

and advice sought from the Parliamentary Draughtsman on the subject. Under the Third Schedule, when an employment broker's license was transferred, it was transferred from the day of transfer to the first day of the month following the next quarterly licensing meeting for the district. Going back to Clause 7 of the Bill, it would be found that a person who desired to obtain a license under the Bill had to give 14 days' notice of his intention to apply for a certificate; so that if a person were to apply for a transfer of that license, say 10 days before the licensing meeting, and the transfers were only made operative until the first day of the month following the next quarterly licensing meeting, he might be three months without a license. If the Parliamentary Draughtsman's attention were directed to this, he would probably draft another clause stating that if it should not be practicable to go to the next meeting of the justices, the applicant should go to the next practicable meeting at which such application could be made.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The matter would be brought under the notice of the Parliamentary Draughtsman and if necessary the Bill could be re-committed for the purpose of making the suggested amendment.

Question put and passed; the report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT — BILLS BEFORE THE HOUSE.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I intend to move that the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, 14th September. I would like to remind hon. members of the desirability of then going right on with the Health Bill. It is rather a big Bill, and it is necessary that it should get up to another place in good time.

Hon. G. Randell: Does it contain any amendments on the Bill of last year?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There are a few which I mentioned yesterday. I may also say that if possible I will in the meantime have the Municipal Corporations Act Amendment Bill distributed to members.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Is it a big Bill?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No; merely half a dozen amendments. I will have it distributed in the interval.

Hon. M. L. Moss: Is it dealing with the rating clauses?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes, it does deal with those clauses. I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, 14th instant.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 4.54 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 1st September, 1909.

	PAGE
Papers Presented	116
Bills: Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, Mess- age, 1s	117
Legal Practitioners Act Amendment, 1s	118
Workers Compensation Act Amendment, 1s	118
Vaccination Act Amendment, 1s	118
Licensed Surveyors, 1s	118
Abattoirs, 1s	118
Licensing, 1s	118
Opium Smoking Prohibition, 1s	118
Redemption of Annuities, 1s	118
Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage, 1s	118
Bills of Sales Act Amendment, 1s	158
Questions: Education Department Attendance Medals	117
Land transfers	117
Potato Importation, supervision	117
Japanese Competition	117
Railway Conferences	117
Mail Service South-West Coast	118
Address-in-Reply, third day	118

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

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Premier: 1, Regulations under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. 2, Amended part Regulation No. 59. 3, Amended Regulation No. 117 of the Fremantle Harbour Trust. 4, Amended Regulations made under the

Pharmacy and Poisons Act. 5, By-laws passed by the Municipalities of Northam and York.

BILL—AGRICULTURAL BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

Message.

Message from the Governor received and read recommending the Bill.

First Reading.

Bill introduced by the Minister for Lands, and read a first time.

QUESTION—EDUCATION DEPARTMENT ATTENDANCE MEDALS.

Mr. McDOWALL asked the Minister for Education: 1, Has the Education Department discontinued granting medals for punctual attendance as set forth in Regulation No. 128, 1905? 2, If not, why has not Miss Ivy Huntly, of Coolgardie, who has attended the State School, Coolgardie, for a period of six years without having missed a solitary day, and without having once been late, received a gold plated copper medal in accordance with the said regulation?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1. This department has not discontinued granting medals, but since September, 1907, the medals have been of silver. 2. Miss Huntly will now receive a silver medal with a gold figure 6 thereon. This is being forwarded to-day.

QUESTION—LAND TRANSFERS.

Mr. BATH asked the Minister for Lands: 1. Will he reconsider his determination to concentrate all transactions in connection with land transfers to the Transfer Branch in Perth? 2. If not, what steps are being taken to minimise the very great inconvenience which will be entailed by the new arrangement?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1. It is impossible to reconsider the question as all registrations have been handed over to the Registrar of Titles. 2. All possible assistance will be rendered at the various land agencies to minimise any inconvenience that may be caused by the change.

QUESTION POTATO IMPORTATION. SUPERVISION.

Mr. BATH asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1. In view of the serious effect of the prohibition on the importation of potatoes in raising the cost of living, will the Government so far release the restrictions as to permit of the importation under Government supervision of potatoes from clean areas for the purpose of table consumption? 2. Has any attempt been made to arrange with the Governments of the affected States for the importation of potatoes subject to Government inspection at the ports of shipment and discharge?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1. Arrangements have already been made in this direction. 2. Yes.

QUESTION—JAPANESE COMPETITION.

Mr. BATH asked the Premier: 1. Has his attention been drawn to the serious menace to the interests of white workers, such as laundrymen, divers, sailors, storekeepers, doctors, lawyers, by the admittance into the country of Japanese competitors? 2. If so, what action has he taken in the matter?

The PREMIER replied: 1. No, but a protest was received against the admission of a Japanese doctor. 2. The protest was forwarded to the Commonwealth authorities and a reply received to the effect that the exemption of three years officially promised to the Japanese Consul General in April last to enable the doctor to enter solely for the purpose of practising his profession at Broome cannot now be withheld, and will issue subject to the qualification required by the law of Western Australia being established at the earliest possible date after his arrival.

QUESTION—RAILWAY CONFERENCES. COST.

Mr. GILL asked the Minister for Railways: 1. What was the cost to this State in connection with the conference of heads of Railway Departments held in Melbourne early in the present year? 2.

What was the cost to this State in connection with the Railway Commissioners' Conference held in Melbourne in May of this year? 3, Does he intend to lay on the Table of the House a report of the proceedings of those two conferences?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, £155 12s. 6d. 2, £68 7s. 2d. This amount, as well as that mentioned in answer to No. 1, represents not only the cost of attending the conference but also includes special inquiries into various matters which were made by both heads of branches and the Commissioner. 3, It was not intended to make the report public, but the Government will give consideration to the matter later.

QUESTION—MAIL SERVICE, SOUTH-EAST COAST.

Mr. HUDSON asked the Premier: 1, Are the Government paying a subsidy on the South-East mail service? 2, Have any steps been taken by the Government to ascertain whether the mail service is being carried out according to the terms of the contract, if so, with what result? 3, If the contract is not being performed according to its terms, will the Government withhold the payment of the whole or a portion of any subsidy?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, Yes. The matter is at present the subject of correspondence between the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth and this Government. 3, Yes.

BILLS (9)—FIRST READING.

1. Legal Practitioners Act Amendment, introduced by Mr. Bath.

2. Workers' Compensation Act Amendment, introduced by Mr. Hudson.

3. Vaccination Act Amendment, introduced by Mr. Bolton.

4. Licensed Surveyors, introduced by the Premier.

5. Abattoirs, introduced by the Minister for Lands.

6. Licensing, introduced by the Attorney General.

7. Opium Smoking Prohibition, introduced by the Attorney General.

8. Redemption of Annuities, introduced by the Attorney General.

9. Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage, introduced by the Minister for Works.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Third Day.

Resumed from the previous day.

Mr. HEITMANN (Cue): When I asked for the adjournment last night it was with the object of securing the opportunity to say something on certain matters concerning the well-being of the people of this State, and it was also because I objected to seeing the debate close at that juncture, because I consider that after about seven months of recess it is due to the people of the State as well as to members of this Chamber that we should hear something from Ministers themselves. Some people say that the Address-in-Reply is altogether unnecessary. That may be so in connection with legislation, but we have many other things to discuss, and the most important, I think, is the administration of the various departments. I take it we should hear something from the Ministers, and particularly from the Minister for Lands, whose policy in connection with the Lands Department it appears to me is changing almost from week to week. Also, I think, we should hear something from the Minister for Mines in regard to the policy in connection with mines, and particularly in connection with the State battery system, because I believe it is again contemplated to alter the system of charges in connection with State batteries, and I think it is due to this Chamber that we should hear something from the Minister for Mines in this direction. I do not intend, like most members, to discuss matters in connection with the relationship between the Commonwealth and the States, but I would like to say in passing that I think the point made by the Leader of the Opposition last evening is well worthy of the consideration of this Chamber, and well worthy of consideration by a special commission of inquiry, that is in connection with the sliding scale, and the difference, if any, in the price of com-

modities now and before the end of the period of the sliding scale. As we know, Western Australia previously had the advantage of a sliding scale, and though we have not that advantage now, and though we pay no duties on most of the stuff coming into the State, yet we find the prices to the consumer just the same, and in some instances higher, I believe, than they were when we were paying inter-State duties. We should try to find out where the difference is going, whether the manufacturer or producer is getting the advantage, or whether the middleman is. At least it is certain the consumer is getting his produce no cheaper now than when we were paying inter-State duties. The first matter on which I wish to make a few remarks is one that is to me of even more importance than an abstract financial question, and it is one that is causing a considerable amount of discussion at the present time in this State. I refer to the new policy of the Health Department; and I am afraid that the members of this Chamber, and particularly the Government, do not realise their responsibilities to the people in this particular direction; because we find that not only the present Government, but previous Governments, and Governments, I suppose, throughout Australia from time to time, the moment they find the finances tightening, seek the civil service or departments dealing with the health or the domestic well being of the State as the first things to deal with. The Government are no different from others. The year before last we had the then Treasurer bringing down a proposal in connection with teachers in our Education Department, and this year we find the Department of Health with a new scheme brought forward in connection with the hospitals. While I agree there is some room for economy in this direction, I feel sure that the gentleman in charge of the administrative portion of the Health Department is proceeding in the wrong direction when he sets out to cut down the subsidies to hospitals.

The Minister for Works: Then what would you do to economise?

Mr. HEITMANN: What I would do first of all would be to see that the ad-

ministrative expenses of the head office were cut down to the lowest, and I would at the same time see that there was a little business acumen shown in the administration of the department.

The Minister for Works: We have been doing that.

Mr. HEITMANN: The fact that the first proposition the Government have is to deal with the Medical Department, which affects the poorer people of the State, proves to me that the Government do not understand the question. If they do, well they are purposely avoiding dealing with the question as I think they should. Now they say they are giving too much to the poor of this State; at least, that is practically what they say.

The Minister for Works: Oh, no.

Mr. HEITMANN: I admit there is room for economy. I could show cases in this department where there has been an absolute waste of money on the part of the officers in Perth. I can give one instance that occurred last year in connection with the Cue public hospital, where they were working for some six months, I believe, short of a nurse. Instead of making a permanent appointment at a salary which I believe was £70 per annum, the department, which, according to the Minister for Works, has some business methods, sent up during the course of the six months some four or five nurses in a temporary capacity. Now the expense of that method can be easily seen; there were first-class fares and expenses to be paid, and the temporary nurses were paid at two or three guineas per week, whereas a permanent appointment could have been made at £70—little enough I know. The excuse was that they could not get nurses. I am sure the department could get nurses if they were prepared to pay a decent salary. Be that as it may; I am not going to discuss how these reforms can be brought about; but I am satisfied that the £18,000 which it is proposed to save by this scheme, or nearly the whole of it, could be saved by the application of businesslike methods in the department. The Health Department for many years past has been subjected to more criticism, I believe, than

any other department of the State. And we find now that the first thing the department does to justify its existence—and I believe there is a new gentleman in charge of the department—is to strike at the hospitals. The first matter brought before us is that the State can no longer maintain the full expense in connection with hospitals and generally with the Health Department. We are told that it is costing more in Western Australia than in the other States. I venture to say that if proper inquiry were made we would find the hospitals in this State are costing less than similar institutions in any of the Eastern States. And the fact that we are going to save £18,000 from the Treasury, or the fact that we are spending £18,000 too much of the Treasurer's money on the hospitals, does not prove that we are paying too much for the poor and needy, or for the health matters of this State, but I believe that it can be proved that the money is being wasted by the department. It is all very fine to quote the Eastern States, but it is known to every member of the House that a different system is in vogue in the Eastern States. While we find the Eastern States spending much less on hospitals out of the Treasury, we find that they have local methods of financing these institutions, and I believe there is more spent on the hospitals in Victoria than is spent on the hospitals in Western Australia. As a matter of fact there is no hospital in this State, including the chief hospital in Perth, that will compare with the country-town hospitals in Victoria. We have a hospital in Perth that, in my opinion, is an absolute disgrace to the capital. For years past the Health Department and the Government have been prepared to build wing after wing at this hospital and to extend in every direction, knowing full well, as it must be known, that the time will come in the near future when this hospital must be shifted from the centre of Perth. At the present time there is not room for the patients to walk 20 or 30 yards. Instead of spending this money, as we have been spending it on the Perth hospital for years past, or instead of spending it

on the Children's Hospital on the hill, it would have been much better if a site had been chosen somewhere out of the City, say in King's Park, or some other suitable spot, where there would be more room for the staff and patients. It would be much better in years to come. Now, coming back to what it is going to cost the State, the fact that we are going to save £18,000 does not prove that we are going to save it to the people themselves; but it seems to me that the gentleman who brought about this scheme fails to recognise the relationship between the individual and the State as a whole. It matters not, in my opinion, whether the money for the upkeep of the hospitals comes from the people through the Treasury or from the people locally. As a matter of fact, I prefer that all maintenance money should come direct from the Treasury instead of forcing the boards to go hat in hand among the people of their district, begging. While the Treasurer is relieved of £18,000 the people are not relieved of that amount, for the alteration in the system merely means the transfer of the obligation of collection from the Treasurer to private individuals, boards, and controlling bodies. More than that is being done, for by relieving the Treasurer of the £18,000, the extra burden is being placed on those who are charitably inclined. I object to it, for from my experience in such matters the man who is most inclined to assist charitable objects is he who is really least able to do so. Let any collector for charitable institutions be interrogated on the question, and he will say that from his experience it is the poor man who is most liberal in the cause of charity. In proportion to his ability to pay, the working man gives more than those who are better able to contribute. The new scheme places a burden on the people of the small localities which they should not be called upon to bear. In Cue, for instance, whereas in the past the hospital has cost from £1,700 to £2,000 a year, the Government are now prepared to make a grant to the extent of £700. I would point out to the Minister that the miner on the fields has

to pay to the extent of 6s. or 7s. a week for safeguarding his future. This sum is altogether apart from municipal, roads boards and other rates and taxes, the money being paid in subscriptions to institutions. If we are going to force him, in addition to this burden, to contribute towards the upkeep of the hospital, why do not the Government go "the whole hog" and say that the people on the Eastern Goldfields, the Mines Trust, for instance, who get their water about 50 per cent. under the cost price, should pay adequately for the water they are receiving. While on the one hand we talk of saving £18,000 out of the hospital grant, on the other hand we are giving to the big mines at Kalgoorlie £50,000 or £60,000 a year. It seems ludicrous, therefore, that we should be asking chiefly the working people of this State to save the Treasury this sum of £18,000. My chief objection is that it appears to me that the department have proved even to themselves that they cannot successfully manage the scheme and that, therefore, they want to put it on the shoulders of someone else, and do not care whether or not the health of the people is safeguarded. By the scheme certain people of the State are relieved of their obligation to contribute towards the hospitals, while an extra tax is placed on the few people who are charitably inclined. From my own experience I know that miners have great calls made upon them to help those who are sick, and they pay away pounds and pounds a year in order that some of their fellow men may live. This duty should fall on the Government, and through them, indirectly, on some of the employers in the person of mine owners. The continual comparisons made as to the cost of the hospitals here and in the Eastern States prove nothing, and, if the matter were looked into very closely, I am sure it would be found that the institutions in the Eastern States cost just as much as those here. Dr. Hope, who is in charge of the department, and who has recently been travelling through the various districts trying to establish the new system, has stated constantly that there are certain individuals treated in the Government

hospitals who could well afford to pay but refuse to do so. This may be so but, after all, it is only a matter of collecting the money, and the Government should well be able to institute some good system of collection, whereby all those people who are treated at the hospitals and can afford to pay should be compelled to do so. The Government should be able to do this work better than a board. Those who make such a statement as that to which I have referred seem to be viewing the question only from the metropolitan standpoint. If we are to do as the Government propose, and prevent those who are able to pay from receiving treatment in the hospitals, many persons will be unable to get any medical treatment and hospital accommodation. For instance, at Cue, there is no proper hospital. Whoever becomes ill there and requires hospital accommodation must go to the public hospital, for there is nowhere else for him. The question of whether he is going to pay for his attendance or not is altogether beside the issue. Such a man, if he can afford to pay, can easily be made to do so.

