

a second time, and so amended in another place as to be nothing like the Bill originally introduced. Now we have this Bill. We ought to be very careful that we are not making another mistake.

Mr. Raphael: Mr. Hughes has been consulted on this Bill.

Mr. LATHAM: If that gentleman has agreed to it, everybody should be satisfied. I accept the Minister's statement that he will refer the words to which I have drawn attention to the Parliamentary Draftsman, pointing out that it is just as well not to confound the courts when a case is before them. The body of the Bill refers expressly to the Hon. A. M. Clydesdale, but in the title that gentleman is referred to as "chairman."

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3—Saving any existing judgment under Section 39 of the Constitution Acts Amendment Act, 1889, but barring other actions:

Mr. McDONALD: I understand from the Minister that no such actions as are referred to in the last part of the clause are pending now.

The Minister for Justice: Not to our knowledge.

Mr. McDONALD: I presume the idea is to provide a bar against any action which might be commenced between now and the time when the Bill goes into effect.

The Minister for Police: That is so.

Mr. McDONALD: Then I see no objection to the clause.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 4, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

### *Third Reading.*

**THE MINISTER FOR POLICE** (Hon. H. Millington—Mt. Hawthorn) [5.50]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have counted the House, and am satisfied that there is an absolute majority of members present.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time, and transmitted to the Council.

## ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [5.51:] I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Thursday next, at 4.30 p.m.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 5.52 p.m.*

## Legislative Council,

*Wednesday, 23rd May, 1934.*

	PAGE
Swearing-in of members	326
Question: Royal visit, school children's display	326
Joint House Committee	327
Bill: Secession, 28.	327

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

## SWEARING-IN OF MEMBERS.

Hon. C. B. Williams (South), Hon. E. H. H. Hall (Central) and Hon. G. Fraser (West) took and subscribed the oath and signed the roll.

## QUESTION—ROYAL VISIT.

### *School Children's Display.*

Hon. A. THOMSON asked the Chief Secretary: In view of the school teachers' refusal to assist in preparing the children of the State for a massed drill exhibition, such as was given during the Centenary celebrations, and which was considered undoubtedly the finest and most important event of the whole of those celebrations, will the Government give serious consideration to employing an independent instructor so that our children may not be debarred from seeing and hearing the Duke of Gloucester whilst here, and also enable our distinguished guest to have an opportunity of seeing and speaking to the future citizens of the State and the Empire?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: If circumstances warrant, the matter will be considered.

### JOINT HOUSE COMMITTEE.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, ordered: That the Hon. G. W. Miles be appointed to the Joint House Committee in lieu of the Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom, retired.

### BILL—SECESSION.

#### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

**HON. C. G. ELLIOTT** (North-East) [4.38]: As a representative of the most important mining province in the State, a province that registered a definite vote against secession, I feel I would be wanting in my duty if I did not voice a protest against the object of the Bill now before this Chamber. That the majority vote in favour of secession made it necessary for the Bill to be introduced, I fully realise and quite appreciate, but the manner in which the Case for Secession has represented the gold mining industry is, to say the least of it, most misleading and in many instances wrong. If the Case as set out is allowed to go to London, the harm it will do the gold mining industry, from an investor's point of view, is hard to calculate. In paragraph 365 of the Case, the value of the gold mining industry to the State is recognised and its production value shown as £173,000,000 to the end of 1932. In paragraph 366 and in almost every succeeding paragraph dealing with the industry, the Federal policy is blamed for the decline of output. I desire to show that that statement is incorrect and that the attitude of the Commonwealth Government towards the gold mining industry, has, on the whole, been one of assistance and of benefit to the industry and, consequently, to the State. Dealing with the decline in gold production from 1903 to 1929, the following statement appears in paragraph 371:—

This decline . . . was due largely to the burden placed on the mining industry by the Federal policy of protection.

Mr. Kingsley Thomas, the Royal Commissioner appointed by the State Government in 1925 to investigate the causes of the decline, placed the blame elsewhere. After

four or five months of close investigation of the whole question, he stated in his report—

Drastic re-organisation is essential so that gold mining may be placed in a position that will reflect the gold-producing capabilities of the Golden Mile.

He also said—

Lack of policy and the existing state of stagnation, drift and apathy, have already placed some of the mines in a precarious position.

Another factor in the decline of production not mentioned in the Case was the high cost of commodities brought about by the Great War. In Paragraph 375 the public utilities that were provided by the State on the goldfields are mentioned, and the paragraph concludes with a stupid comment in which doubt is raised whether the Federal authorities would have provided the water scheme. Those utilities are national ventures for the safety of the State as a whole, and not undertakings for the sole benefit of the gold mining industry. Even if they were, taking the stated expenditure of £13,000,000 on those utilities, one would think that the acknowledged addition to the wealth of the State, of £173,000,000 to the end of 1932, was an ample return. In Paragraph 377 the grudging admission that the Federal Government passed the Gold Bounty Act told half the story only. The suspension of the Act while the price of gold is in the vicinity of £8 per ounce is justifiable, and acceptable to the gold producers. The Case deliberately omits the most important feature of the Federal Gold Bounty Act, namely, the arrangement to pay the bounty immediately gold value falls below 110s. per fine ounce. The omission of this most important point falsifies the evidence against the Federal Government and may do untold harm abroad. While many parts of the British Empire hold attractions for capital to be employed in gold mining, the wisdom of the Commonwealth Government makes investment in Australian mining secure in a way not available elsewhere. The Gold Bounty Act guarantees a bonus of 10s. per ounce immediately the present price of gold falls below 110s. per fine ounce at Melbourne. Until the 31st December, 1940, the Gold Bounty Act thus offers a safeguard to capital and to all gold producers. And I would have you,

Sir, remember that this safeguard is a provision of the Federal authority, which the Case says has done its worst to handicap the industry. Incidentally, some £80,000 has been paid under this Act. Paragraph 377 also mentions the Wiluna Mine and its large capital expenditure over a period of years before production was assured. But no mention is made of the important part played by the Federal Government in assisting the mine over that period. In 1930 the Commonwealth passed an Act entitled the Western Australian Agreement (Wiluna Gold Mines) Act, which guaranteed the State £300,000 for the express purpose of assisting the development and equipment of the Wiluna Mine. As a result of this great financial and moral support by the Commonwealth, that mine is now producing a profit of over £50,000 a month, and supporting a population of about 4,000 people.

Hon. A. Thomson: Did the State do nothing towards the development of Wiluna?

Hon. C. G. ELLIOTT: Paragraph 380 says—

The history of gold mining in Western Australia is a story of burden upon burden being imposed by the Commonwealth.

Since when has release from taxation been regarded as a burden? The Commonwealth Income Tax Assessment Act, No. 51 of 1924, exempts all persons from taxation on "income derived from the working of a gold mining property." In the second section of the Case, devoted to gold, the high costs of mining are dealt with and blamed on the Federal tariff policy. Costs are given as 38s. in 1924, as compared with 19s. in 1916. What is wrong that the true facts are not stated in the Case? We are in 1934, when costs are down to such a figure that the quotation of 1924 costs appears to be deliberately misleading. As I said before, the high cost of commodities following the Great War added to mining costs, but in 1933-34 costs on the Golden Mile were 22s. 9d. per ton and at Wiluna 18s. 9d. per ton, the lowered costs being due to the introduction of up-to-date mining practice and machinery. Regarding the latter, many of the mining companies have taken the opportunity offered by the high price of gold to instal up-to-date plant. Notwithstanding the constant statement that the Federal tariff is

detrimental, it is of the greatest interest to note the extent to which the new machinery being installed is of Australian manufacture, of Australian material made by Australian workmen. All the new plant on the Great Boulder Mine, costing £120,000, is of Australian manufacture, together with 90 per cent. of their working plant, and considerably over £80,000 worth of Australian machinery has been installed on the Lake View Mines. Similar proportional figures could be given for the Perseverance Gold Mine's new plant, the Lancefield Mine's new plant, and the mine at Mt. Magnet. Against all these, no Federal tariff operates. Paragraph 449, dealing with the practice of mining, might impress those who know little of mining, but no one else. In this year's report of the Chamber of Mines the president, Mr. Richard Hamilton, states that the average grade of ore treated during 1933—when the Case says the Federal tariff was so detrimental—was 8.16 dwts., the lowest for any year since mining began in this State. Paragraph 499 concludes as follows:—

With a knowledge of such conditions, it could not be expected that the shareholders of mining companies would be willing to find further capital to improve treatment and methods.

That such a statement must surely rise from lack of knowledge of recent mining history in those responsible for the preparation of the Case, you will realise when you hear that in 1929 the New Consolidated Company of South Africa invested £60,000 in cash and £40,000 in shares in the Lake View Mines, and that Mr. Richard Hamilton's 1934 address to the Chamber of Mines says—

A very large amount of fresh capital has been invested in gold mining in this State during the past four or five years.

