the gentleman—he is an excellent man of business, and undoubtedly a good administrator. I am informed by my colleague, Mr. Walker, that he is an able man all round. He may be. He may be the very man for the position. But why stipulate that he must have a thorough knowledge of matters which he admits he has absolutely no knowledge of whatever? I think it is a pity that appointment was made. I admit that when I referred to the appointment in speaking to a member of the Government, that gentleman said, "Serve you right; you helped to pass the Public Service Commissioner Bill under which these recommendations, instead of going to Cabinet, go direct to the Executive Council." I admit I helped to pass the Bill; therefore I cannot dwell on the subject any farther. But I think there is a good deal in it. Let the Government take the responsibility of agreeing to the recommendations instead of getting out of it by saying they are sent straight to the Executive Council.

MR. BATH: Who said it was sent to the Executive Council?

MR. BOLTON: The Attorney-General of Western Australia.

MR. SCADDAN: I would like to have a few shillings on the point that it will go through Cabinet first.

MR. BOLTON: There is another matter, with regard to the extended powers of the Harbour Trust. Perhaps it is not usual for members of the Opposition to refer to matters which they are going to support. This has been brought in mainly owing to the late elections; they will have my support of this measure, and I believe that even those gentlemen who look askance at it now will, when they see the measure intro-

duced into the House, be more inclined to support it than they are at present. One of the main features in this measure, as it appeals to me as a member of a Fremantle constituency who had something to do with this matter with the other members, is that the new board that is proposed will be an elective board. That is one of the stipulations which will suit members on this side of the House, naturally, far better than a nominee board. Then again, there will be a stipulation that this board, being given power to raise money for a graving dock, a swing bridge, and other improvements, shall, without having recourse to the Treasury, provide interest and possibly sinking fund on the outlay. I cannot see how members can possibly take any exception to that. If they do, and if they object to a board which will be responsible for raising the interest and possibly the sinking fund on the money borrowed, I think that is far preferable to asking the Government to go on the money market for any specific purpose. Moreover, if the Goldfields Water Scheme is placed under a board, let that board be asked to supply interest and sinking fund on that scheme also. The Fremantle people are desirous of having extended powers given to the new trust; and the new trust will undertake to pay the interest and part of the sinking fund on their outlay. That will relieve the State and the Government of a considerable responsibility; and I think that the proposal should be at once accepted by this House. Perhaps while on this point I can refer to a small paragraph in the Premier's policy speech at Bunbury; and this is again a reference to the Fremantle election—I wish I could get rid of the subject. The Premier said that the electors of Fremantle would decide on the following day whether they would adopt the suggestion of increased powers to the Harbour Trust. I somewhat regret that; because I deny the right of the Fremantle electors to decide any such point. The remark of the Premier would have been justified had a general election been in progress, and had all the Fremantle members been standing for re-election. But I object to what may be termed the insinuation that if the Minister for Works (Hon. J. Price) was not returned, then I as a private member who had assisted

his opponent, and the other members for Fremantle constituencies, would be cast aside, and increased powers not granted. [MINISTERIAL MEMBER: Oh!] Well, the Premier has fathered the statement that the electors of Fremantle would decide on the following day whether they would agree with his proposal; that is, if they elected Mr. Price, they would agree; if not, there was certainly some doubt as to their agreement. If the members of both Chambers had met and talked this over and agreed concerning it, surely it would not have been left to the electors of one of the Fremantle seats to decide whether the proposal should be adopted. The remark of the Premier was at least injudicious.

MR. BATH: That is a mild manner of putting it.

MR. BOLTON: It is a mild manner of putting it. The Government propose to introduce a Municipal Corporations Consolidation Bill. I wish only to say that I hope the Government will make provision to give every municipality the right to rate on the unimproved land value, if so desired. Many municipalities are crying out for this right. If we give them the right, we do not make that form of rating compulsory; but at least some municipalities will be assisted; and I hope the Government will make the necessary provision in the Bill. In regard to the Public Health Consolidation Bill, I wish to throw out a suggestion I made two years ago to this House, that the Government consider the advisableness of abolishing by that Bill compulsory vaccination. Having on one occasion asked most members of this House for support on that question, I know of my knowledge that a good many will support the abolition of compulsory vaccination. Some may oppose the change; but I will ask the Government to give it serious consideration. A previous Government told me that when the Government introduced the Bill I could introduce my proposal as an amendment; but I should much prefer the amendment to come from the Government, or that the Premier should tell me that there will be no opposition to the amendment. If the Government introduce the Bill this session, I appeal to Ministers to do away with compulsory vaccination, and they

will please the majority of the electors. The Fire Brigades Bill has been promised for a long time, and will be supported by me. The reduction of the Upper House franchise, proposed by the Government, will of course have my support. I wish that Ministers would do away with even the £15 qualification proposed to be retained. I do not like to insinuate; but I cannot help thinking that the Government are in respect of this measure expecting a defeat—possibly not in this Chamber, but it is just possible that another place may not agree to the reduction. Opinions expressed by members in that Chamber show that they are not in sympathy with the proposal.

MR. BATH: And they are members whom the Government helped to elect.

MR. BOLTON: Just so. It may come to this, and sometimes I hope it will: if another place refuses to adopt this reform, will the Government show its sincerity by breaking a lance with that other place? If the members of this House decide to carry that measure, then it will be at least the duty of the Government to fight another place, and demand that this reform shall become law. We shall see whether the Government is sincere in this proposal, and in the proposal for a tax on unimproved land values. If the Government be defeated on those measures in another place, it will be its duty, as the introducer of them, to fight; and Ministers will receive ample assistance even from this weak Opposition.

MR. BATH: Do not look at the Honorary Minister. He does not want the measures to pass.

MR. BOLTON: Well, while I was speaking of that, he happened to be the only Minister present; hence I had to look at him. Another Minister has since arrived. I will support taxation of unimproved land values, and if possible without exemption. I know that some good arguments—and I admit that they are good arguments—will be advanced by some members who know more of the land question than I know or perhaps may ever know. I am fully prepared to listen to their arguments, which I believe will be sound; but my idea is to impose this tax without exemptions. I cannot help referring to the member for North Perth (Mr. Brebber), who spoke on the

Address-in-Reply, and spoke especially of one subject—the tax on unimproved land values. His speech followed somewhat on the lines of that of the member for Perth (Mr. H. Brown); and as the member for North Perth has been closely associated with him in municipal life, it naturally followed that their arguments would be much alike. I have no objection to what the hon. member said. He certainly did not understand taxation of unimproved land values, as was pretty clearly pointed out to him by the member for Katanning (Hon. F. H. Piessé), who followed. The only other matter the hon. member (Mr. Brebber) referred to was not in the Governor's Speech. The hon. member told us why he could not come over to the Labour party. The reason was that he would never give up his freedom. As a member who attended the Ministerial caucus, it would have been better for him had he never spoken about caucus methods; and his absolute ignorance of the methods of the Labour party only shows that he needs education. May he get that necessary education. If he can get it on that (Government) side of the Chamber, he is welcome to it. My only hope is that he will be educated. He knows absolutely nothing about the methods of this party; else he would not make such childish statements as he made in concluding his remarks on the Address-in-Reply. The Government, though they do not give us any definite information, propose to build some new agricultural railways. I am inclined to think that the Nor'-West railway should come first.

MR. SCADDAN: Three Ministers are opposed to that.

MR. BOLTON: I cannot help it. I hope at least that the House will have time to consider the proposals. The Government propose to build farther agricultural railways; and yet the only opposition the Government are experiencing to their unimproved land tax proposals comes from the very members who are to be benefited by these new railways.

MR. BATH: No hope for the Nor'-West while the South-West exists.

MR. BOLTON: Then I hope that the South-West will soon become *non est*. For years past the South-West has been fairly well looked after, and the Nor'-

West completely starved. The objectionable feature of this question is that most members who have spoken in opposition to the taxation of unimproved land values are men with good arguments for agricultural development by the building of railways; and yet, with the very same views, they refuse to pay a tax on unimproved land values. I say, if they do not like the tax and are prepared to fight the Bill providing for it, the Government are not justified in giving them sops by building for them agricultural railways. Surely, seeing that these railways must increase the value of their property, or at least must give them facilities for getting their produce to market, then these gentlemen should, without grumbling, pay the tax on the unimproved land values.

MR. BATH: They have paid nothing for so long that they do not like paying now.

MR. BOLTON: Possibly that is so. I regret that the Government have not included in the Speech a proposal for the continuation of the Jandakot Railway. [MR. COWCHER: An agricultural railway?] If it were an agricultural railway, there would have been no justification for the Government neglecting it so long. This is hardly an agricultural railway, nor was it intended to be agricultural. It was built simply to relieve the congested traffic that had to travel through Perth from the South-West to get to the port of Fremantle. I maintain that the completion of the railway should long since have been taken in hand, and the Government might at least have put it in the programme for this session. Only a short distance has still to be covered to complete the junction with the South-Western Railway. As to the reappointment of the Commissioner of Railways, I think that some statement additional to the answer to a question asked this afternoon should have been made in the House. Last session this matter was discussed by members on both sides of the Chamber; and the mover of the present Address-in-Reply was very strong on the point, being absolutely opposed to the reappointment of Mr. George for a farther term; and it is wonderful to me that the same hon. member did not notice the omission of the subject from the Speech this year. I think it would have

been far better had the Government made some statement on this point, and not left it in suspense. It is generally thought that some arrangement will have to be made this year as to whether a farther term will be offered.

MR. BATH: The Government have to give the Commissioner 12 months' notice, or 12 months' extra salary.

MR. BOLTON: If that be so, somebody will be misled by the answer that the hon. member interjecting received this afternoon. Either the answer is not quite what was expected—

MR. A. J. WILSON: It is certainly not what was expected, or it would have been disappointing.

MR. BOLTON: No. There could have been disappointment apart from the answer. One member, speaking on this subject, claimed that some railway employees had been reduced. The Minister for Railways (Hon. H. Gregory) interjected, "Name them." Well, I do not think it altogether fair to name wages men who have been reduced; but I will say what the Minister can surely not deny. Permanent way men are now receiving 7s. per day. That is a plain statement. And yet this country was involved in enormous expense when a large body—in fact, nearly all the railway men—were on strike to get the permanent way men's wages raised from 7s. to 8s. a day. If there be a set wage for certain work, surely men are entitled to that wage. The Government agreed to arbitration; the arbitrators decided that permanent way men should receive 8s. a day; and what justification can there be for reducing their wage to 7s., the amount now paid? The Premier said he did not think it right that the remaining members of the Cabinet should shoulder all the blame for the actions of the preceding Government, but that they would at least shoulder the blame in connection with their own departments. That Minister for Railways is still Minister for Railways, and he should shoulder some of the blame he will have hurled at him during this session; because if he does not care to interfere with the present Commissioner, then he is not fit for his position, or the Commissioner is not fit for his. Reductions have taken place. If the Commissioner is not to blame then the Minister is, or the Minister is to

blame for not putting the Commissioner right. I know the paltry, petty economy exercised in regard to wages men and low-paid men on the goldfields. The goldfields allowance was allowed by the Arbitration Court, and because a man was not working on Sunday, or worked for less than a week, if not altogether permanent they deducted a percentage of the goldfields allowance of 1s. a day. Fancy deducting 1½d. because a man was an hour short! This cannot be disproved. It is only necessary to remind members of the interpretation case taken to the Arbitration Court a few days ago. When I received the information, the case had not come off. It has since come off, and the court has decided, I do not say rightly or wrongly, that the Government were wrong, and that they must pay the full goldfields allowance for residence on the goldfields, and not for the hours worked. This workers' Government instituted something entirely new, which I should consider more applicable to Russia than to Western Australia. They ask employees of the Government, more especially the traffic employees, to work on Sunday for no pay. If that is the economy the Government are going to carry on, I think we would sooner have reckless expenditure than economy to the poor wages men asked to work on Sundays without any pay. It is a practice in some places, at least it is at Fremantle, for some of the staff to be booked off in the week and brought on on the Sunday to make up the time for the week. That is an absolutely disgraceful proceeding, and if the Minister is prepared to allow it to continue he must shoulder the blame. He may say that it has not been brought under his notice. I know that it was brought under the notice of the Commissioner that not one man working on the Fremantle Station, and a good many have to be employed on Sunday, was in receipt of any pay; and when the Commissioner heard this, I am given to understand on good authority that he put a stop to it and said: "It is going too strong. If you have 10 men working there on Sunday, why don't you pay three or four of them? It doesn't look so bad." The *serang* or *pooch-bah* at Fremantle followed the suggestion. But it is the practice to-day that men are booked off during the week and put on on the Sunday, and

surely it is not right for any employee to work seven days for six days' wages. There are other matters I should like to refer to, but in the absence of the Minister for Railways I leave them, except this, that I brought under the notice of the Minister last year the matter of the Parkerville tunnel. The Minister promised in this Chamber to have four air-shafts put in the tunnel. I presume he has since seen the Commissioner and that the Commissioner has said "Take no notice," and he has done so. Not the least move has been made in that direction. When the Railway Estimates are received in this House I shall again refer to the matter, and instead of the mild way in which I appealed to the Minister to do something which he promised to do and did not do, I shall feel inclined to speak stronger. Another matter which I might safely leave is in connection with the Bill passed through this House authorising the expenditure of £400,000 in sewerage works. I regret no mention is made of Fremantle. "Parochialism again," members may say; but I am afraid that by the time the Government think of Fremantle, obligations will have been entered into for spending all this money. I object strongly to the whole of this amount being spent in Perth, where they are so bitterly opposed to the proposed new taxation and yet ask for such an immense sum as will be spent on their sewerage scheme. [MR. A. J. WILSON: Would you exchange the dock in Fremantle for the Perth sewerage scheme?] Does the hon. member mean to bring the dock to Perth? There is a matter I intended to speak of, but I shall simply refer to it in a few words. I think it was the duty of the Government, possessing such a strong Attorney General—[MR. COLLIER: Head-strong!]  
—to take some notice of what appeared to me a libellous statement about our Chief Justice. I cannot help thinking, without desiring to labour the point, that if the Government allow such statements to be published and put about in this State as were published in a certain paper in this State, it is rather bad for the Government. It is their duty in my opinion to protect a man holding the position of Chief Justice, and I think that at least some notice should have been taken. The mere fact of

taking no notice of it is not sufficient in this instance; because if the paper is wrong the Government should take some action, and if the paper is right the Government should take another action, to remove that gentleman from his honourable position. Either that gentleman is not fit to hold the position, or the Government should take action against the writer of the article.

MR. A. J. WILSON: Do not place too much reliance on the gutter Press.

MR. BOLTON: When such an article is published the Government should at least take notice of it, because it will be inferred by a certain section, and must be inferred, that there is a great deal of truth in it. They will say that where there is smoke there is fire. If it is untrue, the Government should put a stop to such scandalous statements. If it is true, it is not a credit to this State having such a gentleman at the head of our courts. There are some of the measures of this Government I intend to support. Perhaps that is strange to the Government, coming from a member of the Opposition. While I reserve my right to criticise any of the measures, yet I intend to support some of them, believing they are the first step towards some reform. I must express the hope that the Government, which I look upon as a new Government, will show a more earnest desire to take up work that will advance the prosperity of this State than was shown by the last Government, and then I believe they will place the State in the prosperous condition that we all think it should occupy, and hope it soon will occupy.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. J. Mitchell): I desire first of all to refer to the remarks of the member for Mt. Magnet (Mr. Troy) in connection with my attitude towards the agricultural railways passed last session. I want to say right here that I never had any intention of opposing agricultural railways or light railways for the development of any of our natural resources. [MR. SCADDAN: Now!] In fact I would be perfectly prepared to set aside a sum sufficient to construct, as occasion arises, a thousand miles of railway for the development of our agricultural resources alone, to say nothing of the

lines needed for the development of our mining interests.