The Minister for Works: The sums such people should pay amount to a very large figure each year.

Mr. HEITMANN: Many other things cost a large amount of money, and in the present case the sum could be easily collected.

The Minister for Works: Do you claim that the individual should not pay medical fees?

Mr. HEITMANN: I consider that he should.

The Minister for Works: Your argument is that he should not.

Mr. HEITMANN: The arguments of the Principal Medical Officer have no effect upon the collection of the fees. Local management should be disconnected from the financial scheme altogether. While not denying that local management is going to economise, I see no reason why the local people should be asked to go round hat in hand collecting funds for the hospital. The argument is used that without financial responsibility the proper local men will not be obtained to

manage the institutions, but surely that argument cannot apply. We have men managing concerns as important as a health body, for there are the municipal councils, water boards and roads boards, and in many places these institutions are managed admirably. The same good local management could be applied to the hospitals without the people being taxed to an undue extent. The money for the hospitals should come from the coffers of the State, for by that means every man will know what he is paying, and those who are not charitably inclined will have to contribute indirectly just as much as those who are ever ready to assist in ameliorating the condition of the sick and indigent. Coming to a matter which applies particularly to my own district, I would refer to the Cue public hospital, in order to show how the department are ready to grasp every opportunity of shirking responsibility. Only a little while ago there was an agitation in Cue about the state of the hospital, and, at my request, various municipal bodies and members of roads boards made an inspection of the hospital, and were absolutely unanimous in condemning the building, saying that it was altogether unfitted for the purpose for which it was used. In reply to a request that a new hospital should be built there, the department made a proposal that the local bodies, who had already condemned the building, should take over the management of the hospital in its then state. They said that the sum of £60 would put the building in order. It was well known to the department at that time that the building was falling to pieces, that it was most unsuitable from every standpoint, and that it was only a matter of time when a new hospital must be built. The Government should build a new institution there at once. Another matter in connection with the Health Department to which I would refer is as to the general health of the population, and particularly in regard to school children and the dreaded disease known as miner's phthisis. I am not making this charge against this particular Government, but governments generally have failed absolutely to recognise their responsibility in

this direction. It seems to me their argument is that if they can avoid spending a few pounds, they should do so by cutting the health vote down as low as possible. I view the question from both the humane and economic standpoint. I do not wish it thought that this is a party question, but I consider that it is one that needs full and lengthy discussion, not only by this Chamber but by every responsible body and interested person in the State. If one looks into the correspondence on this matter, he will realise that in a very few years the cost of the treatment of consumptives in this State—and the remark applies equally to other parts of Australia—will mean more than the present cost of wiping out the whole trouble. What are we doing in this connection? What are the Government and the people doing? Times out of number has the matter been brought forward, and it has been pointed out that men are continually forced to sacrifice their lives not only by mere accident in the mines—for that is sometimes a very easy death compared with the one to which I have referred—but also by the ravages of this terrible disease known as miner's phthisis. It is dreadful, on looking up the records, to find how many people in Australia are suffering from this disease. Only recently an article appeared in two magazines in Australia giving the figures, which are perfectly appalling. At the time when plagues such as small-pox or bubonic were discovered in the State, the Government did not think twice about spending enormous sums of money to stamp them out. There were scares from one end of the country to the other, but the complaint to which I refer is insidious, and is generally increasing in extent. It is not sudden like the plagues, but it is a hundred times worse than any plague we have ever had in this State. While this disease is making headway in such an appalling manner, the Health Departments in this and the other States are prepared to cut down their expenses instead of launching out in an endeavour to grapple with the question. We find the department in Perth issuing pamphlets giving advice as to the

treatment of the disease, but there they stop. There are hundreds, and I venture to say thousands, in the State walking about now spreading millions of germs of this disease. No precautions are taken to prevent the nuisance of spitting in the streets, in trams, and public buildings, although the municipal by-laws provide against such an offence. The harm is done, and no one seems to care whether the disease spreads or not. The Government should deal firmly with this question, and make the Health Department recognise that it is better for the people from an economic, as well as from a humane standpoint, that they should grapple with this question instead of making continual and feeble efforts to patch it up. There are now men on the fields standing at the doors of the hospitals begging for admission, only to be met with a refusal. This is not generally known, but it goes on, notwithstanding the fact that we term ourselves humane people. We say we are doing our best for the country, but yet there are these men suffering from the disease, and also suffering greatly mentally owing to the knowledge that should they not recover from it, their wives and families will be dependent upon outsiders for support. These unfortunate men stand at the door of the public hospitals and are refused admission, and are told that the Government of the State are not prepared to spend any more money on the health of the people. What is to become, I ask, of a country so neglectful of the welfare of our people as this? I wrote to the department recently with regard to this matter and not only did I find that there were people suffering from lung trouble waiting to enter the sanatorium at Coolgardie, but I found that there were cases of phthisis in the Perth hospital waiting month in and month out to go to the sanatorium, and at the same time they were among the other patients, both surgical and medical, spreading the disease there. It is simply a scandal, an absolute scandal that we should be so neglectful of the health of our people. It is all very well to go on from day to day and say that things will come all right with the general progress made in sanitary ar-

rangements and that general hygienic instruction is going to remedy affairs. In my opinion, however, it is going to take more than that. It will have to be a drastic action on the part of the Government and the people to stamp out the evil. The remedy must come from the people themselves, and it is no use issuing pamphlets of instruction unless we are prepared to force the people to carry out those instructions. It is the duty of the Government to educate the people and to expend even millions of pounds when they will cure themselves of the disease and stamp it out. This disease is common to the mining community: there are hundreds on the goldfields to-day who are suffering from this complaint. It was only a little while ago that I called on the Premier and asked him to provide for a special inquiry in connection with this matter at Day Dawn. I must thank the Premier for the prompt manner in which he dealt with my request. The inquiry was made; it was only a start, but I am in hopes that sooner or later something more will be done. The inquiry has disclosed a startling state of affairs. I would like to tell the country and the members of this Chamber that at the present time I could give the names of 50 men who a few years ago were strong and able-bodied, and who to-day are either dead or are in various stages of this disease. At Day Dawn there is something radically wrong. As pointed out by the medical officer when he made an inspection, there was a large increase in the number of cases. This matter is not only going to affect us from a humane standpoint, but it will spread among families, and will have a serious effect on future generations. From an economical standpoint I think this Government should grapple with the question and try and find out some remedy for the evil. I am satisfied with the course adopted by most members in this House and recognised by most people; that is the policy being followed of settling people on the land. I am satisfied it is going to do some good in the direction of relieving some of these unfortunates, and if I could, I would have no hesitation in closing up the mines in Western Australia and putting the men engaged in them on the land.

Although it may seem an extraordinary statement to make, I am satisfied the day will come and it is not many years distant, not a hundred years at all events, when gold mining will be absolutely prohibited. I am satisfied that the general trend of public opinion is in the direction of giving better conditions to all classes of workers. At the present time it is easily noticeable that a vast improvement has been made in the condition of the workers in factories. There we find men working in the bright daylight and even a certain amount of space is provided for each worker; yet the unfortunate individuals who are forced to go into the mines and work only to get their daily bread have not even that provision made for them. We have, it is true, mines regulations which provide that a certain amount of air shall be passed through the various workings, but I am satisfied that this is only a regulation, and that is about the end of it. The condition that I would give to the miners would be such that would close every mine in Western Australia. I recognise fully that gold mining is much worse than the mining for baser metals or coal. In a coal mine the natural formation of the lodes lends itself to good ventilation. In some copper mines it is not too good. In iron mines good ventilation prevails, but it seems to me that some time or other a natural condition will prevail, and it will be that public opinion will force mine owners to provide good ventilation and such conditions to the men engaged in the industry, the cost of providing which will be so great that it must end in the closing up of the mines. I have often been asked when advocating this view "what conditions do you want?" I want these conditions: I want it possible for a miner to earn his living and to go through his life's work without sacrificing one day in order that he may live. I would just like to say a word further in connection with the hospital question, that is, in connection with the Perth Public Hospital. There was a time when I thought that if we were to get some of our fighting men, men who had fought for the workers, upon the board of manage-

ment, that some alteration would be made. I find, however, in this morning's paper that certain economies are contemplated in the Perth Public Hospital, and I notice among others that in the future probationers in that hospital are not to be allowed sick leave unless it is by permission of the board. This may be all very well. They go further and say, that loss of time through sickness on the part of a probationer in training shall be made up. This might be well too. If the standard of training is taken at three years there cannot be much wrong; but if the members of that board would only inquire they would find that 50 per cent. of the probationers fall sick on account of the long hours and the hard work they have to perform. It is well known, and inquiries will prove what I say to be true, that it is simply extraordinary the number of nurses, particularly those in their first year, who go down through sickness brought about by the long hours, the hard work and coming into contact with various diseases which they often catch. I did hope that when that good old friend, Mr. Taylor, got on the board of management that the staff, generally, would have at least one champion, but I find now that matters are going along in just the same way, and the conditions under which the nurses work are just the same as they were formerly. Our old fighter has fallen in with the members of the board, and is not prepared to put forth some of that fighting power that he showed years gone by in the back blocks of Queensland.

Mr. Taylor: You are speaking without your book.

Mr. HEITMANN: I may be speaking without my book in this direction. It was mooted a year or two ago that the nurses of the public hospitals of this State should be worked on the 8 hours system, and I am perfectly satisfied from correspondence I have from New Zealand, and from my own observations that the 8 hours system could be worked in the hospitals. We were told that this would cost more, but supposing it did cost more, surely these nurses sacrifice sufficient to warrant that extra expenditure. They work for 10

and 12 hours a day, for a miserably low salary. Of course for what they receive they should be prepared to make sacrifices. For the first twelve months they receive £12, and at the end of their three years they are paid £30 a year. I certainly think that the motion which was moved in this House some five years ago by Dr. Ellis should be reintroduced and carried. I am convinced that the shorter hours could be worked and that it is only a matter of finance which prevents it. I believe at the present time that the Children's Hospital staff are working on the 8 hours system, but whether it is a success or not, I cannot tell. In the matter of the Perth Public Hospital, as I stated recently, it is foolish to spend large sums on that building, and it is also foolish on the part of the Government to make grants for the building of extra hospitals. If I had my way the Children's Hospital in Perth would never have been built. It is only an extra call upon the community, and will become a burden sooner or later upon the Treasury of the State. While we find that this new hospital has been built in Perth, we read also that the Perth hospital is able to close up certain of its wards. I ask any man of business is it not more economical to work one concern instead of dividing it into two, and providing two secretaries, two matrons, and two staffs to look after what should be attended to by the Perth Public Hospital? I regret that those charitably inclined people were foolish enough to put money into a building of this kind. It is bound to fall back upon the Government in the end. I am quite satisfied of that. I consider that the health of the people should be the Government's first consideration; that the Government should always provide the best advice, and the best medical attention for the most humble and the poorest in the land. I know of a case where, had the patient been able to afford proper treatment he would have been alive and well to-day. Without being personal I should like to draw attention to the time some three years ago when we were expecting to learn of the death of the present Attorney General from day to day, and I know at that par-

ticular time another friend of mine suffering from a similar trouble—lung trouble. I believe the hon. member had—died, simply because those belonging to her could not pay for proper advice and attention. This is to me scandalous, and every day the same thing can be seen. It is of no use closing our eyes to its going on in the City, and particularly on the goldfields where you will find hundreds of afflicted miners living upon the charity of their fellow men. It is not right. Many of them could be cured; of that I am positive. It has been proved beyond all doubt that if taken in the early stages the disease is curable. Many of the old theories in connection with phthisis have been exploded and it has been proved that with proper treatment and taken at the proper time a large percentage of cases can be cured. In this regard the only institution we have in this State dealing directly with the question is the sanatorium in Coolgardie, and I am surprised to find that we have not from that institution any special report, or literature of any sort. I think the Government should see that there is no man in this State wanting for medical advice, wanting for hospital attention, simply because he has not the money to provide it for himself. I hope the time will come when the Government will recognise that their first duty is in respect of the health of the people, and that by contributing to their health the Government will be contributing to their contentment and happiness. I wish to deal briefly with the burning question of the time, one which is exciting a good deal of attention and one which is of the utmost importance, namely the civil service of our State. It is strange to note—and this complaint is not peculiar to the present Government but would appear to be general to all the Australian Governments—that as soon as it is found that the purse strings are tightening and the money is getting short the first thing they do is to try

to cut down the wages or extend the hours or in other ways ask the Government servants to pay the piper and make up the deficit. Now in my opinion the Government who think they are going to solve the financial question simply by dealing with the public servants, either do not appreciate the question or are afraid to grapple with the real solution, namely, the readjustment of our taxation measures. In this State, with the other States of Australia, we have a discontented service; and it is worthy of remark that during the last two years the Labour party, so heartily reprobated by certain sections of the service, have been fighting for one department or another, endeavouring to effect an improvement of their conditions or at least to retain the conditions at what they are. Last session, we on this side of the House were fighting for the Police Department and the Railway Department, and now it seems to me that the time has arrived for this side of the House to show the country that we are in sympathy with the civil servants and that we do not hold the opinion—

Mr. Taylor: The elections are too far off.