What facts I have been able to set before members will show that, so far as the gold mining industry is concerned, the Case does not present a true picture of the Federal attitude towards this State. The attitude of the goldfields people towards Secession is embodied and explained in the following motion passed by the Kalgoorlie Municipal Council on Monday, the 30th of last month:—

Should the Case for Secession be presented to the King and both Houses of the Imperial Parliament by petition, address or personal delegation, proper representation be also made showing that the Eastern Goldfields portion of Western Australia recorded a substantial majority vote against Secession, and implor-

ing his Majesty and the Imperial Parliament to leave the goldfields electorates, which include our natural seaport, Esperance, and also the territory through to the South Australian border, within Commonwealth territory, should Secession be granted to the rest of the State.

That explains clearly the position on the goldfields regarding the question of Western Australia seceding from the Commonwealth. I do not believe in miracles, but if a miracle were to happen and Secession became an accomplished fact, a movement would be started on the goldfields within 24 hours, having for its object the seceding from the State of Western Australia and the linking up with the Commonwealth.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: What would happen if we were to cut off the water supply?

Hon. C. G. ELLIOTT: As I say, a movement would be put into being which would shake this wonderful State of ours to its very foundation.

**HON C. B. WILLIAMS (South) [4.58]:** I am wondering why the secessionists have at last linked up with the communists, for, after all, it means that if Western Australia secures Secession, communism will be much easier in Australia. I sometimes wonder why we of the Labour Party did not support Secession from that point of view also.

Hon. G. W. Miles: But you are an opponent.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I am not opposed to anything that will be of benefit to the working classes. If we get Secession in Western Australia—I voted for it—it will make it much easier for the Labour Party to put into operation the socialisation of industry, for they will have a big area and a small population to deal with. I can see that very shortly all of us will be looking for a job. Once we cut away from the Commonwealth, we shall be without their army and will have to raise an army of our own to keep down the communists and to keep down the Labour Party, who require the socialisation of industry and the nationalisation of production and exchange, which will be much easier if we break away from the Commonwealth and go on our own. Let us not forget that there are thousands of unemployed in this State, probably on the verge of revolution. There are thousands of farmers ready and

ripe to support anything that they think will lift them out of the mess in which they find themselves. I wonder why Labour did not stand for secession. I have had some experience of strikes, and I know that when a strike is a small isolated thing, it is easy to win. When it becomes a large affair, it is difficult to win. It would be much harder for socialism or communism to gain ascendancy while we are part of the Commonwealth than it will be when Western Australia is separated from the rest of the Commonwealth and the goldfields are separated from the rest of Western Australia. We on the goldfields will be a Labour State, a socialised State. We shall have no Legislative Council. I voted for secession, though not for the reasons I am now giving, because I had not thought out the matter along those lines, but I had visualised what is occurring in this State. Western Australia, separated from the rest of the Commonwealth, will be much easier for the Labour Party to conquer. Labour has returned some 30 odd members to Parliament, and though not successful in the recent Legislative Council elections, we shall get rid of the present representatives once separation is secured.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Lang conquered the Legislative Council in New South Wales.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I am not running Mr. Lang down. Whoever the Labour leader might be, provided he stands for the people, he will suit me, but the Labour leader who stands for a 22½ per cent. reduction in my salary does not suit me. Will secession be of any value to Western Australia? For a certainty the goldfields will not tolerate a continuance of the treatment which they now receive from Perth, and which after secession, would be 100 per cent. worse. It was with the people of Perth that the secession movement originated. I do not blame the farmers; they will vote for anything that they think might improve their present condition. So will the unemployed. A gentleman named Hehir, a councillor in Kalgoorlie, endeavoured to get the agency for Peters ice-cream in Kalgoorlie, but obstacles were placed in his way by the railway authorities. When he found that he could not obtain the necessary concessions for purchasing the ice-cream and conveying it to Kalgoorlie, he installed

machinery at a cost, I believe, of £1,000. Some members may be shareholders of the Peters ice-cream concern; I do not remember having eaten any of the ice-cream; much less am I a shareholder. When the Kalgoorlie man installed the machinery, Peters decided to send their ice-cream direct to Kalgoorlie to compete with his. He had been unable to obtain freight concessions on empty returns, and yet the railway authorities conveyed Peters drums back to Perth freight free. That seemed strange, and the Kalgoorlie man obtained a list of Peters shareholders, which cost him £3. In that list appeared the names of the ex-Commissioner of Railways as the holder of 1,000 shares, the Secretary for Railways, Mr. Tomlinson, 1,000 shares, and Mr. Hickey, who, I believe, is in charge of the transport section, 113 shares.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: That is disgraceful.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: It is true. Jack Hehir would not take Peters ice-cream because he could not get the necessary concession on the drums being returned to Perth.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: The matter should be inquired into.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: When he installed machinery at Kalgoorlie, Peters were granted the concession. We hear much talk of the goldfields people purchasing their requirements from the Eastern States. A month ago a special train arrived from Port Augusta laden with goods for Kalgoorlie. What an insult to Western Australia, and to the people who deal in those lines! It is an absolute insult that firms in South Australia or Victoria can transport their goods to Kalgoorlie and under-sell the business men of Western Australia. That was a special train and not a mere coachload of perishables. The president of the A.L.P. in Kalgoorlie, Mr. Kenneally—not the one down here who is always in a bother, but another decent chap like him—keeps fowls and wanted an incubator. On inquiry he found that the freight from Adelaide to Kalgoorlie was 14s. and the freight from Perth to Kalgoorlie was 14s. Yet the price of the incubator in Adelaide was £2 less than the price in Perth. Where does the £2 difference come in?

Hon. A. Thomson: In freight across.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: The through freight from Adelaide to Perth would be only 28s. and if 14s. were allowed for the

freight back to Kalgoorlie, it would not account for the £2 difference because the Adelaide quotation included freight, while the Perth quotation was exclusive of freight. Perth business people seem to think that the goldfields people can be bled at will. The socialisation of industry is coming, and the sooner we get secession, the sooner will socialisation arrive. We ought to cut out business men like those I have instanced who cannot compete with firms 2,000 or 3,000 miles away. This State is hamstrung because it has no decent men at the head of its affairs. In saying that I am not alluding to the Government; I am speaking of the business men of the community. Mr. Holmes referred by interjection to the Mundaring water supply.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You get your water from us, but buy your beer from the Eastern States.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I do not know that the question of the water supply will cause us much worry.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Would you get water from the East?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: We of the goldfields pay for water much more than does any resident of Perth.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It costs the State £100,000 a year.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: And it has given the State over £100,000,000 worth of gold. It is saving the State from poverty at the present time. It enabled the hon. member to rise in life, and it enabled me to rise from the position of a miner to that which I occupy to-day. The water supply did much for Western Australia, and if similar works were undertaken now, there would be an end to the poverty that exists.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It washed you whiter than snow!

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: It is not bad water, but it is fairly dear as compared with the price charged to the people in Perth. Mr. Baxter will realise the imposition he laid on the goldfields people to compensate for the poverty existing elsewhere.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: They pay a reasonable price for the water.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I have never known a man who, on putting up his prices, would admit that they were unreasonable. The hon. member would not say that the price was unreasonable; he is too much of

a gentleman to do that. I realise that the price is reasonable.

Hon. A. Thomson: Why should the State have to find money for it every year?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Why should the poor mugs on the goldfields, who live under conditions in which they require more water than does anyone in the metropolitan area, have to pay so much more for it? We are not worrying about the water. Mr. Holmes has travelled within the State much more than I have, and he must know that within 80 miles of Kalgoorlie there is a wonderful supply of water. The Sons of Gwalia mine at Leonora does not worry about the Mundaring scheme. There is no town north of Menzies that draws on the scheme. All those places have all the water they require. When we get the new province, instead of conveying the water to the goldfields through 375 miles of pipeline, it will be run a distance of 140 miles, and down-hill at that. If we ever reach the stage that the communists desire to reach, we can blame the breakaway party, the party that would break up everything that is worth while. Australia has become a nation, and why should they seek to break it up? Are the workers of Western Australia likely to be any better off if we secure secession? That is all I am concerned about.

Hon. A. Thomson: Yes, they are.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Are the farmers going to be any better off?

Hon. A. Thomson: Yes.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Why?

Hon. A. Thomson: I will tell you later on.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: The condition of the farmers has not improved since the hon. member has represented them, and his representation extends over years. In fact, their condition has become worse.

Hon. A. Thomson: Surely you do not hold me responsible for that.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I hold the hon. member responsible for his share.

Hon. A. Thomson: I will take my share of the responsibility.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: They will not be any better off, but the people who control the wealth of Western Australia, I believe, will be better off. There are people who are able to pull the strings to benefit themselves, but when the time comes and they find that secession is of no advantage to Western Australia, back they will want to go into the Federation again. They are like the man of whom we have heard—what he misses on the swingboat he will pick up on the merry-go-

round. If secession will improve the lot of the workers, let us have it immediately and not waste time talking about it here. It is not going to improve his lot. It will be necessary to build a tariff wall around the State. I have not read the Case or looked at the Bill, and do not require to do so. It is said that our industries are being undermined by Eastern States competition. If we become a separate country, that competition will have to be stopped. How are we going to do that? Not by putting soldiers on the wharf, but by doing what the whole of Australia has done to prevent outside competition. We shall have to put a wall around Western Australia. Who will pay for that?

