

wished to convey to him on behalf of the settlers of Kendenup my best thanks for his efforts in their interests. While the Royal Commission appointed did not achieve much for those people, it served to reveal a scandalous state of affairs. It is amazing that such sharp practices should be countenanced in civilisation. Those settlers have spent £100,000 in hard cash on their holdings, yet to-day they find they have no security of tenure, nor any redress. It is time the law was put into action to protect them from men of the De Garis type. If our statute-book does not provide for such action, it ought to be reviewed. I hope the Government will give serious consideration to the proposals put forward for the relief of the 67 settlers now at the mercy of De Garis, and will afford those people a reasonable chance of making good. I sincerely trust that assistance for the Government will be forthcoming from members of the Opposition, so that the State may benefit thereby.

Mr. DAVY (West Perth) [5.53]: I find myself experiencing some difficulty in determining just what is the right note to strike in such a debate. The range of subjects appears to be as wide as the horizon. Just consider the difficulties facing a new member making his maiden speech on the Address-in-reply. In the first place, he is set amid unusual surroundings. Then he has to face the not always unexpressed criticism of his audience. And he has to remember all the time that every word he says, and every word said by any interjector, and his reply thereto, are being taken down by "Hansard" and may be used in evidence against him in the future. I know of no other place where a speaker is confronted with those conditions.

Mr. Lambert: Then you now know the feelings of a man in the dock.

Mr. DAVY: No, not the feelings of a man in the dock, but rather the feelings of a man questioned by a policeman who has just arrested him. The man in the dock can keep his mouth shut if he likes; he need not go into the witness box. The other man can do that too, but there is an awful temptation for the man just arrested to talk out of his turn, as we saw in a recent case. In addition to the difficulties I have mentioned, there is a certain degree of humility expected of a new member. The new member who appears to be able to reform the whole of the troubles of his country during his first two minutes in the House is just as foolish as he is vain. Some of those who have gone before me in this debate have dodged all these difficulties by confining themselves to preferring requests to the Government, or the remedying of various ills under which their constituents imagine themselves to be suffering, or alternatively have given vent to the grievances of their constituents. I am in the unfortunate—on this occasion, but otherwise for-

unate—position of representing a constituency that really has no grievances. West Perth needs no more railways or tramways than it already has. I cannot imagine where we could put a new bridge in my constituency, unless it were to stretch from my electorate across the river to the constituency of the member for South Perth.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: Evidently West Perth has been well looked after.

Mr. DAVY: Yes, because we happen to be in the centre of things.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: And thanks to the zeal of your predecessors.

Mr. DAVY: I give them that credit. Certainly our footpaths are not too good, but that is a matter for the City Council; our sewerage system is not complete, yet it is more nearly complete than is that of many other electorates, some of which, indeed, have no sewerage system at all. So it will be seen that I have no chance of escaping the difficulties confronting me by confining myself to remarks of a general nature, or by recapitulating the grievances of my constituents. The question before the House is the Address-in-reply to the Governor's Speech. I heard that Speech read on the opening day, and have since read it for myself. I find that 90 per cent. of it consists of, I will not say eulogy, but, at all events, approval of the deeds of the late Government, whilst the balance of 10 per cent. consists of a somewhat sketchy outline of the legislative proposals of the new Government.

Mr. Sampson: The first part of it is very proper.

Mr. DAVY: I am not going to disagree with either the first or the second part of it, at all events, not for the moment. The 10 per cent. dealing with the proposed legislation, I find on perusal, indicates—in a manner which it is impossible to disagree with, because there is not sufficient information given—the intention to introduce legislation of a new nature, and to introduce amendments to existing legislation. In regard to many of those proposals, so far as I can judge at present, I am in favour of them. For instance, I notice the Government propose to introduce amendments to the Workers' Compensation Act, to the Industrial Arbitration Act, to the Municipal Corporations Act, and to the Pearling Act. Those are just a few of them. I am of opinion that some of our Acts stand in serious need of amendment. Whether the amendments that will be deemed to be urgent by the Government will be those that I shall deem urgent remains to be seen. The Government may see defects where I see virtues, and virtues where I see defects. The proper time to express one's views on that legislation is when it comes before us. I should like to refer to the speech delivered by the member for Guildford (Hon. W. D. Johnson) last night. It appealed to me as a very able and statesmanlike criticism of the deeds of the past Government, and a very able and statesmanlike attempt at an



explanation of the difficulties under which this country is labouring. I was surprised to find that I agreed with a great deal of what the hon. member said. I think I would have agreed with a great deal more had I been in a position to know the facts. I found him advocating, in preference to railway extensions, the construction of roads and the use of motor lorries. I have not all the facts before me but I am convinced that in the near future we shall find that most of our main railways will be fed in that way, by constructing good roads and using motor traction.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: You will have competition.

