

North Perth, and City of Perth, (d) Local Boards of Health at Augusta, Black Range, Davyhurst-Mulwarrie, Denmark, Derby, Kelmseott Road District, Meekatharra, Newcastle, Perth, Ravens-thorpe, Three Springs, and West Guildford; (4.) Proclamations under—(a) Fisheries Act, closing certain waters, (b) Pearl Dealers' Licensing Act, declaring Denham to be a place where pearl fisheries are carried on.

By the Minister for Works: (1) By-laws made by—(a) Goldfields Water Supply Administration, (b) Roads Boards of Upper Gascoyne, Wyndham, Mt. Margaret, Moora, Murray, Black Range, Cue, Brunswick (poundage fees), Broomehill, and Mourambine (poundage fees); (2.) Leonora-Gwalia Tramway by-laws and regulations; (3.) Annual report for 1908-9 of Metropolitan Board of Water Supply and Sewerage.

By the Minister for Mines and Railways: (1.) Annual report of the department of Mines; (2.) Explosives Act, 1895, Order of Council; (3.) Mines Regulation Act, amendments to regulations under; (4.) Reports and returns in accordance with Sections 54 and 83 of the Government Railways Act, 1904, for quarters ended 31st December, 1909, and the 31st March and 30th June, 1910; (5.) Railways by-law 59, liability of Commissioner of Railways in respect to ship passengers' baggage and effects.

By the Attorney General and Minister for Education: Annual Report of the Education Department.

STATUTES COMPILATION—PHARMACY AND POISONS LAW.

Mr. SPEAKER laid on the Table a compilation of the Pharmacy and Poisons Act, 1894, and the amendments thereto, made in accordance with a resolution of the previous session.

BILL—MOUNT LAWLEY RESERVES.

The PREMIER (Sir Newton J. Moore): In order to maintain the undoubted rights and privileges of the House, I move (without notice) for leave to introduce a Bill to vest certain re-

serves at Mount Lawley in His Majesty, to change the purposes of such reserves, and to classify them as permanent reserves of Class (A.).

Leave given; Bill introduced and read a first time.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

First Day.

Mr. MURPHY (Fremantle): I have the honour to move the adoption of the following Address-in-Reply to His Excellency's Speech:—

*May it please your Excellency,—
We, the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of the State of Western Australia in Parliament assembled, beg to express loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign, and to thank your Excellency for the Speech you have been pleased to address to Parliament.*

Before I proceed to deal with the subject matter of the Speech, I desire upon my own behalf to crave from the members of this House the same kindness, the same courtesy, and the same toleration which they have tendered to new members under similar circumstances. I am well aware that on many previous occasions new members have occupied a position similar to that which I occupy this afternoon, namely, as mover of the Address-in-Reply; and I am perfectly willing, in fact I am compelled to admit that most, if not all of them, have acquitted themselves of that task far more creditably than I shall be able to do. But, Mr. Speaker, I venture to assert that none of them have had such an easy task to perform as that which will fall to my lot to-day.

Mr. Angwin: They have never had so much in a speech before.

Mr. MURPHY: Probably not. My fortunate position is that it must undoubtedly be very easy for me to stand here and say good things of a Government which has done such magnificent work in connection with the development and the progress of the State as the Moore Government have done since they first took office. Pleasant, indeed, it is for me from a personal standpoint to

