

people to make those outer districts prosperous and, in doing so, will bring prosperity to the whole of the State.

On motion by Mr. Money debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.10 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 19th August, 1920.

	PAGE
Message: Assent to Supply Bill	178
Leave of Absence	178
Address-in-Reply, fifth day, amendment, Single Chamber, defeated	178

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

MESSAGE—ASSENT TO SUPPLY BILL.

Message from the Governor received and read, assenting to Supply Bill (No. 1) £2,059,000.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motions by Hon. G. J. G. W. Miles, leave of absence for 12 consecutive sittings of the House granted to the Hon. R. J. Lynn (West) on the ground of urgent private business, and leave of absence for six consecutive sittings granted to the Hon. J. J. Holmes (North) on the ground of ill-health.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Fifth Day.

Amendment—Single Chamber.

Debate resumed from the previous day on the Address-in-reply and the following amendment moved by the Hon. A. H. Pantou:—“That the following words be added to the Address—‘And we respectfully suggest to Your Excellency that the time has now arrived when the Government of the State can best be carried on by a single Chamber elected on an adult franchise.’”

Hon. J. W. HICKEY (Central) [4.35]: In supporting the amendment I take advantage of the opportunity to offer a word of welcome to the new members, all of whom

have made their maiden speeches and I think are to be congratulated on them. Despite the criticism which has come from the opponents of this amendment, its supporters put it forward with every sincerity and heartily commend it to the consideration of the House. Any reform must, of course, bear hardly on someone; and certainly any reform must meet with a certain amount of opposition, as our experience in this Chamber has shown. I listened attentively to the speeches of opponents of the amendment because I thought I might gather from them material for making a speech myself. I almost regret that you, Mr. President, are not on the floor of the House. Knowing the views you take of this Chamber, and the very conservative guard you place on the position of the House, I am satisfied that you, Sir, would put up a bit of a fight. So far as I have observed, opponents of the amendment resort mostly to ridicule and to the casting of aspersions on the sincerity of the supporters of the amendment. Indeed, almost a direct charge of insincerity has been levelled at the mover, Mr. Pantou, and particularly at the seconder, Mr. Moore. Sir Edward Wittenoom stated that Mr. Moore was guilty of temerity in seconding an amendment of this description after being only 24 hours in the House. However, Mr. Moore and Mr. Pantou are capable of looking after their own interests and of defending themselves. After all, the brains of the country are not always in Parliament. Men who have taken a life-long interest in their country—particularly men connected with the Labour movement, who take a peculiarly keen interest in the people and as a consequence are conversant with public life almost from their infancy—have studied political economy and know something about the political views of the community. Sir Edward Wittenoom's criticism, therefore, was altogether wide of the mark. Perhaps Mr. Moore has made quite as long a study of political economy as has Sir Edward Wittenoom. It is somewhat of a coincidence that the mover and the seconder of the amendment should during the last few years have had a wide experience, an experience not possessed even by Sir Edward Wittenoom, their most severe critic. They have had opportunities of studying the circumstances of other lands. During the last few years they have had opportunities that have not been given to many members of this House. Whilst doing their best for Australia's sake in other lands, they have seized the opportunity to study the changes operating in those countries. They retained their observing faculties while abroad, and have given this House the benefit of their experience. I shall support the amendment, which proposes a reform that is long overdue. I particularly welcome the amendment because it has been moved and seconded by two returned soldiers who consider that the conditions which they left here when they went to the Front should be altered. I sincerely

trust that both those gentlemen will remain in public life a long time. I trust that they will be able to look back eventually on as long a public career as Sir Edward Wittenoom's, and I trust further that they will then be able to take a charitable view of things and give other people credit for possessing some little brains and some little broad-mindedness. Various members have spoken in a similar spirit against the amendment, but in my opinion absolutely no argument has been put up against it. I suppose we must feel grateful to the leader of the House for the speech which he delivered last night, and which was undoubtedly a most masterly effort. The hon. gentleman agreed with almost every proposition put forward in favour of the amendment, and so far as I could observe his speech did not contain really one argument against the amendment. He agreed that something should be done as regards the franchise, and he has previously made that statement on the hustings. The only objection he raised, apparently, was on the score of unification. Probably his objection is justifiable, because in connection with a proposition of this kind it cannot be expected that men shall grasp the whole situation straight away. Let us, however, cast back our minds to a few short years ago when the action and the attitude of this Council in blocking progressive legislation were causing the people of this country to look across to the Federal arena for protection and support. That occurred during a period when the Labour party was in power. As an effect of the treatment extended by this Chamber to the legislative proposals of the Labour Government, the confidence of the people of this country tended to turn towards the Commonwealth. The Federal Parliament at that time was instituting such reforms as the maternity bonus, the old age pension, the Commonwealth Bank and note issue, the small arms factory—