Mr. DAVY: Competition is what I like. Many members opposite probably do not like it. I have always held the opinion that competition is the oil that makes the machinery of society work.

The Minister for Railways: It is sometimes an economic waste.

Mr. DAVY: Sometimes it is and some times it is not. Where it is a severe economic waste it may be necessary for the State to step in. It is seldom, however, that the State is able to do as well as private enterprise with all the economic waste. I am inclined to agree with the member for Guildford on that point. I am also inclined to agree, with the meagre knowledge I have upon the subject, with what he said as to the proper method of preparing the South-West land for group settlement. It has never seemed to me possible that raw and entirely ignorant town dwellers should be brought to Western Australia, given an axe such as they have never had in their hands before, and told to chop down trees, clear the land, and do it economically on a sustenance allowance of, say, 10s. a day. Every Australian has handled an axe since boyhood, even if his operations have been confined to chopping wood in the back yard. The average Englishman, however, never sees an axe during his lifetime. If he does see one, it is totally different from the type we use out here. With it one could not chop down a jarrah tree in 100 years. It has always struck me that it will prove to be economically wasteful to endeavour to clear land by this unskilled labour. It would be better if we had endeavoured to clear the land by contract, using the latest machinery and most skilled labour, before we put our settlers on to the groups.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAVY: Applauding as I do the general tone and thoughtfulness of the hon. member's speech, I was sorry he allowed the tone of that speech to descend from the high and pure atmosphere of statesmanship to the lower and more sordid level of party politics, when he exhibited a desire to take every credit for everything the Labour Party had done, and refrained from giving credit to everything the Opposition had done.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: You misquote me. My desire was to give credit to the late J. M. Hopkins, who has been robbed of the credit due to him.

Mr. DAVY: That was not the impression left on my mind, or on the minds of other members sitting on this side of the House. The hon. member challenged this side of the House to search the records and find a single act that Sir James Mitchell had ever done for the development of the lands of Western Australia. That is a very bold challenge indeed. Particularly is it bold when we consider that the member for Northam (Hon. Sir James Mitchell) was Premier of the State for years, was Minister for Lands for another period, and was a member of this House for many more years. It would be remarkable if such a man had done nothing during his career for the benefit of agriculture. The statement is so obviously exaggerated that it does not merit an answer.

Mr. Richardson: It was a ridiculous statement.

Mr. DAVY: It hardly behoves me, as a new member, to take up the cudgels on behalf of the member for Northam. I wonder whether the member for Guildford would have made his challenge so emphatic and vehement if the member for Northam had been sitting in his place last night.

Mr. Richardson: He would not have done so.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: You will find out before long that I would have done so.

Mr. DAVY: The Premier, in replying to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition when he moved to reduce Supply, stated with regard to the 44-hour week that no successful candidate on this side of the House at the recent elections had dealt in any way with the subject. The Premier was wrong. The question was brought up at a great number of meetings that I held during the campaign. The usual form of the question was, "Is the candidate in favour of a 44-hour week?" My answer was that the question in that form could not be answered. If it meant, would I like to see that no man had to work more than 44 hours a week, and that nevertheless every man got all reasonable requirements, my answer would have been "Yes." On the same terms I would be in favour of a 34-hour week or a 24-hour week. The shorter the week can be made, without letting the enemy of mankind find work for idle hands to do, the better it would doubtless be. The question is not a matter of policy. I cannot see how it can be regarded in that light. How can it be a matter of policy to believe in a 44-hour week any more than in a 34-hour week or a 54-hour week?

The Minister for Lands: Yours was a very diplomatic reply to the question.

Mr. DAVY: I thought so, too. It was also an honest reply, and one that I believed.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: A successful reply.

