

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 22nd November, 1916.

	PAGE
Papers presented	1052
Assent to Bills	1052
Ministerial Statement, conduct of business	1052
Select Committee Wheat Marketing Bill, extension	
tension of time	1052
Bills: Franchise, report stage	1052
State Salaries (Commonwealth Taxation), 1st	1074
Stamp Act Amendment, 1st	1074
Betting suppression, Com.	1074
Papers: Kimberley Cattle, Government Purchase	1052

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

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: 1, Annual Report of the Fremantle Harbour Trust. 2, Amended By-laws of the Claremont Roads Board under the Health Act.

ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills:—

- 1, Roman Catholic Church Property Act Amendment.
- 2, Adoption of Children Act Amendment.
- 3, Western Australian Day Funds.
- 4, Permanent Reserve.
- 5, Execution of Instruments.
- 6, Zoological Gardens Act Amendment.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT—CONDUCT OF BUSINESS.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [4.35]: I desire briefly to inform hon. members of the intention of the Government in regard to the conduct of the business for the next week or so. As most members are aware, the Prime Minister has convened a conference of State Premiers. This was to have met in Melbourne during the present month, but it was impossible for the Premier of Western Australia to attend at that time. The Prime Minister was deeply anxious that all State Premiers should be present at the conference. I think it will readily suggest

itself to the minds of hon. members that the matters to be dealt with at that conference are of supreme moment, not only to the State and to the Commonwealth, but probably to the Empire itself. At any rate it is considered essential, in the interests of Western Australia, and particularly its financial interests, that the Premier should attend that conference, and Mr. Wilson proposes to leave Fremantle next Saturday week. It is not the intention of the Government that Parliament should sit during the absence of the Premier. It is consequently our desire that, as far as possible, the business on the Notice Paper shall be dealt with during the remainder of this and the coming week. As to whether the session will be concluded at the end of next week, or merely adjourned until the beginning of next year, is a matter for subsequent decision, depending chiefly on the progress made with business in another place. It may be found necessary to ask hon. members to sit on one or two days additional to those appointed by our Standing Orders, and possibly to sit at an earlier hour. At present I do not propose to do this, but merely to ask hon. members to sit a little later than is our custom and to sit on Thursday night. It may be necessary to ask the House to suspend the Standing Orders in regard to one or two Bills, but that procedure will not be attempted unless absolutely necessary. I trust that, with the co-operation of hon. members, we shall be able to get through the business without unduly imposing on the time of hon. members.

SELECT COMMITTEE WHEAT MARKETING BILL.

Extension of Time.

On motion by Hon. J. M. Drew, the time for bringing up the select committee's report was extended to Tuesday, 28th instant.

BILL—FRANCHISE.

Report of Committee adopted.

PAPERS—KIMBERLEY CATTLE, GOVERNMENT PURCHASE.

Debate resumed from Tuesday, the 14th November, on the motion by Hon. J. J.

Holmes, "That the contract for the purchase of 12,000 Kimberley cattle for next season's delivery, and all papers in connection therewith, be laid upon the Table of the House."

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM (North) [4.40]: When Mr. Holmes submitted to me this apparently innocent motion, I quite agreed to his proposal, but I certainly was not aware that it would be attended with such dramatic results. I think Mr. Holmes has been a little premature in his action. What I expected would have been done was that, in the event of the House carrying the motion, we should all have had an opportunity of seeing the agreement. But previous to our seeing this agreement Mr. Holmes has made a very interesting and striking speech. It seems to me the better procedure would have been to carry this motion for the tabling of the agreement and so enable us all to see it, then to have framed a further motion in accordance with the opinions we might have formed from a perusal of the agreement. Under the circumstances I think Mr. Holmes's action was premature, because unless he has had an opportunity of seeing this agreement he must have been to a large extent presuming as to its contents. I cannot agree, either, that Mr. Holmes chose a good time for submitting a motion of this kind. I think, even if he had not been as friendly to the Government as perhaps he is, he could hardly have gone farther out of his way than he has done to gratuitously embarrass them. The Government are confronted with a great many difficulties. They have inherited some of the troubles, and therefore I think their well-wishers would hardly like to embarrass them unnecessarily. So I am afraid that, although I agree to a large extent with the action of Mr. Holmes, it was a little ill-timed. We have heard a great deal about a secret contract. Was it a secret contract? I have not applied to the Government to see the agreement, and I am not aware whether Mr. Holmes has applied, but the time for one to say it was a secret agreement was after one had been refused permission to see it. I have had no conversations with Mr. Holmes about it, so I am simply imagining what has taken place. I feel certain that if I had applied to see the contract the Minister would have permitted it, and I cannot think it is anything in

the nature of a secret contract. I absolutely disapprove of the Government purchasing cattle at all. I have spoken emphatically against any Government going into commercial enterprises; and the purchasing of cattle is a large industrial and commercial enterprise. I am not authorised to apologise for the Government in any way, nor am I in their counsels.

Hon. J. E. Dodd: You have made a pretty fair apology so far.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: I am going to try to make a better one. The times are so abnormal that some excuse may be made even for the Government carrying on a business in this way, which perhaps they are not favourably inclined to. We all know that during war time matters are abnormal, and therefore, in the circumstances, some excuse may be made for the action of the Government. My other argument is that this business is a legacy from the previous Government. We do not know how far the present Government may be compelled to carry on the business initiated by the previous Government. Perhaps, in the judgment of the present Ministry, this may be one of the best ways of doing it. Many of us who object to this class of business, or any other class of business such as butchers' shops and steamships, being carried on by the Government say, "Let the Government get rid of the cattle and the butchers' shops and the steamers straightaway." But if the Government were to adopt such an attitude, they would show very little interest in the welfare of the State. If they are going to get rid of these large enterprises involving many thousands of pounds, they must do it gradually. Especially in these abnormal times must they wait for advantageous opportunities of sale. It would be impossible to get rid of a large business such as the cattle business or the steamships or butchers' shops at a moment's notice. That being so, I listened with a great deal of interest and a great deal of pleasure to what I may call the historical statement of Mr. Holmes in connection with the cattle business and the steamships. I am quite certain that statement opened the eyes of a great many members of this House as well as affording them a very interesting two hours. Whether the statement was all fact, I am not in a position

to say; but I know a great deal of it was fact; and in the circumstances it was most interesting. But, so long as the Government continue to purchase cattle, there are three things which they must have—ships, shops, and paddocks. It is utterly useless for the Government to attempt to purchase cattle unless they are in a position to carry out the business fully. If they are not in such a position, they may find themselves crippled by being what is called “cornered.” I can give an instance of how easily people who do not understand the meat business can be tied up in a corner. For some years I have represented as managing director a very large company, which own as many cattle as three or four stations put together. Amongst the transactions I had on behalf of that company was the sale of some 600 or 700 bullocks to a firm in Fremantle. The cattle were sold from East Kimberley at so much per lb. fat meat delivered in Fremantle. These cattle were delivered in Wyndham in what would be called “meat condition” at the time. They were put on the boat, and owing to a hot trip and other causes their condition on arrival at Fremantle was such that the purchasers said, “They are not fat meat, and we will not take them.” After some negotiation, the purchasers agreed to take half the cattle as meat, and the other half were thrown on my hands. Hon. members may picture to themselves my position with 300 East Kimberley cattle at Fremantle, cattle infected with tick and in quarantine, which no settler could purchase as stores. The only purchasers, therefore, were two or three butchers, or people who could kill them and use the hides and as much of the flesh as possible. The end of the transaction was somewhat on the lines that Mr. Holmes drew the other day—instead of getting £4 per head as I had been getting for all the Manila business at Wyndham, I got £1 10s. at Fremantle. This incident shows that if the Government are going to purchase cattle at all they must, as I say, have ships, shops, and paddocks; otherwise they are at the mercy of the purchasers.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: They must have money, too.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: The Government have any amount of money. I

think Mr. Holmes, if he will not mind my saying so, has been a little inconsistent in his argument. First of all, he freely abuses the Government for dealing in cattle at all, and gives them thoroughly to understand that they do not understand the business and have been acting most unfairly in their purchases. Altogether the hon. member expressed the opinion that it was utterly inadvisable for the Government to touch the cattle business at all—an opinion which I share. But, in the next breath, Mr. Holmes freely advocates that the Government should continue the shipping business on the North-West coast. This he urges them to do, apparently without any reservation whatever. To show how thoroughly illogical the hon. member was, I may point out that he drew attention to terrible mistakes made with several ships by the last Government. He said the last Government ran the “N2” on the coast, and lost so many bullocks which were smothered, and did this thing and the other thing. So far as Mr. Holmes is concerned, I think we may safely claim that this is not a party House, because that hon. member first of all abuses the present Government for purchases of cattle and then abuses the late Government for the way they handled their ships.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I did not abuse them at all.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: I think the hon. member found fault. He said that the “N2” was run on the rocks, that in the case of another shipment some bullocks were lost on the voyage, and that another ship was run on a sand bank.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I explained what happened in 1913 and what happened in 1916, and I showed how the reforms came about.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: The hon. member contended that the Government ought not to conduct the cattle business, while he advocated that they should continue the shipping business. I contend they should not continue either. Personally, I object to all these State trading concerns. I can adduce another instance showing why the Government should not enter into the cattle business at all. The meat business, like most businesses, requires expert knowledge. During the time I was connected with a cer-

tain company I was informed that an agreement had been made in England between the Government of Western Australia—which, I believe, was then a Labour Government—and the company I represented for the purchase of a large number of cattle. These cattle were, I think, to average 600lbs. delivered at Wyndham. That circumstance shows that my company did a silly thing since it meant picking out the largest and best of the cattle and leaving the rest. The Government in order to protect themselves said, "If these cattle on reaching Wyndham do not average 600lbs. we will reduce the price and pay you for them according to what they weigh." That sounded a perfectly fair condition to protect the Government. But, fortunately for the company, a condition had been inserted by the company that under no circumstances was delivery to be refused. The season was a very bad one, and the result was that the cattle instead of averaging 600lbs. averaged only about 500. The Government would be obliged to take delivery of the cattle at the proportionate reduction, with the result of being landed at Wyndham with poor cattle to bring here. The consequence would have been that the Government would be landing in Fremantle stores which would have to be quarantined. Thus it appears that unless people understand the business it is easy to get tangled up. The contract I refer to was a big contract; but, fortunately, the season being a bad one, the company as well as the Government were glad to retire from the bargain, and so very little damage was done. It is evident, therefore, that unless one has expert knowledge of these matters, it is most difficult to carry them out successfully. No Government can carry them out properly, because no Government possesses the expert knowledge. It might be said that the Government could get a manager. But if one could get a manager to do a business as large as the Government will do, that manager would do one of two things—either he would run a business on his own account, or he would find a private employer who would pay him much better than the Government would. Mr. Holmes made a few disparaging remarks about a company with which I am associated, namely, Dalgety & Co.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: This is evidently a family affair.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: I think Mr. Holmes said that the company were running away from the coast like rats—like rats from a sinking ship, he said, in order to participate in high freights ruling elsewhere. The steamers in question did go away to participate in high freights elsewhere, but not like rats from a sinking ship. They had been discouraged in their business on this coast to such an extent by the interposition of Government steamers that they did not know where it was going to end, and consequently the owners of the steamers—not Dalgety & Co., because they are a firm who always have had the best interests of Western Australia at heart—naturally said, "As these large freights are offering elsewhere, we will go where there is a certainty, and not remain where there is only a chance." Dalgety & Co. used every possible effort they could with the owners in order to have the steamers retained on the coast. In the circumstances, however, the Government having come into the trade and having arranged freights at different rates—

Member: Could not those steamers have made more on the Eastern coast?