MR. BATH: The member for Mt. Magnet was referring to your statements during the recess.

THE HONORARY MINISTER: Probably that is so; but I objected in the House to the method in which these railways were to be constructed, because I believe that the building of these light railways is only part of a great scheme of land settlement. I want some definite scheme laid down in order that we may achieve the best possible result from the expenditure of this money. For instance, I thought and I still think that there are railways which should have had preference to the railways we decided on. In my opinion the two short spur railways from Newcastle and Greenhills should have been dealt with, because I think we should make these short lines, if possible, paying propositions. If we extended the line from Newcastle for 30 miles we should be in very good country indeed, and I hope that at no distant date that line will be undertaken. Again, if we extended the line from Greenhills we should be doing similar work. It is absolutely necessary in the interests of the country that these lines should be made to pay working expenses, and the only possible way to do so is by extending them; and more especially because the land through which the extensions will go is without question very good indeed. Some reference has been made, or was made last session, to the question of the non-improvement of lands lying along existing railways. I entirely agree that these lands should be improved; and I repeat that if the Opposition can devise some means of compelling holders of these lands to improve them, I will support that. But it must be remembered that, though a good deal has been said about the holding of large estates, it is an absolute fallacy. The real culprit is the small holder. [MR. A. J. WILSON: Very frequently.] There are few large estates, and they are, almost without exception, improved to some extent.

MR. SCADDAN: That is a good argument for no exemptions in the land tax.

THE HONORARY MINISTER: I do not agree with you. The small holder has not from choice left his selection unimproved. It has simply been with

him a matter of money. It has been impossible for him to carry out the improvements he would have liked to do. Under our land laws it is very easy to acquire land, and it ought to be easy under the Agricultural Bank Act for a man to improve his holding. Unfortunately the small holders have not done all they might have done, not because they were not willing, but because, as I have said already, they were unable to do so from want of funds. Instead of a land tax to compel these people to do their duty by the State, I would propose by some other means to afford them some help. With that object we have decided on liberalising the Agricultural Bank. The Premier has explained that we intend to bring in a Bill which will liberalise the Agricultural Bank Act to such an extent as to make it quite possible for any man to go on the lands of this State. [MR. STONE: But the cash is nearly all gone.] We propose to liberalise the bank so that it will be possible for the poorest man in this State who has sufficient energy, to get on the land. We propose that he may receive a full advance for all work done to the extent of £300, and for work done beyond that value a farther advance of £200 on a 50 per cent. basis. This will be an extremely liberal measure. We say, "Here is the land. You pay us 10s. an acre spread over 20 years. There you have to do improvements, but here is the money of this bank of ours which you may use to effect your improvements." This full advance of £300 will just enable a man going on the land—if he is not an experienced agriculturist he must go into some district where he can obtain some ideas during the time of clearing, ringbarking, and fencing his holdings—to live for at least three years while making his improvements. I think that this measure will be regarded not only here but throughout Australia as an extremely liberal one: no one can expect anything more liberal. I will tell members why I am favourable to liberalising the Agricultural Bank. It is because so much of the country is held by the small owner, and it is because we intend to make it possible for every man in the State to select land. Although everyone in the State is in favour of immigration, so far as I am concerned I wish to put

on the land in this State the people who know the country, who are acclimatised and know the conditions under which they will have to labour. I believe in giving a man cheap land, cheap money and plenty of it. We should say to our own people, "Here you are; here is something for you if you will only take it." I do hope that the people of this State will respond to this liberal offer on the part of the Government. This measure will enable us to stand right before the public of the State and say, we are going to do for the worker more than has ever been done before. [MR. BATH: Where are you going to get the money?] I have always found in my business life that a good idea is much harder to get than money: you will always find that it is so. I have told members that we are going to make it possible for every man in the State to become a farmer. To-day I received a letter from the mayor of Northam asking me to approach the Premier to get 100,000 acres set aside so that 100 Northam people may each select 1,000 acres of land. [MR. HORAN: Parochialism again.] If the member can get 100 people from his district to go on the land, I shall be glad to urge the setting apart of 100,000 acres for them. This will show what the remarks of the Premier in regard to the Agricultural Bank have done. These people in Northam are principally mechanics; they have decided to go on the land and they have decided to form a sort of co-operation so as to be able to get there, and when they get there to be able to carry on.

MR. HORAN: Will the present Government support that?

MR. TAYLOR: They will support anything.

THE HONORARY MINISTER: In connection with the farther building of agricultural railway lines, I wish it to be distinctly understood that, as far as I am concerned, I intend to see that the small holder gets the land that is nearest to our railways. It is absolutely necessary that the small man should not only have the very best of the country, but the very best means of transit. Whilst the large man may be able to go 10 or 15 miles from a railway, it is quite impossible for the small man to do so; therefore, for that purpose I favour the cutting up



of land adjacent to the railways for settlement in the way I have indicated. Mr. Bath has said that I do not believe in a land tax. He is absolutely right. I do not believe in increased taxation at all in the ordinary sense; but taxation is necessary, and one of the only means left to us is the imposition of a land tax. Whilst I do not believe in it I am compelled to support it: I am compelled to support this proposal because I realise that increased taxation is necessary, and I support it the more readily when I remember that much of the money we have lost through the falling off in the revenue from the Customs is in the pockets of the people. Notwithstanding what Mr. Bath has said, some of the farmers do pay duties. Much of the money that the State has lost through the falling off in the Customs revenue is in the pockets of the people, and the people will in consequence have to pay some other form of taxation.

MR. BATH: It is in the pockets of the middleman.

THE HONORARY MINISTER: It may for the moment be in the pockets of the middleman, but it will not stay there long. I am perfectly certain that the public generally are quite capable of taking care of themselves, and seeing that the middleman to whom the hon. member refers does not have the money that ought to be saved to them.

MR. BATH: I am referring to the views of your own side.

THE HONORARY MINISTER: These are my views. I can trust the people to get all they are entitled to, and a bit more as a rule. Some reference has been made to the Public Service Commissioner. I believe this officer is not only an exceedingly capable man, but I believe his appointment will prove to be a very useful one, and so long as the Act remains I hope the Government will support the official. I object to the Government being made a buffer of, but the Commissioner should be the buffer between the Government and the civil servants. [Interjection.] We have not had time to consider the classification of the civil servants. The member for East Fremantle referred to the great Nor'-West. I agree with him that something ought to be done there, and something is being done. We are putting

down artesian bores, and if we prove the existence of artesian water there, then we shall have done a great deal to help the squatter, because he will be enabled to put down bores to provide water for his stock, and in that way increase the carrying capacity of his property. I want to say that we cannot carry out the building of railways, neither can we carry out a scheme of advances to settlers except by borrowing money. I am not at all afraid to go to the market for the money for the purposes indicated. It is absolutely necessary that we should borrow money. The money borrowed in the past has been well spent, and the money we shall borrow in the future will be equally well invested, and in the directions I have indicated it will be an absolutely good investment.

MR. BATH: Figures do not prove that to be so.

THE HONORARY MINISTER: I think the figures do prove it to be so. I think the figures go to show that the money we have borrowed in the past has been very well invested indeed when you remember that on an investment of £13,865,000 the result for 1904 was only a loss of £4,600.

MR. BATH: That is allowing for working expenses?

THE HONORARY MINISTER: Not for sinking fund.

MR. BATH: Interest.

THE HONORARY MINISTER: Interest, but not sinking fund. I should like to refer again briefly to the Agricultural Bank in order that members may realise that this bank has been doing some good work during the past few months. We have had 1,100 applications during last year, aggregating £171,000, of which we advanced £96,000 to borrowers, and we must realise that the expenditure of this £96,000 was very good for the country. I would like to say that I hope the time is not far distant when instead of advancing £96,000 during the year we shall advance three or four times that sum.

MR. E. C. BARNETT (Albany): It must be a source of great gratification to members of the House and to the country at large to know that very great developments have occurred recently at great depths at Kalgoorlie, also the promising outlook at the present time at Ravens-

thorpe on the Phillips River, which with the favourable prospects at Black Range and Pilbarra, I think can reasonably lead us to hope for a brighter future in mining than we have had in the past. I trust the Government, taking in view the favourable prospects of the mining industry, will give the construction of railway lines to assist these promising fields their early and most careful consideration. In connection with the construction of railways to assist the mining industry, while I shall support every reasonable proposal where I think the circumstances warrant such a line being constructed, it will be only fair that a special rate should be charged. The credit of the country would be pledged to construct what in a great measure would be speculative railways. The construction of these lines would lessen the cost of the working and development of the fields. While the country is prepared to assist in the development of the mining industry in this manner, a special rate for a time at least should be charged on both the carriage of goods and the conveyance of passengers. In making this suggestion and in advocating this idea I do not think I am asking anything unreasonable from the mining industry, nothing more than an ordinary business man would ask in taking a risk. Referring to the construction of agricultural railway lines, I have to refer to one point in connection with this matter with great regret, and that is the unseemly haste with which the measures for the construction of three railway lines were passed last session and rushed through the House. I trust not only this, but any future Ministry will not again put such a strain on the loyalty of their supporters as to ask them to pass such important measures without allowing them time to give the same due consideration. Were the three measures spoken of brought before the House at the present time, I would require to know a great deal more about them than I do now before supporting them. Whilst approving of the policy of the Government to construct railway lines to develop the agricultural interests of this State, I think it will be wise, before this is gone on with to any great extent, to fully consider the relative merits of loop lines and spur lines of railways. From informa-

tion I have gathered during the recess I think it is very doubtful whether in many instances the construction of loop lines instead of spur lines, which are so largely advocated at present, would not, with an equal expenditure of money, open up a larger area of country, be more convenient, afford a more regular service to those settled on the land, be more economically worked, and require a much smaller amount of rolling-stock to work them. I think a mixture of the two systems would be advisable. I am convinced that under some circumstances loop lines would do more for the State than spur lines would. I trust that before any lands opened up by these new railway lines are thrown open to selection the Minister for Lands will insist upon the system of survey before selection. I also think that a fair value should be charged for the land. We do not want to give away the land in the future as has been done in the past. We are pledging the credit of this State, or proposing to do so, in a large extent to raise money to construct these agricultural lines, and one of the great assets of this country consists of its lands. What I would propose in connection with this is that the land be surveyed before selection, plans drawn out, and the size of the blocks surveyed be in accordance with the quality of the land. Where the land is of first-class quality, a moderate-sized block, a few hundred acres, will keep a family comfortably; where the land is of poorer quality, the size of the block surveyed should be larger. As to the value to be placed upon the blocks, if the land is worth £2 per acre the person who takes it up should be charged that amount; if it is worth 5s. an acre, let him pay that sum; and if it is only worth 2s. 6d. an acre, put that value upon it. The terms on which settlement should take place in the future are that 5 per cent. interest on the value of the land selected should be charged to the selector. [MEMBER: Value for value?] Yes. The money should be received as interest, not as part of the purchase money. The selector should have up to 20 years, as at present, to complete the purchase, and at any time during the currency of that period he should be able, on the necessary improvements being completed, by paying

the value fixed on the land, to obtain the Crown grant of the same. I think this proposal one of the most reasonable outside of Western Australia on which land is offered to the selector. It is one that would safeguard the interests of the State and not in any way tend to check selection. Thousands of acres of land have been taken up in the past, and at a very recent period, and those who have selected them will take 20 years to pay in. After an expenditure of £1 or 30s. an acre sales, have taken place at £2 10s. and £3 an acre; and in some cases even more is asked. If the land is worth this money, surely the State is entitled to a portion of the increased value which is going to take place. And the interests of the State should be safeguarded to that extent. I consider it the duty of members of this House to see that in any future legislation the interests of the State are safeguarded. I am a supporter of the proposal of the Government to impose a land tax. I consider that the finances of the State should be conducted as nearly as possible on the same lines as would be adopted by a prudent business man in carrying on his business; that is, that the Government should make the revenue of the State at least balance the expenditure. The doubt in my mind is whether the Government have gone far enough; whether they should not at the same time have introduced an income tax. There is not the slightest doubt that in the past in Western Australia wealth has not contributed its fair proportion to the revenue of the State; and in speaking on this matter I am not doing so in any selfish way, because I am pleased to say I shall have to contribute pretty liberally both towards the land tax and income tax. I look upon an increased taxation at the present time, in order to get the finances into a sound state, as an investment on the part of those who are in a position to pay it. I am certain that the increased prosperity which will follow through the finances being got into a sound state will put us into a much more favourable position to go on the London money market to borrow money; and that the extra money paid by the owners of property and those who have wealth will more than be returned to them within the course of a very few years. I

regard extra taxation in this matter as an investment, and not as a loss. Whilst supporting the Government in their proposals to increase taxation, I would strongly urge upon them the necessity for exercising every economy in the shape of avoiding all unnecessary public buildings and all unnecessary unproductive public works. I am of opinion that a considerable saving can be made in the civil service of this State. I think that lots of offices in this State are overmanned, and the question is how we can deal with this. The suggestion I would make, and I think it is the only way out of the difficulty without creating an amount of hardship, which we all wish to avoid, is this. In the natural course of things some retire from the public service of this State every year; they have to do so on account of ailments. Deaths occur, and there are vacancies from other causes. I would urge upon the officers administering the different departments of the State that, instead of making fresh appointments to the service, suitable men be transferred from one position to the other; and if this system be carried out we shall find, in the course of a few years, that the public service will pretty well have righted itself, and the administration will be carried out equally as well as at the present time and at much less cost.

MR. TAYLOR: That is largely adopted now.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: It was the policy of the Leake Government.

HON. F. H. PRIESE: It was the policy of every Government.

MR. BARNETT: With reference to the proposal of the Government to give the Fremantle Harbour Trust power to borrow money to construct a graving dock, the member for North Fremantle (Mr. Bolton) spoke as if the harbour works at Fremantle belonged to Fremantle. I take it that the harbour works at Fremantle, out of the revenue of which it is proposed the Harbour Trust shall pay the interest on the proposed graving dock, are a national matter. The works have been constructed by money borrowed by the State, and I, for one, want very full information as to the cost of the proposed dock and the expected revenue from it before I consent to such a large and valuable asset of the

State being practically handed over in its entirety to the Fremantle Harbour Trust or to any other board. Whilst impressing upon members the necessity for economy, there is one section of the community which I consider should receive every consideration from them. The section to which I allude are the settlers in the sparsely-settled districts; and the roads boards in those districts should receive every reasonable assistance from the Government in constructing roads where needed, even though the assistance given appears very large in proportion to the amount of rates paid. For this reason, that in constructing roads and bridges the Government are opening up country of which in many instances 99 per cent. is owned by the State and only 1 per cent. by the selectors; so that the investment is really for the benefit of the State itself more than it is for those who will settle on the land; and unless country is opened up in this manner in many districts settlement will be very slow.

At 6:30, the SPEAKER left the Chair.

At 7:30, Chair resumed.

