

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 15th November, 1910.

	PAGE.
Papers presented ..	1448
Explanation, Marine Assessors' qualifications ..	1448
Procedure as to Urgency Motions ..	1448
Questions: Water Supply, Claremont ..	1448
Public Works, Departmental construction ..	1476
Railway construction, Boyup-Kojonup ..	1476
Upper Darling Range Railway ..	1476
Redistribution of Seats ..	1477
Papers presented ..	1477
Urgency Motion: Public Servants and Defence Forces, suspension of Prison officials ..	1448
Bills: Roads, Report of Select Committee ..	1477
Southern Cross-Bullfinch Railway, 2a ..	1477

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

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Minister for Works: Map of route of proposed railway from Southern Cross to Bullfinch.

By the Minister for Lands: Annual report of Woods and Forests Department for 1909-10.

EXPLANATION—MARINE ASSESSORS' QUALIFICATIONS.

The PREMIER (Hon. Frank Wilson): With reference to my answers to the questions submitted to me by the member for Albany on the 1st November, relating to nautical assessors, I regret that an error was, unfortunately, made in the information supplied to me by the department concerned, in regard to the term during which Captain McConnachy held a certificate as master. It appears that Captain McConnachy first obtained his master's certificate in Adelaide in October, 1869, and, subsequently, a master's certificate in London in August, 1883, so that he was the possessor of such a certificate for 41 years, instead of 27 years, inasmuch as the South Australian certificate was omitted. I make this explanation at the request of Captain McConnachy, who has written me on the subject.

PROCEDURE AS TO URGENCY MOTIONS.

Mr. TROY (Mt. Magnet): I desire to move the adjournment of the House on a matter of urgency.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not yet called for questions to be answered.

One question having been asked and answered,

Mr. SPEAKER said: I made a mistake in regard to the point raised by the member for Mt. Magnet; his notice to move the adjournment of the House should have preceded the questions on the Notice Paper.

QUESTION—WATER SUPPLY, CLAREMONT.

Mr. FOULKES asked the Minister for Works: 1, Has an analysis been made of the water supplied by the Claremont Water Works? 2, Does the Minister intend to lay on the Table of the House a report of any analysis so made? 3, What is the average temperature of the water when pumped into the Congdon-street tank? 4, Is the Minister aware that frequent complaints are made by users of the water that it is unfitted for domestic and gardening purposes? 5, Will the Minister cause inquiries to be made to ascertain if any steps can be taken to improve the quality of the water?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, Yes. 2, Yes, if so ordered. 3, Average temperature when pumped in, 103, Fahr. Average temperature when supplied for reticulation, 70 to 80, Fahr. 4, Some complaints have been received as regards action on delicate plants, but since the inception of the cooling plant, they have been very few. The water is identical in type, and equally as favourable to plants, as that used at the Zoological Gardens. 5, The water is potable, but further reservoir and cooling capacity will be added as the consumption increases.

URGENCY MOTION—PUBLIC SERVANTS AND DEFENCE FORCES.

Suspension of Prison Officials.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received notice from the member for Mt. Magnet that he desires to move the adjournment on a matter of urgent public importance, to draw attention to the suspension of two officers

and the treatment of a number of other warders employed at the Fremantle gaol. Those in favour of the motion being proceeded with will rise in their places.

Seven members having risen in their places,

Mr. TROY (Mt. Magnet) said: I desire to move the adjournment of the House to protest against the action of the Government in suspending two of the principal warders at Fremantle and threatening a number of others with dismissal. I regret I was unable to give the Premier that length of notice I would like to have given in ordinary conditions; but I understood yesterday that the member for Fremantle (Mr. Murphy) intended to move the adjournment of the House in order to have this very important matter discussed; and as he is the representative of the district, I was prepared to give way to him had that been his intention. However, I learned later on it was not his intention to move the adjournment, and I thought it desirable to move in the matter myself.

The Premier: The member for Fremantle was going to ask some questions without notice.

Mr. TROY: There may have been some arrangement on the part of the member for Fremantle in regard to his intention, and he may have preferred to ask questions without notice; but the point involved is of the utmost importance, and cannot be dealt with properly by asking questions, but must be dealt with by this House, as it affects an important principle and the interests of Australia generally. Trouble arose in the first place in connection with the suspension and dismissal of Warder Wise, who was employed as a warder in the Fremantle prison. I have on the Notice Paper a motion asking for the reinstatement of that official, and, therefore, I do not intend to discuss any matters concerning him, but at the same time I must, during the course of my remarks, make some reference to his case, because it has a distinct bearing on the recent action taken at Fremantle. It will be remembered that on the 19th October the Hon. J. W. Kirwan asked the Colonial

Secretary certain questions in another place; the questions were as follows:—

1. Whether the report was correct that Warder Wise, of the Fremantle prison staff, was dismissed for having disobeyed an order of the Comptroller General in refusing to sever his connection with the military authorities? 2, If there was any truth in the report, what were the facts? 3, Whether in view of the possibility of such a report creating doubt in the minds of Government servants as to the attitude of the Government towards those of them who have already joined or are desirous of joining the defence forces, would the Ministry give the assurance that the action of Government servants joining the militia or volunteers met with their warm approval? The Hon. J. D. Connolly replied as follows:—1 and 2, Yes, the exigencies of the prison service necessitated the Comptroller General of Prisons requesting the resignation from the defence force of two warders employed in the Fremantle prison as it interfered with their duties as warders. One of the two warders affected by the instructions sent in his resignation; the other, Warder Wise, though warned of the consequences, persisted in refusing. 3, Yes, provided such service does not interfere with their duty to the department in which they are employed. The Commonwealth Government, however, have recognised the difficulties attending the disciplinary staff of prisons, and the amending Defence Bill provides, *inter alia*, for the exemption from service of persons employed in the police or prison service, etc.

A further question was asked by the Hon. J. W. Kirwan on the 25th October as follows:—

1, Whether, in connection with the statement of the Colonial Secretary on October 28 that two warders employed in the Fremantle prison had been asked to resign from the defence force as it interfered with their duties and that one of them named Wise had been dismissed for refusing to resign, the Minister had noticed the following statement made in the Commonwealth Parliament by Senator Needham on Octo-

ber 19 and published in the *West Australian* of October 20:—"The man in question (Wise) had been employed as a warder in the Fremantle prison for three years and a half, and two years ago he joined the Australian Garrison Artillery. Sometimes he was on night duty and sometimes on day duty. When on the former he attended parades on Sunday afternoon, and when on the latter he attended parades one night in the week. During his period of service as a soldier he had not asked for one minute's leave to attend to his duties as a member of his corps. He was told by the prison authorities that the fact of his attending these drills and parades was interfering with his duties as a prison warder, and he was asked to resign either from the forces or from his position in the prison. Warder Wise declined to do either, in view of the fact that he had discharged his duties as a member of the Garrison Artillery during his leisure hours"? 2, Would the Minister secure from the Comptroller General specific instances of where Warder Wise's duties as a member of the defence force interfered with his duties as a warder? 3, What reply had been sent to the telegram sent by the Minister for Defence on 13th instant respectfully urging reconsideration of the case in the interests of the defence of the Commonwealth? The Hon. J. D. Connolly replied as follows:—1, Yes, I have noticed the report of the statement referred to, but it does not appear to have been made in connection with any statement of the Colonial Secretary. 2, His duties as warder were interfered with by having to be granted time off; to change duties with brother officers; and having frequently, whilst on night duty, required his hours of duty changed to enable him to attend to his military duties, which was unfair to the other officers, and naturally caused discontent. 3, Following is the text of the reply sent:—"Regret delay replying your telegram thirteenth. Warder Wise was requested to resign military forces, as duties interfered with prison duties. State Commandant

was consulted, and agreed without hesitation to grant free discharge, recognising nature of two duties must clash. See Section 77, amendment Defence Act. Wise was warned of consequence, but persisted in refusing, and was dismissed for disobedience of orders of the Comptroller General. In view of the section referred to, there appear to be no grounds for reconsideration."

That apparently was a very definite reply by the Colonial Secretary to the enquiries made by Mr. Kirwan. The statement was to the effect that the duties of Warder Wise as a member of the military forces had interfered with his duties as a warder and that his fellow servants had been penalised in consequence. That would have been allowed to pass had it not been that the warders at Fremantle were not made of the material that the Comptroller General and the Colonial Secretary thought they were, for, unlike many civil servants, they took a determined step and gave the following most emphatic denial to the answers made by the Colonial Secretary. The letter was written by a number of the warders at Fremantle and it is addressed, "To whom it may concern."

We the undersigned members of the Fremantle prison staff, enter our emphatic denial of, and protest against, the statement made by the Colonial Secretary in reply to questions asked by Mr. Kirwan, M.L.C. We also state: 1, That Warder Wise's military duties did not in any way interfere with his duties as a warder. 2, On no occasion did Warder Wise change duties with any one of his brother officers for the purpose of attending military duties. 3, On no occasion have Warder Wise's hours of duty been altered to permit him attending military duties. 4, No discontent existed among the officers concerning Wise's military and prison duties. 5, Warder Wise's military duties were at all times performed in his own time." The signatures attached to the document are as follows:—Geo. Dymock, P. W. David McLaren, V. Harmer, J. R. Whyte, H. S. Wisdom, A. E. Bates, J. O'Connor, J. Canavan, S. W. Fielding, T. J. Pinston, M. Frank, J. E. Gurney, J. Featherston.

A. Loveday, B. Hodges, P.W., H. H. Smith, G. T. Leslie, J. A. Harders, T. J. Bolder, L. S. Barlow, and J. T. Munro.

No person in this Assembly could take any exception to the warders having made that emphatic denial. It was what would have been expected from any honourable body of men because a statement, coming from the Colonial Secretary and going out to the country would undoubtedly mislead the people regarding the true position of affairs. I want to commend these warders despite the fact that their action has met with the disapproval of the Comptroller General and the Government, for the action they have taken in this connection. A great many officers situated in the same position would have merely said, "It is no business of ours and if we take up the attitude of disputing what the Colonial Secretary has said, we will have things made hot for us in the future." I am glad to say that the warders did not take up that position. They determined that no matter what the consequences might be they would put before the people of the country the truth with regard to the dismissal of Warder Wise. As a result of this action on their part we have another arbitrary and most tyrannical procedure taken by the Government through their officer, Mr. Octavius Burt, an action taken because the warders had the temerity in following the course which they did. The letter which they received from the sheriff is as follows:—

To Warder—. By the publication in the public Press of a communication signed by yourself and other warders as relating to matters connected with the business of the Fremantle gaol, you have rendered yourself liable to dismissal under gaol regulations 28, 29, and 35, and you are hereby called upon to at once place in writing anything you may have to say why you should not be dealt with accordingly. (Signed) Oct. Burt.

I understand, moreover, that this person, Mr. Octavius Burt, visited the prison and had the warders carpeted before him.

Mr. Bolton: Just like a lot of school boys.

Mr. TROY: Mr. Burt took them to task for their temerity in having disputed the replies given by the Colonial Secretary. This act on the part of the sheriff is reminiscent of old penal despotism, reminiscent of the convict days which it would appear are still with us, and apparently we have among us still a number of officials who adhere to the policy carried out by the administration during the time that Western Australia was a Crown colony. Unfortunately, too, we have the spectacle of a Government which, despite the progress made by the people in the State, has itself made no progress and adheres to these absurd regulations. I cannot see how the Government can be divorced from the action of the Comptroller General. It must be remembered the Comptroller General would never have had the courage to take action in suspending the officials had it not been that in the first instance in connection with the dismissal of Warder Wise he was backed up by the Colonial Secretary and the Government. There is no doubt about that fact. The fact that Warder Wise was dismissed proves that the Comptroller General was backed up by the Colonial Secretary and if further proof is required we have the answers given by the Colonial Secretary to the enquiries made by Mr. Kirwan and which, by the way, have been proved to be absolutely incorrect. Since then two of the principal officers who put their signatures to the refutation have been suspended and that is the position we have to-day. It is therefore to draw the attention of the House and the country to the existing position of things that I have moved the adjournment. The people of Fremantle, I am glad to say, have not allowed this matter to pass without some protest. A public meeting was held on Sunday afternoon, when the following resolution was carried:—

That this meeting affirms the right of every public servant to exercise his personal liberty during his own time, without official interference, and ex-

presses its sympathy with Mr. J. Wise in his unjust dismissal by the Wilson Government. It appreciates the manly action of the Fremantle prison warders in defending Mr. Wise against the unfounded charges and misleading statements made by the Government officials. It learns with indignation that these men are now being punished by the officials, and strongly urges the Government to arrange for an immediate and independent inquiry into the whole question. That copies of the foregoing resolutions be conveyed to the Premier and to the leader of the Opposition.

That motion was moved and seconded by residents of Fremantle and it was carried by a large majority; therefore it deserves the consideration of the House and hon. members, no matter on what side they may sit. What has been the attitude of the Government right through, and can the Government be held responsible for that which has occurred in the Fremantle prison? In the first place I insist that while the Colonial Secretary is a member of the Government, the Government must accept the whole responsibility. The Colonial Secretary placed an interpretation upon the Defence Act which Senator Pearce, the Minister for Defence, pointed out was absolutely incorrect. He pointed out that Warder Wise was exempt from service as a member of the Commonwealth defence forces because he was a warder employed in the Fremantle prison by the State Government. Senator Pearce points out that this is not so, that he is only exempt in time of war, and not in time of peace. As a result, there is no exemption, so far as Warder Wise is concerned, in regard to service in the Commonwealth military forces. Senator Pearce went on to say that he had made inquiries in the other States to see if the same attitude was adopted there as was adopted by the Western Australian Government. He learned that in Victoria and Tasmania no obstacle was placed in the way of warders being members of the defence forces; in New South Wales no general embargo was exercised, each case being considered on its merits, while in South Australia the question had never been raised. The Western Aus-

tralian Government, therefore, have apparently taken a course not followed by any other State Government, they have placed an embargo on these officers, a course which has not been followed by the Governments of the Eastern States. Now, if it has not been found necessary in the Eastern States for the respective Governments to prevent prison warders serving in the Commonwealth forces, then such a necessity cannot exist in Western Australia. Not only have the Western Australian Government taken up the attitude of penalising their employees for rendering patriotic service, but they have failed in courtesy to Senator Pearce, for they allowed his telegram to remain for over a week before replying to it. According to the Defence Act a private employer can be fined if he penalise an employee for serving in the Commonwealth defence forces; and while it may be difficult to penalise the Crown, I do not think the Western Australian Government should be exempt from all penalty in regard to their action in this case. At the bottom of the whole business lies a paltry spirit of parochialism and jealousy. It has been the common practice of the petty conservative Governments of this State, and other Australian States, to annoy the Commonwealth Government by a policy of pin-pricking in an endeavour to nullify the good work done for the defence of Australia. If I cared to continue I could recount a number of instances in which this Government, and every like Government, have adopted a parochial spirit and jealous attitude in regard to the defence work of the Commonwealth Government. Even in regard to the old-age pensions we know that an endeavour was made to involve the Commonwealth Government in difficulty, for the Full Court was appealed to in an effort to prove that the Surplus Revenue Bill was unconstitutional. Right through Australia we find, except in connection with defence matters, every petty conservative Government doing their best by a pin-prick policy to involve the Commonwealth Government in difficulties. Here in Western Australia, only in regard to defence, the Government, who talk patriotism on every occasion do their best to prevent the peo-

ple rendering patriotic service to the country, did their utmost at the last Federal elections to deprive the Commonwealth Government of money with which to finance their proposals; and in the same spirit they are preventing their officers from serving in the defence forces of Australia. They have done their utmost to dissuade their servants from joining the defence forces, and have even gone to the extremity of penalising them, as in the case of *Warder Wise* who was dismissed for standing up for a principle, and who should be supported by every member of the Assembly, and, indeed, all the people of Western Australia with patriotic feelings. A Government that would penalise their officers for engaging in any scheme for the defence of the country are not doing their duty by the people, and are not deserving of the support of members of the House. In Great Britain the territorial forces were much injured by the meanness of the private employer; but while the private employer in Australia is willing to allow his employees to serve, sometimes at considerable inconvenience to himself, we find that the Western Australian Government are the only Government penalising their officers for carrying out a patriotic duty. Should not a prison warder be given the same consideration as any other person? Is he to be expected to work 24 hours a day for seven days a week; is he to have no time in which he can, if he desires, engage in recreation, which in this case took the form of serving with the military forces; is he not to be permitted to serve with the defence forces, not to be entitled to the consideration given to every other person of the community, no matter whether a civil servant or a private individual? I contend it is very necessary that this matter should have the fullest discussion. It has already been discussed in the Commonwealth Parliament, and the attention of the people of Australia has been drawn to it. It is of vital concern to the people of the Commonwealth, for it affects a great principle, not only the principle of the defence of the Commonwealth, but the principle of whether a servant of the

Crown is a servant whose whole time must be at the beck and call of the Comptroller General; or whether, on the other hand, he is entitled to the same consideration as is afforded to every other individual. I insist that he should be entitled to such consideration, and that the Parliament will lay it down once for all that if the Government of Western Australia intend to penalise their servants and the people of the Commonwealth, the Parliament will not support that action for one moment. It is the duty of members to take action at once, and I hope they will not lose this opportunity of expressing their emphatic opinions regarding the attitude of the Government. If we have civil servants who, like the Comptroller General, put false words into the mouth of the Colonial Secretary, those officers should be punished; and if we have a Colonial Secretary who has not the backbone to punish those officers it is high time the Government asked for the resignation of that Minister, and put another person in his place who would see that the will of the people is carried into effect. If there is a Government to-day who support the arbitrary action of the Comptroller General in regard to the penalising of these warders, and the dismissal of *Warder Wise*, it is the duty of the House to turn that Government out of office; and in doing so members will be supported by the people not only of Western Australia but of the whole Commonwealth. The Premier may laugh, feeling, I suppose, that he will be able to talk this Assembly over as he may have been able to satisfy the member for Fremantle; but he will find on this side no dumb-driven cattle; there are members here who will insist that the public service shall get fair treatment, who will see that the regulations of the old convict days are no longer required. It is their duty to vote for the motion. I beg to move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MURPHY (Fremantle): Without assuming any more importance than attaches to the humble position of member for Fremantle, I may say I have asked the Premier to let me be the first speak-

er after the mover of the motion. The mover is quite right in his inference that it was my intention to move the adjournment of the House myself if certain things did not take place. The moment this trouble took place in Fremantle, by which the two principal warders were suspended and 19 others received written notice that unless they could satisfy the Comptroller General with their reasons why a particular document had been signed and published they were liable to dismissal—it may be strange, but the warders placed themselves in communication with me. A meeting was held on Saturday night, at which 17 warders attended. The warders desired that until my efforts failed no publicity should be given to the matter, no public meeting be held to air their grievances, no house-top cries uttered. From that meeting two men were sent to the Fremantle Trades Hall with the object of, if possible, stopping the Sunday afternoon meeting.