Mr. DAVY: I also went on to say that at the moment I was of opinion that the country, in view of its financial position,



could not afford to give its employees a 44-hour week. That, too, was an honest statement and it is an opinion I still hold. The matter is purely one of finance. The Government is a large employer of labour, and if it can afford to allow its employees to work four hours a week less than other people, I am delighted to think it can do so. My conviction at the moment, particularly in view of the somewhat gloomy picture painted to us the other day by the Premier concerning the finances of the State, is that we cannot afford it. That seems to be the final and definite answer to the question. Very few people, I thank Heaven, in Western Australia do less than a full week's work.

Member: There is a considerable number in the Government service.

Mr. DAVY: The only people who do not work very hard now are those who have worked hard in their youth, and are now enjoying leisure in their old age. Many men that I know of about my own age work as hard at their occupations as a navy or a railway man. So far as hours go, I have not enjoyed anything like as short a week as 44 hours for the last three or four years. I do not expect to be able to do so for the next 15 or 20 years. It seems obvious that the hours of work have been slowly but surely diminishing ever since machinery was introduced into manufacturing, with the resultant greater output. I feel sure that as the application of machinery becomes more general and the machinery itself more efficient, there will be a steady increase in the output, while the hours of work will continue slowly but surely to diminish. If we try to substitute for the word "slowly" the word "quickly," we run a big risk of substituting for the word "surely" the word "uncertainly." We do not require to effect these changes in too great a hurry. The Government are running the biggest business in the country. That business is in sore straits for want of money. It would appear to be unwise, not wicked or wrong, for the Government to take this step of reducing hours.

Mr. Angelo: Your views are beginning to coincide with those of Mr. Theodore.

Mr. DAVY: I do not know what his views are. No doubt I will find myself sharing quite a number of views with him.

Mr. Latham: And very reasonable ones.

Mr. DAVY: No doubt I shall share quite a number of the views of almost any honest and reasonable man. I should like to refer to two tendencies which appear to exist in the Parliaments of Australia and New Zealand, and in a less degree in other countries. These are, strange to say, diametrically opposed to each other. On the one hand there is the tendency for Parliaments to obtrude into affairs that are not truly theirs. On the other hand, there is a tendency for them to withdraw from affairs that are truly theirs.

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

Mr. DAVY: At the tea adjournment I was beginning to remark upon what appeared to me to be the tendencies of Parliaments not only in Western Australia but throughout Australia, and to a lesser degree perhaps, in the older countries. First there was the tendency for Parliament to intrude upon matters not rightly within its province, and the second tendency was for Parliament to withdraw from matters that rightly concerned it. I am credibly informed that the Labour Party speak on matters of policy as with one voice, and I am on safe ground, therefore, if I assume that the definition given by the member for Guildford (Hon. W. D. Johnson), when he described in his speech last night what were and what were not the true functions of government, represented the view of the Labour Party. The definition appealed to me as very succinct and clear. I will have an opportunity later to find out whether that definition was created in his brain or was a definition arrived at by others. To me it was a new definition. He said that the true function of government is not to do for the people what the people can do for themselves but to do for the people what the people cannot do for themselves. I am in entire agreement with that definition, but if that definition has been applied and adhered to by Parliaments of Western Australia, and is being adhered to to-day, all I can say is that the people of Western Australia must be a singularly helpless crowd. In these days, the Governments of Western Australia—I am not accusing the present Government alone—have become accustomed to do for the people all manner of things that have been done by the people themselves in the past and which people of other countries can and do do for themselves to-day. The functions of Parliament as opposed to the functions of government—the member for Guildford's definition had relation to the functions of government—in my view are these and these only: its duty is to grant Supply and to give statutory authority to the Government for the carrying out of their policy. Thus when the Government, as I say they do, intrude into realms which do not truly belong to them, Parliament does the same. If some member interjected with a query as to what they were doing, I would answer that to-day the Government make bricks, run railways and boats, can meat and saw wood, as well as many other things that in other countries are done by the people themselves.

The Minister for Lands: They were knocked out when the war started.

Mr. DAVY: Of course, in time of disease the human body has to be subjected to treatment which in health no sane man would permit. In war time a country has to subject itself to treatment which would not be healthy in normal times. I admit



there is a great tendency to do things in war time that would not be tolerated during more normal periods.

