

there will not be any opposition to the passage of the Bill because the contract has to be completed and the money raised before the end of the present year. I do not think it is necessary for me to refer to the Bill in detail. The first three clauses give the municipality power to purchase and carry on the works and the other clause gives power to raise money for the purchase. In the Schedule we have the agreement between the Colonial Gas Association, Limited, and the municipality of Geraldton. I hope hon. members will realise that the Bill is in the best interests of Geraldton, and that it is a good proposition. Knowing that hon. members will recognise it is in the interests of the State that municipalities should own the lighting systems I feel sure there will not be any objection to the passage of the Bill. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. Bath: I understand that it is a Private Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: No. 258 of our Standing Orders provides—

Every Bill for the paving, lighting, draining, cleansing, or otherwise improving any city, town or district, or for supplying the same with water, promoted by the Municipal or District authorities of such city, town, or district, shall be deemed to be a Public Bill.

I thought the question might be raised and I took the precaution to consult the Crown Law Department and I have their authority for declaring this to be a Public Bill. It states that the Bill comes within the category mentioned in the Standing Orders, and a case is quoted as having occurred in New South Wales, where they have a Standing Order dealing with similar Bills which is on all fours with ours.

Mr. Taylor: This Bill provides for the raising of a loan and consequently taxation.

Mr. Bath: I am perfectly satisfied. I understood the hon. member was introducing it as a Private Bill.

The Attorney General: A private member introducing a Government Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

House adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 25th August, 1910.

	PAGE
Questions: Railway Loco. Depot, removal	... 491
State Mining Engineer, leave of absence	... 491
Public Servants Increments	... 492
Superannuation Allowances	... 492
Bills: Bread Act Amendment, 1s	... 492
Licensing, 2s	... 492
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment	... 506
Health, 2s	... 507
Privilege: Summonses Served on Members	... 492
Comments on Members' Conduct	... 519

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

QUESTION—RAILWAY LOCO. DEPOT, REMOVAL.

Mr. SWAN (for Mr. Horan) asked the Minister for Railways: Does the Railway Department contemplate the removal of the West Perth loco. depot to East Perth or other suburban station?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: The extension of the Perth goods yards for future requirements is under consideration, but no determination has been arrived at.

QUESTION—STATE MINING ENGINEER, LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. SWAN (for Mr. Horan) asked the Minister for Mines: Is he satisfied that the present backward state of the geological survey of Western Australia warrants the granting of four months' leave of absence to the State Mining Engineer?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: The fact of the State Mining Engineer taking the leave due to him under the provisions of the Public Ser-

vice Act will not affect the state of the geological survey of Western Australia.

QUESTION—PUBLIC SERVANTS' INCREMENTS.

Mr. DRAPER asked the Premier: Will the Government bring in a Bill this session to amend "The Public Service Act, 1904," with respect to—1, The payment of annual increments within a class up to the classified value of the position; 2, The reconstruction of the appeal board?

The PREMIER replied: 1, The necessity for amending the Public Service Act on this point is not apparent. The Government recognise, as does the Public Service Commissioner, that an officer's maximum salary—that is, the salary to which he may attain without waiting for promotion to a higher position—will, if he shows himself worthy of this consideration, be reached by increments provided from year to year on the Estimates. The Government are not prepared to favour any amendment of the Act which would render these increases automatic, since to do so would, in their opinion, take away that incentive to energy which is necessary to an efficient service. 2, Should the condition of business allow, it is the intention of the Government to amend certain provisions of the Act this session. Their views in regard to the constitution of the appeal board have already been given to the House.

QUESTION—SUPERANNUATION ALLOWANCES.

Mr. DRAPER asked the Premier: 1, Have the Government refused to grant pensions under the Superannuation Act to any persons for any reason other than misconduct? 2, And, if so, under what authority, and what are the names of the persons so refused?

The PREMIER replied: 1 and 2, The answer to the questions asked by the hon. member for West Perth in regard to the superannuation of officers would entail an exhaustive examination of hundreds

of files, seeing that practically every officer retired from the service considers that, on some ground or other, he is entitled to a pension. Further, the making available of the information asked for in regard to the whole body of officers retired without pensions would not, in my opinion, be to the public interest. Again, as the hon. member doubtless knows, Parliament has, under the terms of the Act, left, and left very wisely, I think, the decision of these questions absolutely to the Executive Council. Information in regard to any particular case will, if possible, be furnished, provided public interests are not prejudiced by so doing.

BILL—BREAD ACT AMENDMENT.

Introduced by Mr. Bath, and read a first time.

PRIVILEGE—SUMMONSES SERVED ON MEMBERS.

Mr. SCADDAN (Ivanhoe): Before the Orders of the Day are called on I would again ask what has been done in connection with the matter of privilege being inquired into by the Standing Orders Committee?

The PREMIER (Sir Newton J. Moore): Perhaps Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the committee, could best answer the question.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will be pleased to do so. All the information there is to give is that the committee have been sitting up till the last moment before coming into the House, and have had to further adjourn for more evidence which it is desired to take. The committee have adjourned till to-morrow at three o'clock.

BILL—LICENSING.

Second Reading.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. J. L. Nanson) in moving the second reading said: I may intimate to hon. members that I do not intend on this occasion to occupy the attention of the House for any length of time. As hon. members will recollect, last session the Govern-

ment introduced a Licensing Bill, and I then dealt very fully with both the policy and the details of that measure. The Bill we are now introducing is, in all respects, identical with that introduced last session.

Mr. Walker: As it left the House?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Not entirely as it left the House. The hon. member will recollect that the Licensing Bill of last session got into Committee where, when the appointment of the licensing benches was being considered, an amendment was carried providing for elective instead of nominated benches. The Bill as introduced this session is, as I have already pointed out, identical with the Bill as introduced last session, and we provide in this Bill for nominated licensing benches. When the Bill reaches Committee members will have an opportunity of going into that matter, and the arguments both for and against the two systems can then be advanced.

Mr. Bolton: The House has already carried it.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It often happens that the Committee make an amendment, and on re-committal a different decision is arrived at. There is certainly no reason why, in introducing this Bill, we should not avail ourselves of the opportunity of re-inserting the clause as it originally stood.

Mr. Bolton: You are not seeking to defeat the measure?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: No; certainly not.

Mr. Swan: Nor to waste time?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Not at all; if the hon. member would interject less, less time would be wasted. I may say in regard to the delay last session that the rejection of the clause dealing with the constitution of the licensing benches had nothing in itself to do with the decision not to advance the Bill further. Hon. members will remember that the session was very fully occupied. A large number of amendments to the Bill appeared on the Notice Paper after the second reading, and it became perfectly clear, even if it had not been so before, that the Bill could not get through the

Committee stage without occupying a great deal of time and entailing much necessary discussion. The Government were faced with this position: there was a probability that, having got half-way through the Bill, we should have found that, owing to our desire to secure the adjournment by Christmas, we could not proceed further; and it was thought better, therefore, as there seemed to be next to no hope of getting the Bill through in one session, that we should not proceed further with the Committee stage. But the fact that an amendment was made in regard to the constitution of the licensing benches certainly had nothing to do with the delay in proceeding further with the Bill.

Mr. Taylor: Is the Bill to-day in the same form as it was last session?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Precisely, except that there are a few minor alterations in regard to matters of machinery, of administration. For instance, in Clause 26 we have some small alterations in regard to railway restaurant car licenses, and we have some alterations in regard to the transmission of licenses in certain events, such as the demise, bankruptcy, or insanity of the licensee. There are alterations in regard to the continuance of licenses if for some reason licensees become incapable of holding them. There are also some minor alterations with regard to the adulteration of liquor. The alterations are all with regard to purely machinery matters. Hon. members will remember that the principle of the Bill was, firstly, it established immediate local option, secondly, it supplied means of compensation in regard to the abolition of licenses in existence before the measure becomes law, provided such abolition was in obedience to a local option poll. The measure also provided that there should be no granting of new licenses except in obedience to a local option poll; furthermore that after the passing of the Bill if new licenses were abolished they should receive no form of compensation either in money or time or in any way whatsoever. So far as existing licenses it was provided that after a lapse of ten years they also

on abolition should be in no sense entitled to compensation. As for abolition during the ten years period hon. members will remember provision was made—and the same is in the present measure—for compensation to be raised by a levy on existing licenses. I do not think I need occupy the time of hon. members longer. My own wish is that the Bill should get into Committee as soon as possible, because I recognise it is a highly controversial measure, as any Bill dealing with this question must be, and that it must necessarily occupy a large portion of the time of the House this session. I take it there is on both sides of the House only one desire, that is, that we shall this session get the Bill through Committee and, if possible, carried not only in this House but in another place. It will be indeed disappointing if as one of the legislative achievements of the present session we cannot pass the Licensing Bill which, while it will not give either side or school of opinion all it wants, will in its main provisions give what we regard are the demands of the larger portion of the public of the State.

Mr. Bolton: Does not the Minister think it would save time if it were introduced as amended?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Not necessarily. At any rate there are considerations other than the saving of time; and thinking, as I do, that the particular amendment referred to was certainly not a step in the right direction, I am anxious to again test the feeling of the House in regard to the constitution of licensing boards.

Mr. Bolton: Do you still provide in the Bill that no one interested in the trade shall have representation on the board?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: That is still in the Bill.

Mr. Gill: Why is the first local option poll fixed for so late as 1912?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Last year we provided for the poll to be taken in 1911. This year it is made for 1912. However, that is a matter of detail that can be dealt with in Committee. It is

not a matter of principle. I content myself with moving *pro forma*—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. Bath: Why *pro forma*?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I look upon this debate as a matter of form until we get into Committee.

Mr. SCADDAN (Ivanhoe): The hon. member can rest assured that Opposition members will not unduly delay the passage of this Bill in Committee; but at the same time I wish to say that I regret very much the Attorney General has, in the Bill now introduced, practically flouted a decision previously arrived at by this very Parliament. I could very well understand if the Attorney General had introduced this Bill in another Parliament that he should ask a new Parliament to reverse a previous decision; but on this occasion the House is constituted just as it was when the Bill was previously dealt with, with the exception of the new members for Beverley and Fremantle. But even with that difference, judging by the division list on this question of nominee or elective licensing benches on the previous occasion, those two hon. members, even by supporting the Government, cannot alter the decision previously arrived at. That being so, would it not have been preferable for the Attorney General to make provision in the present Bill so that it could pass the second-reading stage and progress in Committee until we reach that point at which the Bill was previously dropped? The Attorney General says he is not satisfied with the decision previously arrived at, and he thinks we adopted a wrong course—that may be so; I believe the hon. member is in earnest in making that statement—but it only goes to prove that what had been said previously in regard to the Bill is absolutely correct, namely, that the Government when defeated on the question of nominee or elective licensing benches dropped the measure.

The Attorney General: That is not so.

Mr. SCADDAN: The hon. member may say that now, but he has said this afternoon that he was of opinion we ad-

opted the wrong course and that he would endeavour to get the House to take up a different attitude. Judging from what happened after that division, the Government dropped the measure because they suffered a reverse on this question. I hope the Government will be prepared to accept many defeats on this Bill before the measure passes through the whole of the Committee stage.

The Attorney General: That is quite possible.

Mr. SCADDAN: But judging from the previous attitude of the Government, I am afraid that the local option question in this State is far from approaching consummation. However, what I want to point out particularly is that the Bill we are to consider now is a consolidating measure dealing with the whole of the liquor traffic, while the main point the public are desirous of having settled is the question of local option. I consider it would have been preferable to have a measure dealing purely with local option and, later on, another measure consolidating the liquor laws or dealing with all other questions, so that we shall not have the question of local option set back for a number of years, notwithstanding the fact that a great majority of members are in favour of local option, simply because the Government are not prepared to accept defeats in other directions. That is how I view it. I am afraid local option is very many years ahead of us yet.

The Attorney General: We provide for it.

Mr. SCADDAN: I understand that; but if the Government are to be defeated on some of the elements in the Bill before us, as they were last year on the matter of licensing benches, and they drop the measure, where is local option? There is no doubt the whole of the public are demanding local option, yet we cloud the issue in a consolidating measure, and the possibility is, if the Government adopt the attitude adopted last session, we will not get it for a number of years.

The Attorney General: Pass this Bill and you will get it.

Mr. SCADDAN: Will the Attorney General assure us that, despite what amendments are made in the Bill, he will go through with it, if the provisions concerning local option are carried by the House? What happened last session may happen this session with the result that the Bill will be dropped again because the Government are not prepared to suffer defeat in connection with other matters in the Bill, that is, other than the local option provisions. I do not desire to delay this measure going into Committee, and I am prepared to see the second reading passed this evening. We discussed the Bill previously on the second reading and proceeded to some extent in Committee, and it would have been better had the Attorney General accepted the Bill as it stood when it left our hands in Committee last session, because then we could have saved a good deal of discussion which, judging from the tone of the House on that occasion, will be exactly the same this session. That being so, what possible benefit is there in re-introducing the Bill as it was previously introduced? I hope that if this Bill is to be dropped on account of any amendment being made as on a previous occasion, the Government will take the earliest opportunity of introducing a Bill dealing with local option. The people desire it and they should be given local option at the earliest possible opportunity.

Mr. BOLTON (North Fremantle): The idea of introducing the Bill as introduced this afternoon by the Attorney General is farcical in the extreme. The argument of the Attorney General as to why the Bill did not pass through last session is that there was not sufficient time, that certain amendments having been made it was found impossible to complete the Bill: but in the same breath the hon. gentleman explains that this Bill now introduced is exactly similar in form to that introduced last session, so that there is exactly the same ground to go over this session and it will be a reasonable excuse for the Government to advance—and I make bold to say they will advance it—if the Bill does not pass this session. The House last session adopted

the principle of elective benches, and is it to be supposed by the Attorney General that we are going to allow that to go by the board this session? Does it not follow that the amendment passed last session will be again introduced and passed this session? Is it not reasonable to think that the same time will be taken up to get the Bill through to the same stage that it reached last session? I think it is farcical to pass a certain amendment and then to have the Bill re-introduced and not give effect to one single amendment already passed by us.

Mr. Foulkes: There was only one.

Mr. BOLTON: The amendment passed by us practically defeated the Bill. It was put into the waste-paper basket afterwards.

The Attorney General: No.

Mr. BOLTON: Whether that was the reason or not, we are bound to form our own conclusions. Mine is that the amendment was so drastic as viewed by the Government that they decided they would not proceed. What will happen this year? The same amendment will be carried, and the Government will say there is not sufficient time to deal with the Bill. With few exceptions members are in favour of local option, and they know the people are asking for it. They must realise the people are as far off getting it as ever; and seeing that the Government have re-introduced the Bill without the amendment passed last session, the people will still be waiting for local option at the end of this session.

Mr. GILL (Balkatta): Like those who have spoken, I think the Government would have been well advised if they had adopted the amendment passed last session and embodied it in this Bill and by that means saved a good deal of time. Certainly there need be no long discussion on the second reading, but when we get into Committee the same old arguments will be used and the same fight will have to be put up again in connection with those matters fought out last session, so that there will be a good deal of time wasted. But the aspect that appeals to me more than anything else is one not touched on by the Attorney General. Last session he dealt very exhaustively

with the Bill and assured us that the Government intended to make the whole of the Bill an open question. Seeing the attitude they have adopted now with regard to an amendment the House decided on, I would like to know if, during the present session, it is the intention of the Government to allow the Bill to be an open question and to give members a free hand to do with it as they desire, or if the Bill is to be made a party measure. If it is to be open to members to vote as they think fit then proper consideration can be given to the Bill. Therefore, it will be well to have an assurance from the Attorney General on the question.

The Attorney General: A reasonable latitude will be allowed.

Mr. FOULKES (Claremont): I am quite sure this Bill will not be treated by the Government as a party question. It should not be.

Mr. Price: The Attorney General says it will be a party question.

Mr. FOULKES: He has not said that. I do not agree with the arguments of the member for North Fremantle with regard to the Bill being practically the same as that introduced last session. It must not be forgotten that it is open to us to bring forward amendments on any clause we think fit. A large number of important amendments in the way of proposed new clauses were introduced last session but it is highly probable that had they been brought forward they would not have been adopted without still further amendment. All that I am concerned with is to see that an amending Bill is brought forward, then we can suggest any amendments we like. I do not attach much importance to what clauses are now included in the Bill, for we can amend them. As a matter of fact, I would not mind if there were blank pages for we could fill them up quite easily. I join with other members in hoping that if the Government find the majority of members are against certain clauses they will not allow the Bill to be dropped. I do not think they will. I have been watching very closely, and was glad to see that in the Orders of the Day for to-day the Licensing Bill occupied first place, and

I hope it will hold that position until it is passed. Last session I noticed that after the Bill had reached the Committee stage it was gradually dropped to the bottom of the list. I will do my utmost this session to keep it well up, perhaps not first on the Notice Paper, but among the first three Bills.

Mr. Bolton: How are you going to do it?

Mr. FOULKES: I am sure the Attorney General recognises that there is a strong desire on the part of the majority of members that this Bill should be considered as one of the first Bills of the session, and that he will be only too glad favourably to consider the views of members.

Mr. Scaddan: It was to have been one of the first of this Parliament.

Mr. FOULKES: Anyhow it is the first on the list to-day. Many members on this side of the House agree with me in considering this Bill to be the leading one of the session.

Mr. Bolton: It will last as many years as the Fremantle dock.

Mr. FOULKES: I do not think so. There is no doubt that the great majority of members are most anxious that a new Licensing Bill, including provision for local option, should be put into effect as soon as possible.

Mr. Bolton: The Government do not seem to be so.

Mr. FOULKES: If they are not they will gradually learn to be so. I believe the Attorney General realises that the majority of members are most anxious for the Bill to be dealt with. There will be many contentious clauses in the Bill, and we must recognise that it is impossible for us all to have the clauses carried in the way we should like; there will have to be a good deal of give and take. For instance, take the clause dealing with the constitution of the licensing benches. I remember that last year I voted for the principle that licensing magistrates should be elected. There are many other clauses, however, which I consider to be of far greater importance than that one. and I would be prepared, if I could ensure the passage of the clauses I consider of

greater importance, to sacrifice the one dealing with the appointment of the benches.

Mr. Bolton: Here is the explanation why the Bill is introduced in its present form.

Mr. FOULKES: I am not responsible for that provision being left out of the Bill. Had I been responsible for the measure there would have been many alterations. I am very glad to see that the Attorney General and the leader of the Opposition agree that the second reading of the Bill should be carried this afternoon. There will be many opportunities later on for us to discuss the various clauses.

Mr. ANGWIN (East Fremantle): I was rather surprised to hear the member for Claremont say that he will be willing to forego a certain clause because he thinks he can get something else.

Mr. Foulkes: Something of more importance.

Mr. ANGWIN: Seeing that the clause relating to the appointment of licensing benches is almost the first contentious one in the Bill, how will it be possible for the hon. member to receive a guarantee that he will get something else later on? I was very much surprised to see the Bill re-introduced without there being included the provision decided upon last year with regard to the election of the benches. No matter what members have entered the House since then, it will be impossible if members vote as previously to defeat the clause agreed to last session, seeing that the Speaker will not have an opportunity of giving a casting vote either in favour of or against the clause which was carried by an absolute majority. The country have a perfect right to expect that members should exhibit a certain amount of stability of opinions, and should not change their views on a question like this every time the wind blows in the opposite direction. The Attorney General said there is very little alteration to the Bill. I find, however, on referring to the numbers of the clauses to which amendments were made last year that they do not correspond with the numbers in the present measure,

showing thereby that there have been alterations. It will be necessary for every member to look carefully through the measure and see what alteration has been made to clauses and what clauses have been omitted. It would be inadvisable to rush through this measure too hurriedly. The principles of the Bill might be the same as last session, but the details are different. It is not my intention to discuss the question now, as there was a full debate last session. No doubt next week the Bill will reach the Committee stage and by then I shall have looked carefully through it. I am sure there will be just as large an array of amendments on the Notice Paper concerning the measure this session as there was last.

Mr. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret): The Bill is no stranger to this Parliament, for it passed its second reading and reached a certain stage in Committee last session. Some members adopted a certain attitude in Committee last session—in my opinion an attitude highly justified—by altering the constitution of the licensing benches, making them elective instead of nominative. It was anything but refreshing to hear the member for Claremont just now shifting his ground on that question. Last session that member was strong in his advocacy in making the Bill a workable measure, so that it should deal with the liquor traffic in the most efficient manner possible; but to-day we find that he is foregoing one of the principles which this Parliament established last session, namely, elective benches. He has pointed out to-day that he will be perfectly satisfied to let that go for something else. I did not hear the hon. member say what that something else was.

Mr. Foulkes: To secure the passage of another clause of greater importance.

Mr. TAYLOR: I did not hear what that clause was. How do we know that that "clause of greater importance" does not rest only in the imagination of the hon. member.

Mr. Foulkes. No, it does not.

Mr. TAYLOR: Then let the hon. member be fair to the Chamber and to those

who supported him last session, and tell us what that clause is.

Mr. Bolton: There is no other clause.

Mr. TAYLOR: He should do this so that members would be able, perhaps, to make their opinions on this measure equally as elastic as his.

Mr. Foulkes: I will do that when we are in Committee.

Mr. TAYLOR: It is when a member speaks to the second reading of a Bill that he should intimate the line of action he is going to pursue during the Committee stage. It is indeed refreshing for a Minister in charge of a Bill to know, by their second reading speeches, how members on both sides of the House are going to treat the Bill when it reaches Committee. If there are any big principles in the Bill which are going to be materially altered, or if there is a division of opinion in the Chamber as to the principles, an indication should be given on the second reading. I am sorry the member for Claremont was over-anxious to indicate that he had changed his principles on a vital question in order to support something which was unknown to the Chamber.