Hon. J. E. Dodd: And compulsory training.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: And compulsory training, and I would also remind the hon. member of the Australian Fleet. All these reforms were opposed by a section of the same people who oppose this amendment to-day. Throwing back our minds to that period, we can recognise that there is some justification for the attitude of the party mentioned by the leader of the House last night as aiming at unification. I admit that some arguments can be used against unification. But unification as a principle seems to my mind, and to the minds of the people with whom I am associated, a sound principle. Viewing the history of Western Australia and the conditions obtaining in this State to-day, we must recognise that some radical alteration is required. I do not assert that the system of unification as advocated by some people to-day is altogether a proper system. But some new system must be introduced so

that all sections of the people may be articulate and may have an opportunity of declaring what progressive legislation they consider desirable for the prosperity of the State. It must be admitted that the Federal Government have lost sympathy at least with Western Australia. They have failed, and failed miserably, to promote proper relations with this State. Not only is an alteration of the Constitution required, but there is need for fostering more sympathy than prevails to-day between the States and the Commonwealth. That might be brought about by some system of unification, because what applies to the Federal Government's relations with this State also applies to the relations of the present Government in Western Australia with the back portion of the State. The system of centralisation, which has been in evidence for quite a long time, is practically killing the State. When we remember that something like one-half of our population are centred in the metropolitan area, we must admit that a radical change is necessary and that any change must be for the better. Unfortunately, the Labour party are not in power in the Federal Parliament to-day, but we are putting forward the argument that some alteration should be made here in Western Australia. If some system of unification were adopted, as a result of which each section of the community had a say in the legislation, perhaps by the constitution of provincial councils in various parts of the State, there would be more local autonomy. Owing to the attitude of the Legislative Council towards legislation which has been submitted for its consideration, the whole policy of this State seems to be one of centralisation. To-day the Government are practically legislating for the metropolitan area, and the metropolitan area alone. I do not want to be incharitable but I blame the Constitution for that to a large extent. With all due respect, to many members of this Chamber, I would say they are here as a reflex of vested interests to a great extent. They are the reflex of financial institutions such as the associated banks, the insurance companies and the financial houses of various descriptions, and their interests and investments are centred around property in the metropolitan area. This state of affairs must be altered and, consequently, no great complaint can be offered if we suggest unification as a remedy. Under unification, possibly, each port would get its natural trade and would enjoy its local autonomy. Perhaps Bunbury, Albany, and Geraldton would form bases for a proposition of this description, and the people in those parts would get the benefit of the money earned in their localities, and the trade to which they are entitled. The secondary industries in the back country would be developed, and we would not have the centralisation and congestion that prevails in the metropolitan area to-day. The leader of the House said this was the only objection he raised to the amendment moved by Mr. Panton. If this

is the only objection, I ask hon. members to consider very seriously before they vote against the amendment. Even a system of unification, with the objections which hon. members fear might follow, would be a great improvement on the Constitution which we have to-day. Mr. Hamersley, in the course of his few remarks, mentioned that he saw no demand for any alteration, and that the people required no change. The leader of the House also said that, in his opinion, the people were not ready for a change, did not require a change, and had not asked for a change. As one who knocks about the country a little, and as one with a fair knowledge of public opinion, I have no hesitation in saying that the time is long past since the people demanded a radical change in our present Constitution. A short time ago we had a measure for an alteration of the Constitution turned down by this Chamber. In fairness to the leader of the House, I must say that on that occasion he was piloting the measure through this Chamber, and he gave it his personal support. At the same time, it received scant courtesy at the hands of members generally, and it was turned down. That being so, the people who were then alive to the need for this reform are more insistent to-day in demanding some alteration to the Constitution. Anyone who has studied history must realise that we are now passing through an era of change. We cannot mark time; we must progress or go back like a crawfish. The proposal contained in the amendment might be novel, but it is a step in the right direction. But a majority of the members of this Chamber have no intention of making any alteration; they are quite prepared to go on building up the deficit and accumulating political sins as they plod along their way. Radical changes are taking place throughout the world. Educated people everywhere are now demanding a share in the government of their respective countries. Wherever we look, we find that the people are demanding a greater share in the government, and where Governments, and even Empires have fallen, it has been due to a refusal to hearken to the voice of the people. The voice of the people is always demanding something. It has demanded something right down through history and, where that demand has not been recognised or considered, something has happened. That has recently been the position in various countries. The Romanoffs, Hapsburgs, and Hohenzollerns have tottered to the ground because they have refused to listen to the voice of the people. This amendment echoes the voice of the people of this State for an alteration in our Constitution. Public meetings have been held, but no better illustration should be needed than the return of new members to this Chamber, Mr. Moore for Central province and Mr. Baglin for West province. Particularly do my remarks apply to Mr. Moore, because I was actively engaged in his campaign. At every meeting, and sometimes three committee meetings were held in a day, he advocated the abolition of the Upper House and