Mr. HEITMANN: I am happy to say that never yet in the course of my political career have I mentioned any matter with the view of securing a vote. I have never put forward anything with the hope of earning political kudos. In the matter of the civil servants I hold the view that the present action of the Government is absolutely unjust and unfair to the individuals concerned. Why should it be that the moment we find ourselves short of money we turn to the civil service and say, "We must reduce your wage or at least lengthen your hours."? I have often heard it said that the civil servants are a special class apart, that they are working for the Government and are being paid out of the Treasury and that in consequence their wages must be cut down in times of financial stringency. But what right have the Government to ask the civil servants to make a sacrifice beyond those being made by other members of the community? And while the

principle is bad its application by the Government is even worse. The Government do not ask each civil servant to make the same sacrifice. We see them prepared to cut down the wages of the lower paid men and leave intact the wages of the higher grade. This cannot be denied. I am not surprised that there is discontent in the public service, that among the school teachers there is a feeling of dissatisfaction, a sense that they have not been treated fairly by the Government. Under the terms of the Act the public servants are classified by the Public Service Commissioner, and I know of case after case where the maximum salary having been fixed by the Commissioner the increase necessary to bring the salary up to that maximum has been refused by the Government, even after its recommendation by the Public Service Commissioner. I am not at all surprised that the civil servant comes in for a good deal of criticism by the general public. There is no room in the Government employment for really good men. The good man is either driven out of the service or his ambition is killed. His ability is not recognised. In this State there are placed over him men, a good many of whom are not qualified for the position, are not prepared to see his ability come to light. They prefer that there should be no possibility of his rising to the position of a superior officer. During recent journeyings through the State, I was surprised to find that men of the professional staff are receiving totally inadequate salaries. There are men on the engineering staff, in charge of works costing anything up to £120,000 or £130,000; men who are left in full charge most of the time, and who, after 12 years' service, are to-day receiving £180 a year. The head of the department who simply sits down and lets things go as they like, and depends upon the subordinates to do the work, gets considerably more; but I am sorry to say that the engineering staff of this State are the most mercilessly sweated body of men of my acquaintance, and the Government, in refusing to recognise their just claims are themselves a gang

of sweaters from start to finish. We talk about the conditions in outside employment: why they constitute a paradise as compared with the conditions of the civil servants in Western Australia. It is no wonder that they are not prepared to put their best efforts forward. We find trained men who have been in the service for many years getting £130 per annum. This is not one case; there are half-a-dozen at least on the engineering staff alone—men who have been classified at £60 and £70 above their present salary, but whose claims have been refused by the Government even after they have been recommended by the Public Service Commissioner. In connection with the scheme of the Minister for Lands for settling civil servants on the land, I am perfectly satisfied that if he does get a hundred to go it will be found that they constitute the best men in the service, the men who have sufficient enterprise and ambition to leave the departments. Instead of inducing such men to remain in the service by paying them decent salaries, we are sending them out of the service while we retain the drones. Again, under the general scheme of economy, I would like to say that this Government can get just about as low as possible in points of sweating. Only recently the Colonial Secretary's Department—and I am sincerely sorry the Minister does not belong to this Chamber, for I find that the charge applies chiefly to his department—made engagements in England to bring out a certain number of certificated nurses. They were paid in England on two years' engagement, and instead of receiving the £70 which rightly belongs to the position they were cut down by £10. I say again that sweating is rampant right through the departments. If the same conditions prevailed outside the departments it would lead very soon to a state of lawlessness, for it would be impossible to prevent the people from getting what was their right. We expect the civil servants to be loyal, yet we sweat them down until, as Mr. North said, "the worm will turn;" and I am exceedingly pleased that the worm has at last decided to turn. They

have been working under conditions that would make any worm turn. It must not be thought that by allowing the civil servants their proper salaries the Government would be adding to the administrative expenses, for I am satisfied that by paying a man his proper salary and giving him to understand that his best efforts were expected, the expenses of the departments could be cut down materially. It is now rumoured that the Government intend to again put an impost on the school teachers of this State. If that be so the Government will, I fancy, find that the teachers, although they accepted it last year, are not ready again to submit to this iniquitous system of taxation. As I say, the principle of taxing a civil servant in an especial manner is bad, but its application, as we have had it from the Government, is absolutely unjust.

The Minister for Works: What would you have done?

Mr. HEITMANN: I would have faced the situation and would not have done as you did in taxing them. However, this is the equity which we expect from you and which we receive.

The Minister for Works: We did not take anything off; you are wrong.

Mr. HEITMANN: It is a splitting of straws which the ex-Treasurer has adopted in dealing with this question. A school teacher enters the service and finds that the salaries which he is to receive from year to year are laid down. When the ex-Treasurer said he did not take anything from them he means that he simply disallowed the increments they were led to believe they would get. If there is any difference I cannot see it. Looking at it from the standpoint of the State itself, I am inclined to think the last department we should touch is the Education Department. I am in agreement with an Australian writer whose real name I do not know, but who usually writes under the pen-name of "Jimmy Pannican." In an article in one of the Sydney papers he recently stated something to this effect: "Pay your low wages, get your incompetent men and place them anywhere you like—in the army, in the church, in the Government

—but for the sake of humanity keep them out of the Education Department." I am inclined to agree with him; because it is to the education of the children of this State we look for the progress of the State. I have just a few words to say on the Lands Department and the land settlement policy. I agree with the Minister for Lands in his desire, so often expressed, to settle people on the land; I agree that every facility should be given to the people to settle on the land; but I am perfectly satisfied that at the present time, with all the reforms introduced by the Minister, it is almost as easy to find diamonds in Western Australia as to get a decent bit of land. If we were sincere in our desire to place people on the land we would pay more attention to the wants of our own people, and less attention to bringing out immigrants from England, because we could find thousands in this State prepared to go on the land. I could mention cases brought under my notice by the individuals themselves of persons desirous of going on the land, who have come to Perth and been unsuccessful. In one case, one man went three times and applied for land only to be defeated by the lands board, and generally speaking that man's desire to become a bloated landowner was driven out of him. This is only one instance of scores of cases, or hundreds I may say. While we give so much attention and so many facilities to the stranger coming to our shores, I think it is only due, especially to those miners on the goldfields who desire to get away from the evil effects of gold mining, to give our own people every facility to get on the land. If the Government could set aside 20,000, 30,000 or 40,000 acres of decent land I could guarantee to settle the area with a hundred men before Christmas. It is almost as easy to get diamonds as land it seems to me. But it is very easy for some people to get land. Some people can get the best parts of the State for farming, while other intending farmers are not allowed to get any land at all. It was only recently I was discussing the question coming up in the train along the Great Southern railway. We were discussing the question of the new policy of the Government, but it

was simply astounding to the observer to find along this line miles and miles of good country with not a bit of improvement effected beyond fencing; and I think it is time the Premier carried out that threat he made in his last speech at Bunbury, that he was going to do something to force the landowner who was not using his land to bring it into use.

Mr. Gill: The Premier said something should be done.

Mr. HEITMANN: The Premier threatened them. There is land in this State close to the various railways well worthy of being utilised, but no attempt is made by the owners or by the Government to have it used. One has only to go along the Great Southern railway to see some good country which could be profitably used if we could give men the opportunity of doing so. Now in respect to selection of land and the work of the Lands Department, while I do not say there is corruption in connection with it, I say the actions of that department are such as would lead one to believe there is some corruption among some of the officers. Recently a gentleman in Cue applied for some land. He was informed by the clerk in charge that he knew it was vacant, but on the map he received, which was dated that month, it was shown as being occupied. The gentleman asked the clerk to inquire. This the clerk did, but nothing was heard for about five weeks, when suddenly there walked into the Cue office a man who had previously held the land. He had with him an application for the block. This application was fully written out with all the information on it required, and was complete with the exception of the signature. I want to know what authority an officer of the Lands Department had to send that application, which was information, to a landowner in the locality, from whom he had not received any application for information. To me it seems that this officer has been in the habit of receiving something for giving information. Another man wanted the land, but the information was sent to some big landowner, and not only was the information sent, but also an application form filled in and just ready for

signature. I have asked the Minister for an explanation as to this, and to date I have not received any explanation. I want to know if it is the custom of the Lands Department to do this kind of thing. Here is a genuine case, and I am satisfied, as far as the Lands Department is concerned, the man who applied for the land and wanted the land would not have got it had he not someone to appear for him at court.

The Minister for Lands: He got it.

Mr. HEITMANN: Yes; but he had someone to appear for him.

The Minister for Lands: Who appeared for him?

Mr. HEITMANN: I did. He had one appearing for him who was prepared to expose these things in the Lands Department, and the Minister must know that there is a man in the department who either does not know his business, or is absolutely dishonest.

The Minister for Lands: It is not fair to say that.

Mr. HEITMANN: Not fair? A gentleman by the name of McInerney applied for the land, or sent down inquiries for it from the office in Cue. Presently an application was sent to a gentleman named Meehan. Of course the department will say that it was a mistake. It must have been a mistake considering that Mr. Meehan had not even inquired about the land. As a matter of fact, when he got the application form he came to the office in Cue and asked what it meant, and as soon as he knew that Mr. McInerney was applying Mr. Meehan said that the land was no good to him because it was cut off from his holding by the rabbit-proof fence.

The Minister for Lands: Mr. McInerney got the land.

Mr. HEITMANN: He would not have got it had he not had a member of Parliament to inquire about it for him. I am perfectly satisfied that the strings were pulled somehow, and that Mr. McInerney would not have got the land otherwise. I have written to the Minister about the

matter, and I think it is up to him to ask the officer concerned what authority he had for sending out that information. I certainly think it is the Minister's duty to do so. There is another matter in connection with the Lands Department. It has been mentioned previously, and I think it cannot be mentioned too often to show the methods of the Lands Department in cutting-up land. I have written to the department about this although it is not in my electorate, and as it was my duty towards the member representing the Wellington district I also wrote to the hon. member. I took the matter up simply at the request of the settlers. I did not want to take any work out of the hon. member's hands, it would not be fair if I did, but I told the settlers that I was prepared to assist the hon. member in getting some of their grievances fixed up. I am referring to the Stirling Estate, and the settlers have had about five years of it. When I first mentioned the matter I was ridiculed. The department and also the member for the district said that the land was all right, and that the settlers were doing all right, and were prospering. Here we are bringing men out from England with £10 capital, but some of the people on the Stirling Estate have spent up to £300, and are not making a living yet. One case that came under my notice was that of a man who held about 160 acres. He held nine blocks in all, but there were only two of them adjoining. The price charged for the blocks was decidedly beyond the value of the land. As much as £12 14s. per acre is being charged for some of these blocks, and I think it is high time the board that has been appointed went down to the district and found out what is wrong with that estate. It is admitted by the Minister there is something wrong, and it is due to the settlers who are working hard and trying to make ends meet that something should be done. Now, just a few words in connection with the Mines Department. There is a proposition now, I believe, from the Minister for Mines to alter his policy in connection with the State battery charges. While there may be some justification for that, I think the

same applies here as in connection with the Health Department, that with proper supervision from the heads, with better work performed by the engineers, it would be unnecessary to alter the charges. I am not in favour of unduly fostering the mining industry. I am not in favour, for instance, of crushing continually year in and year out for a price that will not pay the department, or at least will not pay the crushing. In my opinion it is no good to the industry, and if an industry cannot pay the charges when the administration and general costs are brought down to a minimum, then the industry, in my opinion, is no good. But I am satisfied that if the Mines Department were to supervise properly, and were to bring businesslike methods to bear, and did not waste the money as in many cases is now done, it could crush at the present minimum charge and not lose money. Again, I am not in favour of asking men with a good show to pay for the crushing for the men with the poorer show. I believe that a figure should be struck at the lowest possible cost to the department, and then the same charge should be made for one and all, the rich as well as the poor show. We should charge the prospector for what labour we do for him, but I am satisfied first of all different methods will have to be applied to the engineering portion of this department. We know that thousands of pounds are being wasted continually in connection with the State batteries. I intended to have a little more to say upon the State batteries, but there will be any amount of opportunity on the Estimates. I brought forward the matter of health simply because I think it is worthy of all the prominence that can be given to it, and worthy of all the time that can be given to it by members of this Chamber, and that it is our duty as members representing the people of this State to force the Government to recognise that their first duty to the country in general is the health and happiness of the people.

Mr. CARSON (Geraldton) : I think we are all agreed that the Address-in-Reply serves a very useful purpose in giving every member an opportunity of

approving or disapproving of the policy and the administration of the Government; but at the same time I think that if after the mover and seconder of the Address-in-Reply spoke, the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Government also spoke, it would save time very much and give us greater opportunity for dealing with the Bills and other business concerning the country. I think that if we were to use the time when dealing with the Budget to discuss these things it would serve the same purpose, because then we have the opportunity of dealing with all the various departments and those matters that affect the welfare of the State, and it would save a great deal of repetition. Undoubtedly at the present time the great need is the adjustment of our financial position, and also the carrying on of the present developmental policy the Government have instituted. How we are going to adjust the finances I fail to see, unless some further taxation is imposed. I hope it will be possible to achieve the desired end without further taxation, because, at the present time, there is a good deal of depression in the State. People, however, are now more hopeful, and, I believe, they have every reason to be hopeful, because of the very prosperous season in front of us. When the harvest has been gathered in I feel sure things will be very much better than they are now. The Government should exercise great care in dealing with our public service, and I speak now more particularly in regard to officers of the Railway Department and the school teachers. In the former case there are young men who are being taught the duties they have to perform; the railways are growing apace, and it is necessary to retain those men whom we now find doing such useful work for the department. If these men do not receive sufficient remuneration for the work they are doing they will be leaving us, and the Government will find a difficulty in securing other suitable men, and will probably have to import them from the Eastern States and pay much higher wages than those now in the service are receiving.

At the present time there is a scarcity of school teachers and, therefore, it is wise that care should be exercised in dealing with them. This scarcity exists not only in this but also in most of the other States, and we should give those Government officials every consideration. What we need is to obtain the very best teachers, and to do this we should pay the highest salaries we can. Last year I, with other members, took exception to the Government denying the teachers their increments. Reverting to the Railway Department, I know of a young man who has been in the department for over nine years, and now he does not receive a salary of more than £120 a year. It is not to be expected that this man will stay in the department, especially in a growing country like this, where opportunities to succeed are so great. Unless care is taken we shall not be able to retain these men in the service. They should be given at least what they are entitled to receive. With regard to other branches of the civil service which come under Mr. Commissioner Jull, I recognise there is a good deal of discontent there. I appreciate highly the attitude taken up by the Minister for Lands in his endeavour to get some of the civil servants to go on the land instead of being thrown on the community or seeking for employment elsewhere. The scheme the Minister has outlined is an excellent thing for the civil servants, and, I am sure, will prove of great benefit to the country. As to the suggestion that the hospitals should be handed over to local control, I feel sure that under the proposed subsidies the local people will not be able to carry on the institutions satisfactorily. This remark applies more particularly to settlers in districts such as that I represent. At Geraldton patients are received from as far as Yalgoo in the one direction and Mingenew in the other. Before the goldfields hospitals can be carried on there must be some form of taxation on the part of the local bodies, or else they will be unable to raise the necessary funds. I believe in local control. It is impossible to depend upon the donations of charitable persons for carrying on

these institutions, and it would be very much better to make a general tax. I am in accord with the Government railway policy, for in a huge country like this, a country with such wonderful natural resources, it is impossible to develop and settle it without railway communication to the various centres. I recognise the Government have done good work in this direction, and in speaking on the subject I wish particularly to refer to the linking up of the Lawlers district with the present railway system. The Premier announced in his pre-session speech that he intended to give railway facilities to the Lawlers district. He has not yet made a definite announcement as to the route the line will follow, and in that he is wise. Personally, I think the connection should be made from Sandstone. The Government have repeatedly, and rightly, assured the different centres that every port should have its rightful trade, and seeing that the Sandstone route is 200 miles nearer than the other route, surely it is clear that the connection should be made from that end. The consumers on the field to be connected would be greatly penalised if the construction were carried out at the Leonora end. Another argument in favour of the lines being linked up from Sandstone is that the Victoria district at the present time has no outlet for its produce. Some time ago a deputation waited on the Minister with regard to the wharfage rates at Fremantle, and reference was made to the large overseas markets existing. There is no doubt that those markets do exist, but they are not needed until the local demand for products such as chaff, fruit, vegetables, etcetera, is supplied. The people of the Lawlers and Wiluna districts now need, and will need to a still greater extent in the future, such supplies, and if the opportunity is given by the construction of the railway from Sandstone to Lawlers, these supplies can be provided direct from the Victoria district. The wharfage rates are imposed more particularly in the interests of the producers at this end of the State. When the Premier has listened to a deputation which

will wait on him shortly, I am sure he will not be able to do otherwise than give a decision in the direction of having the line constructed from Sandstone. We recognise that Lawlers needs railway communication. At the present time the Government have a plant there, and it would be a considerable saving to the State if they went on with the construction of the line while that plant is there. I have risen to speak in this debate chiefly with the desire of referring to the construction of the Lawlers railway, for this work is of vital importance to the people of our district. Endeavours are now being made to put people on the land. There is a vast area of good cereal land in the Victoria district which the Government are now opening up, and it is a just claim that the district should have the advantage of the line being connected from Sandstone.