find myself this afternoon a supporter of a Government who have changed, in a period of four years, despondency and depression into hope and comparative prosperity. The first subject matter in the Speech that I desire to refer to briefly is the inestimable loss our Empire has suffered since this House last met by the death of our late Sovereign, King Edward VII. I am perfectly well aware, after the very brilliant speeches which have been made in connection with this sad event, not only in this State, not only in the Australian Commonwealth, not only throughout the British Empire, but in every civilised country of the world, spoken in every civilised language, made by the most eminent statesmen, and the most brilliant orators, all of whom have truthfully borne testimony to the great merits possessed by our late Sovereign, that anything I might have to say must appear very feeble indeed when compared with that which has already been uttered. But, Mr. Speaker, amongst the many things which have been said about his late Majesty which appealed to me more than anything else, was the remark of one speaker who proclaimed that King Edward was more than a King, that he was a man. I say that the late King Edward truly was a man, a very humane man, subject to all the frailties of our human nature, but at the same time possessing virtues that very few of his critics possess. I do not want to labour the subject. I only want to say that amongst many of those who mourn his loss, I suppose none regretted his death so much as those who realised from their personal positions what his death meant. In the Speech of the Governor reference is made to the great efforts of our late King to promote universal peace, and, I suppose, the masses of all the nations of the world, those whom we may at least call truthful believers in the future of christianity, the men of peace, to those who realise and believe that war, or to put it in plain English, the destruction of human life, is fraught with so much distress, the death of King Edward was a sad blow indeed. To those who had come to realise in the weight of taxation that is necessary to keep up standing

armies and standing navies of nations, the crushing out from life of large numbers of the men and women, and in many cases children of the nations concerned, the death of King Edward was also a sad blow indeed, and I am quite sure I cannot say any more than this, that by his death we have lost a great King; by his death we have lost a great man, and we can express the hope here on both sides of the House, that his successor, our present King, and other rulers of the world, may take as an example the brilliant record of King Edward's reign as the guiding star for their own political actions, and it will be said of them, as I think this afternoon we can say of our late King, the world is all the better for King Edward having lived. I want now to refer to that other sad event which has taken place since this Parliament last assembled here, and in which this Parliament is more particularly concerned. I allude to the death of the late member for Fremantle, the Hon. James Price. I knew the late Mr. Price intimately. We were on very friendly terms for a number of years before his first election to this Chamber; and though at times I may have differed from him, and have argued with him, I never for one moment lost my high estimation of the late member as a man, or my utmost belief in his uprightness, his integrity, and his honour. It is possible to conceive that in this Chamber he met many earnest and keen political opponents, who were prepared in the heat of political debate to give knocks and to take some in return. I am quite sure, however, that the late Mr. Price did not have a personal enemy. By his death the Government have lost, not only a true and valuable colleague, but this House has also lost an esteemed member, and I know that Fremantle has lost a representative who, at all times, in keeping with his high Ministerial office, and the duty he owed to the State in general, did all that he could to advance its interests and promote its prosperity. We are all the poorer by his death; and I can only hope, from a personal and selfish standpoint, whether my career in

this House be long or short, my conduct may be such to all parties concerned that I may, at least, make the sense of that loss less keen than it may otherwise have been. As a new member I suppose I may be considered somewhat presumptuous if I lay it down as an axiom that it is a wise thing for any Government, a wise thing for any Parliament, a wise thing for any individual members of Parliament sometimes to pause in their work of progressive legislation and take a retrogressive glance at the work already performed; because from that retrogressive glance, one may gain encouragement to go on with one's policy either on account of good work already performed, or from experience gained by any mistakes that may have been made, or one may gain renewed determination or increased energy to perform those things which, owing to want of time or lack of opportunity, one has had to leave undone in the past. Without wearying the House I propose to take a very slight glance at the condition of the State four years ago, when the Moore Government first came into office, as compared with what it is to-day in some of its main features. I know that hon. members of the House are probably more conversant with the information I propose to give than I am myself, but somehow or other they do not seem to make use of it when they get outside on political platforms, and I think it just as well at the opening of a new session that the information should be given in a very concise form. For a considerable number of years, both in the House and outside, it has been recognised that the principal factor necessary in the further development and increased prosperity of the State is the important factor of additional population; but it has remained for the Moore Government to do something that has made that increased population possible. I might have gone down to the various departments and got special information and statistics, but I thought it was much better to take a document that was not only open to every member but open to the public in general. Four years ago, in 1906, the year when the Moore Government first took office, the population of

