

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I move—

That the following stand as the Second Schedule:—"Rabbits, foxes, dingoes, dogs run wild or at large, sparrows, starlings." New schedule put and passed.

[The President resumed the Chair.]

Bill again reported with further amendments.

#### BILL—FORESTS.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

House adjourned at 4.45 p.m.

## Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 7th November, 1918.

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

[For "Questions on Notice" and "Papers Presented" see "Votes and Proceedings."]

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. THOMSON, leave of absence for one month granted to the member for Albany (Mr. H. Robinson) on the ground of ill-health.

#### BILL—FORESTS.

Read a third time, and transmitted to the Council.

#### BILL—INTERPRETATION.

##### Council's Amendments.

Schedule of two amendments made by the Council now considered.

##### In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; the Attorney General in charge of the Bill.

No. 1—Clause 31, before the word "document," wherever occurring, insert the words "notice or":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

The words "notice or" occur before "document" the first time the latter word is used, but not later. The Council's amendment, therefore, seems to me an improvement.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 2—Clause 31, strike out the word "registered" in Subclauses 1 and 2:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The word "registered" was inserted here at the instance of the member for Sussex. Before the Bill was transmitted to the Legislative Council—in fact, the next morning after the amendment had been made—it dawned on me that the provision as to registration would apply to every document to be served, would apply to the many thousands of notices the Colonial Treasurer and the Commissioner of Taxation require to send out. The tax on the State would be enormous for work which is now done by the General Post Office without such a tax. Therefore, at my suggestion, the word "registered" was deleted in the Council. Had I given more consideration to the amendment, I should not have accepted it. Accordingly I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a Message accordingly returned to the Council.

#### BILL—PRISONS ACT AMENDMENT.

##### Council's Amendments.

Schedule of two amendments made by the Council now considered.

##### In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair, the Attorney General in charge of the Bill.

No. 1, Clause 3, 64e, Subclause (2): Add the following words: "And shall act without remuneration":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: This is a matter we discussed somewhat fully in this Chamber. There was no mention in the original clause as to whether there should be remuneration or not. Some members of the Committee thought that there should be remuneration, and others considered there should not, but the matter was left quite open. The Legislative Council suggest that there should not be remuneration. I have no hesitation in saying that if it is impossible to get the proper personnel of the board—and without that proper personnel the Act would be no good—without remuneration, I would immediately come to the House again and ask to be given permission to remunerate. At the present moment I am not prepared to dispute that which has come to us from another place. I therefore move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I am sorry that the Attorney General has agreed to accept this amendment. Many of those who speak about prison reform imagine that all we require to do is to appoint a board of well-meaning and, in some cases, interfering busybodies who know nothing of the subject they are called upon to deal with. The Attorney General is taking up a weak stand when he says that if

he finds he is unable to secure a suitable personnel he will come down with an amendment. If that is his attitude he should have resisted the Council's amendment, because, as the Bill stands now, it gives him a perfectly free hand. The only way to achieve the object he has in view, without going to the trouble of bringing down an amending Bill later on, is to reject the amendment and retain a free hand for himself. If he can get people to do the work for nothing, well and good; if not, he is free to provide fees for them. I think, however, that we are wasting time discussing the Bill, because the whole thing is a farce. I am going to oppose the amendment, and I hope members will do likewise.

Hon. T. WALKER: These boards as a rule are not executive, useful boards; they are mostly a convenient little group of people with good intentions no doubt. There is much room for science in the reform of our criminals, as there is in the reform and treatment of lunacy, or even patients in our hospitals. I have not a spark of sentiment in this matter; I look upon a diseased creature as one who requires scientific treatment, and we cannot provide that treatment by a board such as we now have, and consisting of the chaplain, the superintendent, and the visiting magistrates. That kind of board cannot possibly bring the necessary knowledge to bear on the treatment of a prisoner. I want knowledge brought to bear on the treatment of the unfortunate, and we cannot get that in voluntary service. We have to pay for knowledge there as we have to pay for the treatment of lunatics in the asylum. Almost two-thirds of the persons in the gaols of Australia are mentally deficient or diseased or on the border line of lunacy, if they are not actually lunatics. I trust the Committee will not approve of the amendment made by the Council. I want to make my protest emphatic.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am inclined to agree with the view put forward by the leader of the Opposition, and perhaps it would be better to leave the clause as it was when it left this House. There is no restriction then as to whether we shall or shall not pay. If we adopted the amendment and afterwards found that it did not work we should have to come to the House for permission to pay the board.