Mr. Bolton: And unknown to himself.

Mr. Foulkes: I should like to have the opportunity of correcting the hon. member. What I said was that there are many clauses in the Bill of a varying degree of importance. Some were of greater value with regard to the views which I held on this matter than other clauses, and, as an instance, I said I would be prepared to give way with regard to the third clause in the Bill which provides for the election of licensing magistrates if I could secure the passage of a clause of greater importance later on. The hon. member for Mount Margaret stated—

Mr. Murphy: On a point of order: I understood that no hon. member was entitled to interrupt an hon. member who was speaking, except on a point of order. A personal explanation, such as that which the member for Claremont is making, should come after the member for Mount Margaret has finished his speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fremantle is correct, but, when the member for Claremont rose the member for Mount Margaret sat down, and I allowed the member for Claremont to continue.

Mr. TAYLOR: At all times during a debate in the House, if another hon. member has risen to make an explanation, I have resumed my seat, because an explanation at such a stage might prevent some unnecessary discussion taking place. The explanation by the member for Claremont, however, seemed to be more like another second reading speech. I listened to it with some patience; recognising the anxiety of the hon. member to enlighten the House; but he failed to enlighten us one iota. The hon. member has not yet indicated what those clauses of greater importance are likely to be, and I am justified therefore in pointing out that he has gone back on the principles which he advocated last session. Neither has he indicated what he expects to get in exchange. The hon. member has stated that there are to be clauses of greater importance which he desires to have carried, and he is going to sacrifice his principles to have those carried, but he has failed to even indicate what they are to be. If I took up a position of that character, the first thing I would try to do before changing front would be to give reasons for doing so. The hon. member was very anxious to let us know that he was not going to vote in the way that he did last session for a big principle in this measure, namely, the question of appointing licensing magistrates. The principle is worth fighting for. I shall stand with those who fought for the elective principle last year, and I will be found fighting for it again this session, and I hope that all those members who voted that way last session will again be found supporting it this session. I have seen no reason during the recess to alter my views. It is a fundamental principle, and my opinion with regard to it will hold good for all time, namely, that a bench of this character shall be elective and not nominative.

Mr. Murphy: Why not apply that principle to the Arbitration Court?

Mr. TAYLOR: We do elect our representatives there, and the employers elect theirs.

Mr. Murphy: Not the general public.

Mr. TAYLOR: They have no representation.

Mr. Murphy: You might apply it to the Supreme Court, too.

Mr. TAYLOR: I like the member for Fremantle making a comparison between the Supreme Court and the licensing bench.

Mr. Bath: That is his idea of carrying out local option.

Mr. TAYLOR: I am leading up to that. We have later on in the Bill to deal with the principle of local option, the question of allowing the people to indicate to the licensing bench whether they desire hotels in their areas. Then why should they not have a say in the appointment of the bench? I say that it is a fair attitude to take up, and, as far as I am concerned, I will fight for that principle. I believe in local option, and I believe that the people in a district should be the best judges as to whether they require a hotel in their area or not. They are more capable of judging than a handful of people who sign a requisition got up by some enterprising individual, perhaps in many instances supported by a brewery or a wine and spirit merchant, to influence the bench that a hotel is required. This mere handful of people may be the immediate friends of the individual who, perhaps, as I have stated, is in the clutches of a brewery, or a wine and spirit merchant, and they sign the requisition that a license is necessary in their area when the whole thing ought to be decided on a wide franchise.

The Attorney General: We provide for that under this Act.

Mr. TAYLOR: The member for Claremont indicated that as far as local option was concerned, he had something of greater importance which he was going to place before the Chamber. I would like to see the Bill in Committee in order to hear this very important clause

drop from the hon. member's lips like a rocket-stick from the sky. I hope the hon. member will not go back on his last year's attitude, but will support local option and give his assistance towards making the measure a workable one. As the Attorney General has stated, there is no necessity at this stage for long speeches. I desire, however, to compliment the Attorney General on the masterly way in which he introduced the Bill last session. He marshalled all his facts, and made the principles of the Bill as clear as it was possible to do. One has only to peruse *Hansard* to find out exactly what the position is, but I must say this, while complimenting the hon. member for the clear and lucid manner in which he explained the provisions of the Bill last session, I cannot compliment him for going back to the nominee proposals on which he was defeated. At least he should have accepted the decision of the House and declared that his desire was to pass the measure, and that the anxiety of the Government with which he was associated was so great in that direction that they would accept the direction of Parliament and give what Parliament had asked for. There was not any change in the Parliament which would justify the alteration. The decision of the House should have been accepted, and the Attorney General should have declared that he would do so in order to facilitate matters and to get the Bill on the statute book.

The Attorney General: There is nothing to prevent amendments being made.

Mr. TAYLOR: But it is only ploughing and harrowing, and ploughing and harrowing again.

Mr. Gordon: If you are fighting a principle, do you give up?

Mr. TAYLOR: I have fought principles, and won them, and fought others and lost them, but the Minister and the Government have told the people of this State time and time again that their desire was to deal with the liquor traffic, and they failed last year in doing so. They have emphasised that they are willing to pass the legislation this session, and, that being so, the Government

should have adopted the easiest course to carry out that promise, and that would have been by introducing the Bill this session in the form in which it left the Committee stage last session.

The Attorney General: If I have not done so, some other hon. member may do so.

Mr. TAYLOR: If the Bill had been introduced in the manner in which I have suggested, fault would not be found with it in the same forcible manner as is now likely to be the case. The opposition in this House will be so strong that unless an alteration is made, I am afraid the Bill will not get along very well for a few weeks.

Mr. Foulkes: We will push it on.

Mr. TAYLOR: Well, you can palm a lot of things on to me, and I recognise that I am a bit credulous at times, but, when the hon. member tells me that he will push things on, I find it difficult of belief. I gave him a patent safety match-box the other night and he could not push the slide off that, yet he talks about pushing things in this Chamber. Another thing I want to point out is the necessity for the Government to justify in the eyes of the people their sincerity with regard to this measure. If there be anything to prove conclusively that the Government were insincere last year, it is the very fact of the measure coming before the present session in the form in which we find it.

The Attorney General: We are sincere, but unconverted.

Mr. TAYLOR: There may be some force in that argument. I have seen the Attorney General converted on several occasions. I know the hon. gentleman meets everything with an open mind, but I want to say that that in itself convinces me of the insincerity of the Government at this stage. I have no desire to say more. I have helped, as far as I am able to do, to make this a workable measure, and I shall continue to do so. I have certain obligations in connection with the movement with which I am associated, and there are certain fixed principles in connection with that movement which I will endeavour to have embodied in the measure. There are many other things

in connection with the Bill which hon. members will be able to deal with as they think fit. The liquor traffic has been discussed, not only in this Chamber, but in the country, and we have decided upon following certain lines. We are strongly in favour, and have every reason for our beliefs, that the liquor traffic should be controlled by the State. There can be no fault found with people who believe that certain principles are the best for the economic working of the affairs of State, and they are justified in pressing them, and that can only be done by educating the people from the platform. We have done so, and we are fixed in the conviction that the liquor traffic should be nationalised. However, although the Attorney General says he is open to conversion I am not going to undertake the task of converting him to the principle of nationalisation. If I did there would be no possible chance of getting the Bill through before Christmas. I am going to give my support to those clauses which I believe are desirable; but there are others which will meet with my opposition in Committee. I have no objection to the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. OSBORN (Roebourne): I am pleased indeed to see that the clause dealing with the constitution of the licensing benches has been reinserted. I certainly did oppose it last session, and I am going to vote against it this session. I am very glad it has been reinstated, because this time I will have an opportunity of placing my amendment before the Committee in time for it to be discussed. Last session I had no idea that the elective principle had a chance of being carried, and it was not until the last moment that I endeavoured to have discussed an amendment on the amendment moved by the member for Brown Hill. The object of my amendment was that the chairman of the bench should be nominated, while his two colleagues should be elected. That is my opinion to-day. If we had the chairman nominated, I am certain we would have nothing to fear from the election of the other two members. An elective board would be elected by the people in the district in which the board would sit. I am not quite clear as to whether

that is right, or whether the board would serve in other parts of the State; but whichever way it may be, a board wholly elective could not be satisfactory to the people of the State generally.

Mr. Scaddan: Your reason for holding that view last session was that elective members could be bribed.

Mr. OSBORN: So they could, and I repeat it again. Moreover, a bench elected to deal with the question of licenses would consist of fanatics, one way or the other; some would side with the publicans while others allied themselves to the teetotallers. Surely that would be undesirable. We do not want on the benches persons with biased minds; we want there persons capable of judging for themselves without holding fast to any partisan line of thought which would do injury to the State and to the people generally. All elected members would be elected on certain principles—principles which they would be bound to carry out. They would pledge themselves to the electors—a condition of affairs which would be very dangerous indeed. It is quite certain that these elected members would be either pledged to the hotelkeepers or nominees of the teetotal party. I do not think either section should predominate on the benches. For myself, although a total abstainer, I entertain no disregard for those who take alcohol in moderation, while I pity those who take it in excess. Those who do not take it at all are, I think, much better off. I hope to be in time this session with my amendment, and to endeavour also, as I indicated in speaking to the Address-in-Reply, to make some alteration in respect to the supervision of clubs. I sincerely believe that all clubs where drink is sold and consumed should be open to inspection by the authorities. If a club be conducting itself in such a way that it is not offensive to anybody, no hardship will be inflicted; but there are certain clubs which require supervision, and unless the power be given to supervise all, then the undesirables cannot be inspected.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Which are the undesirables?

Mr. OSBORN: I am not going to name any, but certainly they exist, and I say it

is time we provided a clause in the Bill dealing with such clubs. I have no reason for speaking any further on the second reading. I am pleased to think I shall have another opportunity of opposing the principle of elective benches.

Mr. DAGLISH (Subiaco): In supporting the second reading of the Bill I desire mainly to urge both sides of the House to bear in mind that our primary object is really to improve our licensing law, and to secure on the statute-book the adoption of the principle of local option. Personally, I am willing to make sacrifices in regard to some clauses rather than fail in that main object. The House, or at all events certain members, have for six years past been trying to secure the adoption of the principle of local option; but at the close of each succeeding session we have been just as far off the attainment of that object as when the session began. I hope that a spirit of give and take, manifested on both sides, will prevent this session from ending in the same fruitless fashion as its predecessors. I desire to refrain from discussing the point that has principally occupied members this evening. I shall, of course, have no opportunity of discussing it in Committee. My opinions on it are pretty well known; they were embodied in the Bill I had the honour of presenting to the House some years ago, and again I dealt with the question on the second reading of the Bill of last session. I am still inclined to believe that, as far as possible, the opinion of the licensing bench should be a reflex of the opinion of the electors of the district over which the bench adjudicates; and it can only be so if the electors themselves have the opportunity of appointing that bench. But if it should happen that the opinion I hold on this question is not acceptable to the House I am certainly not going to sacrifice the larger question of local option to that fact alone. I should be prepared to accept the local option principle, and fight for the other at any and every subsequent opportunity. On the same grounds I contend that the House is entitled to demand of the Attorney General, and the Government, that if on the question of nominated benches the House

should decide against the Government, in the same way it should be recognised by Ministers that the main point of this measure is to improve the administration of our licensing law and secure the local option principle; and that other details, even details of importance in the administration, must be sacrificed to that main issue. I contend that in putting forward that view I am in no way sacrificing any principle or any opinion I have held, or advocated. But, in fact, if the plea be urged that the member for Claremont must not support the Bill if it do not include the principle of elective benches—

Mr. Scaddan: Nobody suggested that.

Mr. DAGLISH: At all events, that was the inference I drew. I do not wish to press the point; but I wish to say that if the member for Claremont be justified in sacrificing the Bill because defeated on the principle of elective benches, then in the same way it must be admitted that the clause constituting the licensing bench is of such importance that the Attorney General might claim justification for dropping the Bill if he be defeated in favour of the elective principle.

Mr. Angwin: Not if it be in accordance with the wishes of members.

Mr. DAGLISH: I am saying we require on both sides—and my remarks are directed as much at the gentleman in charge of the Bill as at his critics—we must recognise that our primary duty is to give the public control over the liquor traffic. And while I believe that control will not be absolutely complete until we have elective benches, it is better to give it in an incomplete form than to give no control at all. I hope there will not be what hon. members seem to anticipate, namely, a waste of time on this question. I hope there will be reasonable discussion of important points in respect to the measure, but I hope there will not be more than that. I do not know whether the Attorney General has any new reasons to urge against the opinions expressed last session in favour of elective licensing benches; if he has, or if he thinks that that by his eloquence he can convince hon. members whom, last session, he failed to convince, I contend he is justi-

fied in asking the House to reconsider its decision. To that extent it is not altogether reasonable that he should be attacked for asking the House to reconsider such decision. It has been done in previous Parliaments. In the Ministry with which I was connected it was done in regard to the municipal law, when the House was asked, in regard to voting at municipal elections, to reconsider in 1905 a decision arrived at in 1904. And any Ministry, if they regard as important any particular provision in a Bill which has been opposed by the House one session, are entitled to, at any time, ask the House to reconsider the decision. But while it may perhaps lead to a certain amount of discussion, I hope that discussion will not be more prolonged than the merits of the clause demand. I am not altogether satisfied in regard to one point in the Bill, apart from this provision for nominated benches, that is, in regard to the license fee. I contend there is not sufficient margin between the small country hotel and the large metropolitan house. In regard to the license fee, the lowest is £40, the highest £100. I do not think that difference even appreciably approaches towards the difference in value of the trade monopoly granted to the two different classes of houses. I do not know whether the rental value of a house is the best way of assessing the license fee, but I think that the city house should pay proportionately a much larger license fee than that embodied in this particular measure. I hope the Government will do, as hon. members have urged them to do from both sides, that is keep this Bill in the forefront until it gets through the House, because it must go at a comparatively early stage in the session to another place if there is to be a chance of its finding a place on the Statutes this year. The Government should recognise that the country demands that this measure should be passed this session, and they will run a considerable risk of forfeiting to some extent their place in popular regard unless they fulfil the task they have undertaken. Therefore I hope on this, perhaps the lowest of grounds, the Bill will be pushed for-

ward through all its stages with the greatest expedition.

Mr. GEORGE (Murray): I quite agree with the remarks of the last speaker that it is desirable that different members should give way on minor points in connection with the Bill, but this Bill has such a wide scope that it is desirable there should be no appearance of hurrying it any more than there should be any appearance of delaying it with the idea of defeating it, or of delaying it in such a way that perhaps defeat would be more preferable. Unfortunately, in a matter of this sort it is a question that appeals greatly to extremists on both sides. There are people who object to interference with their liberty to get drunk, while there are others who object to others getting drunk and take very good care they do not themselves get drunk. I think it is as dangerous to get temporarily drunk on the question of drinking water as it is to get temporarily drunk on whisky. When one gets pestered by extremists on both sides with literature which the ordinary day of one's life will not allow one time to digest, it leads one to think that this is a question that calls for moderate people to deal with. I hold no brief for the temperance people, nor for the licensed victuallers, nor do I intend to, but I protest strongly against the fact that, while we are asked to get this Bill through in the interests of temperance, these people do not give in their dealings the same amount of temperance as they ask us to give in listening to their views. When the next election comes on we shall find that all prospective candidates are troubled with a schedule of various wants with, "Are you in favour of this or that," in connection with the temperance question, and at the bottom usually the addendum, "No reply will be taken as the negative." We are just as likely to be parochial in connection with the temperance question as with other matters, and to forget the big issues, fighting elections as if there were no other matters to be considered. I must say that it is neither the temperance man nor the intemperate man in liquor or language gets his own way. Those who manage

to succeed in this life, whether in persuading or governing men or in making money or otherwise, are those who can give and take, and I hope those on both sides of this question will refrain from interfering in Parliamentary elections and paddling their own little oar, no matter what the bigger issues of the State are. As far as the Bill is concerned, it was circulated last night. It is supposed to be an exact copy, or as near as possible a copy, of the Bill of last session, but a considerable amount of time and work has intervened between last session and to-day, and I am free to confess that my mind is practically a blank as to what the Bill of last session was except that my efforts were directed towards obtaining anything that would alleviate intemperate conditions in this State. To jump a Bill on us in five minutes like this because it was brought before the House last session and expect us to grasp it, is asking more than I can swallow. We are ordinary men, not gifted with abnormal memories, and only allowed 24 hours in the day.

The Attorney General: It was announced in the Governor's Speech.

Mr. GEORGE: The hon. member knows the value and purpose of the Governor's Speech, what it is supposed to do and what it does do. It has raised a considerable amount of criticism, and I am not going to add to the information of the House on that subject. I think in view of the other legislation that we know is coming forward, unless we are prepared to pass this Bill this session, we might just as well take a vote on it now and pass it out and so not waste time. Personally, I hope the Bill will be carried.

Mr. Scaddan: It would have been carried last year if the Government desired it.

Mr. GEORGE: I do not believe in raking up the dead leaves of former Autumns to fertilise for the coming Spring. I hope this Bill will pass and that alterations can be made in Committee. There are several points on which I feel very strongly, but I feel it my duty—and I hope I will not be singular in that respect—if I cannot get all

I would like, to sacrifice some of my views for the purpose of getting the Bill through.

Mr. Angvin: You might have to sacrifice the lot.

Mr. GEORGE: I do not think so. Bad as the Government are—and we know they must be bad after the character they were given the other night—I do not think they would ask us to sacrifice all our opinions. At any rate, if they did, I would have in that respect just as much freedom as the member for East Fremantle. I want to see the Bill through, but on minor matters I am prepared to subordinate my views in order to get the Bill through, because I know that if the Bill is found not to work as it should do, there will be amending measures brought forward in other Parliaments, and I have no reason to doubt that the men of future Parliaments will be quite as sensible and painstaking as I hope we are.

Mr. MURPHY (Fremantle): No matter what our opinions are in regard to the principles of this Bill, I think we are all desirous that it shall not be delayed. I was anxious to move the adjournment of the debate, but realising what has been said and that an adjournment of the debate from the present sitting until Tuesday night prevent our advancing the measure one stage, I have no wish now to do so. No matter what other members may have said as regards having thrashed out this subject thoroughly last session, two, if not three, of us have come into the House this session, and some further explanation might have been made for us as regards the main principles of the Bill beyond what we have had this evening. Surely it is not expected of the member for Beverley and myself, both of whom I venture to say have very decided opinions on this question, that we are to wade through *Hansard* of last session and from that gain the opinions of hon. members, not only regarding the advisability of the main principles of local option or regulating the liquor traffic, but also in regard to the question of nominee or elective licensing boards. The member for Beverley and myself have simply been told, "We decided last year; if you want our

reasons go to *Hansard* and find them"; and that treatment has come from the Government side of the House as much as from the Opposition. However, I recognise second reading speeches are generally speeches on main principles, that very seldom have any dealing with the ultimate fate of a Bill. Whatever attitudes and whatever opinions I may have with regard to any clause of the Bill, have to be settled in Committee. I have many amendments to move upon this Bill.

Mr. Scaddan : You have not received them yet.

Mr. MURPHY : No, I am keeping them up my sleeve. I do not know whether the rules of the House compel me to give notice of the amendments I intend to move, but I do not intend to give notice because I do not know what the Bill really is. It has been placed in my hands to-night, so far as being a member of the House is concerned, and I have not had the opportunity to go through it. If it is in any way a copy of the Bill of last session, no doubt many amendments could be moved that would make the Bill very much better.

Mr. Angwin : Why not assist the Minister by giving notice of your amendments?

The Premier : It has been on the Notice Paper for a week.

Mr. MURPHY : Whether we have had notice of it a week or a month or a day, it seems to me it does not make much difference, especially as the Bill has been discussed by the majority of members of this House in a previous session. They must, therefore, be well versed in the principles of the Bill ? If it would advance this measure in any way by securing the adjournment of the debate until next week, I would have been prepared to move the adjournment, but it appears to me that it is not necessary. Evidently most members have made up their minds upon the main principles of the measure, consequently I do not want to delay the Bill now. I will fight as hard as I can in Committee in order to get inserted those amendments I think are necessary for a good Act, and to ensure fair dealing with the general community of the State. So far as the principle of an elective

board is concerned I will not say anything more than this : It seems to me that if there is an elective board appointed for any district it will not be a reflex of the opinions of the people of the district but will reflect the opinions of one section, which is the only organised section in that district.

Mr. Bolton : The licensed victuallers ?

Mr. MURPHY : No, the temperance party.

Mr. Scaddan : I have a list of amendments desired by the trade.

Mr. MURPHY : So have I. It seems rather unfortunate that in connection with this question of liquor reform, if one wants temperate language, extreme views, and biassed opinions, all three are confined to the temperance party of Western Australia—the Western Australian Alliance.

Mr. Bolton : And the licensed victuallers of Fremantle.

Mr. MURPHY : Yes, they also ; because they happened to upset the calculations of the hon. member.

Mr. Hudson : I am glad to hear that admission.

Mr. MURPHY : I admit it because it stops an argument with the hon. member. The Attorney General has taken up a fair attitude on this Bill on the present occasion. It was introduced last session, and contained a provision that the licensing boards should be of a nominee character. The majority of the House last session altered it so as to provide for an elective board, and now members get up and charge the Attorney General with having done something he should not have done, because he introduced a Bill in the form in which it originally appeared last session.