Mr. Angwin: The Trades Hall had nothing to do with it.

Mr. MURPHY: I am just telling you what took place at the meeting which I attended. Let me get away from this particular question and refer somewhat personally to my action as regards the dissatisfaction that existed in the Fremantle gaol long before I was elected a member of the House, and to what I have attempted to do since I have occupied the position. Immediately after my election I had interview after interview with warders who came to my house making certain complaints. Two of the members opposite will remember that the first thing I did after being sworn in was to ask them if they would consent to sit on a select committee for which I purposed to move with the object of inquiring into the working of the Fremantle gaol. I asked two members on that side opposite, and two here, following the usual course that prevails in New South Wales, and presuming that I would be appointed as chairman of the committee. At the request of our late Premier, Sir Newton Moore, I allowed that intention to move for a select com-

mittee to go by the board for the time being.

Mr. Johnson: You have let too many intentions go.

Mr. MURPHY: Probably. Time went on and a change of Government took place, so far, at least, as the Premier was concerned. Then the request I made to the late Premier I made to our present Premier, Mr. Wilson, substantiating the grounds for an inquiry. What was the result? Mr. Wilson listened to what I had to say and to what the Colonial Secretary had to say—neither of us knowing anything beyond what we had been told—I dare say that with all due respect. I am told by the warders and the Colonial Secretary is told by his officers. The Premier immediately recognised that the position was serious enough, anyway, to have some inquiry, and over a month ago Mr. Jull was appointed as a special commissioner to make inquiry into the working of the Fremantle Gaol.

Mr. Collier: Has that inquiry been held?

Mr. MURPHY: No; but that just shows that at least I have not been idle.

Mr. Scaddan: You have evidently been pretty idle during the last month.

Mr. MURPHY: Why?

Mr. Scaddan: In not keeping them up to the inquiry.

Mr. MURPHY: Let the hon. member take it up and try. I remember a previous member for Fremantle (Mr. Needham) who was three years at it and did nothing at all.

Mr. Gill: He was only here for 16 months.

Mr. MURPHY: Well, 16 months. The reason why the inquiry was not held has nothing at all to do with the motion now before the House. At that meeting on Saturday night—and I want to make it clear not only to the House, but also to the country how that letter came to be signed—at that meeting of 17 warders, Warder Wise was present—I would like the member for Mount Magnet to listen to this statement—and in my presence he was told that when he asked for those signatures and obtained them he did so under the promise that the document was

not to go into the public Press. Those warders told Warder Wise that had they known that document was to be published they never would have signed it. It was obtained from those men for private information.

Mr. HUDSON: The question is whether it was accurate or not.

Mr. MURPHY: I will deal with that by and by, but I do not want any credit to be given to those men other than that they willingly signed the document knowing that it was never to be published.

Mr. HOLMAN: They knew they would be "shot out."

Mr. MURPHY: Now, we come to what took place last Saturday. Two principal warders were suspended, and 19 others got notice of dismissal unless they satisfied the Comptroller General that their action was in keeping with his notions. Unless I had known before I came into this House that the two principal warders had been reinstated, and that so far as the other 19 are concerned a reply which I had drafted, and which they all signed, had been accepted, I would certainly have moved the adjournment of the House. Those men have been reinstated without any stain on their character.

Mr. BOLTON: Is that to end it?

Mr. MURPHY: So far as my action was concerned, and so far as the promise I gave to them was concerned, I performed my duty. I do not see how anyone could expect that after obtaining the promise which I did obtain I could stand up in this Chamber and move the adjournment of the House about something with which I had not been connected at all.

Mr. TROY: Whose is the blunder?

Mr. MURPHY: Let us not forestall matters. Let me say that the general administration of the prisons in this State does not end with that matter. I am prepared to give notice later on this evening to ask the Government a straight out question as to whether they are prepared to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire not only into the working of the Fremantle gaol but also into the general prison system of the whole of Western

Australia, and I feel that the appointment of such a commission would give satisfaction, if not to all, at any rate to the general community of this State. I only rose to say that so far as I am personally concerned I have not neglected my promise to the men, my duty to my constituents, or my duty to the State as a humble member of this House.

The PREMIER (Hon. Frank Wilson): I regret that the hon. member who has moved this motion did not give me some longer notice in order that I might go carefully into the files and see the exact bearing of the case on which he had moved the adjournment of the House. Naturally one cannot in half an hour, which is about the time he gave me, inquire fully into the matter.

Mr. HOLMAN: There has been notice in the Press for the last two days.

The PREMIER: I have had no notice in the Press during the last two days at all. If the hon. member had taken the ordinary course and told me this morning early, I should have had an opportunity of getting a full grip of the matter.

Mr. TROY: I gave you the same notice that I gave myself.

The PREMIER: The hon. member has had the subject under his consideration since Saturday last, judging by the newspaper accounts of what has taken place.

Mr. TROY: Pardon me! I have not.

The PREMIER: The hon. member for Fremantle came to me shortly after one o'clock to-day and mentioned that he was going to ask a question without notice as to what had been done in regard to the warders. I said, "Very well, I will tell the House what has been done in regard to the warders." He also said that he would like to get some information in regard to a proposal for the appointment of a Royal Commission regarding the working of the gaols generally. I said, "Very well, if you like to ask a question I will give you a reply." That does not take much looking into. If an inquiry has been held in regard to charges against officials, I can certainly give the information without any undue notice. But, when an hon. member uses that to ventilate the question of Warder Wise's dismissal, in regard to which he had previously tabled

a notice, it becomes a larger question, and requires more study and attention. Let me say at once that I am sorry he has taken up the position he has done, and not confined himself absolutely to the action in connection with the 21 warders who signed a certain document which was duly published in the Press. Now I have left Warder Wise out of the question altogether. I admit that the two questions have perhaps some intimate connection. As the hon. member stated the warders have apparently taken this action at the request of Warder Wise and as a protest against the treatment of Warder Wise, and therefore to that extent the hon. member was justified in referring to Warder Wise's case. But, let us first deal with the matter of the 21 warders. Here we have the position as I have culled it from the Press, and also certain resolutions sent to me from the meeting held in Fremantle on Sunday afternoon last. These resolutions I received when I went to my office this morning, having been out of town for part of Sunday and the whole of Monday. The Press, I see, published a statement of this indignation meeting at Fremantle, and published in extenso the document which these warders signed, the letter which the Comptroller General of Prisons wrote to the warders, and also, of course, some very warm speeches by the chairman (Mr. Carpenter) and Messrs. Angwin and Bolton in reference to the matter under consideration. Let me point out to hon. members that no matter what opinions they may hold with regard to the treatment of Warder Wise, I think they must concede at any rate that the action of these other warders, if it had been taken knowingly, and with a full knowledge of what it meant, and that their statement was going to be published in the Press, is a reprehensible one in the extreme.

Mr. Troy: A very courageous one.

The PREMIER: No, not courageous. Now, let us take the wording of the document. It commences—

To whom it may concern.
That is the whole world at large. There is no question of keeping a document of that sort secret, and it is passing strange to me that any warder could have signed

that document and thought it was not going to be published. It goes on to say—

We, the undersigned members of the Fremantle prison staff, enter our emphatic denial of and protest against the statement made by the Colonial Secretary in reply to questions asked by Mr. Kirwan, M.L.C.

Mr. Holman: Why should they not?

The PREMIER: It must be obvious why they should not. The individual warders could not possibly know that the statement was absolutely untrue; they could only know so far as their own individual experience went that they had not been called upon to take up duty on account of Warder Wise being away on military service, and that so far as they knew there had not been caused any discontent. I have the papers here, and I have occupied the few minutes during which the mover was speaking, to turn up Warder Wise's applications for leave. So far as that goes, whether they were granted or otherwise, Warder Wise made application, and yet these warders declare that the statement of the Colonial Secretary is untrue. That is only one point in passing, but no matter whether it was true or untrue, will hon. members tell me that it is in accordance with the discipline of a gaol, a police force, or an army, that the men should give the lie direct to their superior officer in a statement such as this?

Mr. Angwin: Yes, if he tells a lie.

The PREMIER: If that is to be the case, then good-bye to discipline for ever. We will have mob rule.

Mr. Angwin: How is the Minister to know the truth unless he is told?

The PREMIER: I will give the hon. member something from the file in Warder Wise's own handwriting, so that he will see that it is true so far as I have it in the files.

Mr. Bolton: You are quibbling like the Minister.

The PREMIER: The hon. member is becoming offensive.

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

Mr. Bolton: If it is offensive I will withdraw the statement that he is quib-

bling, but later on I will have something more to say; he knows what I mean.

The PREMIER: After giving the lie direct to the Minister—of course the Minister cannot personally be cognisant of what takes place, he must rely on his officials, but let me say at once that if I find that the Comptroller General, or any other official in connection with this matter, has wilfully or knowingly misinformed the Minister in regard to this or any other matter, I will be the very first man to say he must get out.

Mr. Angwin: They led him astray. I have given proof of that to the Minister myself. I wrote to the Minister drawing his attention, and he admitted he did not know the statement was untrue.

The PREMIER: Of course I cannot reply to that. I know nothing about those communications. It is impossible for me to do so. At the outside I have only had ten minutes to look up the matter, and then I am interrupted by statements I know nothing about. I was saying that if the Comptroller General has wilfully and knowingly misled the Minister, he is not fit for his position.

Mr. Scaddan. You do not want to be too explicit about what you will do. If it is proved, you might be put in a difficult position.

The PREMIER: Let us come back to this statement. They state first that Warder Wise's military duties did not interfere in any way with his duty as a warder; that is, in their humble opinion. It may be so in the individual opinion of warders, but I ask reasonable people who is to be the judge as to whether they do interfere with his duties as warder. Who is to be the judge, his fellow warders, or his superior officers controlling the department—the Comptroller General, or the principal gaoler, Mr. George. Who is to judge? Surely to goodness it must be admitted that if one warder is to be permitted to give the necessary time to defence force purposes, which amounts to several days in the year, to say nothing about odd hours off, all the warders of the institution could claim the same right; and no matter how the Government might be inclined, and are inclined and willing

to help forward the defence movement—they have always shown that inclination—if the whole of the warders of the gaol were called out to attend to military duties what would become of the duties inside the walls of the gaol? Whereas it might be easy enough to put up with one individual warder joining the defence forces, and perhaps be easy enough to arrange for him to attend the different functions and the different drills in connection with the forces, and easy enough to give him the necessary week or 14 days, or whatever the time is, to attend camp once a year in connection with his post as a member of the defence forces, yet hon. members must see at once it would be absolutely impossible to give every warder in the institution the same right and the same privilege, or the prison would be left unprotected, left without officials. The same thing applies to the police force. We cannot expect that the police officers are to be permitted to become members of the defence forces in the same way as the ordinary civilian, for the reason that their duties in the protection of the life and property of citizens demand that they shall be elsewhere; and if we give one member the opportunity of being absent we must give it to all, and there would be no police force. Again, let me point out that it is not very arbitrary to take up this stand, for the reason that both warders and members of the police force are naturally trained men. They are practically all on a semi-war footing, if I may use the term; they know how to handle firearms: they are skilled in rifle shooting and they are disciplined in drill. So we have in these men already, without the annual training which the ordinary citizen must go through to make him at all competent or desirable as a member of the defence forces, men fairly-well trained and disciplined for use in case of war, or in case their services should be demanded on an emergency.

Mr. Scaddan: It is a matter for the Commonwealth to decide, not for us.

The PREMIER: It is not a matter for the Commonwealth: it is the right of the State to control its own servants.

Mr. Seaddan: It is the right of the Commonwealth to decide who shall defend the country.

The PREMIER: No. Every man must defend the country, I do not care what he is. I cannot be called upon to take this military service, I am over the age, but I can be called upon to defend the country. The hon. member put it that these warders were entitled to the same consideration as other people. I admit it at once. I admit that warders and civil servants and members of the police force are all entitled to the same consideration as citizens outside the public service; but at the same time, let me say again, duty must be observed; and if we are to have that efficient service in State departments we are entitled to, then we must not permit the two duties to clash and interfere. We cannot have dual command and control over these men, and the Commandant himself on these papers has recognised that. When he was appealed to he came to see the Minister and had a long conversation with him in regard to the matter; and he also on one occasion, I believe, called upon me at my office in reference to the point; and he said at once that he realised that the two duties must of necessity clash, and therefore, so far as he was concerned, he was quite prepared to grant the necessary discharge to Warder Wise in order that the warder might resign his position in the defence forces. This came about because Warder Wise had pleaded that he had signed on for three years and could not break his contract with the defence forces, but when this was brought under the notice of the Commandant he said, "Yes, I see at once that the duties must clash and therefore I am quite prepared to let Warder Wise go and to grant his discharge." After that, Warder Wise was asked on more than one occasion—I think so far back as April last—to resign, together with another warder named Dymock. Warder Dymock resigned promptly, but Warder Wise refused after first saying that he wanted time to consider the matter. He allowed that time to go by, and he ultimately refused to do as he was requested and resign from the defence forces. Then, as far as the information

goes, the Comptroller General left for the North-West and was away for some time, but he left word that Warder Wise must be again requested to resign in order that his position in the defence forces might not interfere with his duties in the gaol. The warder did not do so, and the superintendent asked that the matter be allowed to stand over until the Comptroller General came back from the North-West. The member for Mount Magnet asked some questions in the House on the 13th September in connection with this matter, and answers were given which I think he has quoted to-day.

Mr. Troy: I have not quoted them, but you have an intimate knowledge of the matter considering you only had half an hour's notice.

The PREMIER: I have a precis with me and I am picking up the knowledge as I go along. The hon. member asked if the Premier was aware that efforts had been made by certain officials in the Prisons Department to compel men under their control to leave the Federal Defence Forces, and what reasons, if any, were given by such officers for their attempt to interfere with State employees serving the Defence Department during their own time. Sir Newton Moore replied that the exigencies of the prison service necessitated the Comptroller General of Prisons requesting the resignation from the defence force of two warders employed in the Fremantle prison as it interfered with their duties as warders. Then the hon. member asked if any appeal had been made to the Government against this official attempt to deprive men of their rights as citizens, and if so, what reply had been made to such appeal. The reply was that one of the two warders affected by the instructions did make a request for reconsideration of the matter, and that his request was refused by the Colonial Secretary after conferring with the State Commandant, who reported that he had no hesitation in granting this, or any other warder, a free discharge, as he could readily see that the nature of the two duties must clash.

Mr. Bolton: He was a long time seeing it, because there are a number of

officials in the service who are in the defence forces; in fact the superintendent of the gaol holds a long service medal.

The PREMIER: How long ago was that? There are only two warders affected; one has resigned and the other has refused to resign. The member for Mount Magnet also asked whether the Government were in favour of allowing all State employees, in common with other citizens, facilities for serving in the defence forces, provided such service did not interfere with their duty to the department in which they were employed. Of course I replied yes, we did favour it, also that the Commonwealth Government had recognised the difficulties attending the disciplinary staff of prisons, and that the amending Defence Bill provided, *inter alia*, for the exemption from service of persons employed in the police or prison service, etcetera. Now, with regard to the hon. member's statement as to the custom that pertains in the Eastern States, I have not definite information before me, but I believe there is no case of this sort in existence. I think I am right in saying it. I do not know of my own knowledge, but I have been led to understand that there are no warders in the Eastern States placed in the same position as these two men. I see that some explanation was given by myself in an interview to the Press that seems to put the position in a nutshell. This is the extract—

Our position is exactly similar to Queensland, where the Minister for Defence admits the hours of duty are such as to preclude warders joining the forces, excepting as members of rifle clubs. The Government are keenly alive to the necessity of military training and preparation for war by the whole adult community, and every encouragement has been given and facilities granted to enable persons in the employ of the State volunteering their services in connection with the defence movement. It will, however, be readily recognised that there are difficulties in such disciplinary staffs as police and gaol officials being relieved from duty

for the purpose of training, and, indeed, such is not necessary, seeing that they are to a great extent trained already by the very nature of their occupation. I may say that these officials are always encouraged to become members of rifle clubs, to which a large number of the police belong at the present time.

However, to return to Warder Wise, when the Comptroller General came back he saw Warder Wise and asked him why he had not resigned, and stated that if the warder did not do so he would suspend him, and intended to recommend his dismissal. There was ample notice, as hon. members will see, and Warder Wise rather impertinently answered, in the presence of the superintendent, that he did not intend to do anything of the sort, and the Comptroller General could do as he liked. Surely it must be subversive of discipline if an employee can tell the Comptroller General, "You can do as you like."

Mr. Angwin: He should have gone on his knees.

The PREMIER: No, nothing of the sort. Then Warder Wise was suspended on the 28th October; and as he would not obey the instructions, he was subsequently dismissed. He defied the Comptroller General as I have shown, and of course it was causing some feeling in the gaol and discontent; and his action, as hon. members must admit, was likely to interfere with the discipline of the prison.

Mr. Bolton: What was causing the discontent. Wise's action or the Comptroller's action?

The PREMIER: Wise's action was causing the discontent at that time, because he defied the authority that was in control of the prison; and if he had been allowed to go on defying, hon. members can see at once the whole of the officials would be up in arms and against the authority of their superior officers. The proper attitude was for him to say, "I will send in my resignation, and I will appeal to a higher authority."

Mr. Bolton: The Colonial Secretary? What is the good of appealing to him.

The PREMIER: The hon. member must not be personal; he is always personal in his interjections. He knows full well that he is allowing his personal prejudice and feeling to interfere with his judgment. Warder Wise was not peremptorily dismissed as the reports in the newspapers make out; he was warned as far back as the 13th April last and he continued to be warned to the date of his dismissal.

Mr. Underwood: Why should he be warned?

The PREMIER: The answer I have already quoted as having been given to the member for Mt. Magnet surely ought to have directed his attention to the position he was in.

Mr. Scaddan: Is it a coincidence that he was warned on the 13th April?

The PREMIER: I do not know to what the hon. member refers.

Mr. Scaddan: The Federal elections were held on that day.

