

very quickly and developing more rapidly. I refer to the cats. They were introduced to a large extent to cope with the rabbits and to some extent they do so, but hitherto the rabbits have not been sufficiently plentiful, and consequently the cats have had to fall back to a large extent on birds. I am afraid that unless the rabbits improve and extend in numbers, which, God forbid they should, either the cats will have to be destroyed or the number of birds will. I hope every effort will be made to preserve the birds and both the animals and the flora and fauna. I am pleased to see that there are two species included in the schedule, the emus and the dingoes. The emus are exceedingly destructive on large sheep stations on the fences and they do damage to wells and tanks and arrangements set out for animals of greater value than themselves. I think they will, to a very large extent, look after themselves, but no one has any conception of the damage they do until they are seen on a sheep station to the number of 100 or 150 coming down at a time. In a season like the past when they died of starvation, indeed it would have been far more charitable for them to be peacefully killed and to make the best use of their skins. I believe it is open for people to hunt them and get the skins; that will possibly minimise them. As to the dingo, it does not require any defence on my part because it is a pest, but it would be unwise to destroy dingoes altogether, therefore; in company with emus, I should keep a number of specimens in the magnificent Zoological gardens which we have and which my friend Sir Winthrop Hackett has done so much to popularise. If they were kept there out of harm or in some enclosure, then I agree with Mr. Piesse that they should not be allowed to die out altogether. I do not know that I need say anything more in connection with the Bill, but it commends itself to the good sense of members, and I have the greatest pleasure in supporting the second reading.

On motion by Hon. E. M. Clarke, debate adjourned.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: 1, Copy of jetty regulation No. 25; 2, By-law of the Victoria Park local board of health.

House adjourned at 6.0 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 7th August, 1912.

	PAGE
Paper presented	902
Bills: Shearers, Shed hands, and Agricultural Labourers' Accommodation, 1A. . .	902
Tramways Purchase, 3A. . .	924
Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, 3A. . .	924
Health Act Amendment, 3A. . .	924
Excess (1910-11), Returned . . .	924
North Fremantle Municipal Tramways, Amendment Returned . . .	924
Nedlands Park Tramways, Amendment Returned . . .	924
Election of Senators Amendment, 1A. . .	924
Inter-State Destitute Persons Relief, 1A. . .	924
Return: Uniform Contracts, police and railway . .	903
Gascoyne Vermin Board, advance and rates . .	903
Papers: Broome Murder case . . .	905
Motion: Australian flag for schools . . .	910
Dairy Inspectors' reports . . .	919
Railway construction, contracts to expedite . .	924

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

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the Minister for Lands: Report of Advisory Board on the proposed connecting railways between the Great Southern and South-Western Railways (ordered on motion by Mr. E. B. Johnston).

BILL—SHEARERS, SHED HANDS, AND AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS' ACCOMMODATION.

Introduced by Mr. McDonald and read a first time.

RETURN — UNIFORM CONTRACTS, POLICE AND RAILWAY.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS (Subiaco) moved—

That a return be laid upon the Table of the House showing—1, The terms and conditions governing the contracts for the manufacture of police and railway uniforms. 2, The names of the present contractors, the price per uniform of the present contracts, the date on which the present contracts expire. 3, The rates of wages paid to the workmen engaged in the manufacture of these uniforms, the percentage of female to male labour so engaged, also the percentage of juvenile to adult labour so engaged.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): There would be no objection to laying the papers on the Table of the House. The hon. member, however, might have given some reasons for asking for the return. However, the information would be obtained. He was doubtful at first in regard to the third paragraph of the motion, but, so far as the terms and conditions of the contracts and the names of the contractors were concerned there would not be much difficulty. There might be some difficulty in regard to ascertaining the percentage of female to male labour engaged, but every effort would be put forward to secure the information the hon. member desired.

Question put and passed.

RETURN—GASCOYNE VERMIN BOARD. ADVANCE AND RATES.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY (Moore) moved—

That a return be laid upon the Table of the House showing—1. The amount of money advanced to the Gascoyne District Vermin Board under the Act. 2, The amount of interest due per annum to the Government. 3, The number and names of ratepayers under the Act and the amount of rates due per annum by each ratepayer. 4, The names of those ratepayers who have not paid rates and the amounts due in each case.

For the information of hon. members he would point out that a few years ago it

was represented to the Government that rabbits were encroaching in the Gascoyne district and settlers asked for assistance to enable them to fence off the vermin. An Act was passed called the Vermin Act, and it came into law early in 1909, and gave the Government power to advance a sum of money for the erection of rabbit-proof fences by the settlers, and for the appointment of a board to collect rates to pay interest and sinking fund. The board in the first instance was appointed by the Government, and when the machinery provided by the Act was set in motion the board was elected by the ratepayers. It had been represented to him by persons interested in this country that the rates were not being regularly paid and that, in consequence, the board had found it necessary to increase them, to enable them to pay interest and sinking fund. It would be obvious to hon. members that it was certainly unjust that this payment should remain on the shoulders of, he would not say exactly, a few, but at any rate payment should rest on the shoulders of everyone concerned. The Act distinctly provided that the rates should be paid forthwith after they had been imposed. If the payment was not enforced it was an injustice to those who were paying, and it was correct that the rates had had to be raised in order to make up the deficiency which accrued through neglect on the part of a number of ratepayers. It would be agreed that that was unjust. In order to clear up the question he desired to obtain the return and hoped the Government would be able to let the House have it. It might take some little time, but it would only mean the Government asking the vermin board in the Gascoyne district to send the return in: members would then be able to see exactly the position.

Mr. Underwood: Who are the ratepayers who have not paid?

Hon. H. B. LEFROY: The owners of stock. They had to pay not only on the amount of land, but also the stock they held.

The Minister for Lands: They pay on the land they hold.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY : Yes, but their voting power was arranged according to the number of stock they held.

The Minister for Lands : The rating is entirely on the land.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY : That was so, but the number of votes that each person had was determined by the amount of stock held, up to a limit of four votes. He hoped the Government would not object to the motion. If there were people living in the district who felt that they were suffering an injustice, it would be as well that the matter should see the light of day.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. T. H. Bath) : So far as the Government were concerned the question of supplying the return asked for in the first and second paragraphs rested with them, but in regard to the third and fourth paragraphs, which dealt with matters concerning the vermin board, the information could only be secured by the courtesy of the board. There would be no objection to the information asked for in the first and second paragraphs being supplied, and the Government had taken steps to communicate with the board in the hope of securing the other information. The vermin board were the body to whom the application should be made in the first instance. In regard to the question of rating and the payment of rates in this district, the position was that the holders had had a pretty bad time during the past two years, and representations had been made to the Government by the board, which had resulted in the Government extending the time for payment of the principal from twenty years to thirty years in order to give the board an opportunity of lightening the burden to the individual holders of stock in the district. On looking into the question he was convinced that the system of rating was absolutely unjust, i.e., rating at so much per hundred acres, because it meant that the man in possession of the pick of the pastoral country paid no more, although his stock carrying capacity was greater than the man far back who was able to carry less stock. This question of the basis of rating was one he was investigating at

the present time with a view to ascertaining if it could not be placed on a more equitable basis, fair to all. Apart from that, there was no objection to making available the information which the Government had at their disposal, and if the further information asked for in paragraphs 3 and 4 was supplied by the board he would be pleased to place that also at the disposal of the hon. member.

Mr. McDONALD (Gascoyne) : The information asked for in the first two paragraphs of the motion was contained in the report given last session by the Auditor General, namely, the amount loaned, the amount of interest due, and also the amount of sinking fund to be paid each year. As the Minister for Lands had stated, the seasons had been very bad over a large portion of the country enclosed by this fence, and on that account, in one or two instances, not only were the rates not paid to the vermin board, but the Lands Department had been asked to allow a remission of the rents for the year. So far as could be seen, nothing was to be gained by publishing the names of the defaulting ratepayers, or of other ratepayers either. The payment did not rest on the shoulders of a few. Some time ago the chairman of the board had interviewed the Minister for Lands with a request that the time for which the loan was given, namely, twenty years, should be extended to thirty years, and the reason given was that, owing to the bad seasons, many of the ratepayers could not pay the rates due to the board. Notwithstanding that fact, and although the request was complied with by the Minister, no sooner were the rates due than the board began to press for payment. The member for Roebourne would corroborate that statement, because most of the persons who were defaulting were in his electorate. The rating, as the Minister had pointed out, was exactly a sum equal to the rent, and although the member for Moore had made the suggestion that it was raised on the basis of the stock carried, the hope of the small holders was that some more equitable means of rating would be found than that of making the rate equal to the rent. Some

sort of stock tax should be imposed to enable the small holders to pay their rents to the vermin board.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY (in reply): The Minister for Lands was deserving of thanks for agreeing to supply the return asked for. Of course, one could fully understand the position that it was necessary for the Minister to take up, and that nothing further could be done than he had kindly agreed to do.

Question put and passed.

PAPERS—BROOME MURDER CASE.

Mr. NANSON (Greenough) moved—

That there be laid upon the Table of the House all papers relating to the trial, conviction, and commutation of sentences in the case of Thomas Bilebba and Condido Colestrom, found guilty on June 20 last of the murder of Constable Fletcher.

He said: When I gave notice of this motion the Attorney General, in reply to a question by me, stated that he was not prepared to treat it as formal. I trust, however, that, although he does not regard the motion as a formal one, it is not his intention to oppose the giving of this information, because I cannot conceive that the making available of the information sought for could in any way be prejudicial to the public interest, but, rather on the contrary, the giving of that information is desirable. The crime for which the two men mentioned in the motion were found guilty was committed in a comparatively remote portion of the State, and, so far as I have been able to gather, the most meagre particulars of it have been published in the metropolitan newspapers. In the ordinary course where a trial on a charge of so serious a nature takes place in the capital, we can rely on the daily Press to present a comparatively full report of the evidence and all the salient features of the case. In the present instance, however, as far as I am aware, there was little or no report of the trial in the metropolitan newspapers, and therefore, the evidence taken at that trial, upon which one necessarily must base one's

opinion as to whether the action of the Executive in commuting the capital sentence was or was not justified, is not available in order to enable one to form an opinion. The object of this motion is purely to obtain information. It is not in any sense of the word condemnatory. I should be the very last, I hope, to condemn Ministers for whatever advice they might give in regard to the exercise of the prerogative of mercy unless I had had an opportunity of going very closely into the case and had the facts before me to satisfy me that it was my duty to make a public protest. But in this instance I am not in that position. I am prepared, at the present stage, at any rate, to presume that the advice given by Ministers was advice warranted by all the circumstances, but we cannot shut our eyes to the facts that this crime was committed in a part of the State where there is a large coloured population in proportion to the white population, and that the victim of the crime was also a police constable. I am not in a position to state whether he met his death while in the execution of his duty or not; that is a point which the papers, if they are made available, must necessarily disclose, but it is obvious, taking the local circumstances into account, that this case is of somewhat more than the usual interest, especially when we also bear in mind the fact to which I have already made reference, that there has been very little information furnished through the usual channels of the public Press in regard to it. I am well aware that a charge has been made against Ministers in *The Sunday Times* that the capital sentence was not carried out in this case because three members of the Government were on principle opposed to capital punishment.

Mr. Underwood: A good principle too.

Mr. NANSON: I do not in any way associate myself with that charge. I have not the information which would justify me in doing so, and I should be very loth indeed ever to believe a charge of that kind against responsible Ministers of the Crown or to publicly formulate it except on the strongest presumptive evidence, and that evidence I have not in my

possession; but the fact of a charge of that kind having been made in the public Press does, I think, lend additional weight to the expression of opinion put forward in this motion, that these papers should be laid on the Table. I may say, however, that the motion had been drafted and that it was my intention to give notice of it before I had ever seen that article, and indeed, quite regardless of what criticism had been indulged in, because I wished to satisfy myself of the facts of the case, and wished to have an opportunity of reading the file; and, although I have no doubt the Attorney General would willingly have given me access to the file if I had applied to him, still I think the better course, when there is no objection to laying the papers on the Table, is that one should move a formal motion, as if it is carried, the papers can be made more generally available than if the more restricted way of communicating information were adopted. I do not think it is necessary to say more in support of the motion. The information sought will, I take it, consist mainly of the judge's notes at the trial and the usual formal papers. I can only conclude as I began by expressing the hope that the Attorney General, whether he feels that it is an opportune time to make a statement in regard to the case, or whether he does not, will at any rate not oppose the laying of these papers on the Table.

Hon. FRANK WILSON (Sussex): I second the motion.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. T. Walker): On general grounds I have an objection to laying papers of this kind on the Table unless very strong reasons are shown in support of that course, because it is a sort of double punishment to anybody to have their case threshed out in public, followed by ostracism, and a condemning of them to contumely during the time they are serving their sentence. Moreover, every person who goes into the Fremantle gaol for whatever offence, has relatives and possibly innocent friends who are harrowed by any undue publicity in regard to the prisoner after once he has been sentenced. In the cause of hu-

manity—I think I am justified in using that term—we are not anxious to parade our vindictiveness or in our administration of calm justice in the punishment of offenders, we are not anxious to bruit it about in the world. Furthermore, in many of these matters there are documents of a more or less confidential character, and I do not know that these should be thrown open to the eyes of an idle or curious world. For instance in these papers I have a confidential letter from the judge on the matter. I deemed it my duty to consult the judge, as is the usual course, and he gives me then, not an official document, but a confidential document, and advice which enables the Executive to come to some conclusion, a reliable conclusion, based on the word and testimony of the judge who presided at the trial. I admit frankly there are unusual reasons in this case for making the documents public. It is quite true, as the hon. member said, that the reports of this trial at Broome have been exceedingly meagre, so sparse as to be misleading. In addition to there having been no report of a reliable or lengthy detailed character, there has been an attack which has been referred to by the hon. member in moving the motion, an attack by *The Sunday Times*, one that it is difficult to understand from a paper that claims to have some influence in the community. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I venture to refer to that attack which was made on the 28th July, and opens as follows:—

The assassins—

"The assassins," I use the words twice. of Constable Fletcher are to cheat the gallows. The Executive Council, in its wisdom, has decided to commute the death sentences passed on two cowardly cut-throats for the wilful and unprovoked murder of an unarmed white man.

I admit anything of that kind would make the whole community shudder if it were true. A paper—no matter how decent or indecent the paper may be—circulates widely and is read.

Mr. Underwood: They take it as a work of imagination.