MR. BARNETT (continuing): During last session, the member for Claremont (Mr. Foulkes) introduced a short Bill to prevent the granting of any additional publicans' licenses. The hon. member understood that the Government would at an early date introduce an amending Licensing Bill, which the then Premier promised to introduce during this session; a Bill to deal comprehensively with the liquor traffic, and to introduce the principle of local option. On the strength of the Premier's promise, I voted against the Bill of the member for Claremont. As there is no reference in the Governor's Speech to a Licensing Bill this session, and as many members are pledged to their constituents to support a certain measure of local option, I think it is the duty of the Ministry to introduce this session a short Bill to provide that no additional licenses shall be granted until the Government have had time to prepare and introduce a Bill fully dealing with the liquor traffic of this State. I am certain that a short Bill with that object would receive nearly unanimous support, and would be in the best interests of the

country. I should like to draw the attention of the Ministry to the report of a select committee of this House appointed last session to inquire into the alleged surfeit of horse-racing, and should like to know whether Ministers intend to act on that report. I consider that one of the principal causes of the existing depression in this State is the wasteful expenditure induced by this surfeit of horse-racing; and the sooner steps are taken to regulate this sport, the better it will be for the country. I should also strongly urge the Government to pass laws relating to gambling, giving the police fuller powers to deal with this growing evil.

MR. C. A. HUDSON (Dundas): I do not intend to-night to make a long speech; and I propose to endeavour to avoid such matters as have been fully dealt with here during the debate on the Address. But I cannot allow this occasion to pass without entering a protest, with other protests that have been entered here, against the policy, or want of policy, adopted by the Government in the preparation of the Speech delivered by His Excellency the Governor. The absolute destitution of that Speech makes it very difficult for anyone to treat fairly, calmly, and considerately all the matters brought before the House, and leaves him in the position of not really knowing what is intended to be done by the Government who have prepared that alleged programme. I say that the Government have not, in this instance, fairly treated the members of this Assembly, and that has been shown by the speeches not only on this (Opposition) side of the House, but on that. Members have not been treated with that consideration which should be accorded on an occasion like this. There is in the Speech an absence of any definite proposals. Certainly there is a number of platitudes introduced. The Speech is full of platitudes; full of promises that Ministers will do this, that, and the other; nothing definite, but statements that they are about to do something for the development of the natural resources and industries of this country; but what their proposals are they do not have the consideration to mention. What, then, has happened? In the course of this debate the corkscrew has had to be applied to obtain from Ministers any idea at all of their proposals. Certainly

they would seem to have inspired the member for Swan (Mr. Gull), because he gave us some information. In a very lucid, eloquent, and logical speech, he clearly showed to the country either what was or what should be the policy of the Government. However, I think that the truth lies a little beyond the ken of the member for Swan; because there can be only one of two reasons, to my mind, why the Government have been so reticent, so close in their treatment of us. First, they may have made up their minds that they will not disclose their measures until they have had them thoroughly discussed in caucus; and what leads me to this opinion is that those who have been in their caucus have been able to enlighten the House on certain subjects, when even Ministers themselves would not give us light. The only other theory I can formulate for the inaction of the Government is that they are adopting the policy previously adopted by men in the same position—waiting an opportunity to count heads, and to find out how far they can go with their legislation. In either case, I say that they are not showing that determination and resolution demanded of the Government of a country, and that they are prostituting the principles and the functions of Responsible Government. When this Governor's Speech is stripped of its raiment of platitudes, we find that the Government intend to develop the natural resources and industries of the country.

MR. A. J. WILSON: Are any of them about Norseman?

MR. HUDSON: I do not know whether the hon. member is the paid interjector for the Government side; but I do not propose to take any notice of him. I take up the position that the Government say they intend to construct railways throughout the State—some railways in the agricultural districts, and some on the goldfields. I should like at this stage to explain the attitude which I took up when the three agricultural Railway Bills were introduced here last session. On that occasion, I and other members in Opposition distinctly stated that we were in favour of the construction of agricultural lines, but that we could not and would not bring ourselves to support such measures unless we had more time to

consider them. Our action on that occasion has, I think, been perfectly justified, even out of the mouths of those who have spoken on the other side of the House. To-day an hon. member said that it was a strain on his loyalty to have to vote for those Railway Bills. Even the Premier himself, when speaking last night, said it was absolutely necessary, if a member were to treat properly measures brought before the House, that he should be thoroughly acquainted with the subject involved. The Premier said he had travelled through the country, sometimes riding on horseback, out all night, and so forth, to gain information. That is what I and those with me voted for when we opposed the introduction of those three Bills; and that also was the position then taken up by the member for Fremantle (Hon. J. Price), now Minister for Works. But he did not do what was done on this side of the House. He spoke very forcibly against those measures, but was conveniently absent from his seat when they were put to a vote. I should like to say that the construction of agricultural railways is a sound policy for this country, and one which I think is approved by everybody. I do not wish to utter one word in protest against the construction of these railways providing due and proper inquiry is made into them before the Bills are brought into this Chamber; and these inquiries should be particularly directed to ascertain whether or not the railways are going through property to provide for owners who are already upon the spot and have large areas, who are not benefiting the country, and who have not done so in the past. In choosing these lines it is the duty of the Government to provide for a number of settlers and not to provide for the aggrandisement of the few. Before leaving this subject of agricultural railway lines, I may mention that they are for the purpose of settlement, certainly, but they are for the purpose of opening up the country and settling people on the land to become producers. These producers will require a market for their produce, and I am pleased to see in the Governor's Speech—there are certainly one or two features in the Speech with which I am pleased, and that is one of them—[THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is extraordinary]—I

hope I am not surprising the Minister, it would be a pity to disturb his equilibrium—I am pleased to see in the Speech that at last the Government have discovered it is necessary to have a market for the produce of the State, and that the goldfields supply that market. So when the question of the construction of railway lines on the goldfields is taken into consideration, I trust the Government will see that those railways are constructed in places where there is population and where there is a large extent of auriferous or copper country. There are two railways needed in my district which I may mention at this stage without attempting to deprive the member for North Fremantle (Mr. Bolton) of his rôle of the parochial. In Dundas, at present, there is not one mile of railway. There are three goldfields and a copper field. The information leaked out in another place that the Government were going to build a railway from Ravenshorpe to Starvation Boat Harbour. I would like to ask the Minister for Railways whether he is aware of any project for the building of that railway from Ravenshorpe to Starvation Boat Harbour, whether the port of Hopetoun is to be neglected altogether, and, if so, why he has not made the country acquainted with the fact; and whether, if it is the intention of the Government to build the line from Starvation Boat Harbour, they have reserved any land there. I would be very much interested in the replies, because I could make use of the information when addressing the House on mining matters. Another matter that would be of benefit to the country is the construction of the Norseman Railway, which has been before the House so often, and which has been promised so often. I do not propose to go into the matter on this occasion, because I am going to seek another opportunity and to avail myself of it, if I get it, to discuss that matter. The Premier told us last night of the intention of the Government in regard to the agricultural railways, and he promised us that the Minister for Mines and Railways would disclose to us to-night something in regard to the Bills to be brought forward for the construction of railways on the goldfields.

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES:** I do not think so, in regard to railways.

**MR. HUDSON:** The Premier promised it. Passing to the question of the Mines Department, I am pleased to see that the Minister is in a good humour. I desire to congratulate him on being a very promising Minister for Mines. It seems strange to use the adjective, because the Minister has had such great experience, but I think his experience is largely in the direction of making promises and not being able to carry them out. I do not wish to labour this question; in fact I am not physically fit to do justice to the subject to-night; but I would like to emphasize the fact that the Minister has made promises time and again to assist the prospectors in the development of the mines in outlying districts of the goldfields. So far as my experience goes, not one action has he performed since his appointment as Minister for Mines in that direction. I would like to draw the attention of the Minister to the question that has been before him on many an occasion, and upon which he has made very many promises, that is the question of the treatment of the slimes at the Government battery at Norseman. At this battery there has been lying from 1902, I think, a very large dump. It was collected previously, but the Minister promised that the slimes would be treated and that the men would be paid by the results from that date. The slimes are still there and the men have not received any money. The prospectors that won the stone from which the slimes were obtained are still working there, and the Government are holding up thousands of pounds of their money and not allowing it to be distributed. Even as late as this year the Minister distinctly promised that a plant for the treatment of these slimes would be erected and completed by the end of April, and that the men would be able to get their money as the slimes were treated; but not one piece of machinery has been placed there, not one thing has been done, and it is in the same position to-day in July, 1906, as it was when the Minister promised the plant in April, 1902. That is not the manner in which the Mines Department should be administered if it is the intention of the department to assist the prospector. There are many other matters I might bring under the notice of the Minister in the same way, in particular the question of the erection

of a battery at Kundip. He has had that matter placed before him on several occasions, and nothing has been done, although the yield of gold has materially increased. The Minister is better acquainted with the figures than I am, and I do not propose to go into details, preferring to deal generally with the subject; but the number of leases has increased twenty-fold, and so has the gold yield, without any assistance from the Government beyond the payment of a subsidy of 2s. to a tinpot battery owned by a company.

**THE MINISTER OF MINES:** Are they not getting their stone crushed at Government prices?

**MR. HUDSON:** No. I desire to let members know how the affairs of the Mines Department are really conducted. We have been informed that the Government have made a sale of the smelter at Ravensthorpe for the sum of £5,000. I dare say the Minister will congratulate himself upon having made a good deal, and I have no doubt he will get a great deal of satisfaction from the statements made by the member for Swan (Mr. Gull), who said that he approved of the smelter having been sold and that it was a good riddance. Bearing in mind the generally expressed intentions of the Minister to assist the prospector, I would like the House to consider what benefit the sale of the smelter will be to the prospector. The excuse put forward for the sale of the property to Mr. Kaufman has been that it was not a paying concern to the Government, and that as the purchaser had acquired many of the mines in the district and options over others and had control over the district, therefore the Government were not able to use the smelter any more and the Minister was bound to sell. I would like to know by what mysterious process the Minister for Mines was able to absorb the ideas of Mr. Kaufman. Anyone viewing the position calmly and considerately will see how the transaction came about. The Minister for Mines, who has not been in the district for some considerable time, met Mr. Kaufman. Mr. Kaufman has bought certain mines in the district and has options over others, but the Minister will not, I think, say that Mr. Kaufman has control of all the mines and all the copper-bearing country in that district.

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES:** I did not say so.

**MR. HUDSON:** No; I say that you could not say so. I am using that for the purpose of my argument. The Minister cannot say that Mr. Kaufman had nearly all the mines or nearly all the copper-producing country in that neighbourhood. It is possible for the prospector—and if he is to be encouraged he will do so—to go out to find other mines in that neighbourhood. What encouragement is there for men to go out prospecting? There is about 15 miles of copper-bearing country. Is it likely that a man will go out prospecting for other mines when he finds that the only place where he can get his ore treated is at the smelter owned by Mr. Kaufman? The man will have to go, as the Minister did, to Mr. Kaufman saying, "Please, Mr. Kaufman, buy my smelter." When the prospector finds a show he has to go to Mr. Kaufman and say, "Please, Mr. Kaufman, treat my ore." Certainly an arrangement has been made—I do not wish to mislead the House—for the treatment of ore for two years; but when the two years have passed, the whole of the field will be at the mercy of Mr. Kaufman.

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES:** I hope we will have a railway then.

**MR. HUDSON:** I hope the Minister will be able to disclose whether the Government are going to build that line or whether Mr. Kaufman has bought that also; whether the Minister has made a sacrifice not only of his own scalp but of the scalps of all the people down there to enable Mr. Kaufman to have a monopoly of that field. It has been quite on the cards that Mr. Kaufman is going to build a railway from Ravensthorpe to Starvation Boat Harbour, that he is going to get a new harbour, and that the old town, where the Government and the people have invested money, is to be thrown aside, because Mr. Kaufman is to have a railway. That is the position in regard to the smelter to-day. I object to the transaction, because it is not of any assistance to the prospector to give a monopoly to one man over the whole of the situation. I was going to speak on other subjects, but I am afraid I am not able to do so. I trust the remarks I have made will at least do something towards the assistance of those who are working

in the back blocks of the country, and who are opening up and making markets for those who have been spoon-fed in the cities. I trust the remarks I made on opening will not be misconstrued, that the Government will take members of the House more into their confidence, so that due consideration and inquiry can be made into the projects submitted, and if the measures proposed are in the interests of the State and for the welfare of the people, I shall support them.

MR. G. TAYLOR (Mt. Margaret) : I am not going to promise the House that I shall not deal in personalities or anything of that description, because members who have preceded me in this debate, even Ministers, have promised the House not to do so, and the House has been subjected to a torrent of abuse. In dealing with the Address-in-Reply, under the circumstances in which it has been placed in the hands of His Excellency the Governor, it is right for me, as the oldest Labour member in this House, being one of the first six who was returned in 1901, and the only one of the six remaining in the House as a Labour member to-day, and having had the advantage of seeing the changes which have taken place in this Parliament during that period, to give my experiences to the House to-night. I hope I shall not weary members in doing so. We have had in Western Australia since responsible government nine Premiers. Of that number eight have held the position of Premier while I have been a member of Parliament. Seven have led the House while I have sat in it. The position of parties when I came into the House was this : there were three parties, the remnant of the Sir John Forrest Government, which ran for a very long period in this State, a reign longer than the whole of the other Governments that have followed; there was the Opposition which was led, the year previous to my entering into Parliament, by the member for Cue of that day, who is now the member for West Perth, and there was also the Labour party numbering six. I want to show to the House that, notwithstanding the changes in all these Governments, there has been no circumstance surrounding the change of any Government that savours of so much disgrace to the politics of Western Aus-

tralia as the changes in the Government who now hold the reins of power. I want to point out the position of parties to-day. The Leake Government claimed to be the first Liberal Government in Western Australia. Of the members of that Ministry and followers of it there are but three members sitting in the House to-day. These three are the member for West Perth, the Minister for Mines, and the Treasurer. I am now dealing with the supporters of the first Leake Government, the remnant of the opposition to the Sir John Forrest Government, leaving the Labour party on one side. [The MINISTER FOR MINES interjected.] We have three of the first Liberal Government remaining in this House. I was one of the strongest supporters of that Government until it turned dog. I supported that Government until that Government betrayed me. The first action of treachery which occurred in Western Australia emanated the day I left and refused to support that Government. [Interjection.] No matter what odour surrounds the Daglish Government, it is nothing compared with that which surrounds the present Government. I could perhaps speak more viciously of the Daglish Government than any other member, having gone through the mill as I did; but from sitting calmly and listening to members and the Press of the country discussing the position of the Government, one cannot compare the changes in the Daglish Government with the changes in the Rason-cum-Moore Government. There are in the House to-day of the old Tory Government, as it was called in those days, the Sir John Forrest Government, the member for Wellington (Mr. Hayward), the member for Canning, then the member for South Perth (Mr. Gordon); Mr. Piesse, member for the Williams; Mr. Ewing, the member for the South-West Mining District then, now member for Collie; Mr. Monger, for York at that time; Mr. Rason, at that time representing Guildford; Mr. Stone, Mr. Butcher, and the member for Roebourne (Dr. Hicks). We have these gentlemen to-day supporters of the present Liberal Government that we hear so much talk about. On my first entering Parliament these members were Conservatives, but they are supporters of the Liberal Government to-day. There are really only two of the Liberal Leake