Hon. A. Thomson: The same people who are paying now.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Of course. I told the hon. member that for years he has not been properly representing the farmers. He is still misleading them when he puts up that sort of thing. The farmers will pay ten times more than they pay now if we get secession. How could Western Australia pay them 4d. a bushel for their wheat? We have not enough people here to enable us to do that. I admit that something is required to keep the farmers on the land under present conditions, but as a separate community we could not afford to pay them 4d. a bushel. Nor could we afford to do what Mr. Baxter has advocated, namely, impose a tax of £1 an oz. on our gold production.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Did you say £1 an oz.?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Let us make it 1s. The principle is just the same. So far as mining is concerned, Western Australia is the most prosperous State in the Commonwealth, with its hundreds of miles of auriferous country which has only as yet been scratched. Millions of pounds are pouring into the State. I have here a letter from the manager of the Phoenix mine at Norseman, who bears out what I say. He has written to the members interested in the district asking them to do something with regard to the State water supply. Amongst other things he says—

To show the growth of employment on the mines we would point out that in 1922 there were only 30 men employed, and to-day there are 260 men employed.

This is an increase in 12 years of 230 men engaged in the gold mining industry in that district. That means employment for other men in woodcutting, in cutting up beef, and

in selling stores, etc. The letter speaks for itself. That is what mining is doing for Western Australia. If Secession came about we would be obliged to have a tariff, just as Australia as a whole has. I have read that South Australia is in trouble over its butter. We in this State have to keep Eastern States butter out.

Hon. L. Craig: And we are going to do it.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I do not mind that, if our producers can supply the whole of the local demand. The producer ought to be paid for his labour. The trouble with the dairy farmer, the wheat farmer and the wool-grower, is that they want the lot, and no one else is to get anything.

Hon. A. Thomson: But they do not get it.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: They are not entitled to do so while they enunciate such principles as they do, and when they say that the working man's wages should be cut down to the bone.

Hon. L. Craig: They do not say that.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Their representatives have said it in this House. The more money we earn the more we have to spend. If every farmer could earn £400 a year in the course of five or six years, this city would be flourishing in no time. I admit that the farmer works hard enough to justify his earning that much. What is required is an adjustment so that none of our people will face poverty. At present our dairy farmers have to send their butter fat to the factory for 5d. or 6d. a lb., and have to grow wheat for 1s. 6d. a bushel. If butter fat could be sold at 2s. or 2s. 6d. a lb., and wheat at 3s. or 4s. a bushel, all the motor firms that ever existed in Perth would be opening up at once. The farmers' representatives in Parliament have a different outlook from those who represent working class communities. All that we who are interested in the working man want is that he shall receive an adequate return for the labour he gives to his employer. The more money that is put into circulation the more successful will be our primary industries. Politicians have not proceeded along the right lines in this matter. Secession is going to do no good for Western Australia. It will still place upon the farming community and the gold mining industry burdens which they cannot bear. What would it do for the woolgrower? Would it open up more woollen mills in this

State, when the one we already have is not patronised as it ought to be? I am sick of hearing the people worrying about something that will never come about, especially when, if it did come about, it would be to their detriment. All the Communists in the world would flock to Western Australia if it were a separate dominion. We should be isolated from the Commonwealth and from our kith and kin. We should take notice of what has happened in the Balkan States, in Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Macedonia and at least a dozen countries which have bled the world of its best citizens in the years gone by. All these countries could be put into a corner of Western Australia. If ever the day comes we shall have nationalisation of industries far more quickly than it can possibly come under Federal rule. I agree that Western Australia has suffered many disabilities, and that many of them have been brought about by the mismanagement of this country. To-day the best market for our products is in Kalgoorlie. What does Western Australia do to hold it? What do the business people do to secure it? A referendum has been taken on the question of secession. I belong to a party which abides by the will of the people. The people have expressed their will. I am not going to vote against the Bill. I am not troubled by the bumbles in Kalgoorlie although they may worry Mr. Elliott, because he belongs to that particular province. The majority of people on the goldfields voted against secession. I voted for it, because I did not want the protest from Western Australia to be futile. Since then I have realised that it would be a good thing for Western Australia if we had another little State on the goldfields. We would be much happier and much more free from taxation than we are to-day, and would get our water and everything else we require much more cheaply. We could grow all we want in the territory between Southern Cross and the southern coast.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: And you could have a few more riots.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: The hon. member should realise that the political party he supports may be said to be linked up with the cause of that riot. I am not sticking up for the rioters.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That has nothing to do with the Bill.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: It was a provocative interjection, but I think the hon.

member had better resume his discussion on the Bill.

HON. C. B. WILLIAMS: I am innocent of any connection with the riots, because I was not in Kalgoorlie at the time they started. Had I been there, I might have been blamed for them. I will pass over the interjection. The whole thing was a regrettable chapter in the history of Western Australia, and I think everyone will agree with that. I shall have to abide by the results of the referendum. My part of the world does not want secession, and I do not want it myself. I trust that when the Bill reaches the Parliament of the Old Country the opinions of those who do not believe in secession will be respected.

HON. R. G. MOORE (North-East) [5.27]: This is not a question whether we are in favour of Secession or not, or whether or not Secession would benefit Western Australia. The Chief Secretary has said this measure merely expresses the desire of the people to secede from the Commonwealth. I wish to refer briefly to one or two things that took place prior to the referendum. All thinking people must concede that it is a very serious matter to break away from the Commonwealth. When this question was previously before the House, and we dealt with the appointment of a committee to prepare the Case for Western Australia, I said I was confident that the Federal Parliament would see to it that its views were put before the Imperial Parliament and that both sides of the question were stated. Before the referendum took place, the leaders of the people made an earnest endeavour to put both sides before them in order to educate them, and enable them to record an intelligent vote when the day arrived. The member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) went to the goldfields as an advocate for Secession. He had a splendid meeting, and was accorded a very courteous reception and a courteous hearing. He went away well satisfied with his efforts. Later on the Prime Minister visited the goldfields to put his side of the question. He also was courteously received and thanked for what he did. He also went away well satisfied with his reception. But when those who did not favour Secession endeavoured to put the Case before the people of the metropolitan area, they were not

allowed to do so, whether they were local men or visitors. On every occasion they were howled down by hooligans. I do not say that those who howled were hooligans because they were secessionists, or secessionists because they were hooligans, but at any rate those who did the howling down were both. The result was that when referendum day came the people of the metropolitan area, and of many other areas as well, had not had the opportunity of hearing the other side of the Secession question.

HON. A. THOMSON: That did not take place in country districts, at any rate.

HON. R. G. MOORE: I said, in the metropolitan area. I do not think much of it did take place in country districts. I questioned Mr. Munsie, the Minister for Mines, about the Secession feeling in the country districts. His reply was, "I never mentioned Secession while in the country districts, nor was I asked a question about it." Mr. Munsie will bear me out in this. On the other hand, in the metropolitan area, where the greater part of the population and, consequently, the majority of the votes are to be found, those who made an earnest endeavour to place an intelligent view of the Secession issue before the people, so that they might know what they were voting on, were not allowed to do so. And that was so not only prior to the taking of the referendum, but also after the referendum had been taken. Those opposed to Secession were still refused a hearing after the referendum. On the goldfields, as I said, both sides were accorded the same courteous hearing, with the result that goldfields residents got all the information available on either side of the question, and on referendum day were in a position to record an intelligent vote. Eventually, Secession was turned down on the goldfields. I shall not labour the question of what will be the effect if the effort to obtain separation should prove successful. The people on the goldfields are not in favour of Secession, and have said so definitely; but I do think that on any great question both sides should be heard. As a British people we are proud of what is known as British fairplay. We know that if we go before a court, both sides of the issue can be stated and British justice obtained. But the Case for Secession which has been



prepared has not been so prepared as to place the views of both sides before the Imperial Parliament. It merely puts up the argument for Secession.

Hon. A. Thomson: Because Secession is the will of the people.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: Whether it is the will of the people or not, the Case states only the argument in favour of secession. At all events, Secession does not represent the will of the whole of the people of Western Australia. I am prepared to vote for the Bill because I am prepared to give effect to the will of the people. At the same time I consider it to be the duty of those in authority to ensure that the Case which is to go before the Imperial Parliament puts both sides of the question fully. I take it that in the Imperial Parliament those who are opposed to secession will not be howled down by hooligans, but that a fair and impartial decision will be obtained. In that event I shall be quite satisfied to abide by the issue. I have previously made myself clear on the point that I am not a secessionist. I realise, however, that the present is not the time or the place to discuss whether secession is good or bad for Western Australia. Still, I do hold that on any important subject brought before a tribunal, both sides should be heard, in order that there may be a fair and just decision. I hope the Federal authorities will do their part and stand up to their job, and I know that in this instance they will be allowed to say what they have to say instead of being howled down.

