

for Perth, is declared vacant, and also the necessary steps to see that the seat is filled.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member will hand that to me in writing I will submit it to the Crown Law Department and make a statement to the House subsequently.

NOTICE OF MOTION—WANT OF CONFIDENCE.

Mr. SCADDAN (Ivanhoe): I give notice that on Thursday next I will move the following motion:—

That the Government do not possess the confidence of the House.

The PREMIER (Hon. Frank Wilson): In view of the hon. member's notice of motion of want of confidence in the Government, I propose to ask the House to adjourn, but I would suggest to the hon. member that he should bring his motion on to-morrow instead of on Thursday. If the hon. member assures me that he wants until Thursday, then I shall fall in with his wishes; but if he wants until Thursday, I shall probably want a day in which to reply to his indictment. Could not the hon. member bring his motion on to-morrow?

Mr. Scaddan: It is the shortest notice on record. There is only one sitting day intervening.

The PREMIER: Then, I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Thursday, the 6th October.

Question passed.

House adjourned at 5.3 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 6th October, 1910.

	PAGE
Papers presented	809
Questions: State saleyards, opening	809
State Hotel, Gwalia	810
Railway Station, Southern Cross, telephone	810
Land Selection, Dalwallinu	810
Perth Tramway Trouble, fine	810
Railway Employees' fines	811
Railway Advisory Board	811
Miner's Phthisis, Commissioner's Report	812
Select Committees, Extension of time—Roads Bill, Workers' Compensation Amendment Bill	811
Privilege, Mr. Brown and an office of profit	812
Motion: Want of Confidence in the Government	813

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

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Premier: 1, Papers relating to the claims of W. P. Smith, late of Government Printing Office, for a retiring allowance. 2, Additional regulation under "The Jetties Regulation Act, 1878." 3, Port Regulation No. 42B. 4, Additional regulations made by the Fremantle Harbour Trust. 5, Alterations and additions to Gaols Regulations. 6, By-law passed by the Guildford Local Board of Health. 7, By-law passed by the Municipality of Northam.

By the Minister for Lands: 1, Purchase of private Estates—(ordered on motion by Mr. Taylor).

QUESTION—STATE SALEYARDS, OPENING.

Mr. JOHNSON asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, The names of auctioneers who received invitation tickets to be present at the opening of the State saleyards at North Fremantle? 2, Which firms received tickets for distribution? 3, Why was the opening day fixed to clash with the Midland Junction weekly sales? 4, Is it proposed to continue clashing or is another day to be fixed?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1. None. 2. The firms which had arranged to conduct the sales on that day, Messrs. Elder, Shenton, & Co., and Dalgety & Co., Ltd., were asked, purely as a matter of convenience, to

undertake the distribution of railway tickets from Perth to Fremantle, on behalf of the department, to the business men interested in the yards. Nineteen tickets were so distributed at a cost to the Agricultural Department of 1s. 4d. per ticket. 3, Wednesday has been fixed upon as sale day because it is held, by all interested, to be the most suitable day in the week for sales, as it permits stock to be sent away to the Eastern Districts in time for the Friday killing. 4, In view of the foregoing, it is intended to continue sales on Wednesdays.

QUESTION—STATE HOTEL, GVALIA.

Mr. GOURLEY asked the Minister for Mines: Is it the intention of the Minister to erect a library and reading room in connection with the State hotel at Gwalia? If not, why not?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: Yes.

QUESTION—RAILWAY STATION. SOUTHERN CROSS. TELEPHONE.

Mr. HORAN asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Having regard to the papers laid upon the Table by order of the House on the 14th September, in reference to the Southern Cross railway telephone connection, will he answer, if the papers are complete, why no record is observable from two deputations that waited upon him regarding the same object? 2, Does the file disclose any new facts other than those announced by me in my letters of the 24th July, 1907, and later dates, and to which the department have disagreed? 3, When did the deputation, recorded by the Minister in his memo. of 8/4/10, wait upon him, and where, and who comprised it? 4, As, according to the Minister's memo. of the said date, he appeared favourable to the work, why did he refuse it on July 31st when the matter was again brought forward? 5, How is it that the numbered folios of the file have compelled the Minister to interpolate pages that did not originally fall into their

proper order? 6, Why, in view of my repeated requests (covering many years) for this convenience, information was conveyed to the Hon. Mr. Glowrey in contradistinction to me?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, Yes, but a request dated the 24th July, 1907, dealing with this and another subject, appears on another file. No record appears of the request made on 31st July, 1910, but the Commissioner was verbally advised of it, with the result that the work was shortly afterwards put in hand. 2, No, but the recent improved conditions in the district warranted the extension. 3, (a) On or about the date mentioned; (b) on train at Southern Cross; (c) Messrs. Le Breton, McIntyre, Roberts, and I believe the hon. member, but my notes do not show who was present. 4, The request was not refused on 31st July of this year, but promised to refer to the Commissioner. 5, This is not so. 6, Mr. Glowrey presented a petition to the Commissioner on the 16th August, 1910, and in view of the representations made as above stated he agreed to instal the telephone, and Mr. Glowrey was accordingly notified.

QUESTION—LAND SELECTION, DALWALLINU.

Mr. HUDSON asked the Minister for Lands: 1, Has application been made for an extension of the time fixed for making improvements on locations 1912, 1915, 1921, Dalwallinu? 2, If so, has such extension been granted?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, Yes. 2, Yes.

QUESTION—PERTH TRAMWAY TROUBLE, FINE.

Mr. BROWN asked the Attorney General: Has the fine of £50, recently inflicted on the member for Guildford in the Perth police court, been paid? If not, why not?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL replied: Yes.

QUESTION — RAILWAY EMPLOYEES' FINES.

Mr. GILL asked the Minister for Railways: What is the total amount of the accumulated fines collected from railway employees up to the end of June last?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: £2,284 3s. 6d.

QUESTION—RAILWAY ADVISORY BOARD.

Mr. HORAN asked the Minister for Lands: 1, On how many days were the manager of the Agricultural Bank and the Surveyor General absent from their offices during the month of September? 2, If they have been engaged on the Railway Advisory Board, does the Minister think the absence of these important officers from Perth is consistent with good administration?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, The manager of the Agricultural Bank, 12 days; the Surveyor General, 11 days (including Sundays). 2, Their absence was partly on Railway Advisory Board work and partly on Departmental work, but it was all work of value in connection with their respective departments, and therefore their absence was not inconsistent with good administration.

SELECT COMMITTEES (2)—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Roads Bill.

Mr. BROWN (Perth) moved—

That the time for bringing up the report of the select committee on this Bill be extended for one week.

He said: The reason why the report was not ready was that two members of the committee were away during the adjournment, and it was not possible to hold meetings.

Mr. Scaddan: How many meetings of the committee have been held since the House adjourned?

Mr. BROWN: No meetings have been held, owing to the fact that Mr. Ware was away ill and Mr. Layman was in the

country. It was, therefore, not thought worth while to call meetings in their absence.

Mr. SCADDAN (Ivanhoe): It would be more in keeping to move for the discharge of the committee, if those members appointed to report upon the Roads Bill do not intend to do their duty.

Question put and passed.

Workers' Compensation Act Amendment Bill.

Mr. DRAPER (West Perth) moved—

That the time for bringing up the report of the select committee on this Bill be extended until Tuesday, 18th October.

He said: The committee have sat six times, and we hope to have the evidence finished next week. We have been unable to get the report of Dr. Cumpston, but we hope that also will be available next week.

Mr. SCADDAN (Ivanhoe): I hope the House will not agree to the extension of time for bringing up the report. When the committee were appointed it was suggested on this side of the House that the object of submitting the Bill to a select committee was to delay the passage of the measure. In fact, I moved an amendment that the time for bringing up the report should be limited to one week; but the House decided to grant a fortnight. Three weeks have now expired since the committee first met and no report is yet available, and an extension is asked for until next Tuesday week. It is apparent that the object of the committee is to prevent the Bill from passing this Assembly.

Mr. Draper: Nothing of the kind.

Mr. SCADDAN: By delaying the production of the report it is evidently thought that even if the Bill is not thrown out here it will be in another place. The committee have had time to give the matter full consideration and should be prepared to bring down the report now. They have sat six times in three weeks, and I venture to say that they have not averaged more than one witness per sitting.

Mr. Draper: That is not correct, it would be well if you would confine yourself to facts.

Mr. SCADDAN: I know what is in the hon. member's mind. As I stated when the select committee were appointed, it would be more in keeping with the position of the Government if they defeated the Bill by putting it to a division rather than by treating it in the manner they are now doing. If they do not desire the Bill to pass, why not say so definitely and give their reasons; let this House and the people know what their reasons against the Bill are. I hope members will not agree to the extension of time asked for.

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

Ayes	24
Noes	21

Majority for .. 3

AYES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Layman
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Male
Mr. Carson	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. Monger
Mr. Daglish	Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. Davies	Mr. Murphy
Mr. Draper	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Osborn
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Harper	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Jacoby	(Teller).
Mr. Keenan	

NOES.

Mr. Bath	Mr. Price
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Collier	Mr. Swan
Mr. Gill	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Gourley	Mr. Troy
Mr. Holman	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Horan	Mr. Walker
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Ware
Mr. Johnson	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. McDowall	Mr. Heltmann
Mr. O'Loughlin	(Teller).