Mr. Bolton : Do you agree with that system ?

Mr. MURPHY : Not only that, but I challenge the hon. member to show me a single instance in any Parliament where a similar course has not been adopted.

Mr. George : That does not make it right.

Mr. MURPHY : It does not make it wrong ; and yet all sorts of statements are hurled at the Attorney General for

having disobeyed the wishes of the House. The Bill was introduced last session as a Government measure, the House altered one important principle of that measure, and for some reason or other of which I know nothing, the Bill was dropped. This session the Bill is again introduced. In what form should it be introduced ?

Mr. Bolton : As amended last session.

Mr. MURPHY : No : it should be introduced in the form in which it was originally brought down. No Government with any sort of self respect would adopt any other course. If the Bill is again altered in the same respect as last session it remains with the Government to say whether it shall be gone on with or not. I have seen a much less important principle than this altered by the House, and resulting in the Government dropping the Bill altogether.

Mr. Hudson : Or they can consider their position.

Mr. MURPHY : There is no reason why members who voted last session that the board should be elective should charge the Government with discourtesy because they have introduced the Bill this session in exactly the same form as it was originally introduced last session. I hope that wisdom and age, and further consideration will show members opposite that when they voted for an elective board they voted for something which was entirely wrong. It is not in keeping with the best interests of liquor reform or of the great principle of local option. I hope that when the principle of the constitution of the board comes up again for consideration the majority of members will see that the control is not placed in the hands of those who are nothing less than faddists on the liquor question.

Mr. HOLMAN (Murchison) : I move—
That the debate be adjourned.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL : I have no very strong objection to the adjournment of the debate for the Committee stage could not well be proceeded with before Thursday next. It is very necessary that before the Bill goes into Committee the numerous amendments which

will be moved to it should be placed on the Notice Paper. I do not suppose members will be ready with their amendments until next Thursday. It will be useless going into Committee on the Bill next Tuesday unless the amendments are on the Notice Paper then. A measure of this kind cannot be properly dealt with in Committee unless we have the amendments on the Notice Paper. I am only anxious in this matter to consult the convenience of members. I want to get on with the Bill as quickly as possible, but in some circumstances the mistake of more haste less speed applies. If we go into Committee on Tuesday without members being ready with their amendments, but little progress will be made. It would be well if members agreed to put the second reading through to-night, and the Committee stage could be fixed for Thursday next. However, if members desire the debate to be adjourned, I will raise no objection.

Mr. Collier : The longer the second reading is delayed the longer members will be in putting their amendments on the Notice Paper.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL : We should go into Committee on the Bill not later than Thursday next.

Mr. SPEAKER : Does the hon. member press his motion ?

Mr. HOLMAN : No.

Motion withdrawn.

Question put and passed. Bill read a second time.

Message.

Message from the Governor received and read, recommending the Bill.

BILL—AGRICULTURAL BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

Message.

Message from the Governor received and read, recommending the Bill.

(Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.)

BILL—HEALTH.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H. Gregory) in moving the second read-

ing said: I think I have more claim for consideration in moving the second reading of the Health Bill and urging that the measure should reach the Committee stage as soon as possible than my colleague who moved the second reading of the Licensing Bill. The Bill which he introduced is claimed by many members to be of the first importance this session, and I think it can be admitted that while that measure deals with many important matters relating to the liquor traffic, the Health Bill not only protects those who drink whisky and other spirits, but also introduces that form of legislation which will deal with food supplies, the protection of health, the sanitation of districts, and all matters pertaining to the health of the community. More than that, I think the Licensing Bill was introduced in 1904, yet the Health Bill has been more often before the Parliament of this State since period. In 1904 we had a Bill introduced into this House, and it was exhaustively dealt with by a select committee. In 1907 a Bill was introduced into the Legislative Council, and a select committee of that Chamber was appointed, consisting of a couple of Ministers who had previously had dealings with the Health Department, and also a member of the Central Board of Health, and an exhaustive amount of work was done, the result of which to a great extent appears in the Bill now before the House. Again, last year the Bill went through all its stages in the Legislative Council, and was brought to this House for the second reading. Unfortunately, however, we did not go any further upon that occasion owing to the impossibility of dealing with it on account of the termination of the session. However, I feel quite satisfied that hon. members will do all they possibly can to enable the measure now before them to reach the Committee stage, and that they will endeavour in every way to make the Bill a good one. It is one which, I think, will be dealt with by both sides of the House with the desire to make it as perfect as possible, and to try and have it placed upon the statute-book of the State, thus consolidating the laws relat-

ing to health matters. We have not had a consolidating measure since 1898, and in the interval there have been a few small amending Acts passed by various Parliaments. The necessity for this Bill has been apparent for the past six years. The Bill which is before members at the present time is almost similar to that which was introduced last year, in fact I may say that with the exception of those clauses dealing with the food supplies the Bill is nearly identical with that presented last year. The new provisions in connection with the food supplies have been introduced to enable the Minister to appoint an advisory board for the purpose of making regulations dealing with the standardisation of our food supplies. That board is to consist of the president of the Central Board of Health, the Government Analyst, a bacteriologist, and two gentlemen who will be acquainted with ordinary trade requirements. These gentlemen will frame regulations for the Minister, and, if approved, the regulations will give special powers to the central board with regard to our food supplies. The authorities will be able to make special examinations of food and drugs, and present a report with regard to them, and, if afterwards approved by Ministers, the report of the board in connection with any food exposed for sale in Western Australia may be furnished to the public and no redress will be possible.

Mr. Heitmann: Are you giving them power to set up standards?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: They would have full power, and the hon. member will see that clearly shown in the clauses dealing with the food supplies. Members generally have declared that it is advisable that the Government should have very strong powers with regard to health administration, and this to my mind is the principal matter in the Bill. It does not necessarily follow because you give stringent powers to a local authority or to the Central Board of Health, or to the Minister, that these powers will be exercised upon all and

every occasion. A Bill of this sort, if approved by Parliament, must be administered with a great deal of tact, but extensive powers are absolutely necessary because one never knows when we may be visited by an epidemic or a plague, or anything which may need stringent and more concerted action for the purpose of overcoming any such outbreak. Criticism and discussion, to my mind, will centre around the administrative clauses. That is to say, to whom shall be given the control of health administration. For a number of years past we have had a Central Board of Health, the members of which have been nominated by the Governor. In past debates in connection with health administration, some have expressed their belief in Ministerial control, while others have not favoured Ministerial interference in any form and have urged that the control should be vested in a board, and while some believe in a nominative board others favour an elective board. I think it would be wise to point out to the House the methods of administration in the Eastern States, so that members may compare for themselves the kind of administration that exists elsewhere to deal with health matters. In New South Wales they have a central board consisting of from seven to ten members nominated by the Government. The local administration is by the municipalities, and outside the municipalities by the police and the police alone. In Victoria they have a central board of health consisting of a chairman and a medical inspector appointed by the Government, and seven members elected by various groups of town, borough, and shire councils. The local administration is by towns, boroughs, and shires. In South Australia they have a central board of Health consisting of a chairman and four members, all of whom are elected, the others being appointed by the Governor. The elective members are elected one by the city and suburban local bodies, and the others by country boards. The local administration is by municipal councils in the first instance, and in the second by district councils. In Queensland there is a commissioner who is assisted by a nominated

central board whose functions are purely advisory. In Tasmania they have a department of public health, presided over by a chief health officer, and the administration is by local bodies and the municipal councils appointed by the Governor. In New Zealand there is a department of public health presided over by a chief health officer, and local matters are dealt with by the district health officers who are appointed and paid by the Government. In this city we have various propositions made, and as I have pointed out we have at the present time a central board, the members of which are nominated. Locally we have the municipal councils, and health bodies appointed by the Governor. Under the existing Act the municipal councils are health bodies, but the roads boards are not. In the Bill before the House we propose that the municipal authorities shall continue to be health bodies, and we also propose to create the various roads boards into boards of health.

Mr. Bath: You already have that power. Under the existing Act they can be constituted boards of health.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Many of the roads board districts are so large that the administration throughout the whole of the area might not, in the opinion of the Government, be complete; and it is provided that they can apportion portions of the roads board area to such nominee health boards which may be created. In so far as the central board board is concerned at present, we have the president, who is the Principal medical Officer, and four members nominated by the Government. With a view of giving effect to the desires of members generally, it is now provided that in addition to the president, there shall be a board, two of whom shall be nominated by the Government. These two will be gentlemen able to advise on health and architectural matters, and on all matters pertaining to sewerage; gentlemen who might well be described as technical advisers to the board. We desire to give representation to the local bodies and, with that end in view, to apportion the State into two districts, each nominating one representative. So there will be

upon the board two gentlemen representing the various local bodies throughout the State. That should satisfy the local authorities that their interests will be looked after in all matters brought before the board. I think it is essential, in the first place, there should be sufficient technical knowledge amongst the members of the board to assure that the work of the board will be carried out on the basis prescribed by Parliament in the Health Act. On the other hand, if it be felt that the central board is encroaching too much upon the duties and functions of the local authorities, the local authorities will have the consolation of knowing that on the board they have two practical representatives who will be able to place before their colleagues the full merits of the case as they appeal to the local authorities. Then we have the right of direct appeal to the Minister. We give Ministerial control to this extent: that if any local authority is dissatisfied with any instructions issued by the central board to the local board, that board may appeal to the Minister, and the Minister may intervene and give counter-instructions, or confirm the actions of the central board. So it will be found we give under this Bill the very fullest right of appeal to the Minister; we give, I think, the fullest Ministerial control that can be desired, and at the same time we give that authority to the central board which must be essential to the proper working of the Bill. As I pointed out at first, in framing a measure like this we have, possibly, to give powers which in the ordinary course of events we would think too drastic to be given to any authority. But I would remind hon. members that so far back as 1898 most of these powers were given to the local authorities and the central board, and in only a few isolated instances have there been any friction between the central board and the local authorities. However, occasions are bound to arise when the very strongest powers will be found necessary, and it will be found that the drastic conditions which may be objected to by some members in connection with this measure are absolutely essential to the proper con-

trol of the health of the people of the State. The clauses dealing with taxation are very similar to those which were in our previous Bill, with the exception that in regard to rating powers the local authority may tax on the unimproved value, or, on the other hand, on the annual assessment. Many of our roads boards have utilised this first-named system, and their books have been prepared for taxation on the unimproved values. Therefore we are placing clauses in the Bill under which, should a roads board be constituted a health board, their present books will be available for their work, and they will be able to tax according to their present system. Under the Roads Board Act they have the power to tax on the unimproved value, and this will enable them to continue that system when rating under the Health Act. We also make a provision which will enable the health boards to borrow money. Special powers are given for that purpose. Instances could be quoted where this has been found to be necessary. The sanitary systems in Kalgoorlie and Boulder were at one time conducted by private enterprise. The local municipal councils desired to secure the control of these, but under their constitution they had no power to borrow money for the purpose.

Mr. Angwin: Such power is given in the Municipal Act.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Not for health purposes.

Mr. Angwin: Yes; for sanitary purposes.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I was not aware of it. I know the Kalgoorlie and Boulder councils had to make special arrangements. If I remember rightly, they borrowed money from the Government under special conditions to enable them to take over the contractors' plant and do the work themselves. Anyhow, provision is made in the Bill which will enable the health boards to borrow money for the purpose; that is to say, any health board may borrow money for this purpose, subject to certain conditions, and the approval of the central board and the Minister.

Mr. Daglish: Why should the central board have to approve of this expenditure?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Naturally they would advise the Minister. I do not see how the Minister could be expected to familiarise himself with the merits of such cases; he would have to go to the board for advice.

Mr. Daglish: The Under Treasurer would be the better adviser.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The central board will have special knowledge, and I think they will be the very best advisers to the Minister. But, on the other hand, if the local authority can show good reasons to the Minister, I presume he would be justified in ignoring the adverse advice of the central board and giving the necessary approval. I do not suppose, unless good reasons could be shown, the Minister would ignore the central board; because, as I say, by virtue of their special knowledge of all matters pertaining to the Act, they would be the best advisers. However, as I pointed out, we have made special provision to enable any local authority to appeal directly to the Minister, who will have full authority in all such matters. But in the Bill there are dealt with many matters other than that of finance. There are the questions of sewerage, and of drains. Provision is made that as the sewerage system of the metropolitan area comes into being, the legislation dealing with that work will take precedence over all the clauses in this Bill dealing with sewerage and drains within the area controlled by the first named Act. We go very fully into the question of the disposal of sewage. That is a matter over which the metropolitan board can have no control, and it will have to be dealt with in the Bill. In regard to dwellings, some important amendments have been made on the Bill of last year. Under that Bill no power was given for the ordering of the immediate demolition of houses declared to be unfit for human habitation. That power is provided under this Bill, and where it shall have been found necessary to condemn houses, the board will be empowered to order the demolition of these condemned houses which, standing vacant, often become the resort of bad char-

acters. As I say, the central board will have authority to order the demolition of these houses within a certain period. Provision is made for appeal against the instructions of the board, and we provide powers that we have not under the present legislation. In regard to boarding and lodging houses, it is recognised that such houses require a certain amount of supervision. I may state that lodging houses will have to be registered, and be open to periodical examination by the inspectors. Many provisions are made for the proper order and cleanliness of these houses. The only houses classed as boarding houses are those where more than six persons are usually, week by week, accepted as boarders; where there are more than six such boarders the houses will require to be registered. I think that where people make provision for accepting lodgers it is incumbent on the State to see that their houses are kept in proper order. Nuisances and offensive trades are controlled under the Bill, and where permission is refused by the local authority for the carrying on of an offensive trade, power is given to appeal to the central board or the Minister. We have had many instances of local authorities refusing to allow an offensive trade to be carried on within their district, even though the carrying on of that trade may not constitute a nuisance or be offensive so far as health is concerned. In the past the local authorities have had power to refuse to allow such trades to be carried on; but, as I say, under the Bill provision is made for appeal to the central board or the Minister. In respect to food supplies the Bill is very complete, dealing with the inspection of all foods, milk, and dairy produce, and the sale of drugs. A special board is to be appointed for the standardisation of foods. That board is to consist of the Principal Medical Officer, the Government Analyst, the Government Bacteriologist, and two gentlemen connected with trade. It is essential I think that we should have on the board persons used to trade matters so that when any action has to be taken the central board will not frame regulations which will be prejudicial to ordi-

nary trade matters. Then we have a bacteriologist so that in regard to formulas and standards we will have the advantage of the knowledge of that gentleman, and in the same direction I think it will be advisable to have the advice of the Government Analyst; and in addition we have the Principal Medical Officer. These gentlemen are to have very large powers under the Bill, more especially with regard to foods and drugs. They will be able to examine medicines; they will be able to advise and, if the Minister approves, will be able to provide that certain medicines, drugs and appliances shall not be allowed to be sold in the State. They can make special examinations of food, and publish full reports of their examinations. They will be able to deal with various matters in connection with food supplies and the labelling of foods. An officer of the department has pointed out to me that the paper on which the ingredients of the mixture are printed sometimes shows one of the ingredients in large type and the other ingredients in small type not very readily legible to the person buying the compound. Provision is made for all these matters in regard to the selling of food, and also in regard to the delivery of bread and meat. The board will have power to prohibit the killing of cattle supposed to be suffering from tuberculosis, thus protecting the people in this direction. Following that, they have power to deal with all matters pertaining to infectious diseases. If cattle or other animals are being imported and are found to be suffering from infectious diseases, or if the board have reason to think they are, the board can order their slaughter or can issue instructions that the cattle shall be merely retained for slaughter and not for breeding purposes. Strong powers are also given to the board in all matters relating to persons suffering from consumption. All such cases have to be notified to the central board; and if the patient removes from one district to another, his removal must be notified to the central board and the local authorities concerned. Assistance is given to these patients in many ways to aid them and to help them combat the disease. It

will be found that all matters dealing with infectious diseases are very complete in the Bill. If it is found that any person suffering from an infectious disease is engaged in any industry connected with the manufacture or disposal of our food supplies it is an offence against the Act. The clauses dealing with hospitals are similar to what we have at present, but there is something new in the provisions dealing with the protection of life. There provision is made for the registration of nurses, midwifery and general nurses. I think the clause dealing with those who follow the calling of midwifery will be found to be carefully drawn up so as to do no injustice to those who have been following this calling. Any person who has been practising as a midwife for the past two years can be registered without examination if she can show she has had sufficient practice and if she is of cleanly and sober habits; but after next year no persons will be allowed to practise unless they are registered and pass examinations; that is, with the exception I have just mentioned. Provision is made for midwifery nurses in outback districts, but we do not allow them to practise. Although they may attend cases they cannot practise the calling. If a case occurs five miles from a doctor or where there is no doctor or certificated midwife available, any person can attend the case. Provision is also made for the registration of general nurses. It is not compulsory that every nurse should have a certificate; but we make provision for the certification and registration of nurses. Some may probably desire that all nurses should be compelled to have certificates before they practise, but I do not agree with that. We should be very very cautious indeed to see how the present Bill making provision for the certification of nurses acts before we make it compulsory for every person practising as a nurse to be certificated. But no person will be allowed to advertise or to put up a board notifying that she is a certificated nurse unless she has received her certificate.

Mr. Taylor: The provisions of this Bill do not meet the requirements of the nurses in Perth.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I think so. All they ask now is that they should have a representative on the board which is to frame the regulations under which nurses are to be certificated, and I am given to understand that the object they have in view is to have different standards. Certain of the nurses have very high qualifications.

Mr. Taylor: They want to keep up the standard

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes, but I understand they desire to be able to give first, second, and third-class degrees. I should not like power to be given to a board to make the certificate of such a high grade that we would have no nurses of a medium or low grade.

Mr. Taylor: The higher standard would probably carry higher fees.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That may be so, and it might give those nurses the greatest amount of custom. But we do not want to altogether stop those who have been practising for years as nurses but may not be sufficiently qualified to take advantage of a very high class of certificate.

Mr. Collier: That is a class that would meet the needs of a large section of the population, because a large section of the population cannot pay high fees.

Mr. Heitmann: Then try to bring the large section up to the standard of being in a position to pay high fees.

Mr. Collier: That is all very well.

→ The MINISTER FOR MINES: However, this is a matter we can deal with more exhaustively in Committee. I did not want to see a board appointed to make the standard of efficiency so high that it would make it difficult for many of the nurses in this community to obtain certificates. I think the clauses will be found fairly complete, but when we are in Committee we might make provision which would enable grades to be established; because, so far as I understand, the board will only have power to make provision for one standard of efficiency. They might be given the power to make regulations by which one or more standards of efficiency could be established for the certification of nurses un-

der the Health Act. In any event we should be careful that regulations will not be framed that would limit the number of nurses available.

Mr. Taylor: If three grades can be framed I think it would meet the wishes of the nurses.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I did not propose when introducing the Bill to go so much into detail. As this measure has been so often before Parliament, I thought it only necessary to deal with the administration clauses; but at the request of hon. members I have gone fairly fully into matters except in regard to details which, of course, we will adequately thrash out in Committee. We have tried to make health matters somewhat of a chain from the individuals to the local authorities, then to the central board, and then to the Minister and Parliament. I think the Bill is now as complete as it is possible to bring one before the House. We have had the advantage of recommendations made by various select committees, not only of this House but of the Legislative Council. I think the Bill has passed through all stages in the Legislative Council on two occasions with the exception of those provisions relating to finances.

Mr. Underwood: How far do you think you will get this time?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: With the assistance of hon. members I am going straight on with the Bill. I am sure hon. members will admit that there can be no parties in regard to a Bill of this sort. I hope all members will vote as they like, and that they will push on with the Bill. It has been specially prepared by the Health Department, the officers of which have had the experience of the desires of Parliament for many years past; and there has been a special desire to meet the views of all members. As I have pointed out, we will have a central board in which we will have, not only technical advisers to the Ministers, but also to members nominated by the local authorities, thus bringing the local authorities into touch with the central board. They will be able to put the

claims and aspirations of the local bodies before the central board; and if the local bodies are not satisfied with the treatment they receive from the central board they will have the right to appeal to the Minister, just as if there were Ministerial control.

Mr. Taylor: Is that the only time the Minister controls—when there is an appeal?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: There is right of appeal to the Minister at any time. The Minister will have larger powers under the Bill than he possesses now, for, at present, he has no power to do what the local authority can do. But under the Bill he will have power to do that which the local board can do. If an individual feels he has cause for grievance he can, in certain circumstances, appeal to the local court; but under every circumstance, if he desires to do so, he can appeal to the central board or to the Minister. While endeavouring to show there is right of appeal to the Minister, we are trying to create a board which the Minister should consider a body whose advice should be followed on almost all occasions. It is a board capable of advising technically, and a board in sympathy with local bodies. It stands to reason, therefore, that on almost every occasion the Minister will follow the advice of, what may be termed, the advisory board—the central board. He would use his powers very carefully, and would never hasten to do anything against which the central board advised. I would urge members to look to this point carefully, for we should do all we can to recognise the importance of the advisory or central board. The Minister, having a board that can advise him on all these matters, should be careful before deciding against them. The board will be of very great use to the Minister, and of much service in connection with the administration of the Act. We have endeavoured to create a board entirely different from the one existing at the present time, which is a nominee board. Under the Bill, however, there will be three members of the board nominated by the Crown—the Principal

Medical Officer, and two technical advisers—and two other members nominated by the local bodies. These latter should be able to advise on all local matters, and keep the central board in close touch and in sympathy with the local authorities. I will not delay members longer, except to urge them to endeavour to get through the second reading at once, so that the measure can reach the Committee stage. I am eager for the Bill to go into Committee, but I will not press members if they want time to debate the second reading. What I am desirous is that we should make sure of getting the measure through this year.

