

potatoes in a 10 per cent. solution of sulphuric acid is a means of effectively preventing any possibility of infection from these potatoes, and therefore we propose to establish a depot at Fremantle for the treatment of potatoes by this method, which will enable us to exercise a check and prevent the cornering of the local supply. Because I realise that in the cornering of the local supply it will not be the growers who will do the cornering, but the produce merchants who buy from them and then, by exercising a corner, put up the price to the consumer. We will have this means of introducing potatoes without any possibility of infection, and will be able to protect the interests of the consumers of Western Australia by reducing the price of potatoes. We find that the officers of the department feel assured that this process of treatment is much cheaper than the existing method, and I certainly believe we will not go back to the famine prices which have ruled for some time past, and which have made the potato an article tabooed to a very large proportion of the people of Western Australia. I may say there are other proposals in which I hope to have the co-operation, not only of members, but of producers and consumers outside, in regard to the cheapening the price of other commodities. But, naturally, one requires time to deal with these things and investigate them fully. I can assure hon. members we are dealing with this question of cheapening the cost of staple articles of diet with a view to making it less onerous to consumers than it has been in the past. So far as the question of the price of sugar is concerned, that is a matter over which we have very little control; but had the people of Australia exercised a little more consideration at the time the questions were submitted at the referenda we might have had some relief in this matter, which has been a subject of comment for some time past. However, I want to assure hon. members that in any proposal which we may advance we certainly intend to give every encouragement to the agricultural industry to the end that it

may prosper; and we are also going to take steps, so far as lies in our power, to see that in the development of that industry we safeguard the interests of the consumer and provide that where we are able to raise a more economic and better supply of agricultural products, the first advantage of that better supply is going to be reached by the consumers, who to-day are called upon to support very largely the efforts which are being made for the encouragement of the agricultural industry of the State.

On motion by Mr. Dooley debate adjourned.

BILL—SUPPLY (£460,000).

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

House adjourned at 8.28 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 9th November, 1911.

	PAGE
Papers presented	135
Address-in-reply, fourth day, conclusion	135
Adjournment, one week	169

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

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: 1, Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Charities; 2, Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of Fisheries.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Fourth Day—Conclusion.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. W. PATRICK (Central): With other hon. members who have already spoken I wish to add my congratulations

to my friend and colleague, Mr. Drew, on his reaching the high position of Colonial Secretary and leader of this House, and also to the Hon. Mr. Dodd. I would also like to extend to the two new members a welcome to this House. The Governor's Speech is fairly lengthy, although there is a considerable amount of it of a nebulous character. I should imagine there is more than enough business, however, to keep the attention of the House until the end of the session. The Government draw attention to the voting at the recent general elections and point out the high percentage of voters who went to the poll, and there is no doubt whatever it must have been eminently satisfactory to the present Government. It proves the instability of political power—there is no doubt about that—and it shows that no party can hold the reins of power for six years without treading on the toes of the electors. That is one of the chief causes of the political tidal wave that has swept over this State. I am sure as far as this House is concerned every assistance will be given to the leader of the House and his colleagues in carrying through all measures which we consider for the benefit and in the interests of the State and its development. The Governor's Speech states—

The prospect of the early construction of the Transcontinental Railway is an augury of increased commercial and industrial activity within the State.

It just struck me when I read that paragraph that we might have had some statement from the Government as to what they intend to do at an early date in regard to the construction of the connecting link of that railway from Kalgoorlie to Fremantle. The rails and fastenings for the Transcontinental railway, I believe, have already been ordered and practically the work has been commenced, and I read in the *Federal Hansard* when the Hon. King O'Malley was introducing the measure, he said that he expected that in all probability the railway would be finished within two years. If that is likely to be the case our Government ought to be up and

doing at once to prepare plans and see about the construction of the railway from Kalgoorlie to Fremantle. It will be a very big undertaking, because the question of accommodation at Fremantle for increased shipping and all that sort of thing will of course necessarily have to be gone into. I trust the leader of the House will be in a position to tell us about this matter when he is replying at the end of this debate. I am glad to see the Government still believe in the future of the mining industry. There is no doubt whatever that, considering the vast extent of our territory, 200 or 300 square miles of mineral territory, that mining ought to be in its initiatory stage, although no one, on the other hand, can deny that the gold mining industry since 1903 has been in a decadent state. From year to year and month to month, almost every month I think as compared with the same month of 1903 has shown a decline in the gold mining industry. That is not a very satisfactory state of things. No doubt important developments have taken place in various parts of the State which may lead to a more satisfactory condition of things in the industry. I notice amongst other things that "recent development in the large mines of the Kalgoorlie district give reassuring testimony as to the permanency and value of the great lodes at depths." We always expected—although I did not expect it on this occasion—for the Murchison to be forgotten. A most important development has taken place during the last twelve months at the Great Fingall mine. It has been proved that payable gold exists at a depth of 2,200 feet, and this will insure the continuance of that mine for many years to come and possibly it may produce as much gold and pay as good dividends in the future as in the past. I think it worth while drawing attention to this great mine which did not look too well 18 months or two years ago. It has taken now a new lease of life and when it is proved that gold exists at a great depth on the Murchison it may give encouragement to other mines from Peak Hill to Yalgoo to sink at a greater depth to try and prove the existence of gold

at a depth in their localities. The Speech also says—

My Ministers, fully recognising the importance of developing the agricultural resources of the State, have under consideration the routes of several railways, for the construction of which Bills will in due course be submitted to you.

That tells us nothing. There are no special railways referred to and I think there is no member in the House but who will support any railway through country that is shown to be suitable for agricultural development. There are many reasons why railways should be constructed in agricultural and mining country, because under the system of constructing railways which has been carried out during the past few years in Western Australia it has been just as cheap, or almost as cheap, to construct a railway as to build a good macadamised road, and, of course, railways are infinitely superior and can carry an immense amount of freight. The Government propose a very important move, which has my sympathy, namely the amalgamation of the departments administering the water supplies. I think it is a very good idea, and I hope that, in future, when reports are published in the newspapers, they will be of an informative character. In reference to the reports which we have had treating with the water consumed, the revenue, the expenses, and so on in connection with the goldfields water supply, the public have only had before them one portion of the account. In future I trust that they will get the whole of it. They have simply had a statement of the expenses of running the scheme, and the revenue, but we ought to have the total expenses, including interest and sinking fund. Considering the much more satisfactory condition of things that exists now compared with what existed some years ago, and considering that last year's loss on the scheme was only some £25,000, the Government need not be afraid of taking the public into their confidence and giving full accounts from quarter to quarter. The Government intend to increase the capital and

extend the operations of the Agricultural Bank. I think everyone in this State will be in favour of that. The constitution of the bank makes it necessary that we should increase the capital from time to time, because the bank is not at liberty to use the capital which we provide them with. If we provide the bank with half a million of money and that is lent to the settlers, when it is returned it is earmarked and does not go back into the capital, but an ordinary bank is continually using its capital. There is no doubt that the present capital of the bank would be more than ample if the trustees were in the same position as the directors of an ordinary bank, who utilise their capital as it comes in. Of course, we cannot discuss the measure until it comes before us, but our sympathies are all in favour of extending the usefulness of this institution, which has done so much in the past for the settlement of the lands of this State. There is a paragraph in the Speech which says that the Government propose to reduce Ministerial and certain Parliamentary salaries. I believe the proposal is to reduce the salaries of Ministers, and of what other officers I do not know, but at any rate if Ministers consider £1,000 a year perfectly sufficient for themselves I can see no reason why we should object. At the same time, we must not forget that both Houses of Parliament voted the salaries at present payable, and, personally, I do not think them too high. There are many men in the employment of private firms and individuals who have much higher salaries than are paid to Ministers of the Crown at the present moment. There are men in Kalgoorlie on the big mines who are paid £2,000 and £3,000 a year.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Some are paid much higher than that.

Hon. W. PATRICK: I am speaking well within the mark. But not one of them, even in the biggest mines, has so responsible a position as a Minister of the Crown in Western Australia. There is a proposal to amend the Criminal Code so as to provide for courts of criminal appeal, but I would like to see the Bill before saying whether I will support it or

otherwise. Referring, however, to criminal matters generally, there was a grave case in Katanning a few days ago dealing with an assault on two young children. I am going to make no remark on the Judge's sentence, but I understand from the report in the newspaper that the clause in the measure which was passed last session to impose the punishment of flogging has been found to be inoperative. I certainly think that if that is so, it is the duty of the Government to see that an amendment of the Act is introduced so as to make it operative, because if there is one crime more abominable than another it is this one. Personally, I should go much further than flogging—I would treat a brute as a brute. The Government also propose to transfer the appellate jurisdiction of the Governor in Council in divorce and matrimonial causes to the Supreme Court. I have always held a strong opinion, that so far as divorce is concerned, the man and woman should be on exactly the same basis; there should be no discrimination whatever. It is a remnant from the times of barbarism, that there should be any difference at all, and if the Government include in the measure a clause dealing with this point they will have my strongest support. I am very pleased to see that the Government are following in the footsteps of their predecessors in moving as quickly as possible for the establishment of a university. We passed the measure last year and we cannot have the institution brought into operation too soon. The education of the people in this State is one of the greatest things we possibly can do for the future benefit of the people. No doubt there are many important things which have been omitted from the Speech, but one of very great importance is that of immigration. I should have liked some statement from the Government as to whether they intend to continue the system of immigration carried on by the late Government, or whether they intend to modify or stop it. I consider this matter of immigration to Australia overshadows anything else we can do. Here we have a continent of three million square miles, or thereabouts, larger than the continent of Europe, and

we have $4\frac{1}{2}$ millions of people, about equal to the population of Scotland and Ireland. We have had lessons from the wars and rumours of war in Europe during the last three or four months, which show the absolute necessity of peopling this country with white men and women. Germany would have gone to war with France for the sake of acquiring territory in Morocco had not Great Britain interposed diplomatically, and finally Germany only stopped in her demands on receiving what she called compensation, though she had no claim for compensation because she had no rights in the matter; she received some 200,000 square miles of French territory on the Congo in order to prevent war. I can easily understand the position of Germany. Her population is increasing at the rate of one million per annum, and she has said time after time that she must have temperate country in which to extend her Empire. We know that she would have gone to war at the time of the Boer trouble and seized South Africa had her fleet been strong enough. To-day we have the case of Italy saying to Turkey without any reason or provocation, "We want Tripoli, and if you do not care to give us it we will take it." And in process of taking it she is going in for murder on a huge scale. It is the most disgraceful war that has ever been waged. It is not war but massacre, and simply in order to acquire territory in a temperate portion of the globe so that Italy can settle her surplus population. And then within the last few weeks the great slumbering giant of China has awakened, and no doubt when that country is properly organised she will be a tremendous danger to Australia. The building of warships is nothing without people. The only defence is to populate the country. I have no right to say that the present Government do not intend to encourage immigration, but if the Government have decided against immigration I ask them to reconsider their decision. However, no doubt the Colonial Secretary will tell us about this matter when he is replying. I do not intend to say anything further beyond that I have very much pleasure in supporting the Address-in-reply.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN (South): Since Parliament prorogued last February a very important change has come over the relationship between the political parties in this State, a change so material that even non-party people like some members of this Chamber cannot altogether ignore it. As the result of the recent general elections a new set of men have been returned to power, and a new, or comparatively new, party in Australian politics have been placed in office with an almost overwhelming majority in another place, and they have different ideals and different aspirations in many respects from their predecessors. That party in coming into power have excited very high expectations throughout the State. They have excited high expectations amongst the members of their own party outside of Parliament—the members of political and industrial organisations associated with that party—and they have also excited very high expectations among that very large section of public opinion that comes between the two parties in this State—those people who are neither bound to the Wilson party nor to the Labour party, but form a very big section who usually sway the elections, and who on this occasion threw in their weight with the present Government and were responsible for the position of political parties to-day. Those expectations are so extraordinarily high that I think perhaps it is right that it should be recognised by the Labour party as well as by the country generally, that the difficulties that the present Government have to face towards the realisation of those high expectations are extremely great, so very great that the public should not expect them to be realised in a year, or even two years, or it may take much longer. The difficulties to my mind are mainly of a financial character, and in referring to the finances of this State it ought not to be thought in any way that what I say should imply that they are unsound or that the credit of the State is not perfectly good. The difficulties are merely the difficulties in carrying out the policy outlined by the Government, the policy that their supporters expect, having regard to the