Question thus passed.

QUESTION—MINERS' PHTHISIS, COMMISSIONER'S REPORT.

Mr. HEITMANN (without notice) asked the Premier: Has he received the report from Dr. Cumpston, the Royal Commissioner on Miners' Phthisis, or has

he any idea when the report will be received?

The PREMIER replied: I understand the report has been sent to the Governor, but it has not yet reached me.

PRIVILEGE—MR. BROWN AND AN OFFICE OF PROFIT.

Mr. HOLMAN (Murchison): I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker, for your ruling on the question of privilege, which I raised at a previous sitting of the House, as to whether an individual can sit in this Chamber without being a member of it? As a result of the question asked by the member for Perth on Tuesday, police were stationed at the doors of the office of the tramways employees, secretary on the very next day and they seized the property there, and waited until such time as the treasurer of that organisation was able to send away to get the money.

Mr. Bolton: It was the Crown Law Department.

Mr. HOLMAN: Yes, it was the action of the Crown Law Department on that occasion. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that you promised to consult the Crown Law authorities with regard to the question that I raised, and I would like now to know whether a person can sit in this Chamber when he has vacated his seat by having accepted an office of profit under the Crown?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have a communication to make to the House, and I shall make it at a later stage.

Mr. Brown: I will take the risk.

[Later.]

Mr. SPEAKER: As I promised to the House I have obtained a communication from the Crown Law Department, it is as follows:—

Crown Law Department, Perth, 5th October, 1910. The Hon. T. F. Quinlan, the Speaker, Legislative Assembly. Sir.—1. We have the honour to advise that it is provided by "The Workers' Compensation Act, 1902," that if any question arise as to the liability to pay compensation it shall be heard and determined by the mag-

istrate of a local court, sitting with two assessors appointed in manner prescribed by regulation, and that the decision of the majority shall be the decision of the court. 2. The regulation prescribes that the applicant and respondent shall each appoint one person as an assessor. On the assessors being appointed the court is duly constituted. 3. The assessors, as such, do not hold office from or under the Crown; nor do they, in our opinion, hold office under the parties to the suit or either of them. They are not the servants of the Crown, or of either party to the suit. 4. If the assessors do not hold offices of profit from or under the parties to the suit it follows that the assessor appointed on behalf of the Crown in a suit to which the Crown is a party does not hold office from or under the Crown as a party to the suit. He is not appointed to render any service to the Crown, but to act judicially and impartially between the parties, as one of the three members of the court.—(Sgd.) W. F. Sayer, Solicitor General, (Sgd.) A. E. Barker, Crown Solicitor.

Mr. HOLMAN (Murchison): On a question of privilege. After the wonderful revelations we have had here to-night, I maintain that the rotten display of the Crown Law Department should not be tolerated in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no question before the House.

Mr. HOLMAN: I am speaking on a question of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no question of privilege.

Mr. HOLMAN: I contend that there is, and that I can submit a motion at the finish.

Mr. SPEAKER: You can speak in explanation.

Mr. HOLMAN: I have no desire to explain. I want to say exactly what I think.

Mr. SPEAKER: The member may speak in explanation.

Mr. HOLMAN: If the Speaker does not want me to speak now, I will make a chance later on, when I will explain

the rottenness of the Crown Law Department as exhibited now and on many other occasions.

MOTION—WANT OF CONFIDENCE IN THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. SCADDAN (Ivanhoe): I beg to move—

That the Government do not possess the confidence of this House.

I want, at the outset of my remarks, to disabuse the minds of the members of this Chamber, together with the minds of the general public, that this motion has been brought forward for the deliberate purpose of delaying the business of this House. We are of opinion that the time has arrived when the public should know what has been transpiring in the various departments of the State, and also what has led up to the formation of the present Wilson Government. I would like at this stage to refer to an article which appeared in the *Daily News* on Monday evening last, and to say that had I not known the gentleman who was responsible for that article, I would certainly have not given it much consideration, but knowing the gentleman, as I do, responsible for having written the article—

Mr. Heitmann: Gentleman?

Mr. SCADDAN: Individual I will call him. I was saying that if I had not known him so well for a number of years I would not have recognised that he is not responsible in a large measure for what he pens. He is one of those individuals who takes advantage of sitting behind an editor's chair to say things he would not say publicly and in the open. When he was a member of this House I suppose there was no more crawling and cringing individual in the Chamber than this same gentleman, and we know that he would not openly make the assertions that he does behind the shadow of an editor's chair. His references do not affect me as an individual, but they affect the honour of every member of this side of the House. He would lead the public to believe that the object in tabling a motion of want of con-

fidence at this stage was in order to take advantage of Sir Newton Moore's illness, and possibly his inability to record his vote. This is most ungenerous on the part of the writer, but I am satisfied that the thinking public on reading that article will not give it a moment's consideration. There is no desire on our part to trap the Government in any way; we want an open and fair fight, and we hope that the vote which will be taken at the end of the debate will be a true expression of the opinion of the House, and will not be obtained by anything in the nature of a trap. As a matter of fact, it was only on this day that we were conferring with Sir Newton Moore in order to arrange for him to pair so that he might be enabled to proceed to New South Wales and New Zealand in order to recover his health. That is my reply to the charge which has been levelled at us by members in this House, and others outside. Let me say this, that there have been occasions when hon. members on this side of the House, who have not been able to attend to their duties owing to illness, have attempted to obtain a pair from hon. members opposite, and that pair has been refused them. This has happened not once, but several times, and when it comes to a matter of generosity, arising out of a person's illness, it will be seen where that generosity lies, and that prompts me to make the remark that those who cast stones should not live in glass houses. We have never refrained from considering the position of the Government, and party advantage has not been thought of when they have been in a difficulty owing to the illness of one of their members. But I remember the time when the member for Murchison and the member for Boulder were unable to attend this Chamber owing to illness, and we were unable to secure pairs for them. It is just as well that members should know the true position.

Mr. Holman: We are under no obligation to that side of the House.

Mr. SCADDAN: We do not desire to be either. We have arrived at a pecu-

liar position as far as politics in this State are concerned. As I look across the Chamber I find sitting on the Treasury bench persons who have, in the past history of the State, fought most bitterly both in the Chamber and in the country. I remember an occasion when the member for Menzies, the Minister for Mines, stumped the country in opposition to the person he is now prepared to accept as leader, and who will formulate his policy of the future. It is as well to remember that the present Premier on one occasion supported the party then in power, the Leake Government, when a vote of no-confidence was declared by the late member for Kataning, Mr. Piesse. A few weeks afterwards, when that gentleman was unable to form a Cabinet, we find the present Premier accepting a portfolio in the Cabinet formed by Mr. Morgans. Although he had opposed the no-confidence motion against the then Leake Government, he took the first opportunity that presented itself to obtain a seat in the Cabinet of those he was opposed to politically.

Mr. Bolton: And how did the electors treat him?

Mr. SCADDAN: I am coming to that. At the same time the member for Menzies was Minister for Mines in the Leake Government, and notwithstanding the fact that the member for Sussex, who was then member for Perth, had supported that Government on the no-confidence vote, the member for Menzies took up the attitude of stumping the country in opposition to those Ministers who were then seeking re-election, with the result that he was responsible for the defeat of the present Premier of this State, when he sought re-election after having accepted the portfolio in the Morgans Ministry. Not only was he defeated, but the late Mr. Moorhead was also defeated by my friend on my left, the member for Murchison, and I believe another Minister of that Cabinet, Mr. Moss, was also defeated in the West Province. Let me say right here, that it was generally known in the country, and that opinion is held to-day, that

of all the Governments the Morgans' Government was the most conservative, and that was why three of his Ministers were defeated. The Premier and the Minister for Works, that other ultra democrat, who recently formed a democratic league at Subiaco—

The Minister for Works: And it is going strong, too.

Mr. SCADDAN: No doubt it is going strong. These two gentlemen waxed wrath at the statement I made at Menzies that the Premier was considered in this State to be an ultra conservative and a Tory; and let me say that if any proof of that statement is required, if justification is wanted for it, the Premier can be referred to the Minister for Works, whom he should take to task because that gentleman made a similar statement in 1905. On the formation of the Rason Government, Mr. Daglish, then leader of the Opposition, made a statement to the *West Australian*, and in that statement I find the following:—

On that point I can say nothing further than this, that I am somewhat surprised to find that what might be called the conservative element plays so important a part in the personnel of the new Cabinet. The liberal section of the Opposition has apparently been entirely ignored.

That was the statement by the present Minister for Works, who was then leader of the Opposition. On looking up the personnel of the Rason Cabinet I find that it consisted of Mr. Rason, Mr. Wilson, Dr. Hicks, Mr. Gregory, and Mr. Moore. I would like to ask the Minister for Works whether he will state who were the three or four out of those five gentlemen he considered were the conservative element, and whether he will be honest enough to state that the person he considered the most conservative was the present Premier, Mr. Wilson? Let me say that the country believes that it was the present Premier.

The Premier: It must have been Mr. Gregory.