gave his reasons for it. On all those occasions the people were right with him, and we can claim that his return, even by such a narrow majority, proves plainly that the people in the portion of the State which he represents are in accord with a drastic change in the Constitution. I do not think it necessary that any stronger reasons should be demanded than those which were given by Mr. Panton, Mr. Moore, Mr. Baglin, and Mr. Cunningham for the abolition of this Chamber. I thought there was practically nothing further to be said, but that sufficient reasons had been given to influence at least a majority of the members of this Chamber, voting conscientiously, to support the amendment. However, I was impressed by an interjection last evening to this effect, "Give us some reasons; tell us something we have done." This Council has done so very much in connection with measures that have come before it that one hardly knows where to start in order to rake up its political sins. If we took into consideration the Council's mutilation of various measures which have been introduced, we would be here for another week and there would, perhaps, be no opportunity for members to speak on the Address-in-reply itself. There are many measures of this kind which occur to my mind. In reply to an interjection by Sir Edward Wittenoom as to "What have we turned down?" Mr. Baglin mentioned several Bills. But there is quite a formidable list of slaughtered innocents. I have a list which makes interesting reading, and I should like to ask some member who opposes the amendment to explain the reasons why the House opposed the measures on this list. First on the list is the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment Bill. Quite a lot has been said recently about industrial unrest. Apart from the fact proved by history that all wars are followed by industrial chaos and a demand for better conditions, I lay the blame to a very great extent indeed to the fact that this Chamber, during the regime of the Labour Government, turned down repeatedly this Bill dealing with industrial conciliation and arbitration, and I say this with a full knowledge and experience of industrial matters; honestly and conscientiously believing it to be the truth. In regard to many of these measures—and in this Mr. Dodd can bear me out—the whole trend of feeling in this Chamber was against the registration of composite organisations. Since then matters have progressed to this extent, that miners and various other organisations are merging into closer combination, and many of them are now known by the title of the Australian Workers' Union. I have in mind one or two cases in which I have taken an active interest during the last few months. There is the case of the Meekatharra miners' organisation. By virtue of the action of this Council in making it impossible for that organisation to be registered under the State laws, they were unable to go to the Arbitration Court. I went to Meekatharra and found that a stop

work meeting was being held. The men intended to strike, and I could not blame them for taking that step. However, I asked them to give us an opportunity to see what could be done. The president of the Arbitration Court decided to go to Meekatharra in order to prevent industrial chaos resulting, but he went on the understanding that both sides would agree to abide by his decision. That special tribunal went to Meekatharra, and we were very thankful and grateful to its members for their attitude on that occasion. The organisation, though perhaps the biggest and strongest in Western Australia, had no right or authority to go before that court. It had only one recourse and that was direct action. But direct action was prevented by the good offices of Mr. Justice Rooth, Mr. Sommerville, and the late Mr. Daglish. But for their action and sympathy, there would have been no opportunity to get before the court and a strike would have been inevitable. The trouble was that the Chamber of Mines put every obstacle in our way to prevent us from getting to the court, although the mine owners in that particular district were quite prepared to go to the court. There is another matter of immediate moment. The lead miners in the Northampton district have for a long time been working under conditions which are absolutely intolerable. We adopted the round table conference and were able to effect a mutual agreement with the owner of the Surprise mine, which has been honoured by both parties ever since. As far as the Fremantle Trading Company are concerned they refused to attend these conferences, and again we found that by virtue of the action of the Legislative Council in not allowing a composite organisation to be registered, we had no power to approach the court. The miners would be prepared to return to work to-morrow—there are 200 of them idle—if it were possible to get the court to sit. Unfortunately the court decided that they could not sit. They did sit on one occasion but they were not prepared to do so again, and we could not trespass too much upon their generosity. Where we have an industrial combination held up on account of the action taken by the Legislative Council, that surely is sufficient to cause the Chamber to be severely criticised. There are many other matters, too, which can be criticised, but I think I have said sufficient to show, in connection with the Arbitration Act at any rate, what the attitude adopted by the Legislative Council has led to. Many other matters have been mentioned by Mr. Panton, but there is no need to go over them again. There is, for instance, the amendment to the Factories Act. That I think will be the means of bringing employer and employee closer together, and it will have the effect of enabling people to know exactly where they stand. The measure will aim in the direction of bringing about better conditions for the employees, particularly from the health standpoint. Sweating conditions exist

to-day and are likely to exist unless legislation such as that which is proposed is passed. I am rather pleased to note that the hon. member who moved the amendment has suggested that the Bill be referred to a select committee. I trust that the House will not place any obstacle in the way of the appointment of that committee.