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: According to Mr. Drew, the "vultures" went away from the South Australian coast, where there was no opposition. I am not certain, but possibly these boats were commandeered by the Commonwealth Government to carry either troops or stores. I do not think the companies voluntarily abandoned the business. Of course, the opportunity which Mr. Holmes gave to those who are not quite in accordance with the line of thought that moves the present Government, was taken every advantage of by Mr. Drew, who made an admirable speech and put forward the best possible case from his point of view. There is no doubt it was his opportunity. Knowing as much as he did, the hon. gentleman gave a very interesting speech on the other side of the question. I know Mr. Drew fully recognised what a splendid chance he had. I gathered that from his frequent references to copious and carefully compiled notes. I am certain his case had been very carefully prepared. The hon. gentleman made some striking remarks, and

I congratulate him on the case he put forward; though, perhaps, reading between the lines, one might take a different view from his. However, I hope that I have done away with the idea in his mind as to the terrible "vultures," and that he will look upon the shipping company in question from a different aspect henceforth. I do not think I need take up the time of the House further on this question of the purchase of cattle. I feel confident that the interests of the country will be safeguarded from all I have heard. With these few remarks I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN (South-East) [5.1]: I had hoped that the mover of this motion would have contented himself with formally moving for a return covering the transactions of the Government in this matter. I think that both the Colonial Secretary and his predecessor (Hon. J. M. Drew) have taken Mr. Holmes far too seriously in connection with this motion. I look upon his attack on both the present and the late Governments' administration of the State steamships as a matter of animal spirits. He has such a superabundance of spirits as many of his colleagues might envy him, and in consequence it cannot be expected that he would fall into ordinary grooves. In his manner of dealing with this motion he reminds me of a schoolboy let out on a half-holiday, who on his way home comes upon plate glass windows in a new building, and who happens to find some broken brickbats near by. The temptation is too much for him. There is a fine window and a handy brickbat; and he throws the brickbat and breaks the window absolutely without any feeling at all but that of pure animal spirits. It would not have mattered to him whether they were Labour Government windows or Liberal Government windows; in fact I do not think it would have mattered had they been Holmes Bros.' windows—he would have broken them rather than waste the brickbats. Mr. Holmes, in the course of his remarks, led the House to believe he was favourable to the State Steamship Service; but it will be remembered that the hon. member very strongly attacked Mr. Drew's administration of that service, and even went so far as to waste a lot of money on a Royal Commission. Now he is recklessly attacking the present Ad-

ministration in the same way. Perhaps the hon. member has not done this entirely out of animal spirits. There may have been as another compelling force an ambition to show both administrations how they should carry on their business. That would only be a natural ambition in a man who knows all about the subject and who is not hampered with the actual administration, who has not the task of finding ways and means for meeting the difficulties of the occasion. I cannot for the life of me make out what is the matter with Mr. Holmes. He must realise that the present Government were left to carry the baby, ten babies, in fact, were left to them by their predecessors. And what were they to do; were they to kill off those babies without inquiry? I think the present Ministers have shown that they are opposed to competing as a Government with private enterprises in these trading concerns; but like prudent trustees of the public estate they have said, "We must investigate these concerns." And they are doing so. Doubtless there are some of them which it will be considered necessary shall be dropped, sold, or leased; but, for the time being at least, it may be wise for them to be carried on, and the Government, as trustees for the country, must carry them on. Surely this combined business of a steamship service and meat for the public is just one that no Government would be justified in at once putting a stop to. The Government were bound to carry it on for a time. But wherein has the Government left an opening for such a fine distinction as has been drawn by the Hon. Mr. Drew? In my opinion Mr. Drew missed a fine opportunity of rising above party considerations. He might have done this had he admitted that the Government had done only what it felt compelled to do in the interests of the country. Mr. Drew admitted that whilst this Government had purchased 12,000 cattle, the Government with which he was connected purchased 9,000 head last year. I had hoped that Mr. Drew would take up that attitude, but instead of that he has led the House to believe he is opposed to the present attitude of the Government. Although Mr. Holmes and Mr. Drew appear to be agreed on that, they show considerable disagreement on many points. To me it seems that the real objec-

tion taken is that the Government dealt with Emanuel Brothers to the exclusion of the smaller squatters. Emanuel Brothers do not come into the question. The Government bought those cattle, and they are now carrying them for themselves and not for Emanuel Brothers. Why should hon. members permit the public to be misled on the question? Mr. Drew said the present Government had turned down the old supporters of the steamship service and had accommodated men who were opposed to the service. The Government are not accommodating Emanuel Brothers, so far as I can see. The Government, as business men, found that the steamship service was not demanding a proper freight for the carrying of cattle from the North-West. And they found that the former patrons of the steamship service had been having a good time; they were paying a less freight than even Mr. Holmes said they should have paid. Mr. Holmes said the service lost £16,000 as a result from his firm and other firms; and because the Government have said they would not continue that rate but would demand a fair freight the Government are condemned. Where would the public be if the former customers of the State steamers refused to pay the increased freight and said "let the cattle stay where they are and find another market." The Government, we are told, have bought sufficient cattle to prevent depletion of the metropolitan market, and it is idle to say that Emanuel Brothers have been preferred before the old patrons of the steamship service. The Government bought cattle where they could buy them. I have no desire to follow the hon. member in every allegation of his speech in moving this motion but I do want to say that in this troublous time, when the Government have enough on hand in attending to the larger questions of the State and the Empire and in straightening out our financial affairs, Mr. Holmes would have very much better served the interests of the country had he formally moved for The papers and contented himself with that. I hope that even now Mr. Holmes will recognise that this is not a time for prolonging motions of this sort, but a time when we should get through the business of the country.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North—in reply) [5.11]: The speech of Sir Edward Wittenoom on this subject would have been amusing but for the fact that we have known the hon. gentleman for a number of years. He accuses me of having made a speech without first having seen the papers on the question, and immediately he starts out in the same direction himself, with this difference: I knew the subject I was speaking on and the hon. gentleman did not. He is not quite accurate when he says I blame the Government for purchasing cattle. I do not; my people are blaming me because I do not blame the Government for that. My complaint is that the Government bought all their cattle from one firm at one port to the exclusion of all the other shippers and growers in the North-West.

The Colonial Secretary: They did not.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I will prove it as I continue. Sir Edward Wittenoom has also referred to the position of Dalgety & Co. in the matter. Despite what he has said, I would point out that two of the four boats formerly running on our North-West coast have departed, and I think I am safe in saying that between twenty and thirty interstate steamers have left Australian waters for foreign parts. The Australian position has become so acute owing to the action of the steamship companies—and I am speaking with some authority—that the Prime Minister has ordered those ships back to Australian waters so soon as their present charters are completed. I stand corrected on this point, but I believe I am correct in saying that the West Australian Government have had an intimation from the Federal authorities that the "Kangaroo" should do service in Australian waters rather than trade in foreign parts. So much for Dalgety and the other steamship companies whose whole aim since the war began has been to neglect the North-West. Immediately the Premier announced the possibility of the Government parting with the State Steamship Service, however, the representatives of those companies fell over one another in their hurry to get to the Government with the object of securing the control of the service. The hon. Mr. Cullen has said that the only difference between the present contract and that of last year is that the Labour Government

purchased 9,000 head and the Wilson Government 12,000 head. That is not the difference at all. The real difference is that the Labour Government filled their own boats on the North-West coast with anybody's and everybody's cattle, and when they found a shortage in the market they employed the "Moirá" for one purpose alone, to bring down Emanuel Brothers' cattle. The Wilson Government, without knowing if these usual customers were to get any freight at all, or how they were to carry the cattle, made a contract with Emanuel Bros. for 12,000 head of cattle to the exclusion of everybody else, and at the time they made the contract they knew that the only freight they had was freight for 9,000 head of cattle—\$5,000 cattle on the "Kwinana" for Emanuel Bros., and 1,000 head of cattle on the "Bambra" which Emanuel Bros. would have had had it been any good to them. Why Emanuel Bros. did not want the "Bambra" was that she calls at all ports with mails and passengers. It is suicidal and madness to ship cattle in the North on a steamer that is calling at all ports and hung up at the wharves, which is the time when the damage is done to the cattle. If Emanuel Bros. had wanted the "Bambra" they could have had her too. The fact remains that the only space that the Government have got now that they can rely upon is the space for the \$5,000 cattle on the "Kwinana," which goes to Emanuel Bros., and the 1,000 on the "Bambra." Mr. Cullen talks about the Government not being able to get fair freights from the cattle owners, and said that they then decided to ship for themselves. I shall prove, before I have finished, that the Government never offered to carry any cattle. It is absurd for Mr. Cullen to discuss the position that the Government have had to do this because they could not get fair freights from other people. The speech that I delivered in this House the other night has been misconstrued and misinterpreted until one hardly knows where one is. I hope the House and the country will understand the position before I have finished. I did not attack the Government or make the abusive speech which is imputed to me. My speech was a plain statement of fact. The following transpired in connection with my refer-

ence to the Colonial Secretary. The Colonial Secretary interjected and said, "That is not so." Later on the Colonial Secretary said, "Do you suggest that I have any interest in the contract?" and I replied, "Direct interest, not in making the contract, but as a member of the Ministry. I hold the Colonial Secretary responsible for the act of his colleagues." That is all I said about the Colonial Secretary. Dealing with the Minister for Lands (Mr. Lefroy) the Colonial Secretary said I made an attack upon him. This is what I said about him and it is all I said. I want to show the inaccuracy of the whole speech of the Colonial Secretary. These were the words I used—I knew the Minister for Lands to be one of Nature's gentlemen, the soul of honour, and that a more upright man I had never met, but that he was out of touch with some of the 1916 business methods. What I meant to convey was that the Hon. Mr. Lefroy was one of Nature's gentlemen, that he was not in touch with some of the trickery of the nineteenth century, that I had known him for 25 years, that he was a man without guile, and that he was one of the most upright men I had met. And yet the Colonial Secretary has decided to stand up, and accuse me of making an attack upon the Minister for Lands. I am hoping before I sit down that I shall have some interesting statements to make. In my speech the other day I was skirmishing with blank cartridge, but the Colonial Secretary has given me an opportunity and he is now going to stand up to a frontal attack with ball cartridge; and if I do not shake the Colonial Secretary's political structure to its foundations before I sit down I am very much mistaken. I shall endeavour to prove that his doom is already written over his door, and that his political coffin is on the door-step, and that if he does not soon get out he will not have a decent funeral.

THE PRESIDENT: The motion is for the laying on the Table of the House of certain papers, to which the Colonial Secretary has assented.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Yes; but the Colonial Secretary in assenting to that has made insinuations concerning me.

The PRESIDENT: You have the right of reply.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Colonial Secretary said that I had acquired wealth by stealth.

The Colonial Secretary: On a point of order. I object to the hon. member making absolutely incorrect statements. I did not say that he had acquired wealth by stealth. I did quote the saying that is familiar to you, Sir, and probably to members of the House generally, that the hon. member had done good by stealth without blushing to find it fame. I did not suggest that he had acquired wealth by stealth.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: A very nice phrase.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Yes. It has been said that some men were born for great things, and some for small; but some it is not recorded why they were born at all. I do not apply that to the Colonial Secretary. I believe he was born to make inaccurate statements. I should use stronger words if the rules of the House permitted, and I shall show that I should be justified in using stronger words if the rules of the House permitted. The Colonial Secretary started out to fool everyone. That is an impossible proposition. He has fooled some of the people in the State all the time, and has fooled some of them some of the time. He has shifted from his irresponsible position to one of responsibility, and he has started out to fool all the people all the time. He is going to meet his Waterloo before very long, if indeed he has not done so already. I propose to show that the secret contract for the purchase of 12,000 head of cattle delivered at Derby from Emanuel Bros. at approximately a cost of £200,000—

Hon. G. J. G. W. Miles: Payable 30 days after delivery at Fremantle.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Monopolises 90 per cent. of the State Steamship freights to the exclusion of all other ports and all other shipping. It was made without the knowledge of the Colonial Secretary who is supposed to control the State Steamship Service. It was I who first informed the Colonial Secretary that such was the case. That proves what the leader of the Government thinks of his hon. colleague sitting opposite. The Government entered into a contract for 12,000 head of cattle at about

£10 per head at Derby, plus £4 10s. freight, approximately £200,000; they monopolised 90 per cent. of the freight that the Colonial Secretary controls, and did it without his knowledge or consent. The Colonial Secretary admitted this in his speech. He says, "I am inclined to think the hon. gentleman and his friends knew about the contract before I did." How did I find it out? The vendors were so elated with the contract which they had made and the way in which they had tricked the Government that they began to boast about it in the streets. The wine was in and the wit was out. That is how I found out about what I call this secret contract. It was thus that the secret contract became public property. I have already shown that the contract monopolised 90 per cent. of the freight presumably controlled by the State Steamship Service.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: What about the "Moirs"?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The "Moirs" they have not got. The only freight the Government have is the freight of 9,000 head of cattle. That is what the Government boats carried last year and that is all we presume they are going to carry next year, and yet 12,000 head of cattle have gone to one firm without anyone else being given a chance. Until now the firm in question, Emanuel Bros., have never shipped a bullock or a sheep by one of the State steamers. They have consistently refused to ship by that service. They have got their cattle down as best they could. All the other growers up there, however, patronised the State steamship service and yet today these people are in this plight—Emanuel Bros. with 90 per cent. of the freight and all other growers at all other ports with 10 per cent. That means about half a bullock for each port for each ship and there are no freezing works yet established there to enable the other half to be kept until the ship comes back. I propose to show that when I explained the position to the Colonial Secretary it dawned upon him the fix which the Wilson Government had got themselves into. By way of recompense for the service I was rendering to them, he immediately started out and had set a trap for me with the object of ruining my political career and silencing me as a critic of the

Wilson Government. The Colonial Secretary read a portion of the letter written by Holmes Bros. to the manager of the State Steamship Service. He read a portion of it to suit his own case.