Mr. Underwood: Who delayed it last year?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I would not like to suggest that it might have been delayed by long speeches made by members opposite on various occasions and questions, and on points of order.

Mr. Walker: That is not correct.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I do not think we should recriminate about this now. The hon. member can say the reason it did not go through last year was the fault of members on this side; but what I am sure of now is that we have ample time to consider the Bill and put it through this session. I am sure we all desire to give the Bill fair consideration. I am satisfied that, in placing the measure before members, I shall receive every consideration, as I am dealing with a question administered by another Minister, and I shall, therefore, not have that knowledge which one expects from a Minister controlling the Health Department and who is continually being advised by the health officers on administrative matters. I expect consideration from members on that account. With their assistance I am satisfied we shall get placed on the statute-book a Bill which will be satisfactory from a health point of view and satisfactory to the people.

Mr. George: Will the Minister, before sitting down, tell the House in what particular this Bill differs from or conflicts with the Sewerage Act we passed last session.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: So far as the sewerage proposals in this Bill are concerned, as soon as the provisions passed last year dealing with the sewerage apply, clauses relating to those matters in the present measure will become non-existent.

Mr. George: Where is that provided?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I will show the member in Committee. I can assure him that is the case. The present Bill consists of 300 clauses and, from memory, I cannot tell him the number of the exact clause. When we reach Committee I shall have the secretary to the central board alongside me, so that I can be prompted by him in regard to these matters. I can assure the hon. member, however, that provision is made whereby as soon as the provisions passed last year dealing with sewerage apply they will take precedence over all the clauses in this Bill relating to the question, and which will then become non-existent. I beg to move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. BATH (Brown Hill): I can assure the Minister for Mines, who is in charge of this Bill, that members on this side are just as anxious as he is to have a Health Bill passed which will be adequate for the purpose. With the object of passing the Bill as speedily as possible we are prepared to advance the second reading debate to a certain extent to-night. While some members may probably desire an adjournment of the second reading I am willing now to speak to it so as to take it to a certain stage this evening. The Minister has referred at some length to the administrative clauses, and to the measures which have been previously submitted by the present Government, and by those who preceded them, but the whole question of the effectiveness of public health legislation depends almost entirely upon the machinery which we shall devise in the measure before us. The Bill for the protection of public health differs almost entirely from other measures of legislation. When we are dealing with the question of licensing law, or with various measures of indus-

trial legislation, the whole controversy hinges upon the question of what we are going to do, what particular steps we are going to take. Members probably differ in their opinions as to such steps. For instance, in discussing the Licensing Bill the question as to whether local option is desirable crops up, and if we once agree as to the particular action we should take, if we agree, for instance, on local option, or on other Bills that arbitration or workers' compensation is necessary, we find very little difficulty in providing and carrying through the machinery in order to give effect to our intentions; but with a measure for the preservation of public health we have entirely the reverse. Every member knows that medical men, hygienic and sanitary inspectors, and the general public are agreed as to the necessity for certain measures. We agree as to the necessity for well-ventilated houses and drainage and that there must be a rigid inspection of factories, and that numerous precautions must be taken, and on these questions, all those who have given any consideration to the matter are entirely agreed; but when it is a question of how these matters are to be carried into effect, then we have a very great difference of opinion. I have stated previously in this House, when we have been dealing with the question of local government, that my preference is for local government, for decentralising, as far as possible, the government of affairs, and if it were possible in Western Australia, if our local governing machinery and those who have control of it, were able to rise to the occasion, I would be ready to entrust them with administration over matters relating to the preservation of health; but, unfortunately in all discussions and in evidence given in regard to this measure we have had practically a unanimous opinion that the local authorities are unequal to the occasion. I have only to refer to the evidence given by the select committee appointed in 1904, to show that nearly every witness, whether a member of the then central board, medical officers of local boards of health, inspectors, and others, agreed in the opinion that the local authorities should not be entrusted

with anything like full powers for the administration of health in their particular districts.

Mr. Heitmann: Private interests so often clash.

Mr. BATH: That is true. As pointed out in the evidence private interests do clash. So far as the United Kingdom and some continental countries are concerned, local governing bodies find no difficulty whatever in administering health affairs. In fact, they have reached a high standard of excellence, and there must be some reason for the difference between the administration, say, in large areas like Glasgow, London, or Birmingham, or other great centres where municipal government has reached a high degree of excellence, and the administration of health affairs by the local authorities in Australia. The reason for the failure in Australia is, to my mind, the undemocratic franchise. It is a franchise which gives to those affected by health administration an undue influence in local governing affairs, and, therefore, in the appointment of those who will be called upon to administer health matters. This was pointed out by Dr. Black in 1904, when he was giving evidence on this matter. I may state that nearly every other witness also agreed on the question. Dr. Black was asked—

Do you think there is any danger of local influence affecting particular districts; local districts. Say there are on the local governing bodies some representatives whose properties the inspector might have to condemn? That is as regards administration?—Yes?—I see it all the time wherever I go. If I may quote one instance without mentioning names or places I can show you how the whole thing works. In all the outlying districts of this State, almost without exception, it is the same. In my travels during the last six months I have inspected from a public health point of view every place I have visited, and in one particular town I saw a specially grievous nuisance. I drew the attention of the local inspector to it and asked him why he had disobeyed the provisions of the Health Act, which required him to make an

order for its abatement, and gave him power to prosecute without consulting the board, if it were not abated. I said to him, "What is the use of your being inspector if you permit such things? The board might as well save your salary. Why do you not have the thing abated?" He said, "Do you know whom the premises belong to?" I said, "No, and I do not care." He said, "One of my bosses, a member of the board. What can I do?" I quote that as one instance of many hundreds that have come under my notice, and I can assure your committee that is what is happening all over the State at this minute; and that is why local public health administration is so bad.

I have also come across instances where men have been not only on the local government bodies, that is municipal councils or roads boards, but they have been actually on the local board of health, and yet have been prosecuted themselves for acts which were not in conformity with the Health Act. If this condition of affairs exists, how can we expect that there is going to be adequate and effective representation in the district.

Mr. Brown: They are allowing places to be opened which have not yet been licensed.

Mr. BATH: That does not affect public health to the same extent. I have always been in favour of local administration, but when we have that condition of affairs one is compelled to say that as long as our local government is in such a condition, as long as it is on such an undemocratic basis, giving to vested interests that power which enables them to defeat health legislation, then we must come to the opinion that there must be effective and powerful central control. Having this evidence and experience and knowledge one must ask what is the best form of administration, and I emphatically say I believe that the constitution of a department of health to be the best that we can adopt in Western Australia. It has been effective in New Zealand, and was adopted there as an alternative to the system which had been adopted in this State, that is the Central Board of Health. It has been adopted in Queens-

laud also, and in New South Wales although they have a board of health whose powers are purely advisory. I believe this is the best system to be adopted in Western Australia because it will obviate any chance of those local instances of vested interests defeating the intention and the effective administration of the measure. For another reason I believe it would be advantageous in Western Australia, and that is because of our scattered districts and the large areas which are sparsely populated and where we cannot possibly hope to get anything like effective local administration even for the limited powers directed under the Act. If we had administration through a department of health we could combine the duties of medical officer of health for such districts with other very necessary duties such as the provision of medical attention for the purpose of those areas, and so with a combination of the two we could give to these people not only effective administration but what is even more necessary, and that is medical attendance where it is very difficult at the present time, and expensive as well, to obtain.

The Minister for Mines: You would take away Ministerial control altogether?

Mr. BATH: I would have straight-out Ministerial control and I believe we could have all the advantages contemplated under this measure, because in the officers appointed we would have in the principal medical officer, and those with him, experts in the different departments, because we need biological and bacteriological experts, and these officers, while their assistance would be necessary for the administration of the Health Department, would be directly responsible to the Minister controlling the department, and in my opinion it would not be so cumbersome as the nominee central board proposed under this measure. Dealing with the constitution of local authorities, I agree of course that as far as the powers which are proposed to be given under this Bill are concerned, that we can safely entrust them to the municipal councils, and to road boards where the districts are not too big, but where we propose to constitute local boards within a local board district I am strongly

in favour of the elective system. I am speaking from experience on the goldfields, but knowing the deep interest they take in the election for instance of a progress committee, I believe we could safely entrust them with the election of a local board of health rather than have, as is proposed in this Bill, nomination by the Government, which of course means nomination by the Central Board of Health.

The Minister for Mines: I think the difficulty would be to get people to nominate.

Mr. BATH: I do not think so. I find in goldfields areas, and especially in districts where these boards would be established, that there is a deep interest in the constitution of a progress committee. You will find the people there taking a great interest in the election, and in the welfare of the district generally, and I believe they would be just as ready to take the same interest in health administration, that is, if we display the same interest on our part and give them the right to elect representatives. At least, I would like to see the experiment made. We cannot cultivate too much among the people an interest in public affairs, and it is only by giving them the right to display it that we can hope to awaken them in the future. One objection that I have to the measure, in the provisions dealing with administration, is that altogether too great an obligation is laid upon the occupier as distinct from the owner. Power for instance is taken under this Act to compel an occupier to fill up land, or to fill up a cellar, and other things which really amount to an improvement of the property of the owner. In my opinion the owner is the person who should be called upon to do that work, and while I draw attention to it, I do not want to dilate upon it at any length, because I will take the opportunity of remedying some of these matters when the measure is in Committee. In connection with the provision for the protection of and inspection of the milk supply, I am much afraid that even the clause which we have in this Act will prove to be inadequate. Where the supply is coming from so many peo-

ple, it is difficult to have anything like adequate inspection and provide adequate protection for the public, but as the milk supply concerns to such a great extent our infants who are the future population, I have come to the conclusion that we will never be able to deal with the question effectively, and to ensure a proper safeguard for the consumers, until we have something in the shape of municipal milk depots. This would not involve anything detrimental to the interests of the dairymen as the producers of milk, but it would mean that the retailing of the milk would have to be done as is now the case in several cities of the old country where there are municipal milk depots, and where there would be a proper opportunity too for protecting the interests of the country. As far as the milk depot in the United Kingdom is concerned, it is controlled by municipal officers, and there is no inducement to use the pump.

Mr. Gordon: How is it distributed?

Mr. BATH: It is a municipal distribution. They practically act as retail distributors of the milk, and by that means they can absolutely guarantee by the methods pursued that the milk will be pure and up to the proper standard. I am pleased to see the provisions which we have in the measure for the prevention of adulteration of foods and drugs, and I am rather sorry that the member for Wellington is not here, because the provisions which we have in this Bill are a very emphatic answer to the statement he made in reply to a remark of mine on the Licensing Bill last session that there was no adulteration in Western Australia. In a way one can be rather glad of the fact that that hon. member has gone so far through life and remained entirely innocent of the fact that adulteration goes on. While perhaps he is not aware of the great extent to which it does take place, I can agree with his remarks to this extent, that very often those who retail adulterated goods are quite innocent in the matter. They merely retail what is supplied by the agent or the manufacturer, although they are not held guiltless under this measure. The Minister points out that pro-

vision is made for standards to be fixed by the central board. I would like the Minister in Committee to let us know whether the department in Western Australia will adopt the standard which was agreed upon at the conference of medical officers held during this year, and which resolved to adopt the Victorian standard which received so much commendation at the World's Conference held in England, or in some part of Europe, during the present year, and at which Sir John Taverner, the Victorian Agent General, was present. It was stated in the report that Western Australia was not represented, but it was anticipated the State would fall in with the other States in adopting the standard which has been eulogised and accepted by the representatives of the medical profession throughout the civilized world. The difficulty I find in the provisions dealing with the inspection of food and drugs is that there is no provision whatever for getting at the manufacturer. And I never realised to what extent we are really defrauded, either by incorrect description or by adulterated articles, until I put in some time on the land this year and had to indulge in tinned foods of various descriptions. One realises there to what extent people have been defrauded by impure articles or by articles which are not up to the descriptions given. For instance, for years and years people have been under the impression that when they bought the larger sized tins of jam they bought two pounds of jam, that when they bought a tin of condensed milk they were getting a pound of milk, and that when they bought white pepper they were getting pepper. But we find the so-called 2-pound tins of jam contain 28 ounces instead of 32 ounces; the tin of milk 14 ounces instead of 16 ounces; and that pepper of the ordinary brands is never sold, unless it is adulterated with ground rice. And as proved by those who have made investigations, we know that that rice is refuse, is merely the scrapings of ship holds, bought up by these people, ground, and worked in with the pepper. Of course, since the Commerce Act was passed these people have to put the net

weight on the packages, with the result that we find we have been actually defrauded for many years; by false descriptions, misrepresentation and adulteration the people have been defrauded day after day. Here is an instance given by Dr. Black in regard to mustard. He mentioned the particular brand of mustard, but I am not going to repeat it here. He said—

I suppose you are under the impression that it is mustard pure and simple. As a fact it consists of ground mustard seed, wheaten flour, and tumeric, which is a colouring matter to make the flour of the same colour as the mustard. If you take a mustard tin and spend about five minutes looking for it you will find the statement on the very edge of the label, at the side, in a most inconspicuous place. "This is sold as a mixture of mustard and other substances"; and then follows the number of the Act in accordance with which the statement is made.

I hope provision will be made for the description to be put in plain language so that it will be plain to the buyer. Again, we certainly should take power under the Bill to prohibit the sale of patent medicines if the contents are found to be injurious.

The Minister for Mines: We do.

Mr. BATH: But I would like to see the provision go farther, and prevent the sale of medicines which, although harmless so far as the actual contents are concerned, are misrepresented in respect to their effect. As a matter of fact, I would like—

The Minister for Mines: It is there. We have power to examine and report on any drug or food presented for sale to the public, and to make the report public.

Mr. BATH: But there is power only to prohibit when the ingredients are injurious. What I want to prevent is what really amounts to quackery, a combination of brown soap and epsom salts guaranteed to cure any ailment under the sun. I may say this power has been taken in New Zealand, because it was found essential over and above the provision under which they allow the sale,

namely, the Food Act which is in existence in that Dominion. There is another matter which I think should be dealt with in the clauses providing for the protection of infant life. We are continually expressing regrets, which are circulated the world over, at the decline in the birthrate, but there is very often considerably less attention given to the very important question of protecting and saving the lives of those infants which are born; and there is room for a great deal of reform in this direction. I think it is time Parliament gave attention to the question of suppressing those objectionable advertisements which appear regularly in the newspapers, and which are part of the campaign for what might be termed the illicit suppression of the birthrate in this and other communities. We find in their editorial columns the newspapers throughout Australia very often shedding tears of sorrow over the declining birthrate; and in the same newspaper you will find dozens of these advertisements which are of a most objectionable, and, indeed, criminal character. Not only should there be legislation dealing with that, but there should be some standard of honour on the part of those conducting these newspapers, wealthy newspapers, which would lead them to refuse advertisements of the kind. In regard to the provision dealing with the registration of nurses, I must express the opinion that it is totally inadequate. Rather than see a provision dealing with a registration which is inadequate, I would prefer to see no registration at all; because a certificate of that kind is going to be a positive danger rather than a protection. If we cannot assure the people that that certificate is an absolute guarantee of efficiency and skill, then that certificate is going to prove a menace and a danger to those who may be led to attach a great deal of weight to it. There is not the discrimination in this between the provisions for the registration of midwives who will be midwives alone, and the registration of those who will be general nurses. We call it the registration of nurses, whereas in New Zealand and New South Wales they make this discrimination: they have provision for the registra-

tion of midwives, and a separate certificate for the registration of nurses.

The Minister for Mines: We have it here.

Mr. BATH: No; it is all in the one provision.

The Minister for Mines: But two different certificates are provided for.

Mr. BATH: There is also this fact to be borne in mind. In New Zealand, where this legislation was initiated, they assure adequate training, because the State provides maternity hospitals, adequately equipped, under their Medical Department. Therefore they can guarantee that those who receive their training in these hospitals are thoroughly competent and, in consequence, the certificate is an absolute guarantee which may be safely accepted by the people. We should have in Western Australia a provision of that kind. We need to follow the example of New Zealand in that respect; because after all there is no direction in which money can be more wisely expended than in providing every convenience, every resource of safety and protection for what are really the sacred duties of motherhood. The Minister pointed to Clause 257 as though it were an excellent provision. He stated that the provision for the registration and certification of nurses and midwives shall not apply to any person attending any lying-in woman who does not reside within five miles of the residence of any legally qualified medical practitioner or midwife. That is precisely the case this provision ought to meet. Where the services of a medical man are available there is not the same need for security in regard to the person attending the case; because, after all, she is under the supervision of the medical officer. But where a person is sent to attend on a woman who is away from the medical officer, and to whom the services of that medical officer are not available, there is all the more need for guarantee of skill on the part of the nurse.

The Minister for Mines: If the medical officer is not there, what are you going to do?

Mr. BATH: That is the point. We ought to provide the district nurses: be-

cause, after all, when we ask people to settle these areas, we are asking them to undertake the disadvantages of going out into the remote districts where they are called upon to suffer certain inconveniences. We ought to secure them protection in this regard. I believe we should not wait for the bush nursing scheme, for the people in this State can find money sufficient to ensure protection and the services of duly qualified midwives for the women in the outside districts away from a medical officer. I have no intention of dealing with the measure at any greater length. I have no doubt that members on both sides of the House will have amendments to submit. But I can again assure the Minister that we are all desirous of passing an adequate measure; and, above all, after we pass the measure we shall be earnestly desirous that that measure should be administered. Because it is useless to pass these measures for the protection of public health and then allow them to go without administration. I could point to provisions in the Bill—for instance, those dealing with the proper cleansing of lodging houses—which are more frequently honoured in the breach than in the observance, and I say that without administration the Bill will be useless. We can pass Bill after Bill, yet without effective administration and control through the Minister and officers of the department, our public health legislation will be altogether useless.

On motion by Mr. Scaddan, debate adjourned.

PRIVILEGE — COMMENTS ON MEMBERS' CONDUCT.

Mr. HOLMAN (Murchison): On a question of privilege I call the attention of the House to certain remarks that appear in to-day's *West Australian*. I was always under the impression that when members of the House spoke on a question affecting the welfare and interests of the country they were allowed freedom of speech, and that if they overstepped the bounds of decorum and the rules of the House there was only one constituted body having control over them. But in this morning's *West Aus-*

tralian I notice that an individual named Moxon and another named Johnson have made some damaging statements against members of this Chamber.

Member: Who is Moxon?

Mr. HOLMAN: I do not know who Moxon is. It appears to me he is a gentleman who would rather trade in flesh and blood for his own interests than look after the interests of the State.

Mr. George: He was a member of the Arbitration Court.

Mr. HOLMAN: That may be so, but that ought to put him in a better position to enable him to control his tongue. This is what appeared in the *West Australian*—

Tuesday's debate in Parliament.

Commercial men's criticism.—Caustic references were made at last night's annual meeting of the Fremantle Chamber of Commerce to the observance accorded the provisions of the Arbitration Act, and more particularly to the attitude of certain members of Parliament. In referring to the matter, the president of the Chamber (Mr. W. E. Moxon) said that they, as a commercial body, viewed with regret the scandal existing in Perth to-day. "We see the Arbitration Court," he said, "practically ridiculed, ignored, and flouted by the very class that clamoured for its creation. We also see the sorry spectacle of Parliament wasting valuable time in arguing over what an expensive court is provided to deal with, and we see members of Parliament advocating sedition, and indulging in language calculated to promote a breach of the peace. What a spectacle for the darker skinned races about whose general inferiority some folks at time so glibly prate. Trade and commerce cannot be conducted in security if the laws of the land are to be disobeyed, and if members of Parliament degrade their position as upholders of the law, which the debate in the House yesterday and recent events too nakedly showed. We rely upon the Government to govern, that is to administer the laws of the land without fear or favour, but we fear that no Arbitration Act has yet been

evolved that can make a man do what he is disinclined to do, always subject to the great laws of right and wrong. I hope I have the support of the members in these remarks, even if they are couched in somewhat strong terms. Personally I do not think it is a matter we can speak too strongly about. The nonsense which was talked in the House on Tuesday night, and the waste of time entailed by the discussion, was a scandal to the name of Parliament." Dealing with the same subject, Mr. Johnson, the president of the Perth Chamber of Commerce, said that they, as a commercial community, should take some steps to impress upon the Government of the State that it was high time the Arbitration Act was either amended or removed altogether from the statute-book. It seemed to him that the people had to pay for the upkeep of the Arbitration Court when its decisions were being openly flouted by the very people for whom the legislation was enacted. It was high time that this blot, as he regarded it, was removed. The scene in Parliament on Tuesday night was a disgrace to the community. When they read what men who were supposed to be our law-makers—(Mr. Moxon: Law-breakers)—said in Parliament, their utterances stamped them as law-breakers, which was indeed most regrettable. The remarks of both presidents were punctuated by applause from the members of the Chamber.

I maintain that this is a gross insult to the whole of the members of the House. If members on either side overstep the bounds in their speeches there is a body which has a perfect right to deal with them, and that body alone has the right. According to precedent and practice and even according to law we are protected against any debate in this House being questioned by another body or by any person, and the time has arrived when this country should be governed, not by men of the Moxon stamp, as has too often been the case in the past, not by the Chamber of Commerce, but by the people elected for the purpose. If we are to be prompted by a man whose past

is anything but a credit to him, and if we cannot govern the State by this Parliament, then it is time we gave place to others. I have brought this forward, not because I care twopence for what Moxon or Johnson, or anyone else, says against this House, but because I maintain that if we are to uphold the name of Parliament we should protect our interests.