The PRESIDENT: I think the hon. member is straying somewhat from the amendment.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: I am very sorry. Another measure of importance which was rejected by this Chamber was that dealing with the control of trade in war time. If hon. members throw their minds back they will remember the attitude that was adopted towards that measure. It was in operation for 12 months but there was no possibility of re-enacting it on account of the attitude adopted by the Legislative Council. It was hotly criticised here and perhaps by no one so much as the present leader of the House. We find also that the leader of the House adopted a most unsympathetic attitude with regard to almost every piece of legislation which was introduced by the Labour Government. There is another matter that vitally concerns a portion of the district that I have the honour with my colleagues to represent, and which came under the notice of this Council. I refer to the amendment of the Mines Regulation Act and which, because of the attitude adopted by the Chamber, had to be dropped. Hon. members who were in this House at that time will remember the attitude taken by the Council in regard to that measure. Personally, I can only repeat what I said in connection with the Arbitration Act. The health and the lives of the mining community depended a great deal on the passing of that Bill into law. I have not looked up the division list of that time, but I venture to say that those who voted against the measure knew nothing about the particular industry they were dealing with. They may perhaps, after the perusal of a long list of fatalities and accidents which have occurred during the past few years in the mining districts, regret their action. I have before me a tabulated list of the accidents which have occurred and hon. members can have it for perusal. I have no intention of wearying the House at the present time by quoting from the list, but I do express the opinion that it is my belief that the attitude of the Council was responsible for the loss of many of the lives, and many of the accidents which have occurred during the past 10 years in the mines of this State. It is time someone woke up and reviewed the position in this regard. Had the regulations gone through as the then Government desired them to go through, we know that many of the accidents would have been prevented. About 250 men have been killed during the past 10 years. That is an appalling state of affairs in a new country like Western Australia. Most of the accidents occurred in the bigger mines where

they hardly ever observe the regulations. When we review the list of killed and injured we find that the total comes to 6,000. Those figures surely provide food for reflection. The Woorloo Sanatorium, whilst being a monument of humane legislation and a tribute to the thoughtfulness of the Labour party, also serves as a very cruel reminder to hon. members of their actions in past years. Most of those who unfortunately have to go into the sanatorium are men who have been engaged in or about mines. It is time therefore that some consideration was shown towards those engaged in this perilous occupation.

The Honorary Minister: You did not enforce the regulations when you were in power.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: When the Labour party were in power this Chamber turned down the Mines Regulation Bill and under that measure the regulations for the better control of the work in mines would have been framed.

Hon. J. Nicholson: The Mines Regulation Bill was passed.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: The Bill was never passed. Neither were the regulations passed. If the regulations had been passed they would have proved of considerable benefit to the miners, and the appalling state of affairs which I have quoted would have been prevented, or at least many of the fatalities and accidents which have occurred might have been prevented. I could quote a list of the political crimes and the slaughter of innocents on the part of this Chamber, but I think hon. members have been given sufficient information during the course of the debate to remind them of what has been done. Hon. members will therefore require to think seriously before they turn down the amendment which has been submitted. In connection with the trading concerns, and again the leader of the House was one of the bitterest critics of these, it is admitted now that the State steamers are necessary for the proper carrying on of trade with the North-West coast.

Hon. G. J. G. W. Miles: They are not necessary at all.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: Perhaps the hon. member will have an opportunity to say a word or two on this matter, but I do not know how he will justify the attitude of the Legislative Council in connection with the State steamers so far as the North-West coast is concerned. Now that the hon. member is heading the North-West railway proposition perhaps he thinks that that will stand in good stead. Personally I shall be prepared to support the project, but if he waits until the railway line is built the North-West will starve.

Hon. G. J. G. W. Miles: Private enterprise will build it.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: Private enterprise has had an opportunity to build it for a long time, but as in every other part of Australia, it has skipped to other portions of the world

whenever it has had money to invest. In this case it will do likewise and the North-West can go hang. Every member with North-West experience knows that so far as the North-West is concerned that if it had not been for the action of the Labour Government providing steamers, that portion of the State would have starved during the period of the war.

Hon. G. J. G. W. Miles: Nonsense.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: The hon. member will have an opportunity of combating my arguments. We have heard a lot about the North-West since the Ministerial visit and I have no doubt that the leader of the House will give that portion of the State the advertisement it is entitled to. I hope however, when he is doing this he will review carefully his attitude in the past, and that he will not continue to offer hostile opposition to State enterprise so far as that coast is concerned. If the hon. members who represent that part of the State are satisfied that State trading concerns are not necessary, they will have to take the full responsibility of their actions. So far as the Labour party are concerned, if they were in power again they would do exactly as they did before, namely to provide State-owned steamers for the North-West coast.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member is not speaking to the amendment.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: I was endeavouring to draw the attention of hon. members to the position of the State trading concerns and the opposition shown to them by the Council in the past, and I was endeavouring to prove that in consequence of the attitude of the Council, the North-West is at the present time being practically starved. I welcome the amendment. I repudiate the criticism of some hon. members that the mover of the amendment was not serious. I trust an opportunity will be given before the division is taken to prove whether or not members on this side are serious in the matter. Hon. members on that side can retire and leave us to put the amendment through. I hope the action of hon. members last session in connection with the amendment of the Constitution Act will not be repeated, and that they will view this amendment in a broader light. With all due credit to the leader of the House, who supported the Bill which was thrown out last session, and who is in favour of the household suffrage, I say that even that measure of relief would not go far enough, because many would not have a vote under it. I know of numbers in my own Province who would not be qualified under that reform, but who nevertheless if they were to come down to the City and be content to live in a slum hovel, would thereby be furnished with the necessary qualification. I appreciate the fact that the amendment has been moved by two returned soldiers. I never waved the flag to any extent during the war, but I admit that these men have had opportunities for studying the question dealt with in the