The Colonial Secretary: All that I ever saw.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Then the hon. member had no right to make extracts or get anyone else to make extracts for him from a letter until he had seen the whole of the letter. I am going to read the entire letter and show who is stating the truth in the matter and who is not, and who is playing the game and who is not, in spite of all that Mr. Cullen says. This letter is dated 21st June last, five or six months ago, and it is addressed to the manager of the State Steamship Service, Fremantle. It is as follows:—

We understand that you are now ready to receive applications for space for the carriage of cattle from Northern ports to Fremantle for 1917 cattle season, commencing about the beginning of April next, and would draw your attention to the fact that before the State Steamship Service was inaugurated we, in reply to enquiries from the Government, offered to provide approximately 1,000 head of cattle per annum for shipment from the North-West to Fremantle if the Government decided to provide shipping facilities on the North-West coast. Last season we booked freight for approximately 1,000 cattle, 250 per trip for four trips "Kwinana" from Wyndham to Fremantle. You subsequently advised us that you had decided to cut out the first shipment (as our bullocks were the only cattle you had offering for that shipment) although you were legally and morally bound to lift these cattle; we consented to this shipment being abandoned, although we question very much as to whether any other shippers would have done so.

This is what the hon. member did not read—

This season we agreed to ship approximately 1,000 cattle on dates and shipments to be mutually agreed upon. You subsequently advised us as to the booking you had decided upon, and at a later date you advised that in order to meet the wishes of the manager of the Government

cattle station at Wyndham, you would be glad if we would grant you permission to transfer 250 of our cattle from the shipment to be made at the end of July to a shipment to be made on 7th July, and this we consented to do. At a later date you advised that you were 50 head of cattle short for this shipment of 7th July and we agreed to make up the number. At a subsequent date you advised us that some of the smaller owners had sold their cattle to Queensland buyers and were not taking up the shipping space that you had allotted to them, that you found upon readjusting your numbers and dates of shipments the only cattle left for the September shipment was our booking of 250, and as this was about one-third ($\frac{1}{3}$ rd) of the number required to fill the ship, it would not suit you to send the "Kwinana" to Wyndham (although you were bound to do so under our agreement) and in order to get you out of this difficulty we agreed to fill the whole of the space, provided the maximum number was fixed at 750; the weather being hot in September, it was agreed that this was the number it would be safe to put on this steamer. It was also agreed that we were to have the right to deviate the "Kwinana" to any non-tidal port on the run South to fill up any short shipment that we might have to make at Wyndham. At present we are not quite clear as to what number we will be shipping at Wyndham, but it would appear at this stage that we will be able to secure sufficient cattle to fill this steamer at Wyndham. We will advise you later upon this point. The foregoing we think fairly sets out the position as between the State Steamship Service and ourselves, and entitle us to assume that in the allotment of space for the 1917 season our claim for space for approximately 1,000 head of cattle will be admitted, and subject to rates and conditions of shipment being equitable you can rely upon us providing approximately this number.

There was a reply to that letter, but the Colonial Secretary did not read it. He merely read a pencil memo., which will play an important part in the discussion this afternoon. I have, I hope, shown that the Colonial Secretary was not a party to this

transaction; that it was done without his knowledge and consent. The Colonial Secretary did not quote Mr. Stevens' reply to my letter. I propose to quote it. Mr. Stevens wrote on the 27th June, 1916—

In reply to your letter of the 21st applying for space for cattle from North-West ports to Fremantle during next year, all I can say at the moment is that your application will be placed on record for consideration with others in the event of this service making contracts for the carriage of cattle next season. I have no doubt that if the service continues in existence you will be given your fair share of the space available. In regard to what you say as to the manner in which you have from time to time assisted me in arranging the itinerary of the ships, I am quite prepared to admit that you have assisted by meeting me at times in various directions.

I have already explained that the contract was made without the knowledge and consent of the Colonial Secretary. I am inclined to think that the contract was made by the Agricultural Department without reference to the manager of the State Steamship Service. That is a nice position to put the manager of that service in. It appears from the telephone message that when the Colonial Secretary discovered that his Government got tangled up in this contract he passed the information on to Mr. Stevens. It would appear also that Emanuel's representative having got the Government in the bag, the only thing left for the Government to do was to get Holmes Bros. in the bag also, and I am going to explain how I narrowly escaped. The first point raised here is that the Colonial Secretary tried to infer that Holmes Bros. had been offered freight at £5. This is what the Colonial Secretary said, and I can quote his remarks because I took a note of them. He is not the only one in this House who can write shorthand—

Is it to be wondered that the present Government, when they came into office did not know exactly where they stood in regard to this matter, but were very determined, whatever happened, that the blunders of last season should not be repeated.

I never made any suggestion of that kind. The Colonial Secretary went on to say—

I do not propose to search through the files, but I would like the hon. member when replying to tell the House if I do search through the files and I find any record of the honorary minister for State steamships suggesting an increase in the cattle freights.

Then I interjected—

Tell the House what I told you when you came into office.

The Colonial Secretary knows that I told him immediately he came into office that the freights for cattle on the North-West coast were too low. I interjected when he was speaking several times to tell the House what I had told him when he came into office, but he did not reply. The Colonial Secretary stated that Holmes declared that the people of the North never wanted cheap freights. On the 21st June Holmes Bros. wrote a letter, and in that letter quoted a pencil memo. written by the manager, Mr. Stevens, which read—

I discussed these matter on many occasions with Mr. Holmes and he told me that at £5 per head he would not ship.

See how the hon. gentleman evades the question. He allowed the House to believe that Holmes Bros. were offered and refused freight at £5. Freight was not offered and therefore it was not refused. If it had been offered, as the Colonial Secretary wanted it to be offered, it would have been a very indecent thing to do. Why should my firm be singled out as the firm to which freight was to be given to the exclusion of all others? It points to this fact, that when they discovered that freight for 8,000 of their cattle had gone to Emanuel Bros. they were under a moral obligation to Holmes Bros. and the only thing to do was to offer this freight to Holmes Bros. But they could not get the manager of the State Steamship Service to make this offer to Holmes Bros.

The Colonial Secretary: It was never suggested to him that he should.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Why was the hon. member so anxious about the telephone message which he says he got at the time? He was so anxious that he telephoned to the manager of the State Steamship Service,

"Have you fixed Holmes Bros. at five pounds a head."

The Colonial Secretary: That is pure imagination.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Then why did the manager of the steamship service make this pencil memo.? Presumably he had an idea that there was something doing at the other end and that he wanted to protect himself against the Minister. Why did he make the pencil memo. on the file? The Colonial Secretary wanted to know if they had got Holmes Bros. landed with freight for 1,000 bullocks, and he could not get the manager of the steamship service to do it. Mr. Stevens was in this corner, that he was trying to be loyal to his Minister and loyal to Holmes Bros. This is how he got out of the difficulty. Mr. Stevens wrote in pencil—

I have discussed these matters on many occasions with Mr. Holmes and he told me that at £5 a head he would not ship. He also told me that if the canning works were in operation at Wyndham it would affect the number of live stock to be shipped.

The manager of the steamship service knew that if he made an offer to Holmes Bros. the first thing to be asked was, "What about the other shippers"? The service carried 9,000 last year; how will it carry 9,000 this year? Mr. Stevens then would have had to tell Holmes Bros. what the position was. All he had at the time was the "Bambra," but he dodged the question and he ceased to discuss it with Holmes Bros.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Is that memo. of Mr. Stevens correct?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: All I can say is that I have no knowledge of the conversation. We discussed the matter, as I told the House, in season and out of season. I do know this, that on one occasion the manager of the steamship service said, "Are the new members of the Ministry friendly?" I said, "Yes," and he replied, "I thought so." I see the effect of that remark now; I did not see it then. I repeat that my firm had no opportunity of rejecting the offer.

The Colonial Secretary: Quite so.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Then why did the hon. gentleman introduce it into the debate and lead the House to believe that my firm

had been carrying cattle at a cheap rate and when offered an increased rate had refused? We stated we were prepared to carry 1,000 bullocks on equitable terms. The present condition is not equitable. I have said all along that £3 10s. freight is not enough, and in putting in our application for 1916-17 we said we would take 1,000 on equitable terms. The Colonial Secretary said the first decision of Cabinet was that the whole of the space available, after provision had been made for the cattle purchased from Emanuel Bros., should be let pro rata to other shippers at £5 Wyndham and £4 10s. Derby. It shows how much he knew about the subject. The only space they had was for 1,000 bullocks.

The Colonial Secretary: At that time it was not contemplated that the "Moirs" would be taken away.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Before I finish I shall tell how the "Moirs" was acquired and what it is going to cost the State. When he made that statement I remarked that that was news, and the Colonial Secretary has since said that I was not speaking the truth. The fact remains, the freight was not offered to anybody. Mr. Stevens would not offer it, because he had not the freight to offer. He had 10,000 cattle to lift for his usual customers, and 9,000 of his freight had been given away to a firm that had never carried a bullock. At all events, he did not offer the freight to me. If he had done so, as the Colonial Secretary suggests—

The Colonial Secretary: I did not suggest anything of the sort.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If the manager of the State Steamship Service had carried out the telephone message received from his Minister, Holmes Bros. would have—

The Colonial Secretary: I must object to the hon. member drawing on his airy imagination, involving telephone messages and instructions. I never sent any telephone message to the manager to trap Mr. Holmes. I was entirely unaware that that interview had ever been held, until informed of it by the manager. It was not by my instructions. The sole reason why the minute of Cabinet in regard to the booking of the remaining space was not carried out was

because at that moment an uncertainty arose as to the "Moirá" and as to whether the Singapore boats would carry cattle. There was no suggestion that Holmes Bros. should be treated differently from the others.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Colonial Secretary quoted that pencilled memo. and led the House to believe that my firm had been offered, and had refused, £5 freight; and he was so emphatic that he remembered the telephone message: and evidently the manager of the State Steamship Service also remembered it, because he made a pencilled memo. of it. I endeavoured to save the Government from the trap set for them, but they refused to listen to me. Sir Edward Wittenoom stands up and, in his airy manner, says "This is a time for peace." He does not know that I battled on this thing for a whole month, trying every possible scheme to settle the question and place my services at the disposal of the Government and the country; but on all occasions the Government refused to listen to me on this subject. The trouble was that they did not know how much I knew about the matter. They tried to silence me by landing me with the balance of the freight.