Hon. P. Collier: We can say we do not intend to pay if we can get suitable and proper persons without payment.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: That is what I have said all along. I do not want mere faddists. If we can get competent people who will give us their services, let us avail ourselves of them. Since the Empire has been at war, many business men who never dreamt of it before, have given their services to the Empire free which they would not have done otherwise. If we can get suitable service free, well and good, otherwise I shall be prepared to pay for the service. Therefore, I withdraw the motion I made and submit another.

Hon. P. Collier: Allow it to be defeated.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Very well.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 2—Clause 3, 64 (e), Subclause 7—Strike out the words "or by Order in Council":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: If this had been noticed when the Bill was in this House, in all probability the words would have been struck out, because in two or three places, when dealing with the powers of the board, orders given other than by virtue of the statute were excised. This one seems not to have caught our attention. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Resolutions reported, and a committee consisting of Hon. T. Walker, Mr. Mullany, and the Attorney General drew up reasons for not agreeing to one amendment made by the Council.

Reasons adopted, and a Message accordingly returned to the Council.

#### PAPERS—REGISTRATION OF WORKERS' UNION.

Debate resumed from the 3rd October on the following motion by Mr. Munsie:—"That all papers relating to the application for registration under the Arbitration Act by the Goldfields Mining and General Workers' Industrial Union of Workers be laid on the Table of the House."

The MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. C. A. Hudson—Yilgarn) [5.16]: This motion is, on the face of it, quite an innocent one, but the terms used by the mover caused some perturbation in the minds both of the Minister who administers the department which controls the industrial unions, and of the Attorney General. I think that when an explanation is given the hon. member who made certain allegations against officers in those departments, will be one of the first to acknowledge that his suspicions are unfounded. I shall refer to only two points in connection with the application. The first is this: the hon. member, in moving the motion, suggested that Mr. Bennett, the Registrar of Industrial Unions, had endeavoured to help a union to become registered when it was not so entitled.

Mr. Munsie: No, distinctly not.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I am glad to have that expression.

Mr. Munsie: "Hansard" shows that I said I had every confidence in Mr. Bennett.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: On account of the intimation that has gone forth it is, perhaps, better that I should read the minute which was put up by Mr. Bennett to the Under Secretary of Law, as follows—

Attached is an application by the Goldfields Mining Workers' Industrial Union of Workers, W.A., for registration as an industrial union. The union is already registered under the Trades Union Act. When the meeting called for the purpose of authorising the application was advertised the name of the trade union was used, but at that meeting the name of the union, for the

purpose of the Industrial Arbitration Act, was changed, and the application was submitted under the new name. One of the objections urged against the registration is to the effect that the procedure in regard to the name is absolutely fatal to the application (the change of name has not been registered under the Trades Union Act). One of the principal arguments submitted by the applicant union is that it is not convenient for their members to belong to the existing unions because (1) the latter are Federal unions, and all their industrial troubles are settled by the Federal Court. About 18 months ago one or two members of the existing unions stated on oath that they had lost faith in the State court on account of a statement by the President, Mr. Justice Northmore, in regard to increased cost of living. (2) There is violent political antagonism between the two sections on national views regarding the war. The attached notice, as well as the documents submitted, will explain the position. Will you kindly request the Crown Solicitor to advise whether the applicant union is entitled to be registered? When the Crown Solicitor has had an opportunity of considering the matter, I should like to discuss it with him.

That is dated 21st August, 1918. I think it is quite in order that the registrar, having had an application made to him for the registration of a union, and certain novel points having been raised, should have an opportunity of submitting it to the Crown Law Department. In to-day's paper Mr. Justice Rooth, in the matter of the licensing cases recently discussed in the House, stated that officers of the Crown Law Department should not interfere in the administration of justice, but that applications might be made to them for advice. The Crown Solicitor did give advice on the question raised by the registrar, in the following terms—

If it is made to appear to you (1) that the existing union of mining workers is one which contributes from its funds to the support of a political party to which the persons now applying for registration are strongly opposed, or (2) that the existing union is conducted and carried on in the interests of such political party, or (3) that those having the controlling power in the existing union have adopted a policy of ignoring the State Arbitration Court as much as possible, then, I think, it would be open to you to hold that those persons now applying for registration cannot conveniently belong to the existing union. But there is, it seems to me, a fatal objection to granting the present application for registration.