HON. J. GEORGE (Metropolitan) [5.36]: I have listened carefully to previous speakers on the goldfields aspect of this question. We must realise, however, that there are other interests besides mining to be considered. I refer to the other primary industries and to the secondary industries. I have been in Western Australia practically all my life—about half a century—and I have observed the progress of the State prior to Federation and since Federation. Yesterday Mr. Macfarlane pointed out that the population of Western Australia had increased considerably since Federation—I forget the figures he gave; but I have no hesitation in saying that had Western Australia not joined the Commonwealth the population of this State to-day would be practically a million. Prior to Federation the State was going ahead by leaps and bounds. The position was all right for a while after Federa-

tion, but let us look at the state of affairs to-day. Prior to Federation New South Wales had a deficit of £1 13s. 4d. per head, Victoria one of £3 2s. 1d., Queensland £2 14s. 9d., South Australia 3s. 4d., and Western Australia 19s. 2d., whereas Tasmania had a surplus of 8s. 10d. On the other hand, last year New South Wales had a surplus of £2 7s. 8d. per head, Victoria a deficit of 2s. 2d., Queensland a deficit of £3, South Australia one of £11 5s. 4d., Western Australia one of £20 13s. 11d., and Tasmania one of £2 10s. 5d. What has Federation done for Western Australia? I can only say—and I must say it with all the strength I possess—that Western Australia has been absolutely penalised by joining the Commonwealth. If we were on our own to-day, the wheels of industry would be revolving. But what do we find? Laggard industry, practical unemployment. According to the Commonwealth Statistician, Western Australia bought in one year from the Eastern States goods to the value of £10,600,000, and the Eastern States reciprocated by buying in return only £1,200,000 worth of commodities from the West. Are those the conditions under which our State will go ahead? My own view is that it is time for us to do all we can to sever our connection with the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth has promised us a great deal. Federal politicians came here as birds of passage and promised all sorts of things and went back again. They came here saying that they would go around the State in order to obtain a first-hand education in regard to Western Australian affairs. They said they would do a great deal for Western Australia. However, they failed to do it. A period of 34 years is quite long enough to let us know what Federal politicians can do for Western Australia. I am sorry to have to say it, but if we do not sever our connection with the Commonwealth the Western Australian ship of state will soon be on the rocks. It is up to us to fight alongside those who are trying to make Western Australia a country fit to live in. We have reason to be proud of the people who conduct the industries of this State. They are striving against heavy odds. As things are, Western Australia is simply a dumping ground for Eastern States goods. In the circumstances I fail to see what we can do except try to sever the Federal connection. If

we do that we shall be able to sell our goods to better advantage, and prosperity will return to Western Australia. I am proud of this State. It has been good to me. I am proud of the people in it. They strive to the utmost of their power. I do not blame goldfields members for seeking all they can on behalf of the goldfields. Unquestionably, the goldfields have been and are of great advantage to Western Australia. But we must not close our eyes to the fact that the chief asset of this State is the primary producer, who is now having a hard time and should receive consideration. Our secondary industries, too, are struggling hard to maintain themselves. I may glance at two great business enterprises in this city—Goode Durrant & Co., and D. & W. Murray. Those two firms have employed a lot of men, but they have not been able to compete with Eastern State firms. As a result they have been obliged to amalgamate. If that kind of thing continues, the ship of state will be on the rocks. I do not blame the present Government, who are doing all they possibly can; nor do I blame the previous Government. I lay the blame at the door of the Commonwealth Government, who have not done what they should have done for the State of Western Australia. In conclusion let me say that I am a Secessionist from head to toe.

**HON. J. J. HOLMES** (North) [5.43]: Before dealing with the Bill, I should like to congratulate hon. members who have just been returned to this Chamber. Of the men who went out and nominated, all have come back with one exception. Owing to an unfortunate set of circumstances, Mr. Franklin fell by the way. From the results of the biennial election we can draw the inference that the people of Western Australia, or at all events those of them who pay the taxes, are satisfied with this Chamber as a House of review, are convinced that they obtain from this branch of the Legislature sane and sound legislation which the country would not get without it. I wish the House to understand that I am not like Mr. Williams, who tore to pieces a Bill which he acknowledged he had not even read, and finished by saying that he would vote for the measure. Still, such an atti-

tude is excusable in the hon. member, who in his speech admitted that he was one of the mugs living on the goldfields. In my opinion, there are in this country many mugs who help to keep the goldfields going. I should like to congratulate the members of the committee upon the Case they have put up with the material at their disposal. They did their best under very difficult circumstances, but if I were to criticise the production at all, it would be from the standpoint of its length. What might have been done was to call in an expert journalist to condense the report to much smaller dimensions. When I say I congratulate the committee upon the Case they put up from the material they had, I should perhaps go further and say that, having given the matter careful consideration, I shall not be able to see my way to give the proposals contained in the Bill my support. The reasons for my course of action I shall give to the House before I resume my seat. To have federated was a mistake; there is no doubt about that. It was a mistake that I tried to prevent, and, as is known, I had to get out of the back door and make away because I was attacking the policy of one flag, one people and one destiny. I told the people then that we could never be anything except a junior partner, and that the Eastern States would be the senior partner. I explained that the junior partner would do all the work and receive all the blame, and that the senior partner would take all the profits and get the whole of the credit. Now, because another referendum has been taken, I am asked to say that the multitude, who thought they were right when the first poll was taken, are right once more. My attitude is that the multitude are wrong once more, and time will prove it. It was a mistake to have ever federated, but the secession movement now is even a greater mistake, and by the action we propose to take we are likely to ruin our Case. The trouble at the time we federated was that a great number of the people who voted in favour of Federation did not understand the position and would not have it explained to them. I have no hesitation in saying that the great body of the people who voted for secession did not know the far-reaching effects their vote would have, but a great number, including myself, voted in favour of secession in order to show the Eastern States and the Commonwealth that

we were not satisfied with the existing position. There never was any proposal to approach the Imperial Government behind the back of the Commonwealth Government. My opinion is that it is the duty of the people interested to explain from their standpoint what they think of the proposal, and if the House extends to me the courtesy it usually does—I may be a little longer than usual in doing so—I propose to tell members and the people generally the standpoint from which I view the position. Apart from everything else, when we federated we entered into a binding contract with the other States, and this House, as in the past, must be careful about one thing, namely, that the breaking of a contract is nothing less than repudiation.

Hon. A. Thomson: You know what Lord Forrest said.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Lord Forrest said he would take the water into the wilderness, but he did not get much thanks for it from the people. The contract into which we have entered provides one way out, and that is by a vote of the majority of the people in a majority of the States. That way out has not been tested. When we became federated we were aware what the Federal spirit was. For instance, we knew that New South Wales would not agree to federate unless that State had the capital within its territory. We knew also that Victoria would not federate unless the Federal capital was built not less than 100 miles from Sydney. There we had statesmen who had put up a Constitution for Australia squabbling over a pettifoggish detail of that description. That detail has ended up by the building of the Federal capital at enormous expense somewhere in the bush. That was the sort of pettiness that was indulged in at the time, and the people of this State blindly followed. As far as I can see now, there is no way out. The Constitution was agreed to by a huge majority of the people of Australia. It was our Constitution that was endorsed and approved by the Imperial Parliament, and to embark upon a proposal now to send delegates to London to ask the Imperial Parliament to alter the whole policy of the united Empire, and to alter a Constitution made by ourselves seems to me an absurd and ridiculous proposition. Who made the request for the alteration of the Constitution? Secessionists in Western Australia to the number

of 140,000. There are 6½ million people in Australia and 140,000 of them, secessionists, prefer this request. In my opinion we are sending the delegates abroad—they will not go with my consent—on a fool's errand, and when they get to England they will be put in their place. If I were a member of the Imperial Parliament, the first question I should ask the delegates on their appearance at the Bar of the House, would be, "Does not your Constitution provide a way out?" The delegates would be obliged to answer in the affirmative.

Hon. A. Thomson: A pretty hopeless way, too.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The next question would be, "Have you taken advantage of that provision contained in your own Constitution?" The answer would certainly be in the negative. The delegates then would surely be advised to go back to Australia and avail themselves of the provision contained in their own Constitution before attempting to get behind the National Government of Australia by asking the Imperial Government to interest itself in Western Australia's case. Thus the position would be reached when our delegates would have to come back with, to use a common bush expression, their tails between their legs, and crawl to the Federal Government and say, "We tried to go behind your back but found we could not; so now we throw ourselves on your mercy." That, I think, would be the common-sense view that would be taken of the position. We are told that Federation has brought upon the State all its troubles. Federation has had a good deal to do with the disabilities of this State, but I have no hesitation in saying that a great deal of our trouble has been brought about during the last 20 years by incompetent State Governments. I do not particularise any special Government—National, Country Party or Labour. The policy of all Governments has been one of beg, borrow and spend, and get money anywhere and anyhow. So far did we go a few years back that we even depleted the funds of the State Savings Bank, and then we had to rush to the Federal Government to help us to go on with the business. Another one of our difficulties is that the Senate, which was to be a States' House, has become a party House. That has largely been responsible for bringing about the downfall of the smaller States. Is that a matter about which you can appeal to the Imperial Government? It is a matter for the people of Australia.