financial position of the affairs of the State. The new problems presented to the Ministry might be summed up by stating that if the Government carry out their policy, and I am certain they will use every means in their power to do so, it will increase the expenditure, and under existing conditions, if there be no alteration in taxation, I am very much afraid there may be a diminishing revenue. To my mind the Government, or the party now in power, are peculiarly fortunate in the selection of the men to occupy Cabinet rank. I think those members of this Chamber and another place who know the personnel of the Labour party, must agree that the choice of caucus was an eminently wise one—that it almost converts one to the idea that perhaps the best system of electing Ministers is election by party. I am not going to say that there are not members of the Labour party who are quite as good as the members of the Cabinet, but I think we can say of this Ministry, what one can rarely say of any Ministry, that there is not a single member of it who is not eminently qualified to occupy a place in it. The Labour party have given to the science of politics many reforms that will be permanent, and have decidedly added to the general scheme of improvement which is continually going on; but I do think that system of election is valuable inasmuch as it relieves the leader of embarrassment, and also I should imagine it would prevent the jealousy that sometimes exists in parties where a particular individual may not be selected, and there is much consequent irritation. Perhaps also that system which has been adopted with such eminently successful results in State and Commonwealth Parliaments may lead on to still further advancement towards possible elective Ministries. The expectations regarding the new men who have taken office are high, particularly because of what has been done in a short time by the Federal Labour Ministry. I think that anybody who looks back on what has been done since the last Federal elections, and views the actions of the Federal Ministry with an unbiassed mind,

must agree that that Government has already achieved wonders of statesmanship. In naval affairs they have adopted the scheme which was recommended by an expert who was appointed on the advice of the British Admiralty, Admiral Hender-son, and by the end of June the Govern-ment will have expended three millions out of the four million pounds that will be necessary to provide the fleet unit recommended by that expert. So far as land defence is concerned, the present Federal Government is following out the recom-mendations of no less an authority than Lord Kitchener. If the Federal Govern-ment had done no more than that in the matter of defence, I think they would deserve the thanks of Australia, and I think it is a tribute that ought to be paid to them irrespective of the political views of the individual who is judging. But that is not all they have done. They have also provided for invalid and old age pensions, a most beneficent and humane measure, a scheme that will cost over two millions during the present year. But their work has not stopped there. They are also de-veloping the Northern Territory, and they are going even further; they are seeing that the Commonwealth is bearing its share of the white man's burden in the effort to develop New Guinea in the in-terests of the black race there. In addi-tion to that they are keeping faith with New South Wales, and it is extremely important that the good faith of the Com-monwealth should be maintained, and they are doing that by constructing the Fed-eral capital in New South Wales.

Hon. M. L. Moss: What concerns us most is that they should keep faith with Western Australia.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: I would like to ask the hon. gentleman in what single respect they have not kept faith with Western Australia?

Hon. M. L. Moss: They have not carried out the promise to give us our customs revenue for 25 years, the promise made when the elections were on.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: That state-ment is not quite the case.

Hon. M. L. Moss: It is absolutely cor-rect.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: What they have done is this. Despite what was said on political platforms during the cam-paign regarding the financial agreement when the present Federal Government came into power, they adopted in its en-tirety the financial agreement that was agreed upon by their predecessors in con-ference with the States. The difference in regard to the financial agreement was, that this agreement, as it was originally presented to the people by the Deakin Government, was that it was for all time, and the proposal that has been approved by the Federal Government is that the agreement should continue for ten years. I have never heard any suggestion as to whether or not at the end of that ten years it should not still be further continued, but I think when they pledged themselves to continue that agreement for ten years they were doing all they possibly could in the interests of the Commonwealth. Why pledge the Commonwealth further? Another Government will possibly be in power then and another set of circum-stances will have arisen, and why should this Government or any other Government pledge futurity for 25 years? I say that ten years is a reasonable time, because it enables State Treasurers to know what to look forward to, but to ask for 25 years is rather too long, although it is not quite so bad as the original financial agreement. If the hon. member or any other hon. member has nothing further than that to bring against the Common-wealth Government, all I can say is that the case against the Commonwealth Gov-ernment is a very weak one indeed.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: This is scarcely the place to discuss those matters.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: I was taken off the track somewhat. What I wanted to show was that the Federal Parliament having provided an effective system of defence, invalid and old age pensions, the development of the Northern Territory and Papua, and having moved forward in the matter of the Federal capital; having done all these things, the expectations of the public are rather high when the same party come into power in a State. It should be remembered that the Federal

Government are also about to construct the West Australian Transcontinental railway, and having done all this it closes the year with a surplus of £1,800,000. The Commonwealth was never more prosperous or more progressive than it is to-day. I mention all that because I think it is a reason that has actuated the people of this State to hold extraordinarily high hopes as to what this Government will do, and I say it is impossible for our State Government in view of the financial position, to carry out and realise the hopes of the people. It is right that that should be said at the very outset, and that it should be fully recognised both by supporters and opponents of the Government. What is the financial position of the State to-day? The accumulated deficit is £79,000, which is not a very large deficit. The Under Treasurer, Mr. Eliot, prepared a minute prior to the elections which was found by the incoming Treasurer. It forecasted the financial position of the State. In that estimate Mr. Eliot estimated that the end of December would show a surplus of £16,000. In view of the fact that already there is a deficit of £79,000, and that as we have only two months to go to the end of December, I fail to see how it will be possible for that surplus estimated by Mr. Eliot to be realised. But Mr. Eliot went on to say that if the revenue and expenditure of the State during the coming year remained the same as it was during the last year, the end of the financial year would show a deficit of £116,000. Now, owing to expenditure which has already been incurred by this Government, an expenditure of £35,000 in granting increases to railway servants, which were promised prior to the election, a further sum will be added to that £116,000. But I do not know that it would be quite right to anticipate that the revenue for the coming year will be equal to the revenue for last year. We all sincerely hope it will be. There have been some references to the dry season. We were glad to hear some hon. members who know a good deal of the subject say that these references were somewhat exaggerated. Let it be hoped that it is so. But, presuming the revenue to be the

same, even on these two items there is a certain deficit of something like £150,000. And that is not the end; during the last election campaign the then Opposition continually objected to the policy of the previous Government in poaching on loan funds for revenue work. Certain expenditure on additions and improvements to railways and rolling stock was considered to be an improper item to come out of the loan funds, and personally I think that expenditure ought if possible to come out of revenue. Now the amount expended last year on these items in the Railway Department was something like £200,000, and if the present Government fulfil their promise not to spend loan funds on such purposes the position will be still worse from a financial point of view. To me it seems that the Government will be perfectly justified in pointing out that when those promises were made the financial position was not as clear as it has since become, and they would have good reason for asking the State to exercise patience and be not too hasty in an anxiety to see realised the expectations which were excited by the incoming Government. I mention this because I want to point out the extraordinary difficulties with which the Government are faced, and try to show that it is too much to expect that all the anticipations with which this Government came into power should be realised at once, or perhaps for many years to come. I can only see one solution of the difficulties. I think the Government must, where possible, go in for economy, and, in addition to that, I am afraid there is no alternative to increased taxation. Neither proposal is a popular one, but I fail to see how the Government can otherwise meet the position. Some members have commented on the fact that there was no reference in the Speech to the question of immigration. They seemed to make a point out of that. I have never read a Governor's Speech which did not leave out a great deal more than was put in, and the fact that there was no reference in this last Speech to immigration does not imply that the Government are in any way opposed to a policy of immigration. A suggestion I

would respectfully offer in connection with the pursuance of a policy of immigration. I think every reasonable person in the State desires to see immigration encouraged. So ready is the recognition of the need for fresh people that it seems almost a waste of time to harp on the necessity for additional population to fill our vacant spaces—the suggestion I would respectfully offer to the Government is that they should act in co-operation with the Commonwealth Government and with the Governments of the other States of Australia in endeavouring to bring about some uniform system of immigration.

Hon. M. L. Moss: We have been doing very well in the past without co-operation with the other States in this matter.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: I think we would do still better with the assistance of the other States. A proposal came to the last Government from the other States; all I know of that proposal is contained in a reference which was made to it in the House by the late Colonial Secretary. At any rate the proposal was not received very favourably. It was a suggestion from the Premier of New South Wales with a view, I think, of uniform action regarding the whole of the Commonwealth. I think that the money which is being spent now would be spent to better advantage if it were done as the result of uniform action, and if some scheme were to be devised by which all the States should be treated fairly. And I suggest that possibly a conference might be held between responsible Ministers of the Commonwealth and of the States, and at this conference those Ministers could go into the whole matter of the question of finance, the question of advertising in the British Isles, and the question of the distribution of immigrants, and so deal with these important matters in a broad and statesmanlike way. I do not think any members of the Parliament of Western Australia have any fear of comparison between this State and the Eastern States, as they appear to immigrants. This State has limitless undeveloped resources. Surely if the advantages of all the States were placed fairly before immigrants no State could show a better case

for immigration than Western Australia, and I believe that much money now being spent would be spent to far better advantage if the whole of the Commonwealth and each individual State were working in concerted action. Now there is a point in connection with the immigration policy pursued by the late Government which I think it would be worth while of the present Government to make inquiries about, and that is the question of the Melbourne agency. I do not know exactly what is being done by the Melbourne agency, but I would suggest to the present Government that they consider whether that office is quite in accord with the Federal spirit we wish to see exercised between the States. The Ministry should decide whether any effort should be made in the Eastern States to take from them their agricultural or other population. I believe in the policy of do unto others as we would like others to do unto us, and I would ask members how would they like it if, for instance, the Queensland Government were to open an agency, let us say in Kalgoorlie, with a view to persuading miners—of whom hundreds every year are desirous of giving up their occupation and settling on farms with what money they have saved—to inducing these miners to go to Queensland, or some other of the Eastern States, rather than to settle in Western Australia. I for one would regard it as an unfederal action. I would resent it, and I think Parliament and the State also would resent it. Yet this is just what we ourselves are doing in Melbourne. Ministers should ask themselves whether it is advisable to continue an aggressive policy of bringing settlers from the Eastern States to Western Australia. If this State desires to bring desirable settlers from the Eastern States to settle on our lands I will offer a suggestion the adoption of which would result in the bringing of hundreds of agriculturists from the Eastern States without advertisement, and this result would be as certain to follow as the night the day. My suggestion is that the Government make available the enormous tract of valuable agricultural land lying be-

tween Norseman and Esperance. The report of the majority of the advisory board stated that in that area there was $1\frac{3}{4}$ million acres of the best agricultural land in Western Australia at present in possession of the Crown and with so good a rainfall. I ask hon. members, if a similar report had been made regarding any other district in the State, would that district not have been long ere this provided with railway communication? I have met men from the Eastern States who know the value of land; I have at different times met as many as a hundred such men who have gone down there, some prejudiced against the land, and who, in spite of this, on return have spoken in the highest possible terms of the agricultural value of that land. If the railway be built it will unquestionably add a new and prosperous province to Western Australia. Some members complained that this railway is not mentioned in the Speech; that is so, but I look with confidence and with hope to this Government introducing a Bill this session for the construction of that line. I feel perfectly certain that the large number of people who are anxious to go upon that land, not only people in Western Australia, but also people in the Eastern States, will have that opportunity provided for them this session. Before I conclude I would like to refer to the speech of my friend, Mr. Moss. He is a gentleman who to this House is a great acquisition and sometimes a very great danger; he is a gentleman whose power of eloquence is so great that he reminds me of the story of a countryman of mine. This countryman stole a hen. There was no doubt about his having stolen the hen. It was a reprehensible thing for an Irishman to do, but still I must confess he actually stole the hen; and in due course he was charged with the crime in the police court. There was a brilliant young advocate who was briefless at the time, and he took up the case, and by his great ability baffled all the witnesses for the prosecution and made them contradict themselves over and over again. The result was the prosecution had not a leg to stand on, and the barrister made a most brilliant appeal to the bench and

reduced almost everyone, even the policeman, to tears. Finally the magistrate, in a most apologetic voice dismissed the case, and the Irishman left the court without a stain on his character; and as he was going out of the court, he scratched his head and said, "Begorra! When I came into this court I thought I stole that hen, but really I do not think I could have stolen the hen now myself." That barrister by his brilliancy even convinced the guilty man that he was innocent. Mr. Moss has ability of that sort. I do not know of any man in Parliament who can make the worse seem the better cause. He ought to be satisfied with this great ability; it ought to be good enough to establish a case; but I am sorry there is another aspect of Mr. Moss with which I will have to deal, and I am extremely glad that he is here, because I will have to tell him some home truths. When a man comes to this House he ought to be sure of the accuracy of his statements. Yesterday the hon. member referred to the mining industry. Either Mr. Moss is right or the official returns of the Mines Department are wrong, or *vice versa*. It is for this House to say whether the official returns are correct or Mr. Moss. The hon. member brought forward a set of figures, and it was grossly unfair for him to quote them in the way he did. I cannot believe he prepared the figures. It seemed to me he had a brief, and that someone else had prepared them, someone else who was rather careless as to the way he did it. What did Mr. Moss endeavour to prove? He quoted from statistics regarding the mining industry and he referred to particular departments that showed a loss. He showed that the public batteries, for instance, were not paying, that during the ten years or so that they had been in existence there was a total loss of some five figures, but a few thousand pounds loss every year when totted up for ten years looks a big amount. He told us about the water scheme. But he did not tell us the water scheme accounts do not provide for what Sir John Forrest has over and over again pointed out they should provide for. Were it not for that water scheme the cost of running the

railways to the goldfields would be increased by tens of thousands of pounds annually, but there is no recognition of that aspect in the returns that have been prepared in connection with the water scheme. Then the hon. member went on to refer to the expenditure on the goldfields, mentioning even the School of Mines; but he carefully omitted, like others who quote the same set of figures, the total revenue derived from the goldfields; he carefully failed to go into any of the figures concerning the revenue. Now, what would be thought of any goldfields member, if any goldfields member would do such a thing—and I do not believe any goldfields member in this House or in the other House would do such a thing—supposing he were to come along and take the losses on the agricultural railways and tot them up and take the total for a great many years and use it as an argument that the agricultural industry was a pampered industry. Everything that has been done for the agricultural industry has received the warm and cordial support of the goldfields members, and any loss on the agricultural railways they recognise has been paid back to the State many times over, just in the same way as the trifling loss on the goldfields services has come back to the State directly and indirectly ten and twenty times over. For every pound spent on the goldfields the revenue has gained probably twenty pounds in return. But it is not only the unfairness of making comparisons of that kind, one-sided comparisons, and not giving the other side; but when a gentleman comes forward and quotes figures, the least that might be expected of him is that his figures should be correct and not grossly exaggerated. What can be thought of a member of this House who does that sort of thing? Yesterday Mr. Moss in speaking about the mining industry said that the amount from the Mining Development Vote was £50,000 a year. I interjected, "How much was it for last year?" He said, "I will give you the figures later on." Mr. Moss never gave the figures later on, but I will give them now, I will tell what the amount from the Mining Development