The Colonial Secretary: Nothing of the sort.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: What a nice position I would have been in as a representative of the North, trying to do the best for everybody, if I had taken the balance of the space. A nice position I would have been in, to the exclusion of everybody else. I endeavoured to save the Government from the trap set, but they refused to listen. When I first heard of the negotiations I started out to find the Premier, and waylaid him at the Palace Hotel. I told him all about it, but he would not listen; he had something bigger to attend to. I made straight from the Palace Hotel to the Colonial Secretary's office, but the Colonial Secretary was too busy to talk to me; he had to catch the 3.30 train to Northam. I showed the motion to the Colonial Secretary before I moved it, and gave him eight days' notice. I could get nothing out of him, for he persistently dodged me on the subject. When the Premier and the Colonial Secretary would not listen to me—

The Colonial Secretary: I am sure I gave you all the time there was before the train left.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I made up my mind I would let them blunder, and they did. The next interview I had was when I pulled up the Premier in the corridor. We there had quite a heated argument. He drew my attention to the fact that the Labour members were listening, but I said "I do not mind; it is the business of the country and they are entitled to listen." However, he got away without giving me much satisfaction.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: You have had quite an anxious time lately.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I have. I subsequently saw the Premier, who then admitted that the contract should never have been made, that it had got through without his noticing it. I have said that I would shake the political structure to its foundations, and I will do it. In extenuation the Premier drew attention to the papers round him, and said he was there trying to square deficits and he could not do everything. I said, "It is very true. You have a very hard job. But, while you are in the position of Premier, I am here to tell you that it is your duty to see that everybody gets a fair deal; and they are not getting a fair deal under this, because you are dealing with one firm to the exclusion of all others." The Premier had this parting shot at me which I had to take back to my people in the North, between Geraldton and Wyndham: The Premier said, "If we can find freight, we will bring down their cattle, but if we cannot find freight they can keep them." Since then he has turned on that and agreed to buy other cattle. The point is that the Wilson Government did not see the seriousness of the contract, the tangle which they were in, until I spoke in the House. It is not my fault. I offered to meet them, individually and collectively. I sent messages to them that I would meet them at any time, but they knew more about the cattle business than I did. The Colonial Secretary did not see the vital points of that contract until I spoke in the House. He now knows that they are tied up by a contract drawn by a clever firm of solicitors, but he did not know it until I spoke in the

House. He could have known it, and his colleagues could have known it. I am not going to sit down and see my constituents victimised in the way the Government proposes. It will be remembered that in moving the motion I finished my speech at 6.15 p.m. The House immediately adjourned, and the Colonial Secretary, in the most friendly manner, came to me and asked if I was going home. I said "Yes," and he volunteered the information that this was a bad business, and that if the officer who recommended the contract were in his department, he would deal severely with him.

The Colonial Secretary: I think you are drawing on your imagination again.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I know what I am talking about. The Colonial Secretary's only trouble was that the officer who made the recommendation was not in his department, so that the Colonial Secretary might deal severely with him. The Colonial Secretary quoted figures to the House, presumably compiled by the departments of Land and of Agriculture to mislead the Colonial Secretary and the House. I propose to read a copy of a letter I am sending to the Premier, demanding a reply.

The Colonial Secretary: What figures do you refer to?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I will tell you. The hon. member said, "It has been suggested that the hon. member's own firm purchased cattle at Wyndham at £4 5s., paid freight £3 10s., and sold those cattle at Fremantle at £14 3s. 8d., thus making a profit of £6 8s. 8d. I assert that that statement by the Colonial Secretary was compiled by the Agricultural Department, who keep all the cattle records, to mislead the House. I propose to show exactly how the House has been misled.

The Colonial Secretary: The statement was not so compiled.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The gentleman who made the recommendation for the purchase of the cattle, and who presumably supplied the figures to the Colonial Secretary, had the audacity to sit in your gallery, Mr. President, and hear the Colonial Secretary repeat the misleading figures supplied by the Agricultural Department. In order to prove that it is my intention to follow this matter up, I will read a letter I propose

to send to the Premier as soon as I have finished my speech, enclosing with the letter a cheque for one hundred guineas. The first thing I did after hearing the extraordinary announcement of the Colonial Secretary was to call in an auditor. I did that on the very next morning, and I put before that auditor the books of my firm for the last three years. I have here the result of his investigations. That result will show the Government where they are now, and where they are going to land themselves eventually in connection with these cattle. The Government have dabbled in the cattle business, at one hit, to the extent of £200,000. But they have not yet commenced the business. Very soon they will not know where they are. The figures I produce were compiled by Mr. Waugh, an auditor and accountant whom Sir Edward Wittenoom knows to be as capable a man on station books as anyone in this country. Next, I am going to ask the Premier to send the Auditor General to my office to-morrow for the purpose of checking the figures; and the cheque for one hundred guineas will be available for charity if the figures are not correct. The Auditor General can go into my firm's office to-morrow and impound my firm's books; and if he does not find the figures correct, the cheque for one hundred guineas can be donated to charity.

The Hon. Frank Wilson, C.M.G., Premier, Perth. Dear Sir, I enclose herewith statements showing profits arising from cost of cattle shipped by Messrs. Holmes Bros. for the years 1914, 1915, and 1916, from which it will be seen that Messrs. Holmes Bros. shipped by the State Steamship Company. In 1914 Holmes Bros. shipped four lots of cattle totalling 937, average net profit £1 10s. 1d. In 1915, Holmes Bros. shipped three lots of cattle totalling 737. Holmes Bros. re-sold two shipments totalling 486 cattle at an average profit of 4s. 3d. per head on the price Holmes Bros. paid for these cattle.

Hon. members will recollect that one shipment was cut out by the State Steamship Service. Holmes Bros., who knew the market and watched it, foresaw the danger and re-sold two shipments of these cattle—486 head at an average upprofit of 4s. 3d. on the price

they paid for the cattle. My firm foresaw complications arising at Fremantle from a glut in the market, and that is why they made that sale. The letter continues—

Holmes Bros. sold the balance of 251 cattle on their own account at a net profit of £2 4s. 6d. In 1916—

That was during the boom.

Holmes Bros. shipped three lots, totalling 1,311 cattle, at net profit of £2 19s. 9d. per head. In all, during 1914, 1915, and 1916, Holmes Bros. shipped and sold 2,985 cattle at an average net profit of £2 0s. 1d. I enclose herewith my cheque for a hundred guineas with the request that you instruct the Auditor General to forthwith examine my firm's books, and that if the Auditor General finds these figures are not approximately correct, you are to utilise this cheque for any charitable purpose you think fit. What I mean by "approximately correct" is that the Auditor General may compile his figures differently from ours, in which case there may be a difference of a few pence per head in the average net profit. Your prompt attention to this request will oblige, Yours faithfully, J. J. Holmes.

Hon. G. J. G. W. Miles: What was the first cost of these cattle?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I am glad the hon. member mentioned that point. The Government are paying boom prices for cattle. Previous to the war, cattle ranged in price from about £3 10s. to about £4 in the North. But the Government have put up the price to about £9 or £10, and they are going to increase that price by £4 freight, and then they are going to supply the people with cheap meat. I cannot give the cost price of these cattle in the North, but I will give the cost price of the cattle delivered here. The average cost of 937 cattle in the year 1914 was £6 15s. 6d. per head delivered at Fremantle. Not £14. The average cost of the 251 cattle sold in 1915 was £7 5s. 5d. For 1916 the average cost was £7 0s. 9d. On that cost of £7 0s. 9d. my firm made £2 19s. 9d. profit. And yet the Colonial Secretary comes here with figures supplied by the Agricultural Department, supplied by the officer who made the recommendation for the purchase of the cattle bought by the Government, and the hon. gentleman has the aud-

acity to tell the House that my firm made a profit of £6 8s. 6d. per head.

The Colonial Secretary: Are those figures for the one shipment wrong?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The figures I have given are for three years. I do not know about one single shipment. Surely the Colonial Secretary does not suggest that one can single out a special shipment and give the figures. I know nothing about the details. On one shipment there might be a loss of 100 bullocks, and on the next shipment there might be no loss whatever. The books are kept by an accountant, and he reports the profits for the three years as I have stated.

Hon. J. A. Greig: Did Holmes Bros. rear these cattle?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: No. Some of them came off a station in which Holmes Bros. have an interest. But Holmes Bros. had to buy from that station in the same way as from other stations.

The Colonial Secretary: Why did they have to buy from that particular station?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Because Holmes Bros. have only a half interest in that station. Surely the hon. gentleman knows enough about business to be aware that one cannot go on a station in which one has only a half interest, and take whatever one wants. Holmes Bros. have to treat that station the same as any other station. If the hon. gentleman considers that my firm bought cheaper than they ought to have bought, the position is so much the worse for him.

The Colonial Secretary: Have the other owners of that station participated in the cheap freight?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Not until this year. They thought the service too risky. They were far better satisfied to sell their cattle in the North. But now that the service has been reorganised and put on a satisfactory basis, now that there are practically no losses in connection with that service, the other owners have informed my firm that they prefer the cattle to be consigned for sale at Fremantle. The difficulty now, however, is that freight is not available; that is the position we are faced with. I have referred to the Colonial Secretary's action after I finished my speech in moving this motion. When I left the Colonial Secretary, it was

with the impression that he would come down to the House on Tuesday and state that the contract should never have been made. I honestly believed, when the Colonial Secretary left me, that such was his intention. But hon. members must watch events pretty closely. I made my speech on a Thursday. There was an issue of the *West Australian* on the Friday, with not a word from the Premier on this subject. There was an issue of the *West Australian* on the Saturday, but not a word from the Premier. The debate was to be resumed on the Tuesday. There was an issue of the *West Australian* on the Monday, and in that issue the Premier said publicly for the first time that I had put into his mouth words which he had never uttered and that the contract was a good one. That was where the Premier publicly pinned down the Colonial Secretary to coming into this House and putting up the fight which he has put up. Presumably the Colonial Secretary had been backing and filling. The Premier pinned down the Colonial Secretary by stating in that interview that Holmes had put words into his, the Premier's mouth and that the contract was a good one. The next morning, Tuesday, I put it to the Premier to tell me what words I had put into his mouth. I said that on getting that information I should know how to proceed. But the Premier retired from the contest. We have not heard a word from him on the subject since. However, the Premier put up the eloquent member of his party to plead the Government's cause in this House. Presumably the Premier told the Colonial Secretary, "When it comes to making contracts with Emanuel Bros. we are not going to consult you; when it is a question of running the State Steamship Service we are not going to consult you; but you are going to do something to justify your inclusion in the Ministry, and you are going to stand up in the Legislative Council and answer Holmes."

Member: The Colonial Secretary did it, too.

Sitting suspended from 6.13 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The next point I wish to refer to is to explain the reason why this Government endeavoured to beat

me as a representative of the North Province. I am satisfied it was due to the fact that they were not too clear as to their position in connection with the "Bambra," and I have no doubt it was the intention, of at least some members of the Government, that the vessel should be transferred to my firm. I should like to say that, in connection with that, and with several other matters connected with the North province, I could always secure an opportunity of discussing them with members of the Government. But it was not possible to get them to even discuss this matter. I went so far as to suggest that I should meet Ministers, either individually or collectively, and to show them the difficulty they were in, and to try to show them a way of getting out of it. But for some mysterious reason the Government was not prepared to discuss this question with me. For three or four weeks I endeavoured to solve this matter, without being forced to bring it before this House. In a state of desperation, pushed on by my constituents, who wanted to know what they were to do with their cattle next season, I moved the motion. I showed the motion to the Colonial Secretary, and gave him eight days' notice of it. I showed it to him on one Wednesday and moved it on the next Wednesday. As I say, in a state of desperation I was forced to move the motion, but I did not spring it upon the Minister. I showed it to him, and I told him that it was not to be a formal motion, but that I intended to discuss it. I told him this in order that he might be in a position to reply; and although I did all this to make matters easy for the Government, I am honestly inclined to the opinion that there was the deliberate intention of at least some members of the Ministry at all events, to push the "Bambra" on to my firm and so to get rid of me.

The Colonial Secretary: What grounds have you for saying that?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Colonial Secretary led this House to believe that my firm had refused to charter.