The PREMIER: My memory does not go back to the Federal elections. Were they held on the 13th April?

Mr. Scaddan: Yes; and the results were known a day or two afterwards.

The PREMIER: Then I cannot see how the coincidence can apply. That point, however, does not affect the question under consideration. But so far as Warder Wise is concerned we would have been entitled to leave the service. Hon. members will see from the medical reports that he is not a suitable officer to be a member of the defence forces on account of the state of his health. He has already had leave from the service because he was suffering from a bad leg.

Mr. Angwin: Brought about by his duties in the gaol.

The PREMIER: I do not think so. Still, it is shown that no great hardship has been done.

Mr. Bolton: His character is ruined if he is dismissed.

The PREMIER: I just wish to briefly refer to some of the files in connection with the matter. It was stated that no applications had been made by Warder Wise for leave in connection with his military duties. Here is a letter on the

file dated 28th May, 1909; it is an application for leave of absence, and reads—

I respectfully apply for half a day's leave of absence, to wit, Saturday afternoon the 29th, to enable me to attend a special military parade examination to be held by the State Commandant. Trusting that the application will receive favourable consideration, etcetera. I notice that across the corner the word "granted" has been written. There is no initial under it, but I think it is in the chief gaoler's handwriting. This application was sent in by Warder Wise himself.

Mr. Troy: Who signed the word "granted"?

The PREMIER: I have already stated it is not signed, but it appears to be in the handwriting of Mr. George. Then there is another application made for leave by an officer of the Military Department. Mr. Page asks that Mr. Wise, the chief clarinet player in the military band, should be allowed to attend the King's Birthday parade. He adds that he would like Wise to be permitted to leave for an hour or an hour and a-half.

Mr. Angwin: He did not go on that occasion.

The PREMIER: This application is written on a scrap of paper; it is a telephone message.

Mr. Johnson: The band has no connection with the military business.

The PREMIER: Oh, yes, it has. There is a minute here from the Comptroller General himself, who states that the superintendent reports in connection with the questions asked by Mr. Kirwan that Warder Wise changed his duties with a brother officer on Sunday, 24th October, 1909, and that he was granted a day off on the 25th of the same month. Arrangements were also made at the special request of Captain Hills to permit Wise to attend the birthday parade in 1909, but at the last minute Wise did not go. On other occasions Warder Wise went off evening duty in order to attend to military duties, but the dates cannot be given now as no official records have been preserved. Warder Wise was dismissed for not obeying the order of the Comptroller General, and the determination from

which that order sprang is that it is impossible to allow warders to join the military forces. I think I have said sufficient to show that this man has not been dealt with in a vindictive spirit, but that his position was such that it could not be overlooked by the department, and I think the only proper course the officer could have taken under the circumstances would have been to resign in accordance with instructions and then make his appeal. It is true that owing to the questions asked in the Federal House communications have been received by me from the Minister for Defence in connection with the case. It is also true—although the matter is hardly worth mentioning—that the first telegram was detained for nearly a week in consequence of having to obtain information before I could reply to the Minister for Defence. It is also equally true that when the Minister for Defence had written to me, or rather when the Acting Prime Minister wrote to me at the instigation of the Minister for Defence, the Minister for Defence gave an interview to the Press stating that he was awaiting a reply from the Premier of Western Australia to the representations made to secure the reconsideration of the case of Warder Wise. At that time I had not received the letter; it came the following morning. There has been no delay, at any rate not more than was necessary in getting information from the departments. I replied to that communication after inquiries had been made, in the following terms:—

I beg to acknowledge receipt on the 3rd instant of your letter of the 26th ultimo. I mention the date of receipt because on the day previous, namely, the 2nd idem, the Hon. Minister for Defence (Mr. Pearce) is reported to have said, in reply to a question by Mr. Needham, "that he had not yet received a reply from the Premier of Western Australia to the representations made to secure the reconsideration of the case." As there was an unfortunate delay in my replying to your telegram on the same subject, I would not wish it to appear that there had been any delay in regard to your second

communication. This, you will observe, has not been the case from the dates above quoted. I note that Clause 7 of the Bill to amend the Defence Act 1908-9, only applies to service in time of war. The point, however, I desire to emphasise is that the clause recognises that military duties and prison duties clash: hence the provision for exemption. Under the compulsory training provisions warders who are within the prescribed ages will, as you point out, be liable for training in time of peace, but there is no compulsion after those ages? Members of the defence force are liable to serve 16 days every year. If warders are permitted to join the defence forces they will be liable to this service in addition to the compulsory training service of those within the prescribed ages. The case of Warder Wise drew attention to the problem. Either all or none of the warders could be permitted to belong to the military forces. If all joined it would disorganise the staff. If a few joined it would create discontent amongst the rest. The Government, therefore, decided that no warders should be allowed to join. The military Commandant recognised also that the duties of the two positions clashed, and readily consented to grant a discharge to Warder Wise. Warder Wise was requested to resign and refused; he was warned of the result, but persisted in refusing. The Government has given this matter careful consideration and while, at the present time, seeing no reason to alter the decision arrived at, in view of the impending visit of the hon. the Minister for Defence, I shall be pleased to discuss the matter with him, and doubtless you will be good enough to notify Senator Pearce accordingly. I desire, further, to assure the Commonwealth Government that this Government is entirely in sympathy with the defence movement, and on all occasions assist to the best of its power in facilitating its development.

Mr. Tray: Who sent that reply?

The PREMIER: I sent it to the Acting Prime Minister. With regard to the 21

warders who sent along this unfortunate communication—

Mr. Johnson : Unfortunate for the Minister.

The PREMIER: Very unfortunate for the member who published the communication, knowing full well that he was doing something which was not in accordance with proper discipline.

Mr. Walker: Is the accusation against a member of this House?

The PREMIER: No. With regard to the 21 warders the Minister has had the position under his consideration. He fully believes the statement made by a good many of them that when they were asked to sign this document they fully understood it would not be made public, but was simply to be handed to a member of another place, and also the Minister for his information. The Colonial Secretary also has taken into consideration the sworn statement made by the two senior warders who have been suspended. They have made a statement to the effect that they regretted their action in unintentionally infringing the regulations. The warders have each sent in a written statement that they did not know the document was for publication in the Press, and therefore they did not think that they were breaking the regulations, and the two warders who are under suspension have sent in an affidavit that they had not the slightest idea that the statement would be made public. They expressed regret for having unintentionally infringed the regulations, and the Colonial Secretary has decided that the warders under suspension shall be reprimanded and reinstated.

Mr. Johnson: But did they withdraw the statement?

The PREMIER: I do not know whether they have withdrawn any statement. I only know the information has been given to me that they have made the admission that they were asked to sign the document, and that, as they understood it, it was not for publication. I am informed also that some of them have stated they signed the document in order to get Warder Wise reinstated, having been given to understand that if they signed it Warder Wise would be put back.

Mr. Holman: Now they have to say another thing to keep their places.

The PREMIER: Not at all. It seems to me that if the Minister in his discretion acts harshly, hon. members are at him at once for being unjust, while if he takes a lenient view of an offence and accepts explanations made, hon. members blame him for that attitude. What my colleague has done in this case has been to consider the position and consider the accusations—

Mr. Underwood: Did your colleague do anything?

The PREMIER: These inane interjections are wearisome. I have stated what my colleague did. The Minister ordered the warders to be reprimanded and reinstated. That is the punishment so far as it goes. He does not think the offence sufficiently serious to justify wholesale dismissals, and so he reprimands and reinstates. The Government are always willing to treat their officials justly, so far as their information and knowledge guides them. They know there has been some friction in connection with the gaols of Western Australia for some time past. They know, for instance, that the Comptroller General in writing the letter which he wrote to these warders, was not, perhaps, acting as carefully as he might have done in a communication of this sort. It appears on the face of it that the only punishment was dismissal. I am quite willing to concede that the letter carries to my mind the impression that it was a question of, "You are liable to dismissal if you do not give a satisfactory explanation," whereas the regulations, although providing for dismissal as a maximum punishment, provide also fines, reprimands, and reductions in grade. There are many ways of punishing besides dismissal; therefore, to that extent at any rate, perhaps the Comptroller General has been indiscreet. But apart from that; I am prepared to let the gaols of Western Australia be fully inquired into, and my only concern will be to get hold of someone who has the requisite expert knowledge to conduct such inquiry and advise as to whether our gaols are being correctly administered, whether this friction which is said to occur with the offi-

cials of the gaols is grounded on justice and right or otherwise, and also to give proper advice as to the reforms to be made. For this purpose it is necessary that we should have some person who is well versed in criminology and prison management, and my only anxiety is to get a gentleman of such qualifications. If I can find in the Eastern States one who is versed in criminology and prison management, so that we can have a proper inquiry, I am quite prepared, and my colleague is also quite prepared, to welcome an inquiry of that description.

Mr. Angwin: Another gaoler to uphold the action of his friend.

The PREMIER: I do not think he would uphold the actions of his friend. I know full well you cannot place an ordinary civilian in a position to inquire into the management of gaols.

Mr. Walker: That was a very good inquiry in Mr. Vosper's time.

The PREMIER: I do not remember the result of that inquiry. New buildings, I think, were put in hand in consequence of it. That was rather a different thing.

Mr. Walker: No, it was as to management.

The PREMIER: The question of management is one that to my mind ought to have expert inquiry, and I state at once that so far as the Government are concerned we are quite prepared to allow any inquiry of that description in order that we may have the best service in connection with our gaols.

Mr. Johnson: Do you not think the Minister could make the inquiry himself?

The PREMIER: I am not prepared to admit that any Minister could, with any degree of satisfaction, go and interfere with the technical matters pertaining to the management of gaols. I should like to point out that if the Minister were to make an inquiry of this sort it would be an absolute personal inquiry; he could not take evidence, but would have to walk around, listen to what was told to him, and form his own judgment. It cannot be expected that a Minister can be *au fait* with all the technical details of such a department, and I for one would hesitate before I undertook such a duty. I do not

think it would be fair to cast a duty of this sort on the shoulders of the Colonial Secretary.

Mr. Troy: What does he know?

The PREMIER: What does the hon. member know? If it comes down to what we all know, well, who knows the least? In conclusion, let me say that so far as the action of the Government is concerned it has been perfectly above board. My colleague has dealt with the problems that came before him in a spirit of justice and impartiality. He does not believe in a whole body of warders being punished for something they have been persuaded into doing under a misapprehension, something which is a very serious offence indeed if done deliberately, but which they did not intend should take the form it has since taken, and consequently my colleague has dealt with them in a lenient manner.

Mr. ANGWIN (East Fremantle): I could quite understand the Premier's feeling on behalf of the Minister in charge of this department, if that Minister had taken due precautions and made inquiries into the conditions which previously existed. It is all very well for the Premier to say that if the Minister acted harshly members would blame him for his harshness; but the only difficulty we have to contend with in connection with the Colonial Secretary lies in inducing him to prevent others from acting harshly, while in this case the difficulty presenting itself to the Minister is to discover for what reason Warder Wise was dismissed. From conversation with the Colonial Secretary I am of opinion that the Minister himself does not know to-day why Warder Wise was dismissed. The Minister states that Warder Wise was not dismissed because he attended military duties, but because of disobedience, the disobedience consisting of refusing to resign his military duties. I would like to draw the Premier's attention to the fact that one of the reasons given why Warder Wise should be dismissed was because he was hindered in regard to his prison duties by his attention to the band, which was portion of his military duties. The Premier has already read out that Warder Wise applied for leave on one occa-

sion. On that occasion the band in connection with the artillery in Fremantle purposed playing on the King's birthday; but as a matter of fact, the required number of men could not be secured and, consequently, the band did not fulfil the engagement, and as soon as this was determined upon Warder Wise immediately went back to attend to his duties in the prison. When the Minister in charge of the department pointed out that it was not his military duties which were hindering Warder Wise from the discharge of his prison duties, but that it was the band, I realised that possibly there was some truth in the statement that Wise had been neglecting his military duties for the purpose of attending to the band. But, half an hour after speaking to the Minister, I was informed by an officer of the military forces that the band had been disbanded for over six months previously. Very shortly afterwards I communicated with the Minister and expressed the opinion that his officers had not been acting straight with him in allowing him to use such an argument and to say that the warder had neglected his duties for the purpose of attending a band when, as a matter of fact, the band had been disbanded; and I suggested to the Minister that, seeing he had been led astray by his officials, he should send for Warder Wise and hear the other side of the story. That was not done, and I regret that so far as the Colonial Secretary is concerned, I have been grievously disappointed in him. From what I had known of Mr. Connolly, I thought he would be a man of some backbone when he was placed in the control of the department, but after the issue of many matters which he has had under consideration I have come to the conclusion that the backbone is with the officers and that the Minister is under their control. I want to go back to a promise made by the Premier, then Minister for Works, in December, 1909. Hon. members will realise that since 1906 these warders of the gaols and the attendants at the Claremont Asylum have had a real grievance on account of having been struck out of the Public Service Act, just after the Pre-

mier joined the Cabinet. The present Minister for Works refused to allow that to be done on a previous occasion.

The Premier: What, refused to strike them out?

Mr. ANGWIN: Yes, in 1905. From that time onward I have been trying to get a board of appeal to rectify any grievances, and during last session of Parliament I moved a motion in the House for the purpose of granting that appeal. According to the members who spoke on that motion the majority were in favour of its being carried into effect, but owing to want of time the motion was not further dealt with.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. ANGWIN: I was referring to a question which I asked in December last. The then Minister for Works who is the Premier to-day, pointed out that the Colonial Secretary was considering the idea of appointing a committee, an appeal committee, somewhat similar to that which was appointed at that time in connection with the Police Department. Since then those engaged at the prison petitioned the officials in regard to the grievances which existed, and asked that the petition should be sent on to the Minister. In that petition they asked for a committee of inquiry so that they could put their grievances before it. That committee of inquiry was not granted, but eventually the Minister decided that he would appoint Mr. Jull, the Public Service Commissioner, to make an inquiry in connection with the dispute which then existed in connection with the gaol. Before Mr. Jull had an opportunity of holding any inquiry, we find that this Mr. Wise who, I believe, acted as secretary and got the petition prepared with a view to having the inquiry held, was dismissed from the service. Now, I maintain, that when a petition exists, as it did, and one of which the Minister knew full well because he had had it placed before him, previous to any action being taken in regard to the dismissing of the men who took part in presenting that petition, an inquiry should have been held. Seeing that that was not done it will, of course,

be realised that a large number of those engaged at the gaol, such as warders, came to the conclusion that they were not going to have justice done to them by the Minister in the manner indicated in the reply given by the Premier in December last. Then we find that though several answers to questions were given in another place, those answers were not in accordance with fact. Of course, questions of this kind are merely the replies of officials in charge of that department. I realise that a Minister has no opportunity to make a personal inquiry in regard to the truth or otherwise of the answers given to him, but I felt after the Minister made a statement in regard to the dismissal of Warder Wise, that if he had known previously of the suspension of those other officials he would not have allowed such suspension to take place, because it placed the Minister in a far worse position; it placed him in the position that he was drying his utmost to get those men, and other warders, to back him up in the statement he made. It shows to my mind that there was intimidation for that express purpose, and I stated on Sunday at the meeting, to which the Premier referred, that I thought it would have been advisable to have postponed that meeting until the Minister's statement was made in regard to that pressure. We cannot get away from the fact that although the Premier said that these men had committed a breach of the regulations, and although they might express their regret or otherwise, they have not withdrawn their statement that the answer given by the Minister was incorrect. That is the position we have to-day. It has gone through every newspaper in Western Australia that the Minister, through the action of his officers, has been led to make a false statement to questions submitted by an hon. member. Now, I submit, that whether it was against the regulations or not, the Minister should have welcomed such a statement to show that the officers were misleading him. I was very pleased myself that this statement was made, because, in conversation with an officer of the military forces, I

came to the conclusion that the Minister had been kept in the dark by his officials, that they were making statements that had no basis in fact, and for that reason I think the Minister was mistaken in the action he took in regard to the warders. I am very pleased that the men are reinstated. I think the Government have taken the first opportunity available of righting a wrong done to those men, and I do hope that none of them, no matter what the reprimand has been, will ever sit idly by and see one of their fellow employees victimised through the actions of officials, when they are fully aware that those officials have caused the men to be victimised by making wrong statements. It is due, not only to those men, but also to the country, that the man who made those statements should explain the true position. I was very pleased to hear the Premier state that the superintendent had allowed this matter of military duty to remain in abeyance. That proves conclusively, to my mind, that the superintendent has only been acting at the dictates of the Comptroller General; it proves that the Comptroller General is an autocrat, and shows clearly, to my mind, that to him it matters not who sinks or swims, whether the men under him, or the Minister supposed to be over him, as long as that gentleman can act in a manner which he chooses, and I am certainly of the opinion that the Minister should have taken drastic steps and even have acted harshly, in connection with a matter of this kind. When the Minister found that the Comptroller General had given a false statement the first action he should have taken was to have suspended him from his duties; then an inquiry could have been made; but what action was taken? The Comptroller General went to Fremantle, lined the men up, and spoke to them individually. He gave them what is commonly called "rats"; he spoke strongly to them, and pointed out the heinousness of their crime. Not only that; the Comptroller General was aware that the

Minister had previously appointed the Public Service Commissioner to make an inquiry in regard to the Fremantle prison, and he placed these men in a position by such intimidation that I am bound to say that, even before a person duly appointed to make an inquiry, not one of those men would be willing to make a true statement. Even if an inquiry were made by the Public Service Commissioner it would be useless owing to the intimidation brought about by the Comptroller General. However, I trust that the Government will see the error of their ways, and not only reinstate the 21 warders, but will also reinstate Warder Wise for trying, if possible, to fulfil his duties of citizenship.