The framers of the Constitution provided that the House of Representatives should be elected on a population basis, and that each of the States should have equal representation in the Senate. Since ever we have federated there have been 24 senators from the smaller States as against 12 senators from the two larger States, but by the introduction of party politics—Country Party, Nationalists, United Party and Labour—its States' aspect has vanished. Immediately after a general election, members flock back to Canberra, walk into the party rooms and promptly forget their duty to the States. So, I say, that the way to attack one of our problems is to attack the Senate, and instead of sending ambassadors overseas, let them go to the Eastern States, and pin them down to what ought to be done, namely, to see that the smaller States get that fair deal that the Constitution sets out they must have. That has been one of our great sources of trouble—the introduction of party politics into the Senate. I have seen something similar creeping into this Chamber, and this is not the first time on which I have drawn attention to the fact. Unless we are careful and retain this as a non-party House, we may find ourselves in a difficulty similar to that of the Senate.

Hon. C. B. Williams: That is nearly as impossible as getting secession.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I do not intend to vote for the Bill. The hon. member who tore it to pieces in the course of his speech a little while ago knows where I stand.

Hon. C. B. Williams interjected.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If the hon. member desires to make a second speech, I shall resume my seat until he has concluded it.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The hon. member is doing a little towards inviting interjections.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: We talk about the power possessed by our Legislative Council. The Senate has almost equal powers in the Federal arena.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Not quite.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Almost. The 24 representatives of the smaller States against the 12 representatives of the two larger States should be sufficient to prevent the smaller States from being robbed as in the past. We would be better employed in trying to convert the smaller States to our way of thinking, and I say that, having just returned from the Eastern States where I took

the opportunity of associating with every section of the community.

Hon. C. B. Williams: The Labour Party included?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I am satisfied that the power of the rank and file is strong enough to see that the smaller States get a fair deal, and that as far as Western Australia is concerned, they admit that it is an absurdly impossible proposal to expect it to develop two-thirds of the continent at the expense of one-third. Any man with common sense must know that if the people attempt to develop two-thirds of a continent at the expense of the other third, the third must default, and confusion must then become worse confounded to send delegates to the Eastern States. What I suggest is a more practicable scheme than the sending Home of a delegation who, I presume, will be highly paid, for what purpose? In my opinion, the delegation will be told to go back and take advantage of their own Constitution and not to go to England asking the statesmen there to do what is the job of the delegation and other Australian politicians. The delegation, when they go abroad, may be reminded that there are 6,500,000 people in Australia of whom 440,000 are in Western Australia, roughly one-fifteenth of the population of the continent. They may be informed that of the 440,000, 237,000 were eligible to vote at the referendum and that 140,000 of them voted for secession and 70,000 against. I am quite satisfied that a number of the 140,000 who voted for secession never anticipated that the movement would go to the lengths indicated in the Bill, or to the sending of an expensive delegation to the Imperial Parliament. They thought, as I did, that it would be regarded as a gesture to the Federal Government who, we imagined, would sit up and take notice. To my mind, if we followed that track we would do better than by pursuing the suggested course of going behind their backs and then later on having to return to the Federal authorities for assistance. If these proposals were endorsed by the Premier, there would be that element to support them. He is the man who was returned to power with the strong following of which we have heard so much. It is now suggested in some quarters that that big following is rather a source of weakness than of strength in these days. The fact is that the Premier does not even

endorse the proposals, nor does he give the Bill his blessing. He has said that he does not believe in secession. He has stated that he is not a secessionist, and that he will not be one of the delegates to proceed to London. So far as we know, not one of the Ministers of the Crown will proceed on this important errand as a delegate to the Imperial Parliament. Surely that creates a most peculiar state of affairs. In these days of stress and difficulty, the Premier, in his capacity as Treasurer, says that he does not know where to find money with which to carry on the affairs of State. When portion of a jetty was blown away by a willy-willy on the north coast, it was said there was no money available to repair it, and the Minister for Works suggested approaching the Federal Government to ascertain if they would help. Although the Premier does not know where to procure money with which to carry on, he is to find money to send delegates abroad in support of a proposal in which he does not believe, and in connection with which he has stated he will not be one of the delegates.

Hon. H. V. Piessie: But the proposal is in accordance with the wishes of the people.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: That is just what has caused Australia so much trouble. The idea seems to be that everyone must do what the people want. We did what the people wanted when we federated and now, because the people wish it, we are to endeavour to secede. And we know we cannot secede. Surely we have reached the time when someone should take a stand and say to the people, "I know better than you do." I think this parleying with the man on the street corner should cease, and it is up to some of us to think for ourselves. The Premier knows that since the Statute of Westminster was passed, Australia has become a self-governing part of the British Empire, and as long as we confine the effect of our legislation within the bounds of our territorial waters, no Imperial Government will interfere. If we pass legislation that will bring about international trouble, then the British Government will step in. To all intents and purposes we are now an entirely self-governing community. That is what we asked for, and that is what

the Imperial Government and the Imperial Parliament granted. Having been granted what we desired, we now want to ignore the National Parliament, and, by backstairs methods, secure a hearing from the Imperial Parliament. The thing is too absurd to have my support. I go further and say that, in my opinion, when the delegates, if they do go to London, come in contact with the statesmen of the Empire there, they will commence to wonder, by the time the British statesmen have finished with them, whether their intelligence was really sufficient to enable them to proceed on a mission such as the Bill authorises. If I could see a way out of Federation, I would support it so that Western Australia could secede. If the Bill clearly set out the way, I would support it. But on the other hand, if we do secede, what will be the position? If we find that it does not prove satisfactory, I presume that within a few years we shall be asked to vote, by way of a referendum, to decide whether we will ask to be taken back into Federation. Some people seem to place a high value on referendums, but I do not think so much of them myself, particularly when people are not prepared to hear both sides of the question upon which a decision is desired. Let us consider the question from the standpoint of once out, always out. What would be the effect? In the first place, I should imagine the question of defence would crop up at the outset. Mr. Miles told us about the millions of coloured people on the islands adjacent to northern Australia. Surely we cannot expect to be a nation without being prepared to undertake our own defence. Something has been said about the attitude of the Imperial Government and it has been suggested that the British Navy would be called upon to render us assistance in the event of trouble. If I read the English newspapers correctly, the British Navy is much below strength to-day, and if trouble should arise, Britain would not have the ships available to send to Western Australia.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: But that would apply to all Australia.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It has been suggested that the people in the Eastern States would come to our assistance, but I should imagine that their job would be

the defence of their own part of the Commonwealth. Our task would be to defend Western Australia, because we had become a separate entity.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: It would not be much use—

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If you have finished, I will go on. Have you finished? If we are to become a nation, we must be prepared to defend the nation. We have between 4,000 and 5,000 miles of coastline to guard. The people in the Eastern States will not be able to protect us; they will have enough to do to protect themselves. Where are we to find the money necessary to enable us to provide for our own defence? I do not know. Then there is the question of the standardisation of railways. If we are to have assistance from the Eastern States in time of war, as Mr. Baxter suggested, we must have a standard gauge railway from Kalgoorlie to Fremantle in order that troops may be rushed across to our assistance. Who will provide the money necessary to build that railway? The 440,000 people in Western Australia? I think not. Then we come to the question of finance, which is all-important from a Government standpoint. A great authority said some years ago that finance was government and government was finance. I endeavoured to analyse the position to ascertain how it would be possible for Western Australia to finance as a separate entity. I cannot see how it would be possible. I have looked into it from all quarters. I took statistics and details into the bush for a week, studied them there, but was not able to see how it could be done. To begin with, all national finance is calculated on a population basis—the capacity of the people to pay taxation, interest and so on. That is the basis on which statesmen of the Empire, men who know finance, found their deductions. I shall deal with the official figures showing our position as at the 30th June, 1933. If I looked up some of the later publications and brought the details up to date, the figures would be much worse. I find that the gross indebtedness of the 440,000 people in Western Australia amounts to £83,500,000, less the sinking fund of £1,500,000, making a net indebtedness of £82,000,000. On a per capita basis, that represents an indebtedness of £187 for each man, woman and child in the State. To that I must add the proportion of the Federal

loans for which it is stated in the Case we are liable. That represents a per capita indebtedness of £43, bringing our total indebtedness per head to £230. That means that every child who is brought into the world here has a liability of £230 around his neck, with an interest bill of £12 a year, or 5s. per week. That is what we have to start out with.