Mr. SCADDAN: And that gentleman will find when he again approaches the Menzies electors that they will re-echo

my sentiments and give him short shrift. I also want to refer to statements made by some of the members of the present Cabinet and also some of their supporters when our present Premier attempted to form a Government when Mr. Rason retired to take up the position of Agent General. This is interesting reading, because it will give an opportunity to some of those members to explain how they are prepared to-day to sit behind the present Premier, when they, in 1906, held such strong views in connection with that gentleman. Mr. Brown, the ultra democrat from Perth, whom we hear so much about, stated—

At the present time no Ministry can be formed without the inclusion of Messrs. Moore and Gregory, and I do not think these two gentlemen will join Mr. Wilson. It appears to me that the sending for Mr. Wilson is the result of log-rolling.

I am satisfied that Mr. Gregory will take a portfolio from anyone who will offer him one. But this is the best of Mr. Brown's comment, "It appears to me that the sending for Mr. Wilson is the result of log-rolling." The present Premier can ask the member for Perth to explain what he means by log-rolling when the Governor sent for him to form a Cabinet.

The Premier: Perhaps you will explain it.

Mr. SCADDAN: Probably I could, but the member for Perth can explain it for himself. I also find a statement was made on that occasion by the president of the National League at Fremantle, Mr. Gawler, who said—

The whole State is absolutely crying out for stability of Government, yet we find ourselves in this deplorable condition to-day. As regards Mr. Wilson, concluded Mr. Gawler, there is no disputing the fact that his appointment is not popular in Fremantle.

That was sufficient to damn anything. The member for Geraldton had something to say on that occasion, and as he poses as a democrat he will probably be able to explain why he is content to sit behind

a Government led by the member for Sussex. The member for Geraldton said—

Much of course will depend upon Mr. Rason's successor. If Mr. Wilson has really been sent for, as has been rumoured, then I am afraid we are in for a bad time. The party which sat behind Mr. Rason, while it was tolerably united, contained very mixed elements, including reactionary as well as progressive politicians.

I am going to ask the hon. member to point out some of those reactionaries. The statement continues—

The Cabinet reflected, and to some extent reconciled, these contradictory elements, but if the man who was, whether rightfully or wrongfully, regarded as the most conservative member of Mr. Rason's Government, is to take the reins, then it is not unlikely he will have a refractory party to deal with, and anything may happen.

That is not the leader of the Opposition making these statements; it is the member for Geraldton, who concluded—

My own fear is that the stable Government we hoped to enjoy as the result of the last elections, will not be realised. Mr. Foulkes, the member for Claremont, also had something to say. I am afraid many of these gentlemen were disappointed at not receiving Ministerial honours.

Mr. Foulkes: Please read the whole of what I had to say.

Mr. SCADDAN: It will not be necessary to read the whole. The member for Claremont said—

It is risky and difficult changing leaders, constituted as the Legislative Assembly is at present. Mr. Wilson cannot lead a party, and I certainly would not support him as Premier.

Mr. Foulkes: Well, he was not able to lead the party.

Mr. SCADDAN: But was the member for Claremont prepared to follow him? Certainly he said not, although to-day he is prepared to follow him. Then that most influential journal, the *West Australian*, had something to say, pouring ridicule on the idea of the member for Sussex forming an Administration. That paper put it in a fashion that makes

amusing reading when we notice the then Government party from whom the paper suggested it was proposed to form a Ministry. These were the views of that journal—

In the event of the members of the late Administration declining to throw in their lot with Mr. Wilson it is clear that the prospective Premier will be compelled to form an almost entirely new Cabinet. Mr. Piesse, the member for Katanning, is said to be likely to join him, and Mr. Gull, the member for Swan, is also regarded as certain to be included in any Ministry which Mr. Wilson might form. The claims of Mr. Gordon, the late Government Whip, to consideration at the present juncture are said to be unlikely to be overlooked, and the names of others mentioned as probable to be singled out for political distinction are Mr. Brebber and Mr. Monger.

Now, we can imagine how the *West Australian* must have viewed the member for Sussex on that occasion, when they would make him Premier with a team of that description. If that is not pouring ridicule on the hon. member I would like to know what would be. Yet what do we find to-day in the *West Australian*?—"slobber" is no name for it; they are just about as shifty as some of the members on the Treasury bench. But there is still another—we find even one of the present Premier's colleagues making a statement on that occasion, for the Minister for Lands had something to say, as follows:—

While I have no desire to see the formation of a third party in the House, I regret extremely that Mr. Wilson's attitude is likely to bring about such a contingency. I cannot support a leader in whom I have not the utmost confidence.

He does not say he could not sit in the same Cabinet with him. The Minister's remarks continued—

It is no very difficult matter to put forward a policy, but I attach greater importance to the administration of the various departments.

He has forgotten all that, as I will point out later. He concluded with this—

A policy may be borrowed or commandeered, whereas a vigorous administration can only emanate from a strong Government, encouraged by the unswerving sympathy of its supporters. Now, if anything stronger than that is required I do not know where you are going to obtain it. The Minister for Lands was good enough to tell the country, through the *West Australian*, that the present Premier was not the man to lead a Government which would do justice by the country.

The Premier: That was five years ago; he knows me better now.

Mr. SCADDAN: I cannot help calling to memory a little incident which occurred at midnight on one occasion when our friend was attempting to form a Government. The ex-Premier (Sir Newton Moore), with Dr. Hicks, travelled along the Midland line in order to confer with the present Minister for Mines in respect to the formation of a Government to defeat the present Premier when he attempted to form a Cabinet; nor can I forget how the present Premier met the train on the Perth platform, and how disappointed he must have felt when the member for Canning stepped out of the train without having the Minister for Mines in his company. I can imagine the feeling that crept over the present Premier on that occasion. Yet notwithstanding such hostile opposition generally by those gentlemen, we find some of them to-day sitting in the Cabinet with the Premier. The point uppermost in my mind is that somebody must have surrendered his principles; and I want to ask Ministers in turn, starting from the Minister for Works, whether they have surrendered their principles, or whether it is the Premier who has surrendered his. Somebody must have done so, otherwise they could not all sit together on one Bench. The present Attorney General in years past was looked upon as a conservative representative. He attacked the Liberal Government led by Mr. Leake, and on every possible occasion he has attempted to prevent a Liberal Govern-

ment remaining in office, unless he were a member of it. I think it is unnecessary to refer further at this stage to the individuals who make up the present Government. But I think it would be desirable for the Minister for Works, who has accepted a position in the present Cabinet, to explain to the House and the country whether he is satisfied that the Premier has altered his political opinions and principles, or whether he (the Minister for Works) is prepared to follow the Premier simply because it means a position in the Cabinet. There was no stronger opponent to Mr. Daglish, when leader of a Government, than the present Premier; there was no one who attempted to ridicule his policy more than the present Premier, and if proof is necessary *Hansard* can supply it; yet to-day the Minister for Works sits in the same Cabinet with one who was his strongest opponent when he (the Minister for Works) was leader of a Government. Who has surrendered his principles, the Premier or the Minister for Works? Probably I could answer the question myself, but those hon. members can do so for themselves when they address the House. Dealing with the Premier, may I be permitted to attempt to justify the statement I made publicly, namely, that he is the most conservative member of the Chamber, and is recognised as such by the general community. The hon. member has never lost an opportunity in the Chamber of opposing the construction of public works departmentally. He has opposed consistently the introduction of day labour. He opposed a Bill to protect the workers against dishonest and unscrupulous contractors, because he has always been recognised as the contractors' friend; and by taking that attitude against that Bill he set himself up, not merely as a friend of the contractors, but as a friend of the dishonest and unscrupulous contractors as well.

The Premier: That is unfair.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must withdraw.

Mr. SCADDAN: I say he opposed a Bill to protect the worker from dishonest and unscrupulous contractors.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is a reflection.

The Premier: The hon. member said I was a friend and supporter of unscrupulous and dishonest contractors; I ask him to withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must withdraw.

Mr. SCADDAN: In order that I may be able to proceed I will withdraw, merely repeating again that the hon. gentleman opposed most strenuously that Bill introduced to protect the worker against the dishonest contractor, and leaving the member himself to explain why he did so, and the public to draw their own conclusions. The hon. member also most bitterly opposed the land tax proposed by his present colleague, the Minister for Works.

The Premier: Why do not you quote it from *Hansard*?

Mr. SCADDAN: Does the Premier deny it? If so, I will quote it from *Hansard*. The Premier bitterly opposed the land tax proposed by the present Minister for Works.

The Minister for Lands: Did you support it?

Mr. SCADDAN: The Minister for Lands does not require to ask too many questions about my attitude on the land tax. He himself has held several views, and I do not know to-day how he feels on it. The hon. member adopted the same attitude as did the Premier. He opposed it until after the elections and then boldly advocated it.

Mr. Bath: He said he was compelled to support it.

Mr. SCADDAN: Yes; he declared he was compelled to support the tax.

The Minister for Lands: By the condition of the Treasury.

Mr. SCADDAN: As I have said, the Minister for Lands does not require to ask too many questions about the land tax. The Premier, this ultra-democrat, advocated in the Chamber that boys and old men should be permitted to offer their services to employers without any hindrances, irrespective of the fact that we have an Arbitration Court to regulate the conditions and remunerations of lab-

our. Will the Premier ask me to produce *Hansard* on this point?