Government in this House, the member for West Perth and the Minister for Mines, because Mr. Wilson, the then member for Perth, who is to-day Treasurer, deserted his party and went over to the Tories. [MEMBER: Somersaulted.] Acrobatic feats on the Government side of the House are so common that the matter is not worth mentioning. My object in pointing out the position is that in 1901 there were something like 160,000 people in Western Australia, and there are something over 260,000 people in Western Australia to-day; therefore there are at least 100,000 people in Western Australia to-day who have no knowledge of the real acrobatic feats of the gentlemen who grace the Treasury bench, and I am taking this opportunity of addressing the country on this point. We have on the Government side to-day two members of the Liberal Government, and nine or ten Conservatives. The Minister for Mines will say they have absorbed the Tories. I want to say this, to be fair to the Government. Is it reasonable to expect that two gentlemen will absorb nine or ten, or is it fairer for me to say, that the nine or ten have absorbed the two? I believe they have drifted. The Liberals have drifted to the Tories, and to-day we have the Tory of Tories leading the Government of the State. I will deal no longer with the acrobatic feats of the Treasurer. They are well known, but in passing I say I was one of the Labour representatives when the Morgans Ministry took office, and when Ministers had to go to the electors, in accordance with the Constitution Act, for re-election. I was told off by my party to go to the Murchison to help to defeat the then Attorney General, the late Mr. Justice Moorhead. I went there with the Minister for Mines, who had then just been relieved of his office, which I think was held for the time being by the present Treasurer. We travelled to Peak Hill, and we opened our campaign at Nannine in favour of the Labour candidate, Mr. Holman, who, I am pleased to say, was successful at the polls, and I am pleased that he has been returned unopposed ever since. I want to give the country the opinions which were held by the Minister for Mines at that time of the present Treasurer. I spoke from the same platform as the member for Menzies did. I

have been campaigning for a number of years, and I want to say I have never heard in the whole of my history utterances so strong against any Minister in my lifetime as those uttered by the Minister for Mines at that time. I have tried on many occasions to outpace him, but I have failed. I want to say I was then deeply sensible of the fact that there were no Press representatives within hundreds of miles of us, and even with that advantage I failed to be able to denounce the member who now holds the position of Treasurer, with anything like the success the Minister for Mines did. My opinion of the Treasurer is known from one end of the country to the other. But there were no speeches delivered during that heated campaign, no matter how strongly they vilified the Treasurer, that could compare with the speeches delivered by the Minister for Mines. No matter how strongly people denounced him, and they denounced him strongly in Perth, still they could not come up to the remarks of the member for Menzies. And in Perth the Treasurer was defeated at the ballot-box. In that campaign anything at all was good enough for the Minister for Mines to abuse the hon. gentleman with. There was no high standard of politics then. He did his best on every opportunity to vilify the Morgans Ministry. He vilified Mr. Morgans. He characterised the Government as the greatest boodlers and bounders on the earth. He called Mr. Morgans the gilt-edged boodler of Western Australia, and the present Treasurer he called the greatest boodler and bounder in Western Australia. The Minister for Mines said the Treasurer was the prince of boodlers, and that if they allowed him to be returned he would ruin and plunder the country. I want to be sincere. You, Mr. Speaker, were a member of the Government of which I speak. I tried hard to hold my own with the Minister for Mines; I had no record to keep up as a platform speaker, but at the same time I thought I should not be left at the barrier, but I tried and failed ignominiously to keep up with the Minister for Mines. When it comes to absolutely pure and unadulterated abuse the Minister for Mines is a top-notcher. I want to know, why this change of front? I want to know why the Minister

for Mines sits on great questions with the Colonial Treasurer to-day, when something like five or six years only have elapsed since these strong denunciations were made. I do not see any more virtue in the hon. gentleman to-day than I did then. I want to say this for the hon. gentleman, that ever since I have been in this Parliament I have been on opposite sides to the present Colonial Treasurer, and I have always looked upon him as being a man who was an undying opponent to labour, an undying opponent of the principles I represent in this Chamber; and more than that, I recognise in him an able opponent, an opponent to be reckoned with on every occasion; and that is proved and demonstrated beyond doubt by the attitude that hon. gentleman has taken up time after time in the Arbitration Court in defending the capital of this country against the workers. I recognised him then, as I do now, as an able opponent, and I want to say that if he was so bad then he is no better now, in my opinion; and why does the Minister for Mines, who vilified him on that occasion as being a boodler, a bounder, a private enterpriser and the colleague of Teesdale Smith, now sit with him? That gentleman is not here, and I will not use his name again. I will not couple his name with that of the Minister. The report of a combine was spoken of, and the name of my friend the then member for Williams (Mr. Piesse), was bandied about from one end of the Murchison to the other. These men are supporting him. I find he was willing to serve under them. I find that the hon. gentleman's principles are always amenable to any support he will get that will keep him in as Minister for Mines. He is always capable of serving under any leader and gaining their confidence.

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES:** Thank God I never won yours.

**MR. TAYLOR:** The hon. gentleman won mine for six months when I first entered Parliament, at which time I was, I was going to say, young and unsophisticated. I pleaded youth. I will on this occasion plead innocence and not youth. I want to tell the hon. member that I was amongst others of our party who were largely instrumental in putting him in charge of the Mines Department.

When Mr. Leake, with his small minority of 17 members in his party, took the reins of government in this country there were six members of the Labour party—these with the 17 making 23—and they pledged him their support. There were 27 in Opposition, but in spite of that the late Mr. Leake as Premier of this country led the House in a straightforward and able manner with 23 supporters. I defy contradiction of that assertion. I supported the hon. gentleman and his Government until, as I said before, they turned traitor, and the first political treachery practically in this country started on that very occasion in respect to the gentleman who has caused so much discussion in this Chamber, the late member for Guildford (Mr. Rason). It was then he caused so much bad feeling in his own party and in the House generally by his action at that particular time. I only want to point out, in justice to the Minister for Mines, why he has changed his opinion. When that hon. gentleman addresses himself to the question before the House he will be able, with his wonderful oratorical powers, to make clear to the House and to the country the reason why he can sit side by side now with the Colonial Treasurer without feeling ashamed of himself. I am not going to say to the hon. gentleman—

**MR. SPEAKER:** I must draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that although there is a considerable amount of scope allowed in the debate on the Address-in-Reply, it is provided under our Standing Orders that—

No hon. member shall digress from the subject matter of any question under discussion; and all imputations of improper motives, and all personal reflections on members, shall be considered highly disorderly.

I think the hon. member has had a fairly good time allowed him, and I request him in common decency to confine himself to the subject matter before the House, and to, as far as possible, limit his remarks in regard to the person of any Minister or any member of the House.

**MR. TAYLOR:** I have no desire to transgress the rules of debate, and I am always willing and ready to accept your ruling. I recognise that without that

the business of this House cannot be carried on. With all due respect to you, sir, I think that so far as the debate has gone other members have transgressed equally if not more than I have done. Some have talked about scum, and all this, from their own side, in the first person. I am only repeating incidents that have occurred in connection with Governments in this country, which it is necessary in my opinion to mention for future Governments. I will say again that I will try and address myself to the subject before the House, but it is necessary for somebody who has had the experience in Parliament that I have had from this side of the House to point out to the country the political changes and acrobatic feats of the present Ministers, and when we find the Press of this country has forgotten their acrobatic feats, I can bring reports of four or five years ago from the *West Australian* and the *Morning Herald* and read them; but I will not do so on this occasion. I will content myself with reading extracts from the Press during the months of May and June of this year, which will be sufficiently strong and to the point to condemn the present Government in the eyes of the country. Whatever members may think in connection with the few remarks I have made to-night in connection with the old political feeling which existed between the Ministers that sit so cosily together, I have little or no feeling in the matter myself, so far as the hon. gentleman is concerned; only that it is necessary that the country should know how diverse the opinions of those gentlemen were but a few years ago. [Interjection by Mr. GORDON.] I want to let the member for Canning (Mr. Gordon) know that whatever attitude the Government or their supporters may take up I stand to-day in the same position as I stood then. I was then representing the interests of labour, and I am doing so to-day. I am doing it to the very best of my ability, and I assert that no matter how members of this Chamber have excelled in acrobatic feats, I have none to my credit. I may perhaps have done what I should not have done—

MR. GORDON: You tried very hard to upset Mr. Daglish, and succeeded.

MR. TAYLOR: I want to say that I believed then and I believe now that I would not have been doing my duty in this House as a Labour man if I had not done then what I did; and if the same thing arose in this House again with a Labour Government in power, and Ministers would not climb down from a position I considered detrimental to the best interests of Western Australia, I would help to throw them out of power.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: You were pretty mild when you held office.

MR. TAYLOR: I am pretty mild. I am too mild; that is the trouble. I will always condemn what I think to be wrong in this Chamber, and I always have done so. With reference to the present position of affairs I will not give the opinion of the members on this side of the House. I will read reports of gentlemen who have been Ministers with some of the present Government, who are taking a very strong part in the politics of this country, and who are to-day standing for election, supporting the present Government. I will read an interview with Mr. J. M. Hopkins—who is a Ministerial candidate standing for Pilbarra to-day, I believe—which I think is perfectly in order, and I only want to point out the opinions which the present Government's own colleagues have of them:—

Statement by Mr. J. M. Hopkins—A Portentous Blunder—Mr. Wilson's Somersaults.

A representative of the *West Australian* last night questioned Mr. J. M. Hopkins as to whether he desired to offer any criticism regarding the new political development. Referring to the announcement that Mr. Rason intended to recommend the Governor to ask Mr. Frank Wilson to form a Cabinet, Mr. Hopkins said:—"The surprise which such an announcement evokes must awaken Mr. Rason to a due sense of the portentous blunder he has made. The Liberal party will recall the dexterity with which Mr. Wilson somersaulted from their ranks into the emoluments of office under Mr. Morgans. Before that incident was forgotten a similar feat was witnessed when his presence was found once more amidst the Liberals. Loyalty to the State at a critical juncture alone prevented myself and others retiring from the party which admitted democrats of Mr. Wilson's order. Mr. Rason has marred by this his latest methods every creditable record of his premiership. Certain persons have been active during the last few days, and no doubt a stronger man than Mr. Rason might fall from grace when made subject to such

unscrupulous jerrymanderers. The Liberal party is now faced with treachery. Solidarity melts like mist before the rising sun in cases of this kind. For months the present Premier allowed his party to drift to disaster. Rather than face the penalties he so richly earned, he has now sought refuge for himself at £1,500 per year. With that ignoble appointment up his sleeve he now, in opposition to the wishes of his party, chooses the only member of his Cabinet who is mistrusted in the country and objectionable to every politician claiming to represent the wishes of the people as his successor. The problem with which Mr. Wilson is confronted is that of forming a Government which will win confirmation by the electors at the polls. I do not hesitate to say that the Liberal members of the present Administration will point-blank refuse to be associated with a deal that is difficult to describe in adequate language. I am in a position to state that not one goldfields representative will countenance the selection made. On a previous occasion it will be remembered that the Liberals denied assistance to Mr. Illingworth, whom they deemed to be unsuited to the leadership of the party. The same methods used then must be applied again in order that the commission may be returned to His Excellency with the mournful intimation that Mr. Wilson regrets his inability to form a Cabinet, and explaining that Mr. Rason's advice so generously tendered was bad and not worthy of acceptance." Mr. Hopkins went on to say that he did not believe Mr. Wilson would be able to form a Ministry. "Yet if my forecast is wrong," he added, "I am sure of one thing, that each Minister may rely upon most interesting opposition. I may say that my own services will at once be made available to contest any vacancy arising from this latest and most astonishing development."

I should like to say that Mr. Hopkins is a man of his word. His services are available, available to-day at Pilbarra to support the present Government, with the member for Sussex (Hon. F. Wilson) as a Cabinet Minister holding the portfolio of Treasurer—the second man in the Cabinet, as I am reminded, though some go so far as to say he is the first. Mr. Hopkins continues:—

If I might be allowed to put forward a suggestion which I think must present itself at this time, I should say that two important reforms are needed; firstly a reduction of the remuneration of the Agent General from £1,500 to £500 per year, and, secondly, an amendment of the Constitution Act requiring a newly appointed Premier to in all cases go before his constituents.

Now I suppose it was in Mr. Hopkins's mind's eye, when he granted that interview, that it was necessary, owing to the political shuffles that had taken place,

that the Premier should go before his constituents for acceptance or rejection. We now come to another passage which is rather interesting. The interviewer says:—

You are not at all pleased with the present situation? Mr. Hopkins replied: "I certainly am not. If as an auctioneer I were to sum the position up in the language of my business, I should say, 'Going, going, gone, sold.'"

Now, what was in Mr. Hopkins's mind? What was going, what was gone, and what was sold? Was the country sold, or was the position of Agent General sold, or was the position of Premier sold? What had this eminent auctioneer, Mr. Hopkins, in his mind when he had this interview with the Press about his colleagues, and his colleagues with whom he had served in a Government of which the present Government claims to be a continuation? It is not from an interview with anyone on this (Opposition) side of the House that I read these abusive observations with regard to Ministers' integrity and honour, and capability of leading this country to a creditable position in the Commonwealth of Australia. These observations do not come from those who opposed Ministerial members at the last election. These are not my views. If I uttered sentiments as harsh as these, people would say that the member for Mount Margaret was speaking as a partisan. These are not the views of a partisan, but of a gentleman who took a prominent part in what was practically the present Government—for it has been argued that this is the Rason Government—a gentleman who was a Minister and colleague of Mr. Rason, a gentleman who was a Minister in the James Government, and who is now standing for election as a supporter of the present Government. Is it not time that some man stood up in this Chamber with the courage to denounce this sort of thing? What is to be thought of a man who could give such an interview to the *West Australian*, the leading newspaper of this State, and then, within four weeks, stand as a candidate in support of a Government in which the gentleman whom he so vilified is one of the leaders? I say that the politics of this country are at a very low ebb indeed. In spite of all the accusa-

tions levelled at the Labour party by the Ministry and their supporters, they cannot sheet home to us anything like that. No matter what happens in the Labour party or the Labour movement—whether the man in question be a Labour member of Parliament or the secretary or president of a Labour organisation—once the Labour people find that he is not treading the proper path, they have the courage to chastise him, and if necessary they will turn him out of their movement, out of industrialism and out of politics. We find that policy does not prevail with Ministers and their supporters in this House. I wish to be fair to gentlemen opposite. I will read the reports and the utterances of other gentlemen in this State who claimed to be responsible for the return to this House of Government supporters in such large numbers. And the statement I have read is not made by a Labour partisan. The speaker is Mr. J. M. Hopkins, your proved friend—the man whose services were available to put the Treasurer out of public life, and whose services are now available at the north end of this country, I suppose as a servile supporter of the Government. But, I say, if the member for Mount Magnet (Mr. Troy) is any prophet, the Treasurer will be—to use that hon. member's term—"yanked out on his neck" if Mr. Hopkins is returned for Pilbarra. The present occupant is only keeping the Treasurer's seat warm until Mr. Hopkins comes down from the North. But I do not think he will come back successful. I will be careful not to prophesy at this juncture. I leave that to members opposite. I will read some farther utterances of Mr. Hopkins, only because they are the utterances of a gentleman who served as a colleague of my friends opposite, who served two years as their colleague in a Ministry conducting the public affairs of this country for two years, side by side with them; and according to the *West Australian* of the 1st May, this is his opinion of his colleagues:—

"No member of the present Administration," Mr. Hopkins said, "except Mr. Kingsmill, would be likely to join any Government headed by Mr. Wilson. The Constitutional position is this, that His Excellency must be assured that the gentleman for whom he sends has a sufficient majority to carry on the gov-

ernment of the State. It will be interesting to see how Mr. Wilson will overcome this difficulty, more particularly in the probable absence from his Cabinet of every one of the members of the present Ministry, except Mr. Kingsmill aforesaid."