The Colonial Secretary: I did not.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: He led the House to suppose, covered up by a lot of oratory, that my firm was the only firm interested. The hon. member said, "The hon. J. J.

Holmes says he did not reject that offer." I reply that I had no opportunity of rejecting it. Even when I put the hon. member in that position, he said—

I do not suggest that the hon. member was in want of freight. My information was he was informed that it was the intention of the Government that the freight should be £4 10s. to £5.

It is a pity that the rules of this House prohibit interjections, because if I had had an opportunity of interjecting I could have put the Colonial Secretary in order then. After making the deliberate statement that my firm had refused freight at £5 per head, the Colonial Secretary says, "I do not suggest the hon. member refused freight." The Colonial Secretary admits that the information was telephoned to him.

The Colonial Secretary: I never admitted anything of the kind. The hon. member is drawing on his imagination.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Colonial Secretary said, "This is a memorandum made by the acting manager of the State Steamship Service, Mr. Stevens. The information was conveyed to me at the time." Now the hon. member says he does not know anything about it.

The Colonial Secretary: Is the hon. member in order in repeating a statement which I have told him over and over again is absolutely false?

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member is not in order.

The Colonial Secretary: I have told him over and over again that the Government never instructed Mr. Stevens to make any offer to anybody, that the Government had fixed the rate of freight and were not prepared to go further at that time, as matters were so insecure regarding the "Bambra" and the "Maira." The manager of the State Steamship Service, Mr. Stevens, informed me, not by telephone but in my office, that he had told Mr. Holmes those were the prices which the Government intended to charge.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Why did the hon. member lead this House to believe that my firm had been offered freight at £5 per head?

The Colonial Secretary: Nothing of the kind.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The hon. member did lead the House to believe that. It was the one point in his speech which was noted by Mr. Jenkins and Mr. Sommers. However, the country knows the Colonial Secretary and knows me, and I am satisfied to leave the decision to the people of the country. The next point I shall deal with is an attempt to bribe me, which was made on Thursday last, in the precincts of this Chamber. This House will know whether it was bribery when I have recounted the facts. And it was repeated at my office on the Friday morning. I propose to show that the Whip of the previous Wilson Government, Mr. W. B. Gordon, tried to induce a section of the Press, to use the pressman's own words, to "put the boot into Holmes."

The PRESIDENT: Has this anything to do with the laying of papers on the Table?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I claim it has.

The PRESIDENT: Very well, if you will connect it.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The connection between the laying of papers on the Table and the bribe lies in the fact that the offer made was for the purchase of my cattle, and it was made within the precincts of this House. I think I am entitled to deal with that aspect. On Thursday afternoon last, it was understood this motion would be gone on with, but, for some reason or other, it was not taken. Mr. Drew, who had the adjournment of the debate, was prepared to go on, and I was prepared to go on; but the House adjourned at 6.15 p.m. When I came here that afternoon I received a message that Mr. Lee Steere wanted to see me. That message annoyed me. I thought it was not right that Mr. Lee Steere should come into the precincts of this House to discuss a matter of business of this nature with me. That message in itself annoyed me, but I was much more annoyed a little later on when, passing along the corridor, I bumped against Mr. Lee Steere. He told me that the Government that day had decided to buy more cattle, and that he had come to me first. I replied that my office was the place to discuss matters of business with me, that I was here as a representative

of the North Province, and that on anything concerning the North Province he was at liberty to see me but on anything concerning my private business he should see me at my office. He said the matter was urgent, and that he understood I was prepared to reduce my number of cattle contracted for from 1,000 to 500. I told him I was prepared to sink or swim with the others, and when he asked me whom I meant by the others I told him I referred to all the other old clients of the State Steamship Company. The same gentleman came to my office on Friday morning. He had a huge pile of papers with him, and amongst them, he stated, was the secret contract with Emanuel Bros. and that he was prepared to do business on the lines of that contract straight away. My opening remark to Mr. Lee Steere was, "I have come to the conclusion that I am dealing with a set of dangerous men. If you have anything to communicate with my firm put it in writing." I also said that I had had sufficient of irresponsible statements and private interviews in the House, and that if he had anything to communicate with my firm he must do so in writing. He said his instructions were from the Minister, and that he was to fix the thing up at once. I replied that I questioned the wisdom, from the Minister's standpoint, of his trying to rush me into this business. He wanted to show me the contract which had been refused to this House.

The Colonial Secretary: The contract has never been refused to this House.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The hon. member had it here the other evening when he was dealing with this question, and immediately he finished he took it away with him and placed it under lock and key.

The Colonial Secretary: That is another imaginary statement; the contract has never been under lock and key.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Mr. Lee Steere wanted to produce the contract, but I refused to see it. I said I would see that contract on the floor of the House and nowhere else, that I would see it when everyone else had the right of seeing it. He left my office promising to write, and a couple of days

later a letter came in. I put it on one side, and told him I did not propose to touch the question in any way until the atmosphere had become clearer. I have already stated that I decided that my firm would sink or swim with all other people up North, that we would participate *pro rata* in the freight which was offering and would sell our cattle *pro rata* or stay out altogether.

The Colonial Secretary: That is the only offer the Government could make.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: My next point is that the whip of the previous Wilson Government, Mr. W. B. Gordon, tried to induce a section of the Press, to use the pressman's own words, "to put the boot into me." On Friday evening last the pressman called me aside and said "Watch W. B. Gordon." If he had said, "Watch Johnny Walker," or "Watch Jimmy Hennessey," I might have treated it as a joke, but he said "Watch W. B. Gordon." I replied, "What do you mean, what is the joke?" He said, "You know W. B. Gordon, the late whip of the late Wilson Government." I replied that I did. He then said, "He is in town trying to dig something up against you. He has been to me and told me that if we could find out anything he wanted me to expose you in the Press." Who was responsible for bringing Mr. Gordon into town I do not know. I know, however, that Mr. Gordon had not been in town for weeks but that last week he, together with another of the derelict supporters of the late Wilson Government, paraded round Perth on business bent and that business was evidently to dig up something against myself and "put the boot in." So far, however, they have not accomplished anything and I do not think they will. The next point is that the Premier and his shipping friends are annoyed to learn that the State Steamship Service is becoming a payable proposition and they realise that it is through my instrumentality that the service has been reorganised.

The Colonial Secretary: It is through the shortage of freight that the shipping has been unprofitable. It is on the "Kwinana" that the profits are made.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: We are talking about the shipping on the North-West coast.

The Colonial Secretary: They made no profits last year.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I propose to show that the North-West coast is a payable proposition and will be a payable proposition. The Colonial Secretary is up against the fact that in season and out of season he has told the House that there is no hope of the State Steamship Service paying. Now he has to administer the service which is bound to prosper and give results which were not anticipated. We know that the Premier has always been in sympathy with the private owners of steamship companies on the North-West coast. As soon as the announcement was made that he proposed to sell the State steamers all his shipping friends came around him like bees around a honey-pot. When the vacancy occurred in the North-West province, through the death of the late Mr. Pennefather, he put his own colleague, the Hon. Mr. Connolly, up to fight for that North-West province in the interests of private enterprise in the shape of steamship companies as opposed to the State Steamship Service. I went into the arena at a later stage as an advocate of the State Steamship Service and I was returned as a representative for the North. The State Steamship Service has served the purpose for which it was intended. Last year 18,000 cattle were carried from the North-West and the State Steamship Service carried 9,000 of them. The "Kwinana," which has passed out of the State Steamship Service into Emanuel Bros.' hands, carried 8,000 out of the 9,000. The "Kwinana" carried 8,000 cattle and she only lost 53. On the trips that she made to carry these cattle her average loss was two head of cattle for every hundred that she carried. Eight hundred wild bullocks which had probably never been in a yard before are rushed into the hold of a ship in four hours and rushed out again in four hours and one would expect more than that number to be killed in the scrimmage. Yet, the State Steamship Service which no one knew how to run, so the critics said, carried half of the cattle last year, namely, 9,000 head, and the "Kwinana" carried 8,000 of them and only lost 53. The action

of the present Government has made that service impossible. Nine-tenths of the freight of the State Steamship Service has passed into the hands of the one firm that monopolised the freight on the North-West coast for the last 20 years. I said at the onset that I did not blame that firm; they were in a position to pay for all the freight and they had the privately owned companies which would give them all the freights as a business proposition. The State Steamship Service was brought into existence to break up that combination, and the action of the Wilson Government has rendered the good effects of the State Steamship Service entirely neutral. No wonder the Leader of the Government instead of dealing with facts dealt with abuse as he did in his reply the other night. The bitterness of those opposed to State Steamship Service against me is due to the fact that I claim, and hon. members know it to be the case, that I was responsible for the reorganisation of that service on the North-West coast. In 1914, when the service was first started, on the first trip of the "Kwinana," coming out of Wyndham she lost 189 bullocks out of 800. Later in the same year the "Kwinana" was bumped on the Lacrosse Islands and stayed there for ten days. During that time the cattle were without feed and water and arrived in Fremantle almost skeletons. The Colonial Secretary talks about cheap freights on the North-West coast. It is not cheap freights that the people on the North-West want. What they want is their stock carried properly and at the right time of the year, and they want them carried in the best possible manner. What was the use of £3 10s. per head freight to a man like Mr. Dillon, of East Kimberley, who had been battling there for six years? In 1914 he had one hundred four-year-old bullocks worth £1,000 to any man. He shipped those hundred bullocks on the "Kwinana" on that particular trip. He paid £350 by way of freight and lost 69 bullocks. He landed 31 at Fremantle, and when he got his account sales from the agent he found that he had lost his hundred bullocks and owed the agent £122. What was the good of a £3 10s. freight to that man? What he wanted was to have his cattle carried properly. In spite of what the Col-

onial Secretary says my best services—and I know the business from A to Z—have been devoted to the reorganisation of the service, seeing how the cattle should be carried, with a result that the “Kwinana” carried 8,000 cattle last year and only lost 53. In addition, she carried 5,000 sheep, and made an additional profit of £500 on space which had not been occupied before, and space which I drew attention to in 1915. In justification of my firm I would like to say that when the “Kwinana” struck the Lacrosse Islands with 800 bullocks on board 250 of these belonged to Holmes Bros. I believe that something in the vicinity of £2,000 was paid to other shippers. There were two or three actions started in connection with that. So far as our firm is concerned, however, we did not participate in the distribution of that £2,000 to the extent of one penny. Hon. members may ask why we were so generous in the matter. I have been battling for the service since it has been inaugurated in the interests of the North-West. The Colonial Secretary can say what he likes. The few hundred pounds that my firm either made or lost in connection with shipping cattle from the North-West is a mere cypher. My firm is interested in the State from Wyndham to Albany. It is interested in the prosperity of the State, and we are not out to start actions against the State Steamship Service for mishaps which should not have occurred and which could be avoided in the future. Take the last trip of the “Kwinana” for last season. At the time there were no other bullocks offering but 250 on behalf of Holmes Bros. The ship is capable of carrying 750 bullocks, and if the Government had sent the ship to Wyndham—and Messrs. Holmes Bros. could have compelled them to do so—the most freight the Government could have got out of her would have been £1,000. When the manager of the service explained to me what the difficulty was my firm set to work and bought 500 head of cattle from nine owners, took them into Wyndham, and the State Steamship Service picked up £3,000 instead of only £1,000, and yet the Colonial Secretary has the audacity to stand up in this House and make these irresponsible statements which a responsible Minister ought not to make. The hon. gentleman has

one object in life. He started out on an impossible proposition, namely, to fool the people all the time.

The Colonial Secretary: I do not want to fool anyone.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I presume not. The fact remains that the leader of the House started out on a crusade of misrepresentation 18 years ago. It was on the 23rd September, 1898, that the following telegram appeared in a Kalgoorlie newspaper with these headlines—

Fight between Legislators—New Ministerial methods—F. H. Piesse gives the lie direct—They retire to back yard—A stand up fight watched by other members—The Minister had the best of it.

This took place 18 years ago.