The Minister for Lands: Some of those tendencies are still going on.

Mr. DAVY: Of course they are. We have from time to time witnessed all manner of interferences with the liberty of the subject, and by this means Governments have entered into spheres that do not truly belong to them. This has been done in America and Australia. What was more iniquitous—I regret it was done by the Government representing the party to which I belong—than the ramifications of the War Precautions Regulations? They are still in existence and it will take us years before we can get back to that liberty of which the people were robbed by the Federal Government. It may be that most of the regulations were legitimate at the time, but they should have been wiped out the moment the time of emergency disappeared. That has not been done. The same tendency has been shown throughout the history of the world. We know that people have been robbed of their liberties and have not had opportunities to regain them for a long time. At the present time Parliament is steadily intruding more and more into spheres that do not belong to it. If we are to run sawmills and implement works, we have to see that they are run properly. It stands to reason that hon. members must gain a smattering of those industries. The Lord knows, the job of a member of Parliament is difficult enough as it is! It requires sufficient acumen, insight, study, knowledge and work, even when Parliament confines its activities to the realms to which it belongs. If a member of Parliament has any conscience and a desire to carry out his task in an efficient manner, there is sufficient now for him to devote his energies to.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: You would not have many railways without a Government.

Mr. DAVY: In other countries they have their railways. I do not wish to be misunderstood. I am not suggesting that we should sell our railways or do anything so ridiculous. I am talking generally of the tendencies one notes in connection with Parliaments. I believe the railways to be one of those activities that the Government wisely undertook.

The Minister for Mines: What about agricultural development, too?

Mr. DAVY: That is a necessity as well. But it is because there was a good excuse for that departure from the proper sphere of Parliament in the past that this tendency has been increasing. It is difficult to draw the line, and I suggest to members that if we attempt to take another step—in the same direction, I admit—we should give careful consideration before we adopt any such course. As to the second tendency of Parliament—to withdraw from its proper

sphere of activity, it is obvious to any student of the laws enacted in Australia that there is that tendency. Just as it is the function of Parliament to grant Supply and grant legislative sanction in order that the Government may give effect to their policy, so is it the duty of Parliament to see that it is not robbed of its right to pass laws for the enforcement of the policy or Governments. On the other hand, what do we find? In almost every statute passed to-day—this applies more to the Commonwealth even than to Western Australia—there is included a section giving power to Ministers or the Governor-in-Executive Council, which means the Government generally, to make regulations. The expression used in the legislation sets out, for the most part, that the regulation is for the better enforcement of the Act in question. The task of a lawyer, although he does not need to be mentioned in this connection, is difficult enough as it is. Not only do we get from the Federal Parliament at the end of each year a vast tome of statutes, but an equally vast tome of statutory regulations. These regulations are laws that have the same binding force, unless challenged in the proper way, as the Acts themselves. We have the same thing in Western Australia but in a modified degree. We seem to be developing a habit of avoiding our responsibilities and allowing Ministers and the Government generally to pass regulations that should have been passed as substantive laws by ourselves. The result is that it is not even the Minister or the Government who make the regulations; they are made, in many instances, by more or less subordinate officials in Government departments. Laws enacted should be as simple, concise and certain in phraseology as they can be framed. I need not tell you, Mr. Speaker, that ignorance of the law is no excuse in any court of law. If that be so, surely knowledge of the law should be made easier for the ordinary citizen by making the laws as simple as possible! It should be easy for an individual, without the necessity for any explanation, to ascertain what his rights and duties are by consulting an Act. That is not the position to-day. As a practising lawyer, I find I am constantly ignorant of some by-law or regulation which may place an entirely different complexion upon an Act under which a man has certain powers or under which rights or liabilities are conferred upon that person. The result is that before a lawyer dares to advise his client he has not only to analyse the statutes, but he has to consult "Government Gazettes" and pay visits to Government departments to ascertain when the last regulations were framed.

Mr. Marshall: He has to work more than 44 hours a week.

Mr. DAVY: That is so, and I can assure the hon. member that the task of a lawyer is not as easy as it would appear to be. The law is not to be undertaken lightly; it is an onerous and responsible



profession. If Parliament relieves the lawyer of some of the burden, no doubt it will be reflected in the lawyer's bill of costs to his client.