Hon. P. Collier: Who is that?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Dr. Stow. I should like to draw attention to Section 19 of the Industrial Arbitration Act, 1912, which provides—

The Registrar may refuse to register any society, trade union, or company as an industrial union if in the same locality there exists an industrial union to which the members or the bulk of the members of such

society, trade union, or company can conveniently belong.

Hon. P. Collier: He says they cannot conveniently belong, because a few may differ politically. It is ridiculous nonsense.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It is somewhat of an elastic term, but I am not going to discuss that phase of it now.

Hon. T. Walker: That is just the evil—putting it to a man like Dr. Stow.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I think the evil arose through the then Attorney General, who introduced the Bill, using the phrase "conveniently belong." However, to show that he was not biased in any way, Dr. Stow goes on to say—

The meeting called to authorise the application for registration and to pass the rules was a meeting of the Goldfields Mining and General Workers' Industrial Union of Workers; the application is from the Goldfields Mining Workers' Industrial Union of Workers. This is not a mere change of name which, perhaps, would not matter, but the application is not by the society or body to which notice was given to attend the meeting. The application is by different persons. It excludes some of the members of the society which was summoned to meet. Therefore it seems to me that Section 7 of the Industrial Arbitration Act has not been complied with, and the application cannot be granted. It will be necessary, I think, for the persons intending to form the union to establish a fresh society, excluding those members who are not mining workers, have a fresh meeting and make a fresh application.

Mr. Munsie: What date was the reference from the registrar to Dr. Stow?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That was 21st August, and the reply is dated 28th August. I now lay the papers on the Table.

Mr. MUNSIE (Hannans—in reply) [5.24]: I am glad the Minister has laid the papers on the Table. I again want to emphasise the fact that the Minister was under a misapprehension when he said that I stated the registrar had endeavoured to do something in the interests of one or the other of the two organisations. I did not say anything of the sort.

The Minister for Mines: And you did not extend that to the Crown Law Department either?

Mr. MUNSIE: Not other than this: I did say that in my opinion it was unwise in the Crown Law authorities to interfere; that in my opinion the registrar was there to register unions; that if he made a wrong registration the union had the right of appeal, while if he refused to register the organisation, those who represented it had the right to appeal to the Arbitration Court, which is the correct course.

The Minister for Mines: That is so, but you admit that the registrar had the right to seek the advice of the Crown Law authorities?

Mr. MUNSIE: Certainly he has that right. As a matter of fact, I have been with the registrar on several occasions to the Crown Law authorities in connection with the registra-

tration of trades unions. I am pleased that I moved the motion and that the papers have been laid on the Table, if it were only on the score of the one minute read by the Minister. In my opinion the interpretation given to the Act by the Crown Law authorities is, as the leader of the Opposition said, a ridiculous one.

Question put and passed.

## ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1918-19.

In Committee of Supply.

Resumed from the previous day; Mr. Munster in the Chair.

Colonial Secretary's Department, Hon. H. P. Colebatch, Minister—Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister) in charge of the votes.

Vote—Police, £127,193:

Mr. O'LOGHLEN (Forrest) [5.27]: I desire to bring under the notice of the Minister one or two phases of administration in this department. The member for Murchison last evening took exception to the practice adopted by Ministers, who, when introducing measures, get the head of the department to give them assistance. If that is rendered necessary in the case of a Bill, I think it is also necessary in a discussion on the Estimates. One or two items which I shall bring up cannot be replied to by the Honorary Minister this evening, for he has no knowledge of the subject, and consequently all he will be able to do is to give me an assurance that the thing shall be put right.

The Minister for Mines: Is this another Campbell case?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: No, there are more than Campbell cases cropping up in this department from time to time. If the Ministerial head of the department were in this Chamber, he would be able to give a reply to any observations made. However, there are only one or two matters in connection with the Police Estimates upon which I shall touch in the general debate. The first is the policy in respect to the headquarters, Perth. I am informed that in the police barracks there are only half-a-dozen recruits being housed. If these men were given accommodation outside the institution, the building could be utilised by other Government departments, which are in need of further accommodation, with great advantage to the State. There has been a diminution in the number of recruits for the police force during the last few months, and several of the recruits have married and taken up homes of their own. Another feature about this department is the imposition placed upon officers, who are obliged to attend there periodically for the purpose of going through drill. The Police Department is a semi-military institution. The Honorary Minister may find it difficult to prove that this drill is necessary. I fail to see why constables should be called in from the suburban areas, possibly after being on duty all night, to go through this drill, and I have never yet met any sensible man who claimed that there was any advantage to be derived from it either by