But members will see that with all my auctioneer friend's ability to judge people, he misjudged Mr. Kingsmill, the very man who did not serve in the Ministry, as being the only one likely to join it. We find that Mr. Kingsmill is not there. Mr. Hopkins's judgment erred so far as Mr. Kingsmill was concerned. I am sorry that Mr. Hopkins, who held the Treasurer in such high esteem on the 1st May, is still prepared to serve the Government, even with the Treasurer in the Cabinet. Of course, I will not say that the Treasurer is holding the seat merely for the member for Pilbarra to take. I find that the Minister for Mines (Hon. H. Gregory), when interrogated by a Press reporter at Nannine, knew very little about the position. I wish to point out to that Minister that Nannine is an unlucky place for Ministers for Railways to visit. I remember that when the member for Murchison (Mr. Holman) was there once, he got a shock similar to that received by the present Minister for Railways. I should advise future Ministers for Railways to beware of Nannine as a place of evil omen; but I know members of this House who would suggest sending the Commissioner of Railways there, to see whether he would receive a shock similar to those experienced by his departmental heads. According to the newspaper report, the present Minister for Railways knew little or nothing about the position of affairs in Perth with reference to the change of Premier. He was not half so well informed as Mr. J. M. Hopkins. But in the same issue of the same journal I find a statement made, or alleged to be made, by the mayor of Perth; and it is headed, "A Mayoral Denunciation; nothing but a Scandal."

MR. HARDWICK: Was it the mayor, or the ex-mayor?

MR. TAYLOR: The mayor, Mr. Sydney Stubbs. And a gentleman like the mayor of Perth, the chief magistrate of the metropolis of Western Australia, thus characterises at a public meeting the political shuffle of the cards. He

was the chairman of a public meeting convened by a candidate for the Upper House; and this is the report from the *West Australian* :—

In introducing a candidate for Legislative honours to a considerable assemblage of electors in the Town Hall last night, the Mayor of Perth, Mr. Sydney Stubbs, touched upon the resignation of the Premier. The Mayor said : "I declare emphatically that the political shuffle of the cards we had last week is not conducive—and I do not hesitate to say it—to the best interests of the State. (Applause.) I consider it nothing more nor less than a scandal. (Applause.) I wish the Premier were here, in order that I might tell him so; and in this I think I am echoing the sentiments of 99 out of every 100 business men in Perth and throughout the State. (Cheers.)

I wish to emphasise here that the mayor of Perth was echoing the sentiments of 99 per cent. of the business people. He did not claim to voice the aspirations of the people represented on this (Opposition) side of the Chamber. He was representing the business people, whom hon. members opposite represent. And this is how the mayor's speech continues :—

Actions such as we have witnessed during the last few days tend more than anything else one can name to sink politics in the mud. (Applause.) We want to send to Parliament men who will be above such dodges. (Hear, hear.) However, the time will shortly come when the Premier will regret the latest action he has taken.

When we find in a large business centre an intellectual audience of commercial men, over which the mayor of Perth is presiding, and who utters these sentiments in connection with the shuffle, and they are echoed from one end of the hall to the other and applauded, I think we must realise the magnitude of this evil; we must recognise the necessity for taking some action to stem this sort of tactics in Western Australian politics. I certainly hope it will never fall to my lot again to have to read statements of men holding such high positions in Western Australia denouncing their own party, as I have been reading to-night. I could go on reading volumes. Here are Press clippings carefully culled from the respectable journals of Western Australia. When this shuffle was going on I was in Coolgardie with my old personal friend Dr. Ellis, under his care for treatment and rest; and I carefully collected the utterances of these intellectual giants on

this particular subject. I thought it would be worth while keeping them; because I have been for many years listening to those gentlemen who have the same political aspirations as myself, denouncing my political opponents in language similar to this, but never so strong. I realised the value of these utterances, and that they were given from a non-partisan point of view by men who fought every election within reach of them during the recent two elections to send the gentleman opposite to Parliament. The present Minister for Works who at that time was not a Minister gave a short interview; but of course, he was absolutely careful. He had the dock in his mind's eye, and his joining this Cabinet, or supporting any Government, wholly depended on the attitude the Government took up towards the dock. [Interjection by the MINISTER FOR WORKS.] I hope it will not be necessary for the Minister to adopt the same tactics in this Chamber to-night as he adopted at Midland Junction last night. I hope he will keep cool. Before I resume my seat I have a number of statements to read to the House made by supporters of the Government, giving their opinions on the matter; and I am justified in reading them to the House. I will not read the Press reports; but I must, in passing, touch lightly on the attitude of my friends opposite. I have here a statement from the member for Katanning (Hon. F. H. Piesse). The hon. member has practically given his views to the House somewhat contrary to the remarks he uttered on the 1st May. I have here the opinion of the member for Geraldton (Mr. Carson). I do not know whether I will read it to the House or not. The hon. member is not in the Chamber, and as his election is disputed, and as the Supreme Court has not delivered judgment, I will refrain from reading anything in connection with the hon. member; but I know he spoke not too kindly. Now we find that the Honorary Minister has something to say; but as the hon. gentleman is in an honorary position I do not think it is necessary for me to read the opinion he held concerning his colleague the Treasurer, at that time. We had also the member for Claremont sending telegrams to the *West Australian* from a place called Kojonup; and the

wires, I believe, carried the message, but it speaks volumes for the texture of the wire. It is pretty strong. The newspaper says:—

Statement made by Mr. Foulkes.—It was stated in the columns of the *West Australian* yesterday that the name of Mr. J. C. G. Foulkes, the member for Claremont, had been mentioned as a likely supporter of Mr. Wilson in the event of that gentleman accepting from the Governor a commission to form a Ministry. Yesterday afternoon we received the following telegram from Mr. Foulkes, who is at present at Kojonup:—Hearing that you stated I was going to support Mr. Wilson as Premier, please insert to-morrow morning the following statement:—Mr. Rason last October enunciated a policy to the people of the State. He was returned to carry out that policy, and he pledged himself to do his best to carry it out. He now discards his pledges to the electors of the State and evades his responsibilities by taking a post to which he nominated himself.

This is not my opinion, nor the opinion of the Labour party. It is the opinion of a supporter of the late Government, a loyal supporter, an hon. gentleman who has attacked myself and my principles and my party's principles in no mean way, and very eloquently, with great forensic eloquence, has in this House denounced me and my party, and my politics and all belonging to the Labour party. It is the utterance of a gentleman from a distance in the farming districts where he resorts to the telegraph wire. He could not wait for Mr. George's expeditious train to bring it to Perth. The clipping goes on to say:—

He must have known that this action was likely to be injurious to the State and likely to disintegrate the party returned to support the policy enunciated at the last election. It is risky and difficult changing leaders, constituted as the Legislative Assembly is at present. Mr. Wilson cannot lead a party, and I certainly would not support him as Premier. Another meeting of the party should be called immediately to farther consider the position.—J. C. G. Foulkes.

Another caucus meeting of the party! This despised caucus meeting, despised by the hon. gentlemen who sit on the right, despised by the hon. member for Claremont! That hon. member has time and again—I am sorry he is not in his place to-night, but I suppose he will reply to me by wire—has said that he despised the caucus so much; but when he finds that the leader of his party is going, going, gone, sold—I suppose he had heard Mr. Hopkins saying it—he

believes that the only hope is another meeting of caucus. That is the position the hon. gentleman took up, but he will be able to explain it to the House. He lost no time in sending telegrams to denounce the Treasurer. I am not going to say whether he was right or wrong in doing so. I only desire to point out the actual position, considered not from a partisan point of view, but from the point of view of the colleagues of my friends opposite, from those who are helping them to retain the right to control this country. I will pass away from the member for Claremont to "The Political Situation." The interesting situation! Most amazing headlines! I have known members in this House to denounce the sensational Press for having large headlines over their articles to attract the public to read them. There were no headlines so large in the sensational Press as those over "The Political Situation" in the leading journals of Western Australia. I will read this:—

The Political Situation—Return of Mr. Gregory—An Amusing Railway Episode—A Midnight Conference—Attitude of the Late Ministers.

Then they go on to describe about Mr. Gregory holding the key to the situation at midnight. I will not read the Press reports, because they are known. I will confine myself to the actual statements of colleagues of Ministers published in the Press in connection with the situation. [THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Hurry up.] Perhaps the Minister wants to get away to abuse some other Labour candidate for some constituency in the metropolis. He did very well last night. He got along splendidly for a member who in this Chamber an hour before had denounced the member for Leonora for personalities. After delivering a speech making violent attacks on this party in this Chamber, the Minister for Works went straight to Midland Junction to a public meeting and, as reported in the Press, vilified the gentleman who is the Labour candidate.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Are you going to Midland Junction?

MR. TAYLOR: I am not going to Midland Junction to-night, but I may be found at Midland Junction before this campaign is completed. Although I know members will say there was no

necessity for me to receive such advice, I have been advised by my medical adviser not to make speeches for the next six months; but the exigencies of circumstances compel me to make a speech to-night on this situation. A friend tells me that the country calls me. My friend has better ears than I have, because I thought nobody heard the country calling but Mr. Hopkins. The exigencies of circumstances compel me to speak to-night; and if they compel me to speak at Midland Junction, I want to tell the Minister that I will be there, and that I will be in Fremantle if necessary. I throw out the challenge to any Minister that I will speak to any audience in this country that a Minister will speak to. [THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Not for Johnson?] I am not speaking for Johnson to-night, but I am speaking in the interests of the Labour movement with which I have been connected for many years, and I will speak to it anywhere. Individuals drop out so far as I am concerned. I am in the interests of the party. Now we come to the scene at the railway station, to the magnificent dodging and conspiracy at midnight. The papers report it, though I am not sure of the truth of it, that the Premier of to-day went up the line that afternoon in company with the member for Roebourne (Dr. Hicks) to try and kidnap the Minister for Mines about Midland Junction. When they reached Midland Junction they were pursued by the Government whip (Mr. Gordon), and they went on a bit farther so that they would meet the Minister for Mines higher up. They were successful. The papers say they dragged him out of the train, and the train came to Perth without the Minister. The present Treasurer was at the railway station. I will read what the Press said about the hon. gentleman. [THE MINISTER FOR WORKS interjected.] I know the Minister who controls the Works Department is anxious to hear anything derogatory to other members or even to a Cabinet Minister, a colleague of himself, because the election at Fremantle has been anything but pleasant to the hon. member, and I can understand the hon. member wishing to hear of someone else being in the same boat. I have already pointed out that the Minister for Mines

was kidnapped by the Premier and Dr. Hicks.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member knows full well he must address members of the House in a different manner. The hon. member is an old member of the House, and should know that he must address members by the constituencies they represent.

MR. TAYLOR: If I made a slip in that direction it was not out of disrespect to you or to any member of the Chamber. I think that members should try and uphold the dignity of the Chamber. It is not my rule to address members by their surnames.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has addressed several members by their names, which he should not do.

MR. TAYLOR: It was quite an oversight. I did not intend to do so. I like the Speaker, when I make a slip or when I am not in order, to put me right. The gentleman who controls the Treasury waited on the platform at Perth for the train in which the Minister for Mines was to arrive, but it arrived minus the Minister. What does the newspaper say in this respect? I will read it:—

Mr. Wilson, while it was evident that he regarded the incident as somewhat disappointing to himself as a prospective Premier, made no statement to a representative of the *West Australian*, beyond remarking that the action of his late colleague in inducing Mr. Gregory to leave the train at Bellevue seemed somewhat remarkable. "It is queer politics, isn't it?" he observed. After a short conversation with Mr. Gordon, Mr. Wilson nodded "Good night" to his friends on the station and took his departure. Just after midnight the last train from Midland Junction arrived at the platform, and out stepped Mr. Gregory, Mr. Moore, and Dr. Hicks.

I think it was time the Treasurer would nod good-night—after standing on the station platform expecting to meet the gentleman who held the key to the situation and being disappointed. I have a statement here made by the member for Canning, who is the Government whip. We know in all Parliaments in every country an utterance by the whip is an official utterance. This member puts forward his opinions of the caucus meeting held at which the appointment to the Agent Generalship was made. Although I am passing over a great many newspaper statements I cannot pass over an interview given by the member for



Canning, the Government whip; the whip to the party of to-day, the whip to any Government; as I have said repeatedly, he is the same old whip—you can crack him off any handle.

MR. GORDON: Not off the Labour handle.

MR. TAYLOR: We looked out for that. We kept our eyes open, but there was no necessity for the member's application for that position. Here is the utterance of the Government whip. It was given on May 3rd after the midnight expedition:—

Speaking to a *West Australian* reporter yesterday with reference to Friday's meeting of the Ministerial party, Mr. W. B. Gordon said:—As whip of the party I may be allowed to know what actually did take place at that meeting. Mr. Rason asked for an opinion as to the vacant Agent Generalship. He said that if the party desired it he would stay on as Premier, or if they thought it better that he should take the Agent Generalship he would do that. He placed himself entirely in the hands of the meeting, and the unanimous decision was that he should take the Agent Generalship. It is not true that the party has lost its solidarity. It is as solid as ever it was. My reasons for saying this are: first, the question as to whether Mr. Rason should take the office of Agent General was agreed upon unanimously; second, because it was unanimously agreed that, having taken up the appointment, Mr. Rason should retire at once; third, because it was again unanimously agreed that he should appoint his successor in spite of the request that the party would give him some idea of its wishes in this respect. The grounds of the party refusing to do so were their confidence in the man that he would appoint, and also that he might think it a slight if they could not trust him to appoint a man who would act in the best interests of the State. The members of the Ministry were present, but they gave no expression of opinion one way or another throughout the meeting. I can ascribe the turmoil that has arisen to the party, who previous to the meeting of the 27th, circulated reports that the Government were going to be attacked and there was discontent in our ranks. These reports were spread for a purpose, but I still say that as a whole the party is solid, and we are satisfied with Mr. Rason's conduct throughout the whole affair.

The solidarity of the party on the first or the second of May may have been right enough, but judging from the speeches which have been delivered on the Government side since Parliament opened, it is significant to anyone that the solidity of the party has been shaken since.

MR. GORDON: More solid than the pledged crowd over there, anyhow.

MR. TAYLOR: That is a question that could be debated at great length, but I am not in the mood to debate it just now. I am not dealing with the attitude of our party, but the attitude of the gentlemen who put the Speech into His Excellency's mouth. This report says the party are as solid as ever they were. That is the official utterance of the whip of the party. Have subsequent events justified that statement? I say, the events which have transpired have not justified the statement of that gentleman. I have read numerous extracts from members who have condemned that statement, and who clearly point out that the hon. member was not giving to the country the true position of his party. But that is neither here nor there. It is not my province to question the hon. gentleman in giving away the secrets of his own caucus meeting. We have another statement from Mr. Hopkins, and then there is a report in the *West Australian* as follows:—

*An Important Conference—Mr. Wilson, Mr. Gregory, and Mr. Moore.*

Mr. Wilson did not wait at the railway station on finding that Mr. Gregory had not returned by the train by which he was expected, but at once proceeded to his residence in Hay Street. It was after midnight when Mr. Gregory arrived back with Mr. Moore and Dr. Hicks, but immediately he was acquainted with the fact that Mr. Wilson had been waiting to see him, Mr. Gregory got into communication with Mr. Wilson by telephone and informed him that he would be glad to meet him at once. Dr. Hicks returned home, but Mr. Moore accompanied Mr. Gregory to Mr. Wilson's house. The interview between the three gentlemen occupied nearly two hours.