Mr. George: It is very mild to what it was years ago.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It was deserved then. Let me continue—

Bilheeba, the actual stabber, is to be imprisoned for "life," which means, in plain English, twenty years. Colestrom, his accomplice in crime, will nominally serve a ten years' sentence, but allowing for the usual "good conduct" remission it will really amount to seven years and a half. In the ordinary course of events one of the murderers will get his freedom in 1919 and the other in 1927, and there is always the chance of a further remission should a Labour politician interest himself in their favour or a tender-hearted Attorney General decide upon an acceleration of a "humanitarian" policy which is steadily emptying the gaols. Meantime, the mutilated body of the man they murdered will lie mouldering in the grave; his widow, perhaps, will experience want as well as sorrow

I do not know that I need go on with that harrowing portion. It goes further on to say—

Nor was there any appeal for clemency from the public at Broome. The only petition that came from Broome was an earnest petition that the murderers might be hanged at Broome gaol, as a warning to the "silent, sullen people" who swarm in that part of the Commonwealth. Why, then, has the prerogative of mercy been exercised? Simply because the majority of the Executive Council are soft-hearted (and soft-headed) old women who aim at being considered humane and only succeed in being unutterably foolish.

There are two columns of that kind of stuff. I will not insult the House further by reading such absolute rubbish. It is rubbish because it is a statement without a scintilla of evidence or fact to support it, not one fact underlies this article.

Mr. S. Stubbs: Why did you not go for them for libel?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Because the Government were dealt with in their corporate capacity as the Executive,

and the libel, if on anybody, is on his Excellency the Governor, and we were prevented from taking any course of that kind. The truth is it is generally speaking better, and one can afford to ignore attacks of this kind, because the general public are beginning to understand the motives behind. They know the attacks are not just, but party tirades of one or two ambitious embryo politicians.

Mr. George: Give us the names.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Of whom?

Mr. George: The embryos.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It is not necessary. I desire to draw the attention of the House to the real facts of the case, and I do not know that I can do better—I rather question whether I am altogether justified in reading the judge's confidential letter to me, but I presume I may make a breach in the hope of his forgiveness in the matter. I do it because a note of this confidential character is really a resume of the evidence, and more clearly and succinctly states the case than could be stated by reading the evidence in detail. The judge thus states—

With regard to the native prisoners Charlie, Young Sambo and Roger—

There were the natives then with them.

as well as the prisoner Bingie, I have no observation to make save this, that the crime, of which they were severally convicted, was of the usual category and for which so far as I know the policy of the Government of the day has been to commute the sentence to imprisonment for life. They were all cold-blooded tribal murders. With regard to Bilheeba and Candido—

The two parties referred to in this scandalous article and in the motion.

I think that the Governor would be warranted in commuting the sentence also to one of imprisonment for a term of years. The killing was the outcome of a row on the verandah of the Roebuck Bay hotel at 11 p.m. The evidence showed that Thomas Bilheeba had been drinking and was intoxicated. He had, during the earlier part of the evening, a drink or two with the

barmaid at the Pearlers' Rest hotel. Later on the same evening he met her on the verandah of the Roebuck Bay hotel where she was accompanied by the barman (Freeman). He went up to her and spoke to her. She resented his addressing her and Freeman proceeded to give effect to her resentment by putting Thomas off the verandah. A row ensued in which the other prisoner Candido came to Thomas' assistance. Fletcher, the murdered man, hearing the row came out of the bar and instead of using his efforts to put an end to the row he "sailed in" as the witness expressed it, and gave the man Thomas Bilheeba a severe handling. In the meantime the barman Freeman was treating Candido similarly. During the fight Bilheeba drew a pocket-knife and stabbed Fletcher. Upon Fletcher calling out he was stabbed the fight stopped and the accused and all other Malays or coloured men near by were arrested. The white men were clearly the aggressors. They were sober and the deceased was a policeman whose duty it was to put a stop to fights and not to "sail in" as he did. Candido is in law liable to the death sentence because of the view the jury took of the facts. He, however, took no further part in the row than the fight with Freeman. Had Bilheeba been found guilty of manslaughter Candido must have been acquitted. I think this case accentuates the view I have often expressed that now that the Code has made a distinction between wilful murder and murder a distinction should be made in the sentence. A judge now has no option, and if he were given the option I feel sure that in many instances the Executive would be saved the trouble of inquiry.

I do not need to quote the papers further.

Hon. Frank Wilson: What was the verdict, murder?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The verdict was murder. There was no help but to sentence them to death. The judge indicates here that had there been a dis-

tinction in the sentences between wilful murder and murder the Executive would have been spared the necessity of dealing with the case. I do not think I need lay the papers on the Table now.

Mr. S. Stubbs: Were they both convicted of murder?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes. Because the law is that if I am with a person who, as in this case, stabs another, in an illegal action in a fight or row, if in the course of the illegality one of the parties commits murder the other man is guilty also, although there is no collusion. If he commits a murder while doing the illegal act, the other participating in the illegal act constructively has committed the murder also. Candido did no more than fight with Freeman, still he is guilty of murder.

Mr. S. Stubbs: That law requires altering surely.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: That is what the judge is pointing out. I hope I shall be given an opportunity during the tenure of office of this Government of altering the law in this respect. I do not think I ought to lay the papers generally on the Table. Now that the facts are known, I feel convinced that what the judge says may be well put in comparison with what *The Sunday Times* says. There is no sentimentality in the conduct of the Executive, but the case was decided on the facts submitted. Does the hon. member want the papers now?

Mr. Nanson: I can see no objection to them being placed on the Table.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Then I will lay them on the Table.

Hon. FRANK WILSON (Sussex): I am quite with the Attorney General that in many instances it is not desirable or suitable to make public papers of this description, but I must say I can hardly follow his intention as outlined in his opening remarks; because he had a more or less confidential letter from a judge he could not table the papers.

The Attorney General: Not without good reason.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: And then he decided to read the letter to the House.

The Minister for Lands: He said he had no doubt about reading the letter, but in tabling the papers.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: About tabling the papers.

The Minister for Lands: Not on that ground.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: On that ground particularly. Now we have had the letter from the judge who tried the case read and if, as I suppose it does, that letter practically summarises the evidence which was brought before the court and these men were convicted of murder, I think every hon. member in the Chamber is satisfied that it was a case of manslaughter clearly punishable by imprisonment and not by the death penalty. We all desire to protect the feelings of the friends of any unfortunate man who is condemned under our laws, as mentioned by the Attorney General, but we have a duty far above that to consider also, and that is to see that there is no miscarriage of justice. I can quite understand the desire of the people residing in that far portion of the State to have the law put into effect whenever a sentence has been justly given under that law in order that life and property may be duly protected. At the same time, this seems to me to be a case where there was a row or a fight, and the constable, in the exercise of his duty, in his judgment, undoubtedly, thought that he was justified in entering into it and taking the law practically in his own hands, and administering a castigation himself. Unfortunately, he made a mistake; but because one of the persons in that row happened to have a knife on him and used it effectively, it does not make it an act of murder, as I understand it. We have had the judge's letter read, and I do not suppose the evidence can give any further light on the subject. I do not know whether my colleague still wishes to have the papers placed on the Table, but I shall advise him that there will be no harm in having the evidence as well as the judge's letter made public.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (Pilbara): The great feature of this question is the undesirability of Asiatics in this country,

and we have to face the fact that, while we have them here, we are likely to have this sort of thing happening.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You have them also among white men.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: With white men, we treat them as white men, but the leader of the Opposition wants these men to be treated, not as white men, but as black men; and that, apparently, is what *The Sunday Times* wants also. The fact is that while they are here they should be treated under our laws. It has been said that there was a request from the residents of Broome that these men should be hanged publicly at Broome. I doubt very much whether that request was made; but, if it was, it was certainly not made by representative people at Broome, and it does not say very much for the people who made it. I am sure that in Australia we have gone past the times of these brutal hangings, and past the times to which some members would like to go back. I would feel somewhat disgusted if any representative body made such a request. I certainly have no very great appreciation for those members of the House who desire to see that system reintroduced which our forefathers knocked out almost a century ago. I consider the Attorney General has given a full reply to the criticism levelled against him. I feel sorry for the ex-Attorney General. I consider he was looking for ammunition and has found a blank—it is not even a shell, it is not even an empty cartridge case. The hon. member was, no doubt, going to make political capital out of this, and it seems rather sad, seeing the paucity of political capital he has, that he could not get a little bit out of it.

Mr. NANSON (in reply): I do not think that the hon. member was altogether generous in his remarks with reference to political ammunition. However, one scarcely, perhaps, expects generosity from the hon. member, or even that he should be able to credit a political opponent with acting from a sense of public duty. I have no desire in this matter to procure ammunition in order to shoot at the Government. There is plenty of ammunition,

if I wish to go in search of it. I hope at any rate I shall never bring into party politics, if it can possibly be avoided, the question of dealing with the administration of justice and the exercise of the Royal prerogative of mercy. I am perfectly prepared to give to the present Administration, in their advice as to the exercise of that prerogative, the credit of exercising their responsibility in the most conscientious manner possible. I therefore carefully refrained in my opening remarks from uttering a single word that would suggest that I gave credence to the criticism that had been levelled against the Administration. My rule all through, where accusations are brought, is not to believe an accusation until I have had an opportunity of weighing the facts upon which the accusation is based; and, as I said in my opening remarks, I had no knowledge of these facts. Now, this afternoon we have had read by the Attorney General a letter from the judge who tried the case, and I cannot believe for a moment that Mr. Justice Burnside would take exception to the publication of that letter. I will go further and say that, on the facts set forth in that letter, the Executive would have been taking a very heavy responsibility if they had disregarded the opinion of the judge. Assuming, as I think we should assume, that the letter carefully sets forth in concise form the salient facts brought forth at the trial, I believe the Government acted as any other body of men similarly placed would have acted. There is a further consideration, whether, in view of the reading of that letter, the official papers should be placed on the Table. I do not for one moment contend that I feel so strongly on the necessity of laying these papers on the Table as I did before the letter was read; and, therefore, if the Attorney General takes strong exception to laying the papers on the Table, I should not think of taking the matter to a division; but, in view of all the circumstances, in view of the charges that have been made, and in view of the fact that one paper on the file, to the publication of which exception might perhaps be taken, has been read to the House, then I think a good purpose will be served by making the

judge's notes of the evidence available. Of course no precedent is created. I can see perfectly well the objection that any Government may have to a course that may seem to indicate that in all capital cases the papers should, as a matter of course, go on the Table. Indeed, in many cases there is no need for it, because, as I pointed out in my previous remarks, the facts are so fully reported that one can form an opinion, and if other facts are undisclosed, there is a means of obtaining publicity for these facts. From the earliest times in English history Parliament has rightly considered, and asserted its opinion, that although it could not, perhaps, interfere except by statute with the prerogative of mercy, yet it was a subject that was entitled to be criticised by Parliament, and on which Parliament was entitled to seek for information. On that ground, unless there are some strong reasons why the facts should not be given—and I understand from the Attorney General that in this case there is no reason other than that which he has read—there can be no objection to making these facts known. Furthermore I assume that this case has probably excited a considerable amount of interest in the northern portions of the State. I cannot say definitely that this has occurred, because I have not been in communication with the people up there on the subject, but probably the making available of the judge's notes will be welcomed. At any rate, if we can judge from His Honour's letter, the making of these notes available will only serve to confirm the belief that the Executive were justified in the action they took. I trust, therefore, the Attorney General will not oppose the laying of the papers on the Table, and that the motion will be permitted to pass.

Question put and passed.

The Attorney General laid the papers on the Table.

MOTION—AUSTRALIAN FLAG FOR SCHOOLS.

Mr. FOLEY (Leonora) moved—

That in the opinion of this House instructions should be issued by the Min-

ister that the Australian flag (blue) be flown at all schools throughout the State on all occasions when flags are flown.

He said: I wish to preface my remarks by stating I am not moving that the flag be flown because I have any particular strain of military blood in my veins, or because I desire that Australia should at any time be called upon to indulge in warfare. On the contrary I believe—if it were practicable—in the disarmament of the whole world. I believe the best this world is capable of could be brought about by peaceful carrying out of each country's duties by the best men that each country could produce. The introduction of flags in any country has to a certain extent been based upon sentiment. The best and brightest that ever any country has accomplished has been based in the first instance purely on sentiment, and as that sentiment grew it has developed into something more material than mere sentiment. If the passing of this motion can in any way engender a true national Australian sentiment in the younger portion of this vast Commonwealth, our work in this direction will not have been wasted. The flag I wish to have flown over the various schools is one that in itself is purely Australian, with the addition that we, as Australians, being part and parcel of the greatest nation on earth, wish to show our allegiance to Great Britain by having the Union Jack, which has maintained so important a part in Great Britain's history, perpetuated by giving it a place in our own flag. Further than that, those persons entrusted with the responsibility of saying what the flag should contain have also thought it wise to include in that Australian flag the great Southern Cross of the Southern Hemisphere.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Why not include the black swan?