the officer or the department. I believe that members of the police force object to the practice, and cannot see what benefit the department can derive from it. I also wish to make a protest with regard to the method of transfers in the Police Department. It appears to me that very often strings are pulled for the purpose of moving officers to some other part of the State. I wish to mention particularly the case of a constable who after 18½ years of service, was removed from a fairly important town to an insignificant one, merely for the reason that he incurred the displeasure of less than half-a-dozen of the leading citizens of the centre in which he was located. The officer in question was stationed at Beverley, and had been there for just on five years. He joined the police force in 1900 and has had a splendid record right through. On two or three occasions he has been in charge of stations. On the 3rd May he was obliged to prosecute certain persons in the town for a breach of the Licensing Act. Before launching that prosecution he put the case before his inspector, who instructed him to proceed. That removes from the constable's shoulders the charge that he was actuated by vindictive motives in going on with the case. The full details of the prosecution were sent to the inspector. It happened that a couple of solicitors, and the proprietor of the local newspaper, who was a member of the licensing bench, were the defendants, and the constable was reported for having shown partiality. The inspector made inquiries and found that the charge was not proven. It appears that some of the leading residents were determined to get even with the constable, and reported him again. On the 15th June the constable reported that certain proceedings were going on at one of the hotels in the town. The inspector again urged him to take action, but in this case the prosecution was dismissed. As a result of the application made by a few of the residents, Chief Inspector McKenna instituted an inquiry and exonerated Constable Johns from any blame whatever. On the 19th August, only a little while after he fell foul of these three or four citizens, he was ordered to leave the town and go to the less important station of Three Springs. This meant a loss to him and a reduction in his salary.

Hon. R. H. Underwood: There was no reduction in salary.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: There are pickings at certain stations and various ways of supplementing one's salary, and this does not apply in the case of Three Springs, which is one of the least important police stations in the rural areas. On being instructed to proceed to Three Springs he protested to the Commissioner and pointed out that he had a clean record of 18½ years, and that he did not think it right, because four or five persons differed with his method of administration, he should be removed. In reply to the protest, the Commissioner pointed out that he had the utmost confidence in this officer and had nothing against him, and that his record in the department was a splendid one.

A petition was sent out against this officer's transfer. It was signed extensively, it is stated, by 95 per cent. of the residents of the town. This petition was presented to the Commissioner, and a deputation consisting of Mr. Wansbrough, ex-member for the district, Mr. Filmer, a justice of the peace, and Mr. Bateman, a member of the roads board, supplemented the voice of that petition. They got no satisfaction from the Commissioner, so they waited on the Colonial Secretary, who endorsed the attitude of the Commissioner, as he generally does. Although it was said that a man should not be penalised because four or five men have a set on him, the whole thing went through the usual official channels, and the deputation was informed that there was nothing else for it but for the officer to go to Three Springs. The Colonial Secretary said that he had nothing against the man. In my opinion the Minister and the Commissioner have no right to yield to the wishes of less than half-a-dozen people, simply because they had some pull.

Hon. R. H. Underwood: The Minister does not go into these questions.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: He did in this case because he received the deputation.

Hon. R. H. Underwood: There should be no deputation about these matters.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Perhaps not, but why did the Minister receive it unless there were some facts to be advanced?

Hon. R. H. Underwood: He could not tell what facts were to be advanced until the deputation had advanced them.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I want to know if the Minister approves of this kind of thing? A big public meeting was held, and a purse of sovereigns presented to the constable on the eve of his departure. It appears from the Press reports of the meeting that this officer enjoyed the confidence of the people of the whole district. Many of these people have told me that they objected to less than half-a-dozen persons, because they had to be prosecuted, being able to exercise the influence they did.

Hon. R. H. Underwood: That is ground for objection.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: They wanted this officer removed because he had done his duty.

Mr. Duff: These removals are happening every day. It is only right that the residents should have some say in the matter.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: It is a different matter if a majority of the residents desires to have an officer removed.

Mr. Duff: The residents are not running the police force.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Four or five of them are in this case.

Mr. Pickering: What was the ground for the prosecution?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The constable prosecuted four or five of the leading residents of the town because they were committing a breach of the Licensing Act.

Mr. Thomson: What was the breach?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: That they were on licensed premises after hours.

Mr. Thomson: For what purpose were they meeting there?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I do not know.

Mr. Thomson: I will tell you. It was a repatriation committee meeting that they were attending.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: That is an extraordinary thing.

Mr. Thomson: It is correct.