Mr. George: Bring them before the Bar of the House.

Mr. HOLMAN: I am going to move that before I am finished. I am satisfied if we are to protect ourselves and not be put down as law-breakers because we tried to protect the interests of certain people and because doing so does not agree with Moxon's ideas, we should call these gentlemen in here and let them point out the members of the House who are law-breakers; and I think we would find that those who are breaking the laws most severely are Moxon and Johnson themselves.

Mr. George: There are the newspapers also.

Mr. HOLMAN: I do not know about the newspapers, but I am of opinion that Mr. Speaker should take this matter up and protect members of the House. It is laid down in *May's Parliamentary Practice* that members of the House of Commons have spoken against the King himself when the rights of the people are at stake. They have a perfect right to say what they desire in the House, and the only persons who can take them to task are the members of the House. It is stated in *May* on page 96 in the chapter dealing with Privilege of Freedom of Speech—

This important privilege has been recognised and confirmed as part of the law of the land.

The Attorney General: You object to freedom of speech outside.

Mr. HOLMAN: I object to men like Moxon referring to members of this Chamber as seditious and law-breakers when they are trying to protect the interests of a certain number of the people of the State. If we were wrong in our remarks in this House it was Mr. Speaker's place, and Mr. Speaker's place only, to call us to order; but we are

called to order by a man like Moxon who, in the past, has had too much power, too much control at Fremantle, and has received too much favouritism from the Government. If we are to be taken to task by him and prevented from saying what is our right as members of Parliament and representatives of the people, the sooner Parliament is done away with in Western Australia and our affairs are thrown into the Federal Parliament the better. They would be able to protect the interests of the people regardless of the Moxons and Johnsons and other bloodsuckers in the land.

The Attorney General: What do you suggest we should do?

Mr. HOLMAN: I am asking members to protect their rights and privileges. If they fail to do so they fail to do their duty to this Parliament and to the interests of the State. *May* goes on to say—

According to *Elsynge*, the "Commons did oftentimes, under Edward III., discuss and debate among themselves many things concerning the King's prerogative, and agreed upon petitions for laws to be made directly against his prerogative, as may appear by divers of the said petitions; yet they were never interrupted in their consultations, nor received check for the same, as may appear also by the answers to the said petitions." . . .

As the proceedings which had already taken place against Strode were declared to be void, it is evident that freedom of speech was then admitted to be a privilege of Parliament, and was not at first enacted; and that the statute was intended to have a general operation in future, and to protect all members of either House, from any question on account of their speeches or votes in Parliament.

This lays it down clearly that we must be protected on account of our speeches or votes in the Chamber. If our speeches are against the laws of the land or the rules of the Chamber, this Parliament should deal with them, but we should not allow our rights and privileges to be interfered with by men of the Moxon or Johnson calibre. *May* goes on to say

under the heading of Interpretation of the Privilege—

But notwithstanding the repeated recognition of this privilege, the Crown and the Commons were not always agreed upon its limit. In reply to the usual petition of the Speaker, Mr. Edward Coke, in 1593, the Lord Keeper said, "Liberty of speech is granted you, but you must know what privilege you have; not to speak every one what he listeth, or what cometh in his brain to utter; but your privilege is 'aye' or 'no.' " In 1621, the Commons, in their protestation, defined their privilege more consistently with its present limits. They affirmed "that every member hath freedom from all impeachment, imprisonment, or molestation, other than by censure of the House itself, for or concerning any Bill, speaking, reasoning, or declaring of any matter or matters touching the Parliament or Parliament business.

That shows clearly that in this place a man can utilise his speech in any direction he likes until he is called to order from the Chair, and if he oversteps his bounds and privileges the members of the Chamber should deal with him, but we should not allow men of the calibre of these men to interfere. In the past, however, the representatives in this Chamber have always had to carry a big handicap from people of that class, and now when members in the interests of those down-trodden by troopers' horses in Perth say anything in Parliament for the protection of the people of the State, they should not be put down as seditionists and law-breakers. I do not admit we were wrong, but even if it were wrong, it was far more justifiable to protect the wrongs of the people on the floor of this House than for us to take the law into our own hands in the street and cause what might be a riot. If I had studied my own feelings on Thursday last, as one who has been through great troubles in this State and through times of trouble in the Eastern States, and had I not kept entire control of myself I would not have been responsible for what I would have done. I would have either shot or

broken down the horsemen who trampled people under their feet. Again we have in *May* this extract—

This would have been a sufficient recognition by law of the privilege of freedom of speech; but a further and last confirmation was reserved for the Revolution of 1688. By the 9th Article of the Bill of Rights it was declared, "That the freedom of speech, and debates or proceedings in Parliament ought not to be impeached or questioned in any court or place out of Parliament.

The Attorney General: No criticism of Parliament?

Mr. HOLMAN: You can have as much criticism as you like. I am one of the last in the world to object to fair criticism, but I strongly object to be called a seditionist or a law-breaker by Moxon or his colleague or men of that calibre whose sole interest is to bleed, and get all they possibly can out of, the people of the State on every opportunity, and who have used the whole of their position and power and, oftentimes, money to defeat the rights of the people.

Mr. George: Did Mr. Moxon give any names?

Mr. HOLMAN: No, I am going to ask that these names be mentioned here at the Bar. Let us know the seditionists and law-breakers who dared to come into the precincts of this Chamber and tried to preach sedition, because if we have men of that calibre in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker's position in the Chair is not free from danger, because the first seditionists try to attack are those in high authority, and I would be sorry to see an attack by any member on anyone in authority in this Chamber. Again *May* says—

But, although by the ancient custom of Parliament, as well as by law, a member may not be questioned out of Parliament, he is liable to censure and punishment by the House itself, of which he is a member. The cases in which members have been called to account and punished for offensive words spoken before the House, are too numerous to mention.

Then it goes on to say what has happened to them and says further—

If a member should say nothing disrespectful to the House or Chair, or personally opprobrious to other members, or in violation of other rules of the House, he may state whatever he thinks fit in debate, however offensive it may be to the feelings, or injurious to the character of individuals.

I have shown clearly that Johnson and Moxon have overstepped their bounds when they referred to members of this Chamber as seditious and law-breakers, and I intend to move that both these gentlemen be called before the House to give such information to the House to show who these members were and to make their charge before the Bar of the House so that members so accused will have the opportunity of protecting themselves.

Mr. SPEAKER: I desire to draw the attention of the hon. member to Standing Order No. 139, which says—

Any member complaining to the House of a statement in a newspaper as a breach of privilege, shall produce a copy of the paper containing the statement in question, and be prepared to give the name of the printer or publisher, and also submit a substantive motion declaring the person in question to have been guilty of contempt.

That is the method of procedure.

Mr. HOLMAN: I have a copy of the paper here, which is printed for the *West Australian* Newspaper Company, Limited, by James Gibbney, at the *West Australian* office, St. George's-terrace, Perth. This paper contains the remarks I have just read.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member moves in the manner prescribed we can proceed.

Mr. HOLMAN: I am not accusing the paper, but the gentlemen who made these statements as published in the *West Australian*. They are the gentlemen I wish brought before the Bar of the House. Further than that, I would refer to Sec-

tion 359 of the Criminal Code, which says—

Any person who, not being a member of either House of Parliament, unlawfully publishes any false or scandalous defamatory matter touching the conduct of any member or members of either House of Parliament as such member or members, is guilty of a misdemeanour, and is liable to imprisonment with hard labour for two years, and to a fine of five hundred pounds.

I hope the authorities will take the matter up and deal with it in a proper way. I desire to move in the matter in accordance with the Standing Orders.

Mr. SCADDAN: I would point out that there is no complaint against the newspaper. The Standing Order only applies when a member desires to lodge a complaint against a newspaper. We do not claim contempt on the part of the *West Australian*.

Mr. George: They might not have reported them properly.

Mr. SCADDAN: Then the gentlemen named can say so when they come along. The complaint is that the statements made are a breach of privilege of members of this House. I find in *May*, on page 89, "It is the present practice, when a complaint is made, to order the person complained of to attend the House."

Mr. PRICE: I would draw attention to Section 14 of the Parliamentary Privileges Act, which says—

The publishing of any false or scandalous libel of any member touching his conduct as a member by any person other than a member is hereby declared to be a misdemeanour. And it shall be lawful for either House to direct the Attorney General to prosecute before the Supreme Court any such person committing any such misdemeanour. And any such person convicted before the said court of any such misdemeanour shall be liable to imprisonment for any period not exceeding two years, or to a fine not exceeding one hundred pounds, or to both such punishments.

Mr. Jacoby: No names were mentioned in the speech.

Mr. PRICE: The libel is against the whole House. I would like to take exception to the remarks made by Mr. Moxon. I have no complaint to lay against the paper, but I enter my protest as one of those who was referred to by the Attorney General the other night. The Minister charged the members for Mount Margaret, Murchison, and Albany with being lawbreakers, and the published report of his remarks in the paper is as follows:—

If every line of their direct incitement to disorder were made plain to the public.

That has been the cause of this unfortunate libel, for, undoubtedly, it is a libel uttered by Mr. Moxon and Mr. Johnson against members of this House.

Mr. Jacoby: Have you a motion before the House?

Mr. Holman: Yes; that those men be brought to the Bar of the House.

Mr. PRICE: The statement was first made by the Attorney General, and that certainly led, I take it, Mr. Moxon and Mr. Johnson to make the remarks they did. Had the Attorney General been sufficiently courteous, or had he confined himself strictly to the facts, and spoken only those things which were facts, I hardly think we should have had gentlemen outside accusing members of this Chamber of sedition and of being lawbreakers. The accusation was first made by the Attorney General and he refused to withdraw it. He charged the members for Mount Margaret, Murchison, and Albany with being lawbreakers. That is the direct charge made by him, and in the circumstances one can hardly wonder that gentlemen such as Mr. Moxon and Mr. Johnson should repeat it outside. I resented the statement when it was made; I equally strongly resent its being repeated outside. I am hardly prepared to go to the extent suggested by the member for Murchison, I only desire to raise a protest against it, and I trust that in future the Attorney General will only utter in this Chamber those things that are facts, and not deliberately mislead the public as to what has transpired. When charged with having made these

statements the Attorney General quibbled and wriggled and worked his way out of it, after the words had been recorded. If the Attorney General is prepared to say he did not intend to accuse certain members of being lawbreakers, which undoubtedly he did according to the Press report, if he says the report is wrong, then it is different. How can we expect the Attorney General to take proceedings against men who only repeated what he had said in this Chamber? Would it be fair to ask him to do so? If the Attorney General would say the report in the Press is true, and I have read it as it appears in the Press, all Mr. Moxon and Mr. Johnson have been guilty of is a repetition of the libel cast upon members by the Attorney General himself.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before anything further is done, I rule that the member for Murchison can proceed if he complies with Standing Order 139. The course to be followed afterwards is that, if contempt is proved, other proceedings are taken. At present we are not aware whether Mr. Moxon and Mr. Johnson are the persons referred to or anyone else. We must first prove that the contempt has been committed, and then there is provision for following up that with a charge of contempt. At this stage I think the newspaper can be dealt with.

Mr. Price: That does not dispose of the question of privilege I have brought up.

Mr. SPEAKER: Only one such question can be dealt with at a time. The member for Murchison can move his motion in accordance with this Standing Order.

Mr. HOLMAN: In deference to your ruling, and as you inform the House proceedings cannot be taken under the section of the Criminal Code, or under Section 14 of the Parliamentary Privileges Act. I will move in the way you indicate.

Mr. WALKER: May I say, with all due deference, that the ruling of the Speaker seems to be wrong. The object of the House is not to bring the paper

before them. The paper committed no offence for it is protected by law. People who publish a fair and just report of public proceedings are, to that extent, privileged.

Mr. George: Suppose they did not publish the exact words, are we to condemn men on an inaccurate report?

Mr. WALKER: The point is this; for the purpose of the hon. member who has drawn attention to the breach of privilege, it is assumed that that report is accurate, that it is a fair report of what took place, and in such circumstances it is a privileged report to that extent and there is no offence committed by the paper. But the person who has been reported has committed an offence against the House, and this House cannot be so stultified as to say it has only power to reach a newspaper and no power to reach any individual.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not say that.

Mr. WALKER: It is to reach those who have offended that the hon. member desires to direct his motion. I would suggest, if this House is inclined to take a strong course, that instead of bringing Mr. Moxon and Mr. Johnson before the House, we do what the Parliamentary Privileges Act enables us to do, namely, direct the Attorney General to institute proceedings. That, I submit, is the proper and dignified course to take.

Mr. Scaddan: It would be a friendly action, I am afraid.

Mr. WALKER: Then we have the Attorney General. for if he makes a breach of the privileges of the House and is false to this House, we shall know how to deal with him. I would suggest to the member for Murchison that he should word his motion in this way, "That this House directs the Attorney General to take proceedings against Mr. Moxon and Mr. Johnson for contempt of this House."

Mr. George: What about the newspaper; we would not have known of it if a report had not been published?

Mr. SPEAKER: I suggest that the Attorney General gives us an expression of opinion on the point.

Mr. WALKER: I do not think he is much of an authority.

Mr. SPEAKER: So far as my reading is concerned, it seems to me to be commonsense to follow the practice laid down in the Standing Orders.

Mr. DAGLISH: On a point of order, I desire to say it appears to me that Standing Order 139 is intended to refer to the statement of a newspaper published by a newspaper, and not to a report. I understand that the member for Murchison has couched his remarks in rather an ambiguous fashion, because he began by calling attention to something which appeared in the *West Australian* newspaper. As a matter of fact what he intended to do was to call attention to something he believed had been said by certain persons, and the publication in the *West Australian* was a mere incident of secondary importance. I think that if the *West Australian* published as part of its ordinary matter the statement the hon. member complained of, then the hon. member's motion must come within the terms of Standing Order 139, but when the hon. member complains not because a newspaper has published something because a person or persons have said something, it would be an absurdity if he were required to bring up a person who, in his opinion, was innocent, and who acted, likewise in his opinion, bona fide, in publishing a statement merely in order that afterwards he might bring up certain persons at whom in fact his action was aimed. There is nothing in the Standing Orders which need conflict with the action the hon. member desires to take? At the same time I wish clearly to remark that I am in no way committing myself at the present moment to anything more than a statement as to what seems to me to be the rules of the House on this question.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. J. L. Nanson): It is perfectly clear that if a member of the public comments in terms which reflect upon the conduct of a member in this House, it is competent for the House to take notice of the language, and if members are satisfied that such language was used, the person may be called to the Bar of the House, be brought there by the

Sergeant-at-Arms, and punished for contempt of Parliament. There is no doubt whatever as to the well established law and custom of Parliament in these matters, and the member for Murchison in the course of his remarks cited several instances where the action he desired to take had been taken. I might go further and point out that there are other cases in which both houses of the English Parliament—the House of Lords, and the House of Commons, have acted with what I might call almost savage ferocity against members of the public who have dared to commit the unspeakable offence of commenting upon the action of members. One unfortunate gentleman who in the year 1623, commented upon the action of the House of Lords was not only fined £1,000, but was sent to the pillory and imprisoned. We have not a pillory in Western Australia, or, at any rate, not in the form in which it was used in those days. Neither am I aware whether we have within the precincts of the House a Chamber fitted up as a dungeon for offending members of the public.

Mr. Walker : You can send them to Fremantle Gaol by a warrant of the Speaker.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL : No doubt we can send people who libel hon. members to Fremantle Gaol, but, while there may be no question as to the well established law and custom of Parliament with regard to these matters, that law and custom is, I submit, to be interpreted with common-sense, and I venture to say that if in the exercise of our undoubted powers we were to call Messrs. Moxon and Johnson to the Bar of this House we should make ourselves the laughing stock or even worse than the laughing stock of the whole State.

Mr. Holman : My motion has not been received by the House, and there is nothing before the House. I am waiting for my point of order to be determined.

Mr. SPEAKER : The member for Kanowna raised a point of order, and I invited the Attorney General to express his views.

Mr. Walker : But he is debating the whole question.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL : I am not debating the question in the slightest degree. I was explaining that as far as the law and custom of Parliament is concerned there is ample warrant for the action the member for Murchison is taking ; but I want to debate the general question.

Mr. SPEAKER : The member for Kanowna has raised a point of order as to whether other proceedings can be taken now.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL : Hon. members may take any of the actions suggested by the member for Kanowna. I think it would be advisable for the motion to be moved and then we shall have an opportunity of discussing the matter.

Mr. HOLMAN : I shall move a motion in accordance with section 14 of the Parliamentary Privileges Act which reads—

The publishing of any false or scandalous libel of any member touching his conduct as a member by any person other than a member is hereby declared to be a misdemeanour.

We have very recently seen where desperate attempts have been made, and I must say too where people have run over themselves to prosecute innocent individuals for standing in the streets, and not committing any breach of the law at all. On this occasion I sincerely trust that the Government will take some stand, and, although one of their own class may be implicated, I trust they will give him the opportunity of proving that he was innocent. I beg to move—

That this House directs the Attorney General to take proceedings against Messrs. Moxon and Johnson, presidents of the Fremantle and Perth Chambers of Commerce respectively, for their contempt of this House as reported in the West Australian newspaper of 25th August.

Mr. SPEAKER : I find on looking up authorities that some years ago there was a parallel case, and that being so, I feel justified in accepting the motion moved by the hon. member.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: There is a manifest inconvenience in hon. members springing a surprise such as this in the middle of the debate and absolutely without notice of any kind, but in this case I do not think that members will have very much difficulty in coming to a decision as to what is the right course to adopt. As I said when I was speaking before, there is no doubt that even apart from statute law under which it is now proposed we should work there is tremendous power vested in Parliament, but whether that power dates from common law or custom of the country, or whether it is to be found in the statute law, it was never intended to be used without discretion. What is the position that hon. members have to consider? We know that during the debate on Tuesday night when the conduct of the police was discussed that members opposite, I refer more particularly to the member for Murchison, the member for Albany, and the member for Mount Margaret, indulged in language of the most vehement description, language, which, in my opinion—an opinion formed at the time and which I see no reason to alter—language which in my sober and earnest opinion was of the nature of a direct incitement to lawlessness.

Mr. Scaddan: Would you call it sedition?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Sedition, the hon. member is no doubt aware, is an exceedingly wide offence. The language was of the kind that had a tendency to incite people to lawlessness.

Mr. Price: Do you say that I used that language? Give me one instance, and do not talk in generalities.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am speaking of the opinion that I formed in this House after hearing those speeches, and I was not excited at the time.

Mr. Bath: You were.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The language of those hon. members being very strong and vehement, would be read by members of the outside public, whose feelings were more or less inflamed with regard to this unfortunate trouble, as an incitement to lawlessness.

It would be read by them as a defence and an incitement to lawlessness. That opinion may be right or it may be wrong; it may be justified or it may be unjustifiable.

Mr. Price: Speak the truth.

Mr. SPEAKER: That must be withdrawn.

Mr. Price: Am I to ask the hon. member to speak untruths?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member knows perfectly well that what I demand is within the strict orders of the House.

Mr. Price: I have sat here and heard the Attorney General make accusations against me.

Mr. Gordon: Oh, withdraw.

Mr. Price: Why should I do what you tell me? Mr. Speaker is in charge, not you. I sat patiently here to-night listening to the Attorney General making what I can only call a cowardly attack upon myself. He deliberately misconstrued my statements, and when I ask him now to point to a single utterance of mine which may be said to have been an incitement to lawlessness the Attorney General cannot do so. However, I will withdraw.

Mr. Scaddan: Is the Attorney General in order in stating that members in speaking in the House were inciting to lawlessness?

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not hear him say it, but if he said it, it must be withdrawn.

Mr. Scaddan: The Attorney General did say it, and the ruling should apply to him as well as to others.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a reflection on the Chair.

Mr. Scaddan: I did not mean it that way.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member said what you say he did, he must withdraw, whoever he may be.

The Attorney General: No, sir, I—

Mr. Price: The Attorney General denies it. He distinctly said—and you must have heard him say it—that the speeches of the members for Murchison, for Albany, and for Mount Margaret were direct incitements to lawlessness. That is word for word what he said.

Now he denies it. How can you trust him?

Mr. SPEAKER: If the Attorney General said any such thing, he must withdraw it. For my part I was reading up this other case. This is a most important matter and has been sprung on the House. I may say that in my 20 odd years of public life, up here and down in the old House, under the late Sir James Lee Steere, if a member had any such thing to bring before the House, in every case he went to the Speaker and consulted him beforehand. It is only a matter of courtesy which I also expect from hon. members, but which I never get; these cases are invariably sprung upon me.

The Attorney General: I hope you will acquit me, sir, of any desire to embarrass you in the discharge of your duties. I do not wish for a moment to say anything contrary to the rules of the House, but I submit I am entitled to express my opinion.

Mr. Scaddan: The Attorney General should withdraw the statement.

Mr. Bath: The leader of the Opposition took exception to a statement which I am confident every member in the House heard. The Attorney General said that the speeches of the members for Albany, Murchison, and Mount Margaret were a direct incitement to lawlessness.

Mr. Gordon: In his opinion.

Mr. Bath: No. The leader of the Opposition took exception to that and asked you, Sir, whether the Minister was in order. You said you had not heard him.

Mr. SPEAKER: No; I was reading up this other case.