amendment. They have been close students of economics, close students of existing conditions in the country, and have studied the conditions in other parts of the Empire. Now they come back and demand of us this proposed reform. I might remind hon. members that on account of the Council's action in rejecting the Bill last session, the Hon. T. Moore, who is now entitled to take a seat in this Chamber, and who was good enough to go away and fight for this country, is denied the right of a vote for the Council. It is strange, but none the less true. Hon. members sent here to review hasty legislation should think seriously before casting a vote against the amendment. I hope hon. members will take a broad view of the situation and throw their minds back to the attitude of the Council on many occasions, particularly in respect of the proposed amendment of the Constitution last session, when the Council denied a voice in the government of the country to men who, however, were good enough to go away and fight for that country. We have heard a good deal particularly during the visit of the French Mission, of the phrase "Liberty, Fraternity and Equality." I trust that the forthcoming division will show that the phrase is not altogether an empty one.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS (North-East) [5.20]: This is the first time I have been privileged to listen to a debate in the Chamber. I have found much of interest, particularly when hearing the arguments put forward in support of the amendment. I have sat and heard hon. members emphasising what the House has done in the past. The point that appeals to me is what the House is going to do with the amendment. This being my first speech in the House, let me take the opportunity to thank hon. members generally for the cordial reception and kind welcome they have extended to the newly elected members. I have attended many union meetings, street meetings, political gatherings, and conferences, and I can say that the whole of the arguments adduced in support of the amendment have been previously worked threadbare. To me it has been practically a gramophone record of utterances by speakers at union gatherings and street meetings. The party responsible for the amendment have on numerous occasions and in no unmistakable terms indicated that they desire the abolition of the Council. They have in my presence referred to it as a House of old fossils, the House of ham fat, and in other opprobrious terms. We now find hypercritical members of these associations sitting here themselves. Apparently they lack the moral courage to stand up in the House and move, as they have been instructed to do, for the abolition of the House. They are drawing a red herring across the trail by moving the amendment, and I suppose they realise it is far easier to carry an amendment than to put it into effect.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Are you going to vote for it?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: At a later stage I will indicate how I view the proposal to vote for the amendment. In my opinion Mr. Panton, who is responsible for the amendment, was not sincere.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member must not accuse another hon. member of want of sincerity.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: In my opinion members of the party who subscribe to the policy of the abolition of this House are not sincere.

Hon. J. Cornell: Say have not been.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Well, they have not been sincere in submitting the amendment, knowing that they have no chance of getting it carried.

Hon. T. Moore: Do I understand the hon. member to again say that we are not sincere in submitting the amendment? I have listened to enough of this.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member is not the arbiter of what he must listen to.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Knowing as I do the usual tactics adopted outside the House—I will not say inside, because I am still unsophisticated as to what is done inside—in my opinion this amendment is merely a political dodge in order that certain hon. members may be able to go on the hustings at a later stage and impress upon the public that they endeavoured to secure the abolition of the House. It is merely early propaganda on their part. I did expect that the mover of the amendment would have indicated the various countries where the uni-cameral system successfully obtains. He has not indicated where this has proved a success. The mover and the seconder have charged the House with being undemocratic; yet they have come here with a proposition asking us to lead the van of progress, to carry the amendment, to institute a great reform in a democratic cause, namely, to have but one House and that elected on adult suffrage, all of which in my opinion does not indicate a sincerity of purpose. The policy to which the organisation they represent is wedded is unification.

Hon. A. F. Panton: For how many years were you wedded to it?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Their policy is to bring about unification. Mr. Hickey dealt with the beauties of unification as it affects Western Australia. Much may be said in favour of unification where a country is developed; but in a State which, like Western Australia, has yet to be developed, I think we speak early when we discuss unification. Judging by the votes that have been cast at various elections, I should say that we shall have to wait until such time as the public take a greater interest in the various local bodies and thereby secure for unification the publicity so much required. It has been averred at various times that working class representatives who endeavour to be impartial are not doing justice to those who elected

them. Judging from the remarks that have been made, I should say that this view has animated some of the speakers in support of the amendment. Our supreme concern should be the general welfare of the community. To give effect to that it is necessary that impartial consideration should be given to every measure that comes before us, remembering at all times that minorities as well as majorities have their rights. One hon. member said that this Chamber had killed democracy and that it was out to block Labour legislation. Furthermore, he indicated that the soldiers went away to fight for democracy.

Hon. J. W. Hickey: Not at Kalgoorlie.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Kalgoorlie sent away a good percentage to fight for democracy, and they have fought for it and obtained it.