The PRESIDENT: Does the hon. member think this has anything to do with the placing of papers on the Table of the House?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The position is this:

The PRESIDENT: I ask you that question. Every speaker must connect his remarks with the subject before the House. It is trying the patience of the House to go back to 1898.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Yes. The position is that I am entitled to prove that the Colonial Secretary, in his reply made erroneous statements regarding myself. In order to justify that, I propose to prove that he started out with this object in view eighteen years ago and he has not altered.

The Colonial Secretary: In order to do that you will quote a telegram sent by someone else and published in a paper in Kalgoorlie.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member may proceed if he thinks that this matter is germane to the question.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: There is a later wire in reference to the “mill” between Mr. Piesse and Mr. George in which it is stated that they fought for ten minutes and that Mr. George got the best of the encounter. The hon. member was turned out of the Press gallery for sending that telegram. Sir Walter James who was then member for East Perth had something to say on the subject and his remarks will be found in

Hansard of that year on page 1966. He said then—

The motion of the Premier might go a little further and see who this correspondent is. If it is any correspondent who is allowed to sit in this House or in the Press gallery, he should be kicked out and not permitted to enter again. . . . He is the person upon whom the responsibility primarily rests and if he is capable of fabricating deliberately a story so entirely untrue as this, because he happens to be associated with a paper which pays him a weekly salary, one never knows what he will not do, and the sooner he is removed from the gallery and told that he cannot come there again the better.

That is what transpired eighteen years ago and it forces me to the conclusion that the hon. member started out at that time with one object in life and that was to make irresponsible statements. Unfortunately for him, however, he has attained a position of responsibility now where he must be responsible for his actions. Still he blunders on in the same way. The Colonial Secretary in his speech boasted that my firm made money and he insinuated that I had made wealth by stealth and that I had put patriotism in my pocket. What happened was this: In 1913 when the State Steamship Service was inaugurated it was in a state of chaos. The Labour Government meant well but they had no experience. The privately owned steamship companies were delighted at the prospect of the State service going on the rocks. I saw that something had to be done to keep the State service going and that if the service went on the rocks Heaven help the people in the North-West. My firm chartered the steamer "Kwinana" and we sent her to the Eastern States to load stock. My firm made £1,400 out of the charter. We could have gone on making money, and ordinary people certainly would have gone on.

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: How very extraordinary not to.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I did what very few men would have done. I told the Press and the public exactly what happened and but for my interview which was published in the Press no one would have known what was going on. That exposure saved the State

Steamship Service. That was the commencement of the re-organisation of the service. A Royal Commission consisting of four gentlemen was appointed to inquire into what was said by one J. J. Holmes and they were to report to His Excellency the Governor.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: Were there two J. J. Holmes' there?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: No, there was one. The Chairman of that Royal Commission intimated at the last sitting that I had proved everything I had said about the State Steamship Service. The Commissioners, however, were never allowed to report. If they did report, the report was never made public. Not being satisfied with the course that was adopted I entered into correspondence with the Governor. I claimed as a loyal and free subject in a British community that I was entitled to a verdict from a Court which was specifically created to try me. After some correspondence with the Governor I believed I threatened to petition His Majesty the King from whom I was certain to obtain justice. I subsequently obtained the Governor's consent to publish the correspondence, but as the Chairman of the Commission had stated from the bench that I had proved everything, I felt that there was nothing to be gained by bringing His Majesty's representative into it. Therefore, I abandoned further proceedings. That is the transaction referred to by the Colonial Secretary when he talked about wealth by stealth. Coming to the point in the Colonial Secretary's speech wherein he referred to what I stated about the Wilson Government having conspired with cattle owners to make this last purchase of cattle good, the Colonial Secretary never denied that. He knows it to be a fact. I know that the Wilson Government are not anxious to make anything that the Scaddan Government did look good. Nevertheless they made that look good and the question that arises is, if they started out in conjunction with other people to keep up the price of cattle purchased by the Scaddan Government, what is to happen to their cattle which they propose to bring down next year and sell, presumably, at the highest price they can get. How will that fit in with the statement of the Colonial Secretary that he proposes to bring down this cattle and provide

cheap meat? The Colonial Secretary said that shortage of freight made it impossible for more than a portion of the requirements of the people to be brought down. We all know that. But my point is, seeing that there was a shortage of freight how is it that the whole of the freight was given to one firm to the exclusion of all the others. The Colonial Secretary said that the profits are going into the pockets of the pastoralists. What is the Colonial Secretary's action in connection with the representation of the agricultural community. Does he claim that the profits of the agricultural community are going into the pockets of the people? The Colonial Secretary has a Bill before this House at the present time, the object of which is to obtain for the agricultural community every possible penny they are entitled to get. I go further and say the Colonial Secretary in face of the falling railway revenue has been a party to making a reduction in the agricultural rates in order that the agriculturalists may make every penny they are entitled to; yet he comes into this House and makes an attack upon me because I attempt as a member of the North Province to stand here and try and see that justice is done to my people. The hon. member's position is this; he is endeavouring on the one hand to keep up the price of bread and on the other his Government enters into a quarter of a million contract to bring down the price of meat. He will bring down the meat, but I do not know whether he will bring down the price of it. That remains to be seen. The Colonial Secretary says these steamers should have made a profit last year. So they should. I have already dealt with that aspect and I propose to show that this year there is a handsome profit in the cattle business of the North and I think hon. members ought to know it. The "Kwinana" will carry 800 bullocks a trip. She will do the round trip from Derby to Fremantle in 12 days. There are no loading or unloading charges because the cattle run on and off. Before the war the "Kwinana's" value was £75 a day. I will put it now at £150 a day and assume she is a chartered boat. At £150 a day that comes to £1,800 for the trip. She will carry 800 bullocks at £4 a head so that there will be £1,400 per trip or £3,000 a

month clear profit during the next cattle season. The trouble is that the small people in the North will not be allowed to use the "Kwinana" because she has passed out of the hands of the State Steamship Service. The Colonial Secretary ridiculed the idea that some of the pioneers of the North would have to appeal to the Industries Assistance Board. The Colonial Secretary does not know them. The men I refer to are small men and under the State Steamship Service, when there were half a dozen big people shipping up North, the small men could sell to the half dozen people who were anxious to buy and there was competition in the market and a fair price was obtained for the cattle. Under the present arrangement however where one firm has all the space, that firm has a monopoly.

The Colonial Secretary: They have not all the space.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: They have the space for 8,000 or 9,000.

The Colonial Secretary: They have not.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Then the report in *Hansard* is not correct. It is stated that the space the Government have in the "Kwinana" is for 8,000, and that there is space on the "Bambra" for 1,000. If Emanuel Brothers get the "Minderoo" and the "Charon," they are capable of carrying about 3,000.

The Colonial Secretary: Five thousand.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: That is what the hon. member's advisers tell him. The hon. member will not listen to the representatives of the North who know exactly what they are talking about. The "Minderoo" and the "Charon" last year ran a trip to Singapore and a bye trip to Derby, two trips in six weeks. This year the itinerary is a monthly trip to Singapore. Last year the "Minderoo" and the "Charon" ran a trip to Singapore which took a month, and a trip to Derby which took a fortnight, and they carried 4,000 cattle.

The Colonial Secretary: They carried 4,318 cattle.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: This year they are going on a monthly service, and all that the "Minderoo" and the "Charon" can carry is 3,000. A peculiar thing about the contract is this: The "Moir" will carry 6,000, but if the "Moir" is secured she is to go to

Forrest, Emanuel, and in exchange for her the "Minderoo" and the "Charon" will be taken from Emanuel Bros. It is a lovely position for Emanuel Bros. to exchange space for 3,000 cattle for space for 6,000. How the Colonial Secretary, or any man endowed with common sense, could have been a party to such an agreement I do not know. The Colonial Secretary said the "Charon" and the "Minderoo" were already secured by Forrest, Emanuel for next year, which brings us back to the fact that Emanuel Bros. have had these boats for 25 years and have them again this year. But they are not satisfied. They are going to give these two boats, capable of carrying 3,000, to the Government, and the Government are going to give them the "Moirra," capable of carrying 6,000. It is an astounding state of affairs. The Colonial Secretary said that Emanuel Bros. are acting as agents for others. I have not seen the contract, but I would be surprised if there is anything in it proving that Emanuel Bros. are agents for others.

The Colonial Secretary: The people for whom they are acting as agents have told us so.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Colonial Secretary admitted that the Government should have bought cattle from other owners pro rata. Then he said the other owners would not sell. How could he know that, seeing that the owners did not know that the Government would buy? The contract was made without anybody else knowing anything about it. The Colonial Secretary said they were not certain as to the "Moirra" for next year. Moreover they were not certain as to the contingent liability attached to the "Moirra." Last year the "Moirra" was commandeered by the Commonwealth Government and transferred to the State Government on condition that the State Government gave a guarantee in respect of an indemnity. The same condition will apply this year. So hon. members will see the difficulties the Government are running the country into by handling these cattle. The Commonwealth Government would not transfer the "Moirra" to put into the cattle trade without an indemnity from the State Government. The Commonwealth Government have power to seize ships for war purposes, but can any-

body reasonably contend that seizing the "Moirra" for the cattle trade is seizing her for war purposes?

The Colonial Secretary: You are not blaming this Government for that, are you?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Minister knows the difficulties experienced last year, and he tells the House the Government expect the "Moirra" for next year. If they get her it will only be under a similar indemnity. The Colonial Secretary said the "Kangaroo" was unlikely to be brought into the trade, but that she would be available in case of mishap to any of the boats in the trade. I understand the "Kangaroo" is earning anything from £50,000 to £100,000 a year. Is she to be tied up at Fremantle awaiting a mishap to one of those other boats on the north-west coast? Does the hon. member wish us to believe that that is the proposition? What could the "Kangaroo," trading in foreign waters, do if any of these boats on the North-West met with a mishap? To be available for assistance, the "Kangaroo" must be tied up at Fremantle awaiting the emergency. One of the chief points I previously mentioned was that the Government have tied up all this freight to one firm. The Colonial Secretary did not deal with that charge at all. Again, I said the steamers would have to run direct between Fremantle and Derby, to the exclusion of all intermediate ports. The Colonial Secretary at the time shook his head, but in his reply he did not say a single word in rebuttal. This question of cheap meat for the public is all a myth. These cattle are bought at something like £10 per head and the Government take all risk of mortality. One important point not to be lost sight of is that tick has recently broken out in Derby, and will almost certainly be followed by tick fever, which will mean an immense loss. Tick has appeared on cattle in Fremantle, brought down recently. Cattle from Derby have died of tick fever in the southern districts here within the last month. The cattle are bought by the Government for delivery at Derby. The place where the tick fever will show itself is aboard the ship. Then the Government will discover another of the difficulties they are up against in con-

nection with this wonderful purchase of cattle, and will see further how difficult it is to provide the metropolitan area with cheap meat when the supply is 1,500 miles away. The House can judge from the audited statement I have read this afternoon what profit there is in the cattle trade and what the Government are likely to get out of it with an army of highly paid officials who do not understand anything about it. In spite of all that the Colonial Secretary has said, in spite of his inaccurate statements, I think I have proved that the Government have been tricked into a contract that never should have been made. Emanuel Bros.' representative, knowing the difficulties, and knowing of the tick outbreak and the serious loss likely to occur, has successfully manipulated things until the responsibility has been shifted from the shoulders of his firm to those of the Government. Couple that with the facts that Emanuel Bros. are in the position that they can sell their own cattle this year or keep them as they think fit, and they can buy other people's cattle at their own price, or leave them on the station. It has been suggested that the Government should repudiate their contract. That would be a fatal move. When I moved the motion I drew a distinction between Emanuel Bros., who I said were gentlemen of honour, and their local representative. I believe that if the Government were to approach Emanuel Bros., the firm would reduce their contract by one-half on the circumstances of the making of the contract being explained to them; but if the Government start out to fight Emanuel Bros. on that contract, they will find themselves opposed to shrewd business men. I have suggested that the Government should compromise in respect of this contract. I offered the suggestion to the Government before the House heard anything of the contract, but, as I have explained, Ministers refused to listen to me. It was in a state of desperation concerning my constituents up North that I moved the motion. I am prepared to meet the Government to-day, lay all my cards on the table, and if there is a way out of the difficulty my services are at their disposal.