the State was, in round numbers, 254,000, whereas to-day it is 283,000, a clear gain of 29,000 people. Members on both sides of the House will recognise what that means, as increased wealth, to a young country such as Western Australia is. It seems to me absolutely absurd to attempt to attract people to the State unless we can offer them some advantages as regards greater social standing, or better wages, or more certainty of constant employment, or a greater chance of ultimate success in life; but I venture to assert that the Moore Government have done many things in that direction to attract population to these shores. Our land laws to-day are the most liberal of any portion of the British Empire; the financial assistance we render to those who propose to go on our lands is of a greater extent and of a larger amount than that which can be received elsewhere; while the period of time over which our settlers are permitted to convert conditional purchase land into freehold is much more than could be classified as ordinarily liberal. I do not want to weary the House, but I want to show what has taken place as regards the working of the Moore Government policy during the last four years. In 1906 the total amount of acreage in the State under crop, under permanent artificially-sown grasses, and including new ground cleared during the season and prepared for next season's crop right down to the new paddock just ringbarked and fenced was 2,452,936 acres. That was at the end of February, 1906. On the other hand, at the end of February, 1910, that acreage increased to 4,669,999 acres, pretty nearly double the acreage existing four years ago. Then the purposes to which that land was put then and is put now are very interesting, although somewhat stale news to members of the House. Four years ago the total acreage under wheat amounted to 195,071 acres; to-day it amounts to 448,918 acres, considerably more than double. Four years ago the amount of acreage in the State under oats was 15,713 acres; to-day there are 73,342 acres under oats. Four years ago there were 3,665 acres under barley; to-

day the quantity is 8,022 acres. And what has been the marvellous production by the greater development of our lands? Four years ago the total amount of wheat produced in the State was 2,308,305 bushels; last year we produced 5,602,368 bushels of wheat. Four years ago we produced only 283,987 bushels of oats; last year we produced 1,248,162 bushels of oats. Four years ago we produced 49,000 bushels of barley; last year we produced 101,673 bushels of barley. And so it is with all other crops we might go through. These are facts that speak more for the good the Moore Government have done in the development of the country than any platform speeches may do; these are figures that are published by the statistical bureau of the State; and I suppose hon. members on both sides of the House will accept them as reliable.

Mr. Collier: Give us some figures about the mining industry.

Mr. MURPHY: I will when I come to them, but I want to give a few figures that may interest the member for East Fremantle who started to celebrate my advent to the House by claiming to be the first interjector. Four years ago the total value of wheat exported from the State amounted to the magnificent sum of £7. That is, in the year 1906 we exported wheat from Western Australia to the value of £7 sterling—no more and no less. Last year, in 1909, we exported from the State wheat to the value of £120,000, and for the first five months of this year we have exported wheat from this State amounting to £359,000 in value. And if any further proof is necessary of the magnificent development and progress the State has made, I would like to give it in what is considered by all classes of politicians as the most reliable barometer. If we desire to gauge a country's prosperity we are generally told to look at the savings the people of the country can put on one side for rainy days. Consequently I took the trouble to look up the amount of money deposited in our Government Savings Bank four years ago and compare the figures with what was done dur-

ing the last year. I do not think that any member will deny that the majority of those who use the Government Savings Bank are the wage-earning class; and consequently, when we see a much larger advance in the amount deposited in one year we can say that the individual comfort and prosperity of the wage-earning classes of the State are increasing. In 1906 the amount deposited in the Government Savings Bank was £1,734,000. That was at the end of June, 1906. At the end of June, 1910, there was £2,400,000 deposited. During this period our population, I have already shown, increased by 29,000, and the average per head of the population is rather interesting. Whereas in 1906 per head of the population the Government Savings Bank deposits averaged £8 17s. 8d., this year they average £11 19s. 9d. We want no further evidence that as far as the wage-earning classes of the State are concerned their prosperity has increased year by year during the regime of the Moore Government. That is what the Moore Government have done in the past. As far as the agricultural development of the State is concerned, hon. members know that, in keeping with their agricultural policy, the Moore Government recognised that, no matter how good or how fertile the land of the State might be, it was absolutely absurd to send men a long way from a railway with any hope that those men would make a success, unless they were prepared to provide them with some means by which they could get their produce easily and cheaply to the markets of the world. Therefore the agricultural railway policy of the State had gone ahead with land settlement, and during the time the Moore Government have had the reins of administration of this State in their hands they have pretty nearly doubled the railway mileage they found when they came into office in 1906. And not content with first settling the people on the land on terms more liberal than intending settlers can find elsewhere, not content with finding them railway communication by which their products can

be brought to the markets in which they are to be sold, the Government have gone a step further and seen that at whichever of the four ports of Western Australia those products reached ample shipping accommodation should be provided to see that those products were shipped as cheaply as possible. Four years ago when the Moore Government took office, there was one port in this State. We believe that there had been such ports as Albany, Geraldton, and Bunbury in existence in days gone by but they dropped out of the recollection of most people. To-day we have four prosperous ports.