Hon. J. Cunningham: Have they all got a vote to-day?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The splendid valour and sacrifice shown on the field on battle to retain democracy would have proved in vain had the union leaders and pessimists obtained their way during the war. The potent factor in winning a war is the courage and grit of the people who constitute the nation. Had we all shouted when the hon. member was at the Front, as many of his friends did, "Australia has done enough!"

Hon. A. H. Panton: Done too much.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: "Peace by negotiation," "No indemnities," "Three cheers for revolution," and all that class of thing, instead of hon. members standing here—

Hon. A. H. Panton: Where were you shouting?

The PRESIDENT: Order! If the hon. member does not keep order, I will have to take means to make him.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Instead of hon. members talking about killing democracy inside this Chamber democracy would now have been as dead as Julius Caesar.

Hon. T. Moore: It is dead.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: That is a matter of opinion. The name of Australia would have been a by-word and a reproach, instead of, as it is now, being on the highest pinnacle of fame. Mr. Cunningham, my colleague in the North-East province, has been pleased to fill this Chamber with the melody of his voice in reference to certain prosecutions which took place, particularly in the North-East province. His reference to that matter cuts no ice. The matter has been quoted on the public platform before to-day, but I presume the hon. member desires to have his remarks faithfully recorded in "Hansard" for some future political propaganda.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member is not right in imputing motives to any other hon. member.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The question he introduced was one that caused a considerable amount of irritation in the North-East province some time ago, when we discovered

that roll-stuffing had been carried on to a large extent, this having resulted in many prosecutions. On this question, the leaders of a certain Labour movement took a very active part. The party spirit was naturally very keen, and these leaders thought it desirable to place persons on the roll who had really no qualifications to be there. If the hon. member will look up a claim card he will see that when a person signs that card he makes a declaration that the contents are true. He stands here, however, and points out that prosecutions have taken place, but he knows well that prosecutions did not take place, except against individuals who had signed these particular claim cards when they did not possess the qualifications. They have had an opportunity of dealing with these matters themselves. They took upon themselves to enrol quite a number of persons, and, to use a slang expression, they "fell in." As the organiser for the Federation referred to by Mr. Cunningham, a part of my duty was to inspect the rolls, the very rolls that he referred to. It was discovered that there were hundreds of persons who had been enrolled but did not possess the qualifications. We found that three single men had been enrolled for the one residence, and that they lived in a camp which was proved to be worth £6. Further investigation disclosed the fact that that was being done on a wholesale system, and naturally we sought to have these persons removed from the roll. I communicated with the authorities, who took the necessary action in that regard. Many innocent people were prosecuted. The unfortunate part is that some of the people who were responsible for the enrolment of these persons were not prosecuted. We found, when the matter came before the court, that they were chiefly union officials, publicans and sinners, and even members of the Legislature. I regret that they were not prosecuted in their turn for enrolling these misguided individuals whom they had induced to sign the claim cards. We also found that the organisers would go out and see some poor widow hanging out clothes on the line. They would point out to her that her name did not appear on the roll. They then produced a claim card and asked her to sign it, which, in order to get rid of them, she usually did and was therefore put on the roll.

Hon. T. Moore: Was she not entitled to a vote?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Not for that particular property. Therefore when she was brought before the court, the necessary notice having been sent to her, she, with others similarly situated, went along to the Trades Hall and asked what was to be done. They were urged to stand by their claim cards, and assert their rights, and told that if they were prosecuted these people would see that they were fixed up financially. One of the chief transgressors in this direction was a man named Burnett, who had been brought be-

fore the court on two occasions and was a man who had been convicted for making disloyal utterances. He had put scores of people on the roll and told them that if anything arose out of it they had only to go to the secretary and it would be made all right. The prosecutions duly came on, but we found at the eleventh hour, in connection with the second batch that was being brought before the court, that owing to representations made by some of the members of the organisation to the then Attorney General—I do not know whether they threatened him politically or whether it was due to their persuasive eloquence or something else—something happened, and all the further prosecutions were withdrawn.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Much to your disgust.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: We then found that the people who assured those enrolled that they would stand by them, if all was not well, repudiated the whole of their liabilities, and the poor people were mulcted in the cost of the prosecution. These prosecutions and persecutions, I understand, were not confined solely to the North-East province. Some time ago I read in the Press that in the West province there was a certain Mr. Baglin who was successfully charged under this heading. It never occurred to me until I entered this Chamber that it may possibly have been the hon. member of that name. That probably accounts for his not making any reference to the matter.

Hon. F. A. Baglin: I will make reference to the matter later on.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I understand the reference to these rolls made by Mr. Cunningham because he will have to face his masters in two years' time. Yesterday Mr. Dodd made reference to certain provinces, and pointed out that if they could return two Labour members it was quite possible they could return a third when the opportunity occurred. As Mr. Cunningham knows, the North-East province is represented by Labour men, and the last two contests have been fought on the platform as to whether it would be represented by official or national Labour. He can, however, see the writing on the wall, and is therefore interested in bringing the matter forward here, and having recorded in "Hansard" what the national "win the war" party have done, so that he might be able to resurrect it in the future. Naturally he views the situation with apprehension, unless he heeds the representations which I understand have recently been made to him that he should commit political hara-kiri and take on the secretaryship of the organisation for which he formerly acted. It may be that he is waiting the decision of the House as to whether it shall be abolished or not, when he can take on other work.