This is the way in which Governments are formed in this State, by midnight conferences; by colleagues waylaying Ministers on the railway line, kidnapping them so as to win them to their side. All this was brought about by the gentleman who controls the Treasury. I have here a statement made by Captain Laurie, a gentleman who has supported the Rason Government and the James Government. He was returned to Parliament against the Government of which the Treasurer was a member. Captain Laurie defeated Mr. Moss, who was Colonial Secretary in the Morgans Ministry. Captain Laurie has represented the West

Province in the Upper House ever since and has not altered his shade of politics. This is what that gentleman said during his election campaign in Fremantle:—

**Mr. Rason's Appointment Denounced by Captain Laurie—A Discredited Agent General.**

Speaking at Fremantle last evening Captain Laurie, who is seeking re-election as a representative in the Legislative Council for the West Province, touched upon the political changes which had taken place during the last few days. It was only a short time since, he said, the Legislative Assembly went to the country, and Mr. Rason was returned with an excellent working majority. There was also an excellent Opposition to watch the majority and see that the affairs of the country were carefully managed. We were now told that Mr. Rason was going to London as Agent General, and that Mr. Wilson had been called upon to form a Cabinet. He for one could not help expressing his disappointment at the fact that the man whom the people of this State had put into power should at the very first opportunity leave the party with which he was associated simply to satisfy his own ends. (Applause.) For a man to provide for himself in the way that Mr. Rason had, the best thing that could happen to him was to go out of the country. (Applause and a Voice: "Not as Agent General.") Mr. Rason was going to London as a discredited Agent General, and that, he was sure, was not to the advantage of the State of Western Australia. (Applause.)

These are statements made by honourable men who support my friends opposite. Not one utterance I have delivered here to-night is from any member of the Labour party or any person in the State who opposes the politics of my friends. I have contented myself with only bringing facts forward from men whose political principles are shared by those of my friends who are controlling the Treasury benches. And when we find that, is it not high time for some member on this side of the House to explain to the country the actual position? I wish to say again that my explanation of the position to-night is largely to that 100,000 people of Western Australia who have come into the State since I have been a member of Parliament, and since the first great acrobatic feats have been performed by my friends controlling the Treasury benches and the Government side of the House. It is absolutely necessary that the people of this State should be addressed in the language of truth, and I hope and trust that such a political position will never again arise in the history

of Western Australia. It calls for the strongest denunciation. No matter what remarks these honourable gentlemen have made during the last month which I have read to Parliament, no matter what effect they have on the Agent General when he reaches London, and no matter what effect they have on this State in the motherland, it is absolutely necessary that someone should tell the people in the old country and the people in this country that this appointment has covered Western Australia with degradation. I wish to emphasise that, and I have endeavoured in my humble way to do so to-night. And on every occasion on which anything like this crops up in the history of politics I will do the same. So far as my friends are concerned, and the manner in which they have reached the positions they hold to-day, I will pass on and content myself by making a few remarks with reference to some of the departments controlled by them. I wish to point out that we have from members on both sides of the House during this debate heard many complaints, and many valuable suggestions have been offered to my friends who have the administration of the various departments. I want to touch on a subject which is of great importance to the mining industry of this State. I am in this unfortunate position, that the papers which I desired in connection with the smelter at Ravensthorpe, in regard to the purchase or sale of it by the Minister for Mines, have not been laid on the table of the House. I cannot blame the Minister or the Government for that. The procedure of business prevented me from moving that motion until the Address-in-Reply was disposed of. It has not been disposed of, and consequently I cannot move my motion for the return showing the cost of this smelter from its inception. The papers have pointed out that the smelter was sold by the Minister for Mines to Mr. Kaufman for £5,000. I do not know whether that is true or not. If it is not true, I suppose the Minister will deny it, so that it will enable me in dealing with this sale to treat the Minister with that justice he deserves. If this sale has been effected, it is a very strange thing indeed. It has been reported that the smelter has been sold for £5,000. I believe the first smelter, the old smelter,

cost something like £8,000. There was something like that figure, I think, expended on the first smelter, and last year this Parliament voted something like £7,000 for renewing that smelter. I do not know how much of that money has been expended, but if I had before me the returns which I asked for, I would be able to point out what has been the case. If the money has been expended—and I know some portion of it has been—we have sunk in smelters there and equipment something like £15,000, and we have also lost on running of the smelter something like £3,000 in working expenses. The smelting was done for £3 a ton by the department, and it cost something like £4 a ton in round figures to do it. I have the figures of the Mines Department, showing that it cost £3 19s. 6d. That being so we have lost practically £1 a ton on 3,000 tons, which means £3,000 to this State. That £3,000, added to the other two amounts I have quoted, will make about £18,000. I will come down considerably, and say we have spent £12,000 or £14,000 there. I do not know exactly what portion of the last £7,000 voted by this Parliament was expended on the new smelter. I am justified in assuming that all the equipment of the new smelter was taken from the old smelter, and that being so I suppose that the whole of the equipment of the old smelter and the new smelter have been disposed of for £5,000. The leader of the Opposition was justified in demanding a statement from the Premier and from Ministers. I have made a statement to this House, and he knows that the position does exist, when we have papers like the *Morning Herald* quoting tabulated figures and statements in connection with this position, and they have gone uncontradicted by the department. I am speaking of the issue of Saturday week last, a column and a half of figures culled from the Mines Department's figures, covering a period of three or four years, and they are uncontradicted. They show that these smelters cost a great deal more than £5,000. I do not care how this country views the administration of the Minister for Mines, how favourably it is viewed by the people, it cannot be viewed favourably when they know that the hon. gentleman has disposed of property to Kaufman & Co. for

£5,000 which cost this country perhaps £15,000. I have made it £18,000. I may be wrong, but I will come down to £12,000; and if the amount be £12,000, the sale has not been justified even from a commercial and business standpoint. But when I deal with the other aspect of the question it will be less justified in the eyes of the people. We find that the State of Western Australia had at one time sunk something like £70,000 or £80,000 in the Ravensthorpe district to prove to this country that we had a copper-producing area there. The Government of the day bought the ore from the prospectors when they had no means of smelting. When they were raising it from the bowels of the earth and had no means of treating it, it was considered wise by this Parliament and State that we should go to the rescue of the prospectors to open up that valuable copper area and add to the mineral wealth of Western Australia. Parliament liberally voted the money for this purpose, and a smelter was afterwards erected by means of the funds of this State. It was proved that we have a valuable copper area there, and what have we done there? Having proved it, having used the funds of the State to do so, we have sold the area and sold the smelter to Kaufman & Co. Is that what you call wise administration? Is that the administration of a Minister for Mines who is administering the department in the interests of the prospector? This hon. gentleman claims on every occasion, especially when there is an election on, that he is the prospectors' friend, that he has no sympathy in common with anyone except the prospectors. What will be the verdict of the prospectors at Ravensthorpe to-day as to my hon. friend, when they know that the State money has been spent and how it has been expended? I see we have been recouped. Fortunately the Government used the smelter and smelted the ore which they purchased from the prospectors, and they were recouped; but the State should not be used to prove that a mining area is valuable, and the smelter then be sold to Kaufman & Co.; an honourable gentleman, a shrewd business man, a man whose business capacity is too great for the Government of this country or the people of this State to allow the Minister for Mines to

deal with him single-handed. The Minister has no possible chance. The hon. gentleman knows full well that in dealing with a shrewd man like Mr. Kaufman he has no chance. I do not blame Mr. Kaufman. He saw that there was a splendid opportunity. He recognised a weak Minister, and in all human probability a weak Government, and he said to himself: "Now is my chance. I will purchase this smelter, and by so doing I will get the grasp of the whole of that area in the palm of my hand." What is the position of the unfortunate prospectors at Ravensthorpe? There is one smelter there, a smelter erected by the State of Western Australia at a big cost, and then sold by the Minister for Mines, a Minister of the Crown, to Kaufman & Co. for £5,000; sold after the area was proved to the country to be a rich one. Proved for what? Proved for a syndicate. Proved for Kaufman & Co. That is the position. I take it that it should not have been utilised for that purpose. The prospectors there are now at his mercy, as has been pointed out by their representative, Mr. Hudson. He has pointed out very ably that the prospectors there have to go cap-in-hand to Mr. Kaufman. To do justice to the Minister, I have been informed by Mr. Hudson that he made arrangements by which Mr. Kaufman will have to smelt for these prospectors for two years.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: You did not read my statement in the paper.

MR. TAYLOR: Read your statement? I would want to have a lot of time on my hands to read the self-advertisement of my hon. friend in the papers. I do not read the advertisement portion of the journal, consequently I can never read the utterances of the Minister. What position are these prospectors in that are left? Is it not widely known that Mr. Kaufman had under offer nearly the whole of those properties for something like £60,000? All you have to do is to have a conversation with a gentleman called Mr. Grant, who was a prospector there, and he will exactly place the position before one. He had the most wealthy of those propositions under offer, and he saw his opportunity and closed on the smelting area as the result. [Interjection by the MINISTER FOR MINES.] What Mr. Grant told me is absolutely

contrary to that. It is generally known, known in the Press, that Mr. Grant went to the Eastern States. When he failed to complete this deal with Mr. Kaufman he went to the East to try and float his claims, so that they could be worked locally and controlled by local people in the Eastern States and Western Australia, knowing that he had a smelter behind his back, and behind the back of the company that he floated to smelt his ore. But when he returned to this State he found that the smelter was sold.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member is making a statement absolutely contrary to fact. I demand its withdrawal.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member must withdraw.

MR. TAYLOR: I am stating a fact supplied to me. If it is untrue, I will withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER: There must be no condition about the withdrawal.

MR. TAYLOR: I will withdraw the statement; but the withdrawal does not alter the fact that the position which I have outlined exists in a large degree even yet. I wish to point out to the Minister that Mr. Grant sold his properties for something like £2,300, and those properties were under offer for something like £40,000—they and other properties not so valuable. They are unsold now; and the owners cannot sell them, and Kaufman does not want to purchase them. The prospectors will have to walk out. He will only freeze them out with his smelter. I wish to know what power have the Government to compel Mr. Kaufman to fulfil his contract to smelt for the public for two years. I should like to see his contract.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: You would not understand it.

MR. TAYLOR: I should need to be an eastern conjurer to understand the dodgery of my friend. I do not hope to understand it. I believe that the Attorney General (Hon. N. Keenan) will be able to tell me all about Mr. Kaufman; because it is generally understood that the Attorney General is attorney for Kaufman and Co.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: I do not like to contradict the hon. member. I am not quite certain; but I believe that

Stone and Burt are the attorneys for these people.

MR. TAYLOR: I wish to say that the Attorney General is recognised as the attorney for Kaufman and Co.; and the Minister cannot deny the statement that the firm of Kalgoorlie solicitors known as Keenan and Randall were solicitors for Kaufman and Co., and drew up the agreement for the purchase of Merton-dale or Merton's Reward. Will the Minister deny that?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: How do I know?

MR. TAYLOR: It is a good job that you do not know. I am stating what has been generally known through the Press, that they were the solicitors acting as attorneys for Kaufman and Co. It is known in Perth legal circles that the solicitors who represent other companies deal with the Attorney General in matters connected with Kaufman and Co. I do not know whether the Attorney General is doing that kind of business to-day; but it has been done repeatedly. The hon. gentleman may contradict me. I can only tell you what is the general opinion.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: If the hon. member will allow me, I should like to mention that Stone and Burt are the attorneys for the company.

MR. TAYLOR: For how long have they been its attorneys?

MR. SCADDAN: About half a minute.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Owing to absence from the House I am not fully seized of the subject under discussion; but I understand that it concerns the Phillips River Copper-Mining Company. I have never been attorney for that company. As a fact, in my private business and for a considerable number of years, as the hon. member knows very well, I have acted for Mr. Kaufman in his private capacity, but I have never had anything to do with his company. And the hon. member could easily have acquired a knowledge of that fact had he chosen to ask for it.

MR. TAYLOR: I accept the statement of the Attorney General. Perhaps I shall be speaking more correctly if I deal with Mr. Kaufman as an individual and not as a "Co."

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member must withdraw the statement. It has

been contradicted by the Minister referred to.

MR. TAYLOR: I have withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER: You said that you accepted his statement. As you know, you must, in accordance with the rules of the House, withdraw the statement when it is contradicted. And you must also refrain from imputing any motives at all. There can be no two opinions about your speech, I think, for you evidently implied a motive when you referred to the Attorney General in his official capacity as being also attorney to Mr. Kaufman or to Messrs. Kaufman and Co. Therefore you must, in compliance with the rules of the House, withdraw the statement when contradicted.

MR. TAYLOR: I withdraw it, and I withdraw also the "Co." of Mr. Kaufman, and I will deal with Mr. Kaufman as an individual, and with the Attorney General as one of the firm of Kalgoorlie solicitors known as Keenan and Randall. I have no desire to impute any motives. I have a desire to address this House in the language of truth; to tell the House the position as I know it, and as it is generally understood. I say that I heard the Attorney General contradict recently the member for Mt. Leonora (Mr. Lynch), who accused him of representing companies. Now I will accuse the Attorney General of representing a company, and will see if he will contradict me. The Minister represented the Chamber of Mines at Leonora, before the Arbitration Court, when I represented the workers; and he was there as a lawyer.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member has immediately removed the whole substance of his statement by his concluding remark. He knows perfectly well that in any case, even he himself is entitled to ask me to act for him, and I have acted for persons indiscriminately, without any consideration of what they represented or did not represent. And he knows perfectly well—and his last statement shows he knows—that I never appeared except in my professional capacity. There is no representation in that. When I was appearing the other day in court, and when a former member of the hon. member's Government was a plaintiff in the action and I was acting for the defendant, did I represent the

defendant? I was acting as his solicitor; and the hon. member knows that perfectly well, when he uses a phrase which everybody else understands to involve some action other than the ordinary practice of my profession.

MR. TAYLOR: I have heard the apology of the Attorney General.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: It is not an apology.

MR. TAYLOR: I wish to say that the Attorney General has represented companies in the Arbitration Court, and has represented the Chamber of Mines.

MR. SCADDAN: Does he not sit in the Chamber of Mines?

MR. TAYLOR: Of course. As I am reminded by a member from that centre, the Minister has sat in that chamber as a representative of a company.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: He knows that I resigned that position when I became a member of Parliament.