The Premier: Yes; produce all the *Hansards*.

Mr. SCADDAN: Also he appeared before the Arbitration Court as advocate for a firm who had put in a citation asking the court to grant 6s. a day as a living wage. He denied it the other night at Subiaco. He has the opportunity of denying it now and compelling me to withdraw. He went into court and advocated that citation on behalf of those employers, asking the court to fix 6s. a day as the minimum rate of wage for employees in that industry; and I want to know whether the hon. member can now assert, as he does on the public platform, that he is generally desirous of seeing the workers getting the full benefits of their labour? If a man cannot earn more than 6s. a day in this State I do not know what sort of a specimen he can be.

The Premier: What citation was that?

Mr. SCADDAN: The Premier is somewhat doubtful. If my statement is not correct can he not deny it?

The Premier: What citation are you quoting?

Mr. SCADDAN: The Premier is pretending he does not know. He told the public at Subiaco the other night when addressing a meeting, together with his colleague, the Minister for Works, that the statement that he had advocated 6s. a day in the Arbitration Court was a deliberate lie.

The Premier: I did not; there was no reference made to the Arbitration Court at all.

Mr. SCADDAN: It is hardly worth while turning up what was said; the fact remains that the Premier now admits it.

The Premier: Admits nothing.

Mr. SCADDAN: He admits it, with the result that the Premier is now shown in his true light as the "friend" of the worker, a sort of friend to whom the workers, when they get an opportunity of recording a vote for him and his Ministry, will give short shrift, and his Cabinet likewise. The Premier is also one of those democrats who vigorously attempted

in this House to interfere with the free-education system in our primary schools; and it was only by the attitude adopted by the Opposition in rousing public opinion throughout the country against the proposal that the Government were compelled to withdraw that regulation. Yet this is the gentleman who is going to introduce a Bill for the establishment of a university, which some people in the State—one of them being part proprietor of the *West Australian*, Dr. Hackett—have set their heart upon, and which they recommend should be one at which there should be no fees charged. The Premier, who attempted to introduce fees into the primary schools, will introduce this Bill! I suppose the Minister for Works, who also has his heart on the subject, is prepared to believe that the Premier will introduce the Bill providing for a university without fees; but I do not think the public are prepared to believe it. There are members on this side of the House who undoubtedly wish to see our education system extended, not in the fashion that the Premier would extend it by charging fees in our primary schools and so on right through to the university, but by giving to the poorest boy in the community, so long as he shows some possibilities, the opportunity of going into the secondary schools and from there to the university, in order that we may get the best out of our boys irrespective of their ability to pay fees. However, I do not anticipate we are going to get very much from the Premier, from one who adopted the attitude he did in charging fees in our primary schools. One paper has summed up the Premier's attitude very well, and I may repeat it here. It will be understood I am merely speaking in a critical sense. This paper says, "He is a queer mixture of inherent toryism modified by accommodating opportunism." There was never a truer statement of any person than that appearing in an influential journal circulating in this State.

The Premier: Was that the *Worker*?

Mr. SCADDAN: Sitting in the same Cabinet, and supporting the policy of the present Premier, we have the member for Greenough (Hon. J. L. Nanson), that

great advocate of the erection of State flour mills and the export of flour instead of wheat. We have not heard very much about it since the hon. member has joined the Cabinet. We used to hear something about it when he was sitting on the cross-benches; but since he has been taken into the Cabinet we have heard nothing about the advisability of exporting flour instead of wheat.

The Minister for Lands: We are doing it.

Mr. SCADDAN: It would be interesting to hear from the Minister for Lands what quantity of flour we are exporting in lieu of wheat; and I would ask the Attorney General to explain whether he has put that principle in his pocket—the principle of the erection of State flour mills—and whether he is now prepared to assist the Minister for Lands in exporting wheat, thus leaving the dairying industry to go to the wall by our not having the by-products. We will never be able to build up the dairying industry in the State so long as we export the wheat instead of the flour. We want the by-products to help to build up the dairying industry, and it is a pity the Attorney General cannot bring sufficient pressure to bear on Cabinet to have his pet hobby—the principle of the erection of State flour mills and the exportation of flour—consummated. Of course the Premier strongly opposed it. I remember well the fight that took place across the Chamber between the present Premier and the member for Greenough when the latter brought up the subject. The Premier opposed it very strongly, and pointed out—I suppose he had no personal object in it—that he was part owner in a flour milling firm and that they were doing their best to get an export market for their flour which, he said, was second to none in the world. I would like to hear from the Premier how much flour has been exported by that firm since he made that statement in the House. I merely mention these matters in order to show that the hon. gentlemen now sitting on the Treasury bench apparently have no concern about the political opinions held by each Minister, but that all they desire is

that they shall remain in possession of the Treasury bench for a further term. When the people of the State are asked to express an opinion, and when they are given a fair opportunity of expressing it, and are not muzzled by gerrymandering of electoral boundaries as proposed by the present Government, I am satisfied they will not tolerate such a mixture of political opinions as now exists on the Treasury bench.

Mr. O'Loghlen: A job lot!

Mr. SCADDAN: They are a job lot. Now, dealing with the administration of some of the departments, I want to be as brief as possible in order that it may not be too much trouble for the Minister for Lands to turn up files in his department. I know how busy he must be from the mess into which he has got his department. Almost every day and in every newspaper we find reference to the maladministration of the Lands Department. We find letters from men who have lived in the State 20, 30, and 40 years complaining about the methods adopted by the department. We find letters from men recently arrived in the State, brought out here by advertisements in the English newspapers telling them about the opportunities presented to anyone who desires to get on the land in this State. When they arrive they find that the land is not available unless they kick their heels about Perth and follow up the Minister at his office very frequently and, according to rumour, go even further than that. There is such scandal at the present time in connection with the administration of the Lands Department that I contend, for the honour of the State, it is essential that a thorough inquiry should be held into the administration of that department.

The Minister for Lands: Let us know what is wrong.

Mr. SCADDAN: The hon. member adopts exactly the same attitude as other Ministers for Lands have adopted in other States of Australia when accused of maladministration of their departments. We know what occurred in New South Wales, and we know what occurred

in Victoria in this regard; and if a similar state of affairs can be avoided—and a full inquiry is the only way by which we can avoid it—we should avoid any scandals being perpetrated in this fair young State of ours. That there are some scandals is shown in the Press, scandals such as have occurred in other States. We find land-jobbing absolutely rampant, and some accusations go so far as to say that officers of the Lands Department have assisted in this land-jobbing.

The Attorney General: And members of Parliament.

Mr. Heitmann: And Ministers.

Mr. SCADDAN: Do not make any mistake. Let me tell the hon. gentleman we do not want to cover up anything. If anything has transpired that is not above board, irrespective of who the members of Parliament may be, let an inquiry be held and the persons responsible suffer. Make no mistake; we want to hide nothing. There are rumours about in connection with the manner in which Mr. Hedges, member of the House of Representatives, got his land south of Cunderdin; and if I am not mistaken, the Minister for Mines has land there.

The Minister for Mines: Yes; I have some land there.

Mr. SCADDAN: I thought so. It was rumoured the Minister had land there, because he recently took a motor car off the train at Cunderdin and went down there. I am not sure whether it was the Ministerial motor car. It is convenient to have a Ministerial motor car in which to travel about to inspect your land and see that everything is all right. But there are rumours in connection with the manner in which Mr. Hedges obtained his land. I believe he has a fair quantity of it. Some of it, I understand, is dummied. It would be advisable for the Minister to make inquiry into this and give the House full particulars. It is asserted that Mr. Hedges just got in in time to prevent this area being declared a reserve.

The Minister for Lands: When did he get it?

Mr. SCADDAN: The Minister can find out in his department if he wants to

know. I give him the opportunity until Tuesday next to find out and give particulars to the House. There are several scandals in connection with the transactions at Dalwallinu. I believe the Attorney General knows something about one of the gentlemen who has brought the matter before the public. The Press are very slow to move, if the statements made by that gentleman are correct. I believe the *West Australian*, who have told the public times out of number that their desire is to see that whatever transactions occur in the State shall be fair and above board, and that justice is done to every individual, when that gentleman went along and attempted to use their columns to expose some of these transactions in the Lands Department, for a considerable time would not accept his letters. I believe the *Daily News*, that wonderfully outspoken journal I referred to earlier, point-blank refused to publish his letters at all. I believe they went to the department and obtained files, which hon. members cannot obtain very frequently, and they told Mr. Moor, the gentleman I refer to, that the matter was more serious even than he had stated, and that there was not only perjury in connection with the matters but something even worse, that the statements made by Mr. Moor were so serious that they would do injury not only to the Government, but to the State as a whole if all of these transactions were published. These statements warrant some inquiry, and this motion will give the Minister for Lands the opportunity to explain his position and the position of his department in these matters. On the Address-in-Reply I said that from almost every land agent in the State one could obtain conditional purchase land, and also free homestead farms granted by the department if one had sufficient money to pay for them. There are publicans in this State who have obtained land over genuine applicants desirous of settling on the land and taking it up under residential clauses. These publicans have obtained the land, and immediately afterwards placed it in the hands of a well-known

legislator who is a land agent—I refer to Mr. Sommers. It is as well that these things should be known; I do not want to mince matters; I have with me a plan out of Mr. Sommers' office, of certain lots that were issued during March of this year to certain publicans in the State. These publicans did nothing whatever on their land, but the blocks can be obtained from Mr. Sommers, a member of Parliament, in one case three lots totalling about 2,000 acres in round figures for £250, and in another case 900 odd acres for £100. Yet we are told there is plenty of land in the State for everyone who wants it. There is! We are told there is no land-jobbing, but the land agents are full of it. We have had genuine applications for land from people who have had money and have been desirous of spending it on the land. We have had them asking every day, yet they cannot obtain it. We have had them appearing before land boards times out of number—at the very lands board at which these publicans got the land they had no desire to do anything with. What does the Minister say? He says, "What can I do? I cannot get sufficient surveyors." Yet, next day you will find him saying, "We have 600,000 acres available for settlement." And that goes on every day. It was the first utterance made by the Minister, and I believe there are still 500,000 acres available to-day, though we find hundreds of people desirous of obtaining land who cannot get it.