Mr. Lambert: Now your imagination is running away with you!

Mr. Corboy: That may be used in evidence against you later on!

Mr. DAVY: There are one or two State Acts to which I will draw attention. During the last Parliament, the Licensing Act Amendment Act was passed. One of the provisions was that the public-house keeper was to keep a record of all the visitors who came to and went from his establishment, and failure to keep such a record was made an offence. It was also provided that the form of the book should be as prescribed. That meant to say that the book would be as decided upon by the Government in the ordinary way. When we came to examine what was the prescribed form, we found that at the bottom of the page there was a lot of writing. First of all, this writing set out that the entries in the book had to be made in ink. This august Assembly never considered that it was to be a criminal offence if a man did not keep his book written up in ink, but the Minister in charge, or the clerk in charge, decided that if a licensee did not have his book written up in ink he was actually committing a criminal offence, for which he would have to suffer a penalty. Further, it was said that it should not be necessary to have a guest enter his name in the book every day that he was staying in the hotel, provided he entered his name in the book on the day that he arrived and on the day that he left. The law never contemplated that, I am sure; this Assembly would never have made such a ridiculous piece of legislation as that. Of course it is easy to make a man sign the book when he arrives at an hotel, but when he pays his bill and he has his baggage in the taxi cab outside the door of the hotel, it is easy for him to say, "I refuse to sign my name." What earthly remedy can the publican then have? Yet if a publican does not see that that is done he commits an offence for which he is liable to a penalty.

Mr. Lambert: We shall have to protect the publican when his guests are leaving.

Mr. DAVY: It makes the position all the more difficult, if my friend's estimate of the character of the people who stay at hotels is correct. Let me quote another example. The Traffic Act was passed, and it was intended by that measure to take from the City Council the control of the traffic in the streets of Perth. That Act also created a department to deal with the traffic in towns other than Perth. I am not concerned with that. It was quite clear that the intention of Parliament in passing the Traffic Act, and in making amendments to the Municipalities Act, was that both should correspond with the intention of Parliament, and that the Commissioner of Police should have conferred upon him the job of con-

trolling the traffic on the roads in the ordinary sense of the word. Usually there is a section in an Act giving power to make by-laws, and that was included in the Traffic Act. When by-laws were made and published, it was found that the police had been given power under those by-laws to deal with offences such as walking on the right side of the footpath, wheeling perambulators on the footpath, expectorating on the footpath and throwing grape skins on the footpath.

The Minister for Lands: They did not have the power before.

Mr. DAVY: The only way in which the validity of the regulations could be tested was to contest them in the Police Court, and take the matter to appeal, because a magistrate would seldom declare a by-law or regulation to be invalid. But if an individual decided to contest the regulations he would have to do so at his own expense. If he entered a defence against his prosecution in the Police Court, he might be let off. Even then he had to pay his own costs. I am told that the Crown Law Department advised the department in charge of the traffic that they could make by-laws to deal with the traffic on the roads, and the department proceeded to invade the sphere of the City Council by making regulations to deal with the control of all matters on the footpath. It was perfectly manifest that when this House and another place passed that Act it was never intended to do anything but control traffic in the streets. I submit that the time has come when we must check this tendency, this lazy tendency—

The Minister for Lands: The Act has been altered since.

Mr. DAVY: I believe that is so. If we pass bad by-laws, we should not afterwards approach Parliament and ask that those bad by-laws be made good.

The Minister for Lands: I was responsible for that amendment.

Mr. DAVY: Then the hon. member did good work. Our duty is to make substantive laws and to see all laws are made so that they shall be thoroughly understood by everyone. We should not delegate to any person or body, except within the most rigid limits, our undoubted function to make laws. I hope in future Parliament will bear that in mind and not put such sloppy sections into Acts of Parliament. I use that expression with all due respect to the House. In addition to this question I submit that in the past we have not been careful enough with the drafting of our laws. Several of our recent Acts have been so badly drafted that the lawyers are likely to reap a harvest as a result.

Mr. Corboy: You should not regret that.