Mr. FOLEY: I will tell my hon. friend why I do not wish to see the black swan included in the Australian flag. I have the Speaker's permission to exhibit here the flag of which I am speaking, and I wish to show my friend that the black swan is not necessary to this flag. This

flag, I would like to point out, is purely Australian. Whichever way you look at this flag you are looking at it with Australian eyes. There are no State rights about this flag and, therefore, the black swan is not necessary to its completion. Whichever way you look at this flag you look at it through Australian eyes, and as long as we look at anything through Australian eyes it will be seen that it behoves the States to look after their small portion of this Empire. On that flag are five small stars, and one great star called the great white star, representing the Commonwealth of Australia. Since this particular flag I am exhibiting was made there have been two more small stars put on the Australian flag in order to have each State represented. There are six States. There have been other stars put on the Australian flag to represent the Northern Territory and Papua; so you will see that every State in the Commonwealth is now represented. Australia is represented as a whole, and the Union Jack of Great Britain, the country from which our forefathers mostly sprang, is represented also. That Australia has no wish to belittle the Union Jack is clearly shown by its inclusion in the Australian flag. The flag stands for all that is lofty and high as far as sentiment is concerned. We wish the Australian flag to be flown over the schools in this State, because the younger children, indeed the majority of the children at school throughout Australia, scarcely know what the Australian flag consists of. Every other country in the world has some animal, some flower, or some flag which they revere when national sentiment is spoken of. I contend that no body of men, no body of school children, no body of the people of Australia could feel insulted when they saw at the head of a procession a flag which has had the approval of the Imperial authorities, and which embodies all the essentials of the Australian flag. There is to be said of the Australian flag that some races, namely, the Kaffirs, the Indian coolies, the Javanese, and the Kanakas, have no desire to have a flag of some other nation, or some part of a nation with

which they are not conversant; but throughout Australia, only recently, if any person had raised an Australian flag there would have been an outcry. Australia has lived past this, and is living at the present time in the hope of being in the near future one of the great nations of the earth. If we can engender that idea of being a great nation, based on national sentiment and national purity, then I think by the flying of these flags in the schools we are in a great measure developing the patriotism of the school children. The Imperial Government have given the seal of approval to the design which now floats over all our drill halls and public buildings with which the Commonwealth has anything to do, and it is hard to conceive how any opposition could be offered to flying this flag in the schools, seeing that at present Scotland will not even allow the Union Jack to be put in one corner of her national flag consisting of a lion rampant. I contend that no hon. member will deny that Scotland has in the past shown her allegiance and faith in the great British Empire. We have also the flag of Ireland. Recently we had the opportunity of hearing the Premier and the leader of the Opposition speaking from the same platform on a certain question which I think can be brought in when we are referring to a flag. Although the national flag of Ireland is not the same as the national flag we wish to see flown in Australia, no one can say the people of that nation have not in the past done their duty towards Great Britain. One reason why we should fly the blue Australian flag is that that flag, on which was marked the Southern Cross, was the first flag ever flown in Australia, and it has been handed on to us and has been recognised by the Federal authorities, who have decided that it shall be the blue flag which shall float over their buildings and their ports when a flag is flown. There is no need to weary the House on this question, but I do hold that now Australia has come to think as a nation, and is doing her part towards bettering the condition of the people, by that attitude she is adding to the prestige of the British Empire.

If we as the Australian nation are doing that, we are doing our duty. When the American boys were here the Australian cadets wished to present them with an Australian flag to take back to America but, although the Australian flag was approved of by the Imperial authorities, officialdom or regulations of some sort precluded the presenting of the flag by one of the Australian cadets. It had to be done by a private Australian boy. The American boys were allowed to have that flag at the head of their procession when it was given to them by a private Australian boy, when the restriction was removed. So it will be seen that there was no insult offered to the Imperial authorities or to Great Britain. We have a flag of our own and one which, I hope, if ever it be necessary, will be carried to success, although I trust it will never be fought under, because it is my earnest hope that our nation will be one of peace.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. T. Walker): I am not quite sure what obligations this may place upon the Minister, what duties may devolve upon him. The motion reads "Instructions should be issued by the Minister." I am in doubt as to what Minister is intended, and I am still more in doubt as to what power any Minister of this Government has to issue orders with regard to the flying of a particular flag.

Mr. Taylor: We know all about waving the flag at election time.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am not at all sure that it is for any Minister or any executive officer of the Government to issue such instructions. Is it not rather a matter for whoever is in command of the army of the State, the army of the Commonwealth, or the army of the Imperial Empire? Just imagine me issuing such orders! A British fleet comes in here, and they propose to fly the Imperial flag, but I issue orders that the Commonwealth flag shall go up alongside the Imperial flag. I would like to know how they would regard it, whether they would consider me as a rebel.

Mr. Turvey: Or an Australian.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: There are times when even an Australian has to bow the head to a superior authority.

Mr. O'Loughlen: This flag combines the two, the British and the Australian.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Still it is not the Imperial flag, it is the flag of a section of the British dominions. A section, it is true, of which everyone of us should feel intensely proud, but it is not the Imperial flag, and whether we should have authority for running that flag up alongside the Imperial flag, I do not know. We have no power to order the flying of a particular flag.

Mr. Heitmann: You can order it in the schools.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: No, it is not the flag of this State. Could I order the Chinese flag to be flown;

Mr. Heitmann: I think every man should have a flag of his own.

Mr. Taylor: They do have at election time.

Mr. George: Could we fly it on the top of this building?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: You can by courtesy fly the flag of every nation in the world, but they are not our flags, and the hon. member hit the nail on the head when he spoke of the sentiment for a particular flag. It is the particular sentiment clustering around around particular flags that makes it difficult to indiscriminately use them. There are flags that signify a particular sentiment at a particular time, that are fitting and appropriate for a particular event, and all other flags flown on that occasion would be incongruous and mar the sentiment.

Mr. S. Stubbs: Not long ago a flag was flown near a warship at Albany, and the man was hauled before the admiral for daring to fly the flag.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes, I might hoist up a flag which would be an insult.

Mr. McDowall: This motion is with regard to flags hoisted at schools.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member should read the motion. Whenever any flags are flown in this State, up would have to go at the schools

the Australian flag blue. I do not know what kind of a mess we should get into if that were done. While I desire to have this general sentiment cultivated, and I think the hon. member has shown his love for national sentiment, I do not want to forget another more intense, because narrower sentiment, and that is the sentiment which will cluster around the Western Australian flag. I quite agree we should never forget that we are members of a great nation in the Commonwealth, and the Commonwealth is a nation fit to take her place among the nations of the world, but still the Commonwealth is part of a greater empire, and we must not forget the sentiment that is around the empire. Neither must we forget the sentiment that surrounds our own homes. In my humble opinion there is much to be said in favour of an honourable emulation and rivalry between the sister partners of this Commonwealth, and if I may be allowed to express the opinion, I might say that this youngest sister of the States, the Cinderella, as she has been called, has within her equal possibilities with any of the older established States, and this State should have her flag honoured and respected as any sovereign State in the British empire. That is my sentiment. I believe in Western Australia as a great country in the growing.

Mr. O'Loughlen: There should be no difference between State and State as regards the flag.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Then why should there be any difference between Commonwealth and Dominion? If we fly the British flag we fly the flag of every State in the whole of the British dominions, and on that score it would be unnecessary. If you are going to fly a flag in conjunction with the British flag, which covers and includes all flags, then I want to come in with Western Australia, and if we have a flag for our own particular section of the State, I will have that as well. I believe in intensity, as well as in diffusion, of sentiment. I believe we are attached to the particular spot we love as much as to the greater portion, namely, the State. What I want

to point out chiefly is that I have no power to order the flying of flags on some occasions. If there is what I might call a vice-regal function when the commander of the forces in Western Australia is in command of the day, I could not order what flags he shall fly on such an occasion. That would be impertinent, and however much I might wish to have it done, I could give no order, and if I disobeyed the orders of the commander of His Majesty's forces in Western Australia I might be arrested or suspected of disloyal sentiments. All I can promise is that I will make representations in the proper quarters that this is the wish of this House. The hon. member knows that the Commonwealth flag is to be flown on every festive occasion when holiday-making and episodes clustered around by sentiment are transpiring. I have put it in rather a verbose way, but whenever we are honouring the British flag we should be proud to associate the Federal flag with it. I would not advise this House to set to work to order the commander of His Majesty's forces in these dominions regarding what flag shall be flown at events where he, technically speaking, is in command of the day. I think the hon. member has served his purpose by expressing this sentiment, and I am sure he only desires to have that sentiment impressed upon the Minister for Education and the authorities who have charge of the flag, so to speak, and having served that purpose I think he will be content to withdraw the motion.

Mr. McDOWALL (Coolgardie): I do not altogether agree with the Attorney General. I think he is making too much of a song about the commander of our various regiments. As a matter of fact I think he is slightly misreading the intention of the member for Mount Leonora. Mr. Foley simply desires that a flag should be flown at schools throughout the State. I think it is only right and proper that this State, which pays for the education of its children, should endeavour to inculcate in them a love for the Australian flag, and I should say not only this State but the whole of the States of the Commonwealth. Although the Attorney Gene-

ral desires the mover to withdraw his motion, I think this House should express some opinion on the subject. If we simply come here and have a few minutes' conversation, and then withdraw the motion, no good whatever is effected; nothing is done. Let us put it to the House and get an expression of the representatives of the people, and see if they are desirous of instilling patriotism into the people of Australia. There is no question of being rebels; that does not enter into the matter at all. We are a thoroughly loyal lot of people.

Mr. George: Loyal to whom?

Mr. Mc DOWALL: To our Sovereign and to our country. Our country principally at present is Australia. We desire that everything that inculcates love of country, everything that arouses patriotism, everything that educates the young people of a country to express their love for it on every occasion should be done. The flying of this flag is undoubtedly calculated to educate the youth of Australia up to some idea of the importance of their country. I, for one, do not desire to speak at any length on the question because, so far as I can see, it is one that should commend itself to members without any effort whatever. The Attorney General complains that he does not know which Minister is to give the instructions to fly the flag at the schools. It can only be the Minister for Education. The Attorney General is only assuming an innocence that he does not possess when he makes a statement of that kind.

The Attorney General: It might be the Premier.

Mr. McDOWALL: It might be, but it is undoubtedly intended for the Minister for Education, and I sincerely trust that without wasting much time and without much delay we shall by a resolution of the House express our desire that the Australian flag shall be flown at such schools. It is useless to withdraw the motion and have no expression of opinion. The sentiment that the Attorney General expressed is what he objected to the other evening. He tells us to withdraw the motion and he will make representations to the proper quarter. I am not satisfied

with that. I want an expression of opinion from this House that the Australian flag should be flown. In order that there may be no misconception as to who is to issue the instruction, I will move an amendment to insert after "Minister" the words "for Education." That will make it perfectly clear as to who we intend should issue the instruction. If the second contention of the Attorney General is correct, and he objects to the flag being flown on all occasions when flags are flown, we would probably be able to amend the motion to meet his views, but I want some expression given as to whether, in the opinion of this House, the flying of this flag is advisable or desirable.

Mr. Wisdom: What about Empire Day?

Mr. McDOWALL: That is certainly a day when the Australian flag should be flown with the Imperial flag. It is not our desire that the British flag should be interfered with in any way whatever, but we know, and the Australian Natives' Association know, that there has been a considerable amount of cavilling in connection with this matter. We know we have had a promise from the Federal Minister for Defence to fly this particular flag and yet that promise has not been recognised on some occasions.

Mr. Heitmann: Have you consulted Lyon Weiss?

Mr. McDOWALL: I am speaking on a serious subject, and I cannot take notice of frivolous interjections. I do not think it is necessary to take up any further time. I shall content myself now by moving the amendment—

That after "Minister" the words "for Education" be inserted.

Mr. LEWIS (Canning): I second the amendment.

Mr. DWYER (Perth): The hon. member in moving this motion, and the mover of the amendment are both prompted by a sentiment which appeals to all of us, that of fostering here a spirit of patriotism. I think it is desirable that the growing youth of Australia should be taught to appreciate the land of their birth, to take a pride in its glory and successes, in its past history, and in its immense natural resources. They should be taught to be-

lieve that it is a heaven-sent land to them and to those who have sought its shores for the purpose of making a livelihood and making it their permanent residence. They should be taught to take a glory and pride in this land of theirs, and to believe it is the grandest gem in the diadem of the Empire. That is the object I think of the mover of the motion, and with that object I think everyone will sympathise. There is no feeling so productive of good for any country than the feeling of patriotism among the citizens of the country. After all, that is the feeling which binds us together, makes us believe in the future of the country, makes us feel—

All are but parts of one stupendous whole,
Whose body—

if I may paraphrase Pope—

.....the Empire is, Australia the soul.

If by fostering this spirit of patriotism we can incline the Australian youth to take a bigger interest in their country, and in the big political problems that face it, we will find them grow into more useful citizens. There are tremendous problems facing this country that will have to be taken in hand without very much delay. The question of defence, and the question of our Asiatic neighbours, all these are cropping up; they are affording a fertile source of discussion at the present time, but very shortly they will come beyond the stage of discussion, and we will be faced with the problem of what we are to do in a practical way towards settling these difficulties. If the Australian youth feels that pride in his country which I think he ought to feel, and if he feels, to use Goldsmith's words, that—

Such is the patriot's boast, where'er we
roam,

His first, best country ever is at home.

If he believes that, he will become more attached to his country, more attached to its shores, he will be jealous of its honour, always ready to stand up for its rights, always ready to do what he can for the good of its citizens as a whole; he will also—and I think this is a point which appeals particularly to members of this side of the House—be anxious to see

that every man and woman in Australia is given a fair chance to get a fair livelihood; he will see to it, so far as he can, that every man and woman in Australia is given equal opportunity to advance in life, comfort and happiness, no matter from what social strata he or she may be drawn. We should do all we can to foster and encourage Australian patriotism both from a sentimental and from a practical point of view. It cannot be said that Australians will make any the worse citizens of the Empire because they have a particular and special delight and glory in their own country. Now, while I endorse and support the members for Mount Leonora and Coolgardie in their desire to foster this, I do not think it can altogether be done by the mere flying of a flag; I think that we should probe deeper, and go further than the mere flying of a flag. We should have it as part of our school curriculum that one day at any rate in the year should be devoted specially to the history of Australia and the lessons it teaches and to the study of Australian subjects, and, if necessary, a display of the flag, with instruction as to the meaning of the great Southern Cross and the other emblems upon it. That is how to foster the spirit of patriotism, not the mere hoisting of a flag, tying it with a string, and leaving it to float in the wind. That is all very well, but it does not go far enough; it does not inculcate in the minds of the Australian youth a proper spirit of patriotism, or make people proud of their country and proud to be called citizens. But reading the history of the country and learning the lessons it teaches, and reading the lives of our great explorers and all of those who have made this country's history, must make one proud to belong to the same nation: and any boy who reads and understands this country's development on political lines, where Australia has been in the vanguard in all political progress, must also feel proud to belong to that country. It is to cultivate this spirit that it is necessary to go further than fly a flag. We ought to set a day apart for the study of Australian history, and the lessons which Australian history teaches. I listened attentively to the Attorney Gen-

eral, and I could see that the motion as framed, from his point of view, was almost impracticable, because it means that the Australian flag will be flown on all occasions on which flags are flown.

Mr. Wisdom: Is it not flown on all occasions?

Mr. DWYER: No.

Mr. Wisdom: What flag is flown?