Hon. V. Hamersley: And yet you say we must remain in the Federation.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Because we cannot get out of it. All this proposal amounts to is to give some delegates—not the Premier or any man in authority—the opportunity for a jamboree abroad at our expense. We have had enough of that, so far as I am concerned. Viewing it from another standpoint, the amount extracted from the population of Western Australia for the financial year ended the 30th June, 1933, was £19 per head in taxation, and for that year it cost £21 per head to enable the State to carry on. It will be seen, therefore, that if we became a separate entity, that is what we would start off with, without having made provision for defence or other national requirements. All the financial experts whose dicta I have read are of the opinion that the greatest possible national debt any civilised community can carry is a per capita indebtedness of £100. In Western Australia we are carrying an indebtedness of £230 per head.

Hon. A. Thomson: And the indebtedness is increasing.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The answer to that assertion one generally gets is that we have a lot of the money invested in public utilities and so forth. That is quite true. For instance, we have £23,000,000 involved in our railways. On the other hand, if we had invested all this money properly—this is where the failure on the part of State Governments has come in—so that our investments were returning interest, we could point to them and say, "Look at our assets." But if I have an asset that will not pay interest, let alone sinking fund charges, then neither I nor any other sane business man would endeavour to get out of the investments and cut our losses. A non-paying asset, especially a State asset, is, in my opinion, a liability, not an asset.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I was pointing out the indebtedness of the State on its per capita basis and explaining that if the money borrowed had been properly invested there would not be nearly so much to complain of. I was endeavouring to prove also that the wrong investment of this money was due to difficulties which were not to be ascribed to Federation but rather to our State Government's mismanagement. Let me deal with group settlement. Surely no one can complain that Federation has been responsible for that fiasco. I do not think I am exaggerating when I say we have invested £8,000,000 in group settlement. That money at 5 per cent. interest should be bringing in £400,000 per annum, whereas I have it on the best of authority that instead of £400,000 having been paid in last year, something like £4,000 was paid. That £4,000 was paid by the settlers, but this State has to pay £400,000. So there is there a liability of £396,000 per annum, considerably more than £1,000 per day interest, which the 440,000 people of this State have to pay.

Hon. L. Craig: That money did not cost 5 per cent.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Suppose it cost only 2½ per cent. Some of the money was borrowed at a cheap rate, but the then Premier, Mr. Collier, wisely considered that cheap money was not an advantage, because it was an inducement to spend, and the cheap rate lasted for only a few years, after which we had to come back to the full rate. I have no hesitation in saying that that episode is costing the people of the State more than £1,000 per day, and that Federation has been in no way responsible for it. The next blunder was made when the present Premier and Treasurer, Mr. Collier, entered into that Financial Agreement, the acceptance of which, in my opinion, if we ever had a chance of getting out of the net of Federation, prevented us from doing so, since it took away our right to borrow except through the Loan Council. Ever since that day, when we have wanted money we have had to go back to the Federal Government and the Loan Council, and every time we went back begging for more money we got further into the Federal net. One point has to be considered, namely, that the Federal Government in point of lending money have treated this State very liberally as to the amount; they have given us more than our quota with, I

think, the ulterior object of advancing us all the money they could spare knowing that the more we borrowed from them the more difficult would it be for us to get out of the Federation. If we secede, how are we going to finance the State? I told you this afternoon what the expert financial advisers consider is a safe per capita liability, namely, £100, and I have shown that, if we separate, our per capita liability will be £230. I suppose if we secede the Commonwealth will cease to finance us any longer. Then to whom are we to turn? I suppose we shall go back to the London market, where probably we shall find, when they begin to analyse our figures, that they will not consider Western Australia, as a separate entity, anything like the security that we are while part of the Federation. The Commonwealth Bank would take up the same attitude and so, too, I am sure would the Associated Banks. We have lost our State Savings Bank with the policy of the various Governments of getting money anywhere and spending it as they thought fit. The Financial Agreement abolished the per capita payments of 25s. per head per annum.

Hon. A. Thomson: That could have been done at any time.

The Chief Secretary: Those payments were abolished before that.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I will tell the hon. member what did happen. The Commonwealth Government under that agreement agreed to provide 7½ million pounds per annum for 58 years and distribute it amongst the States. That 7½ millions was distributed as follows: £3,000,000 per annum to the wealthy New South Wales; £2,000,000 to wealthy Victoria; £1,000,000 to Queensland, and £1,500,000 between South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania. The two big States with factories established and their country developed, Victoria and New South Wales, got £5,000,000 between them, while Queensland and the other three States got only 2½ millions split up amongst them, although we had one-third of the territory of the Commonwealth to develop. So seriously did I view the matter that I went to Canberra and interviewed Mr. Bruce, the then Prime Minister, who said—

We, the Commonwealth Government, agreed to provide 7½ millions for 58 years, but we allowed the State Premiers to make the distribution.

He repeated that the State Premiers had made the distribution, that it was not a distribution he would have made, or even that he approved of, but that it was made by the State Premiers, of whom Mr. Collier, the Premier of Western Australia, was one. What more could I say?

The Chief Secretary: I may have something to say on that.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Minister probably will have something to say. He it was who piloted that agreement through this House with the assistance of the Labour Party and the Country Party. And he then told me that our financial troubles were at an end, that everything was right, that we were sailing full speed ahead, and that all our tribulations were passed. He will need to have something to say in explaining on what grounds he forecast that paradise.

The Chief Secretary: I can do it.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: A burning question seems to be the Federal tariff imposed by the Federal Parliament. The tariff, I admit, has been used to the advantage of manufacturers in the Eastern States. But I have yet to learn that the manufacturers of Western Australia are very different from the manufacturers of the Eastern States, and I fear that when Western Australia is a separate entity her manufacturers, with the pull they will have over any Government in power, will succeed in getting imposed the same tariff as we know to-day, or perhaps a higher one, which will enable our own manufacturers to penalise the public of Western Australia as the Eastern manufacturers are doing to-day.

Hon. A. Thomson: It will be a distinct advantage to have the customs revenue to spend.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: We get our quota of the Customs now. We shall want it all to finance this country as a separate entity. I cannot bring myself to believe that the Western Australian manufacturer is going to prove less selfish than the manufacturers of the Eastern States.

Hon. A. Thomson: We do not agree on that.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: We know exactly what Queensland has done with the sugar monopoly, and the way the people of Australia as a whole have been dealt with under that monopoly. Yet when I

picked up the "West Australian" of the 16th inst., I found that the Premier of Queensland, Mr. Forgan Smith, in London the day before had said—

We (in Queensland) do not agree with the proposition that a nation can become prosperous by making a number of its people poorer.

Yet Queensland with its sugar monopoly puts an imposition on the whole of Australia, including Western Australia with all its fruit available for jam making. And Mr. Forgan Smith has the audacity to go to London and say he does not believe in the proposition that a nation can become prosperous by making a number of its people poorer. Those men really annoy me. I do not think they are entitled to be called statesmen. Queensland I believe is the State where they preach the brotherhood of man, and the socialistic policy. They do not say anything about the Fatherhood of God, and there can be no unselfishness and no justice unless they recognise that. The irony of their preaching the brotherhood of man is that they ignore the Fatherhood of God. We have to realise that we are all citizens of Australia and that it is our duty to help one another. As a dominion we would have to obtain more revenue. Let us see where we could get it. We could get it through the Customs at the expense of our people.

Hon. A. Thomson: It is drawn from them to-day.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Yes, but if that is one of the reasons for wishing to get out of Federation, the only difference would be that instead of our people paying to the Commonwealth as they do to-day, they would pay to Western Australia as a separate entity. We have to remember that Western Australia receives its quota under the Financial Agreement. How would it be possible to raise the revenue required except by taxation? What are we going to tax? After all we have heard from goldfields representatives about gold and the gold bonus to be paid when the price drops below £5 10s., is there any Government, State or otherwise, that would suggest a tax on gold production. Gold comprises our principal production to-day, and we are not getting too much out of it. We are providing compensation to the extent of one-third of the cost for injured and destroyed manhood. The Miners' Union pays one-third and the mines pay the other third. For a long time I have urged that the mines should pay the whole lot, because it is in the



mines that the health of the men is ruined, but it is impossible to get any Government, especially a Labour Government that secures so much support from the goldfields, to tackle that proposition. There would be no appreciable amount of revenue to be derived from the gold-mining industry. Wool, if it remains at the present price, might manage to bear the taxation already imposed. If the price goes down, the proceeds of taxation from that source will fail. As to timber, we have imposed hours and conditions, wharfages, freight charges, etc., to an extent that has practically pushed our timber off the world's market. I am looking for means to raise the revenue that will be required to carry on, and I hope members who are supporting the Bill will be able to convince me that it will be possible to raise the requisite amount. Five years ago Western Australia had a wheat crop worth about £8,000,000. To-day we are producing almost an equivalent quantity and are not getting £4,000,000 for it. Where are we going to obtain money with which to finance the wheat industry? At present the money is coming out of the pockets of the wheat growers who have seen better days, and is also being provided by the banks who have accepted securities and must carry them on. How long can we continue to grow wheat at 3s. per bushel and sell it at 1s. 11d.? For the Government to expect to get income tax or other tax from the people growing wheat is absurd. Butter and all the other industries are in the same plight. Yet we are asking to become a separate entity in order that we might finance ourselves.