MR. TAYLOR: The position is this. There is in the Library a monthly record of the doings of the Chamber of Mines; and I believe I can produce in that journal the name of the hon. member in his official capacity, either on the executive—

[MINISTERIAL MEMBER: Why should he not be?—well, why do you get so angry when we prove that you are mixed up with capital? If it is not a crime, why do you ruffle? You can accuse me of representing Labour in any place you like to mention, and I will not get angry. I represent Labour people in any place where they desire to be represented. I represented them in the Arbitration Court when the Attorney General was representing the Chamber of Mines, and sailing as near as he could to the Act passed by this Parliament. Parliament would not allow a lawyer to appear in the Arbitration Court unless both parties were agreeable. On this occasion both parties were not agreeable, and the gentleman who is now Attorney General could not appear in his legal capacity; but what did he do? He was so deeply interested in the position of the Chamber of Mines, and the welfare of the capitalists at Kalgoorlie, and had so little consideration for the employees, that he sat at the table, at the elbow of Mr. Barton, the representative of the Chamber of Mines, who was allowed to plead against me; and the hon. gentleman, with all his

legal acumen, prompted Mr. Barton to defeat the ends and objects of the workers and of me in that court. I do not say there was any harm in that; but I want to know, why does it bring a blush to the hon. member's cheeks when I accuse him of it?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: It does not bring any blush.

MR. TAYLOR: He was there. He evaded the law as nearly as he could—sailed right up to the dividing line; and as a lawyer and the Attorney General to-day, he will, I hope, knowing how near a lawyer can get with safety, make the line wider, so that legal men will not be able to sail so near to it. I have here the monthly journal of the Chamber of Mines of Western Australia, dated the 31st May, 1906. The names of the representatives of the various mines are given. The Kalgurli Gold Mines, Ltd. is represented by F. A. Moss, J. H. Edalls, and Frank Wood; and the Lake View Consols, Ltd., by H. E. Vale, C. J. Moody, and N. Keenan, M.L.A. "M.L.A.," Mr. Speaker! Then on the preceding page the hon. member appears again under "Officers for 1906-7," and we find him as "Hon. N. Keenan, M.L.A." I presume that he had then reached the honourable position of Attorney General, for as a private member of the House he would not be styled "Hon." He appears in this list as "honorary vice-president." And yet Ministers will rise in this Chamber and say that I am misrepresenting them. Ministers will rise, because the forms of this House compel a member, no matter how truthfully he may be speaking, to withdraw a statement objected to by any member who calls the Speaker's attention to the statement and demands its withdrawal. That is one of the forms of the House, and I abide by it. A member may make a statement bound around the centre and edges with truth; yet it has to be withdrawn. I have brought here the monthly report of the Chamber of Mines, Kalgoorlie, setting forth that the hon. gentleman was on its executive, representing certain mines, and the Attorney General denies the statement. Why do members on the Treasury bench take positions of which they are ashamed? I have never taken a position in the Labour movement, either in its industrial sphere or its political sphere, that I have

ever shrunk back from when I have been accused of taking it. But I find repeatedly that the representatives of capital try to hide in the shadow. They are not always successful. The darkness of night will not lend itself to them on every occasion, as it did to kidnap the Minister for Mines at Midland Junction. The broad sunshine comes out sometimes and illuminates their actions.

**THE ATTORNEY GENERAL :** I think the only point which the hon. member wishes to make, if he wishes to make anything but mere noise, is that I was paid, or in some sense rewarded, for services connected with the Chamber of Mines or some other organisation. I pointed out, and still say, that I have no connection at all with any organisation in this country, except in an honorary capacity. I might as well be an honorary vice-president of any other organisation; in fact, I am an honorary vice-president of goodness knows how many.

**MR. TAYLOR :** I have here the official journal of the Chamber of Mines, with a list of the representatives in the chamber of various mining companies. Now am I not justified in holding tenaciously to the truth? Will the Attorney General deny the truthfulness of the publication of the Chamber of Mines of which he is a representative?

**THE ATTORNEY GENERAL :** You yourself read out the title of my office as "honorary."

**MR. TAYLOR :** As honorary vice-president. It shows in another part of the journal that you were representing various mines. I will read it for the edification of the Attorney General. Perhaps they smuggled in the hon. member as they smuggled in the Minister for Mines. It says:—

**Membership of the Chamber of Mines  
for the current year.**

Company or Leaseholder.	Representative.
Lake View Consols, Ltd. }	H. E. Vail C. J. Moody N. Keenan, M.L.A.

I am not going through the report to find out how many more mines the hon. member represents. Here on the front page he is mentioned as honorary vice-

president; and, lo and behold, on the right-hand corner of the page I find—

Hon. Frank Wilson, Honorary Vice-President.

Why, the Executive of the Government are practically the executive of the Chamber of Mines in this country. Here is a paragraph handed to me. Mr. Brennan, speaking at a social given by Mr. Keenan after the election, said:—

No man had more influence in the Chamber of Mines than Mr. Keenan.

In the face of all these publications, in the face of the official journal of the Chamber of Mines, can the hon. member deny that he represents this mine I have quoted? I am repeatedly called to order. It makes no difference to me, for I am speaking the truth. If the forms of the House will not admit it, I withdraw, but I at least have the satisfaction of knowing that I am speaking the truth irrespective of Standing Orders. It is well known that the hon. gentleman represented Bewick, Moreing and Co.; and when he first contested the election against Mr. Johnson he was defeated, his defeat being attributed by the business people of Kalgoorlie to the hon. gentleman's connection with Bewick, Moreing and Co. They have gone farther, for they have accused the hon. member of being either a shareholder, or a director, or something in connection with the Kurrawang Syndicate, which concern has been the occasion for more harsh utterances in this House than any other company in Western Australia. When these statements are made and are repeatedly uncontradicted, am I not justified in saying that the Attorney General has been and is, according to this monthly journal, mixed up with the capitalistic element of this country? Whether right or wrong, I am going to say it. We find in the monthly report of this journal that we have two Ministers of the Crown—[Several LABOUR MEMBERS: Three]—three Ministers of the Crown in this Chamber of Mines, and the Government of the country are the executive of this Chamber of Mines.

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES** (in explanation): That statement is quite untrue. The positions Ministers hold are not executive. The honorary president and honorary vice-presidents have no

power to go into executive meetings of the Chamber of Mines.

MR. TAYLOR: I have not accused the Minister for Mines. I said that the Government of this country were acting as the executive body of the Chamber. I know full well that my feelings and my presence are always with the people whom I represent and who support me; and I take it that the hon. gentlemen opposite are always found in the association of their friends, personal, private, and political. They go to banquets, they are banqueted by their people, just as the representatives of the workers are respected and banqueted by their people; and is there anything more contemptible than for men to be banqueted and then, when accused of it, and when we find their names in monthly records of this kind, they are ashamed, and the blush is brought to their cheeks? Am I not justified in telling this to the people? And I will do it while member for Mount Margaret irrespective of whose feelings I hurt. It would be better for me to sit in silence and allow these things to pass unnoticed; but it falls to my lot to draw attention to them. I feel it keenly when gentlemen on the Treasury bench hold positions of this character—whether honorary or executive or of official capacity I do not know; but I know the journal says that Mr. Keenan is there as the representative of the mine I have mentioned. His defeat at the previous election in Kalgoorlie was attributed to his connection with Bewick, Moreing and Co., when they decided they were going to indent all the stuff for their mines and to start an iron-foundry. Did they not frighten Silverthorne and Adair, and did not every business man in Kalgoorlie speak of the danger of this octopus? Did it not go through the breadth of this country? Was not this House, in fact, moved to take action against this octopus, which not only controlled the richest gold mines in the State, but also tried to control every line of produce? We find that the hon. member's close connection with the company lost him a seat in this House. Next time he came before his electors as a brand-new spanking man, washed absolutely free from Bewick, Moreing and Co.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Who said that?

MR. TAYLOR: It was said at some meeting. It is impossible for me to know who says every word, but I know it has been said. The hon. gentleman tried to jam down my throat something else, but the matter was brought to the light. I cannot drag volumes of papers with me to convince the hon. gentleman. It so happened that this journal was a record of this House and was brought to me to prove conclusively, notwithstanding that I had to withdraw statements repeatedly, that what I said was true. I make these statements with all sincerity; but I find that I have to come here armed with everything in print. Members cannot believe one another. Why, they travelled about in the middle of the night to capture a man, for they could not believe in him. They had not sufficient confidence in their colleague to allow him to come from Nannine to Perth, but they had to entrap him on the way, so that the Treasurer should not get hold of him. [Member speaking very loudly.]

MR. HARDWICK: Why do you not speak up? Don't whisper.

MR. TAYLOR: I know something the hon. member does not wish to hear, and I warn him to keep a little quiet; because as this Government is situated, between Ministers and Honorary Ministers, whips and supporting whips, they will soon have all the Government members implicated in the Government; and a member on this side will not be able to breathe but some official will be able to get up and jump on him. I have been endeavouring to deal with this smelter and have pointed out conclusively the attitude of the Government. I can quite understand why Mr. Kaufman got such a good deal, and what influences were at work when the unfortunate prospectors at Ravensthorpe are left at the mercy of Mr. Kaufman to smelt and treat their copper ore. I can quite understand their unfortunate position. I have been a prospector since I landed in the State, and I know the hardships and the disabilities under which they work. I know all their hard fortunes; and as I was a prospector for four years I know what will be their feeling of indignation against the Minister for Mines when they know his action in selling the



smelter and leaving them to the tender mercies of Mr. Kaufman.

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES:** Strange they have not told me anything about that yet.

**MR. TAYLOR:** They have never had the opportunity to tell you. They do not roam about at midnight trying to get you. They will tell you. The prospectors of this country will not be much longer deluded by the hon. gentleman who controls the Mines Department. They are now commencing to realise that he is not that great friend he pretends to be to the prospector. If the Minister only knew the rudiments of prospecting he would recognise the hopeless position in which he has left the Ravensthorpe prospectors. It is an offence, and a doubly grave offence, that the State money has been used to prove the district to be copper-producing; and now Mr. Kaufman has purchased the smelter for a paltry £5,000, and is going to reap the benefit of the expenditure of that public money. When first expended it was purely a speculative investment, considered justified to open up a new copper field.

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES:** It was opposed by your friend, Mr. Johnson.

**MR. TAYLOR:** The Labour Government had to complete the smelter. We had to carry the baby. The Daglish Government spent a larger sum upon the smelter than was spent before or since.

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES:** Yes; but they received the return in copper from the copper we had purchased.

**MR. TAYLOR:** We had to carry out the work and take the risk, as proved by the Estimates we brought down. The then Premier (Mr. Daglish) and the then Minister for Mines (Mr. Hastie) showed that the investment at Ravensthorpe had been largely successful; but now Mr. Kaufman is reaping the benefit of that expenditure. We proved by the expenditure of public money that the district was valuable, and now we sell the smelter for £5,000. Even the member for Katanning (Hon. F. H. Piesse) recognises it as an injustice to the prospectors. I can tell it by the look upon his face. In fairness and justice to the agricultural members, I say that for the last six years they have most generously voted items on the Estimates, whether from loan or revenue, for the de-

velopment of the goldfields of this State. I know they have not gone into this as deeply as the mining representatives have, but it is necessary they should be told the exact position, that their eyes should be opened to the manner in which the deals are made. I want to know from the Minister the position of affairs; and if the Press exactly represents the position of affairs, it is scandalous indeed. I should like to know what Mr. Kaufman spent in Ravensthorpe before he bought the smelter. What hardships and inconveniences did he suffer? What financial arrangements had he there before he bought the smelter? The Government developed that country, and Mr. Kaufman came along and reaped the benefit. No wonder the Government are acceptable to the people who represent the wealthy classes, when they can come along and do this kind of thing. I hope the Minister for Mines will never be guilty of doing such a thing in that manner again. We are told the Minister has safeguarded, for two years only, the prospectors. Can he tell the House how he can enforce his safeguards, what power he has of enforcing his safeguards on a private individual for the benefit of the prospectors? Can he guarantee to the prospectors that they will not have to go cap-in-hand to this man to have their ore treated? I think the Ravensthorpe people have been badly treated. It has been pointed out by the representative of the district that there is some possibility of the opening up of a harbour that will create another town there.

**MR. HUDSON:** It was stated in another place. I do not know where the member got his information, but it was stated by a supporter of the Government.

**MR. TAYLOR:** It is from supporters of the Government that we get all these home truths that cause the Government so much anxiety when pointed out from this side of the House. All these things have been found out, and the Government supporters have found them out. Before sitting down, it is only fair for me to make a few observations with reference to some other departments or those who control them. The Attorney General went a long way round to deny a certain statement that is borne out by official documents. Now, I come along to Mrs. Bung-em-up, of Fremantle. I

am dealing with the Works Department. I am dealing with the arguments advanced by the Minister for Works himself, and I am not going to flash before the House that picture of his that has been so much in evidence in connection with the Fremantle election. But, I want to tell my friend, from one who viewed that election from a long distance, there is nothing too creditable in the attitude taken up by his party during that campaign. [MEMBER: Which party?] The National Ass. party, the National League party. I want to say the placard, bearing on it in large print the necessity to return a Minister for the Crown instead of a member of a weak Opposition, was significant in the extreme. (Interjection.) The hon. gentleman opposite has inferred certain things from my statement, and I have ample cause for inferring what I have stated from that dodger, in which in large print is the question, "Can a Minister of the Crown serve you better than a private member of a weak Opposition?" That matter has been dealt with liberally by the member for Leonora, and no matter how dignified the Minister for Works tried to appear yesterday afternoon in replying to the member for Leonora, in my opinion he failed ignominiously. I candidly confess he is better when in his right element on the platform at Midland Junction vilifying a candidate standing for political honours. I am not going to say whether the statement is accurate or not. I content myself with saying that the Minister for Works appeared there in his proper element, the one in which he is most successful, that of mud-throwing. The hon. gentleman, we are assured, has large commercial knowledge. He boasts of his commercial instincts and his commercial knowledge, and the Government have not been backward in saying: "We are a Government of commercial experience." I want to know where the commercial experience comes in. The hon. member's commercial experience at Fremantle has been in connection with a laundry. I am not going to say much about that, but it does not take a good deal of capital to start a laundry. I am given to understand by the best commercial authority that a laundry business can be started with a very small capital. You only want a bucket of water and a pennyworth of

chloride of lime, and there is your laundry. But the hon. gentleman has gone beyond that: he has got the up-to-date shirt paralysed. You put the shirt in at one end and it comes out at the other end ready to wear. That is how he has treated the Government. He has put them in at one end, and they have come out washed clean at the other. I want to say, in connection with the Address-in-Reply, that I hope the Minister for Works will carry out the administration of his department impartially. It is a very large and important department in this country.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: What have you found the hon. member's attitude to be?

MR. TAYLOR: As far as I can say up to the present date, I have always found him, since I have been in this Parliament, a very decent fellow like other members. There is nothing wrong with the hon. member, and I am not attacking him personally.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is less creditable to me than your abuse.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: His mind got warped through his confinement.

MR. TAYLOR: If there is any member in this Chamber who is an authority on warped intellects, it is the Minister for Mines: he has a corkscrew intellect.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member must confine himself to the debate. The hon. member must not use offensive or unbecoming words in reference to other members of this House. He has done so frequently to-night, and if the hon. member does so again I shall take extreme steps with him. I warn the hon. member that if he does so again I shall name him.

MR. BATH: On a point of order. Is the Minister for Mines in order in using the same reference to the member for Mount Margaret?

MR. SPEAKER: I did not hear him do so.

MR. BATH: He did so, and it was in reply that the hon. member for Mount Margaret made the remark.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall not allow the Minister for Mines or any one in the House to use such expressions.