Mr. Taylor: You have no chance.

Mr. CARSON: We have no desire to oppose the construction of a line from Leonora to Lawlers if it is wanted, but it would be a much better paying proposition if a line were connected right through from Sandstone.

Mr. Taylor: It will go from your end afterwards.

Mr. CARSON: If we receive our just dues the line will go from Sandstone now. I am very glad that the Government are introducing a Bill dealing with the liquor laws, and I am sure they will give ample opportunity to members to discuss the question thoroughly. I am equally sure that the measure will be a liberal one. I am also in favour of a reduction of the franchise for the Legislative Council, as it is in the interests of the State that the franchise should be widened. I also commend the attitude of the Minister in liberalising the Agricultural Bank Act. That institution has been of very great service to the State and, I believe, by further liberalising it, and by giving the settler more money, we will bring about a greater development of our agricultural areas, and much good will necessarily result. Greater success would be achieved in the administration of the various departments if the members of the Government gave more attention to detail. As a case in

point, I know that in forwarding goods to the fields the Mines Department have on occasions sent eight different consignments of very small articles. The adoption of this course has necessitated an increased charge in railway carriage and, in all probability, extra forwarding charges. There is also the case of an officer of the Lands Department who is sent from Geraldton to Wannamal to inspect a piece of land, and in order to do so he has to spend two or three days in travel, whereas the same work could easily have been done from the City in one day. I hope the Government will give every consideration to the important question of the construction of a railway to Lawlers.

(Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.)

Mr. O'LOGHLEN (Forrest): I have no desire to take up too much time on the Address-in-Reply, but as this is the first Address-in-Reply that I have had an opportunity of speaking on in this Chamber. I am going to avail myself of that opportunity to make a few remarks with regard to affairs in my electorate, and bring under the notice of Ministers a few little grievances, and deal generally with some matters in the Government policy. Judging by the dilatory manner in which some members rise to speak on this question, it appears to me that the Address-in-Reply is getting a little unpopular, and like a good many old customs will soon be a thing of the past. I certainly think it provides a favourable opportunity for many members to deal with grievances, and it gives members of the Opposition the only chance they have of dealing with these questions. In the Premier's pre-session speech he rightly dealt at considerable length with the position of the timber industry which I represent to a large extent in this Chamber. I am pleased indeed to notice with him, and I think every member in this Chamber is gratified too, that the industry is enjoying a period of prosperity at the present time. We find from figures that the export trade has grown to considerable dimensions, to such an extent in fact that very shortly we will

have to seriously take into consideration whether it will be a good policy for the State to go any further. Dealing with the position of the timber industry today, I certainly think that some classification should be made, some more accurate estimate of the extent of the timber resources, so that the position should not be as misleading as it is at present. We have it set down that we have an enormous area of timber awaiting enterprise to bring it into a state of productiveness. It is well-known that our resources are becoming depleted, and I think it will be one of the best things possible if we were to have a classification showing exactly the areas of karri and jarrah which are still available. The timber leases and licenses, in existence at the present time amount to 752,000 acres, and the saw-milling permits cover 119,803 acres. I have no protest to make against the granting of saw-milling permits or the system. Certainly it is a vast improvement on the old system of giving away hundreds of thousands of acres at a pepper-corn rental to large companies, but I very much regret to state that since the sawmilling permit system has come into force, advantage has been taken of it to get large slices of country. I refer to one particular company, namely, Bartram & Sons who obtained a concession in the Nannup district. The inducements held out were largely that this particular company were going to make a bid for the butter trade in that locality. It has been pointed out since they got firmly established there that the butter industry is going to draw people to that district and will be the greatest boon for Western Australia. The facts are, however, that on that particular area, at the present time, the management have a couple of bullock teams, certainly not much in the way of cattle, and they are afraid to allow these bullock teams to stray out of the yards towards the creeks for fear that they will get at the poison. The Treasurer will agree with me that so far as the butter trade being developed is concerned, it is going to be a thing of the distant future. I do not look for a return from that particular industry in that dis-

trict, and I think it was wrong to give such a large area of country as 100,000 acres to these people.

The Minister for Works: Will it not be suitable for the butter industry?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Not while there is such a large amount of poison here.

The Minister for Works: But they can get rid of the poison.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The Treasurer, if he attempts to eradicate the poison there, will take on as Herculean a task as he ever took on in his life.

The Premier: Would not 1,000 acres that other people get in the flora and fauna district be equal to 3,000 acres down there?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I will not say that there would be so much difference, but I will admit that the flora and fauna country contains the best timber land we have in the State. That, however, does not get away from the fact that we are giving away large areas of country.

The Premier: You made strong representations for the granting of a permit.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I might be allowed to explain that I certainly did support a proposal made by the Collie co-operative hewers.

The Premier: You got me into trouble over that.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The Premier was able to get out of the trouble. I need only say that there is no analogy at all between those two cases. In one case we have a company which has secured from the Crown the right to cut in the Jarrah-wood district, while the other is the case of a body of workers who have demonstrated their ability to make the industry pay, and generally benefit the southwestern part of the district. These were men who wanted more country to operate on. I believe a good case can always be made out for these men, and I am prepared to make it out if any opposition is brought forward to the granting of that area to these timber cutters. I believe we should do something more towards the conservation of our forests. We should, with advantage to the State spend a few hundred pounds in trying to win back some of the area which has

been cut out in the Waroona district, and which has reverted to the Crown. We would have to burn off as much as possible of the dry timber on this land so as to give every chance to the young trees to recover. It is a problem that will have to be faced in the near future. As far as the timber supplies of Australia are concerned they are limited, and if we look abroad—I have a report here from America which states—

“Within 10 or 15 years according to Mr. J. H. Finney, Secretary and Treasurer of the Appalachian Forestry Association, United States, there will not be a stick of timber standing east of the Rockies, and within 50 years the entire country will be as barren of timber as the American desert unless something is done to avert the disaster.”

We do not need to go to America to find out the way in which the timber resources are being depleted. We only need to look at the position in the Eastern States. Victoria has closed down on the exportation of hardwoods; in New South Wales a Royal Commission, which sat not long ago, recommended the stoppage of export. When we consider in South Australia they are spending a huge sum of money every year in order to grow their timber, or lay down forests in the middle and in the extreme north of the State, I believe it is the duty of this Government, before it is too late, to pay attention to the conservation of our forests, and try and reserve as much of the new forests for our own future supplies, and do something in the forest lands which have reverted to the Crown. I trust the Government will see that not another acre is given out, and that the country will be reserved for our own requirements. While on this subject I hope the Government will seriously consider the advisableness of extending the Marradong railway. I have no desire, like the last speaker, to come here and ask for a particular railway, but the Government having in this locality carried the railway a certain distance, I think they should extend it a few miles further and tap some fine timber country, and make the line a paying concern. We have to look to the records

of the working timber railways to find that they have been the most profitable. The Donnybrook-Preston railway, which by no stretch of imagination could be called an agricultural line, had to depend on the freight on timber, and if it had not been for the fact that 300 or 400 timber cutters went into that district, it would never have shown a profit. The same thing may be said in connection with the line to Nannup. I venture to say that this line will be utilised to a very small extent indeed as far as agriculture is concerned. Ten train loads a year will take all the agricultural produce that is being raised there at the present time. It certainly has this redeeming feature, that the timber resources are very great in that particular district, and the freight from timber to Busselton will be sufficient to carry the line on for three or four years. Let us hope that as soon as the timber trade begins to wane agriculture will come to the front in that particular district and help to pay for the railway which has been laid down. With regard to the Marradong railway, it needs little argument in favour of the extension, so as to enable the 400 or 500 hewers who have gone there from the Collie district to get on their country. The railway, if constructed for a few miles further on would lead to a large amount of work being done, and it would produce sufficient revenue to pay for the cost of construction. The suggestion is that it should go 15 miles, but if it were to go only five or six miles, it would enable the timber cutters to go out on to their country.

Mr. George: What about the farmers a little further on?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Yes, they are worthy of consideration, and I hope that the line will soon be extended the full distance. I will co-operate with the hon. member to push that project forward because it is of no use building railways unless we can, at any rate to some extent, make them profitable. With regard to the Forestry Department I think there is room for considerable improvement. Last year the receipts totalled £28,900, and the expenditure was some-

thing like £900 for inspection and forest ranging. Taking into consideration the fact that this industry has rather improved, I believe we should get a little more revenue, and I believe when the time comes we should be able to put this department on a better footing. At the present time, if we take as a criterion the head offices in Perth, we cannot but form a poor opinion of the timber industry in the State. The Forestry Department is treated worse than any other department in the State. In regard to forest rangers, I have a fruitful source of complaint to bring before the Minister, and that is that something should be done to provide employment for these men in the intervals between their ordinary duties. Their employment is but intermittent. A man may go out at a fair rate of wage, but the trip will last only three weeks. He is taken to all parts of the State in pursuit of his avocation, but having finished one task it is frequently six weeks perhaps before he is called upon again. I think that without additional cost the Minister could find some way of providing more continuous employment for these men. They are men of wide knowledge of the industry and of considerable experience, and I think it is unfair that their average earnings should be brought down to perhaps £2 a week. (Several interjections.) I mean the timber inspectors. It must be obvious that my remarks do not apply to the rangers, because they are kept continually employed. I do not wish to say anything in regard to the forest rangers; but in regard to the timber inspectors we should stretch a point and give them employment at such times as they are not called upon to actually inspect timber. With respect to the position of the industry generally I am pleased to notice that the Minister for Railways has resolved to get back a little of the concessions granted some time ago in railway freights. He has decided to recall something like £4,000, and I think it is a fair proposal seeing that the timber industry is in such a good way and promises to continue to flourish. This year the industry has reached perhaps a higher mark

in its tide of prosperity than it has ever reached before. The profits of the biggest company for the last year amounted to £136,000, and I think that this year will see that profit still further increased. Hardwoods, we learn, are winning their way rapidly and the trade has apparently come to stay. When we see companies doing so well out of the trade and having such a run of luck I think it is up to the Government to recoup a little to the State for the concessions given in the past. I have a grievance against these timber companies in so far as they have too much power. This has not been given by the present Government but by a paternal Government of many years ago. We find that on the various timber lines it is absolutely impossible for people to get goods carried which they have purchased in the City. There is in existence a monopoly with regard to stores and if a worker with perhaps £10 in his pocket comes to Perth and buys stores at a reduced price he is debarred from taking his goods over the timber tramways. I have a report from the Solicitor General which bears out the opinion that I have for long held, namely, that we are absolutely powerless at the present time to deal with these monopolies. I hope something will be done in the future. If the Government take no action in the matter I am going to move in this House to have rates fixed for the carriage over these timber lines both of passengers and goods.

Mr. Taylor: What about improving the accommodation on some of those open trucks?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: When the member for Mt. Margaret was down there they put on a special carriage for him. They do not do that for me. However it is not altogether the faulty carriages that I complain of, but I think more freedom should be allowed to residents on these timber areas for purchasing their stores where they please. They should not be compelled to deal with their employers and pay monopolistic prices, but should be able to come to the City, purchase in the cheapest market and take their goods over the timber lines at Government rates.

Mr. Walker: Do not the Government administer the Truck Act?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: No, I am sorry to say they do not. It would be just as well if it were repealed. I have had instances brought before me of people who, living at the end of the bush line, came to Perth and bought certain goods. These goods were taken over the Government railways, but the company refused absolutely to take them out into the bush although the owners were prepared to put a man there to load the goods on to the trucks, and to take delivery of them when they got out. It is a matter deserving attention and I sincerely trust that it will have due attention given to it by the Government. As regards the complaint voiced by the Leader of the Opposition when he appealed for sectional returns, I too would appeal to the Government to do something in this matter. Not only members on this side of the House but people right through the country are crying out for sectional returns in connection with the railways. And I believe it would strengthen the hands of the Government to have such sectional returns in black and white and so put the public right as regards the true position of some of the lines. If for instance the country at large knew that there were 100 miles of railway not paying expenses, it would have but little sympathy with any people who came asking for a reduction of freights or any other concessions in regard to that particular line, and the Government would have a very effective argument against granting such requests. I would appeal to the Government to bring this proposition into operation as soon as possible. I regret that in the administration of the Railway Department they are adopting a very poor policy towards some of the outlying centres. It is but rarely that I rise in my place to ask for roads or bridges, but recently I made application for a railway platform at Worsley. There they have a population of 600 people, and four distinct lines of railway, but there is neither landing nor platform provided, and people at all hours of the night have to climb into or out of railway carriages at no little risk to themselves. It is extremely dangerous for women and

children to be groping about a railway train in the dark. When I made application to the Railway Department for this platform they stated that it was absolutely impossible to comply with the request, but that the residents might go to Lunenburg, a mile distant, where they would find a platform. Now it is scarcely reasonable to ask women and children to walk a mile through the dark in order to catch a train that, it might almost be said, will pass their doors. It is altogether out of reason, and if we are going to indulge in this cheeseparing we are not going to win much support for our railway system. The position at Worsley is absolutely scandalous. They have for long been asking for a platform to enable them to get into and out of the train in safety but the Government refuse to give the platform. It will assuredly end in serious accident, costing the Government a large sum of money. I hope the methods adopted in regard to Government contracts with sleeper hewers splitting sleepers for the Railway Department and Works Department will be brought under revision. Timber cutters, after spending months in the bush, are often deprived of their earnings by others—unfortunately sometimes of their own number—running away and not making arrangements for their payment. If the officers of the department were enabled to go along and make their purchases of sleepers from any particular body of men direct, this sort of thing would be avoided. If, say, one man had 100 sleepers and another 200, the departmental officer could purchase directly from these men. This would be a much more satisfactory system than the existing one. I have an instance of a man in the Nannup district who had a dozen employees sleeper-cutting for many months. He drew his cheque for £200 from the Government and was only heard of again the other day when he was brought back from New South Wales. The sleeper hewers in this and similar cases have no redress. I hope a better system will be introduced, and in this regard I will be prepared to give the Government a few practical suggestions.

The Minister for Mines: I think we deal directly with the men.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Yes; but in this particular instance the officer dealt with one of the employeess acting on behalf of a dozen others. That man absconded to New South Wales with £200 of the sleeper hewers' money.

The Minister for Mines: Apparently they put their faith in the wrong man.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Yes; we have instances every day of men putting their faith in the wrong man. I certainly hope, however, that on this question some more protection will be given to the hewers. The member for Pilbara in referring to a subject likely to come into marked prominence, namely, the Asiatic question, dealt with the position as existing in the North-West. But on the Murchison, away out in the Wiluna district, we have Afghan contractors supplying wood to the mines. It is a deplorable state of affairs that in this country, with a White Australia policy, Afghans should be the sole employers in that district. There is nothing more degrading than for a Britisher to have to go to an Afghan to get an order for stores. When the Daglish Government were in power the Minister, Mr. Hastie, refused to give a license to these men.