Hon. A. Thomson: Are we not financing ourselves to-day?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: No. In 1932 where did we get the £900,000 with which to finance the deficit? Last year, where did we get the £750,000 with which to finance the deficit? We borrowed it from the Commonwealth Government. As a separate entity, where could we get the money? We could not get it, and anyone who takes an intelligent view of the situation must realise that. I have for years rebelled against the policy of running to the Commonwealth Government for more and more money. I have likened that to the action of a lot of extravagant sons having a wealthy father. The sons know they can have a good time and only have to send in the bills to father, and father has to meet the bills for decency's sake. That is what has been done by the State. We have been

getting every penny possible from the Commonwealth Government and have spent it without proper consideration, knowing that we could go back for more. Whatever happens that is a state of affairs that cannot continue. There should be a clear line of demarcation as to what the State can get from the Commonwealth and as to the limits within which the State must live. In my opinion, this task has been tackled in the wrong way. We are trying to get behind an existing contract to which we are a party. No one knows better than does the Premier that we cannot do it, and that is why he will not be a member of the delegation. What I fear is that after we have gone behind the Federal Parliament, and after we have been put in our place, as we must be, by the Imperial authorities—we shall be told it is our business and not theirs—we shall have to go cap in hand to the Federal Government to ask for justice, which I believe we could get to-day if we approached them properly. I repeat that we should tackle the Senate where the small States have 24 representatives against the big States' 12 representatives. If we tackled the Senate as we should do and made its members realise their duty to the States, many of our difficulties would disappear.

Hon. A. Thomson: Do you think that the Queensland senators would support Western Australia in the desire to obtain sugar from other places?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Without Queensland there would be 18 senators representing the smaller States, and I am certain there are decent senators in New South Wales and Victoria who desire that Australia as a whole should be developed, and not two-thirds of it at the cost of one-third.

Hon. A. Thomson: You are more optimistic than I am.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The hon. member will have an opportunity to give his views presently. Meanwhile, I hope he will allow me to put my views, distasteful though they may be to him. If we asked for money in the world's market, with the indebtedness we are carrying, the interest we would have to pay, added to our present interest bill, which is almost intolerable, would make the burden unbearable. Holding those views, it is my intention to vote against the Bill. When I voted against Federation, I think that I did the right thing, and that a majority of the people did the wrong thing. The great majority who voted for secession, or for

something they did not understand, will find that they have voted wrongly again, or rather, that no matter what their vote may have been, the manner in which their desire is to be presented to the Imperial Parliament instead of the Federal Parliament, has not been right. Australia is part of the British Empire with full control over all matters within the boundaries of the Commonwealth. That is what we have been fighting for over many years. That is what the Imperial Parliament granted. Now we ask the Imperial authorities to take back something they gave us.

Hon. A. Thomson: Would we not still have the same rights?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If the hon. member made a reasonable interjection, I would answer it.

Hon. A. Thomson: Would not we be in the same position as the Commonwealth if we were a dominion?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: But we are not a dominion.

Hon. A. Thomson: We would be.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The contract in the shape of the Federal Constitution, into which we entered, debars us from becoming a dominion unless a majority of the people in a majority of the States sanction it.

Hon. A. Thomson: Provision is not made in the Constitution against secession.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Would the hon. member approve of repudiating or committing breaches of contracts. If he favours repudiation, I hope he will say so. As to the proposal to forward an address to His Majesty, I think I have shown clearly that this trouble has arisen through the growth of a wrong system—the system of party politics—in Australia, and to ask His Majesty to become mixed up in party politics would be to place him in an untenable position. I know of only one other petition that was sent to the British monarch—Queen Victoria—a matter of some importance affecting one section of the community, and the answer returned was, “Let justice be done.” I am inclined to think that if we get any answer at all to the address to His Majesty, it will be, “Let justice be done.”

Hon. E. H. Angelo: That is all we want.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Then the hon. member implies that over six million people are going to be told to surrender all Imperial right and everything else for 400,000 people in this State. If that

is Mr. Angelo's view, I am sorry I cannot agree with him. It would be wrong for His Majesty, or for the Imperial Parliament, to tell 6,000,000 people in Australia to do what 400,000 of them wished them to do. That is not the way to build up an Empire, and it is not the right thing to do. I regret I have taken up so much of the time of the House. I hold very serious views on this matter. I have tried to put them before this Chamber to the best of my ability in the hope that they will have some effect. I am satisfied the day will come when these will be found to be the correct views, and when that day comes, I shall not say, “I told you so.” I am satisfied to tell the House and the country what I think of the position to-day. If they refuse to accept it, I will bow to the decision of the majority, as I did on the occasion when Western Australia joined in the Federation. Again I say I think my view will be found to be the correct one, just as I believe that the majority who voted for Federation were wrong in so doing. I oppose the second reading of the Bill.

**HON J. NICHOLSON** (Metropolitan) [8.2]: I should like at the outset to congratulate those members who went forth to their provinces and were fortunate enough to be returned as the representatives of those provinces. I also congratulate the new members who have been elected, and join with those speakers in regretting the absence of Mr. Franklin. There is another matter about which we are naturally concerned, and that is the serious accident which befell the Honorary Minister, Hon. W. H. Kitson. It is a source of great satisfaction to us to learn to-night that he is making progress towards recovery, and we hope the recovery will be of such a nature that no blemish will be left upon him. Dealing with the Bill before us, the question we are asked to decide is a simple one. Are we or are we not going to give to the people, who expressed by a large majority, their determination on the referendum which was held on the question of Secession, full expression or not of their views?

The Chief Secretary: That is the question.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Mr. Holmes, in a very excellent speech on which I congrat-

ulate him, rightly mentioned and very strongly spoke upon the sanctity of contracts. I agree as to the necessity of this House at all times seeking to preserve to the utmost the sanctity and sacredness of contracts. A promise was, however, given when the Bill for the referendum was passed that, whatever the determination of the people might be, full expression would be given to it by the Government. This really amounted to a contract. Mr. Holmes, by voting against the measure, will undoubtedly destroy that contract and promise, and violate them.

Hon. J. J. Holmes. Was any mention made of the Imperial Parliament in those days?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The Imperial Parliament does not enter into the question.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It did not enter into it until this Bill came before us.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The people, by a large majority, voted in favour of Secession. It then became the duty of the Government, irrespective of the type of Government that might be in power, to give expression to the views of the people.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: In the Federal Parliament.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: No restriction was imposed upon the method by which that would be done. It was for the Government to seek the correct method by which that expression could be brought before the proper authorities. It was decided, and I think wisely so, that the proper course to adopt was to present the petition to the Home authorities. That is embodied in the Bill before us. It seeks to give expression to the views of the people as disclosed by the referendum. Mr. Elliott, who has recently come amongst us, delivered a very illuminating speech. No doubt it would cause members a great deal of thought if the matter were viewed from his standpoint. If the hon. member will turn the matter over in his mind more fully, he will realise that by their votes on the referendum the people were merely giving effect to that well-known principle in democratic countries of being ruled by the majority and accepting the views of the majority.

Hon. C. G. Elliott: I quite agree with that.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I am glad the hon. member subscribes to that view.

Hon. C. B. Williams: We would not be here if we did not subscribe to it.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Probably the hon. member would be prepared to suggest that the determination of the majority should rule in the selection of members for this House as well as those of another place. It is a method we have adopted in our country and which exists in other countries, and one we should be very careful not to depart from just as we should be careful not to depart from the sacredness or sanctity of contracts.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Do you require an alteration to the qualification of voters for the Legislative Council?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I would not go so far as that. This is a House of review, and we are asked to consider this Bill. Mr. Elliott traversed at some length various points that were brought out in the Case for Secession, now included in a volume of about 490 pages.

Hon. T. Moore: It is not likely to be read by too many people.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I have perused the greater part of it. I was struck, just as other members must have been, by the wealth of detail contained in the volume.

Hon. A. Thomson: It is a wonderful historical document.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It is most valuable and should prove a very interesting historical document.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: One in which a lot of mistakes occur.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: These can be corrected later on if necessary.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It should have been edited before.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I congratulate the committee upon the Case they have compiled. One may not agree with all that the volume contains, but I contend it will go down in history as a record of considerable value. It will probably be turned to in many cases by people who are seeking information concerning the history of Western Australia. I have endeavoured to study the history of the State, and have found the occupation most interesting. In the few volumes which are still in existence, in very diminishing numbers, one finds cause for much blessing on the part of the people of the State towards those who preceded them. The

pioneers of Western Australia are men whose memories should be cherished and revered. The more we can inculcate into the minds of the children of to-day a knowledge of the history of the State, and the more we can ensure a fuller knowledge upon that important matter, the better will it be for those who are to follow us. Theirs will be the duty later on of legislating for Western Australia. It is of great importance that they should be possessed of the fullest knowledge of all the facts relating to the history of the State, for that will constitute a magnificent guide to them in carrying out the responsibilities that will devolve upon them. The Chief Secretary, whose speech was a masterpiece, said that the Case was equivalent to a statement of claim presented in proceedings before a court. A statement of claim is a document setting out the claim of the plaintiff in an action. I suggest that the Case for Secession is rather more in keeping with a statement of evidence. The statement of claim in the present instance is that which is embodied really in the petition to the authorities at Home. I think Mr. Parker will concur in that view. The Case sets out in full detail the evidence which will be necessary to support the statements of fact set out in the petition, and the concluding prayer in the petition. The committee have been generous in publishing that Case, since it is not usual in connection with legal proceedings, for a plaintiff or his solicitor in the first place to publish or make known to people outside what are the facts and the evidence in support of the claim. It is not usual to do that, and therefore I consider that the committee have been most generous in laying before us all a full statement supporting the facts set out in the petition.