Vote was. There was never half of £50,000 spent in one year from the Mining Development Vote; there was never one-third of £50,000 spent in one year on the Mining Development Vote. What are the figures for last year? I have them for the various years, the figures I asked him for when he said the Mining Development Vote was £50,000. What are the actual facts concerning the Mining Development Vote? The hon. member can get them from the Mines Report if he cares to read them.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: There is a bit of the hen-stealer about you also.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: I do not know what the hon. member is referring to. I took the figures from the official reports of the Department of Mines; and if the hon. member says that these reports are not correct, all I can say is that I leave it to the members of the House to say whether or not the report of the officials is correct, or whether or not Mr. Kingsmill is correct. I have the figures. So appalled was I by a statement of this kind that I went to the Mines Department in order to make sure of the case; and I said, "I want you to give me everything that you have of the expenditure from the Mining Development Vote"; and I got figures from them in order to check my own. I found their figures to absolutely coincide with my own figures, although I did not mention to the Mines Department what my own figures were. I simply told them I wanted every single penny spent from that vote for the last ten years, and I have the figures now. I asked Mr. Moss, when he said the expenditure was £50,000 a year, what the figures were for last year, and he said, "I will give them later on." He never did. I will give them now. Last year, what was the total spent out of this vote? Mr. Moss was very careful not to say the Mining Development Vote is also responsible for receipts which considerably reduce the expenditure. I have the figures of the receipts here to show exactly what the Mining Development Vote costs the State annually. What is this wonderful song Mr. Moss made about the £50,000 a year? During last year from

loan and revenue the amount expended under the Mining Development Act was £9,677 3s. 9d. and the receipts were £2,123. When we deduct the receipts from the expenditure the sum of £7,554 is left as net expenditure incurred. Yet that is what Mr. Moss describes as £50,000.

Hon. M. L. Moss: That is exactly what Mr. Moss has not alluded to.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: Mr. Moss is reported to-day in the *West Australian* as saying exactly what he did say. He said, "£50,000 a year out of the Mines Development Vote."

Hon. M. L. Moss: No; for mines development, but not under that Act.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: Mr. Moss may talk till he is black in the face.

Hon. M. L. Moss: I rise to make a personal explanation. The hon. member must not misrepresent me. There is a great difference between expenditure under the Mining Development Act and moneys expended for the purpose of mines development, and the hon. member knows it.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: When the expenditure from mines development is spoken of no one ever suggests that it should be other than expenditure under the Mining Development Act. Mr. Moss may say what he likes, but that was the clear and distinct meaning of what he said, and I wish to make that position absolutely clear. Mr. Moss is not a man who is in the habit of being obscure with regard to his remarks. Every member of the House, whenever mines development is referred to, invariably means the Mining Development Act. When I went into the Mines Department to check my own figures I asked them what the figures under mines development were, and they gave me these.

Hon. M. L. Moss: You are quibbling now.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: There is no quibbling about it, but I say that to say £50,000 a year is spent out of mines development—putting it that way is misrepresenting the facts of the case. The figures I give are the totals spent on mines development. There is no doubt about that point whatever, and Mr. Moss knows it, and he is trying to wriggle out of it. I have the figures

for the last ten years, and so important are they that I venture to read them—In 1901-2, £2,324; 1902-3, £13,643; 1903-4, £14,335; 1904-5, £13,807; 1905-6, £18,377; 1906-7, £24,152; 1907-8, £14,908; 1908-9, £14,862; 1909-10, £9,016, and 1910-11, £9,677. What I would ask Mr. Moss is this. When he comes to the House with his great powers of eloquence and his great powers of speech, his choice of diction and argumentative ability that ought to be enough, and he ought to be certain of what he presents to the House as facts. One hon. member made a pertinent interjection yesterday when Mr. Moss was talking about the mining industry. He said the hon. member did not know what he was talking about, and the figures from the Mines Department and the official report of the department show that this is so. Before I conclude I would like to simply refer to the different relationship that exists between political parties in both Houses of Parliament. The difference that has arisen in this State where one party has an overwhelming majority, and where the ideals of that party are not in accordance with the ideals of a majority in another Chamber is somewhat akin to what existed in the Imperial Parliament. I would remind hon. members what was done by a very exalted personage in the old country under somewhat similar circumstances in a speech that was delivered by Lord Haldane in Edinburgh. He revealed what actually took place when the King was approached by the Prime Minister who wanted to know what would happen in the event of the Commons being returned by a majority pledged to the Veto Bill. The King said "I will abide by the will of the people." That statement of His Majesty shows that he was prepared to accept the will of the people as expressed through the medium of the elections to the House of Commons. The majority of the Liberal party in the House of Commons was not a very great one; in a House of 660 members the majority being a little over 100.

Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett: It was 125.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: Yes, 125. That was the majority and it was nothing approaching the majority that exists

to-day in the Legislative Assembly. Yet the King said "I will accept the will of the people."

Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett: Not quite that, accept the advice of his Ministers.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: I am quoting from the hon. member's own newspaper or the cablegrams that were sent out and I was very careful on the point. The King said he would accept the will of the people.

Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett: That is not what was said in London.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: If the hon. member will look up the cablegrams of that particular time he will see that that was what was cabled out. When the King himself and the House of Lords accepted the verdict of the people as expressed at a general election I am quite sure that this Chamber will accept also the verdict of another place as regards general principles. Of course this Chamber may possibly, in matters of detail, occasionally differ, but where general principles are concerned the people have spoken at the last general elections and I am confident that this Chamber, which prides itself on being a non-party House, will show that it is a non-party House in the true and real sense of the term.

Hon. J. A. DOLAND (Metropolitan-Suburban): In addressing myself to the question before the Chair I would like at this stage to thank members for their congratulations in reference to my success during the recent by-elections, and also for Mr. Davis. We appreciate very much those references, and can only hope that the kindly feeling will prevail throughout the time we shall sit here and that we shall be able to get on together. There is one thing that struck me as peculiar during the time I have been sitting here, and it is the constant reference by members to the fact that this House is a non-party Chamber, and it appears to me to be somewhat of an anomaly. Particularly so is that to me, because just recently having been returned to this House on the particular issue as to whether this House assumed a party attitude or not, I am somewhat of opinion that party politics must prevail

to some extent. Again we have members in this Chamber, Mr. Moss for instance, with a very strong personality, and very firm political convictions, and I am afraid he would not like to sink his own personality or set aside his political convictions when dealing with measures that come before this Chamber. I think it should be distinctly understood that Mr. Davis and myself have come into the House absolutely pledged to a political party who now have the reins in another place, and as I have said before we have come into the Chamber on an election in which the issue was whether this House adopts a party attitude, and amongst other things, whether the franchise of this Chamber should be reduced in order to give a wider expression of opinion to the people. If this Chamber is a non-party Chamber it is only reasonable to expect that members would reduce the franchise so that that wider expression of opinion would prevail, and the accusation would not be thrown at the Chamber that the restricted franchise only admitted one section of the people. That is a phase that has appealed to me, and I am somewhat of the opinion that members here cannot sink their political differences because they are sitting in this particular Chamber. In coming to the Speech itself, exception has been taken by some members to some of the measures contained in the Speech, and exception has also been taken because of some omissions from that Speech. To those who object to the measures or proposals that are not included in the Speech I would say this, that we know the Government do not intend to have a long session, consequently it would be useless to put into the Speech matters which would have no chance of being dealt with this session, and perhaps during the next session, therefore they were not overlooked in the Governor's Speech in that regard. Those questions contained in the Governor's Speech can be given the fullest consideration to by members of this Chamber. Contained in the Speech are many proposals, and to every one of them I give my whole soul support. One proposal that appeals to me particularly is that dealing with the establishment of

homes for the people, and wrapt up in this question is, I think, a solution of what we have been looking for, the high cost of living that obtains. It was interesting to notice the process of reasoning that Mr. Moss adopted in connection with the high cost of living. He has said that it is owing to the increase in wages that the cost of living has gone up. I think that is altogether a wrong foundation on which to argue. We know full well—sensible people must know this—that in order to meet increased demands workmen must have increased wages, and Mr. Moss—I think he has studied the question and is fully conversant with it—must recognise that other factors are at work besides working men in a particular industry, that go for making the high cost of living. For instance Mr. Moss referred to the Federal referendums which were submitted to the people in last April, and assured members that he was opposed to them. If Mr. Moss was desirous of reducing the cost of living to the people in the State he should have taken a stand to see that the referendums were given effect to. As a State he may argue that we are robbing this Parliament of certain powers, but still there were wrapt up in the question the existence of industries this State cannot deal with. I have only to instance the sugar combine that operates over the whole of Australia. It was impossible for any one particular State to deal with a combine or monopoly of this nature. Had the Federal Government been given the power on April 26th to deal with this particular monopoly then one phase of the high cost of living would have disappeared. The only way to have dealt with the sugar industry was to have given to the Federal Parliament power to nationalise this monopoly if they desired and there was the solution of the trouble. There are of course other industries that have the same effect on the life of Australia as the sugar combine, and Mr. Moss in opposing the referendums has shown no desire to solve the problem of the high cost of living. I contend that in this measure for establishing homes for the people we have a basis whereby we can bring about a re-

duction of the cost of living to the people. We know full well in many instances the landlord has been responsible for a very large increase in the cost of living, and if the Government give to the people an opportunity of becoming their own landlords this phase of the difficulty will disappear.

Hon. M. L. Moss: You may take this for granted, that anyone who puts his money into residential property can only get 4 per cent. on it.

Hon. J. A. DOLAND: That is a query. I will relate one instance. I myself have been paying rent at the rate of 12s. 6d. per week for the last 12 months, in fact for a period of four years that was the rent. During the last six months that rent has risen to 17s. 6d. and is still going up. Do you mean to tell me that the profits are only 4 per cent.? Here it is increasing beyond all reason. That is the position. Landlords are only human beings and when the demand for houses increases they take advantage of it all.

Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett: Would you make it freehold or leasehold?

Hon. J. A. DOLAND: Where the Government are providing the land for the people I think that they should retain the ownership of it. It is the policy of the party that, where they provide homes for the people and provide the land as well as the home, they should retain the ownership of the land. There is another proposal contained in the Speech to which some exception has been taken, and that is the proposed establishment of a works committee in Parliament. I think that it would be a wise step, and I do not see any of the dangers surrounding it that some members seem to see. We have this advantage in a committee appointed by Parliament, that in reporting on any proposed work there will be not only a majority report from that committee, but also a minority report. If the committee were not unanimous in regard to a work the minority would have an opportunity of submitting a report, and Parliament would thus have the two sides to the question. I understand that the present advisory board take action only when the Government direct them to do so.

Hon. M. L. Moss: I do not think that is so.