The Minister for Mines: He had nothing to do with the granting of licenses.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I may have made a mistake in the Minister. However action was taken at the time and the Minister was defeated. I hope something will be done in the near future to prevent those Asiatics becoming the sole employers of labour and having Britishers working for them. I sincerely trust the Government will take some action in this matter. In regard to the industrial legislation I am sorry that the Government have not brought forward any proposals for amending the Arbitration Act. Although we have been working for some considerable time for an amendment of the Act, the Government apparently are not prepared to move in the matter, and the workers of Western Australia are looking beyond their State tribunal to Federal legislation for redress of their grievances. If some action were taken in the direction indicated it would serve to

popularise our local tribunal. We should make it a court having the confidence of the workers. This would obviate the cost of taking cases beyond our State. At the present time the majority of the workers of Western Australia have lost confidence in the Arbitration Act and are looking further afield in the hope of getting justice in another court. Another measure which should receive the sanction of this Parliament is the Workers' Compensation Bill introduced by the member for Dundas. On looking into this question we find we are considerably behind other countries in regard to our industrial laws, and I would appeal to the Government and their supporters—particularly the member for Nelson who represents a good number of timber workers—to assist us in placing this measure on the statute-book. At the present time we find that the Act is not comprehensive enough. It is not far-reaching enough in its effects, because it will not take in those men who are sleeper-hewing; if they meet with a serious or fatal accident, they in the one case, or their dependents in the other, can have no redress. I believe this amending Bill will include every worker in these industries, and will also provide for compensation for injury received. I would propose that something should be done in the direction of the State levying a royalty on every load of timber produced towards paying the compensation. I believe that the majority of the people recognise that an industry should pay for its wounded, that if any of those who are carrying on an industry should meet with a serious accident, which perhaps means the loss of a limb, the industry should pay compensation while the person meeting with the accident remains disabled. In the coal mines of New South Wales a sum is set apart on every ton of coal raised, and this goes to build up an accident fund which gives some protection to the widows and children of workmen losing their lives. As I said before, I appeal to several members on the Government side of the House to aid in getting the Act amended, so as to bring about a great deal more satisfaction than exists at the present time. Another measure we have

been promised is Upper House reform, or a reduction of the franchise to £15.

Mr. Swan: Do not take that seriously.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I am not taking it too seriously, seeing that the majority of the gentlemen most vitally interested are not in favour of the proposal; I speak of the members of another place. However, it is inconceivable to me how the Government can bring down such proposals without going the whole of the way, without at least giving us household suffrage. There are at least 21 members in this Chamber sent here pledged to the abolition of the Upper House, and that must be evidence that there is a large number of people in the country crying out for this reform, yet we find on the Ministerial side members who are afraid to trust the people, afraid to let this question go to a referendum. The abolition of the Upper House would not only reduce the cost of administration, not only bring about economy, but it would wipe out a Chamber that, in my opinion, has not justified its existence. However, it is useless saying much on this question, because I recognise the Government are not tackling it as it should be tackled. And what is the result? We find that every day the people are coming to the belief that they must look beyond the State Parliaments, that they are treating the State Parliaments with a great deal less respect than a few years ago, and that they are looking to the Federal arena where the voice of the people is truly heard, and where the men and women of Australia have a voice in the Government of the country, while here we find that a small section of the people has the right to elect members to a House of veto. I am only sorry that the Government did not take action when the Upper House rejected their land tax proposals. I am sorry they did not tackle the issue then. Had they done so I believe the country would have been behind them, and even now I believe that if they attempt to reform the Upper House the people will applaud their action. We hear a good deal at times about the cost of government and talk about a reduction of members. I am as anxious as anyone to bring

about economy in this regard, and if a serious attempt were made to reform the Upper House I would perhaps favour a reduction in the Lower House, even if I lost my own seat; but I believe that one Chamber is sufficient, and I am prepared to step out to-morrow and let a member of the Upper House take my seat if he can win it. We might compromise in this respect by allowing ten members of the Upper House to sit in this Chamber.

Mr. Collier: We do not want to be contaminated here.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Perhaps we would be. Several schemes have been put forward for this reform. I am in favour of the abolition of the Upper House. I have not heard a good argument put forward in favour of the retention of an Upper Chamber, and if the Government hold with democracy they would favour the abolition of the Upper House. When the elections are on some of them proclaim themselves champions of democracy; the Minister for Mines claimed to be an ardent champion; but many of them are afraid to give the people a voice in the election of the Upper House. Now I claim to be as good a citizen as any man who sits in the Upper House, or as any voter for the Upper House, but while I am a good enough citizen to vote in this Chamber, in the national House, I am not good enough to have a voice in the choice of the Upper House.

Mr. Jacoby: Why do you not get married and have a house?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: We heard a good deal last night from the member for Pilbara about marriage. I was going to ask that the member for Mount Margaret and myself should be exempt. Owing to the miserable salaries paid to representatives of the people in this country marriage is an entirely difficult task. However, the Labour party who advocate the abolition or effective reform of the Upper House are getting a good many supporters, even among property owners, especially in the metropolitan area. I know that a good many owners are getting dissatisfied with the Government, seeing that the Government are not prepared to move in this direction.

Mr. George: Dissatisfied with taxation.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: What better could we do than to abolish the Upper House and have less taxation? I am of opinion that on this question we should place it before the people and stir up a good deal more interest than has been stirred up at the present time. The fact remains that the people are looking more to the Federal arena and are losing confidence in the State Parliament because they think the State Parliament has just about run the length of its tether and outlived its usefulness. I am not prepared to join in that cry, but if the Government refuse to give the men and women of the State a voice in the representation in the Upper House I am prepared to assist the people in going beyond the limits of this Parliament for their legislation. We hear many speeches about Unification. In my opinion Unification is gaining many converts in Western Australia because of the obstructive tactics pursued by members of the Upper House. However, I do not think this question of Upper House reform is going to receive serious attention this session, because I think the Government will have their hands full with other questions; and I have not much faith in the fulfilment of their promises, as they have promised this reform of the Upper House for sessions past. However, if they do bring down a measure I hope it will be for household suffrage. As a progressive party the Opposition will take half a loaf before no bread, but I do not see any virtue in supporting the reduction the Government propose to bring about. Let it be at least household suffrage and by that means the Government will gain supporters not only in this Chamber but throughout Western Australia, supporters they have not at the present time.

Mr. Collier: That will be a bad thing.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: It may be, but I venture to say that unless the Government move in this matter we are not going to make the progress that a State Parliament should make. Mention has also been made of a redistribution of seats. I am hopeful the Government

will bring down a Bill that will make a fairly equitable distribution. It is unfair for a constituency of 1,200 electors, such as Sussex, having the same representation as a constituency like North Perth with something like 8,000 electors. I think there is room for a great deal of improvement in this direction. We have been told by some members that we should regulate the seats to suit industries. In fact the seat I have the honour to represent was created by the James Government in order to give the timber industry a certain representation. It was thought the people engaged in that industry were worthy of it, but in my opinion it was brought in to put all the democratic element of the South-West in one constituency. It was given to the Opposition, but at the same time it was said, "Take that, you will get no more;" and by that means the Labour party lost three seats in the South-West. The member for Wellington has suggested that all the timber workers should be put in one electorate. If that is so it would be only a reasonable proposition to allow the engineers a member, and to allow the civil servants a member, and to allow members to workers in other directions. The proposal to put all the timber workers in one electorate cannot be advocated by any member, and I certainly hope that in any redistribution of seats the members of the Opposition will pay strict attention to see that the electorates are put on a fair basis, and that a fair and equitable distribution is made. There have been remarks in regard to the policy of the Lands Department. In dealing with this I do not wish to take up any time, further than to say that the complaint made by the Leader of the Opposition in regard to the delay that sometimes occurs in selectors getting on to their holdings is a fairly common complaint. I could bring several instances to show how men in the timber country in the South-West have made applications for years, only to find that they were refused on the ground that there was marketable timber on the land applied for. I suppose there are over 100 applications in the Lands Department from men who desire to make per-

manent homes. These men believe that in their spare time, when their services are not required in the timber centres, if they had a few acres, say 100 acres, they could do something towards improving the land so that later on they would be able to retire on to their holdings when the timber industry waned. In regard to the timber industry, the position to-day is that the State is getting nothing from it. We give away three-quarters of a million acres to the companies, and the timber is cut off and hardly a settler is left behind. That is not a good policy for the State. It is not a good policy for the Government to stand idly by, letting the companies act as they are doing, refusing to carry commodities over their lines, and refusing to throw open the areas cut out, and refusing to give the opportunity to people who would become permanent settlers. I hope the Minister will give a good deal of attention to this, because every week there are applications from persons wishing to select. We should induce them to select the land and to settle on it where the timber is denuded in order that these men will have homes by-and-by and so that the State will have in the South-West a permanent instead of the nomadic population there to-day. One of the instances is that of a settler well known, I believe, to the member for Murray, who made application for a block in the Forrest district. That application was made six months ago, and owing to the delay he experienced in receiving replies he asked me to look into the matter. The result was that a forest ranger was sent to report, and that official found there was no timber growing on the area. The ground had been let 10 years previously and forfeited, but the would-be settler's application was refused on the ground that there was marketable timber on the land. Another ranger reported that there were only three acres of timber on the 170 acres. Subsequently we find that Millars' Company wanted the holding in order to run a tramway through it later on. The selector was so anxious to get the land, and make his home on it, that he gave permission to the company to construct all

roads and tramways they liked through the 170-acre block. He did not stand in their way in any respect, and said he would grant all their requests so long as he got the land. A reply was received from Millars' agreeing to allow the selector to have the area; but what do we find? After the man had been strung on for six months, after the reports of forest rangers had been received, and after Millars' had given permission for him to go on the land, the Government refused to allot the area. The reason they gave was that they would want the land later on for a State mill. I do not think the Government will be so wildly socialistic as to carry out that project, although I hope they will. The reports in the department to-day show there are several areas available, with good water supplies, etcetera, not far from the locality in question that could be used just as readily for a State mill, or any other purpose the Government might require land for. The selector is almost disheartened after his six months negotiations with the Government and, in fact, is so despondent that I do not think he will pay attention to the land any longer. I hope that grievances like that, which are brought before the notice of the Minister very frequently from the South-West, will receive more attention than was given in the present case. It must be patent to the Ministry that if we can get a small percentage of settlers from among the timber workers in the South-West, we will be doing well for the State. At present these men contribute a good deal to the revenue of the country. We have the largest body of timber workers we have ever had in the State, and there are hundreds of the finest axemen in the world making their living here now. The timber industry is, however, a dying one, and will not recover as fast as it is being cut out. No serious effort is being made in the way of afforestation, and the industry must, in a few years, die away. I have seen reports from some companies stating what they have done in the way of afforestation by bringing about improvements in the conditions, and by trying to preserve the forests so that the young timber is given a chance to grow.

We find, however, that no attention has been paid to this question up to the present. Last year it was advertised abroad that there were millions of acres of virgin forest in this country awaiting the axe. I read advertisements to this effect and gave proof of it last session, and I hope this policy will cease. Western Australia to-day has not too much timber for her own requirements. Of course, we can continue for a few years, but what is that in the history of a nation? The other States are in a worse position still, and they will be looking to Western Australia in a few years to supply them with timber and, in addition, there will be great local demands upon our timber resources. For our railways an increased quantity of sleepers will be needed. The Powellising process has increased the life of sleepers, but there will be a big demand for them in a few years, and the sooner we wake up to that fact the better. The Premier, in the course of his remarks, referred to certain statements made as to dissatisfaction with the Government in some parts of the State, and he spoke of an agitation by "a political derelict who had been dropped by the Labour party and had been refused admission into the Ministerial fold." This reference was rather unfair and unfortunate, and the Premier's very words contradict themselves. In the first place Mr. Keyser—the gentleman referred to—is not a resident of Bridgetown, where the alleged disturbance took place; then, if he is such a political derelict he would not have been able to raise the agitation that existed; he would not have a following of 200 men who have a stake in the country, and who gathered at Bridgetown to protest against the actions of the Government. Instead of shouldering all the blame and responsibility upon a poor unfortunate individual, who has never done much harm, or perhaps much good, the Government should take the responsibility themselves and candidly admit that in some parts of the country they are not as popular as they might be. I am rather sorry to note that a reconstruction has taken place, or that a shuffle of the cards has occurred, so far as one

department of the Government is concerned. I am not so pleased with the changes effected in the Works Department, and I do not look for so much sympathy from the present Minister in carrying out the work of his office as from the late Minister from whom, with all his faults—and there were a good many of them—I always received a very fair deal. It is generally recognised among a large body of industrial workers that they had a better friend in the late Minister for Works than they have in the present holder of the office. I desire to give credit where credit is due. As to the present Minister I do not think he is going to be very enthusiastic about the departmental construction of railways. We saw only a few days ago that a contract was let for the Port Hedland-Marble Bar railway to Smith & Timms, while a couple of days ago the Busselton jetty was let to a private individual. It will be said that the department put in an estimate, that they calculated the cost and put in a tender; that is all very well, but I would sooner see in charge of the Works Department a man more sympathetic with departmental construction, and with the carrying on of that department, than the present Minister. Of course, he may turn out a better man than the late Minister.

The Minister for Works: You have had no experience of him.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Only as to the other department which he was in charge of; but I go by the feeling in the country. I have been informed in various parts of the State, and have been told by hundreds of people here since the new Minister was appointed, that he is not regarded favourably as was the case with the late Minister.

Mr. Taylor: But he was a good Treasurer.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The fact that he has been given another department is evidence that the Ministry, or the Ministerial party, were not as satisfied with his work as Treasurer as they might have been. Unfortunately, the deficit is growing, but

there is no need to deal closely with the financial proposals now, as probably in a couple of weeks the Premier will make his financial statement. I recognise that this question requires the attention both of Ministerialists and Oppositionists, for we must try to do something to stop the present drift from continuing. Apparently the change of Ministers has not done that, for month by month, with monotonous regularity, a further deficit is reported. I hope during the next few weeks some proposals will be forthcoming to improve the position, and that the united wisdom of members will be concentrated on the question of bringing forward some proposals which will improve the financial position of the State. The member for Claremont (Mr. Foulkes) made some suggestions in his speech to his constituents.

Mr. Taylor: A few civil servants.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The meeting was advertised as one of his electors. He suggested that the salaries of members of the Upper House should be reduced by £100 a year. I am not in sympathy with that. I contend that there is no justification for the other House at all, but if it does exist it is only right that we should pay members the salaries they receive to-day. After all, that is a very small matter, and there is nothing statesmanlike about the suggestion. It savours of the reform proposals introduced last session for the taxation of amusements, land agents, tobaccoists, etcetera. Another suggestion was to abolish the refreshment bar at Parliament House during recess. If the member for Claremont were to take his own expenditure in that respect as any criterion—I am not referring to him in an uncomplimentary way—but if he were to take the expenditure of the average member during recess, he would find there would be very little saving, even if his reform were brought about. That proposal also is unworthy of serious consideration, or, at all events, to be placed before his constituents at a special meeting. Very few members take advantage of the refreshment rooms during recess, and I suppose one could count them on the fingers of one's hand. I hope other

members will bring forward proposals of a more statesmanlike character as to the reforms in financial matters than the ones I have mentioned. I will say no more. I will have an opportunity when the Estimates come on of dealing with the several matters requiring attention, and I trust that the position of affairs in regard to the working of legislation in this country will be more satisfactory this session than during the last. I hope for a good deal in the way of industrial legislation, and would like to see the amendment to the Workers' Compensation Act carried. Also an amendment should be made to the Arbitration Act, and a little more attention should be paid to the factory workers in the City. So far as the franchise reform is concerned, I hope the Government will reconsider their decision, and if not prepared to give us adult suffrage for the Upper House, go at all events so far as to grant household suffrage, and so allow the large body of electors in Western Australia an opportunity of saying who is to make the legislation or who is to control the affairs of the people.