Mr. JOHNSON (Guildford): In connection with this matter, members have to ask themselves whether they are satisfied because the Government have intimated that they have withdrawn the injustice that was done to the warders at the Fremantle gaol when the notice of suspension and threat of dismissal were served upon them by the Comptroller General. In the first place we have the member for Fremantle, who first conveys the idea that he is going to move the adjournment of the House to protest against this injustice. Then we find that he has an interview with the Premier, and that the Premier arranges to withdraw the notice that has been served, forgetting altogether that the withdrawal of that notice only goes to emphasise the injustice. Consequently the responsibility on that hon. gentleman's shoulders is greater now—seeing that the Government admit the wrong—than it was previous to that time. We have to ask ourselves, did the Colonial Secretary convey incorrect information to the public? If he conveyed that incorrect information he is directly responsible for it. I am not prepared to remove the responsibility from the shoulders of the Minister; every Minister has to shoulder his responsibility, but in a debate of this description we are justified in asking who it was who supplied that information, and from what we have gathered to-day there is

no other person responsible but Mr. Burt, the Comptroller General. Then, seeing the incorrect information was going to inflict an injustice on an individual, namely Warder Wise, his comrades, men who knew that information to be absolutely incorrect, decided to enter their protest and put a true statement in the possession of someone. Now, I am inclined to censure these warders for not making it public and giving it to the Press. There is no regulation I can see to compel any public servant to suppress the truth from the general public, and if the Minister is guilty of conveying an incorrect report of the case I maintain it was their duty as public servants to see that the public got the true facts; but the fact that they were only going to give it to Warder Wise, and were not going to give it to the Press, condemns them to an extent, because these men had the right to put the Minister right when he was wrong, because they are public servants, and the only way they could put him right was to make the matter public. Consequently I do not care whether Warder Wise gave it to the Press, or whether these warders gave it to the Press, it was right it should go to the Press, it was right that the public should get the whole of the facts. As is usual in all these matters—and I often commend him for his cleverness—the Premier talked right round the subject without getting to the subject at all. He made a long statement about the prison, the administration, and sundry other matters, but he did not get on to the point—was the Colonial Secretary guilty of giving incorrect information, and should these men be reprimanded for giving the correct information? That phase of the question, the only matter worthy of debate here to-night, was absolutely untouched by the Premier. I want more information from the Government on this question than the mere fact that they have withdrawn the letters that have been served on these gentlemen, while at the same time they have reprimanded, or in other words the Comptroller General, who has been guilty evidently of misleading the Minister, has reprimanded

the men because they conveyed the correct information that it was Mr. Burt's duty to give. Yet, because they put the Minister right they have to suffer a reprimand at the hands of the guilty person. We are justified, as members of this Chamber, and as representatives of the people, to know from the Government what they are going to do with Mr. Burt. It is not the first occasion that this officer has been adversely criticised by this Chamber; and here we have an instance, grave enough to cause letters to be served on 21 public servants, absolutely passed over as far as the main culprit is concerned. The Minister suggests that Mr. Burt was indiscreet—I forget the exact words the Minister used—in forwarding that letter, but he forgot to say what he thought of Mr. Burt's misleading the Minister. It would be bad enough if this officer were only guilty of misleading the Minister, but in this case he was also guilty of misleading Parliament; because after all, the information was sought by Parliament, and incorrect information was given to Parliament. But in spite of that, we find Ministers absolutely justifying the action of this officer in connection with his threat of dismissal to these warders, and simply passing it over as an indiscretion. What is the true position? If we go down to bedrock on the question of the dismissal of Warder Wise, we have to recognise that his dismissal was not because he was a member of the military force, but was because, as the member for East Fremantle has pointed out, he had the temerity to ask for an investigation and inquiry, and the temerity to criticise the administration of the gaols. We know in the public service, especially in those departments governed by autocrats such as we have in the Comptroller General of Prisons, these gentlemen wait patiently for an opportunity to get rid of a man. They do not go at him exactly on the offence that he has committed in their eyes; but they let it pass over, and they wait patiently till they get an opportunity of having their vengeance at a later date. That is exactly what has happened in the case of Warder Wise. Take the public

service generally, and it applies generally in all administrations be they public or private. In all these big concerns regulations are framed, and we know full well that in the big majority of cases the concerns could not be operated at all unless regulations were broken. Every worker every day he works in the big majority of cases is guilty of breaking regulations and liable to suspension, dismissal, or fines at any moment the employer likes to enforce them. For instance, immediately a man steps on a tramcar and moves that car he breaks a regulation. A tramcar could not run in our streets if the regulations were strictly enforced. Take the railways. Exactly the same thing applies. The trains could not be operated unless the regulations that have been framed are broken. And so it is exactly with our prisons. The officers are bound down by regulations, but these regulations cannot possibly be enforced, because if they were enforced the prison could not go along, the officers could not do their work. So these autocratic gentlemen always have these regulations so framed that immediately a man makes himself objectionable—and very often the best officers are the most objectionable in the eyes of these autocratic gentlemen—these regulations are enforced, and the man is victimised. That is just the case in connection with Warder Wise. They needed an excuse, and they have hung on to this excuse that he belonged to the military force at the same time that he was a warder in the prison. The Premier, in order to justify the misstatement made by a Minister in another place, accuses Warder Wise of making applications for leave in connection with his military duties when as a matter of fact we know full well that these applications were made in connection with the band of which he was a member. But the band was disbanded months and months ago, long before this question of dismissal of Warder Wise cropped up. It could not be in connection with the band, because the band was not in existence at the time; but it is good enough for the Minister to go right back to that time and use it as evidence and as justification

for the misstatement made by the Minister in another place. If the Ministry are going to enforce these regulations and prevent the warders from taking part in military matters, how are they going to get on with the other civil servants? If warders cannot join a military corps, what about our railway servants and other officials in the Government service? If the Government are going to apply it at all they must apply it generally; and if they apply it generally then they are preventing thousands of Western Australians from doing their duty in the way of preparing themselves to defend Australia. To my mind there is no reason why warders should be debarred from taking part in military affairs—because it is impossible to apply the rule generally; it is undesirable that it should be applied at all, but, if it is to be applied, it must be applied generally, and the Government know full well they cannot possibly do so. So I maintain in the first place it was only an excuse, and evidence of that is forthcoming by the fact that it cannot be this question of the refusal to allow warders to take part in military matters. As it cannot be applied generally the argument is not sound, and it only goes to show that Warder Wise had made himself objectionable in other ways, and that this excuse was an opportunity for punishing him for his temerity in criticising the administration. We should get more information from the Government as to their intentions in regard to dealing with the Comptroller General who has been guilty, in the first place of misleading the Minister and the country, and again of victimising men—even although they have been reprimanded—in having them reprimanded for doing their duty to the public in making the public understand what was the true position in connection with the Warder Wise case. I do not desire to take up any more time on this question. I sincerely trust we will have no more of these whitewashing commissions that are becoming so prevalent in Western Australia. It is difficult to put one's

finger on a Royal Commission, the result of whose labours has been of any use at all in guiding the Ministry as to the administration of the affairs of the State. The only one was the Immigration Commission that was appointed to go into the question of light agricultural railways and other questions of importance to the agricultural industry. This has been seized by the Government and has formed the very foundation of their policy. But take that away—and after all it was one appointed by another Administration, the credit of course being taken by the present Ministry—

Mr. Scaddan: The credit does not lie with those who appointed the commission, but with those who were on it.

Mr. JOHNSON: Take that one instance away, and these Royal Commissions' reports have never been acted on. As the member for Kanowna has pointed out in this debate by interjection, there has already been a Commission inquiring into the administration of the Fremantle gaol, and very valuable suggestions were given by that Commission, but they have not been acted on. The Premier himself admits he has never read it, or has not read it of recent years.

The Premier: I did not say that; you must remember it was 12 years ago.

Mr. JOHNSON: The Minister, instead of reading up that Commission and trying to find information that would improve the administration, says he will appoint another Commission. What I want the Premier to do is to induce his Minister to pay a little more attention to the administration not only of this department but of every department under his care. It is the Minister's duty to look up these reports. We have already been put to the expense of appointing a commission of inquiry. Let the Minister act on that inquiry without appointing another; and I venture to assert that if he will only put a little time into it we will have a vast improvement in the administration of our prisons without appointing another Royal Commission. I trust there will be no more Commissions, and that the Minis-

ter will do his duty and see that Mr. Burt is put into his place, and that the warders in the gaol get justice and are not irritated and interfered with to the extent they are now by an incompetent Comptroller General such as we have in the person of Mr. Burt.

Mr. HOLMAN (Murchison): I do not think the reply given by the Premier is at all satisfactory.

Mr. Johnson: He gave no reply at all.

Mr. HOLMAN: At any rate he spoke for some time and we will take that as his reply. He admitted that the information given by the Colonial Secretary in another place was absolutely incorrect, and if he will not admit that, he has admitted that owing to the fact that the hon. member for Fremantle threatened to move the adjournment of the House, he allowed his colleague to be branded—

The Premier: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. HOLMAN: It is no use the Attorney General looking modest; we know that his modesty is always getting him down. The Premier told the House that the warders had been reinstated and that the two who had been suspended had gone back to their employment, and that they were going to be reprimanded. This proves the information given by the Colonial Secretary was absolutely incorrect.

The Premier: I explained that the statements were made in good faith by individual warders, who were simply giving their own experiences.

Mr. HOLMAN: We heard the Premier remark that certain regulations had been broken but he did not give the Chamber the gist of those regulations. I dare say those regulations referred to giving information to the public or to the Press; had that information been given by those warders in favour of the Colonial Secretary, and in support of Mr. Burt, in all probability some of these men would have received promotion instead of being suspended. The mere fact that those officials spoke the truth jeopardised their billets, and having spoken what they knew to be the truth they were suspended. If officials occupying high positions had given information to the Press in support of the Government or any Minister, they would not have been

dealt with in the manner in which these unfortunate warders of the Fremantle prison were treated by the Government. We find that time after time information is given to the Press and to the public by Government officials and that no action is taken. The reason is that they are boosting up the Government. We find also time after time that Government files are placed at the disposal of newspapers, and that these newspapers are given all the information that they require. This information is supplied by Government officials and yet no action is taken. When we find a few officials giving correct information, and branding one of the Premier's colleagues as a teller of falsehoods, then the unfortunates responsible for this are suspended and the threat of the sack is held over them for a time. The time has arrived when a different attitude should be adopted, and the Premier should take exactly the same attitude with other Government officials as has been taken in the case of the warders at Fremantle. This attitude on the part of the Government goes to show the unfairness, the unreliability, and the incorrectness of the methods adopted by the Government. I would like to know what action would have been adopted by the Premier if Parliament had not been sitting? It was only the threat on the part of the member for Fremantle to move the adjournment of the House that compelled the Government to give the men a fair share of justice.

The Premier: A threat was never made.

Mr. HOLMAN: The member for Fremantle told the House that he informed the Premier it was his intention to move the adjournment of the House, and I defy the Premier to deny that statement. Had it not been for that fact, and the reply which he had received from the Premier that these men were going to be reinstated, the member for Fremantle would have moved the adjournment of the House himself. We see how some men are victimised while others are lauded for what they do. In the Crown Law Department information is given to the Press from files which should have been laid on the Table of the House. The *Sunday Times* can receive information a week

after certain papers have been moved for in the House, and in all probability that file was sent to the *Sunday Times* Office to enable them to obtain information from it. If that is so I would ask the Attorney General why some action is not taken against the officials in his department responsible for giving away official information, just as has been done in the case of these unfortunate warders in the Fremantle prison?

The Attorney General: Will you mention an instance.

Mr. HOLMAN: Barry *versus* the Crown.

The Attorney General: There has been no leakage there.

Mr. HOLMAN: Then it is a marvellous fact that those papers which have been moved for over a month ago have reached the *Sunday Times*, or the *Sunday Times* were able to make whole extracts from them, extracts which were published on the 23rd October, nearly a month ago, and yet they have not been laid on the Table of the House. But because those poor unfortunate warders, earning only a few shillings a day, try to speak the truth and brand one of the Ministers, as I have stated he has been branded, they are victimised. Then because the member for Fremantle threatens to move the adjournment of the House the Government crawl down and admit that the Colonial Secretary did wrong when he gave his reply to the question asked in the Legislative Council. I maintain that the time has arrived when a different attitude should be adopted. If the Colonial Secretary's reply in the Legislative Council was correct, then the Government should have stood or fallen by it. The Government have shown extreme cowardice and unfairness in adopting their present attitude; they were afraid that one of their own members was going to move the adjournment of the House, and expose the whole condition of affairs. It was fortunate indeed that Parliament was sitting at this juncture, otherwise a grave injustice would have been perpetrated, and simply because one individual desired to vent his spleen on a poor unfortunate man. No doubt the punishment for this individual

is reserved for later on when Parliament will not be sitting and there will be no one to appeal to. I am satisfied, from the attitude which has been adopted, that the higher officials will wreak their vengeance on the warders at the earliest opportunity when these men will not be able to protect themselves. A thorough and complete inquiry should be made and the time has arrived when the methods of the past should be altered. We have heard it said that Warder Wise did not apply for leave in connection with his military duties; he applied for leave in order to play in a military band. That band, however, no longer exists, in fact it ceased to exist months before this trouble arose. We find also that there is no attempt whatever made to take action against those officials who have been responsible for the whole of this trouble; the statement is merely made by the Premier that the warders are being reinstated and that they will have to suffer a reprimand. Simply because these men cannot protect themselves, and are in the claws of unscrupulous persons, they have to crawl back into their positions the best way they can. In all probability I should have been forced to adopt the same attitude as these men. I should have been forced through circumstances to accept the position as it came along, but I am satisfied that if those men had a fair deal, and dared to speak the truth without fear or favour, the position to-day would be very different. I am satisfied that through the attitude of the Colonial Secretary in this respect, that he is prepared, just as other Ministers have been prepared on other occasions, to take the word of understrappers, and when they find they are in the wrong they are afraid to take the action that it should be necessary to take. The time has arrived when the truth should be spoken, and that those who speak it should not be afraid of the consequences? In this case we have the word of 21 men against that of one man, and we are informed now that these men have been reinstated, but it is my opinion that they will be allowed to go scot free until Parliament is in recess, when vengeance will be wreaked on them. I would have

preferred to have seen the matter fought out on its merits; if the men are in the wrong they deserved to be punished; if they are in the right those people responsible for the present position should be punished, but in the present circumstances there is no danger of that.

Mr. TROY (in reply): I shall not take up much time in replying, and what remarks I make will be by way of answer to the statements made by the member for Fremantle and the Premier. The member for Fremantle, unfortunately, is not in his place. I do not like to make remarks about a member unless he is in his seat to hear them. I cannot drag him into the Chamber, and if he is not concerned about a matter which so vitally affects the interests of his constituents I cannot help it. I can only express the hope that if he deems his action all that is necessary in this case his constituents will not view it in the same manner. The member for Fremantle assured us he would have moved the adjournment had not the Premier taken action. This, apparently, was the only reason why he did not move the adjournment. I want to know has the action of the Premier in reinstating the two suspended officials removed the grievance? If it has not there can be no justification for the refusal of the member for Fremantle to take action. But he is satisfied with what the Premier has done. The Premier reinstated the officials; but at what sacrifice? Were they honourably reinstated, did they lose any prestige? They were reinstated because they apologised for their action and said they had not intended to go as far as had been done in regard to the publication of their protest. They were expected to become abjectly submissive and apologetic, and the Premier was then graciously pleased to remove the suspension. This is what the member for Fremantle deems to have been all sufficient in regard to preserving the rights and liberties of his constituents. If his constituents consider this is all that is necessary they are indeed easily pleased. Again, what sacrifice did these men make in order to be reinstated by the Premier through the great influence of the mem-

ber for Fremantle? It was at the sacrifice of their honour and honesty and, above all things, at the sacrifice of truth. In the first place, they made a truthful statement protesting against the untruthful statement made by the Colonial Secretary; and they have been reinstated because, owing to the penalty with which they were faced, they regret the true statement they made, and now declare they are sorry for having told the truth; consequently, the Minister says, "You shall be reinstated." The member for Fremantle, who represents those people, is absolutely satisfied that there is no further need for action at all. It is with this explanation he excuses the fact that he intended to let this matter go without any publicity. The member for Fremantle also said these officials had assured him that their protest was not intended for publication. But three seconds afterwards the Premier denied what the member for Fremantle had said; because the Premier pointed out that the protest was headed, "To all to whom it may concern." The Premier said he was satisfied, therefore, that it was for publication. I want to ask the member for Fremantle if he is satisfied that justice has been done, if he is satisfied that he is carrying out his principles, if he is satisfied that the excuses he made this evening in regard to his laxity ought to hold good in the House and in the country? In other words, does the member for Fremantle consider that the mere reinstatement of these officials justifies the Government in their refusal to allow the warders to serve in the defence forces; does he consider that the reinstatement of these officials justifies the Colonial Secretary in making an untrue reply to questions asked in another place?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know that the hon. member is justified in characterising the Colonial Secretary's replies as untrue; the Minister gave the information supplied to him.

Mr. TROY: Your ruling will compel me to allow the member for Fremantle to draw his own conclusions from what is said. The member for Fremantle is perfectly satisfied, and whilst he pretends to

be concerned regarding the privileges of these people, his own constituents, he is going to allow their refutation of the Colonial Secretary's replies to questions to stand against them. The Colonial Secretary said the duties of Mr. Wise, as warder, were interfered with by his having to get time off, and frequently whilst on night duty to require his hours of duty to be changed in order that he might attend to his military duties, which was unfair to his brother officers and naturally caused discontent. And all these officers who wrote the refutation said was that these statements were utterly and absolutely untrue. What steps, then, does the member for Fremantle intend to take in regard to those statements. Does he intend to ask the Government to justify the Colonial Secretary, or does he intend to repudiate the statements of his constituents? He can only adopt one attitude. He will vote in justification of the Colonial Secretary and against his own constituents, and say that they have told absolute lies.

Mr. Holman: He will adopt any attitude.

Mr. Murphy: Yes; any at all, after this catechism. You surely do not take this seriously, do you?