Hon. J. A. DOLAND: Be that as it may, we should have the opportunity in connection with these works of listening to a minority report as well as a majority report from a properly constituted parliamentary committee. If on that ground alone, I think it would be advisable to establish this committee. Some exception has been taken to the action of the Government in regard to the public service in the direction of granting full political rights to the civil servants. I do not think any great exception can be taken to this. Every citizen should have as wide a scope for the expression of his opinion as can possibly be given. There is no comparison between the employees of the State and the people employed in a private capacity; totally different sets of circumstances govern the two. The civil servant at the present time has not the full privileges that he should enjoy, and if we pride ourselves on being a democratic community, giving the widest possible privileges to every citizen, why not let us take this opportunity of extending this privilege to the huge body of public servants? Some doubt has been expressed by members as to the attitude which the Government will adopt in reference to their land policy, but, as Mr. Kirwan has pointed out, the people have adopted this policy, and on general principles I think this House should agree with a policy which the people have accepted. The land policy was made an issue at the recent general elections and it was an issue also at the elections of Mr. Davis and myself, and that policy was adopted overwhelmingly by the people. The broad principle was accepted by the electors, and, as to the fear raised by some members of the possibility of insecurity of tenure, and of those having leaseholds not being able to borrow money, I should say we should endeavour to keep the lands free from the clutches of financial institutions and money lenders. Under a leasehold system we would be doing more to keep the lands out of the hands of these people than by taking money from the selectors in the early stages of develop-

ment, as we do under the present system of alienation. Mr. Cullen has referred to the reduction of the salaries of Ministers, and, like other members, I think it is a question of which the Ministers themselves should be the best judges. As a matter of fact, I understand that the previous Government were pledged to the people to reduce their salaries, but, instead of taking that step the salaries were increased. I do not think that any objection can be taken to this proposed reduction, and if the Ministers themselves desire it this House should abide by their judgment. In regard to immigration, some members seem to be doubtful as to the attitude of the Government, but I would like to assure them that the Government are just as keen on populating the State as any other party. I have only to refer them to the attitude of the Federal Government, who have a desire to see the whole of Australia populated, and who are increasing the federal vote for that purpose this year. In the case of our own State Government members will find that they need have no fear about the attitude that will be adopted on that question. Mr. Connolly has referred to the opposition that was shown by active followers of the Government now in power to the policy that previously obtained under the preceding Government. So far as Mr. McCallum's attitude is concerned, I think his protest was a timely one and that his letter was quite warranted, for I, as an employer in the State, know that at that time, when there was a disposition on the part of the Government to import artisans, on the plea that there was a scarcity of them, there was no difficulty in my particular trade in finding plenty of workers. The same state of affairs obtained throughout all the trades and industries. The hon. member referred to figures obtained from the Labour Bureau, and it is interesting to take note of the manner in which vacancies are filled through the labour bureau. If the bureau sends a man to do an hour's gardening that is considered an engagement of a permanent character, and, of course, it does not take many of these engagements to swell the lists of men engaged. But engagements of that kind are not a true indication of

the stability of industry or the necessity for artisans and other labour in the metropolitan area. The bureau also issues tickets monthly, and it is the duty of an applicant to present his ticket every time he appears at the bureau; on his failure to produce his ticket it is taken for granted that he has secured an engagement elsewhere. The folly of that system is that a man may go continuously to the bureau for a period of two or three weeks without securing any employment, and at the end of that time may decide that he will not bother with the bureau any more; but his failure to return his ticket is taken as an indication of his having obtained employment. In this way the records of the bureau are not a true indication of the state of the labour market.

Hon. M. L. Moss: Is there any difficulty in getting employment?

Hon. J. A. DOLAND: Undoubtedly. On one occasion an advertisement was inserted for a few labourers for sewerage work, and hundreds of men applied.

Hon. M. L. Moss: There is no unemployed difficulty here.

Hon. J. A. DOLAND: Not in the sense that perhaps the hon. member would like to see it, but the fact remains that there is always a certain number of unemployed.

Member: Around the City?

Hon. J. A. DOLAND: Yes, and in some places in the country, where the work that is to be had is for such low wages that men will not take it. We come again to the skilled artisans, and it is in this connection that objection was taken to the policy of immigration under the last Government by certain men connected with the Labour party outside of Parliament. In the skilled trades there is no difficulty in securing labour. In the iron moulding industry we had 10 or 12 men take their departure from the State at the very time when the late Government were crying out for the importation of artisans. These men had to leave Western Australia because they could not get employment here.

Member: Were they not out on strike?

Hon. J. A. DOLAND: No, they were not; they could not get employment in the State. Then again the society of en-

gineers paid the fare of eight men to the Eastern States, and these men were assisted immigrants, so that we had not only to give them assisted fares from England to Australia, but we had to pay their fares out of the State again.

Hon. C. Sommers: Good electioneering tactics.

Hon. J. A. DOLAND: They were no more electioneering tactics than the hon. member himself would adopt when dealing with absolute facts. I am only quoting these facts in answer to Mr. Connolly's attack on Mr. McCallum. The letter which Mr. McCallum sent to the English Press was written because advertisements were being published in the old country calling for artisans in industries which had no vacancies whatever.

Hon. M. L. Moss: It was the most patriotic production that ever emanated from the pen of any man in this country.

Hon. J. A. DOLAND: Whether or not Mr. Moss thinks the letter was patriotic, the fact remains that the party which Mr. McCallum was following was returned by an overwhelming majority, and the only two elections for this Chamber since that time have also resulted in the return of members of that party. That is sufficient evidence of whether the people consider that that letter was patriotic.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): In common with some of the other members I desire to offer my congratulations to the two new members, Messrs. Davis and Doland, who have been returned since we last met. It is not my intention to say much this evening as I take it the responsible Minister, Mr. Drew, will reply to some of the criticisms which have been offered. There are just one or two matters which I would like to say a few words upon. A good deal has been said by Mr. Doland in reference to the non-party attitude of the members of this House. While it may be said it is a non-party House, I think the remarks of those speakers who have principally dwelt on that aspect go to show that if we are not a non-party House we are at least a pro-

perty House, for almost the whole of the remarks of the speakers who dealt with that aspect of the question were devoted with reference to property and property alone. This is perhaps with the exception of Mr. Moss who dwelt at length on the question of arbitration, and that is just one matter which I wish to say a few words upon. Mr. Moss stated that the Act had been a failure, and he implied because the Act had not done all that it was intended to do it would be just as well to wipe it off the statute book. The Act has been in existence for ten years, and I for one, as well as many others have been dissatisfied with it, but I do not think that anyone can say that the Act has not been responsible for doing a certain amount of good; in fact, I think it has done a vast amount of good. From the position I have held in connection with labour organisations I can say that if it had not been for the Arbitration Act or even for the shadow of that Act we would never have had brought about some of those agreements which exist in the industrial world in this country. At Kalgoorlie during the past ten or eleven years we have not had anything in the nature of a serious strike. There have been one or two strikes in connection with non-organised labour, but nothing of any magnitude has happened in connection with organised labour, and if it had not been for the Arbitration Act and the knowledge that there was something else behind us, and the employer knew that also, possibly those agreements to which I have referred would never have been made. Members should be particularly careful in dealing with a matter of this kind. The judges have drawn attention to the necessity for some amendment being made to the Arbitration Act, but the late Government never saw fit to bring about any of those amendments although they were in office for six years. I think when anyone in the position of a Judge of the Arbitration Court and the other two members sitting on it, draw attention from time to time to the need of amendments being made, something should be done in order to bring about those amendments. The Bill which the present Government propose to in-

troduce will be a short one and it will deal simply with one or two anomalies to make the Act effective during the next 12 months, and next session a more comprehensive measure will be introduced. It may be news to some honourable members to know that it is almost impossible for the miners in Kalgoorlie at the present time to take a case before the Arbitration Court for the simple reason that they cannot get their members together in sufficient numbers to carry a resolution to take that case to the Court. A little while ago the timber industry was held up for three days in order to get the engine-drivers together so that a case might be cited before the Arbitration Court. There is therefore the necessity to bring about an alteration at the earliest possible moment. There are one or two other matters also in connection with this Act and I desire to say that they will be dealt with, and one of these is in connection with disputes and what constitutes a dispute. I would earnestly ask honourable members who may be here when the measure is being brought forward not to look at it in the light in which Mr. Moss seemed to imply. I do not know of any Act of Parliament which has done all that we expected it to do. We might say that the Licensing Act, because it does not deal with everything we desire it should deal with, should be wiped off the statute book. I hope when the measure comes before the House we shall deal with it fairly and squarely. I desire to make a few remarks also on the land question and I will say that in spite of all that has been said as to the seriousness of the new regulations and what is going to take place, and what harm is going to be done to the country, the fact seems to be forgotten that the land policy of the Government has been adopted by a large majority of the people in Western Australia, and although Mr. Piesse said that there was a good deal of unrest in ten agricultural districts, I think that the return of Mr. Bath and the close contests at Northam and at Nelson go to show that the people of the agricultural constituencies realise what the policy of the Labour party is in regard to land settlement. I do not think that

the Government will withdraw any of the regulations until it has been proved that they are detrimental to the interests of the country. Mr. Cullen drew a very pathetic picture of the poor man who desired to have his home and freehold, but what does it embrace. How many of those men to whom Mr. Cullen referred in any part of the world have beautiful homes and private property. There is only one country in the world where there is any show whatever in the way Mr. Cullen has indicated and that is France. Three-fourths of the land in the Eastern States is held by a few people and it would be interesting to get a return of the numbers who hold land in Western Australia, and if it is possible to secure those particulars I take it some member in the near future will do so. It is all very well to bring along the sentimental aspect of this question, but so far as the men at the bottom are concerned—and they represent the greatest number—there are very few indeed who hold any land upon which they can build a home. If there is anything the Government can do to alter that state of affairs it will be done, and I believe the regulation which Mr. Bath has introduced will tend to bring about some alteration in that state of affairs. Sir Edward Wittenoom dealt with the matter from a commercial aspect, as also did Mr. Sommers, and the former stated that the banks and financial institutions would not take the risk of advancing money upon leasehold land. If the banks will not do this, the Agricultural Bank, which at the present time advances up to £750, can be liberalised so as to enable it to increase its advances. I have some experience in connection with land and I am not speaking here as a novice. For some years I happened to be in close touch with farmers in South Australia in the capacity of a wheat buyer, and I know what the land shark is capable of, and I hope that anything we can do to amend such a state of affairs similar to that existing in South Australia, we shall do it. For instance, the Pinneroo land in South Australia which was opened up some time ago was taken up almost wholly by speculators in King William Street, and the Government took precisely the same stand

that Mr. Bath has taken now, and it will be found that as time goes on, perhaps more stringent measures may have to be adopted in regard to the matter. It is better for us to do something to prevent the non-alienation of Crown lands than to see them alienated, and then some years afterwards have to purchase them at a higher figure, simply because the money spent in the State has put an increased value on the land. I am not going to say any more except that with the rest of the Government I believe that we have a State which is capable of carrying, as one member of the Legislative Council stated, millions of people. I cannot see anything to prevent the State carrying these millions. We have vast resources and no one can tell me that we are not going to have more discoveries in connection with mining, and that much of this land which has been looked upon as useless will be made useful by scientific discoveries. Moreover, anything that the Government can do to bring about more population by legitimate means will be done. Many of the points raised by Mr. Doland with regard to immigration are absolutely true. He stated that men were being brought here—rightly or wrongly I do not know—but that they were being brought here by false pretences. I met men in Kalgoorlie who had come here to work as gardeners and farm labourers, and immediately they landed in the State they proceeded to the goldfields. One man who was a fitter, described himself in England as a gardener so as to get an assisted passage. I drew attention to that instance last session and I consider that every care should be taken in England to see that the men who come out here are of the right sort and that they should not come out simply to swell the ranks of the unemployed. I do not think that the Government will do anything to stop immigration of the right class of people; at the same time, speaking personally, I trust nothing will be done to swell the number of unemployed by bringing out a lot of artisans for whom there is no work to be found.

Hon. F. DAVIS (Metropolitan-Suburban): It was not my intention originally to speak at so early a stage in the

debate, but after listening to the interesting speeches made by previous speakers I feel compelled to add my quota to the discussion. In the first place I wish to thank you, Mr. President, for the cordial welcome you gave me, and to thank hon. members for the warmth of the reception they accorded to me as a newcomer. It helps one to feel that the members of the Chamber are not altogether adverse to his coming. Prior to my election I had a pre-conceived idea of the character of the House, and it occurred to me that a new member coming to this Chamber might possibly by a slight effort of imagination arrive at the conclusion that he had strayed into an old world Arcadia where the inhabitants, blissfully unconscious of the strain and stress of the outside world, were living a life of simple pleasure, and where harmony and peace ran free. But I find that there is thrust and guard, attack and repartee, and it makes one feel more familiar with the surroundings when he finds that there can be a certain amount of heat and warmth infused into the debates. One feature which struck me in listening to the debate was that almost every one of the speakers claimed that this is a non-party Chamber; but I also noticed that almost in every case the speakers went on to criticise adversely the majority of the measures submitted by the Government for consideration. It served to suggest that, after all, this is a party Chamber.

Hon. M. L. Moss: We have done the same thing with previous Governments in exactly the same way.