Mr. DWYER: In some schools in outlying parts I dare say there is no flag flown; in other schools the Union Jack, the flag of the Empire, is flown. I suggest that the intention of the mover was that on all occasions of school festivities the Australian flag ought to be flown, and that the children attending a school should be gathered under the flag so that they could feel that they belonged to the Australian nation, and that they were a part also of one great Empire, though in particular their allegiance was due to Australia. I would suggest that, later on, the mover might accept an amendment to add after "flown" the words "at school festivals," in order to make the motion practicable. I would be exceedingly sorry if the motion were lost; it would be a reflection on hon. members' patriotism: but I feel, in its present form, the motion is impracticable, and I make this suggestion to the hon. member to modify it and make it practicable and reasonable for acceptance by the Minister for Education, who is a responsible officer of the Crown, and has to look outside sentiment somewhat. I am quite sure the Attorney General is just as anxious as all of us to cultivate and develop Australian sentiment, but he has also to consider the full effect of any motion of this kind when passed: and it would be unfair to place him in the position of endeavouring to carry out a motion deliberately passed by this Parliament which the law itself would not permit him to carry out. That is a difficult position in which to place him, and a rather unfair position. For that reason I suggest that hon. members should consider the question of modifying their motion. Flags are flown when we have visitors such as the United States battle fleet or Japanese warships. They are flown on the 17th March, and on various other occasions too numerous to mention.

I ask hon. members to consider my proposition.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

[*The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.*]

Mr. GEORGE (Murray-Wellington): If there is one thing which has pleased me more than another during the discussion we have had to-day, it is the feeling from the speakers who are really and fully Australian, that is by being born in Australia. The feeling they have expressed which does credit to them, and which is one that should be inculcated throughout the length and breadth of this continent: that is, the feeling of patriotism to the country in which a man is born. I speak as an Englishman born and as an Australian of nearly thirty years' standing, and although I may not pretend to feel for Australia as strongly as those who are born in it, and as strongly as I hope my children, who have been born in Australia, do feel, I can say that Australia spells for me something more than a mere name; a country which is good, which is governed and will always be governed by men of English origin. I can understand the desire of the mover that the Australian flag shall not be obscured.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would remind the hon. member that only a formal amendment is before the House, and I think it would be better to dispose of that.

Mr. GEORGE: I was going to move another amendment.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think this one might be disposed of first.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. GEORGE: I was referring to the member for Leonora, who has submitted this motion to the House, and was stating that in his devotion to the flag of his native land he was not unmindful and did not wish to forget our sense of duty and the sense of love and affection we should have, and which I believe we have, for the flag of the old land, which his forbears and my forbears served under, and the point that struck me was whether the hon. member intended that the Australian flag should be flown on occasions only when the flag of the Empire was flown, or whether it should be used as an almost

every-day occurrence. To my mind, while it is desirable that every effort should be made to cause the children of the State to feel that they are to be, in their small way, citizens of a great country, I think the exhibition of the Australian flag would be incomplete if at the same time the British flag were not flown as well.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): It will be joined with it.

Mr. GEORGE: But I would like to feel that the children of Australia were made to understand the greatness of the country from which their forbears came, and I would like them to feel at the same time a love for their native land, that deeper pride which Englishmen understand and know, that we people who have come from those islands in the Northern seas have practically been masters of the world. While rejoicing as they do that Australia is a part of that Empire, loving it as they will do as their native country, they recognise they are only a part of a mighty whole, which they may be proud to live for and proud to fight for, and, if necessary, proud to die for. The flag of old England has never been used otherwise than in the cause of sweeping away oppression and wrong, and proud as we may feel for our native land, let us not forget that the deeper and enduring pride, the only pride we have, is a knowledge that we sprung from a great country. I think it may not be out of place to say that I am glad indeed it has fallen to the lot of some Ministry in my time to propose to the people of Australia that their duty lies in preparing for defence. I feel that the question of defence and the question of the flag are allied, and that there will awaken in this great continent a feeling of patriotism which we, at any rate at present, can hardly understand. It is not merely the fact of this service being a military service, it is the fact that beyond all that, contributing as it will towards the defence of the continent, it will build up in the youth of our country a physique and a feeling of discipline that they are strongly in need of. The hon. member might perhaps have pressed this matter a little further, and his friend and my friend, the member for Coolgardie,

who is such a great believer in the Australian natives, as I am too, that their idea is that this one flag can be made on all occasions to represent what is required for patriotism and so forth. It may be that if that flag is exhibited in our schools, and if the teachers who are there find that that flag is united to the flag of the old country, the spirit of which I have been speaking will be carried out. But I do want to state that it will be, in my opinion, a bad day for Australia, a bad day for anyone born in the British Dominions, when they forget the great debt they owe the country from which their fathers came.

Mr. Heitmann: I do not think one can be loyal unless he is patriotic.

Mr. GEORGE: Of course he cannot, but he cannot be patriotic unless he is loyal. He may be loyal and patriotic to the country in which he was born, that is natural and what we want, but however strong that patriotism may be, and however strong that loyalty may be, unless it is built up on the strong foundation of a belief in the race to which we belong, I say no patriotism or loyalty will be worth a snap of the finger.

Mr. O'Loghlen: The people of the East end of London have not much to be thankful for.

Mr. GEORGE: We are not discussing the troubles which must be associated with every nation, not only British, but French, German, Russian, and even the great United States. Those blots and ulcers on civilisation which can be found in all great countries are not confined to the English race. They are universal. But what I am speaking of is the pride of race, the pride of belonging to a nation which from a small beginning now dominates the world, and which has done more to civilise the world and help forward humanity than any other nation. We know, and who knows better than those who have had anything to do with large cities, that trouble there must be in all the lower grades of society, and, thank God, the people of the nation, it does not matter whether they be of the higher or the lower grades, are doing their best to make things materially better. The

question of our race is absolutely the question of personal endurance and personal existence. Is the hon. member not aware that at the present time the greatest problem which is affecting statesmen in the old country, and which affects us, is the threatening cloud of war between the old country and one of the other great nations? Is he not aware that the cost of armaments is mounting up and up? What better lesson can be got than the absolute fact that Australia has started its navy? What for? Not for defiance, but for the defence of Australia, and to assist that great old country of which I have been speaking. I would say in conclusion that I am proud to hear the young Australians in this Chamber speak so feelingly and so truthfully about their affection for their country. I say "God speed to them and to their country." They have a country worth living in, worth fighting for and, if necessary, worth dying for.

The Minister for Lands moved—

That consideration of motions be proceeded with.

Mr. Monger: On a question of privilege. I would like to know if this is to be the understanding during the remainder of the session—if the Government with their small majority are going to commandeer every Wednesday evening for the personal convenience of their supporters?

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member is not in order; he is imputing motives. What is the question of privilege?

Mr. Monger: I desire to know whether the motions are to be proceeded with before the Orders of the Day?

The Deputy Speaker: That is the motion which the Minister has moved.

Motion put and passed.

Mr. MONGER: In respect to the motion moved by the member for Leonora, I desire to move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and negatived.

Mr. MONGER: May I ask, Mr. Deputy Speaker, whether you are taking notice of the amendment moved by the member for Perth?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no amendment before the Chair at present.

Mr. MONGER: I understood the hon. member for Perth moved an amendment that certain words be added.

The Minister for Lands: He only gave notice of his intention of so moving.

Mr. FOLEY (in reply): I desire to reply briefly to some of the speakers. I do not wish that the amendment suggested by the member for Perth should be embodied in the motion. My reason is that I have no desire that the flags should be waved only on special occasions, when the holiday making spirit and other spirits are in, and people are tempted to wave flags, when the waving of flags would mean nothing. I say the flags should be waved throughout the schools as an everyday occurrence, in order to engender in our school children the idea that it should be an everyday occurrence to think something of the flag of their country. In a country like America the national flag is flown throughout the States every day, and every day the children salute that flag. I think the amendment proposed by the member for Coolgardie will meet the case. As regards the suggestion of the Attorney General, I have no intention of withdrawing the motion, because, as the member for Coolgardie has pointed out, we desire to get the opinion of the House as to whether or not this flag should be flown. I was almost tempted to bring the flag into the House again when I heard the member for Murray-Wellington speak as he did. In the course of my remarks in moving the motion I was very careful, when using the word Australian, not to mention whether it meant Australian-born or Australian by adoption; because in my opinion there are in Australia just as good Australians by adoption as there are native-born, and the Australian sentiment is as deeply rooted in their hearts as in those of the native-born Australians. The Attorney General spoke about Western Australia. I am a native of the State of Victoria. Still I recognise at the present time Western Australia is the best State of the lot.

All my interests are here, and I have as deep a love in my heart for Western Australia as for my native State. And in saying this I am not insulting my native State in any sense. I hope all the petty feelings which exist between the various States will be cast into oblivion. The flag we had in this Chamber this afternoon stands for the whole of Australia. If the several States desire to work out their individual destinies it is their right to do so, but while we intend to have a flag to fly over Australia we should have our own Australian flag, and the one we had here this afternoon is the truest expression of what Australia can produce.

Question, as amended, put and passed.

MOTION—DAIRY INSPECTOR'S REPORTS.

Mr. LANDER (East Perth) moved—

That there be laid upon the Table of the House the reports furnished by Inspector Brunt on the state of the dairies he has visited during the past 12 months.

He said: Mr. Inspector Brunt has been on a very extensive inspection around the dairies in order to collect data for the committee appointed to fix the standard of milk in relation to pure food supplies, and there is not the least doubt that when we read Mr. Brunt's report, if I am not mistaken, there will be found therein some interesting news which should prove highly informative to the people of Western Australia. Many attempts have been undertaken to discount the assertions made at different times by the Commissioner for the South-West, and others, in respect to dairying inspection, but when Mr. Inspector Brunt's report is placed upon the Table we shall have our eyes opened again. It will be found to be another edition of the old story of the filthy state of some of the dairies.

Mr. GEORGE (Murray-Wellington): I am glad to learn from the few remarks made by the mover of the motion that when this report is on the Table we shall find in it some justification for the remarkable strictures which the dairy ex-

part of the State found it necessary to make. The district which I have the honour to represent has a number of dairies within its confines, and a number of dairymen who have been engaged for many years in providing milk for the metropolis have felt that the remarks made by the Commissioner were, at any rate, too sweeping to be allowed to pass without question. Those dairymen are not unaware that there are dairies and dairies, some of which are unhealthy, and ought to be swept out. On the other hand they say with some reason "We have dairy inspectors, and if these inspectors are doing their work it should be impossible for such a state of things as was referred to by Mr. Connor to exist." They say, further, that if this state of things does exist then the inspectors are not doing their duty, while if the inspectors are doing their duty the remarks of the Commissioner cannot be justified. And they feel, with some degree of strength, that it would be unfair if the dairies which are clean, or which the owners believe to be clean and desire should be clean, should be branded amongst those other dairies which are unmistakably unclean. If this report will show the dairies to which Mr. Connor referred when he made that memorable speech, then it will be for those I represent to feel that the stigma cannot remain upon them. So far as Mr. Connor is concerned, it is only just to say from my knowledge of him that he is a man who, I think, would be very careful not to say a thing unless he could support it with proof. He would have no desire to injure anybody. But, he having had the courage to make those remarks, it is only reasonable that the Government should let those who are entitled to have these strictures placed upon them be known, and those not entitled to be included in the same category allowed to feel that there is no slur placed upon them. I am willing to admit that the question of milk supply is probably the greatest factor we can possibly have in respect to infant mortality. The hon. gentleman knows, and I know, many instances of infants, supplied with milk from dairies, who have pined and pined, and some of them eventually passed out,

while others supplied with milk from private cows have grown up with healthy bodies. So far as the Government experiment is concerned, I for one will watch it with great interest in the hope that I will be able to say they have done well for the country. I shall say nothing about the Government dairy until I see how it turns out. If the Government succeed in supplying pure milk for infants I will say they have done good work, and, so far as that part of socialism is concerned, I shall be glad to support it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): In order that hon. members may not be under a misapprehension, I would like to point out that when we get this report, which I am agreeable should be laid on the Table, it will be found that it contains nothing dealing with individual dairies, but is a general expression of opinion from one who has spent 12 months doing nothing else but visiting the dairies throughout the State on a special mission for the express purpose of taking samples of milk so as to enable the advisory board to ascertain if it was possible to fix a standard different from that which has been in existence in the State for many years. This man has had an opportunity of inspecting dairies differently from the ordinary dairy inspector, because he has been able to see what system is adopted when he is not considered to be an inspector.

Mr. Lander: He caught them on the hop.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): I do not say that, but on many occasions, as soon as an inspector comes to a dairy, methods are adopted which are not the usual practice. This man has been in a position, however, to see the system in vogue in almost every dairy when an inspector is not expected to be present, and no doubt his report will be very interesting. Objections have been taken in regard to the remarks of Mr. Connor, the Commissioner for the South-West, but I am fully satisfied from reports presented not only by the inspectors, but also by the bacteriologist (Dr. McClintock), and other officers in the Medical Department, that no strictures could be too strong on some of the people carrying

on dairying businesses in this State. At the same time, although strictures have been very often passed on dairies in general, it does not follow that every man does not do his utmost to see that his dairy is conducted under the best system. There is a good deal of difficulty in connection with this, because we realise that if impure milk is brought into the City and the seller is taken to the court the retailer condemns the wholesale man who has a dairy in the country, as was mentioned by the member for Murray-Wellington; those in the country, in turn, take great objection to the blame being placed on their shoulders, and *vice versa*. The man who sells the milk says he sells it in the condition in which he receives it and does nothing to make it impure, but I am satisfied that as a result of the action taken by the Government of late in connection with the distribution of milk in the metropolitan area—the examinations and analyses, and in many instances the prosecutions that have taken place—better conditions will obtain in future.

Mr. George: If the dairies are dirty, what have the inspectors been doing?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): That is one of the questions any person can always fall back upon—why does not the inspector close a dairy that is bad? The fact is that the inspector orders improvements to be made and almost every dairyman promises that he will carry them out, but it takes time to put the law into motion to compel him to do that. The hon. member for Claremont could tell the House that the health authorities in his district had almost to persecute people in order to compel them to keep their dairies in order, and I could quote cases in East Fremantle where people have left the district rather than comply with the conditions imposed upon them by the health authorities. Unless dairymen are followed up closely to see that the improvements required are carried out, it is almost impossible to have the dairies kept up to the proper standard. The member for Murray-Wellington would not desire that inspectors should be continually putting people into the police court, and to avoid that they try their

utmost to educate people to the necessity of keeping their dairies up to a high standard. In regard to the Government milk supply there have been many criticisms, but not one of them has had any foundation, so far as the purity of the milk is concerned. The milk supplied to the hospitals is perfectly pure, and the hospital officials are well satisfied with the action of the Government in taking over this supply.