Mr. SWAN (North Perth): The hon. member for Forrest said that the discussion on the Address-in-Reply appears to be getting unpopular. I quite agree with him. Possibly if the discussion were abandoned altogether, it might be to the advantage of the country. There are just two or three small matters I want to speak upon before the motion is put. I was anxious to hear some of the Ministers in reply to some of the things that were stated by this side before I got up to speak, but they do not seem to show any disposition in that way. Therefore I will get rid of my few remarks and allow the thing to go. In the first place, the most important matter we have to consider is the question of finance. The Premier told us in his pre-session speech that he had no misgivings in regard to the finances of the State. I am pleased he has not; he is about the only man in this country who has not very considerable misgivings about them. What appears to me as a new member, a member of about twelve months standing, to be one of the most necessary things to

be done in connection with Parliament is to modernise the machinery of Government. If some attention were devoted to that, there would be more likelihood of getting the wishes of the people given expression to than is the case at the present time. As far as the Address-in-Reply is concerned, it seems to me to consist of throwing bouquets by supporters of the Ministers and the heaving of bricks by members of the Opposition, and judging by the effect upon the Ministers, I think we might save ourselves the trouble on both sides. In my opinion, as I said, there is every necessity for modernising the machinery of Government, but there seems to be no disposition on the part of the present occupants of the Ministerial benches to take any step in that direction. The Labour party have a provision in their platform whereby the wishes of the people can be given effect to better than anything we have had from the other side, that is by the adoption of the principle of referendum. If this principle were adopted it would get over the difficulty in connection with the Upper House, and we would at least have the wishes of the people given effect to there. I think too there are many other matters of importance that might be dealt with in the same way. The member for Forrest referred to the question of the redistribution of seats. I quite agree with him that redistribution of seats is very necessary to give the people of the State a fair deal. As far as I am concerned I have no anxiety to be called upon to represent the wishes of 8,000 electors in this House, while the Minister for Works has only to represent the wishes of some 1,200. I do not think this is a fair thing at all. A good deal has been said about the fact that I represent a minority of the electors of North Perth. Possibly I do, but I have no desire to be in that position. My only wish is that as far as possible the electors should be given fair representation; it does not matter whether they are supporters of the Government or supporters of the Labour party. As far as I am concerned it is no particular desire of mine that the Labour party should occupy the Ministerial benches. My chief

concern is to see the wishes of the people given effect to, and the question with me is measures and not individuals. I do not care who gives us the legislation, as long as we get it. As far as I am concerned if the present Ministry are prepared to give us the legislation asked for by a large majority of people in the country, then I am quite prepared to accept it from them. I think a lot of time is wasted by the bitterness shown between parties. I feel that when we have fought our battles at the elections far more good will be done for the people if we drop a lot of the party bitterness and devote our attention to the legislation before us and do the best for the interests of the State we govern. I hope my remarks are not giving an impression that all the bitterness comes from this side. I recognise there is bitterness shown on both sides, and as far as I am concerned I am a bitter opponent of the policy of the present Government. I will fight them when a general election comes along, and I will fight their policy all the time. But I think once a general election is over, more energy might be devoted to the consideration of the welfare of the State rather than the welfare of any particular party. The Premier in his pre-session speech promised Upper House reform. As far as I am concerned I do not take the thing very seriously. Before I became a member of Parliament I was not quite satisfied about the earnestness of the present Ministerial party in connection with that particular proposition. We found candidates for the Legislative Assembly fighting elections pledging themselves to the reform of the Upper House by way of reduced qualification, etcetera: at the same time we found members of the same party going round and supporting candidates for the Upper House who were absolutely pledged to vote against a proposition of that description. That is sufficient for me about the earnestness with which the Government were approaching this question. In that connection I agree to a large extent with the contention of the hon. member for Forrest. The Ministerial party who are standing in the way of this reform will have to suffer eventually as a

result of their failure to recognise what the bulk of the people are asking for and as a result of their indifference to the cry of the people for more democratic measures. It is an absolute impossibility, in my opinion, to get any measures on the statute-book as far as industrial legislation is concerned that will give fair play to the workers while we have the Legislative Council existing as it is at present constituted.

Mr. Jacoby: I do not think they have thrown out anything.

Mr. SWAN: They never throw out anything at all. We have a sufficiently strong reactionary party or a conservative party in this Chamber to efficiently prevent anything of that kind, but it is almost inconceivable that the Government, practically the same Government which is occupying the Treasury bench to-day, sent along to that Chamber during the life of the last Parliament a land tax, and had it thrown back in their teeth, after which they accepted it practically without a murmur.

The Minister for Works: It is on the statute-book now.

Mr. SWAN: That Act is not upon the statute-book; what is on the statute-book is a hybrid imitation of that particular measure, and as far as I am concerned it is of very little effect.

The Minister for Works: It does not affect you.

Mr. SWAN: No, certainly not, and it does not affect a great many more people that it should affect, who are more in agreement with the hon. gentleman's political opinions than I am. If it did we would not have so much trouble about the extension of the railway system for the purpose of opening up our agricultural lands. During the debate on the last Address-in-Reply I said that there was a large area of land lying close to our existing railways, the owners of which land were not attempting to use it in the interests of the State. That statement was made not only by myself, but by other members of the Opposition, and it was denied by Ministers. Notwithstanding that fact, in the pre-sessional speech at Bunbury we find the Premier saying that

he sounded a note of warning to those people holding unused lands along the railways. Why then this necessity for the warning? Nothing has materialised; the warning simply stopped there. Whilst we have the present Legislative methods it is only natural that the democratic portion of the people of the State should look not to the State but to the Federal Parliament for the legislation that they desire to see placed on the statute-book. It is only natural that they should go to the Federal Parliament for reasonable and fair industrial laws. Even in the case of the shop assistants we find them preparing for an appeal to the Federal Arbitration Court in connection with rates of wages, etcetera. It is no wonder to me that this class of people, although up to recently they have not been looked upon as strong supporters of the party I belong to, are thoroughly disappointed with the present Government to whom they looked for a fair deal. We found last session that there was a lot of talk about the Saturday half-holiday. That is a proposal which has my strongest support, and it is of sufficient importance to have claimed some attention from the present Ministry. It has not received any attention, and it is only natural that the people concerned should be looking somewhere else for assistance. Another matter I want to have a word or two to say upon before I sit down is that double-barrelled atrocity, the Minister for Lands' proposed retrenchment, or what he considers necessary retrenchment in the public service combined with land settlement. This is a thing which is beautiful in theory, but I am afraid it will work out to the disadvantage of the State in practice. Taking a commonsense view of the thing it appears to me that the result of appealing to these people will be that the very men most required to do the work in these departments will be those who will apply to go on the land. I do not want to be misunderstood. I thoroughly believe that in the ranks of our civil servants we have some of the best and most efficient employees of any State in Australia. I am just as well satisfied that we have a pretty fair percentage of wasters there;

and in my opinion whether or not the proposed retrenchment is necessary the Ministers in charge of the several departments should have sufficient pluck to throw the wasters out. If they are suitable for the purpose they could then be placed upon the land. But the trouble with the present scheme will be found to be that as it encourages the efficient officers to leave the service and go upon the land it is not doing the best in the interests of the State. If this system is good, why not apply it to the wages men on the railways? Generally speaking these men would be far more likely to make successful farmers than would be the officers of the clerical division. Yet it is never attempted in connection with any retrenchment in the Railway Department or any other department from the employees of which we might reasonably expect good results as settlers on the land.

Mr. George: Are there any wasters in the Railway Department?

Mr. SWAN: Yes. Possibly the member for Murray thinks they are fewer now than formerly.

Mr. George: There are not many in the Railway Department.

Mr. SWAN: The Railway Department, like every other department, has lost valuable officers through retrenchment, and I as well as the member for Murray could lay my hands on a good many wasters in the Railway Department and other departments to-day. However, they will not be found among the 7s. and 8s. a day men, who are generally worked out when any pet scheme of retrenchment comes along. There is another matter I am glad to see mentioned in the Premier's pre-session speech, namely, the question of the development of the North-West. Notwithstanding the attention the Premier has devoted to that matter and the fact that he believes he realises the great possibilities of the North-West, I do not think the Premier or any other member of the House who has not made a lengthy visit to that part of the country thoroughly appreciates the potentialities of that portion of the State.

The Honorary Minister: In the way of stores?

Mr. SWAN: Well yes, I know its possibilities in that regard and also in respect to the land. The district least known to the average man in Western Australia is the Ashburton district. It is suffering at the present time from lack of facilities. Its shipping facilities are almost an impossibility, and in that connection I think the Harbour and Light Department might pay some attention to its material wants. In connection with the port of Ashburton, which is merely a roadstead, the steamers have to lie about one mile and a half from the jetty; and whilst we have the Harbour and Light Department controlling the jetty and the tramway from the ocean to the township, we have a private firm controlling the lighters conveying produce and goods brought up by the business people and the pastoralists of the district. This particular firm of lighter owners have a monopoly, and seeing that the same firm own one of the stores in the town it gives them a very unfair pull over their competitors. And whilst the people in Onslow are not getting a very fair deal in that regard the people who have stock to export to the metropolis or to any other portion of Australia have no practicable chance of sending it out through Onslow. For if you wish to ship a horse at Onslow you will find the lighterage costs from 30s. to £2. In view of the value of the land in the district it would be well if better facilities could be provided. I recognise that the Government have a very difficult question to face in connection with the development of the North-West. They have very little in the way of natural harbours to assist them, and it will be a gigantic task to provide the shipping facilities necessary to open up that particular country. I also recognise that while the land is held as at present it is practically impossible for the State to derive a fair return for the money required to provide these facilities to which I have referred. I think it would be well if the people of this State generally understood the condition of affairs in the North-West better than they do. Perhaps it will be news to most hon. members to know that from Onslow inland along the

river, comprising some of the finest land in Western Australia, one man holds under pastoral lease both sides of the river for 60 miles.

Mr. George: What does he do with it?

Mr. SWAN: He runs sheep, cattle and horses, but he spends very little money on the place. This man holds about one million acres of the finest land in the State—perhaps the finest land in Australia—and he is paying, certainly not more than 10s. a thousand acres per annum. It would be interesting to peruse a return showing the actual revenue derived from that holding. Whilst he holds all this land I do not suppose £5,000 has been spent on it in the way of improvements during the whole time it has been in his hands. I want to know if that is giving the State a fair deal for the great asset it has in that particular property? The river is not always running, certainly, but if that land were still within the control of the State, it would afford great scope for water conservation, and practically unlimited possibilities for tropical culture. I recognise the position many members of this House are in in respect to this question, because I know the position I was in myself before I visited that part of the country. One must see the country to realise its possibilities. But what are we to do while one man holds a million acres at a rental of 10s. a thousand acres? I am quite satisfied that even if a system of water conservation were adopted and the best use made of the land 10,000 acres of that country would carry as many head of stock and give just as good a result as is being derived from the whole million acres to-day. I do not want to appear personal, but I fancy the holder of this particular property does not enjoy a reputation for large-heartedness. I do not want to say that he is notorious for his meanness, but hon. members can judge for themselves when I tell them that this is the property on which some time ago a claim was made for medical attendance to diseased blacks, and the gentleman who holds this vast area of wonderfully fertile land absolutely refused to pay for their

medical treatment. I understand that for some time afterwards he was refused permission to employ native labour, and rightly so too. On the whole of that great estate I suppose there are not more than 20 persons employed, black and white, the majority being blacks. That brings me to the question of aborigines. I cannot say that I saw anything in the way of brutal treatment of natives while up there. Indeed they are fairly well treated. They are utilised to do work about the station, and fill positions as shearers, teamsters, and the like. I am given to understand that one pastoralist in that part of the State has as his leading teamster a black gin. She is the teamster in charge, and there are several white teamsters employed by the same man. This is the way the natives are treated up there. We find that in his report the Chief Protector suggests how we are to deal with the aborigines question. I do not think there is any harm in these people being employed, for they are better employed than being allowed to remain idle; but I think the more sensible and economical way of dealing with the question would be for the Government to insist on the employers of these natives paying a certain amount to the State for their labour. It would be useless to pay the blacks themselves for their labour, but if the pastoralist were compelled to pay to the State a reasonable amount for the labour of the aborigines it would provide some of the thousands of pounds which the Chief Protector tells us will be required by his department in the near future. So far as the treatment of diseased natives and their removal to the hospitals are concerned, it would be all very well if the work were being properly carried out, but it is not. It is quite a by-word on some of the stations up there that diseased natives are still about the country. Where is the utility of this isolation scheme if diseased natives are still allowed to remain on the mainland? If the Government undertake the responsibility of dealing with the question at all they should deal with it thoroughly. The member for Pilbara last night mentioned the Asiatic question, which is

becoming a very serious question indeed. I recognise it is largely a matter for the Federal Parliament; still I think the State Government might show a great deal more sympathy with the administration of the White Australia policy than they have done up to date. It is quite a common thing in the North-West to find what are, strictly speaking, prohibited immigrants wandering about. When I was at Onslow there was a smart young Chinaman employed as waiter, and no one dreamed that he had less right to be there than white people, until at race-time another Chinaman, whose money he had won at gambling, put him away to the authorities as a prohibited immigrant. It is practically impossible to shut them out under the existing conditions, while the steamers trading along that coast are allowed to call at intermediate ports, particularly at an isolated port such as Onslow.

Mr. Jacoby: It would be a bad thing for the ports if the steamers were not allowed to call.

Mr. SWAN: I take a great deal of credit to myself that I disagree with the hon. member on that particular point. There is nothing to prevent the white-labour boats carrying the things now carried by the black-labour boats. I would not be surprised if the member for Swan (Mr. Jacoby) opposes the White Australia policy. Of course he would not dare to do it openly, else he would not save his skin. At present there is a line of steamers carrying goods to those ports with white crews.

Mr. Jacoby: Once a month only.

Mr. SWAN: But there is no reason why that system could not be extended if the black-labour boats were thrown out of competition. We can quite understand that a white-labour boat has not much chance of competing with a black-labour boat so far as cheapness is concerned. But where the White Australia policy is at stake I consider that it is up to the Government to take some action to prevent this kind of thing going on, because while the present condition of things continues it is impossible to exclude these aliens, particularly, as I said, at a port like Onslow. It

is common knowledge that after dark boats go into the Ashburton from no one knows whence, and leave before dawn for no one knows where. It cannot be for trading purposes in the circumstances. But I do not want it to be thought that the authorities up there are neglectful, because many of the officials there are as ardent advocates of a White Australia as I am. The fact is it is absolutely impossible to enforce the laws at Onslow at the present time. I do not know that this matter much concerns our Government, but it does no harm for members to hear of this condition of affairs, and I can prove my remarks. I do not intend to worry members any further in regard to new legislation because when the Bills come along we will have an opportunity of discussing them; and I do not want to set a bad example by talking at length on the adoption of the Address-in-Reply, when, as a matter of fact, I believe that the whole discussion might be dropped altogether; but there were one or two points I wished to touch on that I would not otherwise have the opportunity of speaking on. For that reason I hope I will be forgiven for taking up so much of the time of hon. members.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. Frank Wilson): The air of calm during the discussion of the Address-in-Reply seems to have had the effect of making everyone very weary and loth to rise to address themselves to the subject under discussion. I have that feeling, more especially because the criticisms levelled at the Governor's Speech, framed of course by the Government in order to set forth therein the policy of the Government, have not called for any special defence at the hands of Ministers. I may perhaps deal, first of all, briefly with one or two matters that are not connected with the questions dealt with in that Speech. It seems that the remarks that fell from the member for Forrest (Mr. O'Loughlen) with regard to our great timber industry are rather contradictory. First of all the hon. member advocated the conservation and reservation for the Government use of the existing forests. I agree with him

that the Government ought, and the Government intend to take steps, to reserve certain timber areas in order that the Public Works Department and the Railway Department may have a sufficient supply for their own use for some years to come. That is a legitimate and very proper course to pursue; but on the other hand, although the hon. member talked about conserving the forests, he immediately advocated the further extension of the railway towards Marradong so that the timber hewers might have further opportunity of extending their operations.