Hon. F. DAVIS: Perhaps so. At any rate it seems to me that it is almost impossible for a member to dissociate himself from his social surroundings, to remove from his personality every trace of bias or feeling which it would be necessary for him to do to be absolutely impartial in dealing with measures. Because every man has a trend to one side or the other; his training, his social environment, all things that have helped to mould and make him the man he is, tend to give him a bias one way or the other, and it seems to me to be impossible for a man to be so absolutely im-

partial as to be able to say that he is a just member of a non-party Chamber. For that reason I cannot accept the contention that this is a Chamber of that character. At any rate, speaking personally, during the election campaign, there was no uncertain sound as to my views on the question. I was elected as a party man unquestionably. From start to finish I advocated the principles which are commonly called the platform of the Labour party. Yet in face of that fact the electors thought fit to elect me as one of their representatives, and on that ground I contend that I am here as a party member. It has been my misfortune during life to have passed through more vicissitudes than, probably, have fallen to most men, at any rate of my age, and it has had the effect of making me view questions from a broader standpoint than would otherwise have been the case. As an employee for years, and as an employer of labour, I have had both sides of the question presented to my mind, and I trust that the whole time I am here I shall ever be found willing to take a broad view, to look at every question carefully when dealing with it, and to exercise the best judgment it is possible for me to do. At the same time I cannot dissociate myself from the party to which I belong, and I think every member here must be affected by the party to which his natural thoughts trend, and among the members of which he has passed his life. Even if it has not been so in the past this House must inevitably become in the future more than ever a party House. I do not mean that only party feelings should actuate myself or other members of the Chamber. In the best interests of the State it is the duty of every member to give the utmost consideration and the most calm and deliberative thought to every question that comes before us. One of the subjects referred to during the debate was that of the Arbitration Act. In speaking of this measure Mr. Moss, in effect, gave as his opinion that it had been a failure. It is quite possible that the Act may not have done all that was expected of it. I suppose no creation of man yet was absolutely perfect. Yet I cannot for the life of me

see why it should be contended that the Arbitration Act has been a failure. The whole of the miners on the goldfields come within its scope, and during the last ten years there has been no strife amongst organised miners on the fields. In fact at least two-thirds of those employed in industrial occupations in the State come within the scope of the Act, and, having regard to the relatively peaceful period we have enjoyed during the last ten years of industrial history, those of us who had knowledge of the State before the advent of the Arbitration Act, who know of the calamitous strike by which the whole of the railways of the State were hung up, will realise that the Act has not been a failure. Probably there are defects in the Act. I know of many myself. It could be amended with great profit to the people of the State, but if we had not the Act on the statute book the State of Western Australia would not be in nearly so good a condition as it is at the present moment.

Hon. M. L. Moss: It has not stopped strikes.

Hon. F. DAVIS: Mr. Moss also stated that the Act only dealt with one section, the employers, or rather that the penalties could only be enforced against one class. Let me call his attention to Section 88, which states that the court may determine what is a breach of an award, and fix a penalty not exceeding £500.

Hon. M. L. Moss: That is only against employers.

Hon. F. DAVIS: I grant that. Section 92 states that property belonging to a judgment debtor—in the case of a union all property held by trustees—may be disposed of towards satisfaction of the judgment debt, and that if the amount raised by that means is not sufficient the union members are responsible for the deficiency to the amount of not more than £10 each.

Hon. M. L. Moss: That does not apply to penalising strikers.

Hon. F. DAVIS: That is for a breach of the award, and, I take it, a striker comes into the same category.

Hon. M. L. Moss: You cannot get at the union, but only at the individual.

Hon. F. DAVIS: Not long ago the present Minister for Works, Mr. Johnson, was fined a considerable sum for having incited a breach of the award in connection with the tramway strike; therefore it is possible to deal with employees as well as employers in connection with strikes.

Hon. M. L. Moss: Virtually it is not.

Hon. F. DAVIS: Other instances could be cited if time permitted, proving that it can be made to apply to employees as well as employers. The first evening I was here I was particularly impressed when listening to Mr. Cullen dealing with the homes for the people proposal. He spoke with a great deal of feeling and pathos of the sanctity of home, and perhaps I appreciated his remarks more than others would have done because, unfortunately, I have had very little of home life. At the same time I cannot fail to recognise that the picture drawn by the hon. member was ideal rather than correct; because, unfortunately for Australia, not one-third of the people own any property at all, and therefore have no homes and cannot be said to enjoy them to the extent which Mr. Cullen said would obtain if the majority of people had homes of their own. The hon. member also expressed fear that if the freehold were not given in this connection as a basis for the homes for the people a great deal of their value would be taken away. It is interesting to contrast his statement with that of Mr. Piesse who, speaking last night, contended that there was practically no difference between a lease in perpetuity and a freehold. In making that contention he cut the ground from under Mr. Cullen's feet. In this connection I would like to refer to one means of giving effect to the principle of homes for the people. We are all probably aware that Mr. Edison, the inventor, has invented a system of building houses, dust, sound, and insect proof, at a cost of a little less than half that which obtains in connection with ordinary houses. The houses are of a variety of ornamental designs, and Mr. Edison has stated most definitely that he will not dispose of his patent to any combine or trust, but that he and his heirs will

retain it for the benefit of humanity at large. I may say that the city of Milwaukee, in the United States, has already applied for permission to use his patent, and the request has been granted. I would suggest that our Government also apply to Mr. Edison for permission to use his patent. For the reason that the cost of the working plant necessary for the erection of these houses is somewhere in the vicinity of £5,000 it would be difficult for the average man to use it, although of course this would be no deterrent in the case of a Government prepared to build a number of such houses. I sincerely trust the Government will take this matter into consideration before they actually make a start with the building of ideal homes for the people, which I hope will be in the very near future. I have listened with a great deal of attention to the remarks made with regard to the rights of civil servants. Strong exception has been taken by many hon. members to this particular idea. I fail to see that there is any ground for alarm in this connection, and it appears somewhat strange that nearly all the speakers should think that if civil servants were granted full political rights they would immediately attack the administration of the particular department in which they were working. I would like to point out that administration is not the only thing a Government does. There are broad principles which have to be determined by political parties and by Governments, and I take it that civil servants who dealt with broad principles only in exercising their political rights would amply justify the giving of those rights.

Hon. M. L. Moss: It would be difficult to know where to draw the line.

Hon. F. DAVIS: The good sense of those to whom it was given would, in the majority of cases, decide where to draw the line. At any rate I fail to see why, because a man is a civil servant, he should be deprived of the same rights every man has in this connection. I would remind Mr. Moss that in connection with the Federal civil service, it already obtains, they have full political rights, and I have not heard of any case where that privi-

lege has been abused or had any evil results. If it obtains in the Federal service I fail to see why it should not obtain with good results in the State service. Mr. Piesse requested that some action should be taken in connection with erroneous impressions created in England by the statements made in the text-books used in the schools. Undoubtedly it does a good deal of harm to have these errors circulated, but there is another side to that subject to which I would call the attention of the Minister. There is equally reprehensible misrepresentation on the part of immigration agents of the States of Australia. Some of the most peculiar stories have been told by immigration agents, not only from this State, but from other States. There was a case related in a Queensland newspaper. A Queensland agent in the old country lecturing in one of the towns made the statement that people did not need to eat bread in Queensland because they had the bread-fruit trees, that the bread simply grew and all they had to do was to take it and eat it. In fact this immigration agent painted a most glowing picture of the conditions in Queensland, so much so that one of the audience at the close of his remarks asked whether there were any disadvantages in the State of Queensland, to which the lecturer replied, "Yes, there are." He was asked what they were, and he said, "It is rather warm there, and water is rather scarce." The Scotchman who had asked him the question, said "Yes; well I have heard the same thing said of another place down below, and I do not know whether it will apply to Queensland." There are many other instances of similarly gross and fallacious statements in connection with the States of Australia, and I think it would be wise on the part of our Government to avoid these errors if possible. One clause of the Education Report deals with continuation schools. I believe the continuation schools in Germany have been of untold benefit to the people, possibly because they have been made compulsory. Unfortunately in this State the education of the boys and girls practically finishes at 14 when they leave school, though pro-

bably from 12 to 18 years of age is the most critical period in their lives, because it is then that their characters are being formed. If at the age of 14 the character-moulding process stops short, the results are generally disastrous to the rising generation; so that I trust the Government in their wisdom will see their way clear to make continuation schools, either in the evening or in the day, compulsory on all from 12 to 18 years of age. I believe it is that, and almost that alone, that has enabled Germany to take its place right in the forefront of commercial communities. I trust the Government will give consideration to the matter because, after all, education is everything to a growing State. People who would progress in the march of nations must be highly skilled and highly educated. I trust in future we shall attach far more importance to education than we have done in the past.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER (Metropolitan-Suburban) : I join in the cordial congratulations offered to the leader of the House and to Mr. Dodd on attaining their present positions. Both gentlemen in their careers in this House have shown us they are capable of taking broad-minded views on all subjects, no matter whether these views are their own, or the same as held by them, or contrary to their opinions. They have shown courtesy in dealings with other members, and that they are attentive to their duties; and I am certain that these qualifications will stand them in good service in their present positions. I will uphold their authority and meet them in every possible way. Unfortunately I was away when the elections took place and this tremendous victory, or disaster, as it may be viewed by different members of the community, took place; and I am unable to analyse the causes of it. Whether it was altogether dissatisfaction with the last Government, or belief in the powers of the present Government, I could not say, or whether it was the swing of the pendulum, the old well-worn theory of the swing of the pendulum—whatever the cause, the result was decisive. No doubt the present Government have come here with

a large majority, a majority that is to be respected; and I hope they will do all the country hopes they will do, and that their energies may be put forward in the best interests of Western Australia, as I am sure they will be. I will cordially support any measures brought forward, and particularly any measures for the welfare of the working man, provided of course that no legal interests are prejudiced or confiscation exercised in bringing them forward. I have every reason to believe the present Government in all their measures will recognise that energy, enterprise and industry have to be respected. I have not analysed the figures of the last election, but I believe there was a very large minority who, by reason of the election, are still unrepresented. I draw attention to this because it will be the case until we have, what I have always advocated, proportionate representation. The present system has been brought forward with the idea of preventing a member being returned by a minority of his constituents. That result was certainly brought about, but we still have to bring about the system whereby all lines of thought in the community are represented in proportion to the strength of those holding those lines of thought. I believe I have the advantage of being supported in these ideas by no less a gentleman than the present Premier, and also I see on the agenda paper for the next Labour congress that one of the unions has put down a proposal for bringing forward proportional representation. I should like to see it brought about. I offer my welcome to my two new colleagues for the Metropolitan-Suburban province. I have had the advantage of hearing them speak to-night and I congratulate them heartily on the quiet and thoughtful manner in which they have spoken, and on the excellent matter in their speeches. We may not altogether agree with what they say, but the fact remains they will be an acquisition to the debating power of this House. I do not altogether agree with one of the views uttered by these gentlemen, that this should be a party House. I am sorry to hear them say that, because it will sur-

prise a good many members of the House. If this is to become a party House there might just as well be an amalgamation of the two Houses; there would be absolutely no need for the existence of the present House. I quite understand the views held by these two gentlemen, because they hold the view of the ultimate abolition of this House; but if they look at the matter from a constitutional point of view, they will see that to make this a party House would be to destroy the idea of the Constitution altogether. A party House is one in which the two parties range themselves on opposite sides to support steadily certain lines of policy. Those who advocate that system for this House forget that it might almost lead to an absurdity. Suppose, for the sake of argument, there was a majority for Labour in another place and a majority for Labour in this House. It would simply lead to this being a House of registration. Again, if there was a majority for Labour in the one House and the majority for another party in the other there would be an absolute deadlock. I go with my friends to this extent, that members cannot altogether leave their political leanings on certain questions outside the House. No one asks them to do so. But when they come into the Upper House we ask them to consider what are the functions of the Upper House. Its functions are to check hasty legislation, and to revise chiefly, and, of course, in the event of its being considered necessary, to give time for pause in order that the country may express its views on certain questions in which the two Houses are at variance. If these are recognised as the true functions of the Upper House, then it goes without saying that it cannot partake of the character of a party House. I hope my friends will recognise it is not the individual actions of the members of the party I am criticising, but it is the organisation of that party. I am quite certain my two friends are quite capable of, and are intent on bringing to the consideration of their duties in this House an absolute impartiality and reasonable-mindedness; but we must remember, if these gentlemen de-

clare they come here as representatives of their party, what the constitution of that party is. We must remember there is a caucus, the decisions of a majority of which are bound to be observed by all members of the party. We must remember also that the platform of the party is framed by trade unions, and, as Mr. Mahon has said, that the platform can be added to, altered, or varied by the same party, and that any alteration is equally binding upon all members of the Parliamentary Labour party. If that be so, how can it be possible for these two gentlemen to be bound by caucus and to revise what they are pledged to support? That is really what the position amounts to. And if, they say, they come here belonging to a party and bound by the platform of that party, then they are utterly unable to revise or check the legislation of this party from another place; they must come here to support it. I submit their duty is either to their country or to their party. Which are they to place first? Surely they should place their duty to their country first. It is not those members, personally, I am criticising, but only the organisation of the party to which they belong, and which, I contend, prevents them from fulfilling properly their duty to the country. As I have already said, I would like to see some attempt made to introduce electoral reform in the shape of proportional representation. The present system showed itself successful at the last election. I believe that a large proportion, up to 73 per cent. of those on the rolls, voted, and seeing that the system was practically a new one, the informal votes were very few. As I had some part in bringing that system into existence I am naturally pleased with the result. In speaking of electoral reform I see that a suggestion has been made by one of the unions to penalise non-voters. I quite agree that that would very likely prove to be an excellent provision. I also see that Federal legislation is proposed to be introduced providing for compulsory enrolment. Hon. members may recollect that I mentioned that point on the occa-

sion of my moving the Address-in-reply last year. I think that would have an excellent effect. Compulsory enrolment, of course, would go a long way to inducing people to vote. A man would then take good care to exercise his franchise. It has been said by some of the previous speakers that a great many of the proposed measures of the Government have been adversely criticised during the debate. I beg to differ from that contention. I think a large number of these measures have been favourably criticised during the debate. I would like to offer my congratulations to the Government on their intention to bring forward an amendment of the local court procedure. Some two years ago I introduced a deputation from the Perth and Fremantle Chambers of Commerce to the then Attorney General, Mr. Keenan, and asked him for an amendment of the local court procedure. Whether or not this is the exact amendment suggested to him I am not sure, but I believe it was in the direction of simplifying the procedure in recovering debts. At the present time it is very complicated, and it is almost impossible for a litigant himself to carry it through. He has to go to a debt collector or a solicitor, and, speaking as a solicitor, I find it is not worth a solicitor's while to collect these small debts; so it would be very much better to simplify matters in order that the litigants themselves would be able to do their own work in that respect. I should like to have seen some attempt made to amend the Mining Act with a view to protecting the public against themselves in mining speculation. This Bullfinch boom, which unfortunately a great many people of Western Australia and elsewhere have suffered from, will I think be said to have been due to the foolishness of the public themselves. But I suggest they should be protected against their own folly. You protect a man prone to drink, as far as you can, and I suggest you must also protect a man against the spirit of gambling.