Hon. J. MITCHELL (Northam): This dairy business has been fruitful of much trouble from time to time, and in connection with it at least one member has earned notoriety. It has always been the custom to abuse everybody who supplies milk to the people. We should have all the reports which the department has received during the last twelve months from the inspectors, because it would be good for the House and for the public to know what has happened. I feel safe in saying that the dairies of Western Australia are quite up to the average of those in Australia generally at any rate. The people who engage in dairying in Perth do so under great disadvantages. Feed is dear and in summer time they have to depend almost entirely on dry feed, but I believe they have tried to supply good and pure milk. There are exceptions of course—men who do not keep their premises clean and do not supply milk up to the standard—but we should be just and fair to the dairymen. When the late Government were in office we had many inspections carried out when sensational statements had been made, particularly by the member for East Perth.

Mr. Lander: You remember that "put up" inspection you had at that time.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The hon. member is the only one who fakes anything. These inspections were fairly undertaken in the interests of the people and not in the interests of the dairymen. I remember the sensational statement being made that if the people drank milk it would be the end of them. We sent our inspectors and newspaper reporters on surprise visits and the dairies visited were found to be all they should be. It goes without saying that we can have a pure milk supply if

we pay for it. There is a dairy in Victoria which supplies the Lady Dalton Institute with pure milk, but that costs twice the price of the milk ordinarily supplied. I think it is 1s. 6d. per gallon. I visited that place, and saw the milk put up, and the great care that is taken in the milking and in the appointments. The milk rooms are kept at a low temperature, and the cows are tested once a year, but in Victoria, where milk is sold as low as 6d. per gallon, I know that the price of the milk of this particular dairy was high indeed. I have forgotten the exact price, but I remember that I considered it twice the ordinary price of milk as retailed in Perth. However, the people can have just what they can afford to pay for, and they cannot afford to pay for milk up to that standard. If all the dairies were to be kept as that particular dairy is kept, we could not afford milk at all. At the same time, I believe there should be continuous inspection, that the dairies should be clean and that the cows should be inspected from time to time, but I am not fool enough to suppose that there is a big dairy in this State or in the other States that is altogether free from tuberculosis. The cattle in Australia are more or less affected, and no one knows better than the member for East Perth that if there is one tuberculous cow in a herd, it takes only a short time for the whole herd to become infected. It seems to me that the solution of the milk supply difficulty does not lie so much in the inspection of dairies as it does in the inspection at the point of delivery. In Sydney they pasteurise a great deal of the milk, and that is wholly free from germ life when it is sent out. The only safe supply we can have is through pasteurising, but we have not reached that stage yet, and in the meantime it is the duty of the Government to see that there are inspections and that the dairies are kept clean. At the same time, the people who are supplying milk must be treated fairly if the public are to get a good supply at a reasonable cost. The milk is dear now, notwithstanding the efforts of the Government. I remember that when I imported cows with a view to encouraging the dairying indus-

try, I was subjected to a good deal of criticism from members opposite.

The Minister for Lands: No, the objection was to the messenger you sent.

Mr. Taylor: Don't you follow suit from that side?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The man we sent was a capable man and an experienced officer, but he was a West Australian, and that was all members opposite had to complain of. Who did the present Government send to the Eastern States to buy cows for the establishment of the Government herd?

The Minister for Lands: We brought cows over and bought them on a tuberculin test.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Tuberculin tests are not always infallible, because the hon. member knows there are times when the tuberculin will not react and the test is useless. Will the Minister say whether these cows have come into milk since they arrived in the State?

The Minister for Lands: I presume they came over in milk.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Cows cannot be brought over in milk nor can the Government rely wholly on the tuberculin test. We know that a tuberculin test cannot always be applied with any degree of certainty. These cows that the Minister for Lands is bringing over will help to swell the supply in the metropolitan area, but if the Minister for Lands transferred cows from the herds already established he will not be doing anything to increase the milk supply. I hope the Minister will tell us where the Government obtained those cows and how many they purchased? There is no doubt that the determination of the Government to establish a State milk supply has discouraged those connected with the industry, and the result will be that there will be less milk for the people in the metropolitan area than there has been unless the Government make it clear as soon as possible how far they intend to go. I believe that the dairying industry should be encouraged and I know it can only exist where supervision is all that it ought to be. I should like to hear from the Honorary Minister what standard he proposes to fix since he has the reports of the inspectors.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): It will be fixed by the advisory board.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Has the standard been fixed?

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Not yet.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: If it is fixed on some samples that were taken, it will be a very high standard indeed. I heard that in one district this inspector had got over five per cent. of butter fat in some milk he had tested.

Mr. Lander: That is possible.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: But not probable. If we fixed the standard at four per cent. we will not have much milk supplied in the metropolitan area. The standard must be reasonable and it is futile to fix a standard above the possibility of the average dairy herd. I intend to move an amendment. We should have the report, not only of this inspector, but of all the inspectors who have visited our dairies during the past twelve months. I move an amendment—

That after "Brunt" the words, "and all other departmental inspectors," be inserted.

Mr. Lander: Make it four years, and you will get some information.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The hon. member can make it twenty-four if he likes. Two other words will have to be altered if the amendment is carried, but I take it that they will be consequential.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. LANDER (in reply): When I moved this motion I had no intention of inferring that all the dairymen in Western Australia were in the habit of keeping their dairies in an insanitary and unhealthy condition. I want to obtain this report from Inspector Brunt. He is a man I have never met, but I have heard good reports concerning him from different dairymen in travelling around Western Australia. Mr. Mitchell has referred to milk being supplied in Melbourne at 6d. a gallon. I would remind him that when he was Minister for Agriculture his department supplied the Bunbury butter factory with milk at 6d. a gallon, possibly to win the Bunbury seat, or perhaps it

might not have been for that reason. However, milk was supplied to that factory at 6d. a gallon instead of being sent to the Children's Hospital. The only difference between the member for Northam and the present Minister is that the one supplied the milk to the hospital and the other to a boodler's factory. Mr. Mitchell's statement that cows in milk will not react to the tuberculin test is ridiculous.

Hon. J. Mitchell: I did not say cows in milk; I said in a certain condition.

Mr. LANDER: That is a rotten condition. It means that they have gone too far or else that they have been tested only recently. If a cow is not too far gone with tuberculosis she will react, so it is simply nonsense for the hon. member to endeavour to get us to believe that a cow will not react to the test. There are only two conditions under which a cow will not react. One is when she is too far gone with tuberculosis, and the other is when the cow has been inoculated so as to deceive the inspectors. That is why we want the reports of the inspectors, to show the dishonesty which exists.

Mr. George: Is there not a time when a cow will not react?

Mr. LANDER: No.

Mr. George: The authorities are against you there.

Mr. LANDER: There is no standard authority in reference to the tuberculin test who is against it.

Mr. George: There is a certain time when they will not react, and you ought to know it.

Mr. LANDER: I have told the hon. member, and I challenge contradiction, that there are only two conditions under which a cow will not react, one is when she is rotten with tuberculosis, as many cows in Western Australia are, and the other is when she has been inoculated with the object of deceiving the inspector. If a cow is inoculated with tuberculosis and tested on the following day, she will not react. That is why they have to place the work of tuberculin testing under the Government supervision in different parts of the world.

Mr. George: The authorities are against you.

Mr. LANDER: When the member for Northam was Minister for Lands and Agriculture forty out of eighty cows which were tested reacted to the tuberculin test, and the Government of the day would not look at them. When we have cows like that in the State, it is time to move motions of this description so that members can be enlightened as to what is going on.

Question as amended put and passed.

BILLS (3) — RETURNED FROM LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

1. Excess (1910-11) (without amendment).
2. North Fremantle Municipal Tramways Amendment (without amendment).
3. Nedlands Park Tramways Amendment (without amendment).

BILLS (2) — FIRST READING.

1. Election of Senators Amendment.
 2. Inter-State Destitute Persons Relief.
- Received from the Legislative Council.

BILLS (3) — THIRD READING.

1. Tramways Purchase.
 2. Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.
 3. Health Act Amendment.
- Transmitted to the Legislative Council.

MOTION — RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION, CONTRACTS TO EXPEDITE.

Debate resumed from the 24th July upon the following motion of the Hon. Frank Wilson:—"That in order to expedite the granting of railway facilities to settlers, and in order to increase the avenues of employment for our people, it is expedient that contracts be called immediately for all railways authorised by Parliament."

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. D. Johnson): I feel that I should express my thanks to the hon. gentleman for introducing this motion as it gives me an opportunity of placing before this House and the country some of the facts in connection with railway construction and incidentally the Government's public works policy generally as compared with the

condition of affairs that existed previous to the Government taking control. But while I feel grateful on that score, I am not prepared to agree with the hon. member when he tried to make the House and country believe that he was influenced with a desire of doing something to expedite public works generally, and that he was not in any way influenced by a desire to injure the Government on party lines. The hon. gentleman started off by saying—

I have not tabled this motion with the idea of showing up my political opponents, either to prove that they are consistent or inconsistent, or that they are departing from their platform pledges in any way.

Then he finished up his speech by stating—

I hope he (the Minister) will carefully consider the matter and not think that I am trying to make a point against him or that this is a party move.

It is all very nice to start a motion with sentiments of that description, and then say a lot of bitter things during the currency of the speech and finish up with the same sentiment and expect people to take it on that face value. In order to arrive at an idea of the influence behind the hon. gentleman, we have to take his speech as a whole, and after all, his speech was a party one from start to finish. Let us just take some of the expressions he used during his speech. He started off by saying—

We cannot afford to let our country stand still.
Not party!

Hon. Frank Wilson: Do you call that party; I do not.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: He also said—

The country will be brought almost to a standstill and not progress as it ought.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Exactly.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Then again—

The Public Works Department has done practically nothing in the last twelve months.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Exactly.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Further—

We have a great unemployed difficulty in this State.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Have not we?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Then he stated—

We have only to look at the labour bureaux each morning to find hundreds of men waiting to find if they can get a chance to work.

Not party!

Hon. Frank Wilson: Of course it is not.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: He also said—

I venture to say he will never construct two hundred miles of railway during the first twelve months of his occupancy of his office departmentally.

Not party!

Are we to keep the country back and allow the settlers to wear out their hearts in hoping and waiting for transit facilities?

Not party!

Because the caucus platform lays it down that they shall follow the system of departmental construction.

Not party!

They have hardly commenced to construct railways yet.

Not party!

Hon. Frank Wilson: You had better read my speech.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am reading it just to show what little notice one can take of the sentiments expressed at the outset by the hon. member. He further said—

A fair start was made at the Mullewa end in view of the Legislative Council elections a short time since. Nine months in office and not a thing done until a Legislative Council election comes round and a Minister has to be returned.

Not party!

Hon. Frank Wilson: That is party I admit; that is your party.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The motion was brought forward for two reasons, to try to discredit the Government's

railway construction work generally, and to try in an indirect manner to involve the member for Narrogin-Williams in some remarks he had made. That was the influence behind the hon. member when he tabled his motion; but, as usual, he could not proceed with his motion, and could not get material to justify the moving of the motion without misstating facts. He evidently had a poor case from the outset and realised it; having to justify the tabling of the motion he recognised he had to make a speech, and in order to build up a speech he quoted very extensively from some utterances made by some politician in Canada.

Hon. Frank Wilson: "Some" politician? A responsible Minister of the Crown.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: He is a politician nevertheless.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Not "some" politician: a "very high" politician.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Well, we will say a very high politician from Canada. But I could not see what bearing this speech had upon the motion before the Chamber. I am quite prepared to admit that the sentiments expressed by the Canadian Minister appealed to the hon. member, because it is one of those speeches the leader of the Opposition glories in, one of those speeches of a "boom and burst" policy he always glories in; consequently it naturally appealed to him. The speech made by the Canadian Minister was evidently made with the desire and intention of attracting immigrants to Canada, and it is that sort of speech that ultimately does more harm to a country than good, because these "boom and burst" speeches paint pictures that are never realised, and, in consequence, when the immigrant gets to the country and finds that the statements made are not borne out by actual facts, he becomes dissatisfied, and not only does he leave the country but he influences others that would emigrate to the country not to go there. It is speeches of that description that cause unemployed difficulties in various parts of the world. Ministers go and make these extravagant utterances and people are attracted in great numbers

anticipating great public works and great prosperity, but their anticipations are not realised, with the result that work is not forthcoming, and the country is faced with the difficulty of finding employment for the number of people so attracted. I want to show that the utterances of this Canadian Minister of the Crown, so extensively quoted, were absolutely extravagant, and I also want to take this opportunity of resenting this perpetual reference to Canada as being a standard to which we ought to aspire. I am getting tired of this perpetual cry that Canada is the country that is doing big things, that Canada as a country is progressing and Australia is doing nothing in comparison.

Mr. George: Oh, no.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: "Oh, no," the hon. member says; nevertheless when the leader of the Opposition was quoting Canada so extensively, he was applauded; it was the one country where there was a progressive policy, the only country doing great things. I am prepared to rejoice with any hon. member at progress in any part of the British Dominions; I am essentially a Britisher, and any part of the British Dominions that progresses has my best wishes; but one becomes tired when one's own country is held up in comparison with a country which, after all, is not up to the standard of Australia. In order to prove this I propose to give a few figures by way of reply to the arguments advanced by the leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I did not make any comparison.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: You knew perfectly well you could not make a comparison, but you undoubtedly held Canada up as evidence.

Hon. Frank Wilson: As an example.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Well, as an example to be followed by Australia. I want to prove it is the reverse, and that instead of Australia following Canada, Canada follows Australia. For instance, a lot was made about Canada's immigration policy, but as a matter of fact the population of Canada is decreasing. It may be news to the hon. member.

The Minister for Lands: It is not decreasing.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: At any rate it is not increasing. The position is this: the population of Canada is not increasing at the same ratio as immigrants are going into Canada. The argument advanced by the leader of the Opposition was that Canada was progressing in every way owing to its immigration policy, but what I want to draw the attention of hon. members to is the fact that the population is not increasing in proportion to the immigrants attracted to Canada. For instance, taking the five years from 1907 to 1911, Canada attracted immigration to the extent of 929,255. The leader of the Opposition said that in 1910-11, quoting from Mr. Foster, the Minister referred to, the immigration to Canada was 354,000, but the official returns give it as 311,084. There is an illustration of over-quoting the actual facts in regard to immigration.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I only quoted the Minister's statement.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is so, but the hon. member used the argument to show that Canada was going ahead whereas Australia was not progressing in like proportion.

Hon. Frank Wilson: No; I did not. I am not prepared to take your figures as against his.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Why did you use this speech at all?

Hon. Frank Wilson: As an example to you to get to work with your railway construction.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: There is no mistake: the quotation was made to disparage Western Australia.