Mr. Angwin: And Fremantle is dropping out.

Mr. MURPHY: Fremantle is not dropping out, and I would be sorry to think that any Fremantle person was so narrow-minded as to think, with the present progress of the State, which we hope will long continue, that the whole trade, import and export, should be concentrated at Fremantle. It is absurd to think so; but Fremantle people desire, and have elected me, as they have elected the members of East, and South, and North Fremantle, to see that the trade which belongs to Fremantle because of its geographical position, should go to it, and that that portion of the State which has Albany as its natural port should give its trade to that port, and the same with Bunbury and Geraldton. We do not want one-pennyworth of trade at Fremantle more than we are entitled to.

Mr. Collier: What about Esperance?

Mr. MURPHY: Is there such a place as Esperance? I never heard of such a place until I saw something of an agitation recently about Esperance. Where did that start?

Mr. Collier: Your horizon is bounded by Fremantle.

Mr. MURPHY: My horizon is bounded by commonsense, and I shall be prepared to support the Esperance movement when one grain of commonsense overcomes that desire to create ill-feeling between the goldfields and the coast

which has been so evident for some time past. I want to say that I have inadequately dealt with some of the great advantages which have accrued to this State since the Moore Government first took office, and which have been mainly due to their policy and to their administration of public affairs. I am pleased to see by the Speech of the Governor that they intend to pursue this policy in the future. I hail with pleasure the announcement made in the Speech that it is the intention of the Government to push on with the agricultural railway policy, because no matter what interests we have in this State, no matter what particular portion of this State we may represent, the whole future and prosperity of the State is founded upon our recognising that the future rests on the development of our agricultural industry. No one should be more grateful for the development of the agricultural industry than the people of the coastal towns. I say here fearlessly that no town in Western Australia has benefited so much by the agricultural policy of the Government as the town which I have the honour to represent to-day. I hope, therefore, there will be little opposition from this House to the proposition of the Government to go on with the comprehensive scheme of agricultural railway extension. I do not think there will be, because I believe all members of this House have recognised from the good results that have taken place in the past what we may expect if we assist the Government to continue to carry on this policy. I notice that the Government are going to introduce a Bill which last session, so I am informed, received the unanimous assent of this Chamber, but which met its death blow in another place, I refer to the measure dealing with the amendment of the Constitution, by which the franchise of the other Chamber might be reduced. I say at once that when the Bill comes before this House it will receive my support. At the same time I tell hon. members that I think they are making a mountain out of a mole hill. I cannot see how the difference between the £25 qualification and that of £15 will

bring about very great results as regards the number of electors who will be qualified to vote. This is tinkering with legislation. I could understand, and would be better able to support a measure giving universal household suffrage as regards the other Chamber—

Mr. Angwin: You can do that now.

Mr. MURPHY: Hon. members must not take me up wrongly. I say at once that while I would give my support to such a Bill, I am opposed to and will always fight the idea of abolishing the second Chamber. I believe in the second Chamber because I recognise, no matter how much may be said against it, that every liberty and every privilege we enjoy to-day, no matter how they may have been retarded or opposed, have been granted to us through the bicameral system.

Mr. Scaddan: Not as the people desire it.

Mr. MURPHY: Just as the people desire it, and anyway whether it is so or not I refuse to experiment in a new form of Government of which I know nothing, and about which no hon. member who advocates it can, from experience, give any positive evidence.

Mr. Scaddan: What about Canada?