Mr. DAVY: I am here, not as a member of the profession, but as a representative of the constituents of West Perth with a duty to perform to the citizens of Western Australia. My friend's cynical remark does not apply to me. With the greatest respect



I submit that there has been in the past a lot of sloppy legislation put through, which, I repeat, has been of no value to anyone except the lawyers, and the honest lawyer, as hon. members know, does not like to see sloppy legislation, even if it does bring additional grist to his mill. I recommend to the Government, with all humility, that there is urgent need for the appointment of a Parliamentary draftsman who shall have no other work to do but to draft our measures.

Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAVY: The work of drafting Bills is not easy, by any means. Until a man sits down to draft a Bill of any importance or size, it is hard for him to realise just how difficult the task is. This work cannot be done in a hurry; it requires careful and close consideration in order that mistakes may not afterwards result. I do not wish my remarks to give anyone the idea that I desire to cast a reflection on the Crown Law officers. The gentlemen in question are extremely able, industrious, and conscientious. But at the present time they have far too much work to do. A man cannot be expected to be advising people on matters of importance at one minute, drafting conveyances at another minute, and preparing difficult Bills, to be presented to Parliament, almost at the same time. We shall reap the benefit if we appoint a competent person to the position of Parliamentary draftsman and instruct him that he is not to do anything but that work. Of course, if he runs out of work in the way of drafting Bills, he can be given the task of preparing a consolidation of existing legislation. Everybody knows the need for this. I suggest that the task of putting our existing legislation in order in the space of a couple of years would appal anyone who recognises the magnitude of the work.

The Minister for Lands: It would take six months to put the Land Act in order.

Mr. DAVY: Yes, it is in a shocking state. The older laws relating to property are in an even worse condition. I am not making any apology for again referring to the speech of the member for Guildford (Hon. W. D. Johnson). He referred to what he termed the outrage of granting pastoral lessees an extension of their leases to 1948.

Mr. Lambert: Is that the only speech you heard?

Mr. DAVY: It was the only speech on the Ministerial side of the House that attempted to give anything like a statement of the policy of the Government. Other speakers on that side of the House have been content to offer remarks about their own constituencies. Of course, we have not yet heard the Leaders of the Ministerial Party.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: What about the Premier? He has spoken.

Mr. DAVY: My only regret is that I had the misfortune to speak prior to the member for Coolgardie (Mr. Lambert),

otherwise I might have been able to direct a little attention to his speech which, I am sure, will be interesting and instructive.

The Minister for Lands: You explained your position when you started by declaring that you did not require anything for your electorate.

Mr. DAVY: The member for Guildford described as an outrage the extension of the pastoral leases from 1924 to 1948.

Mr. Corboy: Would you call it something worse?

Mr. DAVY: No. I will not go into the merits or demerits of what was done. I am afraid that if the hon. member's remarks go out to the world without any explanation or amendment, the public may get an entirely false impression of the position. I remind members of the existence of Section 59 of the Land Act which gives the Government power, at any time they choose, to declare open for agricultural or horticultural selection, any Crown land, even though the subject of a pastoral lease. Our friend the member for Guildford painted a glowing picture of the rich alluvial flats on the river at Minderoo Station, and he spoke of the possibility of damming that river and providing irrigation, and then went on to say that Parliament robbed the State of all this and handed it over to monopolists. The hon. member is giving an impression that is entirely false. The only monopoly those people have over their million acres is the monopoly to use their property for pastoral purposes, and nothing else. At any time the Government may come along and, recognising the possibilities that the hon. member has told us about, declare the land open for agricultural or horticultural purposes, and it will then be within the power of any person to come along to select a conditional purchase lease under Sections 55, 56, or 57 of the Act. Then it will be possible to get to work on the wonderful scheme of irrigation that we heard about. The answer of the hon. member might be that if the property were cut up it could be made to carry more sheep than it is carrying now.

Mr. Hughes: Do you suggest that the banks that lend money on pastoral leases have no security?

Mr. DAVY: I say that the bank that lends money on pastoral leases has no remedy whatever if the Government like to come along and declare the lease open for agricultural purposes. Hon. members and Ministers are perfectly well aware of that. The only remedy that the pastoral lessee has is to make a claim, which he is entitled to do, for the value of the improvements on the land declared open. Of course, he has to be given a year's notice before the land can be thrown open, and then compensation has to be paid to him.

Mr. Hughes: That is an important point you nearly overlooked.