Mr. Harrison: There would be no breach of the Act unless they were consuming alcoholic liquor.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Surely the hon member knows the Licensing Act better than that. It would be a novel plea in a police court if people told the bench that they were on licensed premises for repatriation purposes. The bench would not be guided by a plea of that kind. I have no knowledge as to why these persons were on the premises, but if anyone is in a desperate corner it is a good thing to manufacture a plea of some kind.

Mr. Thomson: They were there for that purpose.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: They certainly were there, and the action of the constable in launching the first prosecution was upheld. I do not know why they were there.

Mr. Thomson: I am telling you.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Perhaps the hon. member was one of them.

Mr. Thomson: If you had the evidence before you, you would know all about that.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I have none of the evidence in connection with this prosecution, except that I know that the court upheld it. This was evidence that the constable was in the right. The second case was dismissed, but on both occasions the inspectors sided with the constable and urged him to go on with the prosecution. If that is the case the constable is not to blame, but the inspectors are. If the inspectors and the Commissioner are prepared to throw bouquets at this constable, he should not be penalised simply because a few people have interested themselves in having him transferred. I am led to believe this sort of thing has occurred in the Murchison and other districts. Does the Minister approve of the system, that, when there is nothing against an officer, and the majority of the residents of the locality are prepared to stand behind him in his public administration, half-a-dozen people who possess a little influence can bring about his transfer?

Hon. R. H. Underwood: I approve of the Commissioner handling these affairs.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: In this case he allowed it to go on to the Minister. Is the Honorary Minister prepared to say that there should be no review of a case, whether the Commissioner is right or wrong? Does he say that the Commissioner is infallible?

Hon. R. H. Underwood: No.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: And that the actions of the police force should not be questioned by Parliament?

Hon. R. H. Underwood: I do not say that public meetings are going to keep policemen in their places.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Is the Commissioner to have an absolutely free hand? I know of many

transfers to which I can take no exception. I believe in giving the Commissioner great powers, because he is competent, perhaps, to deal with the various cases. He knows the business, and controls promotions and other things in the police force. Does the Honorary Minister say that because a decision is given there should be nothing said about it?

Hon. R. H. Underwood: I did not say that.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Did not the Honorary Minister say that he believed in the Minister controlling the police force?

Hon. R. H. Underwood: The Commissioner, and, if he is not capable of doing it, he should make room for someone else.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: If it is brought under the notice of the Honorary Minister that even the Commissioner may fail, is there no other agency by which redress may be obtained? The deputation, which consisted of reputable citizens, must have had a pretty strong case, and must have had public opinion behind it, when these gentlemen, at their own expense, journeyed to the City to put the case before the Commissioner, and afterwards before the Minister. Will the Minister and the Commissioner lay it down that a constable who does his duty is not to be penalised simply because such may be the desire of three or four people who count above the rest of the community? The public meeting expressed disgust at the constable's removal. Irrespective of the place from which the constable is removed and of the place to which he is transferred, does the Honorary Minister approve of the policy of allowing half a dozen people to shift an officer of police?

Hon. R. H. Underwood: The hon. member is not stating the case correctly. Nobody except the Commissioner can shift a constable. Nobody demanded this constable's removal.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: In view of that statement, it may be of interest to read some correspondence on the subject.

Members: From whom? Name!

Mr. Teesdale: Can one man influence the Commissioner, as against a whole town?

Mr. Jones: Easily. It depends on who the man is.

Mr. Teesdale: Do not talk such rubbish.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: If hon. members want the name, it is the member for Beverley.

Mr. Teesdale: Read the report. Let us have every publicity in the matter.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I wish the member for Beverley were in his place to-night. That hon. member objected to being prosecuted, and he wrote to the Attorney General—

Mr. Thomson: How did you get that correspondence?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The member for Beverley reported the action of the constable in prosecuting certain people who were on licensed premises after hours.

Mr. Teesdale: Was the member for Beverley one of them?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Yes.

Mr. Thomson: What was he there for?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: For repatriation purposes, I suppose. If that were so, it would be

a good defence in court. Some friends of mine on the goldfields who not so long ago were found on licensed premises after hours claimed to be sitting as a progress committee; but they were fined, notwithstanding. Certainly the constable should not be penalised if his inspector instructed him to prosecute. The reports in the local newspaper of the send-off which the constable was given—

Hon. R. H. Underwood: Local papers are never wrong.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The writer of the article was, I believe, one of the persons prosecuted. I ask, is an officer who fearlessly does his duty, and against whom there is no black mark, to become the plaything of three or four people whose displeasure he may have incurred?