Mr. MURPHY: The condition of the provinces of Canada is totally different from the conditions as they exist in Australia. In Canada the provinces are not sovereign: here the States are. In Canada the Dominion Parliament is sovereign; not so in Australia. We took this precaution when we entered Federation. As I said before, I am pleased to notice that the Government have announced their intention to again introduce the measure dealing with the reduction of the franchise of the Upper House. Personally, I do not think it will make much difference to the number of electors, but I justify my advocacy of it by saying that there is a certain number, probably a considerable number, who, a few years ago, when rents were high, had a vote for the second Chamber, and who, owing to the reduction of rents, are now living in the same houses and are disqualified from voting because of the reduction of those rents.

Mr. Troy: Then it is the house that has the vote?

Mr. MURPHY: That is what I am objecting to. There is another Bill which I do not expect will receive very much opposition. I would be surprised even if it raised an interesting debate as far as this House is concerned. I refer to the Bill dealing with the redistribution of seats. I am sure that is a measure that all members recognise the justice of, how important it is that it should be brought forward, and how important it is that it should be passed before the next general elections. I am quite sure, therefore, that it will receive little opposition.

Mr. Angwin: It depends on the boundaries.

Mr. MURPHY: Exactly. By a peculiar coincidence we can all see the justice of altering someone else's electorate, or wiping it out altogether, but we can never see the justice of interfering with our own so long as we had a big majority at the previous election. The member for Kanowna will recollect the great difficulty we had when we attempted a similar thing in another Parliament in Australia, and he will also remember the interesting debate and the great amount of talk that took place with regard to the change of names. When it was desired to bring two adjoining electorates into one the question arose as to what that one should be called. Smith wanted to call it by its old name and Brown wanted his name to stand, and so weeks and weeks went on until eventually the numbers were reduced from 141 to 125.

Mr. Angwin: Are you giving us a lesson in stone-walling?

Mr. MURPHY: I do not want to give the hon. member a lesson in stonewalling. I hope that I may be able to take a few lessons from him in that direction. There is no desire on my part to go right through the Address-in-Reply, but I may say that I am pleased to find that the Government is going to do something at least in the higher degree of scholastic attainments as far as the youths of Western Australia are concerned. The time has arrived when a university in this State should be brought into existence.

I am quite sure as long as facilities are offered by which the child of the poorest parent can, by merit or ability, and with the aid of Government subsidies, ultimately graduate at that university, that the Bill will receive little opposition.

Mr. Scaddan: What about liquor law reform?

Mr. MURPHY: I am coming to that now. Hon. members will notice that I am drinking water at the present time.

Mr. Walker: We are not so sure of that.

Mr. MURPHY: Then I will pass it over to the hon. member. I see that it is the intention of the Government to re-introduce the Local Option Bill. I want to say at once that as far as allowing this matter to go to the people is concerned, no one in this House will fight more than I shall to secure that end. I consider the question is of sufficient importance to the people of any locality that they should be allowed to decide whether a public house should or should not exist in that particular locality. I also say that this House and the people of the country have no right to do an injustice even with a majority, to any man in the community, and consequently if the people of any district decide to close up one or two houses in their locality the entire people of the State should be prepared to pay compensation for so doing. It was proposed last session, I believe, that the remaining houses of the trade should contribute the monetary compensation to those which were closed up. I am entirely opposed to that form of compensation. I do not see upon what ground it can be said that a public house or a number of them shall be closed up and that because other houses are kept open and the trade drifts to them, they should pay the compensation. The form of compensation that I would propose would be fair and equitable. It would be such a form by which you could give to every man, according to the amount of capital that was invested in the house that it was decided to close, a certain number of years before compelling him to close his doors. I would pay no monetary compensation at all. That is the form of compensation

in which I believe; it is the form of compensation I would be prepared to support.

Mr. Taylor: What length of time do you consider a hotel should be in existence?

Mr. MURPHY: The compensation should be just according to the amount of capital invested. We could not give a small hotel at Bunbury the same time compensation that we would give for the Palace Hotel in Perth. A commission of reasonable and fair men who would gauge the amount of compensation requisite for the amount of capital invested would decide the term of years for which the licensee should be permitted to hold his license before being compelled to close.