Hon. A. H. Panton: He is quite safe in waiting for that.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: With regard to the amendment, violent changes and fluctuations occur from time to time, when elections are held, in the number of supporters that each of the various parties can command at election time. An election is usually fought on one particular cry, and not on the general policy of any particular party. When the Federal elections were on the people were fighting the story of the social tiger, as put forth by the late Sir George Reid. Then we had Mr. Fisher and Mr. Hughes, of the "Win-the-War" Government, and we also had the "Gone-a-million" Scaddan Government. The figures showing the number of supporters of the various parties fluctuated considerably, and the fate of the Government was in the balance awaiting the result of the elections. The day of brutal majorities as regards Parliamentary life is not yet over. The swing of the pendulum is such that members of all parties are affected from time to time. I do not personally view the Legislative Council franchise as the acme of perfection. This House has rejected many measures it might well have adopted, and on other occasions has amended legislation and cut the soul out of Bills which have come before it. The most important issue in the question, to my mind, is that taxation without representation, or representation without taxation. I do not know that it is necessary to reiterate the many cases which have been quoted. Numerous instances might be given showing that the Council franchise is not as generous as it might be towards the public. I will mention one case which has not yet been dealt with in the debate, and that is in connection with a person who may speculate in £50 worth of land in some particular community, and the other person who may invest £50 or £5,000 in war bonds, Treasury bonds, or some other security of the kind. The latter person is not regarded as an individual who has a stake in the country, and therefore he is not entitled to record a vote for this Chamber. I claim that, when a man answers the country's call in a matter of finance when an appeal is made to him, he is equally entitled to record a vote as is the man who has invested £50 in land, and sits back to wait for the State to develop the country in order that he may reap the benefit of his investment. I consider that the Constitution might be amended with advantage to the public, and I venture to say that when the Commonwealth Constitution was adopted the time was opportune for a recasting of the whole of the State Constitutions. In my opinion they should then have been remodelled, and the State Parliaments reduced to one House, though not one House elected on the adult franchise. As a simple measure of reform, I think the household franchise would be very equitable. In that connection, however, regard must be had to the pioneers in the back country. Until they can get well settled, the ratable value of the properties in which they live would not be sufficient to qualify them to obtain the franchise for the

Legislative Council. If a proposal were submitted to this House to amend the franchise in that direction, I would be inclined to give it my support. If Western Australia is to be ideally governed, every section of the community must receive equality of attention. The interests of all the sections would then commingle, and the supreme concern would be the interests of all, and not the interests of any one section. When that day arrives, we shall perhaps have elective Ministries and "best-men Governments," and get rid of the party evils now troubling us. The proportional system has been put forward here as a solution of the difficulty. On paper it appears to be a very good proposition, but I fear that in practice the multiplicity of parties which it would undoubtedly create would confront us with further trouble. Every party, of course, claims that those opposed to it are obstructionists. The representatives of the Official Labour party—

Hon. A. H. Panton: Why "Official"?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Because that is their official title. Representatives of the Official Labour party set out to effect this reform. Now what would be their policy if they secured the passing of this amendment? I think they would set about putting into effect the policy of their particular party. Taking recent happenings as a criterion of the future actions of the Labour party, who have been guilty of many acts of omission and commission, who have betrayed the great trust that was reposed in them in former years, what would be their line of action if this amendment were carried? Let me say that the confidence of the mass of the people in the Labour movement has been shaken. Formerly the Labour party were looked upon as the guardians of democracy, but that faith has been shaken to its foundations. Assuming for the sake of argument that the object of this amendment is achieved, namely one House elected on an adult franchise, it is only natural to assume that the first thing to happen would be that every member of the Legislature would be called upon to lodge with the controllers of the Labour party his resignation, in order that it might be submitted at any time when he did something that was not considered to be in the interests of the Labour party at the time.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Where does that policy come in?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: We know that in the past members have been more or less subservient to a coterie of individuals outside the Legislature.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Surely you are speaking of the Country party?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The next move of the Labour party would be to enrol every person of the age of 18 years.

Hon. A. H. Panton: They went to the war when they were 18 years of age.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Next would come an amendment of the Industrial Arbitration

Act on the lines suggested by Mr. Hickey, namely a composite organisation leading to one big union. When they have the one big union, they will have a monopoly of unionism. Such is the policy of the men who said here and in another place that they vigorously objected to monopolies. One of their main objects is to conscript everybody into one big union. When that has been accomplished, freedom will be gone.

The PRESIDENT: I would call the hon. member's attention to the fact that the probable action of any party under certain conditions is not considered in the amendment before the Council at present. I must ask the hon. member to speak to the amendment.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The question is, would it be wise to vest in any one party the power that we are asked to confer by the amendment?