The Minister for Lands: Can you give me their names?

Mr. SCADDAN: I have sent them to the Minister, and he has told them, "I can do nothing for you; you will have to put in continual applications before the land board, and eventually they will get tired of your applying and will give you a block."

The Minister for Lands: I showed them where they could get land.

Mr. SCADDAN: The Minister is always ready to show them, but when they go for the land they find it is not available.

Mr. Johnson: He has a standing strip of poison country to send them to.

Mr. SCADDAN: Yes, as the member for Guildford says, he has a standing strip of poison country which he sends them along to. These persons applied on four occasions to the Land Board, but have been unable to obtain land. Of course they can obtain land of a kind, but there are other matters to think of apart from obtaining so much actual land, for a would-be settler requires either railway facilities or the possibility of railway facilities being provided before long, also he needs to be within an assured rainfall. When, however, application is made for land within a reasonable distance of a railway, either existing or proposed, or within a reasonable rainfall area, the Minister says, "I can do nothing for you, you must take your chance before the Land Board." Yet we induce people by advertising in English papers to come out here. It is nothing short of misrepresentation, gross and wilful misrepresentation, and it is doing this country a great deal of harm to permit the advertisements to appear. Here is one of the advertisements—

Special areas for new settlers!

Six hundred thousand acres for special class of selectors. Six hundred thousand acres are gazetted as being available for a special class of selectors to the exclusion of all other persons.

That was put there with the deliberate intention of making Englishmen desire to come out here and to believe that this land was made available for their special use, and that persons other than immigrants would be excluded. The advertisement continues—

Locations comprised in this area of 600,000 acres are set apart as special settlement lands, available for selection by persons who are not already the owners of more than 100 acres of rural land in the State. The fact that this system of special areas will enable settlers to take up contiguous blocks is of special importance in view of the oft-expressed desire of intending emigrants to form themselves into small groups for the purpose of mutual aid and co-operation.

When the immigrants arrive, however,

the Minister tells them that there never was any intention on the part of the Government to give them holdings within a reasonable distance of one another. He tells us in Perth that such a thing was no part of the Government policy.

The Minister for Lands: I said they could not have preference over our own people.

Mr. SCADDAN: The Minister said just the opposite. He said the Government never intended anything of the kind and yet they allow these advertisements to continue. There is a foot-note to the advertisement as follows:—

Important to remember! In regard to ordinary areas, the terms of settlement provide for a free homestead of 160 acres, with the right to take up to 2,000 acres at 10s. per acre, payable in forty half-yearly instalments.

When these people come here they find there is very little land available at 10s. per acre, within a reasonable distance of a railway or a proposed railway. The advertisement brought certain gentlemen out here, and among them was he who gave the Minister for Lands some annoyance recently. He it was who had to telegraph to Victoria asking them to provide him with land there, as he and others had been brought out here under misrepresentations. The matter went before the Minister, who promised to fix up the new arrival and those with him.

The Minister for Lands: I refused to fix them up with what they desired.

Mr. SCADDAN: The papers stated that the Minister promised to fix them up, but when they went along he said he would have nothing to do with them, and could do nothing for them. As a matter of fact, he would not keep the promise he made them, and they had again to wire to Victoria asking the Premier of that State to provide them with land. We hear much boasting from the Government in the country about the number of immigrants they are bringing out. They parade the fact that during certain months a certain number of immigrants arrived, and they would lead the people to believe that all of those immigrants were farm labourers, or

people desirous of going on the land; yet we find the majority of those coming here are domestic servants. They are not likely to do much on the land, and yet the Government boast of their progressive land policy as an inducement to immigrants to come here. They are inducing domestic servants to come here. Only recently I saw in a journal in England a statement made by the Government agent, Mr. Ranford I believe, to encourage domestic servants, pointing out that there were thousands of young men here waiting for wives, and that the immigrants would be met on the wharf at Fremantle and be embraced at once by these Australian youths. A gentleman living at Claremont told me recently that he heard two of these domestic servants speaking together one day. One said: "By Jove, I would like to get hold of Sir Newton Moore now, and get him to dig up some of those Australians who are looking for wives; I cannot find them." Every day we are faced with this position of absolute misrepresentation, which induces genuine people in the old country to sell out and come here and find that they cannot get land. The result is that they kick their heels in Perth, spend what money they have, and then some have to go to the Eastern States. We boast of the land available, but at the same time the Minister says he can do nothing, that he has done all he can. That there is something radically wrong with the administration of the department is proved by numberless instances. The Minister was all right while he could go round boasting of the land and the general settlement scheme of the Government, but when it comes to providing people with land he is absolutely at a loss. He is at a loss to-day and I doubt whether he knows one-half of what is going on in the department. There is the case at Dalwallinu referred to by Mr. Moor in the Press, and in which the Land Board, consisting of officers of the Lands Department, placated a Chinese official who was here on his holidays, in preference to a man who had been here for many years, who had suffered a great deal through coming here, and who, because he was down on his

luck, was passed over in favour of this influential Chinese official, a man of capital, who was placated. A man down on his luck can expect nothing from the Minister. The board granted this Chinese official the block applied for, against a man who had been in the State for many years. Only a few months afterwards, I believe a few weeks afterwards, this Chinese official disposed of his land for £325.

The Premier: He is not a Chinaman.

Mr. SCADDAN: I believe he is a Dane, but he has a Chinese wife. He is a Chinese customs official.

The Premier: A customs official from China.

Mr. SCADDAN: He is a bird of passage, and yet the Government are prepared to placate him while this genuine resident is passed over. Not only that, but the board went out of their way to endeavour to placate the local resident afterwards by asking him and his sons to break the provisions of the Land Act so as to get over the difficulty that existed. Mr. Moor and his sons had applied for certain blocks which the sons obtained on certain conditions, and when Mr. Moor, senior, was not successful in obtaining the blocks which were given to the Chinese official, the board asked him to put in an application for the blocks allotted to his sons and he would get them. That sort of thing is going on to-day in the Lands Department which is administered so finely by the present Minister, that is, according to the statements we hear from the Minister for Mines and others when back-scratching one another in the back-blocks. It would be well to get the Minister to pay attention to the department in order to expose the scandals which exist and which will not do him, the Government, or the State any good. Certain settlers who arrived at Albany obtained land near Mount Barker. They were advised to take it up there, as were scores of residents. That land was taken up by those people on the advice of the Lands Department, but when it was obtained and the owners applied to the Agricultural Bank for loans, they were met with a refusal on the

ground that the land was not suitable for the purpose for which it was selected. On the one hand we have the Lands Department foisting land off on the residents and immigrants, and on the other hand the Agricultural Bank are condemning the land immediately afterwards. Does the Minister pride himself on that kind of administration? We have a case also of an applicant on the goldfields, Mr. McCourt. The Attorney General is probably listening to the facts, for a member of Parliament is in that case too. A gentleman made application for certain lots and obtained them, and I believe they were eventually on the market in the hands of a land agent. Irrespective of the attitude adopted by that land agent—he is in this Chamber and can explain for himself—I quote the case in order to show the sort of thing that is going on here.

Mr. Gourley: On a point of order, the hon. member is reflecting on me, for I understand I am the member to whom he is referring. The land was never in my hands for sale in any shape or form. His statement will be published in the Press and might reflect on me. I know absolutely nothing about it.

Mr. Foulkes: I noticed in to-day's paper that my name is mentioned in regard to a complaint, stating that I had been consulted by the member for Leonora in regard to some transaction affecting land in the Dalwallinu district. I know nothing whatever about the transaction. I am glad to have the opportunity of stating that Mr. Gourley never spoke to me about it. I know nothing about it.

Mr. SCADDAN: There are many members absent from their seats, or we might have had other explanations.

Mr. Bolton: There would be plenty in another Chamber.