Mr. Bath: You said you had not heard him, but that if the Attorney General did say it, he must withdraw. What I would like to know before the Attorney General is allowed to proceed is whether he admits having said that.

The Premier: I heard the hon. member speaking, and so far as my memory goes, what he said was that the speeches of those hon. members might be construed by people outside—

Mr. Price: No; he did not.

The Attorney General: I did not deny having said it.

The Premier: It was to that effect, and moreover— Oh! for goodness sake don't all talk at once.

Mr. Bath: Never mind about your colleague, Mr. Premier, tell the truth.

Mr. Troy: Your whip admitted it.

The Premier: If the hon. member did say that, I have no doubt he will withdraw. If hon. members are under the impression that he said it I have no doubt he will withdraw. The impression on my mind was that he said the people outside reading those speeches might construe them into an incitement to lawlessness.

Mr. Walker: Mr. Premier, he himself said that.

Mr. SPEAKER: In that case the hon. member must withdraw. And I am sorry that the member for Brown Hill, whom we all so much respect, should have forgotten himself to the extent of making use of the expression that fell from him.

Mr. Bath: I may have forgotten myself; but if you will remember, last night the Attorney General made a statement which was reported here, and which, when you asked him about it, he denied. As a matter of fact, this proves that he said it. To-night I ask any hon. member in the House, anyone who wishes to speak honestly, whether the Attorney General again did not say what the leader of the Opposition accuses him of; and again the Attorney General denies it. No matter how much a member may desire to conform to the rules of the House, that sort of thing disgusts one.

The Attorney General: I most emphatically deny that I used the words attributed to me by the member for Brown Hill.

Mr. Underwood: I emphatically assert he did use them. He said it would lead any person outside to believe that, and he said in his opinion, and in the opinion of the outside public, it was an incitement to lawlessness; and he had previously told us that he was cool.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member denies having used the words.

Mr. Scaddan: What is our remedy when we show, as we can to-night—

when we told him he made a certain statement last night and he denied it, and we can show him to-night that he did say it and he still denies; what protection have we?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Standing Orders provides that if a member makes a statement and another member contradicts him, if he denies it, I have to accept his word.

Mr. Troy: May I respectfully suggest that in order to prove who is right you should get the minutes from *Hansard*. Then we could see whether or not we can take the Attorney General's word.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the report here.

Mr. Walker: Let us have it read.

Mr. Daglish: On a point of order. I was under the impression that you had called on the Attorney General to withdraw a statement, and that since there has been a certain amount of discussion but no withdrawal. I think that, as a matter of respect to the Chair, the Minister should withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman denies having said it.

Mr. Walker: I submit that before we proceed we should know what he did say. It is all on this side of the House, apparently, that the remarks were heard; but if the Minister can truthfully deny having made those remarks, then besides him there is not a truthful man in this Assembly.

The Attorney General: The position is made unnecessarily difficult, because hon. members opposite, immediately I get up to speak, rise to points of order. I appeal to hon. members opposite to preserve some degree of calmness and not to bring this House into ridicule.

Mr. Holman: Is the hon. member in order in accusing us of bringing the House into ridicule?

Mr. Price: On a point of order. A moment ago I forgot myself and made a remark which I was sufficiently manly to withdraw when you asked me to do so.

Mr. SPEAKER: You did not deny it.

Mr. Price: You asked for a withdrawal of a certain statement. Am I to understand that no matter what may have

been said, if I said I did not say it it is sufficient?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. Scaddan: Before the Attorney General proceeds further you should read out the exact words used by the Attorney General, and if necessary, call upon him to withdraw.

The Attorney General: I ask to be permitted to make a personal statement. It is the only way in which I can deal with the matter.

Members: Chair! Chair!

Mr. SPEAKER: I will read the statement from *Hansard* if the hon. member will allow me.

The Attorney General: I ask—

Members: Sit down. Chair! Chair!

Mr. SPEAKER: This is the report from *Hansard* showing what the Attorney General said—

We know that during the debate on Tuesday night when the conduct of the police was discussed, that members opposite, I refer more particularly to the member for Murchison, the member for Albany, and the member for Mount Margaret, indulged in language of the most vehement description, language which in my opinion—an opinion formed at the time, and which I see no reason to alter—language which in my sober and earnest opinion was of the nature of a direct incitement to lawlessness.

The Attorney General: Now, sir, I may perhaps be allowed to continue.

Members: No; withdraw.

The Attorney General: May I not make a personal explanation?

Mr. Taylor: Is the hon. member in order in proceeding when you have called upon him to withdraw; I say it is a direct insult to the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must withdraw.

The Attorney General: Those are the remarks I am reported to have used on Tuesday night in the Chamber.

Members: No; to-night.

The Attorney General: I submit—

Mr. Holman: Is the hon. member in order in saying you are out of order in calling upon *Hansard* for a report?

Mr. SPEAKER : I think I have adopted the proper course.

Mr. Taylor : Well, enforce your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER : I am going to do so ; I am going to ask the hon. member to withdraw.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL : Are you referring to words used to-night ?

Mr. SPEAKER : Yes. Here are the words. "Words which in my opinion, an opinion formed at the time, language which in my sober and earnest opinion was of the nature of a direct incitement to lawlessness." I must ask the hon. member to withdraw them.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL : I apologise to you. I was under the impression that the slip handed to me was an extract from my speech on Tuesday night. I understand that I was in error and that you ask me to withdraw these words now, and as I always obey the ruling of the Chair, I unhesitatingly withdraw them.

Mr. Scaddan : Hear, hear, and withdraw your reflection on this side.

Mr. Taylor : Apologise to Mr. Speaker.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL : There is no difficulty whatever on this side of the House in securing ready obedience to the orders of the Chair. But to proceed, although I am not allowed to use those words which I have just withdrawn, I presume I am in order in saying that the remarks of those members on Tuesday evening were of a highly objectionable character and not in the interests of the public, and were not remarks such as should be made in this House.

Mr. Holman : I ask that those words be withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER : I do not think they are objectionable.

Mr. Holman : I demand that they be withdrawn. My remarks were not objectionable.

Mr. SPEAKER : There is nothing in the rules to compel me to ask the hon. member to withdraw these words.

Mr. Price : I do not think the hon. member is in order in saying that I used objectionable statements and that my statements were not in the public in-

terest. Am I in order in saying that the hon. member is—well, a cad ?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL : We have the extraordinary position that hon. members opposite, particularly the member for Albany, would actually like me to be called to order for saying that remarks used in the House are objectionable, or in other words, open to objection. Could childishness go further ? Hon. members opposite indulge in language of the most extravagant description. If I were in order all that would be necessary would be for me to obtain the reports of the debate on Tuesday evening last and read from *Hansard* the language the members indulged in as to the conduct of the police and as to myself and as to other hon. members.

Mr. Price : I ask you to do it.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL : Is all the patience to be on this side of the House ? Are we to sit here night after night and hear virulent, I might almost say scurrilous abuse from hon. members opposite—

Mr. Holman : Skunk !

The ATTORNEY GENERAL : And never show any indignation ? I venture to say that under provocation that had never before exceeded in this House I have during several hours on Tuesday evening and for a considerable time this evening shown on account of self-control that I could wish were emulated by hon. members opposite. But to return to the subject of the motion which, after all, is the important question and not what I have said and what I did not say—

Mr. Troy : Which you denied saying, you know.

Mr. SPEAKER : Order !

The ATTORNEY GENERAL : Hon. members who are themselves accustomed to criticise actions, not only of public men, but of officials, with a considerable amount of freedom, should allow some liberty of criticism, some degree of freedom to members of the public outside to criticise their own actions. As it is, suppose members opposite had full control in this country, suppose they were in an enormous majority, and that those who were opposite to them were in an insignificant minority, and suppose

that some member of that minority, suppose for instance that I had the misfortune to be in the minority and used the language that has been taken exception to to-night, what would those members not do if they felt they were strong enough to do it? No doubt they would like to revive the pillory.

Mr. Walker: What did you do to the woman who was hanged and never had legal proof against her?

Member: Be fair.

Mr. Walker: That woman would have been saved if it had not been for his advice.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The extraordinary venom displayed by the member for Kanowna is the best proof of how ill-fitted he is to be entrusted with responsibility. I feel sure I can appeal with confidence to members to refuse to endorse the motion brought forward by the member for Murchison ordering me to institute a prosecution against certain persons outside the House who may have indulged in language possibly not altogether justified. That, however, is a matter of opinion. My opinion on the point has already given so much annoyance to some members that I do not propose to repeat it. But, admitting for the sake of argument that these two gentlemen, Mr. Moxon and Mr. Johnson, have somewhat transgressed the line between fair and unfair comment, is it not continually done with regard to public matters? Is there any member of the House who has not at some time or another in a moment of excitement said a little more than he would care to do at other times? And are we to set the law in motion, are we to create a wave of laughter or indignation throughout the State by instituting proceedings simply because some members of the outside public venture to criticise public utterances of members of Parliament? I feel sure the majority of members of this House will negative this motion and show by that means that they regard it as one which should never have been brought forward.

Mr. BATH: I hope the member for Murchison will withdraw the motion he has moved, because in my opinion it is

not wise to invest gentlemen who make statements of that kind with the notoriety which they are probably seeking. As a matter of fact, if hon. members, many of them, were to invoke the assistance of the House on what are probably breaches of privilege in scurrilous, malignant and slanderous statements made on every occasion they would keep the House busily engaged all the year round. The regrettable thing about the matter to which the member for Murchison has drawn attention is that it was directly invited by the remarks made by the Attorney General on Tuesday night when inflamed with passion. The Attorney General has referred to-night to incitement which he had received to make this statement, but as a matter of fact hon. members on both sides of the House must realise that the Attorney General frequently and deliberately sets out to accomplish what he accomplished to-night, and the statement which he made on Tuesday night, which was a gross reflection on hon. members, was a direct invitation to people outside to make these statements. I would rather see a motion to ask the Attorney General to exercise something in the nature of self-control than the motion which has been moved by the member for Murchison to-night.

The Premier: Would you add any other names to it?

Mr. BATH: I can tell the Premier that I remember a previous incident when for five weeks the Attorney General studied out and deliberately wrote down one of the most objectionable statements ever made in the House—that is the incident familiar to the House and known in the annals of Parliament as the “skunk incident”—when the hon. member referred to the then Premier, Mr. Leake. It was deliberately written down; it was not on the spur of the moment. If that sort of thing is pursued by the Attorney General it will undoubtedly lead to warm scenes such as to-night’s. I do not think the House should vote for the motion and give to these gentlemen, Mr. Moxon and Mr. Johnson, the notoriety they seek. If one were anxious to point out to those gentlemen that those who live in glass houses should not throw stones, I could

indubitably prove here to-night that Mr. Moxon himself might not be so free from the charge of law-breaking that he is so free in hurling at others. It is well that members of the House who talk about law-breaking should look at their own conduct and see whether they can be free from the charge. I do not think there is any member of the House but will, when he examines himself, admit that he is a law-breaker.

When the Premier goes to a race meeting he breaks the law when he puts a pound on the favourite.

The Premier: No. I put it on the totalisator.

Mr. BATH: Undoubtedly the speech made by the Attorney General the other night was one—I admit hon. members were warm on the Opposition side because they were resenting what we should always resent. In the administration of the law and the preservation of peace there should always be an attempt on the part of the authorities rather to prevent any breach than to invite it by their conduct, and I hope that will be borne in mind by those in charge of the administration of the law in Western Australia. I have hesitation in supporting a motion asking the Attorney General to institute proceedings against these gentlemen, because I think it will much better meet the opinion of the House and its prestige to dismiss the matter and not pander to these gentlemen's vanity or their notoriety-seeking instincts.

Mr. TAYLOR: As one of the three members of the House who have been, perhaps, the cause of this motion, and as the remarks I made on Tuesday evening in defence of a section of the tramway employees have caused so much annoyance and have penetrated my opponents so deeply that they have thought it necessary to mention at their very highest tribunal, the Chamber of Commerce, I am pleased they have that effect. But, so far as I am personally concerned, in this motion, I offer no defence. The only thing I am sorry that I am implicated in any way is that it has brought about a breach of the privileges of the House. It is not a matter to consider what members of the House have been spoken of in that language by the gentlemen men-

tioned, but it is a question of the privileges of the House, and this precludes me from having much to say with reference to the motion. I will make some remarks dealing with that portion of the motion moved by the member for Murchison so far as members on this side of the House are concerned, and the reference made to them as law-breakers. I know Mr. Speaker too well, and know his duties as a Speaker too well, to think for a moment that he would allow me or any other member to make any seditious speech, or any speech that would provoke lawlessness or disorder. The Speaker would absolutely prevent me from making such a speech, but he cannot prevent me from making a speech that will show the Government that they are not administering the laws of this country as they should. I should never be permitted to make a seditious speech, or one calculated to make people outside this Chamber commit a breach of the law.

The Premier: What about the people inside this Chamber?

Mr. TAYLOR: I venture to assert they are always breaking the law. When we have a Minister of the Crown defying the Speaker of this Assembly to such an extent as has been the case—and the records of Parliament have to be read to convince him that he uttered such words—then there are those here who are prepared to break the rules of this House. When the speech I delivered on Tuesday night, and which has been complained of by the Attorney General, and by those gentlemen of Perth and Fremantle, is read, I question whether the Attorney General can put his finger on a sentence or passage of it, as it stands recorded in *Hansard*—and it was recorded in the ordinary way speeches are in this House, namely, in the first person on a question of this kind—which he can say would incite people to break the law.

The Premier: It might incite him.

Mr. TAYLOR: It incites the hon. member.

The Premier: The term "political tape-worm" is certainly not a term of endearment.

Mr. TAYLOR: When the Attorney General speaks he reminds me of a six-foot white serpent that has its back broken about eight inches from its tail, and is doing its best to stand up and hiss. The Attorney General made a most venomous attack, and yet he flatters himself on his evenness of temper and coolness. While I have to stand a lecture from him for speaking with some warmth I can explain that I readily recognise, when I have something to say in favour of a body of workmen in such a justified position as the tramway men are, I cannot help speaking with warmth. I submit, however, I have not spoken words that have any tendency to provoke a breach of the law, and I challenge the Attorney General to read my remarks, or anyone who heard my remarks in Wellington-street before one of the largest crowds that I have ever seen at a meeting here, and say that there was any tendency on my part to provoke a breach of the law. I have not done so in this House; I know I have not done so because Mr. Speaker would not have allowed me to do so. So far as what Mr. Moxon might say, I am one of those, as a democrat, who believes in freedom of speech. I say that every man should be free to express his thoughts as he thinks fit. I believe, as every true democrat does, that freedom of speech and thought and nobility of purpose will make a country, and that men should have the right to exercise those privileges. However, in this case the privileges of the House are at stake. I am not in question, and if members think those privileges have been infringed upon they are justified in taking action. I hope, however, that the member for Murchison will withdraw the motion. I feel sure that now the question has been debated he will do so. I do not think he or any other member desires to give Mr. Moxon and Mr. Johnson any more kudos than they have obtained at present. This country is full of kudos-mongers, and I am not too pleased to be shedding limelight on them any more than is necessary. If this tramway trouble lasts much longer there is no doubt that there will be public meetings, and if those tramway people require me

to address meetings, either in the open streets of Perth, with the permission of the mayor, or in public halls, I will do so and I will be able to address those meetings, and be able to place the views of the tramway employees before the public, in language that will safeguard me from the charges made by the Attorney General, or by Mr. Moxon or Mr. Johnson, and that then I will not be deviating one iota from the remarks I made in this Chamber. Inciting to rebellion, inciting people to break the law! I would like the Attorney General to hear me when I am out on the warpath inciting people to break the law. He said he was almost ill with listening to me the other night; but he would drop dead if he heard a man speaking with warmth.

The Attorney General: I always said your bark was worse than your bite.

Mr. TAYLOR: The Attorney General's sneer is worse than his bite. His biting capacity is very little. But I would sooner have a knock-down blow with an axe from the Premier than be sneezed on by the Attorney General. That is the feeling of the Chamber from one side to the other. However, he cannot help it; it is the Deity's fault and I will not question His handiwork. Let the Attorney General take that into consideration and try to overcome it, and treat members with the respect due to them. Every time the Attorney General crosses swords with me while I am in this House he will come out of the encounter in the future as he has done in the past, that is with his feathers ruffled.

The Attorney General: Oh, no, your feathers seem to be ruffled.

Mr. Gordon: You flatter yourself too much.

Mr. TAYLOR: The member for Canning is not of sufficient importance for people to take any notice of. I hope the member for Murchison will withdraw his motion.

Mr. WALKER: May I say that now that the purpose has been served I hope the member for Murchison will withdraw the motion.

The Attorney General: Pull the knocker and then run away.

Mr. WALKER: If that is defiance, we can test it.

Mr. Taylor: If you want fight you will get it.

Mr. WALKER: This is the point. The Attorney General and his officers are prosecuting men for standing in the streets in defence of men who are fighting for their wives and families, for their bread and butter, and Mr. Barker, the Crown Prosecutor, has been engaged to prosecute members on this side of the House. He has been specially selected for that purpose and the privileges of this House are being broken. That is done from the Attorney General's office.

Mr. Holman: That is the kind, gentlemanly spirit the Attorney General exhibits.

Mr. WALKER: But the moment this House, the whole of this House is abused and treated with contempt, the Attorney General apologises for those who treat this House with contempt. It is for that reason this debate has proceeded. It is to show the honesty of those who are administering in the Attorney General's Department the affairs of the country. That is the object of it. The purpose, however, is now served, for the public know the hypocrisy, if I may use the term, of his department. We can leave it at that. In those circumstances I would suggest that the member for Murchison should withdraw his motion.

Mr. SCADDAN: I do not know whether it is desirable that the member should withdraw his motion now. I thought, too, with the member for Kowna, that it would be advisable to do so, but when the Attorney General begins to make statements such as he did just now, it is as well to show him that we are not here to play, nor even to "pull the knocker and run away." Let him make no mistake about that. If the Attorney General takes up a position of defiance he will find members here ready at their post whenever required.

The Premier: That does not affect the merits of the case.

Mr. SCADDAN: It does so in a great measure. The worst feature of the state-

ment made by Mr. Moxon was that he charged members with doing something in the nature of sedition.

Mr. George: Do you know that is a verbatim report?

Mr. SCADDAN: The organiser for the National League can find that out for himself. It is remarkable the attitude that gentleman has adopted this session as compared with his actions in previous sessions. The remarks made by Mr. Moxon, if made by members of this House in the public streets last Thursday, would have led to their being arrested. On that day we did not dare pass the time of day to a policeman. But Mr. Moxon and his colleague of the Chamber of Commerce—an institution which backs up the Government on every occasion—charged members of Parliament with advocating sedition, charged members of Parliament with degrading their position, and yet no action is taken by the department. We are called law-breakers and men who advocate sedition, and Mr. Johnson says of us "Men supposed to be law-makers sit in Parliament and their utterances stamp them as law-breakers." Yet the Attorney General is ready to defend those men. How does that compare with his attitude in connection with the charges brought against the members for Mount Magnet and Forrest? In that case he brings the whole Crown Law Department against them. Does the Attorney General deny that the Crown Prosecutor is prosecuting in those cases?

The Attorney General: Certainly not.

Mr. SCADDAN: Because he cannot. The whole office of the Crown Law Department is brought to bear on members in this case, and yet the remarks of the men, which have been referred to here to-night, are defended by the Attorney General in this House. I do not think the member for Murchison had the slightest intention, when he started on this question, to call those people to the bar, or to call upon the Attorney General to take action. But he insisted as a member of the House to claim his right of freedom of speech, and I contend he has adopted the right attitude and he has shown that the word of the Attorney

General in this Chamber is worth nothing unless we have it in black and white. I will support the motion if the hon. member will put it to a division, and let me inform the Attorney General that when I get hold of the handle of the knocker in future I will remain there.

Mr. GEORGE: The leader of the Opposition and other members, I cannot remember them all, there have been so many of them, have spoken about what was reported to have been said by Messrs. Moxon and Johnson, as in a measure, curbing their freedom of speech. Although we enjoy the exalted position of members of this Legislature we are simply the mouthpiece of the people who vote and send us here, and if we claim freedom of speech for ourselves we have no right to curb that freedom of speech of those who are our masters. With regard to this particular motion about bringing Messrs. Moxon and Johnson to the Bar of the Chamber—

Mr. Collier: That is not the motion.

Mr. Holman: To take them to the Supreme Court.

Mr. GEORGE: I am not very particular where they are to be taken, but these gentlemen will be lifted into notoriety beyond their wildest hopes by the debate this evening. I am not concerned where we take them, but I would like to suggest to the member for Murchison that there is open to him, as there is to every citizen in the State, a remedy which he could take without bringing the matter up before the House in the manner he has done if he thinks he has been libelled.

Mr. Walker: It is the House that has been libelled. No names have been mentioned.

Mr. GEORGE: Then how does the member for Murchison know that he is the person referred to?

Mr. Holman: I do not know that I am.

Mr. GEORGE: Then I have misunderstood the hon. member's speech very much. I have not listened to every member on the opposite side of the House; I have kept quiet and I have refrained in the interests of peace and order from directing your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that you had a most flagrant

insult hurled at you by the member for Albany. You said that you did not hear the words of the Attorney General, and the member for Albany rose after you made that statement and said he heard the Attorney General make a certain remark, and that you must have heard it. I know it was unwittingly done on the hon. member's part, because he would be the last man in the Chamber to cast such a reflection on the Chair, and I know that in the heat of debate it is possible for members to make statements which are not entirely accurate.

Mr. Scaddan: He could deny it.