Hon. M. L. Moss: What would you suggest doing?

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: I admit it is a very large subject, but there are two

amendments I would suggest. One is to see that on the flotation of companies a reasonable amount is set aside for working expenses. These gambling companies are no good to anybody.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Lots of them are not floated here.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: But a large number are floated here. Many of these mines have been floated in connection with the Bullfinch boom.

Hon. M. L. Moss: By English companies.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: Many of them by South Australian companies.

Hon. M. L. Moss: At all events by companies outside of Western Australia.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: However, we do not want to encourage such companies. We want to encourage genuine development, but not the man who gets the money out of the public and then lets the public fall.

Hon. M. L. Moss: How are you to stop it?

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: It should be stopped. Another very important point is that on the application of a certain number of shareholders it should be possible to get an independent report on a mine. That is a suggestion which might reasonably be taken up. The unfortunate shareholders when they get into a mine know nothing at all about it or its value, and they never can find out. If it were possible to compel a company to have an independent valuation taken of a mine it would prevent a large number of disasters. With regard to the question of leasehold or freehold, I must say that from my experience of the agricultural industry it would be a retrograde step to refuse freeholds to genuine farmers, to men looking for land. I see no mention of this measure in the Speech, although it was made a very important point at the elections. But from my professional experience, in nearly all cases we find the working man is anxious to get what he calls his "deeds." He wants to have land he can call his own. You cannot divorce the sentimental aspect from the legal, and there is much to be said for the sentiment in a man who desires to be the owner of his home. The hon. Mr. Dodd said the

objection of the Government was that if they allowed the alienation of land they would in after times have to buy it back. Perhaps so, when they alienate large tracts of land. It is unwise to alienate large tracts of land which subsequently must be bought back. But I take it the hon. Mr. Dodd's remarks do not apply to the small farmer.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): You cannot prevent the speculator getting hold of the small farmer.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: I agree that the speculator should be restricted as far as possible; but in dealing with the speculator are you not likely to hurt the selector also? From the point of view of a genuine owner I venture to say that largely from a sentimental, if not from the legal aspect of it, these men would refuse a leasehold as not, in their opinion, giving them land as their own, and legally speaking it does not give the land to them as their own. You can never persuade a man that a leasehold is his own. Therefore I venture to hope that the Government will not carry out their ideas in this respect. A little time ago I saw that Mr. Mahon had made a suggestion to the Government that a man desiring to take up land should be offered either the leasehold or the freehold. This is a reasonable proposition, although I have not much doubt as to which he would take. It is very different from refusing the settler his freehold. The Arbitration and Conciliation Act has been touched upon several times during the debate. I think Mr. Moss declared that it had been a failure from the point of view that although it contained a provision against strikes the Act did not prevent them. I am of the same opinion. Since the Arbitration Act came into existence there have been numbers of strikes, and my own personal view is that it is because of the almost utter impossibility of enforcing the provisions against individual strikers. I believe the provisions in that respect are that it is possible to fine a man up to a certain amount; then if he does not pay, I believe, distress can follow, and in default, imprisonment. But, as Mr. Moss has said, it is impossible, or

at least undesirable to bring up, say, 5,000 men before the court, fine them, and then go to the extent of imprisoning them in default of distress. Another point is that what is everybody's business is nobody's business. It is not for the employer to follow out that procedure, but for the officials of the court, and it means that the procedure is never followed out, and the result is that the Act is almost a dead letter in that respect. In regard to its functions I have always thought that the Arbitration Court being a fixed body is less useful than if it were appointed *ad hoc*, as wages boards are. The court is supposed to go all over the country and to know all the details of every trade, and the local conditions of every place, and I really believe that accounts, to a very large extent, for the unsatisfactory effect of a large number of awards given. The tribunal is of a partisan character, one arbiter representing one side and the second one the other, while, in the majority of cases, it is His Honour who decides. Judging by the opinion of Mr. Knibbs, the Commonwealth Statistician, the wages boards operating in a number of the Eastern States have been a great success, and I think it is because they are appointed *ad hoc* and so are in a better position to satisfactorily settle a dispute. I believe that my friend Mr. Dodd is a much better authority on a question like that than I am, and I would be glad to defer to his opinion. When the Bill comes forward I hope that he will give us the benefit of his opinion and tell us what he thinks should be done. I do not propose to detain the House any longer. I am glad to see that the session will not be a long one and that the Government propose, instead of bringing in much legislation, to devote a large amount of their time to administration. That is a move in the right direction. Administration is much more essential, especially when a new Government come into power, than a heavy programme of legislation.

Hon. E. M. CLARKE (South-West): Allow me, with other hon. members to congratulate Mr. Drew on his assumption of office as leader of this House and also to congratulate Mr. Dodd on his appoint-

ment as Honorary Minister. There has been a lot said about the Council; some say that it is not a party place and some claim that it is and must be a party House. I hope that such may not be the case, and that although there may be expressions passed from one to another, members will deal with each measure as it comes forward on its true merits. I feel sure that when these measures are discussed from all their bearings, the liberal representatives and the labour representatives will view the matters from a national standpoint and free from party feelings. At the present time I am not going to say anything about the measures that are to come before us. Enough has been said about them, and I agree with a good deal of it, but the time to deal with each measure is when it takes the form of a Bill and is submitted to this House for consideration. I want to say right here that we know the Labour party are placed in power by the people with an overwhelming majority; there can be no cavilling about that, and saying that they are returned by a narrow majority. I am not going into the question as to what put them there; it is enough for us to know they are there, but when they come in with a great majority, on them rests a big responsibility. Great things will be expected of them in the very near future, and I am sorry to see that the financial position of the State is not as flourishing as it was a short time ago. I realise the Government have a huge contract before them to please everybody; of course, it would be folly to attempt to please everybody, but I hope that the Labour party will attempt in every instance to do the greatest good to the greatest number. In the Speech it was stated that we should have national pride in the State. I feel that pride myself. I am proud of this country and I look upon the State as only in its infancy. There is room in this country for thousands of individuals and I hope that they will come. I am not deterred when I find that there are a certain number of wasters coming in, because it is inevitable that when a multitude of new people are coming into the country we should get some who are undesirable. We know that there are a

certain number of immigrants, I believe a very small proportion, whom we should be better without, men who are seeking for work and praying that they will not get it, but that fact should not in any way deter us from continuing to ask people to come to this land. I may be accused of being somewhat parochial, but I take my cue from the statement in the Governor's Speech as to what the Government will do for agriculture, and I represent an agricultural district, one that I consider is going to be in the near future one of the mainstays of Western Australia. At the present time the amount of money that we are sending away to the Eastern States for food that could be grown in the South-Western portion of the State is something appalling, and I look to the time when we shall produce not only enough for our own consumption, but also a surplus for export. Let me take, for instance, butter and the famine price of potatoes at the present time. These are two products which unquestionably we can produce in Western Australia. I am pleased to see that the Government promise they will look after agriculture, which includes dairying. We must bear in mind also that in the production of butter we are simply competing against the Eastern States, the Governments of which have bolstered up the industry by bonuses and all sorts of aids, whereas the industry in this State has not received much assistance. It is true that there is a factory in the South-West, and that the Government have lent certain money to it, but they have pretty good security in the factory. What we have to look forward to is something akin to the cottages for the people, some form of Government assistance in the establishment of dairies and things like that. I am not going into details, but these reforms are foreshadowed in the Governor's Speech, and I take it that they will be carried out. One of the main things necessary to make a success of that policy is irrigation, and the department has demonstrated in the South-West what can be done on a small portion of land in the growing of lucerne with the aid of irrigation. It has been said that there should be a water scheme for the South-West drawn from the Colli-

River, and I hope that the Government will bear that project in mind. I believe that the surveys have been made, and I think it is an ideal place for a water scheme. It is to be hoped that the Government will push this matter on as fast as they can. Then there is the coal mining industry, and that brings into mind the matter of strikes, which I shall not touch upon at any length. I think enough has been said on that question, but I do feel that the Arbitration Act has not accomplished that which it was intended to accomplish; at the same time, we should have it amended and give it another trial because no labour in the improving of that measure will be thrown away if it succeeds in preventing industrial trouble such as we have had in the South-West of late. Some little time ago a vessel called at Bunbury for 600 or 700 tons of coal and the order could not be supplied because there was a strike on. Bunbury, by reason of its geographical position, is going to be one of the first ports in the State. I will go further and say that the export tonnage of Bunbury is the fourth largest in the Commonwealth, and more than equals the export trade of all the other ports of Western Australia put together. Therefore, we hope that the Government will come forward with improvements to the harbour because the works up to date have amply paid working expenses, interest and sinking fund, and left a balance as well, and when I say that the export tonnage of the port is more than that of all the other ports in the State the demands of this place must be recognised by the Government.

Hon. J. E. Dodd (Honorary Minister): Jarrah is very heavy.

Hon. E. M. CLARKE: I submit that it is not so much a question of value, and I would point out that the profitable character of the railways has been largely accounted for by the existence of timber in that district. Outside of the goldfields there is not a single industry in the State that has given so much employment and so much work to the railways as the timber industry. I regret that the timber supplies are being cut out very fast, and I do hope the Government will take into con-

sideration the advisability of doing something to restore the forests.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Which forests?

Hon. E. M. CLARKE: The whole of them. When we consider the large export from Bunbury, the large amount of employment that is given, and the huge sum of money that is distributed, it is idle to deny that the industry warrants a considerable expenditure at that port. There are other very necessary measures for the south-western district. I have said before, and I say again, that the Collie field has never had until very recently what it is entitled to. It is true that for a number of years the Government have been drawing the larger portion of their coal supplies from that field, and for that they deserve every credit, but, on the other hand, it would be hard to say what we would be paying for coal at the present time if it had not been for the existence of the Collie coal field. We have a railway to that field, but there is no doubt that a better route could be had. There are three routes suggested, one up the Preston valley, one up the Ferguson, and a third along the Collie river, and any one of them should be found superior to the present route. I am not going into details as to the way in which the district has been hampered by the present route, but I hope that the Government will be able to afford the expense of sending an engineer to make a rough survey of these various routes and report as to which is the best, and as to the advisability of building a new line. I have little more to say except to impress upon the Ministry that all down in the South-West feel they want something and something very considerable. I do not wish to use any threat or anything of that sort, but I repeat there will be large things expected. I take this stand now because the Government are in for three years, and no one can say they may until such time as they sign their own death warrants, and opportunity does not occur to talk of these local matters as I have done.