Mr. SCADDAN: There is also a scandal in connection with a gentleman named Myers at Wongan Hills. I have not the full particulars, but I understand that he, while possessed of a homestead block or under residential sections, applied for other lots under similar conditions and

was asked by the department to take advantage of Section 64 to get over the difficulty he had placed himself and the department in. Then there is the case of certain scandals on the Stirling Estate. I have heard of two persons to whom approval notices were sent for the same lot of that estate. One, Mr. Dunkley, who obtained it, was not a resident and did not comply with the conditions under which the blocks were thrown open. Is there any truth in that statement, and if so, who is responsible? That case shows the laxity of the department. When dealing with the administration of the Lands Department one cannot overlook the immigration policy of the Government. During the last two or three months we have had repeated letters in the newspapers coming from different persons, some old residents, others recent arrivals, and some assisted immigrants, referring to the maladministration of the department, and stating they were unable to obtain land they had been led to believe they could get. Notwithstanding these letters we find that during the next few months about 2,000 more immigrants will arrive from England. I want to know what sort of chaos we will get into if something is not done in the Lands Department. Is the Premier going to take any action? When one goes to the Minister for Lands in connection with the treatment of immigrants, or even if one goes to the Premier, the reply that he receives is, "I do not know anything about it."

The Premier: I have never had anything brought before me, and I have never given that reply.

Mr. SCADDAN: But the hon. member has only been Premier for two or three hours.

The Premier: You referred to me.

Mr. SCADDAN: I am speaking of the position of Premier generally. For a considerable time this kind of scandal has been going on, and the Minister for Lands, when the matter is brought before him, says that he is not responsible. I take it, therefore, that the Premier is responsible; at any rate we will know in

future where to send dissatisfied immigrants.

The Premier: Why do you not state facts?

Mr. SCADDAN: I am stating facts, and I say that the whole position has been allowed to drift through neglect on the part of the Government in not appointing a responsible person in London to fill the position of Agent General. It is about 12 months since we have had an Agent General representing this State in London, with the result, and there is no doubt about it, that chaos exists in the Agent General's office. We have as lecturer in England Mr. Ranford who, when in this State, where he is well known, was not too careful about the statements that he made, and he is going about making statements there which, when immigrants arrive in this State as a result of what they have heard from him, will be very difficult to prove. Who is responsible for that kind of thing? Is it the Minister for lands or the Premier? This has been going on now for a period of 12 months, and when asked recently what the intentions of the Government were with regard to the Agent General, the Premier answered that he hoped to make an announcement shortly. I say it is up to the House to demand that the announcement be made immediately in connection with the appointment of an Agent General. Is it because there is no person in the State capable of filling that office that the appointment is not made? I want to know why no appointment has been made, and whether it is because there are possibilities of political changes in the future. It is as well that we should know the reason why the Government have allowed the office to remain vacant for a period of 12 months. In connection with immigration, I want to say that I believe in the suggestion which was made by Mr. Marwick, who was recently elected to another place, and made also by the Minister for Works, and recommended as well by a select committee, that the people who are brought out here for the purpose of going on the land, or

working as farm labourers, should be taken immediately on arrival into the country districts, and not housed in Perth, until they can find employment. The whole difficulty is that they are located near the Labour Bureau, where they register their names in the hope that they may obtain work in the City. If they were immediately taken to the country they would then be available for those who required farm labourers. Under existing circumstances a number of these immigrants obtain work in the City, while other citizens who are artisans are not able to secure what work there may be available.

Mr. Bolton: The Railway Department employs a great number of them now.

Mr. SCADDAN: I know they do, and some of them also in the district represented by the Minister for Works, and that gentleman knows of them.

The Minister for Works: I do not know.

Mr. SCADDAN: Then you want to look up the report of the evidence taken by the select committee. Coming to the Mines Department, let me say that this does not affect the Minister for Mines entirely, it affects the Government as a whole, and when I say this I have in my mind their inaction in connection with the Berteaux scandal at Davyhurst. This House dealt with that question on a previous occasion, and practically forced the Minister for Mines to take some action in connection with it. As a matter of fact I believe it was only through the Premier asserting his position that an inquiry was eventually held. The Minister for Mines was not anxious to have this inquiry, but it showed that the statements made by the member for Boulder were proved up to the hilt, and they were that this man Berteaux had been defrauding the Mines Department and the Treasury of this State. Even when that was proved, we were not able to take action against him. The Minister for Mines and other members of the Cabinet refused to take action against this man, and the Crown Law Department also adopted a rather peculiar attitude. It has been stated here already, and I repeat it again

to-day, that Mr. Sayer made a report to the Premier to be read to this Chamber, and arrived at a decision, showing that they could not prosecute this person, from the files which he had never seen. That was absolutely proved in this Chamber, and on advice such as that the Crown Law Department has taken no action against Berteaux. I believe, and members in the House also believe, that the Government were not game to take action.

The Attorney General: That is not so.

Mr. SCADDAN: Why did they not do so?

The Attorney General: The matter was carefully investigated and the Crown Solicitor and Mr. Sayer both decided there should be no prosecution.

Mr. Gill: Did they say there was an element of doubt?

Mr. SCADDAN: This matter has received so much attention in the House and in the country that it should have been up to the Government to protect their honour and take action, even though they lost the case.

Mr. Holman: They were afraid of exposure.

Mr. SCADDAN: It had been shown conclusively that Berteaux had defrauded the Mines Department, and yet no action was taken, and it was generally known that the Government were not game to take action for fear of other exposures. I say that the Government are lacking in their duty, not only to the country but to themselves, in not taking action against an individual, irrespective of whether he is a friend of the Ministry or not, for having defrauded the revenue of the State.

Mr. Holman: He was a postal vote officer at Menzies.

Mr. SCADDAN: There is no doubt that he did render conspicuous services to the Minister for Mines when that gentleman was seeking re-election. It is a scandal second to none in the State, and had the gentlemen sitting on the Treasury bench been sitting in opposition with a Labour Government in power, there would have been a hue and cry about the dishonesty and the dishonourable tactics of the Government. Yet this case goes by the board;

nothing is said. The administration of the hospitals is another matter for comment in the country, and without labouring the question I wish to say that the Government, apparently with a desire to balance their ledger, are going to make the sick and those struck down by misfortune in the back country, and those who have gone out to blaze the track, as the member for Pilbara would say, be the sufferers. These are the people who are to square the ledger for the Government. The Government have reduced the subsidies to the hospitals because they can find no other method of bringing about what they desire. This is the spirit shown by the Government who parade themselves as a democratic Government. To my way of thinking their only desire is to sink the interests of the masses in order that a favoured few boodlers and others may continue to prosper. We have among the proposals as outlined by the Premier the Redistribution of Seats Bill. Let me say that I know of no more dastardly action to enable a party to continue in power irrespective of the wishes of the people than the proposals as they will be found in this measure. I know of no precedent in the history of the Commonwealth for an action such as that which it is intended to take. Here are the Government going to use their majority to force down the throats of the people a re-adjustment of the boundaries of the various electorates for no other apparent purpose than to enable them to retain possession of the Treasury bench. To my way of thinking it is not a matter vitally affecting any party in the Chamber, though it can be taken for granted that the Government will not deal in any way favourably with this side of the House. But this is not the objection to the move to be taken by the Government. The Legislative Assembly should be a true reflex of public opinion, and the Redistribution of Seats Bill, which is to be introduced for party purposes as proposed by the Government, is nothing short of a determination to prevent free expression of public opinion, in order that this party may continue in opposition. The Attorney General shakes his head. Why, I

ask, have not the Government shown their hand in connection with this matter? If this be a matter of public interest, as it must be, why do not the Government publish what they propose to do in order that the people may have time to consider the question before it is forced down their throats, as will be the case when the Bill is introduced at the end of the session. If the Government are desirous of bringing about a readjustment of boundaries, why not introduce a system similar to that in existence in the Commonwealth Parliament and in the other States? Only recently there was an Electoral Districts Bill introduced into the Queensland Assembly. There the Government might have adopted an attitude similar to that proposed in this State, and they might have made use of their brutal majority to readjust the boundaries of the electorates so as to retain their positions on the Treasury bench. It is rumoured, and there is a certain amount of truth in the rumour, that the Ministerial party had a meeting and discussed this question, and that members supporting the Government have pledged themselves to support the passage of the Redistribution of Seats Bill. It may be as well for the Premier to give that a denial if it is not true. The fact remains, however, that it is freely stated that the Ministerial party have considered this question, and for party purposes are going to use their majority to force it through. Here, then, have we a democratic Government who are going to use their brutal majority to stifle public opinion. The Queensland Bill to regulate the adjustment of the electoral boundary provides in Clause 7—

In making the division consideration shall be given by the Commissioners to (a) community or diversity of interests; (b) means of communication; (c) physical features; (d) the area of proposed districts which do not comprise any part of a city or town—and subject thereto the quota of electors shall be the basis for the division of the State into electoral districts, and the Commissioners may adopt a margin of allowance to be used whenever necessary but in no case shall such quota be de-

parted from to a greater extent than one-fifth more or one-fifth less.