Hon. Frank Wilson: No, only to disparage you.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member says he wants Canada to be taken as an example. Let us see how Canada has been getting on under the class of politician the hon. member quotes. Let us see the example he asks us to follow. In Canada the population in 1919 was 7,185,000; in 1911 the population, unless my figures are wrong, was 7,081,869, so in actual fact—

Hon. Frank Wilson : You are absolutely wrong.

The Minister for Lands : Those figures show rectification by the census.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : Probably I did not read too closely, and probably the population previously was over-estimated, and this was a rectification of the figures. Nevertheless, we can leave these figures alone, and I will say this, and I am absolutely sound in it, that the population of Canada has not increased in proportion to its immigration. When the hon. member was speaking I pointed out by way of interjection that it was no use quoting the number of immigrants that go into a country unless we take on the other side the number of emigrants that leave it. We find, as a matter of fact, so far as Canada is concerned, that I was absolutely on sound grounds, inasmuch as the population of Canada has not increased in proportion to its immigration. Let us take another example from the country we are supposed to follow, Canada is held up as an example. Let us take Canada in comparison with Australia in general production, and in general wealth. Take the export of wheat. I have seen Canada referred to as the Empire's granary. The export of wheat from Canada in 1909 was 49,137,449 bushels, whereas from Australia in the same year the export was 31,549,493 bushels. In 1910 the export of wheat from Canada was 49,741,350 bushels odd, whereas from Australia in the same year it was 47,761,890 bushels. So we see that we increased in Australia in one year from 31,000,000 bushels to 47,000,000 bushels, whereas in Canada the export was almost stationary.

Hon. Frank Wilson : You have to take the flour they export as well.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : Canada is referred to as the Empire's granary and it is referred to as a great wheat producer, and the hon. member has led this country to believe that Canada is progressing in greater proportion than Australia.

Hon. Frank Wilson : So it is; the production was 118,000,000 bushels last year.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : If the hon. member will have his flour, let us take the exports of Canada for 1909. They amounted to £52,755,000. The Australian export in the same year was worth £65,338,000. In 1910 Canada's export was £61,945,000 worth, and Australia's £74,500,000 worth. So, taking in the wheat and the flour referred to by the hon. member, the export trade of Australia is greater than that of Canada, the example we are supposed to follow.

Mr. Moore : What about the wool?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : Let us give the gold. I think I have the wool also. The value of the gold produced in Canada in 1909 was £1,929,645. The gold produced in Australia in that year was £11,600,000. The wool exported from Canada in 1910 was 2,320,746 lbs. and Australia in 1910 exported 665,761,887 lbs. There is no comparison whatever between the exports of the two countries. And so one could go on. I do not propose to weary the House with a lot of figures on the question. The facts are we do not want to follow the example of Canada. We want to continue what we have been doing for years past, and I will be distinctly disappointed unless Australia goes on leading the way and showing Canada what to do instead of trying to follow the Canadian example. The leader of the Opposition after dealing with Canada, referred to the Eastern States and tried to make out that the attitude of the Labor Governments in New South Wales and South Australia was out of sympathy with the avowed policy of the present Government in reference to the departmental construction of public works. And he went on to say that the Government of New South Wales let a contract to Smith & Timms and afterwards took it from them and did the work departmentally. I do not know exactly the point the hon. member wanted to make, but it is as well to clear up the facts which are these. It is true that Smith & Timms took a contract for a railway in New South Wales exactly as they did recently in Western Australia, and they were unable to fulfil it owing to difficulties which they met. Immediately they were faced with these

troubles they appealed to the Government of the day to relieve them of the contract, and in New South Wales satisfactory arrangements were made, just as satisfactory arrangements were made in Western Australia in regard to the Port Hedland-Marble Bar railway, with the result that they were relieved of the work, and in Western Australia to-day the Port Hedland-Marble Bar line is being carried out departmentally and satisfactorily.

Mr. George: I will bet they got the best of the deal.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I question whether they did, because they were met with difficulties they could not overcome, and they appealed to the Government to relieve them of the contract. As long as everything is plain sailing, the contractor will do the work, but immediately he is faced with difficulties and complications, and when ability is required, then the State is called upon to take the burden. The leader of the Opposition also quoted South Australia and stated that for a certain railway or railways which the Government proposed to construct, tenders were called, and after that it was decided to do the work departmentally. The Government started the work, and later on called upon contractors who happened to be Smith and Timms to carry out the work, and the leader of the Opposition used this as an illustration that departmental work, so far as that particular railway was concerned, was a failure. I am prepared to admit that the hon. member was correct in stating that the work was finished by a contractor after it had been started departmentally, but the facts are that the Government started the work on the understanding that certain rates of pay would be given to the workmen and that certain conditions were to be granted. Hardly had the work started, however, before the men approached the Government with what the Government considered to be exorbitant demands. The Government claimed that the men's demands were unreasonable and endeavoured to bring about an understanding but failed, and rather than be harrassed by the men who were taking an unfair advantage, the Government decided to complete the work by

contract. That is not evidence that the work could not be done successfully departmentally, but it is evidence that a body of men tried to take advantage of the Government and the Government, rather than give way to exorbitant demands, called upon contractors to complete the work. So far as Western Australia is concerned, I am happy to say we have never met with difficulties of that description. It is true that we have had demands from men employed by the Public Works Department, but I am glad to say that we employ men who take a reasonable view of things and, as far as I have gone, up to date, I have had no serious difficulty in arriving at a fair and amicable understanding with those whom we employ. We go along smoothly because wise counsels prevail and because the men are loyal to the undertakings they enter into. Let us take another South Australian illustration made by the leader of the Opposition. The hon. member said that certain work was wanted expeditiously and the Government, feeling that it was urgent, let it to a contractor. While that might have been so, and I believe it was so, let us take the conditions as they exist in Western Australia. When the leader of the Opposition was in power he wanted to build the Bullfinch railway expeditiously, and did not invite contractors to carry out the work. He knew full well that the departmental construction had proved so satisfactory in Western Australia that he determined to do it departmentally, and it was done very expeditiously indeed. To get away from Canada and the Eastern States, and to come right home, the leader of the Opposition stated that the people were handicapped owing to want of railway facilities. I admit that there are people who have been suffering for some time from the want of railway facilities, but I place the full responsibility for that unsatisfactory state of affairs upon the shoulders of the present leader of the Opposition. It is he who is responsible. He has caused all this discontent amongst a number of people in various parts of our great agricultural areas. I want to ask the leader of the Opposition who placed the settlers out in the Cowrowing and Mount Mar-

shall areas, and who promised them railway facilities within a reasonable time? Who was it showed them on maps, railways constructed? Who told the people of Lake Brown that if they went out a railway would be granted to them? Who told the people out beyond Bolgart that the line would be extended within a reasonable time? The honourable gentleman and his Government promised railway facilities to all these people, and for years past the people have been suffering because those promises have never been fulfilled. It has remained with the present Government to carry out the promises made to these settlers, and the leader of the Opposition has now the audacity to refer to the fact that the people are handicapped for the want of railway facilities, when he is the person responsible for the unsatisfactory state of affairs.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Have you given them the Bolgart extension yet?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The line is under survey to-day, and the Bill will be introduced this session, and we will within a reasonable time carry out the promise which the hon. member failed to fulfil during the years he was in office. Let me refer to some more people who have been promised railway communication. There are the farmers at Wadderin and those at Emu Hill and Kirkenin. To these people the hon. member promised the same railway, although they are 25 miles apart, and the people of Emu Hill were to be served by the Wickepin-Merredin line, and those at Kirkenin, almost 20 miles away, were to be served by the same railway. These are people who are dissatisfied to-day because the promises made by the leader of the Opposition and his friends have not been fulfilled.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You have hung up the railway.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Who was it built the Dowerin-Merredin line and permanently isolated for all time the unfortunate settlers in the Yorkrakine area? Who was responsible for that, and who is crying out more to-day because of the want of railway facilities than those

unfortunate settlers in the Yorkrakine area?

The Minister for Lands: And North Baandee.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, that is another area. The blunder made in connection with the Dowerin-Merredin line, and which isolated the Yorkrakine people, also isolated the North Baandee people. All these are people who are calling out for railway facilities, and they were promised them by the hon. member who brings forward this motion. The leader of the Opposition proceeded to quote certain experiments that had been made in the different States in regard to public works. I am not prepared to admit that we want to go to Eastern Australia to learn anything in regard to experiments. It appears to me that they are starting experiments to find out how they can obtain better results than they have obtained under the contract system. We, however, have gone through all these experiments. What they are doing to-day we in Western Australia have already done, and I venture to assert that after they have done experimenting in Eastern Australia they will come to the same conclusion as we have arrived at: that if we want good results and the work done well, we must do it ourselves and not trust to contractors. Let us take our results. We started experimenting in railway construction. We tried contract and departmental work, and the result of the experiment has proved conclusively that the best system for the State is undoubtedly departmental construction. Let us take some illustrations. The tender for the Goomalling-Dowerin line was £7,173, and the work was done departmentally at an actual cost of £6,162. On that line a saving was effected of £1,011. The tender for the Wagin-Dumbleyung railway was £13,887, and it was built departmentally for £11,053, the saving to the State in that case being £2,834.

Mr. McDowall: Does that include extras?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The tender would not include extras.

Mr. Dooley: Does that include all extras?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : Well, of course, the extras are not shown in the tenders, although, naturally, they are included in the actual cost. Let us take the Katanning-Kojonup line. The tender for that was £21,089 and it cost departmentally £17,334, or a saving to the State of £3,755. Let us come to another line, the Mount Magnet-Black Range. The tender for that was £86,979, while the cost departmentally was £71,460, or a saving to the State of £15,519.

Mr. George : Were the specifications the same all through ?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : I am not prepared to say that it was on exactly the same specification, because on many occasions we have improved on the specifications. The alterations when made were alterations made with a view of getting better results, and better work, and were not made with the object of getting inferior work. One can safely say that, speaking generally, the specifications were the same, and that on practically every occasion when an alteration has been made it was to the improvement of the line. In addition to saving £15,000 on the job in respect to this Mount Magnet-Black Range railway, the net profits of operating the line during the period of construction amounted to £6,500. That is on one proposition alone. Then take the Bridgetown-Wilgarrup line. The tender for that line was £51,765, while the departmental cost was £31,734, or a saving to the State of £20,031. So we have gone through these experiments, tried the two systems, and found the one so satisfactory that the Ministry would have been absolutely disloyal had they not profited by the example, by the work done under both systems, and carried out the work departmentally. Let us take another illustration, namely, the Port Hedland-Marble Bar railway. The estimate for the construction of that line was £124,000 in rough figures, while the tender was one hundred and nineteen thousand odd pounds. This railway was let to a contractor, but unquestionably that contractor, by the evidence since forthcoming, never intended to finish the line.

The line should never have been undertaken by contract.

Hon. J. Mitchell : You settled up with him.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : Yes, I will deal with that directly. No doubt this is the one line above all other lines which should have been done departmentally. It represented a new method of construction; it was in a country not generally known and one beset with difficulties, and it must have been patent to the Minister, if he had taken the slightest interest in his department, that all sorts of difficulties would arise; and immediately difficulties arise the contractor starts to build up his claim for extras and delays. Fancy letting a railway from Port Hedland to Marble Bar and undertaking to supply all sleepers! We know the difficulties of transit which existed then. Since that time, of course, the Government have begun to remove those difficulties; but there were no State steamers in those days, and we had to trust to private enterprise, with the result that all sorts of difficulties cropped up. It must have been clear to anyone taking an interest in the question that great difficulties would have to be encountered in regard to the delivery of those sleepers. It was only the first lot that were got away to time, and immediately afterwards delays occurred, with the result that all sorts of claims were put in for those delays, and the contractor had to admit that he could not finish the line. Subsequently a claim of something like £70,000 was put in by the contractor for extras in respect to that line. He had appealed to the Government to take over the construction and finish the line. In the interests of the State I agreed, because I could see that we could obtain no idea as to when the line would otherwise be finished. The country was waiting for the line, and I thought it was my duty to overcome the difficulties, if it was at all possible; and consequently I said that if I could come to an understanding with the contractor and get him clean out of it, I would take the job over, but not without a clear understanding. The contractor started

off with a claim for £70,000. The departmental engineers entered into negotiations, and after some trouble they brought him down to £36,000. The negotiations were conducted for some time and ultimately I was appealed to, and, sitting in the manner of an arbitrator, I agreed that the contractor should get £28,000 in full payment of his £70,000 claim, that is to say, if he agreed to walk right out. That was agreed to, and we took the line over and finished it.

Mr. George: What did you get for the £28,000?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Certain extras were admitted by the department. So far as my memory serves, the department admitted to £21,000, and we finally settled at £28,000, Mr. Teesdale Smith on his part, of course, claiming £70,000.

Mr. George: Then there was £21,000 for engineers' mistakes?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No, it is not fair to put it that way. The line was constructed on a new method, and certain difficulties were encountered in the construction, while alterations had to be made. It was because of those alterations that the departmental engineers admitted certain extras. The fact remains that the contractor admitted his inability to finish the line. He was encountering all sorts of difficulties, and immediately a contractor meets with difficulties he comes to the Government to overcome them. In this instance he got us into a corner and there was only one way to overcome it, namely, by getting rid of him. Within a month or two afterwards the line was finished, and it is being successfully operated to-day.

Mr. George: He caught you on the hop.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: He caught this Government on the hop owing to the want of attention to this matter on the part of the previous Administration. The member for Murray-Wellington would be the last man in the world to let a work of that description to a contractor. It is a country beset with difficulties, and when you have difficulties to face you must keep away from the contractor, otherwise he will get the best of the deal.

Now, not only have we had these experiments in regard to the departmental cost of railway construction as compared with the tenders submitted by contractors, but we have also conducted other experiments in respect to departmental work. For instance, the member for Murray-Wellington decided, when Commissioner of Railways, to have a very exacting experiment made in regard to the construction of rolling stock in the Government workshops. He had brake vans, carriages and trucks constructed and submitted to the most searching tests. The actual costs of the departmental work were compared with what could have been done by contract, and the hon. gentleman admitted that the quality of the work done by the department was equal to, if not better than, that done by contractors, while the cost was considerably less.