Question put and passed.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

1, State Salaries (Commonwealth Taxation).

2, Stamp Act Amendment.

Received from the Assembly.

BILL.—BETTING SUPPRESSION.

In Committee.

Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair; the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1, 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Interpretation:

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: I move an amendment—

That to the definition of "Public place" the following be added:—"but shall not include a racecourse during the holding of a race meeting in connection with which meeting the totalisator is lawfully in use."

I have already explained in this Chamber the object of the amendment. It is practically an amendment of the Criminal Code; which forbids bookmakers to bet in any public place. The passing of the amendment will permit the bookmaker to bet on any racecourse where the totalisator is lawfully in use. The question of the bookmaker is not now before the Committee. Let hon. members disabuse their minds of that idea altogether. The Committee are considering now, not the future of the bookmaker, but the future of the great non-proprietary race clubs of Western Australia. Gambling by means of the totalisator is already legalised. I speak with knowledge when I say that unless the amendment is carried and unless certain legislation now before another place is amended, it will be impossible for the W.A.T.C. to continue racing on the present scale and the Kalgoorlie and Boulder clubs will absolutely have to close down. I make these statements with full knowledge of the facts, and from first-hand information. I have already pointed out what the W.A.T.C. have done, and goldfields members have spoken in the same strain in regard to the Kalgoorlie, Boulder, and Coolgardie clubs. I am sure hon. members will not wish to see such institutions as the goldfields race clubs absolutely closed, as must result from the passing of this clause in its present form. No doubt every member of the Com-

mittee agrees that there is too much racing, but that evil will not be remedied one iota by the abolition of the bookmaker. If people are allowed to bet only on the totalisator, the effect will be to shut up most of the non-proprietary institutions and to allow the proprietary clubs which give stakes totalling only £200 per day to race to the detriment of the genuine sport.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: But the hon. member's amendment will protect the unregistered clubs also.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: But my amendment puts all the clubs on the same footing. In the absence of this amendment, the big proprietary clubs will be placed on a better footing than the non-proprietary clubs. The Colonial Secretary has said that the Government have power over totalisator licenses. This statement is correct excepting as regards the W.A.T.C., to whom the Government do not issue a totalisator license. As regards the other clubs using the totalisator, however, the Government, if they are moved by a genuine desire to curtail racing, can give effect to that desire under my amendment, which expressly states that the bookmaker cannot bet on a course unless the totalisator is legally in use there. The Premier is able to say to all clubs which do not encourage the best class of sport, "I will allow you only such and such a small number of days." In this way racing can be curtailed. But that is not at present the Premier's idea. He has stated as much to the deputations which waited on him in this connection. His present idea is merely to obtain revenue from the totalisator. Unfortunately, he will not see that by crushing the clubs through increase of the totalisator tax he will kill his revenue instead of increasing it. The chairman of the W.A.T.C. has been referred to by the Colonial Secretary as having recommended before the joint select committee the abolition of the bookmaker. I myself cannot understand why the W.A.T.C. did not take action to contradict their chairman's evidence; because, evidently, that evidence expressed only his own personal feeling. His committee did not agree with him; in fact they are against him. I venture to say that 80 per cent. of the members of the club are also against him. To show how little value is to

be attached to the chairman's evidence in this respect. I wish to read a telegram which he recently sent to the Premier from Melbourne:—

Am to-day advised bookmakers to cease first December. You already know my views, but think it unfair alter existing arrangements till after Christmas. Considering club gave fourteen thousand pounds war funds in year 1914-15, and voluntarily gave course military force, which they are now occupying, and impossibility altering totalisator before Christmas, and that stakes for meeting fixed. I think present intended action Government will cause hardship to club and result serious loss. May I respectfully urge you defer action until Christmas meeting over?

That telegram is a direct contradiction of the chairman's evidence before the joint select committee. He realises that the club depend on the bookmaker to carry them through the Christmas meeting.

The Colonial Secretary: Because the totalisator accommodation cannot be extended in time.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: That reason is only subsidiary. The main reason was that the club had made arrangements for the Christmas meeting, but, as I have pointed out, other clubs had also made arrangements up to Easter. It was a selfish attitude to adopt to plead that the club be left alone till Christmas and the Government may do as they like after. Are not other clubs, who have made arrangements, equally entitled to consideration? The main object of the Government in this Bill is to secure revenue, and it is suggested that £15,000 additional would be raised. To do this it would be necessary that an additional £100,000 be put through the machine. I have shown how the Government can raise additional revenue by the taxation of the bookmakers, and I think it right that the Government should secure the required additional revenue in the form easiest of collection. The Criminal Code was passed in 1902 and was the first enactment rendering bookmaking on racecourses unlawful. From 1902 to 1916, under successive Liberal and Labour Governments, there has not been a single prosecution for a

breach of that section of the Criminal Code, although the law has been disobeyed Saturday after Saturday. And again, within the last two or three years, the Government have taxed the bookmaker as a bookmaker. They have called for his books and every betting transaction has had to be shown in the year's transactions, and if there has been a profit he has had to pay income tax on that profit. The law has recognised him as carrying on a lawful business. The Committee should deal with the Bill before the House, leaving the bookmaker out of the question entirely, and so amend the Bill that, instead of leaving the bookmaker's business in the unlawful condition it is to-day, make it a lawful business. And the Committee should consider those other clubs which have done so much in the interest of genuine sport.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I trust the Committee will not agree to this amendment. I am not surprised that Mr. Jenkins dealt with it at such length because this is really the critical feature of the Bill.

Hon. A. G. Jenkins: The whole Bill.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I would not go so far as to say it is the whole Bill, for I understand the hon. member is prepared to allow sufficient of the Bill to remain to enable the Government to collect some revenue. While I am opposing the amendment, I am free to admit that it would be preferable to legalise betting by Act of Parliament than to leave it in its present illegal condition. The hon. member suggests that the abolition of the bookmaker would be practically the closing up of the W.A. Turf Club and the certain closing of the two Kalgoorlie clubs. He has referred also to telegrams received from Mr. Cox. Mr. Cox, in that telegram, uses the expression, "You know my views," and in using those words he intended to convey the meaning that the Government knew of his views in favour of the abolition of the bookmaker. He urged that the decision to stop bookmaking on the 1st December be deferred until after the Christmas meeting, purely on the grounds that the club would not have time between now and Christmas to provide sufficient totalisator accommodation for the anticipated large increase of patrons. Mr. Cox's evidence before the select committee is explicit on the point of his favouring the abolition

of the bookmaker, and yet we are told that to-day the members of his committee and 80 per cent. of the members of his club are opposed to it! The committee sat for a month, and two weeks more were taken in the preparation of the report, and yet not one member of the Turf Club came forward to confute the views put before the select committee and neither, so far as my memory serves me, did a single letter to the Press appear objecting to the abolition of the bookmaker. We are told that the abolition of the bookmaker will entirely destroy the racing clubs on the fields. The select committee went to the goldfields and took evidence and the first witness examined, the president of the racing club, said that he did not consider the bookmaker essential, and that he saw no reason why the bookmaker could not be dispensed with. Another witness examined at Kalgoorlie, who was largely interested in the Kalgoorlie racing club in an honorary capacity, Mr. Cutbush, said that the totalisator was a fairer means of betting, that as a citizen he was in favour of the abolition of the bookmaker but as a horse owner, he was not in favour of it. The chairman of the club advocated the abolition of the bookmaker. A prominent member of the racing community, Mr. Cutbush, certainly did not suggest that the abolition of the bookmaker would destroy the club. We are told that the Kalgoorlie club would also have to close up if this contemplated action was taken. On page 40 of the report of the select committee the evidence of Mr. John William Fimister, the chairman of the Kalgoorlie club, shows that although he does not advocate the abolition of the bookmaker he does not suggest that the club could not carry on without the bookmaker. I assure Mr. Jenkins that the one aim of the Government is not to raise revenue. The Government would prefer not to get a single sixpence out of racing rather than the present excess in racing should continue.

Hon. A. G. Jenkins: That is not what the Premier says.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I know that is the Premier's view. I think from the point of view of the public who patronise the racecourses that the totalisator will entirely meet their needs. We find that in a vast majority of cases the totalisator gives

the investor a better return for his money than does the bookmaker. I was astonished to hear Mr. Jenkins say that the bookmaker would be satisfied with one per cent. whereas the totalisator makes ten per cent., and I find it difficult to reconcile these two different sets of circumstances. I trust that hon. members will agree that the present is the time when we should do something in the direction of suppressing the gambling evil, and that members will realise their responsibilities if they attempt to legalise the bookmaker.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: Mr. Jenkins knows that his amendment is to legalise the bookmaker. He also said that we had only to wait until we saw the result of the division. The hon. member has not said a word in support of his argument for the bookmaker. This amendment means the legalising of the bookmaker. Will Parliament take that responsibility especially at this time, and will it accept the principle that the bookmakers' calling is a lawful one? The arguments of the hon. member show how hard put he is to make out his case. I am in favour of racing as a sport, but not as an established industry, which is necessarily implied if racing is going to depend on some revenue to the owner and trainer through the bookmaker. I hope the Committee will not take the responsibility of legalising the bookmaker in spite of the hon. member's boast that the division will show.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: We are in a ludicrous position. Here are the Government masquerading as protectors of the morals of the people whereas, as a matter of fact, their only object is to get cash into the Treasury till. I desire to express my emphatic disapproval of the attitude of the Government in dealing with the measure. They take up an immoral attitude and at the same time legalise the totalisator.

The Colonial Secretary: It has been legalised for 30 years.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: That is highly interesting. If hon. members will look at the 1913 Statute, in Section 211 they will find that any house or room or any place whatever which is used for any of the purposes following, that is to say for the purpose of betting, is called a common betting house and any person who opens, occupies,

or uses any betting house is guilty of a misdemeanour and liable to imprisonment with hard labour for three years. The Government have the power in their hands at the present time to deal with this question. If it comes to a comparison between the bookmaker and the totalisator I think that the totalisator is a more immoral instrument than the bookmaker, and yet we are asked to support the Government in this Bill. I support Mr. Jenkins because it seems to me that he has a grasp of the position. If I have to choose between making bookmaking a lawful calling and making the totalisator a lawful institution, with the sole object of putting cash into the pockets of the Government, I shall not have the slightest hesitation in supporting the former. I have no hesitation whatever in telling the leader of the House that this masquerading of the Government as a protector of morals, abolishing the bookmaker, and legalising the totalisator is the most immoral proposal, so far as racing is concerned, that I have heard in this country, and I sincerely trust that no vote in this House will be given to support the totalisator, which is corrupting every section of the community, from the child of 15 or 16 up to the punter, who will put his money on the machine.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I take exception to the motives imputed by Mr. Cullen, when he referred to the question of lobbying in dealing with this amendment. I refrained from speaking on the second reading of the Bill, preferring to see what was brought forward in the way of amendments, and I can safely say that up to the present time no member knows the views which I hold in connection with the measure. The Colonial Secretary referred to the fact that the bookmaker is in evidence in New Zealand. I have been in New Zealand since the introduction of the existing law in regard to bookmakers, and I have no hesitation in saying that there is as much street betting going on in Christchurch during the progress of a big meeting as there is to be seen in St. George's-terrace, Perth.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh: That is not correct.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I have seen it with my own eyes. All I can say is that there is a tendency in the one direction, and that is that the legislation which we have been

called upon to consider of late is in the direction of making laws which are nothing more or less than a farce, and which it is impossible to expect the people to abide by. Unless the amendment is carried the Bill will rank with some of the legislation to which I have just referred.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: The amendment will receive my support. If Mr. Cullen is consistent he will have to put up a fight against the continuation of legalising the totalisator. The fact remains that we shall not be doing away with the evil if we abolish the bookmaker. The Colonial Secretary has quoted the evidence of members of the racing clubs on the goldfields. Mr. Fimister, in giving an unbiassed opinion, said he considered the present method was the best, that was, with the bookmaker and the totalisator, but when pressed as to which he would maintain, he said that if it came to abolishing one he would prefer to retain the totalisator. I remember on one occasion the Kalgoorlie Club received about £6,000 as commission from the totalisator, and when we consider that the fees from the bookmakers are considerably below that, it is natural to expect the president of a racing club to say that he would prefer to retain the totalisator. I am not particularly interested in racing, and I have not had my vote influenced in any way, but at the same time, taking everything into consideration, and particularly for the reason stated by Mr. Sanderson, if we view this as an evil, and if we are to have betting, there is no earthly reason why it should be altered so far as the racecourse is concerned.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I feel I must endeavour to correct the mis-conception in the mind of Mr. Sanderson in regard to the issue. The hon. member stated we were asked to abolish the bookmaker and legalise the totalisator. The Committee is not asked to do either. So far as legalising the totalisator is concerned, the machine was legalised by Act of Parliament in this State as far back as 1883, and so far as the taxation of the totalisator receipts is concerned, that has been in operation since 1905. This Committee is not asked to legalise the totalisator, nor is it asked to legalise the taxation of totalisator receipts, nor is the Committee asked to abolish the book-

maker. The Government merely say that if the Bill is passed it will give an effective means of suppressing street betting, and then the Government will put into operation the existing legislation to abolish the bookmaker.