Mr. O'Loughlen: The hon. member has mistaken me. A permit has already been granted.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Then does the hon. member advocate that there should be no further grants to the timber hewers when that area is cut out?

Mr. O'Loughlen: They will have another eight years there.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Notwithstanding that we have a great asset in our jarrah forests we must remember that as the timber matures, when it is ripe for cutting, that is the proper time to fell it and send it to market; and we have tens of thousands of loads of timber in Western Australia that should be cut and converted to a proper size and sent to the market in order that the country may have the benefit. Another of the hon. member's arguments was that the country did not receive a penny from the industry, that the country had nothing in the shape of a fair return. I think I understood him to say.

Mr. O'Loughlen: No, not sufficient return.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I want to point out there is a very small percentage of the returns on the sale of our timber that is not spent within the borders of Western Australia, and more particularly spent in the payment of wages for the employment of labour, which is the best return that any country can get from any industry of this description.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Could not the State do better?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: How could the State do better than get 95 per

cent. of the value of the product expended in its own borders for the purpose of felling the timber and converting it into a marketable size?

Mr. Taylor: Do we get 95 per cent.?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We get that and in some cases we get 100 per cent. and a little loss into the bargain. I agree with the remarks of the member for North Perth (Mr. Swan) with regard to my predecessor, the member for Fremantle (Hon. J. Price). I am sorry indeed that the state of the hon. member's health necessitated his resignation, and that it also necessitated a reorganisation and the taking over of that department by myself once more. I am sorry the hon. member thinks that I am not of that sympathetic nature that will bring successful administration to that department. I interjected that the hon. member had had no experience of me; and I venture to think, in all humility, that if he will take the opportunity of inquiring he will find that the opinion of anyone who has had any connection with me in my business career, or has had an opportunity of working for me, will not exactly bear out the opinion the hon. member appears to have gathered on street corners, from, perhaps, some of those wasters that he characterised as having been in the Railway Department. I do not profess to be entirely in favour of the departmental construction of works. I never have professed to be in favour of that system. I believe that we get the best results for our money by bringing in the competition of the individual, and on more than one occasion I have expressed the view to this House that so long as I was in charge of the Works Department I was prepared to do the work in the cheapest manner possible in the interests of the State. I have carried out that principle I think successfully. When I was previously in control of this department I clearly stated to the Leader of the Opposition that whatever was the cheapest method of construction I intended to adopt it, and I adopted the departmental method on several railways that were being constructed in my time, successfully. I am not prepared to de-

part from that to-day, but wherever I can get a contract let on terms equally favourable to the State then I give the preference to the contract system over the departmental system. There has been no mistake in my views in that respect, and anyone who knows me is aware that I have not hidden those views from the public. I have endeavoured to carry them out, and I believe I have carried them out successfully in the interests of the State. There was one other point referred to by the member for North Perth that I wish to mention in passing, and that is that the workers of this State could not get a fair deal from the Government. I have yet to learn by fuller explanation on the part of the hon. member or others why the hon. member should make a statement of that description. I do not know where the workers have found a lack of sympathy in any Minister of this Administration when any case is put before him.

Mr. Gill: What about making office furniture in the prison?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: What has that to do with the question of the fair treatment of the workers of the State? It has absolutely nothing to do with it. I maintain that the hon. member cannot bring forward or substantiate any case where the workers have been unfairly treated by the orders of Ministers.

Mr. Bolton: What about the printing in prison?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I defy the hon. member to prove where the printing employees have been unfairly or badly treated by the Government. Why does not the member for North Perth instead of bringing statements before the House bring proof? Proof is all we ask. The complaint that the workers of the State cannot get fair play is hardly borne out by the workers of certain sections of the community to-day. We have the proper tribunal for these people to go to, and yet when we find them availing themselves of the opportunity of getting an award, in very few cases indeed do they stand by that award when it is given. That is my experience. Take the Collie award; did they stand to that for

five minutes? Not at all. Take the timber workers' award; did they stand to that? No.

Mr. Swan: Do you think the timber award was a fair deal to the workers.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It was the award of the tribunal.

Mr. Swan: Appointed by the present conservative Government.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Government have nothing to do with the awards of that tribunal.

Mr. Swan: They have to do with the constitution of the Court.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Absolutely nothing; the only appointment is that of the Judge, and he is chosen on the recommendation of the Chief Justice. The other representatives are appointed by those interested, the employers on the one hand and the workers on the other. What sort of a tribunal does the hon. member want?

Mr. Swan: It is strange the workers want to get before the Federal Court.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Does the hon. member want a tribunal that will always be biased on the side on one of the parties? Is that the direction and trend of his thoughts? Apparently it is. It goes without saying that so long as Mr. Justice Burnside, the president of the Court, gives awards which are favourable to the workers he is the very Judge they want, but directly he ventures on the evidence brought before him, to give an award which is, perhaps, to some extent, in favour of the employers, he is the man who should be removed. That is not giving a fair deal to the Arbitration Court. It is not a fair expression of opinion to make so far as the Judge who presides over that Court is concerned, and I am sorry to think the member would insinuate for one moment that the Judge is not the proper man to preside.

Mr. Swan: Did I make a reference to the Judge?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Most decidedly; by interjection. Let me briefly refer to a matter which was mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday. I may say in passing, that although I listened very carefully to his remarks, I

could hardly hear anything fresh in them, and if I closed my eyes, which I may say I did on several occasions, I could imagine it was the Address-in-Reply speech delivered by him in each of the last three or four years. There was a continuation of that wail, which was apparent in each of the speeches he delivered, to the effect that everything was going to rack and ruin, that the finances were very bad, that we would soon be in the bankruptcy court, and there was the everlasting complaint that had the Labour policy of four or five years ago been carried we would have been saved all this loss, and would now be on the high road to prosperity, with an overflowing Treasury chest. I cannot agree with any suggestion of that sort.

Mr. Taylor: It is not expected that you would.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No one expects it, and I venture to think all will agree with me that had the "mark-time" policy of our predecessors of four years ago been continued by the present Administration, which it has not, we would have had nothing but sheer disaster brought upon this State.

Mr. Angwin: Instead of the prosperity you now have.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes; instead of the present prosperity.

Mr. Holman: With a depreciation of 40 per cent. in the value of City properties.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Brought about by our predecessors. The only thing that characterised our predecessors was their policy. Of course, they had, in addition to that policy, to complete a certain legacy of public works which had been handed to them by the James Administration, which went before. The Leader of the Opposition is continually claiming credit for the wonderful expenditure from revenue and loan votes that occurred when the Labour party were in power, but I mention now, as I have done on many previous occasions, that this was only the completion of public works which their predecessors had initiated and commenced, and which they were bound to

carry out. The comparisons of expenditure from revenue during that year of 1904-5 are completely threadbare. They have been controverted time after time, and proved to be erroneous on repeated occasions, and it seems to me it is passing strange that the only point in the administration of this Government which met with any semblance of approval from the Leader of the Opposition was as to the result of the recent Premiers' Conference. The Premier has fully dealt with the agreement arrived at on that occasion, and I may say, without dealing with the finances, that I feel we have some reason to be satisfied with the result obtained. We can say we have obtained the best settlement, so far as our State is concerned, that could have been obtained, no matter who had represented the State on that occasion. The Leader of the Opposition fought with me three years ago for equitable terms as far as our State was concerned, and a fair return of revenue to all the States, but it seems to me, after reading his public pronouncements of the past month or two, that he now wishes to hedge somewhat on the excellent work he did on the occasion to which I referred. Notwithstanding the fact that he approves in general terms of what has been done, and that he compliments us somewhat and says we have some reason to be proud of the efforts put forth and the results obtained, still the fact remains that he wishes now to attach to the acceptance of these terms certain conditions in regard to industrial legislation and in regard to amendments to the Constitution, which I take to be the equalisation of the franchise of the State Upper Houses with that of the Senate, or the abolition of the State Upper House altogether. I believe that is what he is aiming at. Although this question may be a very important one from his standpoint, and that of those he represents, I wish to point out that it has no bearing whatever on the great question of finance. It would be absolutely unwise to refuse a final settlement of that vexed financial problem because any section of the community could not get some matter

in which they were interested dealt with, and dealt with promptly.

Mr. Angwin: Do you think that agreement will bring finality?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I hope it will, that is our aim. We got as near finality as we possibly could, inasmuch as we have the existing power, the Federal Government, pledged to introduce legislation in the direction of the agreement, to make it part of the Constitution, if the people of Australia so will. To begin at once to say that because we cannot get exactly the industrial legislation we require for any section of the community, or that we cannot get some reform in the Upper Chambers of the different State Parliaments, we should block, possibly, the bringing into effect of this financial arrangement is, to my mind, unpatriotic, and certainly detrimental to the interests of our people generally. I might just as well take the same stand and say that because Federal legislation is far in advance of what I consider to be right, that is a reason why I should oppose a settlement of the financial problem. Or I might stipulate that we should have some other form of legislation, which I think would perhaps be in favour of the employers or property owners, or business people generally, and that unless I received that legislation I would not accept this financial agreement. I hope when this matter is under discussion here, as it will be shortly, all will be banded together in order that we may achieve success so far as we are concerned, that we may receive the benefits of the settlement for which we have been fighting, and for which the Leader of the Opposition fought with me three years ago. Otherwise we are going to have chaos, and we will have a return to the Federal Parliament, perhaps, of people who will be pledged in one way or the other so far as the States are concerned, who will have little sympathy perhaps with the great difficulties which have to be overcome in all the States in developing their resources, and who in considering the question of bringing finality to this financial question would think, as I am sorry to say

a good many Federal members at present do, that the Federal Government should take the first pull on the customs and excise and, in fact, that they should annex the whole of it without returning one penny to the State.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Which of them hold that view?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Some of the Federal Opposition members.

Mr. Underwood: Which ones?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The same argument applies to the question of the transfer of State debts. The Leader of the Opposition now advocates that the State debts should be transferred to the Federal Government, although only three years ago he was of the opposite opinion. On that occasion he absolutely opposed any transfer of State debts, and the arguments he advanced at that time have been advanced on every occasion on which we have had a Conference since. He argued that it was not in the interests of the State that the debts should be transferred, that no advantage could be shown in the way of flotation, and certainly that very great disadvantages must accrue if the powers of the State were at all crippled in the borrowings necessary to carry out public works for the development of its resources. I am surprised to think that he should alter his opinion in this connection, and I hope that this matter also will receive fair and broad consideration at the hands of the people of this State. They must take into consideration whether we can possibly carry on if crippled in our borrowings. I shall not here venture to express an opinion as to the purpose for which the borrowing is done, but if it is carried out legitimately, as I maintain we have done during the past four or five years in this State, and prior to that time, the policy must be continued if we are properly to develop the States. This question must be considered by the people, and also whether we can hope to establish industries and carry on our great land settlement policy, whether we can get people to come to our shores and assist in creating wealth in Western Australia, if we are to be hampered in the raising of

the necessary money for capital expenditure in connection with these great undertakings. If that matter is considered, and it ought to be considered apart from any settlement of the financial question as far as revenue is concerned, then surely we can, as I said before, join together in order to get the agreement which has so far been adopted, and bring about finality, and then consider, after we have had the Royal Commission's report, the transfer of State debts; but to allow either of these questions to come into conflict with the acceptance or the rejection of the agreement, I venture to say would be fatal to the interests of our State. I was accused of misrepresenting and distorting the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition in an interview I had with the Press, after he had spoken at Kalgoorlie and Boulder. I should be sorry indeed to think that I had misrepresented or distorted the hon. member's remarks, but I am sorry the Leader of the Opposition did not state in what direction the alleged misrepresentation occurred. If that had been done perhaps I should have replied and explained, or proved the attitude I took up. That I am quite prepared to do at any time. It is passing strange that a member who accuses one of misrepresenting remarks, who in making his comparisons of expenditure between the time that the Labour Government occupied these benches and the present day, should also, to some extent leave out facts and figures which would put rather a different complexion on the conclusions to be drawn. He showed, and took great kudos for it, that the expenditure from revenue on public works in 1905 was £247,000 greater than the amount expended during the past financial year by the present Administration. I admit that is so, but why did not the Leader of the Opposition go on to explain to the House that the revenue they had to expend was £348,000 greater than we had to expend last year. In addition to that, why did he not emphasise—although he did make a passing remark about it—the fact that we had £185,000 more interest and sinking fund to provide last

year than his Administration in 1905? And further, how is it he passed over the very patent fact that our population has increased by 34,000 people as compared with that period, which necessitated provision by the Government for all the requirements of that increased population in the way of education, medical attention, police protection, etcetera, which in itself amounted to some £63,000.

Mr. Swan: £63,000 for 30,000 people?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not say absolutely for 30,000 people but mainly for these people, giving to them extended facilities for education, police protection, hospitals, and medical comforts. We have this position, and it is as well that we should have the other side of the picture. It is not well that it should go forth to the people of Western Australia that the Government have been extravagant in their administration. Every one should know to the contrary. It is well that they should know that the Government have had a very difficult task to perform, and that the Government have done their best to meet the full requirements of the people, notwithstanding the fact that the revenue has been declining, and I say it is as well that members should know that these figures totalled up, show that we were £596,000 worse off last year than the Labour Government whom the hon. member referred to as being such careful administrators, and expended such a large sum of money out of revenue on public works. Is it any wonder that they were able to expend out of revenue £247,000 on public works more than we have been able to do? It shows this fact, that there was a balance of £348,000 which is an evidence of the economical administration of the present Government. I do not care who criticises the position; it is an absolute fact that there is a balance of £348,000 shown to have been saved by economical administration of the present Government in decreased expenditure.

Mr. Taylor: And the deficit of £400,000.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Never mind the deficit: that is the position.

There is another position, the unfair comparison which has been made—may I use the word “distortion,” of figures in the Leader of the Opposition’s speech the other day, or shall I say misrepresentation? I do not like either of the words; at any rate it is unfair comparison. The Leader of the Opposition made a great song about our loan indebtedness. He accused the Premier of having made favourable comparisons for his purpose as far as the indebtedness per head of the population was concerned. I admit the Premier did that and anyone else would do so, but let it be an accurate comparison. The Premier was right and the Leader of the Opposition was wrong. The Premier gave a proper comparison, taking a favourable year. The Leader of the Opposition yesterday gave a comparison, taking wrong figures, and I leave the House to draw its own conclusions as to which is the most reprehensible action on the part of the members concerned. The Leader of the Opposition said that if the Premier had compared the loan indebtedness of four years, that is 1905 to 1909, he would have found there would be a £10 per head increase in the four years, that is in 1905 our indebtedness was £62 per head whereas in 1909 it had risen to £72. He omitted to proceed to show that this £62 did not include a loan floated on the 8th June by the then Government of £1,400,000. It was not included in the figures that the hon. member quoted.