Hon. T. H. WILDING (East): With other members I wish to congratulate Mr. Drew on the position he holds, also the Honorary Minister. I feel sure these gen-

tllemen will carry out the duties of the high office they hold with credit to themselves and also to the Chamber. I was sorry to hear the remarks of some members when they expressed themselves wishful of making this Chamber a party House because members of this House had criticised the Governor's Speech. Members in this Chamber have in the past criticised the Governor's Speech more fully than they have on this occasion, and it is a pity certain members should have made it clear they are wishful of making this a party Chamber. I want to speak chiefly on agriculture and the way it will affect the State as a whole. During the past sixty or seventy years we have been trying to settle the lands of Western Australia; and, notwithstanding the fact that our land laws have been most liberal, it has been difficult indeed to induce people to settle in this State; but during the past six or seven years quite a different state of affairs has existed, and we find people anxious to get on the land. Notwithstanding a great deal of land has been surveyed, nearly all of it has been selected, going to show that the policy of the Government has induced people to take up our land. Improvements have taken place in every district throughout the State. A tremendous amount of land has been brought under cultivation, and its development has been the means of giving a great deal of work to many who were in search of it in this State. Banks have been only too ready to lend money, and this has been of great assistance to the people in clearing and bringing their holdings under cultivation. It seems to me great trouble is likely to arise from the fact that Mr. Bath has thought it necessary to make a statement to the effect that the Government were going to block the transfer of leases. This simply means that people will not select land. They cannot go and reside on it for five years without assistance. They now get a great deal of assistance from the storekeepers. The storekeepers are the means of keeping a great many people on the land, and assisting them to develop their holdings to a great extent. I only heard recently of an instance of one firm which

has £20,000 owing to it by settlers it has assisted on the land, but it has absolutely no security if this new system is put into practice blocking the transfer of leases. We must realise what it means to these storekeepers who do not want the leases, but want to see the men remain on the land to develop it. If the security is taken away from them in this way it simply means bankruptcy. Should the banks who have lent money to the merchants call it in, the merchants will have to bring pressure to bear on the selectors; and if the settlers have any stock or implements, the merchants will have to realise on these, so that it will be the means of bringing about a disastrous effect on each party, merchants and selectors. No bank or financial institution will lend money, because should a man who is on the land fail to reside there for five years, forfeiture will come about, and the bank's security will be gone. So settlers will not be likely to get that great assistance they are now getting from financial institutions. This is said by hon. members to be what they want to block. They do not want to see the banks or other financial institutions assisting the development of the land of the State. I dare say that their idea is that the Agricultural Bank can meet all the requirements of this great State in the future. What sort of a bank is it likely to develop into? We have so much land available now, as well as that already taken up; and if one bank is going to find the money to assist in the development of the whole of our State, it seems to me it will be too much to manage if attempted. There is no need to interfere with the system that has already done so much to assist the poor man on our lands. I do not think we are likely to introduce any laws that are going to give more assistance than our present laws. No doubt in the eastern agricultural portions of the State it will be necessary to defer the rents this year, as many of the farmers have partial failures and many absolute failures; but in doing this, great care should be exercised that the assistance is not abused in any way. There is no reason why we should make too much of this supposed dry season. Although

we have a light rainfall, the fact remains that, throughout the Avon Valley where we have had only about 10 inches during the growing season, we have had splendid crops, up to three ton crops in many places and in others two ton crops. It goes to show that where proper cultivation and farming on the best methods are followed the best results are obtained. This applies even much further east than the Avon Valley. At Dowerin there are good crops where the land was fallowed at the right time of the year. I met some farmers on a deputation to-day and they told me it is the same in the Yorkrakine district, that wherever fallowing was done and wherever cultivation was done they had good crops, and pretty well up to two tons of hay in places, and that they are likely to have from 15 to 17 bushels of wheat. It goes to show that it is not the season that is bad. It is simply the fact that in the past four or five years we have had such exceptionally good seasons that it has induced our farmers to carry on a careless system of farming. They have gone out on the new lands and simply scarified them and drilled them in to get the very best results owing to the good seasons; but this year being a light rainfall, this system has led to failure. It is not because a lot of these farms are too far east; it is not altogether owing to the light rainfall; because at Dowerin they had less than six inches during the growing season, and the same applies to Yorkrakine. I point out these facts because people are running away with the idea that these people are too far east for a season like this. It is not so; it is simply owing to bad methods of farming during the past five years. But they will continue to carry on this system. The men who came down to this deputation and who have seen these failures have told me that it is not going to prevent them carrying on the same system of farming. They say they can afford to lose one year out of six, because they put the crop in so cheaply and got such good results in a good season, and the good seasons are very much in the majority. I am pleased to see the Government intend to carry on a developmental policy. It is absolutely ne-

cessary that agricultural railways should be built throughout this State wherever good agricultural land exists. We cannot develop our lands by any other means except by building railways to give those on the land and those going on it an easy means of getting their produce to market. It is also necessary that roads and water supplies shall be provided for the farmers. I was pleased to-day, when on a deputation to the Minister for Works, to realise what sympathy he has for those on the land, and his great desire to give them the water they so much need. He was most desirous in every way to meet them. It is very nice indeed to see the Minister for Works displaying this feeling towards those who are doing so much to develop the land. Improved shipping facilities are necessary at the various ports throughout the State, and they must be provided with borrowed money, because at the present time taxation is sufficiently high, and I am afraid this year a great many people in the State will feel that our taxation is going to bear very heavily upon them. The deputation to-day surprised me by informing the Minister what they had done in such a short time at Yorkrakine. They have been there only five or six years and already they have close on 100,000 acres under cultivation, while there is nearly as much more being prepared. We know then that unless we have improved shipping facilities the success of these farmers will be retarded. I notice also in the Governor's Speech that it is intended to give mining serious consideration. We all know that mining is a grand industry, and has done much for Western Australia; we also know that the past Government and more especially the late Minister for Mines, spent a tremendous lot of money in developing the industry. We find that there was spent something like a million of money outside waterworks, railways, and batteries. I am not saying for one moment that this was not justified, or that the present Government are not justified in spending a further sum in developing mines, and endeavouring to find others, but what I want to say is that I do not want to see the mining industry

carried on too much at the expense of the agricultural industry, the permanent industry of the State. We have only to look back and realise the position we were in then, and notice the prosperity existing to-day. Six years ago there were plenty of unemployed, money was scarce and almost unobtainable; but what do we find to-day? We find that every industry is flourishing, that our lands are in demand, and that every financial institution is endeavouring to spend money on the lands, and the result of it all is the present prosperity which we are all enjoying. Agricultural development means the spending of money, and I do hope that the Government of the day will borrow money and spend it so as to assist and bring about further development of this great State of ours. The Agricultural Department should certainly not be starved. It is absolutely necessary that we should have inspectors going around the different settlements showing those who have gone on the land how to obtain the best results, because there are so many men on the land who are inexperienced, and if they do not get advice from experts the chances are they will not do that for themselves which we desire to see, and consequently will not assist in the prosperity of the State. The same thing applies in connection with our stock and various other industries. It is necessary that we should have inspectors to go around. At the present time we have a clean country, both in regard to stock and wheat, while, with regard to fruit, we are practically free from the diseases known to many other countries. I think it will be a good deal cheaper to appoint inspectors to keep a close supervision on our various industries than to allow disease to make its appearance and then afterwards make an effort to stamp it out. If we take the fruit industry we must realise what it will mean to us in the near future. There must be a tremendous export trade, particularly in regard to apples and grapes, and that being so, it is very necessary that we should keep it clean. At the present time in London they think a good deal of our fruit. It is looked upon as some of the

best grown in Australia, and, that being the case, we should try to maintain for it that good name. There is another matter I wish to deal with in connection with agriculture, and that is the necessity to establish agricultural schools in the different agricultural centres of the State. We could have them in connection with some of our State farms, and I dare say we could have them in some of the other larger centres. There is no place at the present time where farmers can send their sons to receive an agricultural education; they acquire a certain amount of practical knowledge on the farm, but something further than that is necessary in these days. We want to give the young men of the State an opportunity of learning some of the science in connection with agriculture, and there are a great many youths, who are not farmers, anxious to go on the land at the present time, but we have no place where we can send them, unless they go on to a farm. I have had some experience in this way because a number of men have applied to me to assist them to learn how to farm. I have not been able to do much in that direction during the last two or three years because I have not been able to afford the time. During the past year I received letters from about 50 youths, and parents of youths, asking me to assist them in this direction. This not only applies to people around the agricultural districts, but I have had inquiries from the gold-fields, and from young men with means who have just come out from England and who want to go with someone who can teach them how to farm the land. There is no doubt this is a great necessity and I hope the Government will see their way to do something in the direction of providing agricultural schools. I do not intend to say more but to express the hope that the Government, which has been returned with such a large majority, will do their very best for the State. It rests now with them as to whether this great State of ours will progress in the future as it has done in the past five or six years; and I do hope that if they find in the legislation they are introducing, or in any of the laws that they are likely to put into

force, that they are not doing good for the State, they will at once alter them, so that the people may be satisfied and feel some safety in laying out money to develop the State.

Hon. W. MARWICK (East): I cannot let the opportunity go by without offering a few words of congratulation to the leader of the House, Mr. Drew, on the high position to which he has been elevated, and also to his colleague, Mr. Dodd. I also desire to congratulate the two new members for the Metropolitan-Suburban Province, but I regret very much that they have brought into this Chamber an element of party feeling. I fail to see, as has been explained, how they can give fair and reasonable consideration to the measures which are brought into this Chamber if they adopt a party attitude. I only desire to touch upon a few points in the Governor's Speech. First, I would like to congratulate the Government on the substantial majority which they obtained at the recent elections, and I trust that they will not use that majority to the detriment of this young State. I feel that they have men in their party who have too much interest in the State to do anything which is going to be harmful. I might say also, with regard to the mining industry, and to which I owe a great deal of my prosperity, because I was one of the early pioneers of that industry, that I have watched it carefully and have always been pleased and interested to see any new development take place. At all times I shall give my support to any measure which is brought forward in the interests of that great industry. The State owes a great deal to it and I regret very much that on a recent visit to the goldfields I saw evidence of so much stagnation. It is hard to account for it but let us hope that something will be done to further develop the industry. I trust the Government will follow on the lines of the late Government, and, while on this subject, I would like to take the opportunity of paying a tribute to the late Minister for Mines, who I have heard spoken of, not only in the goldfields but all over the agricultural districts, as one of the men

who had done great work for the gold-mining industry. No doubt there has been a decline in the mining industry in the Eastern Goldfields, but we find from time to time new fields breaking out, and that will probably continue. None of us can help the partial failing of the industry. However, I would draw your attention to another item. I feel somewhat surprised, and I regret very much that so much should have been said in another place about the alleged drought. I have been pretty well all over the agricultural districts during the last few months, and I can say there is no such thing as a drought. We have had a scarcity of rain in many of the agricultural districts, but it is very far from being a drought. The rain has fallen so moderately that it has been absorbed by the growing crops, and but little has been left for the dams. But I am quite safe in forecasting that along the Great Southern line and in the Avon valley the average yield will be better than it was last year. I take it the Government will find when the year is ended that there will not be so much deficiency in the railway freights as they anticipate, and I am confident that they will get a pleasant surprise. There will be more hay carted than there has been for many years. I know that out a considerable distance east the crops are very good. This cry has had a detrimental effect on the progress of this young industry. I know many cases of merchants who have been advancing to our storekeepers large quantities of goods and who are a bit chary about continuing, because they have listened to this cry and are afraid of a failure. I say there is no failure. As Mr. Wilding pointed out, a good deal of this alleged failure has been due to the inferior manner in which some of the farmers have carried out their operations. It will serve to prove to those gentlemen who continue this careless and indifferent way of cultivating the land that it would be wiser to do it in a more systematic manner. I met a man a few months ago who has been eight years on a farm in the dry areas, and he told me he has not yet bought a plough. Talk to some people about farming without a plough and they

would regard you as a lunatic. However, that sort of farming has been going on in our agricultural belts, and I must confess that the best crop of wheat I ever reaped was taken off cultivated land; that is, land that had not been ploughed, but merely gone over with a cultivator. However, such a thing might happen only once in six years, and so it is not advisable to go on with that method. I do hope this cry of drought will cease, because we want the credit of our agriculturists extended. They cannot have too much capital, or have it too cheaply. There is any amount of money available throughout Australia and in the mother country, and the capitalists are only too willing to lend it to the farmers. But the farmers want it cheap, and it will be a difficult task to get it cheap if this cry of drought goes on much longer. One question which seems to have been left out of the Governor's Speech is that of providing abattoirs and freezing works. I very much regret that the present Government have not included that as the first measure to be undertaken. We have heard, especially on the goldfields and in the metropolitan districts, the cry about dear meat, about meat rings, and about cattle kings and so forth. I happen to be one of those who have contributed small quantities of live stock to the metropolitan markets for a considerable time, and I know a little about the conditions. Leading auctioneering firms have asked me how I thought they could overcome the difficulty of stopping supplies of live stock going on the markets at a time when the markets are not able to absorb them. The only possible way is to erect abattoirs and freezers in Fremantle and at Wyndham. Only last week I had a striking demonstration of the fact brought home to me. This week, last week, and the week before, I have had lambs on this market. The week before last they sold very well. Last week there was a pretty good supply on top of the previous week's supply, and still there was a fair market. This week, however, there has been a drop of something like 20 per cent. in the values, and numbers of lambs have been turned back unsold, and will now become stores. Had