Hon. R. G. Moore: They were appointed for that purpose.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: They were appointed to prepare a Case, and the necessary papers in connection with it.

Hon. R. G. Moore: To be presented to both Houses of Parliament.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: They have submitted the Case and the papers, and in my opinion the Government are to be congratulated on having given to everyone the opportunity to know the exact facts upon which the Case will be submitted to the Home authorities. That being the position, we have to realise, as pointed out by the Chief Secretary, that the petition will come before

the committee at Westminster appointed to hear petitions. They will deal with the whole of the evidence, and the Case which we have seen will be part of the evidence; but evidence must be given to support the allegations of fact. I sympathise with what has been said as to the position of the minority in the referendum. There is a great deal to be said with regard to their position. If the minority had been of an infinitesimal character, one could have said, "We can afford to ignore the views of such a minority." But it was a substantial minority: and from remarks made by the Premier, I had hoped, despite what Mr. Macfarlane stated in his speech here, that the Government intended to give the minority some facility and opportunity to have their views presented in some way or other. It would be only fair to give them that opportunity. I shall be glad to hear what the Chief Secretary has to say in that regard.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I thought you said, earlier in your speech, that a minority did not count, that it was the majority that had to be considered.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Yes. I say so still.

Hon. A. Thomson: Not much notice was taken of the minority when Federation was carried into effect.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I speak of what I understand the Premier has mentioned. Mr. Macfarlane, in his speech here yesterday, called attention to the efforts which had been made on behalf of those representing the minority to approach the Premier with a view to having their views represented at Home in some way or other. I have no doubt that it would still be open to those whose views do not coincide with those of the majority, to have them presented, just as that would be possible before any Royal Commission or committee of inquiry. But if something could be done to meet the wish which was expressed, and which I thought was to be granted by some means or other, probably it would satisfy those who feel aggrieved as the result of the referendum. The main point, however, is that we as a democratic people are bound to acknowledge the result of the referendum, and to accept it in the right spirit. There is only one way in which that can be done—by acquiescing in and supporting the Bill, which to my mind gives the necessary power

and authority to enable the matter to be carried to the Home authorities, leaving them to determine the whole question. I do not think it necessary to elaborate either on the Case or on the various clauses of the Bill. One might perhaps deal with several phases of the matter, but I confess that there was one point about which I felt considerable diffidence when the question of Secession first arose. That was in regard to what one might term the financial position—how we are to get out of the financial morass into which we have drifted in the course of the years that have gone. We know that under the terms of the Financial Agreement made some few years ago, the Commonwealth Government assumed responsibility for our loans, and made certain arrangements with regard to borrowing and so forth. Whilst we know what our responsibility is with regard to loans made and created prior to the time of the Financial Agreement and the assumption by the Commonwealth of that responsibility, there is a difficulty that arises under the terms of the Financial Agreement—whether we are not liable, as I think we are, jointly and severally with the other States of the Commonwealth in respect of all the debts which have been created by the Commonwealth. That, however, is a matter which needs to be inquired into a little more fully than I have done up to the present stage. Assuming that our position as a member of the Commonwealth was equivalent to that of a junior partner, as Mr. Holmes put it, in this partnership wherein the other States are senior partners, with the Commonwealth overriding all, are we not still carrying, just as any junior partner carries, the obligation of being jointly and severally indebted to all those to whom that particular firm may be indebted?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Do you think we can get out of that responsibility?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: That is just the question. It is one of the points which no doubt will be considered when the measure reaches Home. I wish to make it clear that so far as State loans are concerned the question applies only to loans created since the Financial Agreement was made with the Commonwealth. Prior to that, all loans created for the various States were created by those States; and those States alone are liable to the persons who advanced the money. But I think a new position has probably arisen since the date of the Financial

Agreement, and there may be some difficulty in that regard.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: We are jointly and severally liable.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: There is a joint and several liability in every partnership to those who have claims against the partnership. That is the position. Whether we are junior or senior partners matters not; there is a joint and several liability. I am pleased to see that some reference is made to this aspect in the Second Schedule to the petition, and that the State is not shirking its present liability. Subparagraph (4) of paragraph 19 reads—

(i.) The Dominion of Western Australia shall assume responsibility for the service of the public debt of the Commonwealth of Australia as existing at the date of the commencement of the Act and for the payment of war and other pensions as existing on that date in such proportions as may be fair and equitable, having regard to any just claims on the part of Western Australia by way of a set-off or counterclaim.

(ii.) The interest and sinking fund, if any, upon the portion of the public debt to be so taken over from the Commonwealth of Australia by the Dominion of Western Australia shall be a reserved charge payable to the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia by the Government of the Dominion of Western Australia; provided always that this provision shall not in any way prejudice or affect the security of any stock or bonds which may have been issued by the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia before the withdrawal of Western Australia from the Commonwealth.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Before you get away from that; that is quite clear. We are responsible for our quota.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Quite so. The question arising in my mind is that when a loan is created, it is created between one authority—now the Commonwealth—and the people advancing the money, who are not parties to this particular document. It is always necessary when one wants to get released from an obligation, say a mortgage, to get the consent of the mortgagee. The same thing would apply to debts owing by partners in a partnership.

Hon. A. Thomson: Still, the Commonwealth did not ask the people who lent it money for their consent to the reduction of interest.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I am just raising the question. I think it well to raise the question. When those people who are not parties to the proposal advanced the money

they advanced it on the security of the whole Commonwealth.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: And they want to retain that security.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: They want to retain that security. It is said that wherever there is a will there is always a way. The only way that this could be accomplished would be by the creation of new loans. No doubt in the course of time as loans are re-converted for the purpose of obtaining lower rates of interest, the difficulty can be overcome. But the schedule points out, apparently, an equitable way of dealing with the matter if there should be any dispute. Sub-paragraph (5) of paragraph 19 provides—

(5) In default of agreement between the Dominion of Western Australia and the Commonwealth of Australia as to the amount of the sums mentioned in the last preceding provision, or upon any other matter whatsoever arising out of or in connection with the withdrawal of Western Australia from the Commonwealth of Australia, the question or questions shall be determined by the arbitration of one or more independent persons, being citizens of the British Empire, and in the case of such arbitration, justice and equity shall be the sole principle which shall dominate the determination of such arbitration.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: If you had a client who owed money, would he have to decide on arbitrators to determine whether he should pay?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: There is a wide selection of arbitrators.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: But all parties would have to agree.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Yes, with regard to the appointment of arbitrators. I think that in making that arrangement the committee are to be congratulated because they made the provision so wide and independent. Ordinarily one would be inclined to narrow it down, but they have left a latitude that is really commendable. I do not think it is necessary for me to stress my views further, beyond saying that I intend to support the second reading of the Bill, and I would impress upon hon. members the desirability of maintaining the principles of democracy and to give effect to that end by voting for the measure.

On motion by Hon. L. Craig, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 8.34 p.m.*

## Legislative Council,

*Thursday, 24th May, 1934.*

	PAGE
Standing Orders suspension ... ..	347
Bills: Constitution Acts Amendment (Temporary), 1R. ... ..	348
Secession, 2R. ... ..	348

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

### STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.33]: I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as will enable messages from the Assembly to be taken into consideration forthwith and Bills to be passed through all stages at one sitting.

I had intended almost up to the last moment yesterday not to give notice of motion for the suspension of the Standing Orders for the purpose of expediting the business of the House. But it was pointed out to me by some hon. members that the two Bills involved—the Secession Bill and an amendment of the Constitution Act—might pass the second readings, and go through Committee, and so with no other business to do—and there is no other business to do—country members would be detained here another day merely to pass the third readings. If suspension were not granted it might mean more than that; it might mean that both Bills would go through Committee by Thursday night of next week, and then members would have to come back again on the following Tuesday—some of them long distances—in order to be present at the third readings. The Bill amending the Constitution Act will come from another place to-day. I will move the first reading, and then move that the second reading be made an order of the day for the next sitting of the House. I will not take the second reading of that Bill to-day. My sole object in asking for the suspension of the Standing Orders is to enable the third reading of each Bill to be moved immediately after the Bill has passed through Committee; that is, if I am satisfied this may be safely done. To meet the convenience of several members, I should like to be able at the dinner hour this evening to adjourn until Tuesday next.