MR. TAYLOR: I believe, Mr. Speaker, you are absolutely impartial, and I believe you when you say that you did not hear the hon. member; but I plainly heard the

hon. member say to me that my mind was warped because I had been confined. Where did the hon. member think I had been confined? I have been confined in a prison, and that is what the hon. member tried to bring out by his innuendo. I have nothing to be ashamed of. I did my term of imprisonment for the same principles as I am advocating to-night.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Will the hon. member sit down? I did not catch the words used, for there were so many interjections. Certainly I must ask the Minister to withdraw such an expression. It is offensive, and therefore must be withdrawn.

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES:** I have pleasure in withdrawing, but I would like to point out that the galling observations of the hon. member were my only excuse.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Every member of the House knows full well that unfortunately the Standing Orders give unlimited scope when members are speaking to the Address-in-Reply; therefore it is beyond my power to confine members, when speaking on this question, to the particular matter before the House; that is, to so limit them as they would be limited in ordinary debate. But it is also known to members that they shall not make use of offensive expressions towards one another. The Minister for Mines has withdrawn. He certainly did exceed himself in making use of such an expression, and the member for Mount Margaret was perhaps hurt somewhat, and forgot himself for a moment. I want the House to bear the name to which it was entitled in former years as being an orderly and dignified House. That is what I am trying to have carried out whilst I am Speaker here.

**MR. TAYLOR:** I will withdraw unreservedly, but I want to say that whilst I am in this Chamber I will resent any innuendos from the Minister for Mines or any other member of the House, whether he be on this side or on that; I will resent it with whatever language is in my power, and if any member in this Chamber or out of it made the same innuendo to me outside I would resent it with a blow. I will maintain the rank that God gave me in His creation at all costs; make no mistake. I know innuendos are flying around, and it is

remarkable that they come from the hon. gentleman; but I do not want to labour the question, so I withdraw unreservedly. I want to say, however, that I will take no insult from any man in this House. I will abide by the Standing Orders, and will in my most heated moments pay the respect due to you in that Chair. I know that the business of this Parliament cannot be carried on unless that dignity is paid to you in your position; but I say that no man breathing will make innuendoes to me about the privations I have suffered for my principles without my resenting them. I am not yet bloodless. Though I have been suffering ill-health for the last 18 months, I have still sufficient power to maintain my position as a man in this Chamber or out of it; and it ill becomes the Minister for Mines, who knows the circumstances surrounding the privations pushed upon me by a tyrannical capitalistic Government in Queensland for defending the attitude which I am defending to-night to the best of my ability, to adopt the attitude he has taken up. In those days I could not defend them as I am doing to-night without being plunged into prison; but through those hard imprisonment days this country of Australia has been somewhat freed, and the representatives of the workers can fight their battles on the floor of the Parliaments of their countries. We had to depend upon the platforms outside when laws were harsh and cruel and were administered by tyrants, with the result that we were plunged into prison and pointed out as criminals when we were honourable men. To-day I can speak in this Chamber, but I could not do it then; and I am pleased to know that I am one of the men who suffered imprisonment for my countrymen to echo their sentiments in the halls of the Parliaments untrammelled, and that they have sufficient pride, principle, and honour to withstand the innuendos made by my hon. friend who controls the Mines Department. I desire to tell the hon. gentleman that it is unnecessary for him to throw his innuendos, so far as I am personally concerned. My personal character will bear the light of day being thrown upon it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. gentleman has withdrawn that.

MR. TAYLOR: It is all very well for a member to make an accusation of that character and to withdraw it because the forms of the House call upon him to do so; but can he withdraw the sting that he puts into the breast of an honourable man? I want to warn the Government that I can foresee, from the position of the Government, that this is going to be a lively session, and if my health stands to me this session I will take my place in this Chamber as a representative of the people who sent me here, and I will put my views as clearly, as logically, and as forcibly before this Parliament as I have power to do. I want to tell the hon. gentlemen opposite that it will be no use to utter sweeping innuendoes and then withdraw them and claim the privileges of the House to protect him, because I will resent them. I have no desire to go farther on that point; but I wish to tell all members of the House the position. There are new members here. This is the first time they have met within the walls of this House, and when they hear an innuendo from a Minister of the Crown that I have been where he indicated I have been, what would most of the men who did not know me think? They would at once say, "Who was this man?" And their memory would not carry them back to 16 or 17 years ago, to the political fights between the Labour party and the employers, when the Labour party in Queensland had only one representative in a House of 72. They had then to fight their cause outside Parliament, and they were men of more than ordinary stamina. They had the pluck in them to dare to ventilate the claims of the workers, and they were chased by the police force. The whole of the combined capital of that country, backed up by the Government, was called up against them. I was one of the foremost in the fight, when I had the power and vigour to defend the position I took up, and I hope I have not quite failed yet. Hon. gentlemen who grace the Treasury benches were, I believe, in Queensland at that time, when soldiers and volunteers, who were inaugurated to protect that land, were sent to the back country on the plains in the pastoral area to blow down the aspirations of the workers, instead of fulfilling the object for which they were inaugurated—to defend their country. I

have gone through the mill. This Labour movement to me is sacred; otherwise I would not be able to defend the position as I do. I am no time-server in Parliament or out of it. I am no time-server in the Labour movement. I won my spurs in it years ago. I stand here to-day and say that no man, woman, or child can cast accusations against me of being a traitor or of showing treachery to my party at any particular time of my political life, covering a period of 20 years. I want to tell members I have had to fight in my younger days to see that I got a fair and honest wage for a fair and honest day's work. As to the workers of to-day, the battles have been fought and won for them, and they ought to be pleased to know there are men prepared to suffer that they may have representatives in Parliament to air their grievances and take part in framing the laws which are placed on the statute-book. At the time I am speaking of we were dragged up under an Act of George IV., which had never before been put into force in Queensland or Australia. The men were dragged up, persecuted and prosecuted in every shape and form. Members need to realise what the workers in this country have done to liberalise and democratise the affairs of Australia. Years and years before there was any thought of the Commonwealth, the struggle between capital and labour produced on both sides keen and constant fighters, and the result was that the laws of the country were made sufficiently free. We fought on the one-man-one-vote question till we made the franchise such that workers had a vote. I have gone through all these stages. I am no mushroom politician in the Labour movement. I want to remind my friends who now grace the Treasury benches after one short year's parliamentary experience that they are exceptionally lucky, they are more than lucky in having gone straight out of the municipal council chamber into Parliament, and in having in the very next year become Ministers of the Crown. I fought my way inch by inch from the age of eight, when I started to work for my living. I know every stage that the Labour movement has reached, both in the industrial and in the political arena. I speak perhaps somewhat

heatedly; but so would any member who had suffered the hardships and the privations which I have suffered unjustly. Physically, I am in consequence a wreck; morally, I am no better to-day than I was then; and I was then tabooed as a blackguard, as a criminal, as a scoundrel; and to-day I am supposed to be respectable because I am in Parliament. I know the power of the Press. Because a man is in Parliament he is considered respectable; hence we find so many Ministers' names figuring in this journal of the Chamber of Mines. I know every stage of the struggle I have had; therefore I will not endure insults from anybody. While I wish to emphasise that, I will pay the respect due to your position, sir, in this Chamber, and to you as a citizen outside of it. There is no man in this House whom I hold in higher respect than I hold you; and I am sure you know that, as a result of our six years' acquaintance in this new building and in the old Assembly. I am one of those who can fight for my political principles in this House, without carrying outside of it any personal animosity. This is well known to members who have known me for the last six years. They know that I have always been a keen and severe critic of those opposed to my political views; but no matter how keenly I may advance my principles, no matter how heatedly I may discuss the position, no matter what Ministers may throw back at me in the rough-and-tumble of debate, I can take it. And I expect them to take the same from me. I say that in this, as in every other English-speaking country in the world, politics should be discussed on purely political grounds, without severing personal friendships. I hope that will be done; but when I find hon. members stooping to do, under the cloak of the privileges of this House, acts which they would not do otherwise, I feel it necessary to resent their actions with all the power in my body. Dealing with the Mines Department, I wish to say that in the large portion of this State contained in the Mt. Margaret electorate the prospectors and the prospectors' association have made repeated applications to the Mines Department for public batteries at various centres. At Mt. Morgans the prospectors' association have made repeated applications for a

battery; but the Minister informs me that his official report of that place does not warrant the erection of a crusher. I hope that the Minister will have a more complete report made of that district, because it appears from statements made to me by prospectors and other people in the district that a public crusher is absolutely necessary at Mt. Morgans; and I hope this will be considered by the Government. I would point out that the Minister for Mines some 14 months ago (Mr. Hastie) promised a deputation that he would erect a battery there, or at least would put the money on the Estimates for that purpose; but I did not find anything on the Estimates. The district is languishing for the want of a public crusher. There is a battery which crushes for the public and is subsidised by the Government; but from what I can gather—I have no personal knowledge—that battery is not a successful concern, and the people desire a public crusher. I hope that the Government will make a more complete investigation of the great mineral resources of that district, and that, if justified, an item will be placed on the Estimates to enable the Minister to erect a public crusher at Mt. Morgans. There are other places of which I could speak; but I will refrain until we reach the Estimates, when I shall be able to give a detailed account of what is needed to open up the mineral wealth of that portion of the State. I have here figures the reading of which would occupy me till midnight. I wish, in conclusion, to show that this country has nothing to be afraid of, notwithstanding the slight falling-off in the gold yield. We have here a very wealthy country from a gold-producing point of view. I have the statistics showing in dollars the world's gold production. The figures appear in an American journal, which places Australia absolutely at the top of the tree as compared with other gold-producing countries; and to the total production of Australia this State contributes 46 per cent. While we have so wealthy a country, we need have no fear for the future or cause for complaint. There is no reason why the member for the Swan (Mr. Gull), when moving the adoption of the Address, should talk about Federation ruining this country, and exclaim that by federating we

chucked our Customs revenue into the gutter. In that connection I will content myself by saying that I am a Federalist now, and was then. I voted for Federation then, and would vote for it now. As an Australian, I want to make my country a nation. That I can do only by Federation, and by having a Federal Parliament grappling with questions that State Parliaments have failed to settle. Make our country a nation, and a white nation. I will not say that any of our revenues were thrown in the gutter. When I find from statistics that in the matter of gold production Australia is absolutely at the top of the tree, and that Western Australia contributes the large proportion of 46 per cent. to the output of Australia, I realise that we are, from a gold-producing point of view, the wealthiest State in the Commonwealth, and the wealthiest area for our size in the world. I am not an agriculturist; I cannot speak of the great fertility of our soil; but I have heard the member for Katanning (Hon. F. H. Piessé) speak of it, and have had the honour and pleasure of visiting his vineyard and his apple orchard. I say his property is a credit to him, and we ought to be pleased and proud to have so enterprising a man helping to open up the State. I have heard him speak of the agricultural wealth of this country. I have travelled over a large area of the agricultural districts, and I know from my own experience in the Eastern States that Western Australia has for pastoral purposes a great future. I have not visited the Kimberleys, nor been much in the North-West. I have been on the Gascoyne, and I know that to be a very fine pastoral country. And if my friends who have travelled right through New South Wales and Queensland, and through the Northern Territory and through the Kimberleys, have informed me faithfully about the value of Western Australia from a pastoral point of view, we have in the great North, in the Kimberleys, a pastoral country of which we should be proud. I am not going to say second to none, because I know from my experience of Queensland that it is absolutely impossible to get better pastoral lands than those in the tropics of Queensland. They, unfortunately, do not get the rainfall. I

will not say that Kimberley is second to none, but I have been credibly informed that it is absolutely good pastoral country. From what we know of the agricultural capacities of our soil and of our gold production and of the pastoral capacities of the State, with all of this we have a great State which, if properly governed, will be a rich State and its people prosperous. I want to impress upon the Government the necessity of being careful so far as their immigration proposals are concerned. Already in the State we have hundreds of men walking about the country looking for work and anxious to get it, and who are, to my personal knowledge, capable of doing it if they get it. They are walking about the country without money and some of them without food. It may be news to the Premier that there are 50 or 60 men calling daily at most of the big mines at every change of shift asking for employment. That is known at the Golden Mile, and the hon. member who represents that locality will be able to speak of it when he addresses the House. I urge the necessity of caution in immigration. I was in Queensland years ago when immigration to that country was at its zenith and when they were importing men. What did the assisted immigrants do when they landed in Queensland? At that time fever and ague were rife there, and the imported men could not stand the tropics until they became inured. What did they do? They streaked across the border into New South Wales and Victoria. Queensland was spending thousands to supply the other States with immigrants. That was before the "eighties." There is necessity for the Government to be careful. I want to point out the necessity of finding employment for people already in the country and settling them on the land, without bringing men from the old country who are not accustomed to our ways and habits and climate, while we have bone and sinew idle, men and women prepared to go on the land. The Labour Government appointed a Royal Commission to go into this matter of immigration, and I realised the necessity then, as now, and desire to point this out to the Premier. The hon. gentleman knows the agricultural areas of this State. I congratulate him on the manner in

which he handled the Lands Department last night. He has shown to members that he understands the Lands Department and the lands of our State. I hope that when he brings down his proposals for immigration he will be careful, and that with this majority of his he will not rush on legislation that other States have suffered from in the early years of self-government. When Queensland was about as old in self-government as Western Australia is to-day, she adopted the same principle; and I have pointed out that largely she was doing it for the benefit of the other States, or the people flocked into the cities. We want men in this country whom we can settle on the land; but give the people of our own country the first opportunity of doing so; and when we have done this it is time to look abroad for others. I have no desire to detain the House any longer. I will point out to the Government that while they have such a large and powerful majority, and while they have the debating power they possess on their side of the House, it will be necessary for them to give members a fair opportunity of discussing every proposal brought down. When the Rason Government, in the closing moments of last session, brought down proposals for the expenditure of something near £30,000 for the construction of spur railways, the present Premier made a speech giving an estimate of the cost of the construction of these lines closer than any member of this House to the contract that has just been let to the Public Works Department. I want to advise the Minister controlling the Public Works Department—[THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: He does not want your advice]—seeing that the work will probably be put under the charge of the Engineer-in-Chief, that the success of the undertaking, that is in regard to the work of laying the rails and completing the line, depends upon the management of the workers; and the employment of the men should be left in the hands of those in charge. I hope no member of this House will use any influence with the Government or the Minister to get anybody a job on that line from the humblest to the highest position offered, because that work cannot be successfully carried out unless the men controlling it have the right to put on or dismiss whom they like. I have been

a worker all my life, and no persons in the Labour movement desire people to be pitchforked into billets. They only want a fair deal and sympathetic administration under departmental construction. I want to give the Minister every assistance in preventing any undue harassing of the men in control of the work. The Minister should give full and complete control to the engineer, and if any member of this House sends any letters of recommendation to those controlling the work, whether it be the Minister or any of his subordinate officers, it should be resented. The Minister should give the man in charge full power. How can the engineer carry out the work if other men have the right to select men to work under him? I have worked too long in railway construction, in mining underground, and in the pastoral pursuits of Australia not to know the exact position; and I say that, unless those in charge of the work have complete control, they will not make it a complete success. I want to point out to the Minister that he should also see that those in charge of the work are unbiased, that they have no feelings against certain people, and that they will give every man a show and will judge by results. Then I am quite confident the Works Department will carry out these railways with credit to themselves and with benefit to the country. I content myself with thanking hon. members for the patient manner in which they have heard me.

On motion by MR. HOLMAN, debate adjourned.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 10-40 o'clock until the next day.