there been freezers here those lambs could have been killed off and put into the cold chamber ready against the time the market required them, which would be in a month or so. What a boon this would be to the squatters of the Murchison and Gascoyne districts in drought seasons, when they lose their sheep by thousands. They had to kill a large number of lambs this year because the market could not absorb them. I hope the Government will establish these freezers, not only for the purpose of taking away our lambs and providing a place to store them in, but also for the assistance of the export of surplus fruit. We have a considerable amount of fruit grown in the South-Western districts, and we look to the London market to take the surplus. I just mention these facts, and I hope they will be taken into account, for I am sure the Government realise that it will be necessary to do something in this respect. In reference to the Lands administration, the announcement of Mr. Bath's policy has raised a great scare among a good many of our farmers. To an extent Mr. Bath is right. I do not believe in land dummying, in any man holding land without using it, and I hope that Mr. Bath will see that the land is used. But I think he is going somewhat too far when he says he will not allow transfers for a number of years. The Hon. Mr. Dodd speaks of having to repurchase alienated lands. I am not going into these details, for I will have a better opportunity later on, but I will say that in many cases the allotments have been too small. I know instances in which, after two years on 500 acres, it has become necessary, even for men trained in offices in London, to sell their 500 acre blocks and buy 1,000 or, perhaps, 2,000 acres on which to exercise their energies. Such cases should be met, and I feel confident Mr. Bath will meet them. I know he will not carry out his policy in the way many fear. He will be lenient, I am sure, and I hope also that he will be cautious. I know from experience that Mr. Bath's utterances have resulted in a great scare, but no doubt that scare will pass. If the genuine farmer works his land he will have no trouble in getting his transfer, if

necessary. Ministers, we are told, intend to bring about a reduction of their salaries. I cannot understand this subtlety, taking into consideration that when the Bill was introduced in another place no objection was raised in any quarter. I take it, in fact I know, that these gentlemen were then desirous of having an increase, and at that stage they had no desire to prevent Ministers from getting an increase also. I think this latest attempt is somewhat ridiculous, and I hope they will drop it altogether.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew) : As the hour is late I shall necessarily have to condense my remarks. In the first place allow me thank hon. members for their congratulations upon my elevation to the position of leader of the House. I desire to thank them also for their assurances of help in my efforts to carry out the business of the Chamber. I had no misgivings as to the treatment I should receive, when I accepted the position I now hold. I have had experience in the Legislative Council before, when I occupied this same position for 12 months. I accepted it at the time without experience, and took charge of one of the most important portfolios in the Government, and although I had not had time to get a grip of the details of various measures this Chamber gave me every assistance, with the result that of the 41 Bills brought down 39 passed the Legislative Council.

Hon. W. Kingsmill : Yet we are told to-night it is a party Chamber.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY : Members, of course, exercised their right of criticism, as they do on every occasion, and I cannot see that there could be any possible or reasonable objection to such a course ; but on no occasion, so far as I can recollect, have the members of the Chamber been unfair or guilty of anything in the direction of wanton criticism. I have reason to extend every courtesy to the members of the House, and to furnish them with every available information to assist them in coming to a fair and impartial conclusion in dealing with measures before the House. The question of freehold versus leasehold has been

freely touched upon during the course of the debate, but I wish to inform you that so far as the Government are concerned, that is a battle which has been fought and won. It was fought and won during the recent general elections, when both questions were submitted to the decisions of the people and were thoroughly discussed from every standpoint. On the one side the advantages of the leasehold system were pointed out, dwelt upon, and emphasised, and on the other side the leasehold was described as something approaching confiscation. After hearing both sides the electors of Western Australia have come to a decision, and that decision is in favour of the introduction of the leasehold system. I do not wish to deceive members, I wish to take them into my confidence, and I tell them that the day is not far distant when the leasehold system will be adopted in its entirety in this State by the present Government. Up to the present only town lots have been withdrawn from sale, but it is the desire of the Government to do nothing that will interfere with the course of settlement, and it is their intention not to abolish the old system until the new is in thorough working order. Their first efforts, therefore, will be to perfect the new system before abolishing the old. There seems to be an impression that land settlement will be very much affected by the introduction of leasehold. But after studying the question closely I have come to the conclusion that whatever may be the effect on town blocks, agricultural settlement will be considerably helped by the new system. At the present time land 20 miles from a railway is bringing 30s. per acre. I do not know what is the experience of members in other districts, but in my own district land remote from railways is being sold at 30s. per acre. A man must have at least 1,000 acres of that land to become a successful farmer, and consequently he must pay for 20 years a sum of £75 per annum. How can an ordinary man who is without capital find £75 per annum for conditional purchase payments over a period of 20 years? If something could be introduced on the lines of the

system followed in New South Wales, to which Mr. Piesse referred last night, and if in the first place a reasonable valuation could be placed on the land and the interest were made as low as possible, as in the other State, a man taking up 1,000 acres would, instead of having to pay £75 per annum, be called upon to pay only about £14 15s. Consequently thousands of people, who under the present conditions cannot take up land because they have not sufficient capital, would be placed on the land under the system which the Government intend to introduce. The question of immigration has been referred to during the debate, and the fact that it has been omitted from the Governor's Speech has been commented upon. There are scores of matters which are not included in the Speech and to which no reference is made. There are various planks of the labour platform which will be eventually introduced, and they are not referred to, and there are a number of railways which are not specified, and other Bills which the Government will introduce, perhaps not this session, but in some future session. But because immigration is not referred to in the Speech that is no indication that the Government have not given this matter careful consideration, and that they do not realise its importance. The first Government to take in hand seriously the question of immigration was the Labour Government under the leadership of Mr. Daglish. We placed on the Estimates a sum of £10,000 with a view to encouraging immigration, and our first step was to appoint a Royal Commission, not comprised of members of the Labour party but of men with lengthy agricultural experience, and with Mr. Charles Harper as Chairman. The sole object of appointing that Commission was to devise some scheme in the direction of encouraging agricultural immigration, and from that step proceeded the system of light agricultural lines which have done so much for the country. The Government do not intend to in any way disturb the policy of immigration, and it is the intention of the Government to continue the policy, but the greatest caution will be exercised in selecting the class of immigrants who will be brought

to Western Australia. The class of immigrant whom the Government desire to see come to the State is the man who will eventually settle on the land. At the present time there are many people coming to this State assisted by the Government who are not suitable at all for the purposes for which they have been introduced. Only to-day, for instance, I had an immigrant come to my office looking for work, and he was a dyer who could not get any employment in Perth. The Government, while continuing a policy of immigration, will endeavour to secure men who will prove the best settlers for Western Australia. We, of course, desire to prevent anything in the nature of an unemployed difficulty, and from figures obtained at the Labour Bureau I have discovered that there were 843 applicants for employment at the bureau during the month of October, or 176 more than during the corresponding month of last year. So that hon. members will realise that great caution must be exercised lest, instead of bringing men who can be profitably and usefully employed as farm labourers, men are brought to the State who will remain in the City and create an unemployed difficulty, which the Government are anxious to avoid. With regard to the proposed Parliamentary Committee of Public Works, and the workers' homes, those are matters that can be discussed when the Bills come before the House, and I do not wish to delay members at this late hour with any lengthy reference to them. In regard to the proposed reduction of Ministerial salaries, Mr. Cullen stated that it was a foolish proposal and it looked as if the Government were posing. When men are sacrificing £1,800 a year their actions can scarcely be described as posing. After the action of the previous Government in introducing a Parliamentary Allowances Bill, and inserting a clause by which their own salaries were raised, in face of the fact that they had previously announced that they would reduce their own salaries, we have decided that we have no alternative but to submit a Bill for the reduction of Ministerial salaries. There has been some complaint from hon. members as to the reference to the partial drought in some

districts—a very innocent and a very necessary reference, which is included in the Governor's Speech because we wish Parliament to understand clearly what the position is. The Government have had to spend a large sum of money in affording relief to distressed settlers. Water supplies have been provided, and the Government intend to go further, and in bona fide cases give extended time for the payment of rents. They will go even beyond that, if necessary. Not only in the Eastern districts but also in the North does this partial drought exist, and the Government have to find money; it is difficult, but they intend to face the difficulty bravely.

Hon. E. McLarty: There was no expression of regret for the pastoralists in connection with their losses.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I think there is some expression of sympathy with the pastoralists, but I think that in most instances the pastoralists are not in such a condition as many of these agricultural settlers are; they have generally a very good banking account. On account of the dry season the expenditure will be increased and the income is likely to be decreased to a large extent, I should think, taking into account the temporary losses of land rents and the loss of revenue in connection with the railways. The announcement of the Minister for Lands in connection with transfers has come in for a large amount of criticism, but the sole object of that declaration of policy is the prevention of the unhealthy trafficking in land that undoubtedly exists. What is the position now? A man, to all appearances a bona fide selector, goes before the land board and there may be 19 other applicants. He takes an oath and swears to certain facts, on the strength of which he secures a block of land, and the 19 other applicants go landless. The next thing that is heard is that within a week or a fortnight he has disposed of his right for £50. There are other cases. Land has been held for 12 or 18 months and nothing done with it, and we can show that it has then been sold without any improvements on it for from £600 to £800. And that is not a solitary

instance. Owing to these discoveries the Government decided to take some action in order to prevent this speculation. Land booming in any shape or form is to be deprecated, but land booming in connection with agriculture is almost a crime. The value of agricultural land is determined by its closeness to a railway and its nearness to the market, and when dealings of this nature are going on, the land is penalised for all time through the intervention of the middle man, and the prevention of that is the sole object of this new regulation. If the regulation is read closely it will be seen that the Minister intends to exercise reasonable discretion in this matter, and every case is to be considered on its merits. The Minister's action is in strict accord with the spirit of Clause 142 of the Land Act, which states that there shall be no transfer without the consent in writing of the Minister. At one time, before there could be a transfer, the Minister had to sign a document, but subsequently that power was delegated to the Under Secretary; now it is the intention of the Minister to personally examine and decide upon all applications for transfer, and wherever there is a bona fide case and it is advisable to show leniency I do not think Mr. Bath will be found wanting. It has been hinted that the banks intend to put the screw on those people who borrow money from them; but in my experience it is impossible to borrow money on conditional purchase blocks unless improvements are carried out. The land must be heavily improved before a private financial institution will lend money on it; and if the Government insist on improvements being carried out, surely they are helping to provide more security for the banks. Suppose a man fails and the bank requires a transfer, can one say that any Government, if the bank had bona fide lent money to assist in carrying out improvements on the land, would confiscate the bank's money? I do not think so. All these things cannot be explained in a regulation, but any man of common sense should be able to comprehend the situation. We would need to draft a regulation that would extend over 50 or 60 pages of the *Government*

Gazette. As a matter of fact, full discretion lies with the Minister, and I do not think it will be found he will act in any way unjustly or harshly to any section of the community except pure speculators. Through these speculators large estates have been piled up in various districts. The speculator uses dummies, and eventually sells back to the Government at as much as five or six times the amount of money it cost him. I can go even further. He not only gets blocks himself but he gets his friends, customers, and relations to take up blocks, and eventually the State has to pay 17s. 6d. or £1 or more per acre for what cost 3s. 9d. per acre. It is said the speculator does not exist, but we have only to look at the advertising columns of the daily papers of two months ago to discover columns of advertisements advertising blocks for sale. Yet some members say if the speculator exists he exists to a limited extent only. Mr. Connolly complained there was no reference in the Governor's Speech to freezing works at Wyndham. The position in reference to these works is that nothing has actually been done except the preparation of plans. The Government have not yet had the opportunity of going into this question, but when they do go into it they will come to some definite decision and act promptly. I need not delay the House. It has often been said that the Address-in-reply debate is a waste of time. I have never supported that view. I think it is valuable from many standpoints. It enables the representatives of various districts to express opinions and criticise the policy of the Government in power, and it is a valuable help to Ministers in another place or their representatives in this House. I feel a certain amount of gratitude to members for the fairness of their criticisms during the course of the debate. I do not think there was a single instance in which an unfair attack was made on the present Government or in which bias was exhibited in any shape or form. Members did not even criticise to the same extent as they have criticised Governor's Speeches on former occasions, but their criticisms

have been delivered in a fair, honest and intelligent way.

Question put and passed; the Address adopted.

ADJOURNMENT—ONE WEEK.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew) moved—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, the 21st November.

Question passed.

House adjourned at 9.53 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 9th November, 1911.

	Page
Questions: Collie Coal Miners, Police Court proceedings, Police Court fines, Magistrate's decisions, Alleged boycott	169
Railway contractors and Government property	170
Election return, Kimberley	171
Papers presented	171
Bills: Criminal Code Amendment, 1a.	171
Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment, 1a.	171
Local Courts Act Amendment, 1a.	171
Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, 1a.	171
Address-in-reply, fourth day	171

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 2-30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (4).—COLLIE COAL MINERS.

Police Court proceedings.

Mr. A. A. WILSON asked the Minister for Justice,—1, Is he aware that on September 20, before the Collie Police Court, Mr. Alcock, on behalf of the Crown Prosecutor, asked for an adjournment of cases against the Collie Burn strikers, and that he and Mr. Wall promised if such adjournment was granted the