Mr. TROY: Does the member for Fremantle consider that all justice has been done by the refusal of the Government to consider the rights and privileges of his own constituents; does he consider the reinstatement of these officials a justification for all they have suffered, for the humiliation and tyranny they have been subjected to? If he does I do not think any reasonable person in the community will agree with him. Then we have this precious promise of a Royal Commission. The term is becoming obnoxious in the House, because every Minister is going to have a Royal Commission as soon as he is found incompetent. Immediately you drive home a Minister's incompetency the Government are going to appoint a Royal Commission. It would seem that Ministers are not responsible to Parliament but only to Royal Commissions. As has already been pointed out, Royal Commissions are only a means

by which the Government for the time being shirk their responsibilities until the grievance is lost sight of. We are to have this Royal Commission as soon as a suitable person can be found to take charge of it, and the Government are going to get a man, apparently, who is just as much associated with the old state of affairs in regard to prisons as are our authorities in Western Australia. He would be associated with the same old penal establishments and would be steeped up to his eyes in conservative traditions in regard to prisons. Men of this class have never effected a reform and never will, yet they are the men to whom the member for Fremantle pins his faith. To look at him one would never imagine the member for Fremantle to be unsophisticated, and we can only ascribe his present attitude to his desire not to inconvenience the Government. I do not know whether the member for Fremantle perused these files; the Premier, apparently, did not give us all that is in them by a long way. The Premier started off by complaining about the lack of time and the short notice given him in which to prepare for this discussion, and yet, while he regrets that he had very little time, we find he has already sent a lengthy communication to the Acting Prime Minister regarding the very same matter. Here on the file he has two pages dealing with the whole question in a most comprehensive manner in reply to a communication from the Prime Minister; and the Premier is the one whom, we are told, always has a grasp of the subject. This is the gentleman who complains he had only half an hour's notice. Again, we are told the member for Fremantle saw the Premier this morning and discussed the matter with him; and the Premier comes along and says he only had half an hour in which to consider it. Further, the Premier unwillingly read an interview which he gave a newspaper some time ago in regard to the same subject and in which he reviewed the whole facts of the case; yet this is the gentleman who had no time to consider the matter and was, so to speak, caught on the hop. I think we are pretty well satisfied that this important matter

has received such publicity that not only the Premier has dealt with it but his colleagues also. The matter has been submitted to Cabinet, and the Comptroller General and other prison authorities have merely carried out the wishes of the Government. The Premier assures us also that the action of the warders in telling the people of the Commonwealth the truth regarding the persecution of Warder Wise is reprehensible in the extreme. After the Premier's statement, if any official misleads Parliament and misleads his own Minister knowingly, any body of persons who endeavour to place the truth before the public are to be deprecated and condemned because they tell the truth, but the Comptroller General who misled the Minister, is to have nothing done to him at all; he is perfectly right in doing what he pleases, the Ministry support him, and the member for Fremantle is satisfied, very easily satisfied, too. We are told that Warder Wise applied for time off and that this was refused. The Premier did not read the letter which he gave in his statement in regard to the application by Wise. Warder Wise wrote on the 21st October, 1909, asking for two days leave of absence. He said—

The Fremantle artillery garrison band of which I have the honour of being chairman as well as a playing member, decided to assist a large committee organised to raise funds for the benefit of the Fremantle public hospital. The band being in its initial stage and limited in numbers, I again appeal to you for consideration in granting my application.

There is no application here, as the Premier led us to believe, for leave to attend a military parade or drill, but merely an application to attend with his band in order to give a benefit performance on behalf of the Fremantle hospital. I am amazed at the Premier reading a portion of this letter and refraining from giving the purpose for which Warder Wise applied for leave from duty. Then again the Premier stated that every opportunity was given to the warders to prepare themselves for military science for the defence of their country; they could join rifle

clubs, and even their own occupation was akin to that of the military.

Mr. Johnson: Then the blacklegs on the trams will become efficient because they carry revolvers.

Mr. TROY: Just so, and yet this Warder Wise was in the artillery in Fremantle, a service with which his official duties did not bring him in any way into contact. He could be all his life as a warder and would never know anything about artillery, and yet the Premier would lead us to believe that he could man a gun at a moment's notice if he were required to do so. Again, he tells us that we cannot have the two duties clashing, but as pointed out by the warders in their protest, and as these papers prove, never on one occasion did his official duties clash with his duties as a member of the military forces. No statement whatever has been made to show that on any occasion when he attended a review or military engagement did such engagement clash with his prison duties. What is the use of assertion when there is no truth in it? And yet it is that assertion with which the hon. member for Fremantle is satisfied. It is a danger to any constituency to be represented by any person who takes another person's word without inquiry on his own part. The Premier also made a statement that the warders' duties in every State would clash with their duties as members of the defence forces but Senator Pearce gives this also the lie direct. He says—

I have made inquiries in all the other States. In Victoria and Tasmania no obstacle is placed in the way of warders being members of the forces.

If in Victoria or Tasmania the duties as warder and those as a private or an officer in the defence forces do not clash, why should not the same position obtain in Western Australia? In South Australia the question has never been raised, and a warder is perfectly at liberty like any other individual to join the defence forces. In Western Australia, therefore, we have the one State where they prevent a warder or a Government official having the same consideration and privileges as he has in any other State of Australia.

Yet the member for Fremantle is perfectly satisfied that they should continue. The Premier as a last resort made a vague, paltry, and brutal excuse. He said, "Anyhow, what does it matter? Warder Wise would have to go in any case because his health necessitates it. He has a sore leg." Warder Wise was to be dissected and held up to ridicule in order that the Premier might have an excuse for his dismissal. Not only had the Government placed a slur on his character but they also charged him with physical unfitness. It was a paltry and brutal excuse, and makes one absolutely disgusted with the whole matter now under discussion.

Mr. Heitmann: With the whole Government.

Mr. TROY: We want to know from the Premier, who has justified the Comptroller General, what he intends to do with this officer who has misled his own Government. If he has not misled his Government, what excuse do the Government intend to offer this House, the members of another place, and the people of the country for the answers which they gave to the questions, answers which have been pointed out by the warders to be incorrect? The Comptroller General who has a free hand makes a peculiar statement about the whole affair. He writes—

The men have been led into doing that which cannot to my mind be justified and is so serious a breach of discipline that I am unable to pass it over.

It is not the Colonial Secretary who cannot pass it over; it is the Comptroller General. There is no reference to the Minister or to any other authority, but the Comptroller General himself cannot see his way to pass over a breach of this character. He continues—

I recognise that so long as members of Parliament can so easily be approached This is Burt!

by those in the public service on what may be considered personal grievances, it is not to be surprised at if men in the position of these officers occasionally go rather far in what they do and say.

The most these men did was to tell the truth, but Octavius Burt says that these men go too far.

Mr. Scaddan: They condemn another man for not telling the truth.

Mr. TROY: The Comptroller General goes on to say—

Under Nos. 28, 29 and 35 of the gaol regulations these men have rendered themselves liable to be dismissed. I would recommend the dismissal of the two principal warders and the reduction to the lowest positions in their rank of the others, did I not feel that it is the example of what so often takes place in Parliament reacting on those in the service of the status of these men which is greatly responsible for the position with which we are dealing.

Mr. Brown: What about the remarks of the Civil Service Association?

Mr. TROY: These remarks are nothing compared with the remarks of Mr. Octavius Burt.

Mr. Scaddan: Is that the sheriff who employed a deputy?

Mr. TROY: Yes. Following on this statement I shall be surprised if Mr. Burt does not come up in the morning and order the arrest of every member of this House. Members of Parliament have no business in telling the truth and standing up and conserving the rights and privileges of the people; the only person who may do that is Mr. Octavius Burt, a remnant of the old penal days, who the Government consider is the best person to offer them advice in this matter.

Mr. Underwood: Mr. "Octopus"?

Mr. TROY: I did not say that, but I believe it will do just as well. He says—

Some mark of disapproval of the action taken seems to be loudly called for and I will after further consideration submit a recommendation to the Minister.

Mr. North also has a statement here.

Mr. Scaddan: What did he say?

Mr. Brown: "I concur."

Mr. TROY: I am going to make an apology to the Comptroller General after

reading what Mr. North has written to the Minister. Mr. North wrote—

For your information. The Comptroller General takes a very tolerant view.

However, I do not wish to record an apology. If it is necessary I will make it later on. Mr. North's letter proceeds—

What the men may have, or say that they, intended, and what they have done are two widely different things. Wise opens the ball by refusing to obey instructions.

Mr. Wise stood for a principle, a principle which is endorsed by 90 per cent. of the people of Western Australia. The letter goes on to say—

and flouting authority, for which he is dismissed. No doubt encouraged by the notoriety he has got through the action of the Federal Government—

How it plays up with all these wee, small Australians opposite! He knows that will please them.

No doubt encouraged by the notoriety he has got through the action of the Federal Government in taking such a prominent notice of the matter, Wise persuaded his former colleagues to put their heads into a noose of insubordination and breach of regulation.

They put their heads into a noose by telling the truth as they did!

hoping to further his own case and regardless of the consequences to them. I do not know what the Comptroller General will recommend, but I think, after giving the lie direct to a Ministerial statement in this unsolicited and gratuitous style, they will be very lucky if they do not follow Mr. Wise.

What can I say after this? There is not much to be said. I shall only make one other remark. The Premier says that the Government here do not allow warders, as it will be a breach of discipline, to go to encampments or take part in any military services. This is a letter from the Under Secretary to the Comptroller General of Prisons on the 18th January, 1910:—

The hon. the Premier has promised the Commandant that, provided the exigencies of the service allow it, leave

will be granted to enable officers of the various departments to attend the military encampment at Tammin from the 20th to 28th instant (inclusive). This encampment will take the place of the one usually held at Eastertide, and the Premier has promised the Prime Minister that leave granted on this occasion shall not count against the annual leave of officers concerned. Will you kindly make the necessary arrangements in respect of officers of your department connected with the military affairs.—(Signed) D. B. Ord, for Under Secretary.

Does the Premier want me to quote many more letters in ample refutation of his statement to-night? Surely he does not want any other denouncement that what he can receive by a brief inquiry into the papers of his own departments. The Premier is apparently satisfied—and his colleagues also—that all that is necessary has been done in regard to the grievances of these men, and that justice has been done to them by their reinstatement; but what we are not satisfied about here is as to what the Government intend to do in regard to giving the officers in gaols, and in every other branch of the service, the same facilities as are given to private individuals by private employers. Why should we have the spectacle of the Government declining to allow the servants of the people to make themselves fit for the defence of the country in time of need, when, at the same time, we expect the private employer to do it, and punish him if he does not do it? We are here to-night fighting for a principle, and there is something more in this matter than the mere reinstatement of a few officials. The position is—are we going to allow the Government to be led by the nose by intolerant and arbitrary officials such as we have in the service as proved by these letters? If we are, we will vote for the Government on this motion. If we are not, I take it members will assist in moving the adjournment of the House to show, at least, there is a party in the House which will not allow this state of things to continue a minute longer than necessary.

There is another principle—whether we are going to allow ourselves, as representatives of the people, to be unblushingly misled by our own officials, whether Parliament is to be subordinated to the officials of the public service, whether these men are to put into the mouths of Ministers statements which are proved later to be untrue, and whether, when these statements are proved to be refuted, they are able to write to Ministers, as they have done in this connection, and endeavour to secure from Ministers a promise to deal arbitrarily with those persons who have told the truth. Are we going to justify this position of affairs; are we perfectly content with the action of the Government? I take it that members are not satisfied, and that we shall insist on the principle that Ministers shall take Parliament into their confidence, that we, as representatives of the people, are entitled to know the true position of affairs, and that if Ministers will not accept their responsibilities, there is in this House a body of men who are prepared to accept theirs.

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

Ayes	20
Noes	21

Majority against .. 1

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. McDowall
Mr. Bath	Mr. O'Loughlen
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Collier	Mr. Swan
Mr. Gill	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Gourley	Mr. Troy
Mr. Heitmann	Mr. Walker
Mr. Holman	Mr. Ware
Mr. Horan	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Hudson	(Teller).
Mr. Johnson	

NOES.

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

Question thus negatived.

QUESTION—PUBLIC WORKS, DEPARTMENTAL CONSTRUCTION.

Mr. HEITMANN asked the Minister for Works: 1, In cases where tenders for public works are not accepted and the work is carried out by the department, is the department expected to do the work for the estimated cost? 2, If not, what is the practice adopted?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, Yes, plus allowance for supervision and extras, if any, but there is no guarantee that the expectation will be realised. 2, Answered by No. 1.

QUESTION—RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION, BOYUP-KOJONUP.

Mr. HEITMANN asked the Premier: In view of the contractor's price for the Boyup-Kojonup Railway construction being £6,500 above the Public Works Department's estimate, and taking into consideration the earnings by the contractor from traffic and extras, also the cost to the State of departmental supervision, will he give a statement to the House showing how the best interests of the country are being served by accepting the tender instead of having the work done by the department at the lower cost?

The PREMIER replied: The House will have the fullest information which hon. members may require placed before it when the Estimates are under consideration. In the meantime I desire merely to state that there is a vital difference between an estimate—be it ever so carefully made—and a tender. There is an obligation on the part of a contractor when his tender is accepted to carry out his undertaking, no matter at what cost to himself, at the price agreed upon. It is impossible to impose any such obligation on the officer who draws up the estimate.

QUESTION — UPPER DARLING RANGE RAILWAY.

Mr. JACOBY asked the Premier: Will he please state when the Pickering Brook-Canning Mill section of the Upper Dar-

ling Range Railway, which was purchased by the Government some time ago from Millars' Company, will be made available for the public?

The PREMIER replied: Arrangements have been made to commence a train service this week.

QUESTION—REDISTRIBUTION OF SEATS.

Mr. SCADDAN (without notice) asked the Premier: Will the Premier inform the House when he proposes to bring down the Redistribution of Seats Bill; does he not think it desirable that the Bill should be presented to the House some time before the discussion takes place on it, as it is a Bill which, after all, is just as important to the country as to members of the House?

The PREMIER replied: I cannot give the hon. member any definite date when I propose to bring this measure down, but I certainly hope to be able to present it within the next fortnight at the latest.

Mr. Scaddan: Can you give any reasons why you cannot state a date?

The PREMIER: I do not propose to give any reasons.

BILL—ROADS.

Report of Select Committee.

Mr. BROWN presented the report of the select committee on the Bill.

Report received, read, and ordered to be printed.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. H. Daglish): With regard to this Bill, I do not think committal pro forma is necessary as recommended by the committee. I beg to move—

That the Bill be reprinted with the amendments recommended by the select committee, and its consideration in Committee be made an Order of the Day for next Friday.

Question passed.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Premier, 1, Papers relating to S. F. McCallum (ordered on motion by

Mr. Holman). 2, Papers relating to Warder Wise (ordered on motion by Mr. Troy). 3, Papers dealing with claim made by R. Barry against the Government (ordered on motion by Mr. Brown).

BILL—SOUTHERN CROSS-BULLFINCH RAILWAY.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. H. Daglish) in moving the second reading said: I do not think the second reading of this measure is one that will call for any lengthy remarks from me at the present time. I desire to point out that the attention of the whole community, and of practically all the English-speaking world, has been directed to this particular district during the past few weeks. The district is somewhat old, and mining has taken place there off and on practically ever since the Yilgarn goldfield has been in existence, but it is one which has latterly not received any great amount of attention. During the past few years, however, there has been a gradually increasing amount of attention given to Yilgarn. On the route of this proposed railway there are two or three places that have been working for some time. At Hope's Hill some four or five miles from Southern Cross there are several parties working on old leases. There has been a public crushing plant erected and some good developments have been reported. A little further North, about 10 miles from Southern Cross, there are at present in existence two large propositions, namely the Corinthian and the Corinthian North. There is a reef there about 1,200 feet in length with a proved depth of 100 feet, and an approximate width of somewhere near 30 feet containing what are said to be payable values.

Mr. Holman: What has been the gold return?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I have not the figures of the return, but there is an estimate that between 350,000 and 400,000 tons of ore are in sight containing payable values.

Mr. Troy: Whose estimate is that?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This is the information I obtained from the Mines Department, and I presume it is authentic.

Mr. Holman: Would it not be better to give the total gold yield?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member will realise in making a railway proposition it is not necessary that the field should have contributed a sufficient quantity of gold to run the risk of being exhausted. We are looking not so much on what has been produced as what will be produced. The size of the lode there is sufficient to provide remunerative employment for a large number of miners for a few years to come.

Mr. Underwood: What about the share brokers?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I have no knowledge on that point. As I was saying employment will be found there for a large number of men for several years to come, even if the lode is not proved to a much greater depth. About two miles to the North-West of the Corinthian district there has lately been a find reported, and a number of leases have been applied for. Then, going on further we come to the Bullfinch, about 21 or 22 miles from Southern Cross. With regard to this district I do not think it is necessary for me to furnish any information to the House further than to state that the fullest details with regard to that mining property have been published in the Press during the past week or two. I have had applications made to me as Minister for Works to provide for road construction in order to enable those who desire to go out prospecting to have ready access to the district, likewise to enable them to obtain such plant and material for residences and so on as are needed.

Mr. Holman: Are they asking for grants to make roads?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member will perhaps understand that if prospecting has resulted successfully there must be facilities given for taking out plant, and the dozen and one requirements of a mining town. The hon. member realised this with regard to Meekatharra, and it would not be a bad

idea for him to take his mind back to that period and apply to the Bullfinch the arguments he used then.

Mr. Holman: It is a great pity that the Government do not apply the same arguments to the Bullfinch as they did to Meekatharra.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I may point out that the present Government were not in existence then. The question for the House to consider is whether we are going to follow up the developments speedily with a railway or whether we are going to allow the cream of the traffic to be enjoyed by carters and others. Another point for the House to consider is whether we are going to spend large sums of money on roads which will not be reproductive and which will require maintenance, or whether we will spend money on the construction of a railway which will be reproductive, at all events to some extent. In regard to this particular district there can be no question, even though the principal mine be the only one on which any development worth mentioning has been carried out, that there will spring up a mining town around it. Even if no new discovery be made that mining town must have all the requirements of a township, and it will be necessary to carry thereto not only the plant required for the mine, but building material to establish residences for the inhabitants of that town. If there be no other discovery made, a town with a population of some hundreds of people must grow up around that mine.

Mr. Collier: Has every town with a population of a few hundreds got a railway?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member knows well that is not so.

Mr. Holman: Will you explain what difference to the revenue that 20 miles of railway will make?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not exactly follow the hon. member's question, but I would esteem it a favour if hon. members will allow me to submit my case fairly completely to the House, and then they can ask questions. I would then be pleased to furnish any information they require. I was going to point out that some means of communication

between Southern Cross and this district would have to be provided. If that communication took the form of roads the Government would have to heavily subsidise the local authority if it did not entirely have to construct the roads. In a large number of mining districts the Government have had to give liberal assistance in connection with the construction of roads. A road over the 22 miles from Southern Cross to Bullfinch has been estimated to cost, if constructed over a width of 16 feet, approximately £15 per chain, or a total of £26,000 including the necessary draining and clearing.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Roads are not provided to other mines.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Roads have been constructed all over the State on the different goldfields. In this particular country it would be absolutely essential that there should be some road communication. Because of the fact that it differs from some others of our mining districts. The soil is of such a nature that it cuts up very quickly and the road would become practically impassable in winter after a little heavy carting, because of the mire, and would become largely useless in summer because of the large quantity of loose dust upon it. It would cost something like £26,000 to make an efficient road, a road that would bring in no revenue and would require heavy annual maintenance charges to keep it in repair. Against that a railway line is estimated to cost £40,000 for the 22 miles, or about £1,800 a mile.