The PRESIDENT: The question is that certain words be added to the Address-in-reply. I will ask the hon. member to discuss that.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: In discussing the question of the addition of the words, the point that appeals to me most is whether it would be advantageous to the State to carry the amendment. I certainly say no to that. I believe that if the matter were submitted to the people by referendum, it would be voted down. If we had the one Chamber elected on an adult franchise, we should have an opportunity to repent at our leisure. If the sponsors of the amendment would endeavour to inculcate on their supporters a broader spirit of tolerance, and a recognition of the many difficulties incidental to a young country, they might convince this House of the desirableness of carrying the amendment. Having regard to the circumstances, however, I cannot support the amendment.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [5.55]: Before briefly expressing my views on the amendment before the House, I should like to join with other members in extending a cordial welcome to the new members, and also to join in the expressions of regret which have been uttered regarding the loss which the House has sustained in the three members who are no longer with us but are elsewhere. The amendment is couched in very simple and almost inoffensive terms. In fact, it is couched in a form so simple that one could almost regard it as harmless. On looking at it more closely, however, we find that the amendment is really one which strikes at the foundation of our Constitution. After the very full debate which has taken place, it is almost needless to go into details and suggest other reasons why the amendment should not be carried—that is, reasons additional to those so ably given by the leader of the House, and I may also pray in aid the reasons given by Mr. Dodd, who supports the amendment but subject to a further amendment. I consider that in the case of both the leader of the House and Mr. Dodd ample

grounds have been advanced to show that it would be utterly inadvisable for such a proposal as this to be carried. We have to look to the consequences; and if we regard them seriously, as members of this House are bound to do, I say unhesitatingly the House will vote against the proposition. After listening to the very able address of the Minister for Education yesterday, I had hoped to hear that the mover and seconder of the amendment had become converted and were prepared to accept the views expressed by the leader of the House. Our system is one which has found acceptance in many parts of the world, but the immediate question we have to consider is, would it be of benefit to this country to alter the present system? That is the vital question, would it be of benefit. Many reasons might be advanced to show that it would not be beneficial. Take, for example, those particular provinces which are represented by several supporters of the amendment, and which have been created by the aid of outside capital. There is, for instance, the North-East Province. Mr. Moore, the seconder of the amendment, also represents a province whose residents are very largely dependent for their advancement on outside capital. We all wish to see the country progress and develop; but can we hope to see this country advance and develop without the aid of outside capital? We are not possessed of the means here to develop it ourselves, and therefore we must invite aid from outside. I suggest, therefore, that one of the first things we have to consider is the security and the inducements which we can offer to outside capital to assist us in the development of our State. One thing which naturally would be looked to is the security of our Parliament. Now, if we take away this second Chamber, undoubtedly capitalists would look somewhat askance.

Hon. T. Moore: What about the Federal House? How does the Federal House get money?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: There are two Houses in the Federal Parliament.

Hon. T. Moore: But they are both elected on the same franchise.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I quite admit that. I am not discussing the question of the qualification of electors. The question is whether this Chamber should be abolished. I may have something to say on the qualification of electors when a motion on that subject comes before the House. Meanwhile I am confining myself to the amendment to the Address-in-reply. The security which would be offered to those people would be greatly impaired by the abolition of this House, and it would be a positive menace and danger to the future development of this country were we to remove that security. Reference has been made to the question of hasty legislation. We have had in the past very many instances indeed of hasty legislative measures reviewed and amended by this House, and we might ask ourselves whether our legislation would be made more perfect by the abolition of this

House and by simply retaining one Chamber; or otherwise. Clearly it would be otherwise. Take again the principle of review which obtains with regard to our legislation here. It is one of the principles which apply to our courts of law. Would any litigant be satisfied to accept the decision of one court of law as final? Litigants, when dissatisfied, feel it is only right to have the privilege of getting a decision, which might have been given against them, reviewed by some other court. The principle has been so long established that no satisfactory reason has been advanced for the abolition of this House. The main ground advanced by the mover and seconder of the amendment was that the single Chamber system would make for economy, but the leader of the House pointed out that if economy is to be achieved only by the abolition of this House, it will be a very unwise course to pursue, and will not attain the desired end. It would mean that the efficiency in our legislation would be impaired, while economy would not be secured. There are many reasons which might be advanced against the proposal but, as the matter has been so thoroughly debated, I do not think it would be fair to take up the time of the House in reiterating and traversing those grounds which have been so ably laid before us. I propose to conclude by stating that, while reserving to myself the right on a later occasion when the opportunity offers to discuss the question of the qualification of electors for this House, I am clearly of opinion that it would be unwise to adopt the amendment. It is my intention, therefore, to vote against the amendment.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes	7
Noes	15

Majority against .. 8

AYES.

Hon. F. A. Baglin	Hon. J. W. Hickey
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. A. H. Panton
Hon. J. E. Dodd	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. J. Mills
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. C. McKenzie	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

On motion by Hon. J. E. Dodd debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 6.8 p.m.