Mr. George: That is correct.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Of course, I am always correct. Not only have we proved that we can do railway construction more cheaply and better than it can be done by contract, but we have proved also that we can construct rolling stock with similar results. Nor have we limited our experiments to rolling stock, for we have tried the construction of buildings departmentally. We had a fairly large job at the Claremont asylum. Time after time in this Chamber have I challenged the hon. gentleman to have an inquiry made as to the result of the work done departmentally at the Claremont asylum, but of course he was not prepared to order any such investigation, because he knew that the experiment had been highly successful. But after having that experience he let further additions to the building by contract. I would like anyone with a practical knowledge of work to go to that institution to-day and compare the work done departmentally with the work since done by contract. I can assure hon. members there is no comparison between the two. The departmental work is better and cheaper. There is no question about it; that particular work is an evidence of the success of departmental construction as far as buildings are con-

cerned. We had a test made also with the construction, departmentally, of portions of the Fremantle jetty, as compared with the contractor's prices, and, if memory serves me aright in regard to that experiment, £10,000 was saved to the State, while the work done was altogether superior to the work we would have got done by contract. So, going right through the experiments made in the State, it will be seen that we have got beyond the experimental stage; that our experiments have proved that the system of departmental construction is soundest and best. We now come to the question of want of expedition. We are supposed to be slow—

Hon. Frank Wilson: Slow as a funeral.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. gentleman, with his extravagant, irresponsible misstatements went so far as to say that we have done nothing during 10 months.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Nothing at all.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. gentleman said he would venture to prophesy that 200 miles of railway would not be constructed during this Government's first 12 months' tenure of office. I will take up that challenge and undertake to do more than 200 miles of railway within that period. Time will show as to what we will do in the first 12 months.

Hon. J. Mitchell: You have only two months left.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, I know. The hon. gentleman stated that he had never adopted the policy, if policy it can be called, of accepting 200 miles per annum as the maximum of which the department was capable. Yet it seems that that proportion was generally recognised as the maximum, and that the hon. gentleman could not rise to the occasion to the extent of doing even the quantity of work he admitted the department was capable of turning out; because in 1908-9 he handed over to the Working Railways only 102 miles of railway. In 1909-10 he again handed over 102 miles of railway. So there were two successive years in which he could not get even as high as the 200 miles, but only a little over 100 miles. In 1910-11, with the elections com-

ing along, he managed to get as much as 232 miles constructed. Even in that year he did not make up for the leeway of the two previous years. But let us come to the year when nothing has been done. Take the 1911-12 year. We have completed 285½ miles of railway.

Hon. Frank Wilson: What nonsense.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We have handed over 285½ miles to the Working Railways, as compared with the hon. gentleman's record of 232 miles. Of course the hon. gentleman will say that we have reaped the advantage of his administration.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Stick to facts.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If the hon. member had stuck to facts, he would not squirm so much to-night, but because he made misstatements and I am giving figures to disprove them, he does not like it.

Hon. Frank Wilson: When did the Premier go down and open the railways and when were the contracts let?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We have been in office for the greater portion of 1911-12 and we have done 285 miles of railway as compared with the hon. gentleman's best, 232 miles. But I do not want that to be taken as our best; I venture to say that we will do better and we will do it when it cannot be said that the late Government contributed to our work in any shape or form. In October, 1911, there were 378 miles of railway under construction; of this total there has been completed and handed over to the working railways 285½ miles. In comparison with that total of 378 miles, we have in progress to-day 451 miles of railway. The present Government who are allowing the country to stand still and who are doing nothing in railway construction are building to-day 450 miles of railway when the hon. gentleman did a little over 200 miles, and yet the hon. member had the audacity to boast of his railway construction as compared with that of the present Government. The hon. gentleman said exactly what I expected him to say—that we could not claim to have handed over 258 miles of railway because his Government had contributed

to the total and that they had done a lot before leaving office, of which we are reaping the benefit. In order to meet that statement, I instructed the Engineer-in-Chief to prepare for me a return giving the amount of expenditure in each of the last nine months of the last financial year as compared with the expenditure in the corresponding months of the preceding year, and the return pans out as follows:—In October, 1910, the late Government spent £22,101 on railway construction; rails and fastenings ran into £6,877, making a total of £28,979; in October, 1911, the railway construction of the present Government ran into £35,839 as against the preceding Government's £22,000 odd.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Is that day labour or contract?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS:—Mostly day labour. Rails and fastenings for October, 1911, amounted to £2,564, making a total expenditure by the present Government in that month of £38,403 as against £28,979 expended by the previous Government in the corresponding month of the preceding year. The respective amounts expended by the preceding Government and the present Government in the other months were—November, 1910—construction £23,219, rails and fastenings £3,548, total £26,767; November, 1911—construction £47,335, rails and fastenings £27,758, total £75,094; December, 1910—construction £24,135, rails and fastenings £1,087, total £25,223; December, 1911—construction £38,219, rails and fastenings £332, total £38,551; January, 1911—construction £11,938, rails and fastenings £2,354, total £14,292; January, 1912—construction £27,943, rails and fastenings £85, total £28,028; February, 1911—construction 21,752, rails and fastenings £16,636, total £38,289; February, 1912—construction £30,521, rails and fastenings £26,849, total 57,370; March, 1911—construction £25,351, rails and fastenings £16,618, total £41,969; March, 1912—construction £61,866, rails and fastenings £33,068, total £94,934; April, 1911—construction £31,042, rails and fastenings £11,143, total £42,185; April, 1912—construction £36,209, rails

and fastenings £7,070, total £43,279. May, 1911—construction £17,804, rails and fastenings £13,361, total £31,166; May, 1912—construction £33,114, rails and fastenings £8,422, total £41,536. June, 1911—construction £84,335, rails and fastenings £8,037, total £92,373; June, 1912—construction £80,152, rails and fastenings £45,677, total £125,829. In that month the Government were using more sleepers or more rails and fastenings; in other words, we were doing more completion of railways and less of mere earthworks. Let us now look at the totals: For the nine months, from October 1910 to June 1911, the total expenditure was £341,347, and for the nine months from October 1911 to June 1912 the expenditure was £543,029; in other words, the present Government spent on railway construction over £200,000 more than the late Government spent for the nine months preceding, and yet the leader of the Opposition rises in this Chamber and states that we have done nothing in regard to railway construction and that the country is standing still. If the country is standing still under the present Administration what was the state of the country under the Administration of the hon. gentleman? Rails and fastenings fluctuate, and possibly it may be said that we paid more for rails and fastenings, which absorbed so much of the difference that the actual construction was not done and the whole of the increase in expenditure was due to material; but in order that there might be no misunderstanding on this point I asked the Engineer-in-Chief to run out the cost of rails and fastenings and the cost of construction, and we find that in actual construction the present Government spent over £129,000 more than was spent by the late Government. I quite anticipate that the hon. gentleman will rise and state that we expended more money but have not got any result. That return, I may admit, somewhat startled me after hearing the hon. gentleman's speech. I recognise that he is prone to extravagance and prone to make misstatements, but I never dreamed that he would have the audacity to make the statement that we were doing nothing and had not con-

structed any railways. When I received that return I immediately thought that some explanation was necessary, but I found that the figures were correct, and in order that there might be no misunderstanding I wrote to the Engineer-in-Chief as follows:—

With reference to the discussion in Parliament concerning day labour, a return has been prepared showing the amount of money expended from October, 1910, to June, 1911, and from October, 1911, to June, 1912, and I find that the Government have expended considerably more money during the latter period. In view of this I should like to know whether this has been due to any extent to increase of wages and if so, to what extent, and also if you are satisfied that the expenditure of this money is an absolute indication of an increased quantity of work done. You will understand that it will be urged that the mere spending of money cannot be taken as an indication of the work performed, and I would like to have your opinion.

That was a perfectly honest representation to make, because I thought that the money expended by this Government was so great in comparison with the expenditure of the late Government that it would be urged that the mere expenditure of money was not any indication of work done.

Hon. Frank Wilson: What reply did you expect to a minute like that?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I expected from the Engineer-in-Chief a more honest reply than I would expect from the hon. gentleman. The Engineer-in-Chief, in reply, pointed out what was an actual fact—that allowing for the settlement in reference to the Port Hedland-Marble Bar railway, and allowing for the number of sleepers that we had hewn departmentally, the railway construction of the present Government averaged 16 miles per month more than that of the late Government: and yet the hon. member who asks what sort of reply I would expect to get from the Engineer-in-Chief in reply to a minute such as I sent to him, is the one who rises in his place to say that nothing has been done by the present Government in

regard to railway construction, that the country is stagnant, and that nothing has been done in reference to public works. That return speaks volumes and shows that we are going ahead more than the hon. gentleman did, and that our expenditure is considerably in excess of what the late Government spent. The position is that we are doing at present 16 miles per month more than the Government of the hon. gentleman were doing. I am not prepared to say that that increase will be maintained; I do not think it is possible to maintain it, because, after all, that would be an enormous increase in the 12 months, but it does show that instead of there being any want of expedition in regard to railway construction, we are going ahead under great pressure and accomplishing a very great deal more than one would anticipate, realising the condition of affairs in the State.

Mr. George: How many miles do you expect to do per year?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not know, but this I am going to say, the hon. gentleman says he does not think I will do 200. I will take that up and guarantee I will do more. As to how much more, I will let the future speak.

Mr. George: You should have some idea.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am not going to anticipate any more than to say I am perfectly satisfied with the pace we are making. We are doing more than I expected, and I am more than pleased with the work which is being done by our railway construction engineers. I am proud of the work they are doing.

Hon. Frank Wilson: The country is not satisfied.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I will come to that before I have finished. It is not the country which is dissatisfied. The hon. member knows the country is more than satisfied, and because of that he tries to discredit the work which is being done.

Mr. Heitmann: Mr. Wilson cannot speak for the country.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Oh, yes, what about the deputations?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS Of course there are political deputations too, and we will come to the Yilliminning-Kondinin line before I have finished. Let us take the position of affairs in June, 1911, as compared with the position of affairs in June, 1912. The hon. gentleman had more incentive to do more than I have. He had in 1911 the Brookton-Kunjin line authorised by Parliament; he had the Quairading-Nunajin line authorised by Parliament; he had the Merredin-Wickepin line authorised by Parliament; and he had the Wongan Hills-Mullewa line authorised by Parliament. In June, 1911, not the slightest thing had been done in regard to them. He had four lines unstarted and now he comes along and says we should be doing more. Yet he had four lines which he had never touched. We have to-day the Brookton-Kunjin line, and the Yilliminning-Kondinin line not actually under construction, so we have two lines, one of which is held in abeyance pending a decision in connection with the Trans-Australian railway. The only line not started is the Yilliminning-Kondinin line. I have one line unstarted and the hon. member had four. He was not doing nearly as much as I am doing; yet he had four lines promised to the people, lines for which the people, as he rightly said, were crying out. Then the hon. gentleman insinuated, or rather stated definitely, that the work done departmentally was not up to the standard, and that the work done by contractors was superior. I do not say those were the words he actually used, but that is what he conveyed, because he made an alleged quotation from remarks made by the Premier. As a matter of fact, all lines are passed by the Working Railways. If they are really not up to standard—I do not say up to the standard line because an agricultural line is not a standard line—but unless they are up to the true standard of agricultural construction, the Working Railways will not take them over. The member for Murray-Welling-

ton knows that we are more exact with departmental work because we can get more from departmental work than we can get from a contractor. When they examine the work done departmentally they are very exacting indeed, and they demand that certain things should be done over and above the specifications, a demand which they could not maintain in regard to a contractor. As a matter of fact the standard of construction departmentally is superior to the standard of construction under contract, and the Working Railways see to it every time.

Mr. George: We are more concerned as to whether we are going to get the railways.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. gentleman stated that the Wickepin railway is scarcely commenced. To prove how inaccurate he is in several statements, I will point out seriatim the exact position with regard to the various statements he made. The Wickepin-Merredin line, he said, is scarcely commenced. The facts are that 17 miles of clearing are complete, 15 miles of earthwork are complete, and about 20 miles of sleepers are on the ground. Yet the hon. member says it is nothing, but that 24 miles of railway construction on the Dumbleyung extension took them eleven months. I have done 15 miles of earthwork and 17 miles of clearing—

Mr. George: In nine months.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. gentleman knows there was no material to start sooner because his party, when in power, failed to order it. They had the authority of Parliament long enough, and the line should have been constructed years ago. It took five surveys before they could start that line. I want, however, to pin the statement down to the leader of the Opposition, who said the line was scarcely commenced.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Did not you get a wire from the unemployed?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member is side-tracking again. I wish he would sit quietly and take his gruel. The facts are that there are 17 miles of railway complete, 15 miles of

earthwork complete and about 20 miles of sleepers on the ground, and yet he says the work is scarcely commenced. That is, however, at one end, namely, on the Merredin section, but we started this line at both ends in order to make up for the time lost by the hon. gentleman. At the Wiekepin end 15 miles of clearing and 7 miles of earthwork are complete, and there are about 9 miles of sleepers on the ground.

Hon. Frank Wilson : That is a lot in nine months.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : It is too much for the hon. member and his party. Because they recognise that we are doing considerably more than they like and that the people are realising it, they are beginning to squirm.

Hon. Frank Wilson : You have had ten months.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : I have done this in ten months, but the hon. gentleman was four years, and did nothing.

Hon. Frank Wilson : Nonsense.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : Let us take another railway. The leader of the Opposition said the Quairading-Nunajin line has scarcely been commenced, and that they are just tinkering with it. What are the facts ? The line was commenced on the 7th May and at present nearly the whole of the line is cleared and grubbed. As a matter of fact, I was at Nunajin on Saturday and Sunday last and the actual earthworks are right into Nunajin, a distance of 40 miles. This return was made up just after the hon. member spoke, and states that 30 miles of earthwork are complete, all the sleepers within a few thousand are on the ground, 20 miles of rails have been delivered and platelaying will commence immediately. Yet, according to the hon. member, we are only tinkering with the line. I want to say, as I told the hon. gentleman and the country, that the Government are going to put up a record with regard to railway construction. Why did I say that ? Because I recognised that the previous Administration had not done justice to the people. They had placed people on the land and promised them

railways and then had not fulfilled their promises. The people were crying out for railway facilities and the Government determined to give them these facilities. I said we would put up a record in railway construction and we are doing it. The Quairading-Nunajin line would be a record outside of the Bullfinch line, and the least said about the Bullfinch line the soonest mended. Outside the Bullfinch line the Quairading-Nunajin line will be a record in railway construction.

Hon. J. Mitchell : You have had ten months.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : According to the hon. member the Marradong-Hotham railway was started in February last, and is not yet finished. What are the facts ? The Marradong-Hotham railway, since authorised to Crossman, making a length of 35 miles, is a heavy line, as the hon. gentleman knows it was slow progress under his control.