Mr. Taylor: Then the length of existence would not play any part?

Mr. MURPHY: Not at all. Every license has the same existence, twelve months—no more, no less. The lease of the house may vary, but so far as the legal part of the question is concerned each hotel has a twelve months' license—no more, no less. The Government are also going to introduce a Bill dealing with the public health. This is a Bill with which I am not conversant, except that during the time I had the honour to be mayor of Fremantle I acted as chairman of the local board of health, and found that the relations between our local body and the Central Board of Health were not as friendly as they might be. It did not seem to me that Bill then proposed was likely to create any more friendly feeling than that which existed. The member for East Fremantle this afternoon gave notice of his intention to move that the District Fire Brigades Bill be repealed. That has been brought about because the central authority administering fire brigade matters in the various centres of population in the State has not been able to grasp the differences of local conditions and to work as a central body should. I say here that my little experience of the Central Board of Health as chairman of a local board of health at Fremantle tended in a somewhat similar direction, and I am not altogether prepared to sup-

port a Bill that would give the Central Board of Health any more power to harass local boards of health than it has at present. However, I shall have to wait until I have the Bill in my hands to see how it will deal with that question.

Mr. Taylor: Do you believe in Ministerial control over public health?

Mr. MURPHY: I would far rather agree to local boards of health being directly responsible to the Minister than to have them directly responsible to some body up in Perth. I would rather give the Minister of the Department, the Colonial Secretary, the power to intervene or interfere, or to bring to task a local board of health when he thought fit in the performance of his duties, than permit what has gone on in the past. Take Fremantle, for instance. We had two inspectors under the local board to whom we were paying fair salaries, and they were going about ordering people to do certain things; but immediately they left the Central Board of Health inspector would go in and tell the people to do something else. That has taken place not only on one occasion, but on several occasions. Unless we have more harmonious working between the central and local bodies, I would rather the Minister in charge of the Department should take charge of the whole thing. I have gone beyond the limit of time I allotted myself. Naturally, I do not feel so comfortable and so easy upon my first experience before such venerable senators as I will do in a few months.

Mr. Taylor: You are looking straight at me.

Mr. MURPHY: I did not mean the hon. member. I was looking at the member for Collie who sits behind the hon. member and who has less hair than the hon. member. I have taken up rather more time than I allotted myself, but I want first to thank members of the House for the extreme kindness and courtesy they have extended to me attempting my maiden speech on this occasion. And I also want to express the hope that during the session we may be able, by the co-operation of both sides, to do some good work as regards the greater de-

velopment and greater prosperity of the State in which we all live. I also want to say I really hope that each and every one of us will recognise it is possible for a member to differ from us without there being any occasion to impute to that member anything but the purest of motives with regard to the interests of the State. I also hope that, during this session your duties, Mr. Speaker, in the Chair will be most light and very pleasant indeed; in fact, I think they will be, especially during the discussion of the Redistribution of Seats Bill.

Mr. Angwin: What about the Southside railway?

Mr. MURPHY: Surely the member for East Fremantle does not expect me to be so mean and contemptible on my first appearance in this House as to take away from him a subject he has rehearsed for the last three months? I would be mean indeed to refer to a subject on which the hon. member will electrify the House when he gets up. I have great pleasure in moving the adoption of the Address-in-Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor.

Mr. MONGER (York): As a rule the bench behind the Ministry has been noted for consisting of silent and servile supporters of the Government, but I trust the efforts made by my friend, the member for Fremantle, will remove from the Opposition side at all events the impression that we on this bench are all servile and silent followers. I think the hon. member's maiden effort this afternoon is sufficient to show hon. members opposite that the member for Fremantle will be as big a fighter as those who occupy seats on the Opposition side. Now, in a British Assembly, such as we are proud to call this Assembly, it is fitting that the feeling uppermost in our minds at the present moment should be one of deep sorrow and regret at the death of our late great Sovereign, who will be known for all time amongst British-speaking peoples as Edward the Peacemaker.

Mr. Scaddan: Take it as read.

Mr. MONGER: That feeling of sorrow extends to his bereaved widow and family. It is, moreover, a sentiment