Mr. Price: I am not going to deny it.

Mr. GEORGE: The member for Albany is man enough to stick to anything he says. I understood him to say that.

Mr. Price: I did say that.

Mr. GEORGE: When a man has made the amende necessary after having made a mistake, I would not throw it up into his face.

Mr. Collier: Are we discussing you, or are we discussing the motion?

Mr. GEORGE: As far as the debate on Tuesday night is concerned, we sat for nine hours listening to what members on the opposite side had to say. I heard a lot of things that pained me, and a lot of things which I am satisfied in my mind did not advance the good of the cause those gentlemen have at heart.

Mr. Swan: We are the best judges.

Mr. GEORGE: That is so, but we also have the right to express our opinion. At any rate as far as this motion is concerned, whatever we get we have two gentlemen, who in spite of anything that may have been said against them in the heat of debate, are well known and respected in the State and hold the positions they occupy by virtue of merit and the work that they have done, and they are entitled to respect for that just as much as hon. members on this or the other side of the House. We have a report in the *West Australian*, a newspaper which I know is absolutely accurate in whatever it says, especially about myself. I am familiar enough with newspaper work to know that when a speech is reported it is not always reported verbatim; they con-

dense the report and they do it as fairly and impartially as they can.

Mr. Scaddan: They use the word "sedition" there.

Mr. GEORGE: This I know, that although in that newspaper, Messrs. Moxon and Johnson are reported as having said this thing, I am satisfied from the remarks made to me in Perth yesterday and to-day, that there are many people who are saying and thinking exactly the same thing.

Mr. Holman: Some of your own kidney.

Mr. GEORGE: My kidneys are all right. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman's are.

Mr. Collier: Because they say that do you agree with them?

Mr. GEORGE: I must say that the debate in my opinion was not in the best interests of the men whom hon. members opposite are trying to serve.

Mr. Taylor: The people who made those remarks to you I suppose are sympathisers of the tramway company.

Mr. GEORGE: I do not know that it is necessary to talk about sympathising with the tramway company. If it were possible for me to end this trouble I would willingly try to do so. When the member for Guildford spoke to me about it I told him I was willing to do my best in the matter without fee or reward. As far as this motion is concerned, and even if technically the member for Murchison has some right in bringing the matter before us, if we were to pass it, we would make ourselves the laughing stock of the State, and I think the people would ask themselves what we were doing. They would say that they are paying the legislators £200 a year, and what for? I do not know whether the word "piffle" is parliamentary or not, but it expresses my opinion of motions of this sort.

Mr. Troy: It expresses your language.

Mr. Holman: And your character.

Mr. GEORGE: My character does not depend upon the member for Murchison or any other hon. member, and the best proof of my character is the fact that in connection with this tramway trouble I was spoken to and requested to take a

hand in the matter by the men themselves. Why? Not because I am the Liberal League organiser, not because I have managed to get a little bit of something for my old age by self-denial, but because they knew that I would give them a just deal whichever way it went. And they cannot deny it. Why should hon. members talk about my character? I have been 20 years in the State, and where is the man who dare suggest a single slur against my character? There is not one member on that side of the House, not one in the State can point to any action of mine which a man should not do. Why, because a man speaks feelingly in this Chamber, should he be exposed to the attacks of these hon. members, to such epithets as "kidney" and that sort of thing. The language used in this Chamber on Tuesday night, I say, would be a disgrace to a low pot-house in the slums of Liverpool.

Mr. Taylor: On a point of order. I take that as a reflection on the Chair.

Mr. GEORGE: No; it is not a reflection on the Speaker; I have known him too long to think of attempting to reflect upon him.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member referred to what took place on Tuesday night; he said the language used was a disgrace. I am not prepared to say he is out of order in saying that. Certainly no member infringing the rules of the House, although all possible liberty was given.

Mr. Troy: On a point of order. The hon. member said the speeches made here on Tuesday furnished language which would not be used in a pot-house. That is a direct reflection on the Chair, because, I am sure, you would not allow any language of that character in the Chamber. If you did so I would be amazed. The statement is not correct; it is unworthy of the hon. member and a reflection on the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am here to carry out the Standing Orders, and I did so.

Mr. GEORGE: There were words used by hon. members on that side, words such as "contemptible tripe." I do not know much about language of that sort, but as I understand it the phrase is

about as filthy as could be said to any man. I have no objection to hon. members, if they think any section of the community is being badly treated—I have no objection to their stating the case in this House and trying to win our sympathies; but I do object to hon. members being accused of being unfeeling, and of having no interest in the workers of the State.

Mr. Collier: On a point of order. Is the hon. member speaking to the question before the Chair? .

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is perfectly in order.

Mr. Collier: In dealing with the condition of the workers?

Mr. SPEAKER: He is perfectly in order.

Mr. Collier: I submit the motion is that certain men be prosecuted in the Supreme Court; whereas the member for Murray is wandering away to his attitude towards the condition of the workers of the State. I submit, therefore, he is entirely out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I say the hon. member is perfectly in order.

Mr. GEORGE: The hon. member's remarks would cause people to believe the condition of the workers is only to be considered by hon. members on that side of the House. I wish to say those hon. members have no right to claim any monopoly of endeavours to ameliorate the condition of the people of the State, whether workers or otherwise. My character has been referred to. My character, as far as the workers are concerned, is best expressed by the feeling the workers have towards me. I know what that feeling is, and so do hon. members. They know that even when I occupied the position of Commissioner of Railways, although strict with the men I was just to them. And if hon. members had been fighting moneybags as long as I have been they would have some occasion to talk about character and stability of motives. So far as this particular question is concerned they are not a happy family on that side, because member after member has risen to counsel the member for Murchison

to withdraw his motion. I, at any rate, hope the motion will not be withdrawn, for I should like the people of the State to see how far Parliament is carrying out its duty, namely, to make wise laws for the governing of the people and to serve their interests in the best possible way. And if by any stretch of imagination or casuistry it can be made out that the debate on Tuesday night, and again this evening, conduces to the best interests of the State, then members on both sides of the House have to learn what the English language means. We spent nine solid hours in this Chamber on Tuesday night listening to attacks which, if I could only find words to express my opinion and the opinion other people have of them I should be pulled up on points of order so numerous as to make you go grey before your time.

Mr. Taylor: It is pleasant to know we can make you bite.

Mr. GEORGE: The hon. member does not know the ABC of the bite the member for Murray has when he starts. I do hope, if Providence spares me for a few years, the hon. member will have a closer knowledge of the modes and methods of the member for Murray than he has at the present time.

Mr. Collier: You should put that in book form.

Mr. GEORGE: The hon. member has been in the State for about five minutes; how much employment has he found for the workers out of his own pocket? Like others, he can talk very glibly as to what he is doing for the workers. What has he done for the workers?

Mr. Holman: He has done more than you have.

Mr. GEORGE: Now we have the member for Murchison, who has forced himself into a position in connection with the timber trade. If he would go among those timber workers he would not find a single one of the old hands who would say a word against me.

Mr. Collier: You had better put this in book form.

Mr. GEORGE: We have to educate hon. members when they stray over the fence, when they do not know what they are talking about. These are the gentle-

men profiting by the work of those who worked and slaved and built the country up before ever they came here. However, it is of no use going into these things. I can see that instead of amusing the hon. gentlemen I am only raising their dander which, of course, is a dangerous thing to do. I wish to say in conclusion that I trust the member for Murchison will not withdraw his motion; because if he does it will show he has put up a cock that does not fight, and I should like to see him, once he has entered the ring and bared his arms, and time is called, fight to a finish.

Mr. McDOWALL: In rising to speak to this subject I may say I feel quite convinced it is impossible to say anything out of order. The member for Murray has spoken about the time of this House being occupied for nine hours in discussing a great industrial struggle of vast importance to this community; he, on the other hand, has treated us to a dissertation in respect to the merits of his own character for the last half-hour. Now is that as important as endeavouring to settle an industrial trouble that is interfering with the whole community? I have not risen for the purpose of criticising the member for Murray or anything of the kind. I desire when I rise to speak to at least express what I mean and to do it as concisely as possible. I sincerely trust the member for Murchison will withdraw his motion. It is all very well talking about putting this to a division, but I do not think Mr. Moxon or Mr. Johnson are deserving of the notoriety or publicity this motion is likely to give them. I am sincerely sorry the matter was ever brought forward. I would let these people talk as much as they like, while I claim to have the right of speech as much as I like in this Assembly or at any public meeting.

Mr. Scaddan: You dare not do it in Hay-street when the tramway trouble is on.

Mr. McDOWALL: I shall be pleased to speak in Hay-street at any time I am requested in respect to the tramway trouble or any other trouble with which I am connected.

Mr. Underwood: Not to use your voice to the fullest extent.

Mr. McDOWALL: Yes, to the fullest extent of my voice if it would reach thousands of persons. It is not commensurate with the importance of settling this tramway difficulty, but if the organ I possess were capable of doing good in that direction it would be available, so there is no occasion to sling off as far as that is concerned. To come back to the subject, let me again repeat I trust the member for Murchison will not be prompted by the injudicious remarks of the Attorney General to push this motion. We are told by the Attorney General that he desires to conform to the usages of the House. We have had an instance this evening where we could not get him to conform to those usages until *Hansard* was actually brought into operation and quoted against him. That was most flagrant. We are told by the Attorney General that he desires to pacify things, that he desires to conduct the business of the House with decency and decorum, yet when we are speaking modestly and decently on this side of the House he interjects "get hold of the knocker and then run away." Is that conducive to conducting a debate of this kind with harmony and decency? If there be anything that would make me vote for the member for Murchison it is the statement of the Attorney General to that effect. But I do not think the question is of sufficient importance. I do not think that Mr. Moxon or Mr. Johnson should be honoured, or that the time of this country should be wasted on a debate that is not warranted. So if the motion is pushed to a division I shall be compelled to vote against it because it is not in accordance with what I call sound common sense. I sincerely trust the member for Murchison will not be egged on by the interjections from the other side.

Mr. Holman: I know what I am going to do; do not worry about me.

Mr. McDOWALL: I am sorry if the hon. member is pushing it.

Mr. Holman: You look after yourself.

Mr. McDOWALL: The hon. member is entitled to do what he likes, and I am

perfectly entitled to do what I think proper. In my opinion the motion is an improper one and can do no earthly good and is one that will give importance to people who do not deserve it. I have a perfect right to express my opinion in that direction, and it is my intention to oppose the motion.

Mr. PRICE: I have no desire to in any way aid in taking action which will prevent free discussion or comment on any action of mine as a member of this Chamber. I wish it to be distinctly understood that as I criticise so I expect to be criticised. It is unfortunate that we are not all of that cold, clammy, fish-like nature which can stand insult without the hot blood rushing to a man's arm giving it the desire to strike. I unfortunately or fortunately have been tutored in a school where a man resents an insult with a blow. I do not belong to that more, shall I say refined—it claims to be refined—class which can hurl forth its shafts of cheap sneers and resents the blow that should follow. I am not of that kind. I have to-night and previously on Tuesday night had barbs of sneers hurled at me by the Attorney General tipped with all the poisonous venom which he is capable of spitting forth, and I am expected to take them calmly. I say at once I am not of that kind. On Tuesday night I challenged the Attorney General with making a certain statement. Had Mr. Speaker asked for the records of Parliament then as he did to-night the unfortunate occurrence which has taken place this evening would not have arisen, because the records would show that what took place to-night is exactly similar to that which took place on Tuesday night. Denial was made on Tuesday night; but unfortunately for the credit of the House and unfortunately for the action of the Attorney General, the records were not called for. Had they been it would have been found that what was said to-night was exactly the same word for word as that which was said on Tuesday night, and which I asked to be withdrawn. The statement was then denied by the Attorney General.

The Attorney General: I do not think you will find it was denied.

Mr. PRICE: On Tuesday night the Attorney General said—

The Premier: That has all been cleared up; a withdrawal has been made.

Mr. PRICE: It has not been cleared up. I am speaking of Tuesday night at the start of this unfortunate occurrence. Whatever may have been said by Mr. Johnson or Mr. Moxon I say that they were encouraged to do it by the remarks of the Attorney General here on Tuesday night.

Mr. Seaddan: Which he denied.

Mr. PRICE: They have only repeated what the Attorney General said. I have said already that the fair criticism of these people or any other people I willingly accept. On the floor of this House where I have been always ready to bow to the rules of Parliament I shall never be found denying statements so as to save my face and get out of an awkward corner. We have had that spectacle from a Minister of the Crown; can we respect him?

The Attorney General: On a point of order. Is the hon. member in order in saying that? I certainly deny it.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the statement?

The Attorney General: The hon. member will, perhaps, repeat what he says.

Mr. PRICE: Here we find that cold, clammy, deliberate attempt on the part of the Attorney General to incite a member.

Mr. SPEAKER: All the Attorney General is asking is that the hon. member shall repeat what he said; personally I do not know what he said.

Mr. PRICE: He asked me to repeat something. In that cold, clammy, way of his, he tries to get me to say something which he will clutch at and then urge that it is a breach of the laws of this House and that I must withdraw. I have said nothing of an objectionable character, otherwise the Attorney General would have heard it.

The Attorney General: On a point of order. While I am unable to quote the exact words used by the hon. member,

the general effect was to accuse me of falsehood. He stated that I made a certain statement, then denied having made it, and had been compelled to admit that what I denied was untrue. Unquestionably the charge against me is one of falsehood. If I may be allowed at this stage to explain. The whole point of difference in regard to the words I used either on Tuesday night or to-night is this. Apparently, according to the statement taken down by the *Hansard* reporter, I said that the speeches of certain members were a direct incentive to lawlessness, and you, Mr. Speaker, speaking from your recollection of the circumstances, said you understood me to say that what I said was that the speeches of the hon. members had a tendency to incite lawlessness. I was under the impression when you said that at the time that it was the effect of the words I used.

Mr. Troy : Is that a point of order ?

Mr. SPEAKER : I wish the member on my left would behave himself ; if he does not I will name him. I cannot hear the speaker, and I am sure that the *Hansard* reporters cannot hear him either, on account of these continual interjections from that side of the House ; we do not hear them from the other side of the House. I hope the leader of the Opposition will try and control his party a little better.

Mr. Scaddan : I take the strongest exception to those remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER : I am continually appealing for order.

Mr. Scaddan : I am not prepared to sit here and be abused in that fashion. It is nothing more than abuse, and I take the strongest exception to it.

Mr. SPEAKER : The hon. member can take what steps he likes.

Mr. Scaddan : And he will do so, too.

Mr. SPEAKER : The member is perfectly at liberty to do so, but I will insist on having order.

Mr. Scaddan : You may insist, but I will not be insulted by anyone. It is an absolute insult to make a statement of that kind.

Mr. SPEAKER : The member can take what action he likes.

Mr. Scaddan : It was a most insulting remark to come from the Choir.

Mr. SPEAKER : If the member proceeds in that way I shall name him.

Mr. Scaddan : I have no objection, you can do so.

Mr. SPEAKER : If the member does not sit down I shall do so. The Attorney General is in order in going on speaking.

Mr. Collier : Any one is in order on that side.

The Premier : I would say at this juncture that we are beating air.

Mr. Price : Am I to be allowed to proceed ?

Mr. SPEAKER : The member sat down. The rules provide that when a speaker is in possession of the floor, he can remain so : and if a person rises to make an explanation he must do so when the speaker has finished. The hon. member sat down and allowed the Attorney General to go on with a point of order, then followed an explanation from him. I am bound to hear him.

Mr. Price : The Attorney General rose while I was speaking. He rose to a point of order, and I attempted to stop him, but you sat me down.

Mr. SPEAKER : You sat down yourself.

Mr. PRICE : The Attorney General demanded that I should repeat something, I declined to repeat anything for his information. The Attorney General will not find me quite as simple as that. What I was pointing out was this : that his cheap sneers, his poisonous venom hurled across the Chamber, which an ordinary hot-blooded individual can not stand, is the real cause of the unfortunate proceedings both on Tuesday and to-night. I know those sneers were, at one stage, directed personally at me. Why ? Because I stated the Attorney General had made a certain statement. Again I say he made it. He denied it and Mr. Speaker called for the records. It was proved he had made that statement, although he had denied it. It was proved in black and white, and we must be pleased that we have some independent officer making these records. Coming to what I said a few moments

ago, we found a Minister of the Crown making a statement "calmly and deliberately in my calm moments," and immediately afterwards, when challenged, he denied having made it, not denied it once, but like that man, that individual, who had, at all events, the pluck to go out and hang himself, denied it thrice.

The Premier: That was not the chap.

Mr. Holman: You are out in your Scripture.

Mr. PRICE: The same set of circumstances that occurred to-night happened on Tuesday night. I would like to know whether the Attorney General is prepared to rise in this House and say that the *West Australian* published a false report of what he said. We find that on Tuesday exactly the same thing occurred as to-night. It is because of these cheap sneers because—well, I will not go on with it, but because of the taunts hurled at members, the unjust taunts hurled by the Attorney General, that men such as Mr. Moxon and Mr. Johnson have been encouraged to make the slanderous comments they made upon members as appear in the report of the *West Australian*. I may say at once that I do not desire to give any more notoriety to Mr. Moxon or Mr. Johnson; they have had quite sufficient. They can comment upon my statements as much as they like. But I desire to take this opportunity of challenging the Attorney General to point to one word, one utterance, one statement in my speech delivered here on Tuesday night which can in any way be calculated to incite a breach of the peace. I was particularly careful to only express those things which I had seen, and I expressed them without comment, and because I did that, because I spoke about certain officers in a department which the Attorney General took under his wing that night. I am to be accused of inciting people to lawlessness and disorder. I shall never do that. What I say I say quickly. I can never sit down, brood quietly and deliberately, and build up those insults which have been hurled across this Chamber by the Attorney General, insults which only the privileges of this House protect a

man in making. It has been said that some men criticise others, and that they are always doing it. I admit I do, and I am prepared to take criticism like a man as long as it is just, fair, and reasonable; but insults I shall never take from any man, and it is because I have been insulted that I forgot myself and made use of an expression in your presence, Mr. Speaker, that I should certainly not have made otherwise. I hope now that this matter has been thrashed out, and it has been proved that the responsibility party for all this feeling is a Minister of the Crown, the matter will be allowed to drop, and that Messrs. Moxon and Johnson will not be given any more notoriety.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a personal explanation. It was objected to on Tuesday night that I had accused certain hon. members of using language which was a direct incentive to lawlessness. You, Sir, stated that while you considered those words were out of order, the words I used were "that the language of certain members had a tendency to incite the public to lawlessness." I was under the impression at that time that your recollection as to the actual words used was the correct one. To-day on reading the *Hansard* report of my remarks on Tuesday I found that I was reported as having used the words as first mentioned by me, "that the language of certain hon. members was a direct incentive to lawlessness." I accepted the report of *Hansard* as a correct one, and made no alteration in that report. The sole difference between hon. members who are accusing me of falsehood and myself is whether I said that the language of certain hon. members was a direct incentive to lawlessness or whether I said that the language of certain members had a tendency to incite the public to lawlessness, and with all due respect I submit the difference is as between "Tweedledum and Tweedledee." It is ridiculous, and would be foolish if I allowed myself to be indignant at charges of falsehood levelled against me when the only question at issue is whether

I used the word "tendency" or did not use it. When it was shown this evening on the evidence of impartial reporters that I did not use the word "tendency" or words to that effect, you ruled me out of order, and I unhesitatingly withdrew those words, obeying as I hope I shall always obey, the ruling of the Chair. I should not have made this explanation but it has again and again been imputed to me in the course of this debate from the opposite side of the House that I have been guilty of falsehood, and although coming from the quarter which it does, the accusation does not weigh very much with me, I feel that in justice to the colleagues with whom I am associated, and to hon. members on this side of the House, I should not allow an imputation of that kind to lie against me without making what I feel sure by all fair-minded men will be regarded as an entirely satisfactory explanation.

Mr. DAGLISH: I do not intend to speak at any length on this question. I rise merely to express the hope that the motion will be withdrawn. Personally, I do not think that Parliament has suffered any injury by the remarks made, and which are reported in to-day's paper. I do not think Parliament can ever suffer an injury in the estimation of the public by any remarks that may be hurled at it, and I think therefore it is quite unnecessary for us to vindicate the conduct of Parliament by using what in my opinion are the undoubted privileges that Parliament possesses. With regard to freedom of speech, I do not know whether it is right that we should have powers in this House greater than those possessed outside, except in so far as they are necessary to enable us to discuss public affairs. I myself always felt inclined to use the fullest freedom of speech long before I was in Parliament in talking of Parliaments and politicians, and always shall be inclined to do so whether I am inside Parliament or outside of it in the future. I always think that nothing but good can result from freedom of speech unless it develops into absolute and dangerous license. I do not know that Royalty has ever

suffered from attacks made at various public gatherings in every monarchy of the world. I am absolutely certain that in no British country has Parliament ever suffered from any of the attacks which have been levelled against it. Holding that Parliament has no need of defence against remarks such as the hon. member for Murchison has drawn attention to, I think if we adopted the motion we should be pursuing an unnecessary course, and should be implying that the welfare and standing of Parliament had been affected by the comments that have been read out. I ask hon. members is it worth while to take that position? With regard to any breach of privilege, if it represented an attack upon the dignity of Parliament in its capacity as representing the people, I would be the first to protest, but, with regard to the words directed against Parliament as a Parliament, or the members of Parliament collectively, or any section of them, I do not care which section it is, whether it is the section I belong to or any other, I should always regard them as so much idle wind which I respect not, and I hope the House in spite of any feeling that may have arisen in the course of this debate will deal with this question purely and simply *on its merits. I hope that Parliament will deal with it in a fashion that will best conserve the interests and dignity of Parliament; and I do not think the dignity of Parliament would be served by putting the two gentlemen named in the motion before a court to answer for the words they have uttered. May I conclude with an appeal to hon. members that it ought to be possible for us to discuss these matters without any very serious differences. There may be wide differences of opinion—I hope there always will be—but I do not think it necessary that the differences of opinion should be allowed to engender personal bitterness. I have risen in the hope that we shall be able to terminate this debate a little more happily than we have been able to carry it on at certain of its stages. I would urge the hon. member to withdraw the motion, seeing that he has achieved

his purpose and has replied to the remarks made, so far as he thought it necessary to reply.