Mr. George : It is not heavy there.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : It is heavy where we are to-day, and particularly heavy. Once we get beyond Crossman, then it becomes fairly light and less expenditure and greater expedition will be shown. It is heavy in clearing and earthworks and has taken longer than the majority of lines. The position in regard to this line is that 33 miles of clearing are complete, and 27 miles of earthworks and bridges are complete; besides platelaying has been carried out to 21 miles and 18 miles ballasted. That is the railway in regard to which the hon. member led the country to believe nothing is being done. Then we come to the most gross mistake he made, and I might say his speech was one continual misstatement of fact. He said the little extension of the Upper Darling Range railway, about one and a half miles in length, was commenced in March last and is not yet finished. This is a line right at his very door in a district which he ought to know very well indeed, seeing he was working in the locality for many years. He ought to know all about this railway, and this is the sort of information he gives the country in regard to something at his

very door. If he is so far out in regard to a matter of this kind, what notice can be taken of his information on matters so far removed as the other railways? Taking this railway right at his door, it was commenced on the 9th March and completed and handed over to the Working Railways on the 2nd July. The hon. gentleman is reading at the present moment, and thinking too, I assume. Although only a short line, there is a long bank at the commencement, and a heavy bank at the end besides several cuttings of some size. It is not comparable with the surface railways in the wheat belt. The cost was £3,186. He states that the line was commenced in March and is not yet finished. Yet at the time he spoke the line was finished and he should have known it. The hon. member further stated that the Wagin-Dumbleyung line took 15 months to construct. The facts are these—and there is no line that the hon. gentleman should know more about so far as construction is concerned than this. He was responsible for the starting of this line, and it was largely constructed under his control. It is 24 miles in length. It was commenced on the 17th May, 1911, and completed and handed over to the Working Railways on the 3rd May, 1912, having taken eleven months to complete the 24 miles. The delay in completion was due almost entirely to the difficulty experienced in getting material. I have stated, time and time again in this Chamber, that a blunder was made in regard to the Dumbleyung extension. What was the blunder? It was the blunder they made in regard to various railways that put up the cost of railway construction in this State considerably, namely, of starting a railway before they were ready, and starting earthworks before they had any sleepers and rails. In regard to this particular line—

Hon. Frank Wilson: You have done that with the Quairading line.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: On the Quairading-Nunajin line the rails are being laid to-day and there are 48 miles in that line. We started in May and we will finish before the end of the year. The hon. member took on 24 miles of the

Dumbleyung extension. He started in May and it took him until the following May to do that 24 miles. But I am going to do 48 miles in half the time. Yet this is the hon. member who talks about the railway construction he did. After getting away from railway construction he went on to the Mount Lawley sewer and referred to the fact that this work was not yet completed, and that want of expedition was shown again. But the hon. member was largely responsible in regard to this particular work. I am prepared to admit that it has been going on particularly slowly, but it will continue to go on slowly in the interest of the State. We have big difficulties to overcome with regard to the sewer in the matter of disputes and differences of opinion with the Perth City Council. Until the latter come to a definite decision in regard to some matters I am not prepared to push on with the construction of this work. It is going on slowly because to expedite it would not be in the best interests of the State. It is another illustration, like the Dumbleyung line, of work being started before the responsibility undertaken was fairly understood. Then he got away from that and got to the Midland Junction workshops and pointed out that we were importing engines when we ought to be constructing them in the State, and he would like to place the responsibility for this importation on the shoulders of the present Government. But what are the facts? We came into office and found that the Working Railways had not sufficient rolling stock to cope with the demands of the State, and we also further found that it was impossible, owing to the want of foresight on the part of the previous Government, to give sufficient space for us to do this work in the Midland Junction workshops as we desired; but rather than hang the State up, rather than inconvenience the agriculturists, rather than inconvenience the sawmill proprietors and others that required rolling stock and required to have their produce shifted, we sent to England for rolling stock, and we will do it again until we are in a position to construct the work as we desire to do it at the Midland Junction workshops.

Mr. George : You got them made by contract. That is what we desire in connection with these railways.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Why is it we cannot do this work at the Midland Junction workshops? Simply because of the blunders made by the previous Administration. They let a contract for the extension of the shops. The hon. member made a great mouthful of the fact that he was extending the shops. What did he do? Exactly the same as he blundered along in connection with railway construction and sewerage works. He started again without actually going into the full requirements. He let a contract for building the walls of the building, but forgot altogether to make preparation for the roofing; and for months and months past the walls have been standing, propped up so that they will not fall down, waiting for roofing. In other words, he put the cart before the horse. Instead of getting the material ready to complete the building, he started with the walls and had no roofing to put on them; and they have been waiting ever since for the roofing. I am proud to say we did get a move on when we took office to try to complete these buildings, and within reasonable time we will have them ready; and when we have the room we will put in the extra machinery, put on extra men, and put in extra work, and be in the position we want to be in of constructing our own engines and rolling stock, and doing it under conditions that will permit of the work being done cheaper than we could get it from outside. I am sorry to say we have been compelled to depart from this policy because of want of foresight and want of expedition on the part of our predecessors.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Have you got the roof on in the last ten months?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We have the roof going now. If we had been in office we would have had the roofing ready when the walls were going up; we would not have waited to order the roofing until after the walls were finished.

Hon. Frank Wilson: That is a serious reflection on the officers.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Minister for Railways informs me that an extra £60,000 is being spent to complete the work, so that we can get the rolling stock work done as I have already stated.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Who stopped the roof going on?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is not a question of who stopped it; it is a question of who neglected to get the cash for it.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You are blaming your own officers.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Here we have an ex-Minister of the Crown trying to cover himself by saying his officers were responsible. I want to know who was in charge of the Public Works Department, and who was in charge of Working Railways. I admit the officers take a great responsibility, but I claim the present Ministers are doing work that was neglected by previous Ministers.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Have you ordered the roofing?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No. Of course the hon. member ordered the roofing, but it was after the walls were up. But we will have the work accomplished in reasonable time. We know that the neglect on the part of the previous Administration in not ordering the roofing and getting it ready before they started the walls has made that building expensive and prevented us constructing rolling stock in that particular centre. The hon. member also evidently got some little information, and referred to the fact that the Engineer-in-Chief was called upon to do too much work. He said we should have the Engineer-in-Chief as consulting engineer so that he would be available for the Government on big matters instead of having his time taken up in various matters of detail. I am inclined to think the hon. member made those remarks because he knew of the alteration proceeding in the administration of the Public Works Department. As a matter of fact, while he talked about it, it was being put into actual practice. The Government are calling for an engineer to take charge of our water

supplies. We intend to pay a good salary, so as to get the best possible man. We will have the Engineer-in-Chief as consulting engineer, and have a good engineer to look after the big irrigation proposals of the Government, and the water supply for the metropolitan area, and other matters generally. We have the water supplies under one administration to-day, but to do it properly we need to have a good engineer in charge with the Engineer-in-Chief as consulting engineer, instead of taking up his time in details as to-day.

Mr. George: Have you not a good man you could put in charge of that?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not say we have not, but applications have to be called, and we have to get the best man offering. We are doing the same in regard to harbours and rivers. We are retiring the present engineer, who has reached the age of 64. Though he is still a competent man and has done good work for the country, he has arrived at the age when it is impossible for him to give the required attention to large works that must be undertaken in the near future; and in order to get them done properly we are calling for applications for an engineer for harbours and rivers, so that, again, we can do as the hon. member suggests, make the Engineer-in-Chief a consulting engineer in regard to harbours and rivers and other works, instead of taking up his time in details. The hon. member preaches it; we put it into actual practice. Then the hon. member also went on to refer to the unemployed on the goldfields. I admit that a large number of men are unemployed on our goldfields, but I am not prepared to admit there is not work for the British unemployed on the fields, if they had the opportunity of working as they should in the mining industry. The facts are that the British workmen of to-day are being cast out among the unemployed in order to make room for Italians and Austrians. It is no use the hon. member saying this unemployment is because of the policy of the Public Works Department or the policy of the Government. It is because his particular friends, the Chamber of

Mines, are keeping out the British workmen who have had their homes on the fields for years, and have thus proved themselves absolutely competent to do the work, and are putting in their places Italians and Austrians. It is because of this state of affairs that we have that difficulty unfortunately on the goldfields to-day. We recognise the difficulty is there, and, as with all other difficulties that face this Government, we are going to overcome it. This Chamber is to be asked to pass a Bill so that we can deal with this undesirable state of affairs and give British workmen an opportunity of working in the mining industry, and of not being ostracised and cast out to make room for Italians and Austrians. The hon. member said that a number of men were unemployed in the city. There is some difficulty in that regard, but I am proud to say we are overcoming it to a very great extent. To-day we have employed in the Public Works Department and on public works over 3,000 men, and we are going along at a great rate, doing works of all descriptions that should have been undertaken years ago if we are to do what was promised to the various settlers in various parts of the State. Then the hon. member got on to the question of my inconsistency. He says that the Minister speaks of departmental construction, and actually practises the opposite by letting contracts. I admit that contracts have been let, and I say that contracts will continue to be let as long as I can get fair competition. Small works in scattered and various parts of the State, where men are situated who have the plant, undoubtedly can be done cheaper by those men than they can be done departmentally. But I want to sound this word of warning, that if the state of affairs goes on much longer that I am experiencing in connection with our petty contracts—of only one contractor tendering, I am going to tell the contractors there will be a lot more work done departmentally. Unless I can get some competition and tenders nearer to the departmental estimates, I am going to extend departmental construction to petty contracts as

well as large contracts. Down at Albany the other day we called for tenders. One tender was received, and it was largely in excess of the departmental estimate, consequently the work had to be done departmentally. As I say, competition is not keen to-day. I do not know the reason for it, but we are receiving in many cases only one tender for a work.

Mr. George: I could tell you why it is. The men are going out of the business.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: There are plenty of men about. I cannot understand the reason myself; but whatever the reason is, I am going to see that the State gets a fair deal, and if these contractors will not give me fair prices, the petty contracts will be done departmentally, the same as the other big contracts will be done while the present Government are in office. Then, in conclusion, the hon. member wants to know, no doubt, as to why we have not started one railway. He had four in June, and he was only doing half as much as we are doing. Yet he was "doing wonderfully" as compared with what we are doing. I have one railway—of course there are two railways, but I have explained the difficulties in connection with the Brookton line. As I was saying, I have one railway, the Yillimining-Kondinin line. It is urged that it should be started because a deputation waited on me asking that the construction be expedited. I would ask the hon. member how many deputations waited on him to urge the construction of the Quairading-Nunajin line; how many waited on him in connection with the Wickepin-Merredin line; how many waited on him in connection with many lines authorised by Parliament that he had not put under construction? But because there is one deputation in regard to one line that has only just been authorised, practically speaking, as compared with the authorisations he had, he claims that we are worthy of censure. Now what are the facts? A deputation waited on me. I conveyed to that deputation that their line would be started faster—with the exception always of the Sullfinch line—than any other line that

was authorised by Parliament. It has not been the practice of waiting until all lines are finished to get authorisations to go on with more. The practice has been to anticipate the construction of lines before the lines previously authorised were actually finished, and I told the deputation in question that their line would be started earlier than had been the practice in Western Australia previously, and in order to be on safe ground, I informed that deputation that the line would be commenced before March. As to the exact date I was not in a position to declare it. To show the progress that is being made, when at Nunajin—and the hon. member for York will bear me out—I told them there that the Quairading-Nunajin line would be laid in February, but we find now that we will be ready before the end of the year. This clearly indicates that I was taking a conservative view of the position. Exactly the same will be experienced in connection with the Yillimining-Kondinin line, and I have no hesitation in saying that we will start that also earlier than I anticipated. I am not in a position to give the exact date, but seeing the progress we are making with the Quairading-Nunajin and the Wickepin-Merredin lines, these people will not have to wait very long. The question of railway construction is not altogether expedited by the letting of contracts. For instance, I could start the Yillimining-Kondinin line just the same as the leader of the Opposition started the Dumbleyung extension, and carried out 24 miles in 11 months. This was because he started his construction before he had material. If I were to let a contract for this particular line I would let it with the supply of rails and fastenings being the responsibility of the Government, and I might state that the important question just now is that of getting the material. We could have got on very much better if we could have had the material earlier, and if the leader of the Opposition had attended to his work when he was in office we might have been able to make a start with the Yillimining-Kondinin line earlier. When the material arrives we shall be ready to make a start, and

when we do start there shall be expedition in connection with this particular line, and I think it will be carried out more rapidly than any other line, with the exception, of course, of the pet Bullfinch, which was constructed by the hon. gentleman opposite. The leader of the Opposition brought forward this motion to try and discredit the Government. He submitted it for the reason that, in replying to the deputation of the Yillimining-Kondinin settlers, I said that the trouble was not that to-day we were not doing enough, the trouble was that we were doing too much, and the hon. gentlemen opposite are beginning to see that we are doing more than they were doing; they are beginning to see that we are moving on and that we are carrying out public works in a systematic and practical manner, and that we are getting better results than they ever got; and it because of our expedition and the comparative want of expedition on their part, that they say "we must move motions, and we must have deputations, otherwise the Government will be there for all time because of the good work they are doing by constructing the railways that we promised, and which promises we failed to fulfil."

On motion by Hon. J. Mitchell, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.5 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 8th August, 1912.

	PAGE
Bills: Tramways Purchase, 1A	941
Prevention of Cruelty to animals, 1B. ..	941
Health Act Amendment, 1A.	941
White Phosphorus Matches Prohibition, 3A. ..	948
postponed	
Motion: Proportional Representation, Hare-Spence method	941

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

BILLS (3)—FIRST READING.

- 1, Tramways Purchase.
- 2, Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.
- 3, Health Act Amendment.

Received from the Legislative Assembly.

MOTION—PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION.

Hare-Spence Method.

Debate resumed from the 6th August on the following motion of the Hon. D. G. Gawler—"That in the opinion of this House the proportional representation system on the Hare-Spence method should be adopted in the Parliamentary electoral system of this State."

Hon. J. F. CULLEN (South-East): There will, I think, be general agreement with the mover of the motion that Parliament should represent as far as possible the minds of the whole of the people, or rather should represent at least the prevailing thought of the principal parties and sections of the people. The old ideal of rule by the best, regardless as to whether the best represented the prevailing thought or not, has been considerably modified. It has been found that this ideal rested on the idea that the people should be given what is best for them, not what they think might be best for them. That rule has been so far modified that now the aim seems to be to make Parliaments up out of the best from each section and each party. It is assumed that the people of all parties will endeavour to send their best men to represent them in Parliament. All will agree that the most effective and successful Legislature