Mr. Scaddan: The contractor ought to get something out of that.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am giving the hon. members the figures, and I may say in reply to the leader of the Opposition that it is proposed to construct this railway by departmental labour.

Mr. Scaddan: We have heard that before.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member has never heard a proposal from me that has not been carried out. This estimate is exclusive of the provision for ballasting, packing, telephone,

culverts, etcetera, which will mean the further expenditure of £4,000.

Mr. Bolton: To say nothing of rolling stock.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is not proposed to get special rolling stock for this 22 miles. The cost of rails and fastenings would be £15,000, and the cost of sleepers, £9,900. I may point out that in regard to the cost of this line the carting of the sleepers would be a rather heavy item because of the fact that they have to be brought from a considerable distance. There are also some difficulties at present in obtaining labour, and these difficulties have been allowed for in this estimate.

Mr. O'Loughlen: That is because you do not pay enough. In South Australia 9s. a day is paid, but you pay only 8s.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This possibility of having to pay a higher wage than has prevailed in the past has been considered in preparing this estimate for the House. The estimated value of rails and fastenings, sleepers, etcetera, which would be available for removal in the event of the line not paying, would be £26,000, or equal to 65 per cent. of the total cost; deducting this £26,000 the railway would actually stand at a cost to the State of £14,000, with a small increase for average depreciation of sleepers. I have already indicated that the total cost of constructing the road would be £26,000, and if this total cost were not entered upon, in other words if the Government did not construct the road themselves, they would no doubt have very largely indeed to subsidise the local authorities in order to help them in its construction.

Mr. Heitmann: We have never heard such a proposition before in regard to any mining camp.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I desire to point out to hon. members that right through the State a very large amount of money has been and is being spent not only on road construction but on road maintenance as well.

Mr. Underwood: There is not a macadamised road outside of Boulder.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I cannot deal with the particular class of

roads in the different districts, but a very large expenditure from the Public Works Department has already been made in connection with assisting the construction of roads in the various districts. I want to come to this point: that if there is good business to be done in regard to this railway the House is surely warranted in considering it. Some few weeks ago Mr. Muir, the inspector of engineering surveys, was sent up to the district for the purpose of making an inspection and submitting a report in regard to it. Mr. Muir's report, dated 3rd November, reads as follows:—

I have just returned from an inspection of the country between Southern Cross and the Bullfinch mine as instructed by the hon. Minister. I am greatly impressed with the possibilities of the field and would recommend the Government to undertake the construction of a railway to Bullfinch (some 21 miles) as soon as they can get rails and sleepers. I would also suggest that Mr. Babington or Mr. Anketell be sent up to lay out the line, grade it, and construct it as they go forward. By these means, supposing the material to be at hand, we could possibly build the line in, say, three or four weeks. The country throughout is well timbered, principally consisting of gimlet wood and salmon gum. The grades would be easy, and I think a surface line with a one in 50 grade could be obtained. There are very few water courses, and the chances are that arrangements could be made for these to be bridged later. In the event of the Government not constructing a railway it would be necessary for them to provide a road which, I think, would cost practically as much as a railway. The country, almost from beginning to end, is of good loamy soil and, providing that the rainfall is sufficient, should be good agricultural land. In any case, they can grow hay or chaff. I saw two or three crops near Southern Cross, adjacent to the proposed line, which showed very good results, and I am satisfied the construction of a railway would be a spur to agricultural development.

I may inform the House that I do not submit this as an agricultural railway proposition at all, but I do say there can be no doubt there is very good soil there if the rainfall were sufficient. I am not laying any stress on that particular clause in Mr. Muir's report. It goes on to say—

The timber along the line, or most of it, is suitable for mining purposes, and if not required at Bullfinch or Southern Cross would find a good market at Coolgardie or Kalgoorlie. There is a sandplain about half-way, from which, I think, good ballast could very easily and cheaply be obtained. Meanwhile, however, I see no reason why the line should not be laid down on the surface, say, without ballasting. I would recommend that a slight deviation to the west (if the grades would allow of it) be made, so that the Corinthian mine should be tapped. This mine, the Corinthian, is a low-grade ore of very big body; the reef is some 40 to 50 feet in width and I understand runs from 10 to 15 dwts. The Bullfinch, as far as I can learn, is practically the only mine yet discovered at the terminal point, but the possibilities are enormous, in fact it is quite likely that this mine will be one of the best that Western Australia has ever produced. I would urgently recommend that action be taken immediately, and, as I before suggested, I think if you sent Mr. Babington or Mr. Anketell up there there would be no necessity for you to have plans and sections sent down to be plotted and graded at head office. The length of the line is about 21 to 22 miles, and I estimate the cost of construction at about £30,000.

Now, that is the report of Mr. Muir, and it is supported by the statement of the Engineer-in-Chief, who says—

The construction of the line as recommended, some 21 miles in length, must be, to a great extent, speculative from a traffic point of view, but in this case I have no doubt would prove a paying proposition.

It is a somewhat difficult thing, indeed almost impossible, to show the commercial possibilities of this line. There can be no

doubt in the minds of any hon. members that the discovery of the Bullfinch must lead to enormously increased prospecting in that particular district, and not only in that particular portion of the district but right through the Yilgarn field, and I hope the same energy will be communicated to prospectors working in other goldfields of the State. With a large auriferous area like that which exists between Southern Cross and the Bullfinch on both sides, and going farther North as far as Golden Valley and beyond, it is impossible to say what discoveries may eventuate within the next few years. The Mining Engineer in his latest report on the Yilgarn goldfields gave some views which I think are worthy of bringing before hon. members although, perhaps, they have already been read by some. The report states—

The Southern Cross auriferous belt extends for over 50 miles in length, and is usually over five miles wide. It is very full of lodes, especially of large low-grade "formations," but in these and in the adjacent country there are also many well-marked fissure lodes. Though a large amount of prospecting has been done there are only quite a few of the mines that have as yet been extensively worked, and most of these have been of decidedly low grade though often profitable. The majority of the shows which have been opened have not been able to attract the assistance of enough capital to enable them to be equipped with proper machinery, and have therefore been worked intermittently and at much disadvantage, usually having to cart the ore considerable distances to be crushed. The low-grade ore bodies most common to this field require treatment close to the mines, with as little handling as possible, and each mine of any size therefore requires to possess its own battery. The field is advantageously situated as regards cost of labour, mining stores, and domestic supplies, and splendidly provided with the best of mining timber and firewood, but outside of Southern Cross itself is at present rather badly provided with salt water supplies for milling, and very

badly with fresh water. Both salt and fresh water are, however, obtainable without excessive cost. The prospects of this field appear to me to be on the whole very promising. There is no field in the State where there are stronger indications of extensive lode-forming action, the auriferous belt being a really remarkable zone of intense and repeated fracturing and crushing of the earth's crust, affording all the geological conditions usually considered favourable for the formation of ore bodies. Good ore has been found more or less all along the belt, and several of the mines seem likely to become of much importance. There is still great scope for prospecting and untried ground for new reefs, and also in the older mines for search in the large "formations" for other ore bodies than those already worked. The district at present seems to me to offer as good opportunities for intelligent prospecting as are to be found in any of the other fields of Western Australia, but recognition must be made of its somewhat unusual features, especially on the prevalence of "shattered zone" deposits, and a wider conception taken of the nature of the lodes than has been usual in the past when the incidental quartz veins have been regarded as alone worthy of attention.

In regard to this country to the immediate north of Bullfinch I may point out there is a number of mines which were worked some years ago, some in the early nineties and, I believe, even in the eighties, and which are known to possess large ore bodies which with new facilities could be profitably treated.

Mr. Collier: What is the name of one mine with a large ore body out there?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am not a travelling mining directory.

Mr. Collier: If you know there are mines there with large ore bodies you ought to know the names of them; that is a question of fact, not of opinion.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Violet is one mine.

Mr. Collier: Where is the Violet?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: I cannot answer the hon. member, but I would like to point out that apart from the Bullfinch itself, which must lead to the establishing of a township, there are a large number of leases taken up over a stretch of seven miles in the vicinity of the Bullfinch, and in some instances a large amount of capital has been subscribed for the purpose of working these leases. What value the leases may have is at the present moment problematical, but we have every reason to hope in the interests of the State that not only around Bullfinch but for some miles away from Bullfinch there may be valuable ore deposits discovered, and I think we have reason to hope that there may be in the immediate vicinity other, perhaps not equally, but very valuable properties. In any case I wish to impress upon the House that I think this railway as put forward is a proposal to construct, at a cost of £40,000, of which £26,000 represents material that will, if the House decides ultimately to remove the line, be easily removable and capable of being utilised in other quarters. I want to point out that we will get the cream of the traffic towards this goldfield, a thing which the Government have failed to get in the past. It is not proposed that this railway should be constructed to the standard of the State railways until the permanency and value of the district have been more fully demonstrated. It is proposed that in the meantime the charges on this line shall be at contractors' rates, because it is realised that it will be necessary, in order to secure profitable working at the outset, that something larger than the ordinary railway rates must be imposed; but the public in that district will be getting an undoubted convenience and they will be required to pay a reasonable return to the Government for the advantages they are obtaining in that railway. I think, therefore, that under these circumstances I am submitting to the House what might reasonably be regarded as a business proposition in regard to which we shall readily get a return of the difference between the total expenditure of £40,000 and the actual materials, which will have

a permanent value and represent at the present time £26,000.

Mr. Scaddan: Why do you make an extra charge to these people?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Because at the outset the line will not pay at the ordinary rates. I understand it has been said also that the Government are giving too much to the district, but the Government are proposing to make the people pay for the advantages they are getting.

Mr. Holman: You are making those pay who cannot afford to pay.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is not so, because the hon. member will know that the cost of cartage over bad roads is far in excess of contractors' prices over a railway, and, therefore, instead of making the people pay who cannot afford to pay too much, we will be saving them from paying the large amount they will have to pay if this line is not constructed. The difference, I am told, will represent something like 4d. as against 1s. 3d. per ton per mile, and the hon. member will realise that in these circumstances the Government can safely recommend the construction of this railway as a commercial enterprise, which will prove helpful to the development of the district.

Mr. HORAN (Yilgarn): I have pleasure in supporting this proposition and I have equal pleasure in complimenting the Government upon the activity they have displayed in introducing it so promptly in order to get this measure of revenue that would otherwise flow into other channels. But further than that, as the Minister introducing the Bill has stated, it should be recognised by all representatives that that extraordinary auriferous belt extends, not for 26 miles, but for at least 1,100 miles from Ravens-thorpe to Mount Magnet, and that eventually this railway will be extended through Golden Valley and even into the electorate of my friend the hon. member for Mount Magnet to that much favoured place Youanme.

Mr. Troy: And "you and me" will rejoice.

Mr. HORAN: This is one of the items which on account of my temporary ab-

sence from the Chamber I did not hear the Minister discuss. At the places we travelled through several times recently we saw wonderfully wide lodes carrying rich gold, and the Minister for Mines and the scientific experts who accompanied him will give evidence of the truth of my suggestion that the railway will ultimately not only go to Bullfinch but far beyond that point. Here also may I state that I received a return from the Railway Department the other day which indicated that many thousands of pounds' worth of timber was being conveyed from different points on the Eastern railway to supply mining props and timber, not firewood, to mines on the Kalgoorlie and Coolgardie belt, with which this branch of railway will secure closer connection and consequently reduce the cost of working a great deal. My ten years' acquaintance with Southern Cross is sufficiently extensive to allow me to say with authority that there have been sandalwood teams employed for years past drawing in sandalwood from 20, 30, and 40 miles out, and this railway must of necessity bring teamsters and their product into closer contact with Fremantle and add immensely to the revenue of the State. Sandalwood is carried at a very high rate on the railways as those connected with the business well know. Independent of that there will be the machinery required at the Corinthian. I have it on good authority that there is at least two years' crushing for a 50-stamp battery there. I admit with most sensible persons that the Bullfinch at the present juncture possesses an element of speculation, but right along the line that it is proposed to traverse there are claims in all directions and I am sure that the machinery which will be required there, whether the ore be oxides or sulphides, will justify the erection of a huge plant from the operations of which the Government will benefit. If anyone needs further evidence he will on a visit to the field see in the large passenger traffic, the motor-cars, and the crowds of people carting there, another channel of revenue which the Government are justly entitled to take advantage of. The Minister,

speaking of course with greater authority than I do, is in possession of facts and figures, which will be supplemented if occasion demands it, later on. I desire to support the second reading.

Mr. Holman: He must have kept his facts and figures to himself; he did not give them to us.

Mr. McDOWALL (Coolgardie): We must all realise that the Bullfinch is in its infancy at the present time, and by some it might be contended that it is not a wise policy to construct this railway. On every occasion when I have spoken in connection with the goldfields of this State the burden of my song has been the immense importance of the gold-mining industry. I have stated, and I state again, that it is worth double all the other producing industries in the whole of the State, and while we desire to encourage agriculture in every possible way, it still must be conceded that the gold-mining industry must also be encouraged. Many of my friends on this side of the House will say, "Why have not the Government constructed a railway to Lawlers; why did they keep Norseman without communication for ten or twelve years; and why are they now rushing this railway to Bullfinch?"

Mr. Holman: Ask Dorrie.

Mr. McDOWALL: I do not want to ask that gentleman or anybody else that particular question. I maintain that in this instance two wrongs do not make a right and if the Government were lax in providing railway communication for other districts that richly deserved it, I am now going to commend them for their prompt action in regard to the Bullfinch field. Of course the Bullfinch may peter out; it is impossible for us to tell the future; but over and over again I have argued that the auriferous country of this State is so extensive and so valuable that even if that particular mine should peter out the country in that direction is worthy a railway for prospecting purposes alone. Under the circumstances, it is my intention to support the second reading of the Bill, and when we find the Minister telling us that it will only run into something like £40,000, of which £26,000 is repre-

sented in material that could be utilised in other directions, members will at once see that the risk is not very great.

Mr. Horan: Over £25,000 was got at the sale of town lots.

Mr. McDOWALL: I was going to remark that. If the hon. member for Yilgarn would not take on himself the whole thing and say, "Alone I did it," I would be able to get through my speech. But we have Bill Adams about to help and it is difficult for me to do so. To come back to the subject: If there is only a risk of £14,000 and half of the township has realised £25,140 I think there is every justification for building the railway.

Mr. Draper: Is that money paid?

Mr. McDOWALL: No, it is not paid, and in that connection I personally hold the opinion that the Government, when they sell land of that description, should impose the same conditions as a private individual, and so be able to sue the buyers for the balance of the money instead of allowing speculation on a ten per cent. basis. We know that if those gentlemen who have paid ten per cent., find that the district goes down, they can get out of their liability. That is perfectly true, and there will be no attempt on the part of the Government to enforce payment. But that is, to a certain extent, deviating from the subject. I am pleased to have sufficient confidence in the Bullfinch to think that it is going to last for the 12 months, and then most of the people will have paid the money. It must be realised that practically only half the township has been sold, and I believe that had the other half been submitted the other day it would have sold as readily as the allotments already disposed of, and in the circumstances the sale of the township allotments would amply pay for the construction of the railway. But I again desire to say my chief reason for supporting this railway, and any other railways penetrating auriferous country, is that the great gold industry merits every possible encouragement, and we have been prone to state that it is not receiving the encouragement the agricultural industry is receiving. I think it will be very foolish on our part to dis-

courage the Government when they are in the humour to do something. An hon. member laughs, but I do not think it is very humorous. I think it is a very sensible proposition. We would have been only too pleased to encourage them had they taken the slightest interest in giving railway communication to Norseman 12 years ago, and it would be the height of stupidity on this occasion, when we find the Government so anxious to assist this mining township, to oppose the construction of this railway. I think all the arguments are in favour of the construction of the line. Therefore I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

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

The Premier: Why the necessity? Does the leader of the Opposition want the adjournment?

Mr. Scaddan: The member for Murchison wants it.

Mr. Holman: Let the Minister for Mines speak.

The Premier: He does not want to speak.

Mr. Holman: Then I want to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member presses the motion of course I must put it.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	26

Majority against .. 12

AYES.

Mr. Bath	Mr. O'Loughlen
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Price
Mr. Collier	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Gill	Mr. Swan
Mr. Heitmann	Mr. Troy
Mr. Holman	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Hudson	(Teller).
Mr. Johnson	

NOES.

Mr. Butcher	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Carson	Mr. Monger
Mr. Daglish	Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. Draper	Mr. Murphy
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Gordon	Mr. Osborn
Mr. Gourley	Mr. Flesse
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. Walker
Mr. Harper	Mr. Ware
Mr. Hornu	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Jacoby	Mr. Layman
Mr. McDowall	(Teller).
Mr. Male	

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. HUDSON (Dundas): In voting in favour of the motion for the adjournment of the debate, I did so for the purpose of allowing hon. members to make further inquiries with regard to this proposition. In all railway proposals we should be supplied with full information. Plans, and other reports should be on the Table of the House, and every member should have the opportunity of perusing them; but in regard to this Bill the plans were only placed on the Table to-night, and the reports have only just been read by the Minister. I would point out that in most cases a proposal for the adjournment of a debate on a Bill of this character is accepted. However, I have pleasure in supporting the second reading, because I believe that the railway proposed will be a very profitable concern to the State. It would be interesting if the Minister for Works would tell us whether the railway was to be built out of loan moneys or out of revenue, as to whether the revenue that is being received from the sale of the lands is to be applied for the purpose of building this railway line, or whether that money is to go into the general revenue and the line built out of loan moneys. I have had a close acquaintance with this district for the last 18 months or so. I have been all over it, and I think there is every justification for the construction of this railway, that there is a reasonable hope that the whole district will prosper, and that the line will become a payable proposition.

Mr. COLLIER (Boulder): During the few years I have been in the House I think this is the first occasion, if my memory serves me rightly, on which the second reading of a Bill for railway construction has been forced through in one sitting. No matter what one's opinions may be as to the merits of this railway, I ask what justification is there for the attitude of the Government in forcing the second reading of the measure this evening. Would anything extraordinary happen to Bullfinch if the debate were adjourned for a day or two in order to give members an opportunity to analyse the speech of the Minister for Works? What is the object of this extraordinary haste in connection with this railway?