The Premier will probably say that we are passing our Redistribution of Seats Bill on those lines, and that we will take all those facts into consideration; but the main fact that they will take into consideration will be that they are in power and that they want to remain in power. If that is not the case why do not the Government state definitely to the people and to the House what they propose to do, or appoint a Commission such as that which exists in Queensland to rearrange the boundaries without consideration of party or for party purposes? It is not a matter of the number supporting any party in the House or in any future Parliament; it is a question of giving the public a fair opportunity of expressing their opinions on political questions of the day. Of course, it has been a method adopted in many other countries, such as America, where the party in office have abused their power to gerrymander the electoral boundaries for their profit, in order that they might return with a majority. That, apparently, is the intention of the present Government, an intention supported by all those democrats on the Treasury bench, even that great democrat, the Minister for Works, who is the president of the Democratic League at Subiaco. I would like to hear that league on this question, and, moreover, I would like an opportunity of addressing that league myself.

The Minister for Works: They want something educational, though.

Mr. SCADDAN: That is why they put the hon. member in the chair—to muzzle him.

Mr. Troy: It is easy enough; all you want to do is to tumble a bit.

Mr. SCADDAN: We have also a proposal for this Chamber to consider during the next few weeks, namely, the Constitution Act Amendment Bill. I want the Premier to tell the House whether he is making provision in that Bill for the reduction of the franchise of another place. It has been the pronounced policy of the party now in power to bring about the reduction of the franchise of the

Legislative Council ever since 1905. The Premier himself has declared that in his own electorate, and has repeated it in the Chamber. The ex-Premier introduced a Bill dealing with the question, but the Bill was thrown out in another place owing to its not having secured the statutory majority required for its passage. Yet we find that at Subiaco the other evening the Premier made reference to certain proposals which it was his intention to put through. For instance, there was the Licensing Bill, the Health Bill, and the Roads Bill, each of which was already before the House; while there was also to be introduced the Redistribution of Seats Bill. These, he said, were four important measures which the Government intended, if possible, should be put through and passed into law this session; but he omitted to make any mention of that part of the Moore Government's policy represented by the proposed reduction of the franchise of the Legislative Council. And in making a statement in the House on Tuesday evening last the Premier referred to this Bill, which he said had been promised for some time. Continuing the Premier said—

And we are going to endeavour to pass it. Amongst other things it will increase the life of Parliament from three years to four years, and it will also abolish the necessity for a member of the House, on accepting a portfolio, having to seek re-election.

No reference is made there to the question of the reduction of the franchise of another place.

The Premier: Did you not hear me refer to it?

Mr. SCADDAN: No. I was in my place, but I heard no reference to that question. I mentioned it to other members, but they also had failed to hear any reference to it. Then, not being satisfied, I looked up the *West Australian*, and, still unconvinced, turned up the *Hansard* report of the Premier's speech; but it contained no reference to any such thing. Of course, the Premier may intend to include it—I hope he does—but I want to point to the omission when he made that statement the other night.

According to his statement the provisions of the Bill would increase the tenure of Parliament, and abolish the necessity for Ministers to seek re-election on acceptance of office; and he declared that the Bill had been promised for some time. I have not heard of any agitation for the Bill, nor of any promise that it would be forthcoming. There has been no desire to extend the tenure of Parliament from three to four years. As a matter of fact, the public complain that Parliament is too lengthy to-day, that we get out of touch with public opinion; and I believe it is true, especially when I look across the Chamber and remark the gentlemen constituting the Government. It is now over two years since the present Government appealed to the country, and clearly they are getting out of touch with public opinion. To extend the term of Parliament from three years to four years is, in my opinion, inadvisable at the present juncture, and I say the Government are not justified in making such a proposal. We hear a lot about policy and pledges, but this has been no part of the Government policy, nor do I think they have given a pledge in this direction. I say we have no right to do this without first consulting the people. It is a matter affecting the future policy of the State, and it is of such seriousness that the Government should not for a moment consider its adoption. Then there is the question of Ministers seeking re-election on the acceptance of office. In this respect I can sympathise with the Premier who, as one having suffered defeat on seeking re-election after acceptance of office, is now taking the earliest opportunity of introducing a Bill calculated to avert that humiliation in future. Has there been any general demand for this reform?

The Premier: Do you not want it?

Mr. SCADDAN: I am not asking for it. Let me tell the Premier that when, after the next general election, we are occupying that bench, we will not be altering our policy from session to session; and even when a change is made in Cabinet, we will not be fearful of appearing before the electors.

The Premier: Who is fearful?

Mr. SCADDAN: The Premier is not fearful? Is this not *prima facie* evidence that he is fearful? He was not fearful on a previous occasion, but when he actually faced the electors he wished there had been some such provision as this which he now proposes. Personally I do not know that it is advisable that Ministers should have to return to the country on accepting office; but it is a good safety valve, and it affords opportunity for an expression of opinion.

Mr. Augwin: As in the case of the Morgans Ministry.

Mr. SCADDAN: The Morgans Ministry was a case in point. I do not know that there is any desire for a change in this direction. Let us give the country the opportunity—

The Premier: Why not discuss all that when the Bill is before the House?

Mr. SCADDAN: I am merely showing the tendency of the Premier, who is not long in power before displaying his reactionary leanings. Here we have been fighting to reduce the tenure of Parliament, and we find the Premier desirous of extending it and avoiding the necessity of Ministers going to the country on accepting office. I do not know that it is necessary to proceed at much greater length. I would like to refer to the statement made by the Premier the other evening, when he proposed that, during the session, he would put through no fewer than nine Bills for the construction of railways in various agricultural districts.

The Premier: I asked the hon. member to assist me.

Mr. SCADDAN: I will, but the Premier might ask the Attorney General also to assist him. It may be news to the Premier to know that the Attorney General is opposed to the construction of new lines. He has opposed the construction of new railways in this State.

The Attorney General: Get out your scrap book.

Mr. SCADDAN: There are some very fine scraps in it: scraps of speeches made by the Attorney General in contradiction of himself from time to time. Every six years the Attorney General changes

his political opinions. He held an opinion in 1904 in connection with the railway construction proposals of the Daglish Government. He said they were not required, that we did not require new railways; but to-day we find him one of the great supporters of the proposed extension of our railway system in agricultural districts. Let me say it is commendable; I am pleased to think the Attorney General has been converted by the speeches of hon. members on this side to the construction of railways in agricultural districts. The Premier himself on one occasion ridiculed the idea of going in for a progressive policy of railway construction in the agricultural districts. When the present Minister for Works, as leader of the Labour Government, brought down his policy, the present Premier attempted to pass ridicule on it. The present Premier was then sitting in Opposition. I will read to you what he said—

The Premier also spoke of putting out spur lines anywhere along the Great Southern Railway, a dry dock at Fremantle, and sewerage works. All these things totted up to several millions of money. When we had publicly stated through the Government of the day that we were going to embark on this progressive policy and build railways here, there, and everywhere, it would have been better if we could have shown by legitimate means a revenue account that at any rate would have balanced our expenditure.

Where would our agricultural railways have been to-day if the Premier, as member of the Moore Government, had made that his first principle—that we should balance the ledger before constructing agricultural railways?

The Premier: That was because you had no borrowing policy.

Mr. SCADDAN: The hon. member knows that is absolutely incorrect. He knows his colleague, the Minister for Works, the then Premier, left a considerable balance on Loan Account in order to construct these railways.

Mr. Bath: One million pounds.

Mr. SCADDAN: There is no consistency in members who adopt an attitude of that kind when in opposition, and then when in office declare themselves in favour of agricultural railways.

The Premier: You have been misquoting.

Mr. SCADDAN: No; I have been quoting from *Hansard*, and the hon. member can turn it up for himself and see if he can deny it. By way of showing the consistency of the Attorney General, it is interesting to look back and see what he had to say. His remarks were as follow:—

In the Greenough district the farmer did not say much on the larger question, but asked for roads to give easy access to a market. Till these were provided more ambitious schemes might be kept in the background. Not only roads but suitable railway facilities were needed—not new lines of railway, but a further use of existing lines.

These are the gentlemen who go about the country condemning the mark-time policy of the Labour Government, and saying that we are attempting to prevent the progress of the State; and, at the same time, taking credit to themselves for having introduced light agricultural railways into the State.

The Attorney General: We did not say new lines were not needed.

Mr. SCADDAN: What you said was, “not only roads, but suitable railway facilities were needed—not new lines of railway, but a further use of existing lines.”

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. SCADDAN: Before the adjournment I was referring to the attitude adopted in the past by some of the members now occupying the front Ministerial bench, and I was also dealing with the legislation proposed for the remainder of the session as outlined in the statement made by the Premier on Tuesday. I understand that since that statement was made one political organisation in the State has had a meeting. Whether they are in the confidence of the Premier

I do not know, but I understand they have decided that by hook or by crook the Redistribution of Seats Bill must pass. Will the Premier inform the House whether the National Political League has had a draft of the Bill or has been informed of the nature of the proposals in the Bill, while the public have not been able to obtain any information whatsoever, except to the extent that the Ministerial party had a meeting and decided that they would put the Bill through despite all the opposition that will be brought against it? It is rather a remarkable thing that a party such as the National Political League should be able to decide that a Bill of this kind should be passed when they have not had an outline of it. If they have had it, they have had more than the general public or members of the House know. It is an unusual course, and I think the Premier should inform the House.

The Premier: Was the hon. member at their meeting?

Mr. SCADDAN: No; but it was published in the newspapers that the league had a meeting and decided the Bill must be passed.

The Premier: I have not seen or heard anything of it.