Mr. TROY: I shall make but personal references, because I do not want to follow the lead set by the Attorney General in that direction. In regard to his explanation, the most extraordinary I have ever heard, I can only say I offer him my deepest sympathy. In the predicament in which he finds himself, a predicament that would overwhelm anyone else with shame, the Attorney General is endeavouring to remove some of the humiliation which is the result of his own action. And I can also sympathise with his colleagues, because the whole transaction must leave in their breasts feelings of the most painful character. In regard to the member for Murray, who is given to preaching in a fatherly fashion, we accept his biblical texts, the quotation and verse from the Bible which he always gives us; but let me at least remind him that there are other quotations. One which I have in my mind is not from the Bible but from a well-known writer. The member for Murray should lay it to heart. It runs, "The lady doth protest too much, methinks." Particularly does this apply when the member refers at great length to his own fine character, his noble bearing, his sympathy for the workers, and his strong humanitarian feelings. In regard to the question before the House the member for Murray expressed the opinion that the report is not an accurate one. I will admit it is quite possible for a newspaper report to be inaccurate; but there is no inaccuracy in regard to the very expressions used. There may be an inaccuracy in regard to the whole speech, but when we have statements so clear and definite as these, there can be no doubt about their accuracy.

Mr. Brown: The statements were too mild altogether.

Mr. TROY: It may be so. I can imagine that the hon. gentleman would have a fellow feeling for these people who are the chambermaids of the general boodling concerns in the State.

Mr. Brown: You would not exist but for them.

Mr. TROY: These people could not exist without the workers. The hon. gentleman himself is a living example of those who exist merely because the workers produce that which they exist upon. The hon. gentleman comes into this House with a free pass from the tramway company.

Mr. Brown: I ask for a withdrawal; that is absolutely untrue.

Mr. TROY: Well, he did have one.

Mr. Brown: I ask for a withdrawal.

Mr. TROY: I withdraw. I did not want to make any personal references whatever.

Mr. Brown: But you have made personal references; you said I had a pass from the tramway company. That is an absolute lie.

Mr. SPEAKER: You must not use that expression.

Mr. Brown: Well, the hon. member will not withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER: He has withdrawn.

Mr. Brown: I apologise.

Mr. Underwood: I protest. The member for Perth used the expression "absolute lie." He should be made to withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER: He has withdrawn, and apologised.

Mr. TROY: Rarely do I address a remark to the member for Perth, because there are in the Chamber others much more worthy of attention. With regard to Moxon, I agree with the member for Brown Hill that we would be giving this man, a notoriety hunter, a great deal too much publicity. Who is Moxon? He brought the blacklegs to Albany to fight the lumpers. By way of showing his deep sympathy with the workers he brought those blacklegs from the East to try to beat down the workers to degradation and poverty. This is the great commercial man who complains about commerce being dislocated. He claims to be a citizen of the State; what sort of respect can we have for a man of that character? I ask the member for Swan, an intelligent member with humanitarian instincts, what respect can we have for Moxon?

Mr. Jacoby: He is a very fine man.

Mr. TROY : A man who tries to bring down the workers by the use of blacklegs. I say we would be giving him too much attention altogether if we bestowed upon him the especial notice contemplated by this motion. I am not going to give him any such consideration, and I hope the motion will be withdrawn. When they want to say something in particular these men always go to places where they are among their own kindred, and where they can make all sorts of statements. If they go to a banquet they never allow another man to reply to them. They call themselves the masters of the State. As a matter of fact, what are they ? Moxon, if he liked, could go out of the State to-morrow without inconvenience. What has been his career ? From bringing blacklegs to Albany he went on to the Arbitration Court. I had to appear before him, I remember. He is a long, gaunt, bowelless man, and he always did his utmost to keep the workers in subjection. The Minister for Works knows that, because he, too, has appeared before him in the Arbitration Court.

The Minister for Works : He is a very fair man.

Mr. TROY : I agree that, according to the light of the Minister for Works, Moxon is a fair man ; but as one who always tries to get a fair deal for the workers I hold that Moxon is not fair—he is unfair. You can always judge a man by his appearance. For instance, the Minister for Works is a portly, good-natured fellow, while Moxon is a long, gaunt, hungry-looking man.

Mr. Monger : What about yourself ?

Mr. TROY : We could not be compared in the same category either. Let me say again the words in this report are very definite, but at the same time, knowing that this man is nothing but a notoriety hunter—I do not know Johnson, I know Moxon—knowing his character, I think it would be unwise to give him the distinction this motion if passed would give him.

Mr. BROWN : With regard to the newspaper report we are discussing, evidently it is a case of the cap fitting because it is worn. I think Mr. Moxon

was most generous in his criticism of the speeches on Tuesday night. I would like the member for Murchison, whom the cap evidently fitted so well, to give the same speech outside that he made on Tuesday in the House. He would probably be up for prosecution.

Mr. Holman : I will go anywhere you like and say it.

Mr. BROWN : It is a scandal for a man like the member for Murchison—

Mr. Holman : I will pull your nose quick and lively.

Mr. BROWN : It is scandalous for the hon. member to call an unfortunate sergeant of police a "white-livered cur" when the sergeant had no chance of reply. Can a man sink lower than that ? Is it Parliamentary language when an hon. member calls the police "white-livered curs," and is it not provoking a breach of the peace for an hon. member to say that if he received a summons he would tear it up and throw it in the face of the Attorney General ?

Mr. Holman : So I would.

Mr. BROWN : Is it not committing a breach of the peace ? Here is a so-called democrat who knows full well that he can come here and slander sergeants of police and policemen when they have no chance of retaliation. Can anything be worse than calling a certain member of this House a "tapeworm" ? Is that gentlemanly ? Some members laugh at that, but let them go to their constituents and their organisations and tell them the lovely language of "tapeworms" and "white-livered curs" they have been using in this House. Is it any wonder that gentlemen outside the House criticise actions and language such as this ? Is it not inciting a breach of the peace when we find the leader of the Opposition going to a public meeting where a woman advocated using weapons to bring things to a head ? I am certain also that if it had not been for the Fremantle model parliament citing Mr. Moxon to attend before them we would not have heard anything about this. I hope seriously after the absolute waste of time, not only on Tuesday night but to-night, we will force this matter

to a division and put certain gentlemen in the position where they ought to be.

MR. UNDERWOOD: After the heat that has been displayed in this discussion it would perhaps be well for some member to calmly and judiciously sum up the case. I do not agree with asking the member for Murchison to withdraw his motion; he can please himself in regard to that: but I think, when we consider it calmly, we must come to the conclusion that it was mistake in ever introducing it. I hold that we are giving too much limelight to Mr. Moxon, and we know there is not such a deal of limelight that we can afford to give it away. I would like to inform the member for Perth that on a public platform, and not under the privilege of this House, I have expressed the opinion that Mr. Moxon was a "canting, snuffing hypocrite." I did not take the privilege of expressing that in the House. I did it on a public platform. I hold further that we should give every liberty of speech so long as there is no harm in it, and I think Mr. Moxon should be allowed to utter his thoughts no matter how idiotic they may be. I also wish to say, just shortly, that we have one or two advantages from the fact that this motion has been brought forward. We have had for instance another of those many opportunities of hearing what a marvellous phenomenon the member for Murray is. The hon. member takes every possible occasion that comes before the House to tell the country and members of the House what an absolute marvel he is. Perhaps it would be of advantage to public interests if the hon. member would put that in book form and we could read it at home. It certainly is to an extent a little bit of waste of the public time for him to be continually telling us about the member for Murray. In regard to the Attorney General, I would just like to say that the hon. gentleman feels hurt at the way he is spoken to from this side of the House, but after all the Attorney General must bear this in mind that it is all his own fault. Members on this side of the House deal with those on the other side as they deal with us, and if the

Attorney General desires to fight, and desires to sneer, bounce, and bully, we will resent it. We are not going to cringe to the Attorney General. We are not going to show the white feather to him. If he likes that sort of thing I can assure him for myself and, I think, for almost every member of this side that we will meet him half way, and any time he feels inclined for a little bit of a dust-up we will be inclined to go over as far as the Table. I have little further to say except that I trust the House will now drop this question of Moxon as he has already had considerably more limelight than he is entitled to.

MR. HOLMAN (in reply): I have no intention of withdrawing my motion. When I take a step I am perfectly willing to stand by it. The main object I had in bringing the motion forward was to show the disgraceful tactics of the Government in connection with this trouble now upon us. Take for instance the position of certain members of this Chamber. Members of the Parliamentary Labour Party were standing in Barrack-street and can produce proof that they were taking no part whatever in any commotion in the street, yet we find the Attorney General has sent the Crown Solicitor to the police court to prosecute them. It is not prosecution; it is persecution. But we have seen it on previous occasions. On every possibly opportunity the Government in any part of the State have taken advantage of the whole of their officers to try to bring the workers down. On the other hand, when anyone who is a friend of Ministers commits a crime, even to killing a man, they allow him to go scot free. We had this in two instances recently. We had one man absolutely robbing the Mines Department, proved beyond a shade of doubt to be doing so, but no action was taken against him. The Attorney General was in office at the time. Another person shot a man; that man died; but this person was aided to get out of the country.

The Minister for Works: What has that to do with Mr. Moxon?

Mr. HOLMAN: I am only quoting this to show that on every occasion workers and members of the House are persecuted and not treated fairly, and that the Government have prostituted their power and done absolutely what was wrong.

The Attorney General: And some of your unions act in the same way.

Mr. HOLMAN: From the example of the Attorney General what can we expect from the department he controls? After the Attorney General's denial to-night, what can we expect from the police? For example, we heard a report read in the House the other night which was deliberately and wilfully untrue, as can be proved.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must withdraw that remark.

Mr. HOLMAN: I was referring to a report, not a statement by the Attorney General, a report which can be proved to be untrue by thousands of people. It was the report sent in by the police. We know well when the Crown Solicitor is sent down to take action in a petty police court case the Attorney General is dragging the office down to a very low state. Any Attorney General who countenances anything like that, in a case which on ordinary occasions is always conducted by the sergeant of police, is misusing his position. I am always prepared to take the responsibility of anything I do. No one can take harder knocks than I for I fear no criticism and it is immaterial to me. If I do wrong I am satisfied to bear to the full the results of it. I am not going to run away from the results of any attempt I make to protect the interests of the men. I have always done my best to protect those interests. I have brought this matter forward to show up those gentlemen who pride themselves on being the elite of the land, who egg the Government on at every possible chance so as to bring about trouble in industrial matters. They pose as commercial men. Mr. Moxon! What was his career in Queensland before he came here? Those who know his career will say he is not a desirable man to have in this State. We had an example of his conduct in Albany

when he flooded the town with blacklegs and scabs, and took away the living of the men there. We have heard a speech from the member for Murray in which reference was made to what Mr. Moxon had done in Western Australia. Others have been here just as long as that gentleman and have worked as hard and harder. Why does not the member for Murray give us the history of the "Black Goose" or Black Swan foundry; all about the scrapiron and things of that kind. I remember the reference to them in the old Chamber, and the fights the hon. member put up against the Kingsmill-Leake Government, and how, after that fight, when the House got into recess, he was made Commissioner of Railways.

Mr. George: On a point of order. The hon. member is making some charge against me in connection with the business I conducted here some eight or ten years ago. Let him state what he means.

Mr. HOLMAN: I say the hon. member was conducting the foundry which, at that time, was known as the "Black Goose" foundry.

Mr. George: It was nothing of the sort. It was the Black Swan foundry, and there was no geese except those people who did not deal with it.

Mr. HOLMAN: Then I mentioned scrapiron, which question was dealt with considerably at the time a certain Commission sat.

Mr. George: What is this scrapiron reference? Let the hon. member say what he has to say instead of drawing on his imagination.

Mr. HOLMAN: I will look it up.

Mr. George: Let him say what he has to say.

Mr. HOLMAN: I am justified in saying what I like, and I intend to do so until pulled up by the Chair. I will do as I please.

Mr. George: So far as I am concerned the hon. member will not do as he pleases. I claim the protection of the Chair, which I have the right to claim. Let the hon. member instead of making cheap sneers and running away, say what he has to say about the "Black Goose" or Black Swan foundry and scrapiron.

Mr. HOLMAN : I will say what I like and will quote from *Hansard* if I like.

Mr. George : I will not allow this to pass in this way. The member made a further statement to the effect that I had to fight the Kingsmill and Leake party across the House and, in consequence, was made Commissioner of Railways.

Mr. HOLMAN : I said I had heard the hon. member fighting against the Kingsmill-Leake Government and that after the fight, when the House got into recess, he was made Commissioner of Railways. I stated facts.

Mr. George : What does the hon. member mean ? Does he mean that I was bribed with the position of Commissioner of Railways ? Let him be a man and say what he means and not try and shelter himself.

Mr. HOLMAN : If I thought that I would say it in a moment.

Mr. George : Why do you not say it then, instead of insinuating ?

Mr. HOLMAN : May I be allowed to proceed, or am I to be subjected to this continual interruption. So far as I am personally concerned I do not object to the greatest freedom of speech either inside or outside of the House ; but I do object to a man of the Moxon type, who introduces blacklegs, trying to bring about reductions in wages. When I have an opportunity of exposing such men I intend to do so in order to let the people know those who are trying to govern the country and who have the Government behind them. We have heard remarks from the Attorney General. I would ask him whether he is connected with the firm of Lukin and Nanson.

The Attorney General : There is no such firm.

Mr. HOLMAN : I was informed there is, and I am sorry to have made a mistake.

The Attorney General : Why does not the hon. member verify his statements ?

Mr. HOLMAN : To get the Crown Solicitor to go to the police court and prosecute in a case like that of to-day is showing what steps the Government will take to bring about the downfall, if they can, even of members of this

House, without any reason. Then we had the member for Perth speaking. We know well the tactics he has adopted ever since he has been in the House and even before that. On every occasion when an opportunity occurs to put a nail into the coffin of any worker in Western Australia, he takes the earliest chance to do so. He referred to men who occupy the positions of secretaries of unions as if they are parasites. The secretary of a roads board is a greater parasite than any secretary of a union. The men we pay to be secretaries of the unions have done magnificent work for the men in the State, for they have compelled the employers to give an increased rate of wages. The increases we have secured during the last three years amount to £50,000, all of which sum went into the pockets of the workers. We hear members prate of the good work they have done, but always, instead of working for or assisting others, all their endeavours are devoted to crush the workers and try to bring them into a lower position, to degrade them. I have been accused of treating the Chair with disrespect by not having given the Speaker notice of the motion I am bringing forward. So long as the Standing Orders give me the privilege of bringing in a motion in the way I did I am justified in doing it. When I read in the papers of the statements made by these men I determined to bring the matter up at once, as I did not like to let it go over until Tuesday. I only brought it up in order to show what action the Government are taking, what they are prepared to do, and what class of men they are supporting. On every occasion the Chamber of Mines and the Chamber of Commerce obtain greater power over the Government of Western Australia than they should. When the interests of the men are concerned we hear no one on the Government side speaking up for them, but when the Chamber of Commerce, or the Chamber of Mines are affected in any way the matter is brought up at once, and one always sees representatives of those bodies seated in the Speaker's gallery, and sending in instructions to

the Government as to what course should be adopted. With regard to the action of the police last Thursday, I may say that I never saw more disgraceful conduct than that on the part of the police then. It was that which caused all the trouble in Perth last Thursday; men were arrested or summoned for doing absolutely nothing. That will be proved before the cases are finished. The statements made to the House were absolutely misleading, and members will bear me out that the sergeant of police who made the report was parading up and down the street on his horse for a considerable time. The statement he made that he did not knock anyone down was an absolute lie; I know that he did. And had I been there, even at the risk of getting two years, I would have taken action to defend my wife when he jostled her from the footpath with his horse.

Mr. George: So would anyone else.

Mr. HOLMAN: I defy anyone to state that I spoke one word which was disrespectful, or even hooted at any time on that Thursday.

Mr. Brown: Do you think it is fair for you friend Mr. Driver to sit on the bench when these cases were being heard?

Mr. HOLMAN: I am not Mr. Driver's keeper, and I think Mr. Driver is able to look after himself. We have heard of intemperate language being used on this side of the House, but what more intemperate language can be imagined than that used by the member for Murray, who spoke to-night of "pot-house piffle" emanating from this side of the House. Because some people have succeeded in getting together a few paltry pounds they look upon the ordinary working man with scorn. This is the kind of thing we have to put up with.

Mr. Monger: Go on.

Mr. HOLMAN: We have never had a sorer spectacle than the member for York, and I am sorry that I have stopped to take any notice of his interjection. It is not my intention to speak further on the motion, and it is not my intention to withdraw it. I have attained the object I had in view, and have proved that the Attorney General is not the man

who should be in the position that he occupies. If he takes such action as he has done what can we expect from those policemen who will be called upon to report in the near future.

Question put and negatived on the voices.

An Explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before we separate I desire to make a brief explanation. Inadvertently I may have hurt the feelings of the leader of the Opposition when I said to him earlier in the evening that he might better control the party on his side of the House, and prevent them from making so many interjections. Perhaps I may say at once I was not justified in saying that, or in asking him to control his party in that respect. What I meant to convey was that I hoped he would assist me during a heated debate to keep order and maintain the dignity of the Chamber. Certainly the interjections were more than usual, although, I am sorry to say, it must be admitted by hon. members that at all times interjections are too numerous in this House. I am sure members will agree with me that this is so, and that they come from one particular quarter. I have endeavoured to keep order as far as possible, and I do sincerely hope that the hon. member will not accept the remarks I made, or construe them into meaning that he has no control over his party. I trust that the hon. member being leader of the Opposition, will do his utmost to assist me in the arduous position that I am called upon to fill. I desire to add further that I want above everything, to be fair to all members.

Mr. SCADDAN: I may say at once, Mr. Speaker, that I appreciate your statement. Undoubtedly I did feel hurt at your remarks, and had I occupied this position for 12 months instead of only a few weeks. I would not have taken so much notice. But under the circumstances, seeing that I have been leader of the Opposition for such a short time, it was hardly likely to expect me to attempt to show a high hand over members on this side. I am and always have been, prepared to support you, Mr. Speaker, in

your rulings, and I do not desire it to be understood that I will be found wanting at any time in assisting you to carry out your duties. I am very grateful for the statement you have made.

House adjourned at 11-55 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 30th August, 1910.

Obituary: Hon. G. Throssell Page 549

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

OBITUARY—HON. G. THROSSELL.

The PREMIER (Sir Newton J. Moore): It was only a few weeks ago that from my place in the House I moved that a message of condolence be forwarded to the relatives of a late member of the House and an ex-Minister. To-day it is my sad duty to ask hon. members to similarly extend to the relatives of one who, for many years, was a prominent member of this branch of the Legislature and who was also an ex-Premier, an expression of regret and sympathy on the death of the head of their family, the Hon. George Throssell, C.M.G. Mr. Throssell, who has been for so many years a leading figure in the public life of this State was born in Fermoy, Ireland. He arrived in the State some 62 years ago, at the age of eight years. He established himself in the town of Northam at the early age of 21 years, and immediately took an active part in all public matters in connection with the advancement of that district. At that time educational facilities were practically non-existent, and the first public work Mr. Throssell undertook was the establishment of a public library. Soon afterwards he became the prime mover

in securing a State school for the district, and later on he took an active part in having Northam declared a municipality. He became its first mayor, and for nine years occupied the chief magisterial position in that important municipality. On the introduction of Responsible Government in 1890, he was returned unopposed as member for the district, and represented that constituency until 1904, when he retired owing to ill-health. He was Minister for Lands from 1897 to 1901. During that period he initiated a progressive land development policy, and has left on our statute-book evidence of his work in that direction. On the retirement of Sir John Forrest he became Premier and Treasurer for a short time. His health having improved in 1907 he secured a seat in the Legislative Council, of which Chamber he was a member up to the time of his death. To-morrow it will be our sad privilege to pay the last honours to one whose name will ever be remembered as having been associated with Western Australia during some of the most momentous periods of its history, and whose services, distinguished as they were by patriotism and loyalty, will live long in the memory of his fellow citizens. I beg to move—

That this House desires to place on record its appreciation of the public services rendered to the State by the Hon. George Throssell, and to express its deepest sympathy with his family in the irreparable loss which they have sustained by his decease. That Mr. Speaker be requested to forward the foregoing resolution to the relatives of the deceased gentleman.

Mr. SCADDAN (Ivanhoe): On behalf of the members on this side of the House I desire to second the motion. I desire, also, that our regret, too, may be extended to the relatives of the Hon. George Throssell in the great loss they have sustained. I may briefly say that although members on this side of the House have frequently held political views in opposition to those of the late Mr. Throssell, still we have always recognised that he was genuine and earnest in his views and that his one object in political life was