I venture to say there has not been any railway proposition submitted to the House supported by less facts and less arguments than those advanced by the Minister for Works. Let us examine the speech of the hon. member. He says that in any case the Government would have to construct a road to Bullfinch, which would cost something like £26,000. Why would the Government have to construct a road to Bullfinch? Why deal with Bullfinch differently from the manner in which they deal with dozens of other mining towns in the State?

Mr. Horan: The quantity of traffic justifies it.

Mr. COLLIER: Then I say it justifies the construction of hundreds of miles of roads in other parts of the State.

[The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.]

Mr. COLLIER: There is a town called Davyhurst, which carries a population of something like a thousand, or did for a considerable number of years, and it is 30 miles from an existing railway, almost completely saudhill all the way, and not an inch of that road is constructed.

The Minister for Mines: That is not correct.

Mr. COLLIER: There is not one inch of that road constructed. There may have been money spent on it in different ways in repairing it a little bit, but there is not an inch of it which one could call constructed in a way such as would cause the expenditure contemplated by the Minister for Works in his argument for a road to Bullfinch. The Minister was speaking, I take it, of a macadamised road that would cost £26,000. I want to know why the Minister for Works thinks the Government would be under any obligation to construct this road when they have not adopted that policy in regard to dozens of other towns throughout the goldfields. The Minister for Works went on further to say that even if there was only one mine in the district, even if there were no more discovered outside the Bullfinch, that mine in itself would carry a population of several hundred, which in itself would justify the railway.

The Minister for Works: No, I did not say that.

Mr. COLLIER: Those were the Minister's words. He said it would carry a population of several hundred, which in itself would justify the railway. Then will every mining town in the State, which carries a population of several hundred justify a railway? If it is so the Government have been neglecting their duty for a great many years past because there are many mining towns in this State with not only a population of a few hundreds but a population bordering on a thousand and some of over a thousand which have been asking for railway communication for 12 or even 15 years, and the Government have turned a deaf ear to them. Does the Minister for Works say that one mine will make a goldfield, and that one mine will justify a railway be that mine ever so rich? Whatever merits this railway may have, or whatever the future of the Bullfinch may be, the argument that one mine employing a few hundred men will justify the construction of a railway is a ridiculous one. The Minister for Mines has read to the House a report by Mr. Muir, a highly amusing report. Mr. Muir stated that the prospects of the field were very bright, and he strongly recommended the construction of the railway. He said there would be a large revenue from the carriage of mining timber alone, and he added that if the timber was not wanted at Bullfinch it could be taken on to Kalgoorlie. He first of all declared that the field was going to be a great one, and that the railway would be justified, and then that if the timber was not wanted there it could be taken to Kalgoorlie. When he said this it seemed that he had some little doubt as to the future of the field. I want to ask the Minister for Mines of what value is the information supplied by Mr. Muir and even that of the Engineer-in-Chief as to the possibilities of Bullfinch as a goldfield. However valuable their information may be on matters on which they are qualified to speak, I say that their knowledge of the possibilities of mining towns is worth absolutely nothing.

Mr. Scaddan: The same two gentlemen are making a report on the possibilities of the Esperance line.

Mr. COLLIER: Exactly. The Minister for Works went on to say that this railway will cause much prospecting. He said it would be impossible to calculate the amount of prospecting that will be carried on for the next two years. It is the first time I ever heard a railway justified on the score that it is going to assist prospecting. The Minister for Works wants to build the railway in order to assist prospectors. From that point of view alone his argument was ridiculous. He told us that North of the Bullfinch there were some mines which were known to have very large ore bodies, and he spoke of one which he was informed by his colleague was called the Violet. That is all indicative of the casual and haphazard manner the Bill has been thrown at the House. The Minister declares there is a mine there with large ore bodies, and when he is asked the name of it he inquires the name from his colleague, and he gives this and other information to the House as facts. If these are facts, why could not the Minister supply the House with some information and let members know to what extent those large bodies of ore have been proved and what they have done in the past, and what their possibilities are. He supplied no information, but merely throws the Bill at the House in a casual way, and expects members to swallow it. I might say at this stage that it is not my intention to vote against the second reading of the Bill, but I think it is my duty to offer some criticism against the manner in which the Bill has been introduced, and against the manner in which an attempt is being made to force it through the House. It is because there is a great boom on with regard to Bullfinch, and because the whole of the State is talking Bullfinch and because there have been a few phenomenally rich crushings obtained from it, that the House is justified in critically analysing the position. Members are not justified because of what they have read in the Press during the past six or eight weeks in swallowing everything

and agreeing to the construction of the railway or because there is a prospect of Bullfinch becoming a rich mining town. Bullfinch may become another Golden Mile, and we all hope it will.

Mr. Jacoby: It is a fair business risk.

Mr. COLLIER: Whatever the future has in store for Bullfinch at the present time we have no evidence whatever that is going to be a great and permanent gold-field, and it is just as well that men in responsible positions in a time like this, which is a critical time in the history of gold-mining in the State, should act cautiously. If this boom continues, and leases are to be traded off on a speculative public who may be prepared to put money into them, the mining industry stands a chance of suffering, and more so than has been the case during the past dozen years. Of the 1,200 leases which have been pegged out, we know that a large proportion of them are wild cats. They are nothing but salt-bush flats.

Mr. Heitmann: Agricultural land, as Muir says.

Mr. COLLIER: Exactly, and if the leaseholders succeed, because of the boom, in trading them off on the investing public, it will be a bad thing for the mining industry. I want to say that this haste on the part of the Government to push the Bill through practically in 24 hours, lends some colour, or at least the speculating public will be justified in coming to the conclusion, that the field has every evidence of becoming another Golden Mile. That is the conclusion the public must draw because they will say "When the Government have such confidence in it, and are constructing a railway to it with such haste, we will put our capital into it." As I have stated, I am going to vote for the second reading but I want to protest against the manner in which the Bill is being hurried through, and against the casual manner in which it has been flung at members by the Minister for Works. Before I sit down I would like to quote the remarks the Minister for Mines made during the course of his visit to the district last week. In the course of a speech in reply to a request for the many facilities the field was asking

for, the Minister stated that he was of opinion the railway could await the further development of the mine, and that Cabinet would weigh and consider the position before embarking on a railway policy to that centre. What has happened since? That statement was made on last Monday week, and on Thursday, his colleague, the Minister for Works, secured the first reading of the Bill for the construction of the railway. Furthermore, we were informed by the Minister that he went there specially to inquire into the claims and merits of this railway, and to advise his colleagues in Cabinet. If that was his opinion on Monday, what advice did he tender to Cabinet on Wednesday? Or what happened between Monday and Wednesday to justify the Minister in recommending the construction of the railway after having said on Monday that it could await further developments. When the Minister had been over the field, he realised the necessity of being cautious with regard to the matter, but for some unexplained reason that caution seems to have departed, and three days afterwards the Government come down with the Bill for the construction of the railway. It behoves hon. members to be very careful to take no action that will have a tendency to injure the future of the mining industry of the State.

Mr. HOLMAN (Murchison): I am very much surprised that an attempt should be made to bludgeon through a proposition like this without giving the people an opportunity of making any inquiry. It is only characteristic of the attitude of the Government when any booming proposition is placed before the country. Then we have the matter prominently brought before us, and it is pushed through without any opportunity of inquiry at all. I remember some little time ago when another proposition in which the Minister for Mines interested himself came forward. That Minister did not have the courage to move it, but he placed the matter upon the shoulders of the then Minister for Works, and there was the same lack of information in connection with that matter which has been experienced here to-day. Speaking of Southern

Cross as a mining field, or of other goldfields in the State, I give way to no man in my desire to see those fields go ahead, or to do everything that it is possible to force them ahead in a proper manner, but I strongly object to a proposition like this being pushed through the House for the sole purpose of booming an already too much boomed proposition. I intend to submit figures and facts to show what has taken place in the past, and to show that a proposition the Minister for Mines absolutely declined to give way to on his visit to Bullfinch is submitted to the House three days afterwards, and I will show that the only effect this railway will have will be to boom the Bullfinch proposition.

Mr. Underwood: And rob the people.

Mr. HOLMAN: Absolutely rob and plunder them wholesale. As regards Southern Cross, for many years past in that district, as well as in other districts, I have always come forward and given my assistance to everything that would tend to advance it.

Mr. Horan: Considering that when you were Minister for Railways you did it the greatest damage that could have been done.

Mr. HOLMAN: I am speaking about Southern Cross, as a mining field, the district represented, or I would say misrepresented by the hon. member. I was one of those who went to the Minister and assisted in getting a battery for Southern Cross many years ago. I travelled over that country with some of the men who are battling there to-day, and I always had a fair opinion of the district. I am satisfied that with a fair measure of assistance and support Southern Cross will yet prove itself to be one of the best mining districts in Western Australia, but I am satisfied that the money which it is proposed to spend on this railway could be better spent in other directions. We take, for instance, the information given us by the Minister for Works. I never heard a more lame or lagging speech on any proposition than that given by the Minister for Works. It was an insult to the intelligence of members and of the

people of the country. He read a report by Mr. Muir stating that the agricultural possibilities were something marvellous. Another member got up and told us that sandalwood would be found in the district, while a third declared his willingness to support any goldfields line. I am willing to support a goldfields line, provided the proposition is a fair and reasonable one. I am satisfied the present proposition could have waited a few months before being brought forward. The Minister for Works said this was a business proposition. He was asked what were the returns of the various mines, and he pointed to the Violet. I can tell him the total production of the Violet up to the end of 1909 was 65 tons crushed for a return of 133 ounces of gold.

The Minister for Works: That is not the answer I gave to the question.

Mr. HOLMAN: No; I am giving the proper answer. The Minister did not know the lease.

The Minister for Works: The hon. member is not quoting fairly.

Mr. HOLMAN: The Minister said there were several important leases there with big ore bodies. He was asked what leases, and he said the Violet. Then again we hear about the great Corinthian lease. The production of this mine up to the end of 1909 has been 42 tons for a return of 30 ounces.

The Minister for Mines: Does that make any difference?

Mr. HOLMAN: No; not a bit. I wonder what made the difference in the mind of the Minister for Mines between the time he spoke at the Bullfinch and the occasion when he spoke down here.

The Minister for Mines: When did I speak down here?

Mr. HOLMAN: If the Minister has not spoken down here he has done something else. There was a banquet last night of which I have heard, and I have recollections of other banquets. I was dealing with the question of the goldfields in that part of the State. In all probability the total crushing from the Bullfinch mine does not amount to more than 500 tons, and surely to goodness it is not reasonable to ask us to build

the li. the purpose, in my opinion, of booming that over-boomed property, which is a grave danger to the inflow of capital to Western Australia. It is a great mistake for us to over-boom that mine and grant the construction of this railway before the place is more fully proved. We are rushing the railway out there in record time; no railway in the Commonwealth was ever rushed through so quickly. It will be a very poor stroke of business if we, by rushing the railway to the Bullfinch, bring in a few thousands of revenue and by over-booming the place persuade people to put their money into propositions which are absolutely worthless, to invest thousands of pounds in wild cats. Yet the Minister in introducing the Bill said we should construct the line as a business proposition. All the line is going to do is to assist in hoodling a great number of people and driving a great deal of capital out of Western Australia. Then the gentlemen who force this line through will turn round and say it is Labour that has driven capital away, and will talk largely about security of tenure and reduction of wages. What has driven capital out of the country in the past? The position was just the same as it is to-day. Take the great Peak Hill mine, perhaps five times as rich in its early days as the Bullfinch. Although the country is different, the gold deposits in Peak Hill are somewhat similar to those in the Bullfinch. Over a great extent of country they got rich deposits of gold just the same as in the Bullfinch. To show, in my opinion, it is not a true lode in the Bullfinch to-day I may point to the fact that they are sinking shafts all over the place. This leads me to believe it is a somewhat similar deposit to that in the old Peak Hill. There they secured thousands of ounces of gold, floated the company and ran the shares to a market value of £10, making the value of the Peak Hill Company something over £1,000,000. After having been sold in the old country the shares reduced in value to a few shillings, and you could not give them away to-day. What has been done at the Bullfinch? I say one of the cleverest strokes of

business ever done by any mining man in or out of Australia was done by Doolette when he refused to part with his proposition and, instead, floated the company and kept the major portion to himself. He was supposed to have placed 50,000 shares on the market at £1, retaining 400,000 himself. It was stated in the Press that half a million had been offered for the proposition. I am not in a position to dispute the fact and, therefore, must take it for granted; but instead of accepting the offer he floated his property. What, then, is the position? He is able to corner the market, and to-day the market value of the property is £1,500,000. What does that mean? A mining investment with its risks is always regarded as a 20 per cent. proposition. At less than that it is very doubtful. Money returns from 6 to 8 per cent., ordinary property from eight to 10 per cent. and mining propositions should return 20 per cent. This means that the Bullfinch will have to return in dividends £300,000 per year for a period of over six years. What is going to happen in the meantime? Those shares are being boosted up, and the mistake made by the Government in pushing forward the construction of this line is that they will boom those shares to a very high price, while, on the information supplied, it will be a total impossibility for the mine to furnish a sufficient amount of money to give the investors a fair return. What was done to boost the Peak Hill mine? Darlington Simpson used something of the same tactics as are being used by Doolette. He utilised the Governor of the State; he got Sir Gerard Smith, better known as "Jerry" Smith, and took him through to Peak Hill, the track being lined with champagne bottles. They dined off golden plates made of gold won from the mine, and the result was that the mine was boomed to an enormous value, and the investors were absolutely robbed. I am afraid the same state of affairs will eventuate in the Bullfinch, although on the other hand, I trust it will prove to be the best property opened up in Western Australia. We had the same sort of thing when the Phillips River was opened up, and the

Minister for Mines predicted a population of from 10,000 to 20,000 people for the district, to materialise within a year or two. To show the sort of stuff trotted out time after time, I asked on that occasion that facts be placed before the House; and I can point to my speech in December, 1906, and defy the Minister to show one incorrect statement, notwithstanding that I was forced to speak without my notes. The Minister for Mines, in trying to boost up the property, told us that the population of Phillips River would in a year or two reach from 10,000 to 20,000 souls. Several years have elapsed since then, and what has been done? The same thing was done as is being done to-day. Kaufmann came out and used the Government for the purpose of floating the property on the English market, and robbed the investors of many thousands of pounds. He used the Government at that time just as Dorrie Doolette is using the Government to-day. After Kaufmann came out and secured the leases from the prospectors, and bought the Government smelter at a ridiculous price—because he found the money to pay for the smelter in the residues and slag left there; he robbed this country of a few thousand pounds in the purchase of the smelter—he was able to boost the proposition until its value reached £1,250,000 on the English market. To-day its value is probably only £200,000, and those people who put their money into such property are being robbed through the assistance of the Government of Western Australia. The present Minister for Mines is one of the first to say the Labour party prevent capital coming into the State. The people who prevent capital coming into Western Australia are men like the Minister for Mines and the members of the Chamber of Mines who, on every possible occasion, when a boodler comes along lend their services and utilise the whole power and influence of the Government authorities in boosting up the boodler and thereby assisting him to rob the legitimate investor who is quite willing to put his money into a show if he has a fair run. I say if the legitimate investor invests capital in Western Australia the Labour

party are the people who see that he gets a fair run every time. The Minister for Mines, when he has an opportunity assists the boodler to rob the people in the older countries, and in this country as well.

The Minister for Mines: Is that quite in order? It is very offensive anyway.

Mr. HOLMAN: If the Minister does not like it I will say that perhaps he does it unwittingly.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is hardly in order.

Mr. HOLMAN: He does it, but, as I said before, perhaps he does it unwittingly. To prove it I quoted the case of the sale of the smelter to Kaufmann and also the promise that the Minister for Mines made of a railway to Phillips River. It was that promise which enabled Kaufmann to boost that property up to the value which he did, and that has done a great deal of harm to Western Australia. Phillips River of itself, if it were given a clear run, is a fair mining proposition, but being boosted up to such a value it was impossible for it to give a return for the money invested in it. We have the value of this Bullfinch mine quoted to us, but other districts have produced much more gold and have a greater population, and yet have been crying out in vain for years for railway facilities. How is it possible that at such short notice and without any settlement being there this place can get a railway? I am sorry that the Government are doing as they are in assisting to place a good many wild cats on the market. I speak as a warning to those who may be induced to put their money into that proposition, not with the intention of retarding development in a legitimate mining field in this State, but to see that those who do invest their money have a fair run. I could quote instances of people who have put thousands of pounds into mining and have been robbed of their money. We have the testimony of many scores of practical mining men who have been prospecting in Western Australia for many years, that many propositions being boosted on the market at the present time have never had a pick put into them, and are away out where

it is impossible to get any gold from them. We have also the argument that £25,000 has been paid for town lots in that centre. Up to the present time only £2,500 has been paid, and in a speculative place like that it is always worth while for a man to risk ten per cent. A lot of these men have speculated £50 or £60 in the hope of making a rise before the next payment comes due. The sale of these town lots is a standing disgrace to the Government, and it absolutely prevents a legitimate business man and the poor individual having a say in the town at all. It is all done for the purpose of boosting up the boodler all the time, and what will the result be? Every person who desires to start in business in Bullfinch will be bled to the very marrow bones by those who bought up the town lots, because the Minister for Mines has stated that he intends to drive them from the leases on to the town lots in the near future.

The Minister for Mines: Why do you not quote correctly? I said I had no objection to them temporarily putting their buildings on the leases, because there was nowhere else to go.

Mr. Scaddau: You said that shortly they would be compelled to go on to the town lots.

Mr. HOLMAN: You did not expect them to camp in trees, did you? You told them they would be compelled to go on to the town lots, but in the meantime they could stop on the leases. Of course they could; they could not go anywhere else. The sale of these town lots did no good to the country because they were bought for speculative purposes, although there were some legitimate bids I admit, and many people there will have to pay through the nose for the right to start business if they so desire. They will have to pay exorbitant prices and they will be ruined before they start. Of course it pays Dorrie Doolette to spend a few thousands of pounds until he is able to get rid of his shares at a high price, and then the unsuspecting public will be "left with the baby to nurse," as the saying is, and all their money gone. It was not my intention to oppose the second reading

of this railway Bill. I will never oppose anything that would tend to improve the conditions of any mining field in Western Australia. I was one of the strongest advocates on the Norseman line, although I badly required mining railways in my own district at the time, but I said in public many times that that was one of the first mining railways that should be constructed in the State. To-day we have the Lawlers district, which I do not represent, and the Wiluna district, which is in my electorate, both of which are far more important to develop than the Bullfinch, but Dorrie Doolette or any other boodler is not there, which accounts for both places being passed over.