Mr. DAVY: It is a matter of no consequence whatever. No one would imagine that the Government could step in and seize the improvements of a pastoral lessee without paying him compensation. If they could, it would indeed be an astonishing thing. I am satisfied to leave it to the intelligence of all members of the House and of the average member of the public that compensation must be paid for improvements actually executed. I would like to refer to the Premier's graceful words of welcome, encouragement, and advice to the new members. He expressed the hope that the new members would not too soon lose the ideals with which they had entered the House. I am not afraid that those who are made of the right stuff will lose their ideals. We may well find that some of our ideals are incapable of realisation in our lives, perhaps because of our own ineffectiveness. I know members on both sides of the House who have long experience of Parliamentary work, and I believe they still retain the ideals they had when they entered political life. It is sad but undoubtedly true that in Australia at present the general public have got into a habit of speaking contemptuously of the Legislature. The term "politician" is frequently used in the Press as one of disparagement.

The Minister for Railways: Australia's representative in London made a remark of that kind only the other day.

Mr. DAVY: I am sorry to hear it. If he did so, the layman, who knows little of what goes on here, might well be excused. The wit who said the people got the government they deserved was not far wrong. When members of the public speak disparagingly of their politicians, they speak equally disparagingly of themselves. I have never held the opinion that members of Parliament were anything like the scoundrels that some sections of the general public seem to think they are. In my dealings with them I have found them in the main honourable and conscientious men. Perhaps members themselves are slightly to blame because, judging from the Press, there is a tendency to cast serious imputations on the honesty of one's opponents. That, however, is usually done in the heat of the moment, and as proof of my statement one may often see the hon. member for A, after having cast most damaging aspersions on the character of the hon. member for B, subsequently enjoying a milk and soda with him. One of the ideals I have brought into the House is that anything in the nature of dishonesty of motive on the part of any member must be clearly and conclusively proved before I shall believe it, and I ask that other members may extend the same consideration to me.

Mr. MARSHALL (Murchison) [8.4]: I apologise for my presence in the Chamber because I am in a rather awkward position. New members apologise to the House be-

cause they are here for the first time, but I have reached the point when I do not know whether I am in or out. It is preferable to be a new member, because one then receives the sympathy of the House. When one gets a little political service behind him, he is referred to as an old limber, and is apt to suffer the wrath of his opponents. I fear the member for West Perth (Mr. Davy) will, by his political innocence, bring about his own political execution, unless he changes in the next few years. He has allied himself to the Labour Party.

Mr. Davy: Do not believe it.

Mr. MARSHALL: Unless he alters in the next few years we shall have the female member for West Perth back again.

Mr. Hughes: We are responsible for his being here.

Mr. MARSHALL: And who may be responsible for the hon. member's presence? I have learnt during my three years' experience that one has to be more than discreet in his utterances here.

Mr. Latham: But you know you are not discreet.

Mr. MARSHALL: I heard an elector of West Perth refer to Mr. Davy as a white man. Though in appearance he is very dark, if the elector referred to principle, I agree with him. I was impressed with the hon. member's address, though there were small points on which I differ from him. The hon. member said that the Government had been unwise in restoring the 44-hour week. I wish he had dealt more fully with the question. In what way is it unwise? The hon. member said the only people in Western Australia that were living an idle life and enjoying riches and comfort were those who for years had struggled hard in early life. I grant that the hon. member was correct. Our troubles have not their origin in the wealth of people in the Commonwealth. Most of our difficulties are due to overseas financial institutions that govern the finance of the world. Unless the hon. member concedes that science has been of some advantage to society, his argument is bad. The Leader of the Opposition said if it took 48 hours to make a pair of boots, and the working week was reduced to 44 hours, you would get only three-quarters of the work done. That is typical of the hon. member's idea of reckoning. During my three years in the House the hon. member has shown no ability in reckoning anything. Years ago one could see men tilling the soil with a couple of horses and a single-furrow plough. Now we have tractors hauling 12-furrow ploughs and capable of doing in an hour what formerly took a week. Who is benefiting by the application of science to industry? The Leader of the Opposition on the public platform proclaimed that he had secured a greater yield per acre because he had applied science to production. Is the farmer getting the benefit of that? No. Neither is the consumer. I congratulate the member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson) on his speech. It is the first time in three years