Mr. Angwin: That is the loan you spent.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We spent portion of it. The bulk of that loan was mortgaged. I can assure the hon. member.

Mr. Angwin: No, it was not.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: On the other hand, the £72 which the Leader of the Opposition quoted for the 30th June last included, he did not mention the fact, the loan of £1,445,000, which I floated in May last. To put the comparison on an absolute equality and fair basis we must include the loans floated on both occasions. In 1905 our indebtedness was £67 15s. 11d. per head, and on the 30th June last it was £71 12s. 8d.,

not an increase of £10, but an increase of £3 16s. 9d. This seems to me to point to the fact that the hon. member has shown a lack of appreciation of the true position.

Mr. Walker: You are counting the babies that have been born since.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I have not taken the hon. member’s babies into consideration. I wish to say that it shows a lack of appreciation of the true position on the part of the Leader of the Opposition, and it seems to me it is lamentable evidence of his desire to put the blackest case to the world as far as Western Australia is concerned, without regard to the true interests of the State. I hope in future he will not take his financial faith from that wonderful financial record he is so fond of quoting, the *Bulletin*, and that he will refrain from using quotations from that journal, and give them as being something of a sound financial character. I take exception to his statement that the borrowing policy of the present Administration is responsible for the financial stringency. Every one must admit that the financial stringency which has come upon the State of Western Australia had commenced, at any rate before the borrowing policy of the present Administration was inaugurated. It is certainly, to my mind, responsible for the present stability of the State. It is responsible for the prospect of the enormously increased productiveness of our lands, and a large accretion in wealth in consequence. I think it will be admitted that the policy which was initiated in the nick of time to prevent a slump in the State, a policy of land development, construction of agricultural railways—whether they are actually paying at the present time or not, is responsible for the large alienation of land since put under cultivation, and large increases in the output of cereals. I venture also to think the prospects of the coming harvest this year are such that we shall have a very big return in hard cash to the producers of Western Australia.

Member: Did the borrowing policy bring the rains?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The borrowing policy has constructed works and has put the people on to the land, and put the seed into the ground, and the result from all that will be due to the borrowing policy.

Mr. Underwood: What about the potato blight?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I forgot the delicate remarks of my friend opposite with regard to the potato blight; I really forget what he did say, but I wish to remark that he rather struck a chord, or a discord, I might say. Whatever may be said about it, potato blight is a serious subject, and I venture to think that he is the first member to accuse the Government of remissness. If the Government had not taken prompt action to protect the interests of Western Australia as soon as it was known that this blight existed—

Mr. Taylor: Is there no blight here?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I cannot say, but there are indications. There are any amount of opportunities for potato growing, and I believe we are still importing between £60,000 and £70,000 worth into Western Australia each year, and if the hon. gentleman desires, I can offer him any amount of swamp country in my own electorate whereon he can produce potatoes, and at the price they have been selling lately, I am sure he would earn a competency in a few years. There is a point to which I must refer briefly and that is the accusation that we have starved the Education Department during our term of administration; and that we have not given proper facilities, so that the £170,000 which we expend annually in connection with the department is not utilised to the fullest extent. In that respect the Leader of the Opposition said we were expending all this money and really wasting it; because, he said, children over 14 years of age had no means of continuing their education. I want to point out at once that this is a gross exaggeration of the position; that children of 14 years of age are not turned adrift from our schools, that there is no limit practically to the period of their education, that they can continue longer

if they wish, that we have made a distinct advance in the education of the State, that we have established central schools in the metropolitan districts and on the goldfields in order that children may have the facilities of practically enjoying a continuation of education, and that we are now building a secondary school in West Perth which will be directly between the primary schools and what I hope will some day be established in our midst, namely, a university. The system has been pushed forward as fast as possible with the means at our disposal. And the very fact that we are paying more per child for the education system in Western Australia—although of course that is accounted for by the vastness of our territory and the greater number of smaller schools—shows that we are not starving this department and that we are doing all that can be expected in the direction indicated. In 1905, when my friends of the Opposition were in possession of these benches, there were fewer than 300 schools in existence. In that year for the first time we reached 300 schools. Four years later we have 425 schools opened, or an increase of 125 schools, notwithstanding the depression that has existed in this State. Is that a bad record for a State such as ours with a handful of people, with huge distances, sparsely populated centres, and with schools accommodating perhaps 10, 12, and 15 children? One hundred and twenty-five new schools opened in four years, and we are accused of neglecting to give educational facilities to our people.

Mr. Collier: The accusation was only in regard to salaries.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member said we had neglected provision of educational facilities. He was referring not only to salaries but to the continuation of education. He said the money was being thrown away.

Mr. Hudson: He did not say you had not increased the number of schools.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No, I know that.

Mr. Hudson: Well, what is the use of your argument?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I cannot give the hon. member brains to

appreciate an argument; I can only point out that the Leader of the Opposition did accuse the Government of not providing proper facilities, and of wasting the £170,000 that this department costs the State each year, because the continuation facilities were not given. I have pointed out that we have not only increased the facilities generally, but have also given the continuation facilities that he complained were not in existence. Can a man do more than that to prove his argument? In addition I want to say we have exercised every economy in this department: and notwithstanding the enormous growth in the number of schools our expenditure has only increased by £29,000 during the four years under review, during which period we have increased our schools by rather better than one-third. I think it must be acknowledged that we have done good work in this direction. Now to deal with the question of teachers' increments. What are the facts in regard to those increments? We did not reduce any salaries: we never have reduced any salaries. It is true that in common with the whole of the civil service of this State, the teachers had to forego their increases. But why should the teachers be treated differently from the members of any other branch of the service in Western Australia?

Mr. Walker: All their increments were due, and in stopping them you were wrong.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, they were due, but I maintain we were right. This House, or a majority of it, thought we were right, and I believe the people at large thought we were right also. The civil servants themselves acknowledged that they must accept some of the burden. Now let me point out that so far as the charge is concerned of the Leader of the Opposition in regard to these particular public servants, they are better treated than are any of the other branches of the civil service. Because the teachers were not prevented from receiving such increments as they earned by qualifying themselves for higher positions, and there are no teachers to-day who are not receiving the minimum salary

of their respective positions—not one of them. Wherever a teacher last year passed an examination which qualified him or her for a better position, he or she got the salary pertaining to that higher grade. In providing these increases, £1,300 or £1,400 were expended, while the total amount of increases refused amounted to about £1,600 in all that great department. Those who did not receive their increments would have received them if they had passed their examinations to qualify them for a higher grade. Where, then, is the injustice? It was the unqualified teachers unable to pass their examinations and get into a higher grade who suffered.

Mr. Bath: Yes, and for the most part they were stuck away in the back country where they had no facilities for study.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Oh yes they had. How can they have the facilities for teaching if they have not the facilities for study? They can have the books sent to them, together with the examination papers, and can correspond with the officials of the department, and so can improve and qualify themselves to pass the examination. I think every facility is given that can be given under the circumstances in which they are placed for our teachers to educate themselves.

Mr. Bath: Yes, it is just as easy as drinking a glass of champagne.

Mr. Hudson: Was the passing of an examination a condition precedent to the receiving of the increment?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No, not in every case.

Mr. Hudson: Well what is the use of attempting to mislead us?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I can only repeat that the teachers of our Education Department are as well off and, in many cases, better off than those in any of the other States of the Commonwealth. I have previously given the figures to show that they are better paid—although in many cases I would like to see them receiving higher salaries, yet as a matter of fact they are better paid than those of any other State of the Commonwealth, and better treated than the members of any other branch of the

civil service in this State. So much in regard to the increments to teachers, which have been stopped. It is not a pleasing duty for any Government to say to anyone, "You shall not have an increase this year"; and we recognise that an increment stopped one year is for ever lost. Still, I submit for the consideration of hon. members whether it is not better to say to a man who has not received an advance, "We cannot give you an advance this year" than to say perhaps to a number of others, "We must reduce you by 5 per cent or 10 per cent." It is much better. I have often had experience of hard times in the old country with numbers of employees, and on every occasion their anxiety has been to maintain their positions at the existing standard through the hard times, rather than have a number of their fellows reduced or retrenched.

Mr. Angwin: Is it better to tell a man of low salary that you are not going to give him an increase or to tell a man of high salary that he can have an increase?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It all depends upon what the member deems a high salary. It is not so much a hardship for a man not to receive what he has only been expecting to receive as it is to take away from him something he has been accustomed to having.

Mr. Swan: You think that by starving him you will get him used to it?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If a married man with a family, on say £300 a year has to suffer a 10 per cent. reduction, he will find it very hard indeed; but if it is merely a case of his not getting an increase of £30 on that £300, he will find it no great difficulty to go on this year as he went last year. There appears to me to be no answer to the argument. I need hardly remind hon. members that although we have been charged with stopping these increments, it was left to this Government to carry out a promise given by the Leake Administration in regard to retrospective increases. We had to find several thousands of pounds in order to make good the promise of the Leake Administration, which had been ignored both by the James and the Darglish Administrations.

That does not show that in the members of the present Government the civil servants have those who are unsympathetic with them, who wish to deal unfairly by them, who are the opponents of the civil servants and wish to crush them. We want to do what is fair. At the same time we expect that they shall willingly accept a fair share of the burden which has fallen upon everyone throughout the State. Now let me say in conclusion that the cry in regard to the hospitals is one which seems to me to be without any strong measure of support; in fact I am sorry to think that it has been raised more for party purposes than in any desire to set the Government on the right track according to the views of hon. members.

Mr. Walker: It is impossible to set you on the right track.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We think that we are on the right track, and that we do not require to be put there. Everyone has complained about the cost of our Medical Department. Time after time it has been attacked by members opposite as being extravagant.

Mr. Bath: No.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Every time the Estimates are on, if the hon. member will turn up *Hansard* he will see attacks on the extravagance of the Medical Department; but now directly the Minister in charge of that department takes it in hand and suggests something that is going to effect economy without impairing efficiency we have a howl all round, and the member for Cue gets up and talks with a cry of horror about putting these hospitals under proper business control, and says we are not doing it. I want to know how we are going to do it, if putting them under the control of local boards will not do it. How can we have a hospital 600 miles from the head office properly and economically run and controlled? Is it not apparent that a local board having the responsibility for the finances as well as the control of the institution in other ways will give that business control which the hon. member desires, but which he evidently does not see can be effected

in this direction? The hon. member believes in local control, but he does not believe in local financial responsibility. That is the very thing we have had to combat for years, not only during our administration but during the administration by the Labour Government, the fact that we had these institutions, the management of which was controlled by boards who had no financial responsibility, but all they had to do was to send in requisitions to the Government. There is an instance in the Perth hospital, the cost of which has increased from £16,000 in the previous year to £20,000 last year.

Mr. Bath: That was owing to the increase in the cost of articles consumed. That is shown in their report.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: A portion of it was I believe; but the same thing occurs throughout the State, and the Premier pointed out several instances that came under his notice in outlying hospitals. It shows at once that those who have no financial responsibility are not going to move in the direction of economy when they find that the provision is more than is required for the centre.

Mr. Bath: You ask them to assume financial responsibility, but you drain their revenue from them.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No we do not, we give them what is considered a fair allowance for medical attendance and nurses, and for the maintenance of indigent patients.

Mr. Bath: Calculated on what basis?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Calculated on what has gone before in the past year or two.

Mr. Walker: And give the Government every chance to break faith.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not know what the hon. member means.

Mr. Walker: The Minister will remember that I waited on him and drew his attention to a breach of faith with the Kanowna hospital.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: What was the breach of faith?

Mr. Walker: The promise to pay a certain subsidy, but the moment the Government found there was a credit in the bank at Kanowna they cut off three

months' subsidy. True, they afterwards admitted their mistake and paid some, but not all, and they still owe on these subsidies to the Kanowna hospital.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member is aware that the hospital is only there to expend the money necessary to treat the patients that come to it. If the hospital to which the hon. member refers has any credit surely he does not propose that the Government should go on paying subsidies to an institution with funds to its credit. I understood the hon. member to say that he had had a satisfactory settlement of the dispute, or that he was satisfied with the compromise that had been effected.

Mr. Walker: It was a case of compromise rather than get nothing.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Whether that be so or not, I submit, with all due deference, that one swallow does not make a summer, that one mistake, if it be a mistake, which I do not admit, is not going to effect the principle, namely, that the hospital will be better managed under a local committee of management with a fixed allowance, knowing that it has the financial responsibility, than if it be managed from the head office in Perth.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Should not the hospital committee make provision for an epidemic, and have some funds in hand?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Not necessarily. No hospital requires to have much money on hand. If an epidemic occurs they come down on the Government and the boards of health. In fact the Act provides that they shall. All I want to point out is that the Government are making a fair attempt to economise in a legitimate direction, and that they are making a wise attempt, in my opinion, to place the management of these institutions under the control of local bodies, as they are managed in the other States of the Commonwealth successfully and economically; also that they are placing the onus on the local managing boards to enforce the payment of fees from patients who use the hospitals and can afford to make payments: and I do not think that anyone can take offence at that atti-

tude of the Government. Rather than condemnation the Government should receive commendation at the hands of our critics in that respect. The cry for economy goes round the State. Wherever hon. members go and address their electors or other meetings they talk economy. The Leader of the Opposition is always talking economy. Yet directly the effort is made in one direction we have wholesale condemnation.

Mr. Angwin: It is not economy; it is only another method of raising money; just removing the responsibility to another man.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is nothing but the business control the member for Cue advocated, which, as I said at the outset, is going to effect economy without impairing efficiency, and surely the hon. member is in favour of that?

Mr. Angwin: No; it is only raising the money in another direction.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I submit in conclusion that the Governor's Speech, which was read at the opening of this Parliament, contains briefly the outline of a continuation of the progressive policy which has characterised the Administration since their inception. I submit, with all due deference—

Mr. Holman: And humility.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: And with all humility, I submit that the efforts of the Government have been wisely directed in the development of the natural resources of the State with good effect. I submit, further, that the finances of the State have been held with a firm hand by every Minister controlling departments, that substantial economies have been effected in nearly every department, and that the lean moneys that have been raised have been wisely expended in the best interests of the people generally. I cannot say more than that. Of course if other members had been in our positions I have no doubt the Leader of the Opposition would have put the break on and cried "mark time" once more. I am thankful that the wisdom of a united people has decided that he shall remain where he is, as Leader of the Opposition,

in order that he may bring forth from time to time these harmless criticisms, so far as we are concerned, and, I venture to think, unwise deductions, so far as the credit of the State is concerned. I hope he will take a more optimistic view of the future of this great country; that he will realise there are unbounded resources, and that the matter of a small deficit, increasing perhaps rather unduly at the present time, is not one for alarm, and that with the recurrence of the good seasons, a plentiful rainfall, and the large export of wheat, which is bound to follow, he may take heart and that the land which he himself has taken up will bring him that measure of prosperity and wealth which I think is going to come to all those who have the faith and confidence to invest in the real estate of this portion of the Commonwealth.

On motion by Mr. Holman, debate adjourned.

BILL—BILLS OF SALE ACT AMENDMENT.

Received from the Legislative Council, and read a first time.

House adjourned at 10.13 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 2nd September, 1909.

	PAGE
Questions: Mining and Foreign Labour ...	159
Railway Project, Leonora-Lawlers ...	159
Open Markets ...	159
Railway, Mundaring Weir ...	159
Address-in-Reply, fourth day, conclusion ...	159
Bill: Sea Carriage of Goods, 2a. ...	169
Adjournment, state of business ...	171

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