Mr. Horan: It is not right to accuse Doolette. I know the gentleman.

Mr. HOLMAN: I admit that he has done some work, and I am pleased to see him or anyone else make a rise.

Mr. Draper: And having made a rise you call him a boodler.

Mr. HOLMAN: Certainly not. I do not think I did call him a boodler, but I say that Dorrie Doolette has made one of the cleverest business moves that any man has ever made in Australia or out of it.

The Attorney General: You have been calling him a boodler all through your speech.

Mr. HOLMAN: How can the Attorney General know? He has been asleep.

The Attorney General: No, I have been listening to your speech.

Mr. HOLMAN: Well, you usually look as if you are asleep. I have seen sleeping lizards on logs on a sunny day, and you do not look much different. I used to see these lizards when I was a boy and every time I went to catch them they were gone. Evidently the Attorney General has also seen them and likes to imitate their habits. It is a marvellous fact that he always likes to lie asleep there enjoying the reflection of the electric light, but when he hears an interjection against the member who is speaking he rises to support it although he does not know anything about it. I was dealing with the question of the amount of income Doolette is making, and although I give him credit for going into the country I say that the

Government should not assist him in hoodling other people. I maintain that the fact of building this line at the present time will not only assist him very greatly, much in excess of anything he deserves, in increasing the market value of his property, but also there is a danger of its assisting in putting other wild cats on the market. The member for Yilgarn laughs generously, but he will know that the Bullfinch Proprietary Company is already floated, and that wild cats have been floated as well, and that there are other wild cats that are not yet floated. We were speaking of banquets a little while ago. I remember another proposition brought forward by Mr. Darlington Simpson, a well known man in the mining world, when they tried to lead me into exactly the same position as the present one. I was a young fellow and only just returned as a member of Parliament, when Mr. Simpson sent two gentlemen to ask me to come to a banquet. I went down to the Esplanade Hotel because they stated that they wanted to talk about the district I represented, and there was a champagne dinner, and afterwards, when everything was primed up, there was a certain proposition made to me in connection with the railway.

The Minister for Mines: You told me it was at the Weld Club.

Mr. HOLMAN: No, it was not. I have been there and seen the Chinamen with the Minister for Mines as well. This was at the Esplanade Hotel. They wanted to get a railway line to boost up the value of the Peak Hill mine on the market. I was not satisfied, even at that time, that Peak Hill warranted a railway, and I was not satisfied with the proposition. I told Mr. Simpson that if he wanted a railway or any other proposition in my district he should put the proposal in writing. He did so, and I replied. Afterwards he sent a letter through the lawyer of the property saying that if I did not take the matter up they would get some other member to do it. I told them to do so. They wanted to boost up the Peak Hill district just the same as is now desired for the Bullfinch district.

The Minister for Mines: You came to me.

Mr. HOLMAN: Yes, I went to see the Minister for Mines and explained the whole position to him. I was a young member, and I went to the leader of my party, and to other members of the party, because I realised the danger of having anything to do with men like that. I am only sorry the Minister for Mines did not come to me when he was interviewed by Mr. Kaufmann and others. I am always one of those who attack propositions which tend to prevent people from getting a fair go. I could have given the Minister for Mines some information on those occasions that would have prevented a great deal of harm being done to Western Australia. It is not my desire to oppose the construction of this railway line, but I strongly object to the expenditure of this amount of money when there are other places in Western Australia that cannot receive any consideration. Take, for instance, the Cue goldfield. It is a goldfield that has produced many thousands of ounces of gold, but now they want a few thousand pounds to go in for a system of boring, and I am doubtful whether the Minister for Mines will give them any consideration. They require a State battery. Had Cue had a State battery some years ago, instead of the department pandering so much to private enterprise, it would have saved Cue and kept a large mining population there. But not only need Cue be mentioned; there are scores of other places in Western Australia which, with a fair amount of assistance and encouragement, would return and develop much better propositions than anything outside the Bullfinch mine in that centre. Again, we have the member for Beverley, who has told the country time after time that mining is going down, that it is—

Mr. Harper: No. I said it was a diminishing asset.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is not in order in interjecting out of his seat.

Mr. HOLMAN: The hon. member said considerably more than that. In fact he condemned the whole mining industry in Western Australia simply because they placed him at his true value when he stood for the Senate.

Mr. Collier: He said that after five or six years there would be no goldfields.

Mr. HOLMAN: That is worse; yet the hon. member in spite of the fact—

Mr. Harper: I did not say anything of the kind. I said there would be fewer people on the goldfields then there are to-day.

Mr. HOLMAN: I happened to hear the hon. member returning thanks after he was defeated for the Senate, and there were several other members who heard him make the same remarks. They were practically published, although the statement was not put in the Press in full. A more damaging statement coming from a supposed-mining man, one who had made his fortune out of the mines, could not be found. It did more damage to the mining industry in Western Australia than even some of the actions of the Minister for Mines, and that is saying a great deal.

The Minister for Mines: Why do you not deal with the Bill?

Mr. HOLMAN: I am dealing with the Bill by drawing attention to the support the Minister is getting for this measure. Although the member for Beverley said there would be no mining fields in Western Australia in a few years' time he is prepared to blindly support this Bill.

Mr. Harper: I repudiate that statement. I did not say that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the member for Beverley takes exception to the remarks the hon. member must withdraw.

Mr. HOLMAN: The hon. member does not take exception to them, he repudiates them. I am pleased the hon. member admits he was wrong and is prepared to repudiate the statement.

Mr. Harper: I did not make it. Why do you not deal with the subject you are up to speak on?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HOLMAN: Deal with what?

Mr. Harper: Deal with the railway.

Mr. HOLMAN: I am dealing with the railway. I desire to point out that it is a grave mistake for the Government to force this Bill through the House on the first night it is introduced, without giving members the opportunity to get inform-

ation, or without even supplying the information to members. As has been said before, the first time this railway was mooted was less than a week ago. It had not been dealt with by Cabinet a week ago. It had not been before the country at all. No request has ever been made for this railway publicly from the Bullfinch, and they never anticipated they were going to get a railway.

Mr. Scaddan: They did in the Palace Hotel.

Mr. HOLMAN: It is not the only railway dealt with in the Palace hotel; and in all probability, unless there is a change in Government, it will not be the last.

Mr. Angwin: Will that make any difference?

Mr. HOLMAN: I do not think so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must get on to the subject.

Mr. HOLMAN: It is a great mistake to try to force this measure through at less than a week's notice. The railway was not mooted a week ago from to-day, yet we have the Government absolutely refusing an adjournment of the debate to give members the opportunity to get information. All the Minister for Works stated was that he had no information to give, because a proposal like this did not require much information at all. That is all the information we have had. We are to take it for granted that, because a Minister makes a few statements like that, the railway should be built, when there is practically only one man in the country at the present time who will benefit by the construction of the railway.

The Minister for Works: Is that why you are opposing the railway?

Mr. HOLMAN: No. I am opposing it at the present time because—

Mr. Draper interjected.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HOLMAN: We are aware that the member for West Perth always takes up the cudgels on behalf of the Government. The reason I take exception to the haste which is being displayed over the matter is that because I consider an opportunity should be given those who are investing money here to get more information so that they might have a better

run for whatever they may invest. If the matter is pushed forward too hurriedly the information which will be supplied will be by no means satisfactory. What has been supplied is absolutely useless; in fact it cannot be called information at all. The Minister for Mines, who was up there only about a week ago, stated it was not his intention to recommend the construction of a railway line for some time at any rate, and when an adjournment of the debate was asked for early in the evening it should have been allowed in order to emphasise that there was no need to hurry the thing through at one sitting. Last night the Government were treated to a great dinner—one of the best dinners of its kind, so we are told—given by the person who is going to benefit by the construction of this railway.

Mr. Scaddan: I never heard of a Ministry being used to such an extent before.

Mr. HOLMAN: He who gave the dinner could not even wait a respectable time; at any rate he might have waited until some progress had been made, but before the second reading of the Bill was passed and knowing what he who is so largely interested, was going to gain, splashed out so as to use the pledges of some of the Ministers at that banquet to further his own interests. I object to members of the Government being made use of in that way. I am satisfied that the construction of this railway line at the present juncture will do more harm to Western Australia than good, and that it will have the after effect of preventing capital from coming to Western Australia, and it will have the same effect as the frauds which were perpetrated at Phillips River, Peak Hill, and Lake Way, and scores of other swindles known to the State, and which have been aided and abetted by responsible men in power. We know too that Governors have in the past been used to boost properties, and that Ministers have been used in the same direction. I am sorry indeed that with all the information and details of the past which are in our possession, the same use can be made to-day of

Ministers to further the ends of those who desire to advance their own interests.

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.]

The MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H. Gregory): We have just had a speech from the hon. member for Murchison which is quite characteristic of him. Time after time he rises in this Chamber simply for the purpose of insulting others, and to do nothing else than to throw mud all round the Chamber.

Mr. Holman: The facts of the case with regard to the Philips River were pretty true.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Members on the opposite side of the House ought to be ashamed to sit alongside the member for Murchison. It is a shame to find that time after time these misrepresentations are being made by him.

Mr. Holman: You cannot point to one.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: In connection with the construction of this railway I have no intention to go back into the past. It is not necessary to do so here. I am quite prepared to do that on the public platform.

Mr. O'Loghlen: As you did at Menzies. You ought to be ashamed of your speech up there.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I shall do it outside, and I shall be prepared to take all the responsibility for it. With regard to the proposition before the House I cannot understand the heat which has been thrown into the debate. Surely hon. members are not going to infer because some of the Ministers partook of the hospitality of Mr. Doolittle last night that the object of the Government in bringing forward this Bill is to create some special benefit for him?

Mr. Johnson: Why the undue haste?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: There is no undue haste.

Mr. Holman: It was not thought of a week ago.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: If there were any opposition to the construction of the line I could understand

the heat which is being thrown into this debate, but all the members who have spoken have expressed their intention to support the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. Scaddan: It is due to the House to get all the facts before they pass the measure.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The Bill is a short one for the construction of a small line of railway, and the Minister for Works has pointed out that even should the field not prove to be a success the profit which will be made in the earlier portion of its existence will repay any losses that might occur subsequently.

Mr. Holman: Look at the harm it will do in the meantime.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The country will be able to get along without assistance from the hon. member. In connection with some of the statements which I am reported to have made at Southern Cross, I would like to make a slight correction. The matter is of little moment, but I think hon. members might follow me when I state that in making a speech up there I explained that three Ministers were asked to visit the field and to make a report to the Government as to the action that should be taken with regard to the construction of this line. It is hardly likely that I should make a distinct and definite statement that the railway would not be constructed. I may say the member for Yilgarn who was present will bear me out. I pointed out that as far as the water supply was concerned, that had been determined before we left Perth, and that they could rest assured that the Government would construct a pipe line to the Bullfinch, and that the only question we had to consider was what would be the average daily consumption. As far as the railway was concerned, I pointed out it would be our duty to report to Cabinet, and I said that to my mind it would be better to wait a little time until further development work had been proceeded with, and hon. members will admit that was a correct statement to make there because I wanted to impress upon those people that every effort should be made to proceed with development work so as to give the Gov-

ernment greater incentive to construct the line. When we returned to Perth and reported what we had seen there we drew attention to the wealth of the district to the north of Southern Cross, and referred to the great necessity there was for cheap means of communication to those large low-grade propositions to the south of Southern Cross, and I hope that the time is not far distant when we shall be able to construct a line also to those places which are capable of carrying a large population, so as to enable economic mining to be carried on, and also to afford greater facilities than they have had in the past.

Mr. Scaddan: There are plenty of goldfields you can give railway communication to.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The *Kalgoorlie Miner* declares the people on the goldfields have to depend upon the Premier who represents a coastal seat, and upon the Minister for Works who represents the metropolitan area for their requirements, and that newspaper adds that these Ministers are the friends of the goldfields, while the three Ministers representing the goldfields districts are enemies of the goldfields.

Mr. Scaddan: Hear, hear.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Apparently the hon. member is going to oppose this Bill. If he does so I will not attribute any wrong motive to him.

Mr. O'Loughlin: Were you correctly reported at Menzies two months ago?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It was an exceedingly good report and I felt very pleased when I read it. Some five miles out there are enormous deposits which many years ago were opened up and worked, and abandoned, and only recently have been again started. A private crushing mill has been erected alongside these shows, and the other day a very rich find was reported from there. But the greatest discovery, from a railway standpoint, has been the Corinthian and the Corinthian North. There is an enormous body of ore up there. I do not know of any instance in Western Australia of such rapid development work on virgin properties. I know nothing of the values, but from the reports I have

received both the Corinthian and the Corinthian North carry payable values. It will be necessary to put large plants upon them, and they will carry a large population. At the Corinthian three lodes have been found to exist, and to the North-West of this discovery some new finds have been reported. So far as the Bullfinch is concerned certainly there is only one mine in which any large amount of development work has been done. Some 1,200 leases or more are pegged out, and in instances some work has been done; but in very few instances have any titles been given to the people who have the leases, so we could not expect much work to have been done. However, we know there is a total amount of from £200,000 to £300,000 provided for working on these leases, and the money will certainly be expended in development, and large numbers of men must be put on for the purpose of thoroughly prospecting the ventures. A township will follow the sale that took place the other day, and until the Bullfinch people have put up their own plant some 500 tons of ore per month will be sent to Kalgoorlie for treatment.

Mr. Collier: For how long?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Only until they get their own plant.

Mr. Collier: If they have faith in their mine they will get the plant as soon as possible.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It does not follow; they may want to develop the mine to a couple of hundred feet to be quite certain of the class of plant they require. No walls have been discovered, and there are five or six lodes proved to run through that proposition. So it may be necessary for them to carry on much greater development work than usual before determining the nature and capacity of the plant they will instal. Hence it may be some time before they proceed with the erection of the mill, and in the meantime they have leased a plant at Kalgoorlie for six months, and it is possible they will give us that 500 tons per month. Then there is the question of machinery going out. The Minister for Works says it is proposed to make the charges on this line for the

first six months ordinary contractors' charges, or 4d. per ton per mile on all goods. We recognise there is a speculative business risk in the construction of this line, and we are prepared to run out the pipe line and ask the House to authorise the construction of this railway on the score that even if this mine turned out a failure and we had to pull the rails up again, the profit made in the meantime in connection with the line would amply repay the State for the work done. But from what I have seen of the district I feel quite satisfied that instead of having to pull up those rails we will not only have to extend the railway South so far as the Great Victoria mine but farther North, where, in all probability, new discoveries will be made, and the question will be the extension of the line still further North to open up the mining resources of the State.

Mr. DRAPER (West Perth): When I came into the Chamber to listen to the debate I had a perfectly open mind in regard to the railway. The arguments I have heard certainly do not tend to the justification of the building of that line at the present time. It is not that there are several mines situated 20 miles from Southern Cross which require a railway in order to put them into a profitable state of development. That is not the reason why this line is to be built. It is admitted by speakers on both sides of the House that there is at least one mine there, but the state of development of that mine has not been laid before the House, and personally I am entirely ignorant as to how far the development of that mine tends to show what the permanency of the mine will be. But I can recollect other mines in the State which have been said to be the richest in the world, which have been called "jewellers' shops," and which in one case was said to be a blaze of gold. None of these mines are in existence to-day. Let me remind the House of the Londonderry. It goes back a long way, but I can remember the flaming reports in the newspapers about the extraordinarily rich finds in the Londonderry. So glowing were those reports, and so prosperous the early history of the mine that in a

very short period it was floated in London for £700,000. Within 12 months of that company commencing operations it was recognised on all hands that the mine was a miserable failure. That is not the only instance we have of one mine said to be the best in the world, or the richest in the State, proving a failure. Hon. members must recollect the Wealth of Nations. It would be amusing to peruse the reports in the newspapers which were published when that mine was first discovered, a mine which, I think, was sold for £100,000. That mine never justified in the slightest degree the anticipations of its success. Coming to more recent times, members will recollect the Queen of the Earth at Yerilla. That, again, was described as extremely rich; in fact, it was said that the gold could be seen in the ore as though it was moss growing on a rock. All these mines, said to be extremely rich and with the most prosperous future, have petered out. They are isolated instances, and if a railway had been built to each one of those mines it must have proved an undoubted failure. Are we any better off to-day in building a railway to this one mine called the Bullfinch than we would have been if the Government had built a line to the Londonderry or the Queen of the Earth or the Wealth of Nations years ago? It is stated here that this mine is extremely rich; and that therefore so far as this mine is concerned it is quite unnecessary to build a railway, but that we have to consider the mining industry. We know, too, that the discovery of this mine has given an immense incentive to prospecting in the neighbourhood. Prospecting parties are out in all directions and it is probable that other mines, let us hope of a permanent nature, will be discovered and in a short time, I venture to think, we shall be in a much better position to know where the railway is to go than we are now. If information had been laid before this House to-night showing that there was an immediate necessity for the building of the railway to this one mine, a necessity not as regards this one mine but as regards the mining industry, I would gladly have supported it, but I regret

that information of that character has not been forthcoming. The time may come when it will be necessary to build this railway; if so, I can only hope that the House will pass the line immediately, but at the present time, if we are going to build the railway to the one mine, there are very likely other mines in the State which can make an equal claim. What is the justification put forward by the Government for the line? Not expenditure of money for the development of the State, but expenditure merely on the basis of a commercial speculation. We have enough work to do in this State out of borrowed funds in the direction of developing our resources. We have more than we can manage and at the present time we are not justified in borrowing money to indulge in works that are put before the House merely as commercial speculations.

On motion by Mr. Troy debate adjourned.

The House adjourned at 11.14 p.m.

PAIR.

Mr. Keenan

| Mr. Davies.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 16th November, 1910.

	PAGE.
Questions: Railway construction, Mt. Magnet-Sandstone	1498
Education Department, Assistant Inspector	1498
Public Servants and Defence Forces, School Teachers	1498
Land Transfers, Wongan Hills	1498
Railway Construction, Wongan Hills	1499
State Hotel for Southern Cross	1499
Miners' wages, Bullfinch	1499
Sweating, Mr. Brennan's statement	1499
Redistribution of Seats	1499
Paper presented	1502
Motions: Railways action, Faiching v. Commissioner	1502
Lands Department and charges of corruption, Commission of Inquiry	1502

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