Mr. SCADDAN: Of course we know they have a paid organiser, a member of this Chamber, the member for Murray; and he attended the Ministerial party's meeting when the matter was discussed.

The Minister for Works: Did he?

Mr. SCADDAN: Probably the Minister can tell me; he knows. I am pretty certain all the members were there except one or two who could not attend; and I think the member for Murray was one of them; and, being paid organiser of that organisation, he would probably give them the information with the result that they could discuss something the House has not had the opportunity of hearing. These are the political methods adopted to-day in order to prevent the free expression of public opinion in this Chamber. Dealing with the forecast of legislation for the remainder of the session, may I draw

attention to the omission of any reference to an amendment of the Arbitration Act? While Ministers find time to deal with the question of the extension of the tenure of Parliament, and with the advisability or otherwise of members returning to their constituents when accepting office, they have no time to deal with the more vital questions affecting the welfare of the workers of the State. It is not that the matter has not been brought under their notice, because the president of the Arbitration Court, and the members of the court, and the newspapers and the public generally have been discussing the matter for months past and saying that the legislation in this respect should be made adequate to meet the circumstances that arise; yet we hear nothing from the Premier, it is no concern to the Premier what becomes of the workers of the country so long as he is reaping advantage from the workers' efforts. The country is prospering, but I am afraid that if the present Government remain in office any length of time it will be one section of the community, and a very small section, that will enjoy the fruits of our prosperity. The past of the Premier leads me to that view. I am not going to refer at any greater length to the proposals of the Government, except to say that I cannot for the life of me see how the House can continue to have confidence in the Government as at present constituted. For a collection of varied political opinions, commend me to the present Treasury bench. We have members sitting on that bench who have in the past condemned in the strongest possible terms the political tendencies of the very person they accept as their Premier, as the one who will formulate their policy in the future. We have one who is recognised as the black-labour representative in the House, the member for Kimberley, one who urged the State Government to approach the Federal Government to relieve the pearling industry by allowing the introduction of indentured labour to work the pearling boats in the North-West. At the other end of the bench we have a gentleman who the

other night formed a democratic league in Subiaco, and one of the planks of that league was that the tropical industries should be encouraged by the employment of Europeans and aboriginal labour only. I want to know how that gentleman can reconcile these two things. He joined the Cabinet at the same time as the gentleman who wants to introduce Asiatic labour, and yet he contends that he still holds the same political views as before he joined the Cabinet. How can the hon. member reconcile the two positions? Again, we have a gentleman who previously championed the civil service and condemned the Government for their attitude towards school teachers and civil servants. Now that gentleman's chief is the one who is the enemy of the free education system. We have the Crown Law Department controlled by an Attorney General who has only left his school in England, yet he is now leader of the Bar in this State; and we are to have confidence in that department, that department which by its action in the Bertheaux case, the Gerald Browne case and, may I say, the Harry Brown case has been conniving at illegal actions and doing nothing to bring wrongdoers to justice. Also, we have the Minister for Mines retaining charge of his department by using the irregularities of his own supporters to oust a person honestly returned at the head of the poll. He sits now, quite satisfied everything is all right, cheek by jowl with the very person against whom some years ago he stumped the country in opposition to that person's conservative tendencies. We have the Lands Department in a muddle that I suppose no other department in the State or in other States has previously got into, with scandals that would never be tolerated in other States of the Commonwealth, and with outside influence brought to bear on the Minister.

The Minister for Lands: It is not true.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not use that expression.

The Minister for Lands: I withdraw.

Mr. SCADDAN: Outside influence brought to bear on the Minister in connection with complaints made when allo-

eating certain lots to persons residing in the State. If it is necessary to mention names I can mention that of Mr. Dunkley and the Stirling Estate. Will the Minister deny that outside influence was used to silence certain individuals when they were writing?

The Minister for Lands: Certainly I do.

Mr. SCADDAN: We will bring proofs that outside influence was used.

The Minister for Lands: The board dealt with it.

Mr. SCADDAN: I am speaking about after the board. So we have departments conniving at illegal actions and taking no action, as a matter of fact assisting persons to escape justice. We have on the Treasury bench the holders of different opinions, one in favour of black and Asiatic labour to encourage the industries in the North-West, and another making it a plank in his platform that it should be done by European and aboriginal labour only. We have the opponent of the worker in every possible sense at the head of the Government, a man who in the Arbitration Court on behalf of certain firms advocated that 6s. a day should be the living wage for those employed in our industries, a man who has stated in the House that elderly men and boys should be at the mercy of their employers despite the fact that we have an Arbitration Court to regulate wages and hours of labour. We have a discontented civil service, the hearts knocked out of our school teachers owing to the action of the Education Department in some directions, some of which were referred to recently by the Minister for Works. We have warders in our asylums and gaols discontented even almost to the extent of leaving work. We have our railway servants making repeated applications to the Premier for assistance towards their welfare. All this is going on, but with the present Government and their supporters there is no hope for the future for the workers. If opportunity were given to the people of the country to express an opinion on members of the Ministerial bench, I am satisfied not one-half of the Ministers

would be returned. There is no doubt about the feeling in the country. Two out of three of the persons you meet in the street will tell you they have no faith in the administration of the present Government with the present Premier at the head of affairs. That being so, I ask those on the Government side of the House, who contend that they hold democratic views, whether they will give the public an opportunity of expressing an opinion on the present Administration. Last session there was introduced a Bill to amend the Agricultural Lands Purchase Act, in order to permit the Government to buy further estates, but no mention was made of the fact that the Bill was introduced for one purpose only, and that was to permit the Government to buy an estate then owned by the member for Gascoyne (Mr. Butcher). Will the Government deny that that is the way they carry on government—by introducing measures for the special purpose, as they did last session, in order to permit them to buy an estate from the member for Gascoyne?

Mr. Jacoby: Do you allege anything corrupt in that?

Mr. SCADDAN: The hon. member would not understand it if I did. The fact remains that when the Bill was passed, no mention was made of the fact that its object was to buy that estate. Yet the member for Gascoyne with the full knowledge of the fact that the purchase was being made, waited until the last moment and sent in his resignation in such a manner as there would be no opportunity of any opposition, and posed before his electors as being the only honourable man in the House. Twelve months ago the Government were introducing a Bill, without mentioning it, to purchase his estate. Why did he not tell his constituents then that he was selling his estate, and that he would have to come before them for their further suffrages? He made no mention of it until the writ had been practically issued. Then he proceeded on the journey to Gascoyne so that no one else could follow. Now he poses as the only hon. member in the Chamber.

Mr. Butcher: That is incorrect.

Mr. SCADDAN: It is absolutely correct; no other man could get there in time for nomination. I contend that the time has arrived when the people should be given another opportunity to express their opinion of the policy of the Government, outlined by the Premier, and as to the administration by the Government of the departments. Members should consider the question from that standpoint, not from the standpoint of extending the tenure of Parliament so as to avoid responsibility. If this is done I am satisfied that in the very near future, as the result of members going before the people, we will obtain an alteration in policy and in the administration of the departments.

On motion by the Premier debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 7.47 p.m.

Legislative Assembly, Tuesday, 11th October, 1910.

	Page
Mr. Holman's Police Court Fine	833
Privilege: Mr. Brown and an Office of Profit, a	
Press interview	833
Papers presented	837
Question: Goldfields Water Supply, meter rents	837
Motion: Want of Confidence in the Government	838

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

MR. HOLMAN'S POLICE COURT FINE.

Mr. Brown having given notice to ask the Attorney General: Has the fine of £25, inflicted on the hon. member for Murchison for assisting in a strike been paid? If not, why not?

Mr. HOLMAN said: I can answer that question now: The fine has not been paid, nor have the costs been paid, nor will they

ever be paid, nor have the two months been done.

PRIVILEGE—MR. BROWN AND AN OFFICE OF PROFIT.

A Press interview.

Mr. HOLMAN (Murchison): On a question of privilege, I desire to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to a paragraph in an interview granted by the member for Perth, or the ex-member for Perth as he is in my opinion, to a newspaper during the last few days. It referred to the matter I brought forward in the House last week, in which I asked your ruling as to whether the member for Perth was in order in sitting in this Chamber as he had accepted an office of profit under the Crown. Since then Mr. Brown has given an interview to the Press, an interview which contains more than one deliberate untruth.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not use that expression in the House.

Mr. HOLMAN: I withdraw it, but I will say that the statement is absolutely incorrect. In the first place Mr. Brown in his interview with this paper said—

I have nothing to hide, nothing to be ashamed of so far as I can see, and I have certainly not abrogated my functions as a legislator any more than has Mr. Holman on several occasions.

That means that I have received payment from the Crown for services I have rendered. I desire to give that an emphatic denial as I have never received a solitary appointment from the Crown in any respect, nor have I received any payment from the Crown in connection with any matter. Further on in the interview Mr. Brown says—

Mr. Holman was nominated as assessor for the plaintiff (Barry) and attended two sittings of the arbitrators, who verdicted for Barry with costs. I was entitled to a guinea a sitting under the Act, and I was paid two guineas for two sittings. Mr. Holman claimed five guineas for two sittings and received three—a guinea more than he was legally entitled to.

In the first place I was assessor for Barry,