Hon. A. G. Jenkins: You do not want this Bill to do that.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: We realise that. The Government realise it would be foolish to abolish the bookmaker on the racecourse, and permit shop and street betting to continue, both being infinitely worse than betting on the racecourse. That is the position. And the Government are impressed with this: That although the calling is illegal, if it has been carried on for a large number of years some intimation should be given before it is definitely suppressed; and the form of intimation chosen was to submit to Parliament a Bill that will do away with street and shop betting.

Hon. A. G. Jenkins: On moral grounds.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. member may sneer at moral grounds if he wishes. The grounds are that an enormous amount of money is being wasted by the community. The Government are firmly impressed with the idea that if the bookmaker is abolished and the Government are given control over racing fixtures, they will be able to save to the community a great deal of money that now goes into channels that ought not to be permitted. It has been said that the bookmaker must be popular or he could not exist. I think he does more than exist, that he lives very well indeed. And when he says to the Treasurer "do not abolish us; tax us at the rate of £100 per annum each," he gives the Government and community some conception of how well he really does live. Mr. Sanderson entirely mistakes the issue when he says the Committee is asked to legalise the totalisator and that the Government are asking permission to tax the totalisator and abolish the bookmaker.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: The Government in bringing forward the proposal to stop betting must be animated by one of two purposes, must be desirous of being the protector of public morals or, alternatively, of improving the finances. The contention of those who support the amendment is that from whichever point it be viewed the pur-

pose of those supporting the Bill in its entirety will be defeated if the Bill be carried. If it be as the Colonial Secretary intimates, the desire of the Government that public morality should be improved, I claim that any attempt to abolish the bookmaker will have just the opposite effect. Some control is exercised over bookmakers to-day, but if any attempt be made to abolish them, then according to Mr. Duffell and others we will have betting carried on secretly by a class of bookmakers new and altogether objectionable. In respect of the point of view of the Treasurer, we have the evidence of men who know much more about the matter than do the majority of members that the abolition of the bookmakers will put an end to good class racing and, so far from assisting the revenue, it will mean the destruction of racing. The committees of both the Kalgoorlie and the Boulder racing clubs are strong opponents of the abolition of the bookmakers, and they hold that to abolish the bookmakers would be to put an end to good racing in Kalgoorlie and Boulder; therefore, I intend to support the amendment on the grounds stated.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: To my mind, the remarks of Mr. Sanderson are perfectly logical. Certainly, he does not give credit to the Government for the high moral attitude they claim; but there is no offence in that, and no reason why the Colonial Secretary should say that those views are illogical. The hon. member carried his argument to a successful conclusion. The Government are trying to claim virtue in the totalisator whilst denying any virtue in the bookmaker. New Zealand and South Australia have been referred to. In South Australia a considerable section of those who frequent the racecourses are what are known as totalisator agents. Really they are bookmakers. Patrons of the race meetings, instead of scrambling around the totalisator window give their money to one of those agents, who takes it and pays the same dividend as does the totalisator. In almost every billiard saloon in Adelaide a book on the races is made. For the size of the population there is more betting through bookmakers in Adelaide than in any other city of Australia. In New Zealand the same state of affairs exists. There, after every race meeting, in-

numerable prosecutions follow for breaches of the betting law. Clearly we cannot suppress betting, and therefore it is much better to bring it under control.

Hon. J. E. DODD: I have not previously spoken on this Bill, but have listened carefully to the arguments advanced. I am unwilling to give a silent vote. Personally I have very little time for the bookmaker, whom I consider largely a parasite. I am willing to go as far as anybody in the direction of limiting parasitic influence at the present time. But it seems to me that the Government are not going about the matter in the right way. If they wish to limit racing and wish to consider the question of betting from the point of view of morality, there is an easier and a quicker way than this Bill available to them. Let them introduce a Bill to control racing. To my mind, it is an absolute scandal that at this time, when we are at death grips and practically fighting for our existence, there should be so many race meetings. I fail to see that this Bill will achieve its end. On the goldfields there are two very fine parks which, according to all who are competent to speak on the subject, will be shut down if the amendment is not carried. I feel compelled to vote for the amendment. If the Government would agree to make to the Kalgoorlie and Boulder clubs grants sufficient to keep them going, I should be inclined to reverse my vote.

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

Ayes	13
Noes	7
				--
Majority for	6
				—

AYES.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh	Hon. J. W. Kirwan
Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. C. McKenzie
Hon. J. E. Dodd	Hon. H. Millington
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. A. Sanderson
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. C. Sommers
Hon. J. W. Hickey	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. A. G. Jenkins	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. J. A. Greig
Hon. H. P. Colbatch	Hon. J. J. Holmes
Hon. J. F. Cullen	Hon. H. Carson
Hon. J. M. Drew	(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed.

Clause as amended, agreed to.

Clause 4—Power to enter and search betting house under special warrant:

On motions by the COLONIAL SECRETARY amendments were made as follow:—Subclause 1, after “money,” line 9, “and all instruments of betting” inserted; also after “cards,” line 9, “books” inserted; also to Subclause 2, the words “and may search any person found in the shop, room, or place” added.

Clause as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 5 to 8—agreed to.

Clause 9—Penalty on persons advertising as to betting, etc.:

Hon. A. SANDERSON: This clause provides that “no person shall send a telegram.” I wish to know what that means. What authority has this Parliament to prevent a person from sending a telegram? We often seem to be unconscious of the existence of the Federal Constitution, but I entertain objection to passing legislation which has no effect.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: No person shall send a telegram in connection with a betting-house.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Whether in connection with a betting-house or a baby, does not matter. Does the leader of the House consider that we have any authority or power over the Federal Post Office?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Mr. Sanderson has raised a point to which I have given no consideration previously. I think this Parliament has the power referred to, though that power may be somewhat difficult to enforce.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I hope the Committee heard the reply, that the Colonial Secretary has given no consideration to this question.

The Colonial Secretary: I said I had not previously given consideration to the point raised by the hon. member.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Quite so. I have called attention to the fact that this clause provides that “no person shall send a telegram.” Having raised that point, I am told by the leader of the House that that point as to sending a telegram has been given no consideration by the Government.

The Colonial Secretary: I did not say that.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: But I say so. This is a Bill introduced by the Colonial Secretary, and is, in the ordinary parlance, a Government measure. Surely even members of the Government in another place would be able to appreciate my point. We have the assurance of the leader of the House that the question has not been considered. I am putting before the Committee the position that this State Parliament is proposing to pass this Bill into an Act to prevent people in this State from sending a telegram, it does not matter for what purpose. That I claim is a matter under the control of the Federal Government and that this State Parliament cannot and will not be able to enforce this clause if it be passed. I ask the leader of the House if the point has been given consideration, and if not, why not? I am dealing with the question from a purely constitutional point of view and have no desire to misrepresent either the leader of the House or the Government.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I would remind the hon. Mr. Sanderson that the Bill was drafted in the Crown Law Department, and whether consideration was then given to the point now raised by him, I am not in a position to say. I shall submit his point to the Crown Law authorities and ascertain whether his contention is correct. As to the matter being within the province of the State Parliament, I take it the State can prohibit the sending of telegrams containing objectionable matter in just the same way as there is a restriction upon the sending of letters. The hon. member will realise that it is an offence to send threatening letters through the post. And while I do not speak as a lawyer, I do not think it is incompetent for a State Parliament to pass laws making it an offence to send telegrams containing certain matters.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: The point raised by Mr. Sanderson is an extremely important one and the question arises as to whether, if this clause be passed and a telegram contrary to the clause is handed in, by sending that telegram the Commonwealth authorities do not thereby become privy to an offence, against the laws of the State. The position which arises is whether the power may be taken under this clause by the State of ex-

exercising a censorship over telegrams despatched by the Federal Government. I am glad the Colonial Secretary has agreed to refer the question to the Crown Law authorities and feel the Committee is under an obligation to Mr. Sanderson for bringing the matter forward. All too frequently legislation is passed which is afterwards found to be inoperative.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: The clause has been copied from a Victorian statute passed prior to the inauguration of Federation, and it may be that the draftsman has not realised that fact. I am not prepared to say whether the State has any control over the sending of telegrams or not. I should be pleased to hear that the Colonial Secretary would agree to the postponement of the clause.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I deeply regret that Mr. Cullen's opinion on the constitutional aspect of the question has so totally failed to support my views, for he tells us that no difficulties whatever can arise in the matter.

On motion by COLONIAL SECRETARY, consideration of Clause 9 postponed until after consideration of Clause 15.

Clause 10—agreed to.

Clause 11—Powers of police to suppress street betting:

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: I move an amendment—

That Subclause (1) be struck out.

This subclause gives power to any member of the police force, without warrant, to arrest a person, bring him before a Minister of Justice and have him searched. This power is too great. It is giving too much latitude to any policeman, who can come along in the street and say that he suspects an individual of street betting and, without a warrant, arrest him and have him searched. The police have already sufficient powers in the matter of suppressing street betting under this measure without these particularly drastic powers. There are many persons who are in the ordinary way of business and who might be talking to a book-maker in the street, and a policeman could come along and treat them in this manner without a warrant. It will lead to a lot of trouble. I hope the Colonial Secretary will

not insist on the retention of this subclause in the Bill.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I admit that the subclause is drastic but I do not think street betting can be effectively dealt with without such drastic provision. At the same time I am prepared, if the hon. member will withdraw his amendment, to report progress.

Hon. A. G. Jenkins: Such a clause is not found in any other Act in the world.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is an extreme provision which we should not enact if it can be avoided. If, after consulting with the authorities, it is found necessary to have these drastic provisions, I will ask the Committee to give these extreme powers in order to deal with street betting.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: I will withdraw the amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 22nd November, 1916.

	PAGE
Papers presented	1082
Questions: Repurchased Estates, reclassification	1082
Perth Tramway Service	1082
Wheat Advances agreement	1082
Railways, Carriage of Goods Great Southern line	1082
Standing Orders Suspension, postponed	1082
Bills: Permanent Reserves Act Amendment, 1a.	1082
Sale of Liquor and Tobacco, 1a.	1082
Workers' Homes Act Amendment, 1a.	1083
Industries Assistance Act Amendment, 1a.	1083
Stamp Act Amendment, 3a.	1083
State Salaries (Commonwealth Taxation), 3a.	1083
Footwear Regulation, 2a.	1083
Land and Income Tax, 2a.	1083
Dividend Duties Act Amendment, 2a.	1085
Land and Income Tax Assessment Act Amendment, 2a.	1086
Treasury Bonds Deficiency, 2a.	1087
Entertainment and Retail Sales Taxation, 2a.	1087
State Trading Concerns (No. 2), 2a.	1085
Nelson Rates Validation, 2a., Com.	1113

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