Mr. Pickering: Read the letter of the member for Beverley.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I do not like reading letters in the hon. member's absence. However, this is it—

Beverley, July 8th, 1918. The Hon. the Attorney General, Perth.

Incidentally, I do not know why the member for Beverley wrote to the Attorney General instead of the Colonial Secretary.

Dear Sir,—I desire to bring under your notice one of the most discourteous, indiscreet, and unjust actions ever perpetrated by a member of the police force in this district. I appeal to you to have an inquiry made through the Commissioner into the case. Either Constable Johns or his chief should be severely dealt with over this matter. It is an absolute insult to me, and to the other three defendants. Our good name and self-respect have been questioned, and our characters blemished, in the eyes of the public, through a disgraceful action of the police force. Had I been one who frequents public houses for the purpose of obtaining liquor after hours at night, I could have understood the constable's action; but I have strictly refrained from having liquor in any hotel in the town after hours for a considerable period.

I do not for a moment think the member for Beverley does frequent hotels after hours for the purpose of obtaining liquor.

If a constable acts as a vilipend, my life will be intolerable. Being a member of Parliament, and chairman of the Beverley Roads Board, etc., it is often necessary for me to frequent the hotels after hours to meet distinguished visitors, officers of different departments, etc., to discuss matters of importance pertaining to the district. According to the action of the police, in such cases I would be liable to be insulted, taken into custody, and prosecuted. I would be leaving myself open to prosecution should I be passing the hotel and had occasion to go into the backyard to make use of the urinal after hours. The power in the Licensing Act is needed; I do not suggest any alteration; but I do contend that constables, when placed in important positions, should use common sense, and discretion . . .

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Very well—and not allow their imaginations to swerve them from the paths of justice. I attach particulars of the case. Trusting you will take immediate action in the matter, Yours faithfully, (signed) F. T. Broun.

Mr. Thomson: Is that the full letter?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Yes.

Mr. Thomson: You infer that the member for Beverley influenced the Commissioner of Police by that letter?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: That letter is quite sufficient for my purpose. I did not wish to read the letter, and I never mentioned the name of its writer until I was asked for the name. We have been assured that the officer will not be penalised by his transfer. But he has, in fact, been penalised. I want the assurance of the Minister in charge of the Police Department that henceforth no officer will be penalised for doing his duty.

Mr. PICKERING: (Sussex) [5.56]: Some imputation has been cast by the previous speaker on the member for Beverley (Mr. Broun), but I am convinced that that hon. member had no intention whatever of using any influence in order to obtain the removal of the police officer in question. The member for Beverley in his letter asked that the constable should be dealt with leniently.

Mr. Jones: No. Dealt with immediately.

Hon. P. Collier: Dealt with severely.

Mr. PICKERING: Prior to taking action, the constable saw those gentlemen sitting in a room, and they were not taking any drink at all. He knew that they were meeting for repatriation purposes. I have risen to express my resentment that any imputation should be cast on the member for Beverley in this regard.

Mr. TEESDALE (Roebourne) [5.58]: In this affair I am not at all interested in the member for Beverley (Mr. Broun). What I want to know is whether the statements of the member for Forrest (Mr. O'Loghlen) convey any imputation against the Police Department? Does the hon. member think that the letter written by the member for Beverley caused the action of the Commissioner in transferring the constable? To me it seems that there is nothing in that letter to cause the Commissioner to take such drastic action. Was a move made in the matter by other residents of the district as well as by the member for Beverley?

Mr. O'Loghlen: I do not know. The Honorary Minister can tell you that.

Mr. FOLEY (Leonora) [5.59]: When visiting Beverley recently, I gathered that the opinions of a good many people there coincide with that expressed by the member for Forrest (Mr. O'Loghlen) to-night regarding this constable's transfer. I have no personal interest in the member for Beverley (Mr. Broun), and I am sure that the member for Forrest, in reading that letter, had no wish to impugn the hon. member's good name. It will be a sorry day for us as members of Parliament when we can influence the removal of police constables from one district to another. If the day arrives when we are allowed to interfere with the administration

of the police force, I shall no longer want to be a member of this Chamber.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister—Pilbara) [6.1]: I have met Constable Johns, particularly in connection with aborigines work and have found him a very good officer. In this instance he was enforcing the licensing laws pretty stringently, which, of course, is quite right, but he got hold of some fairly big townspeople.

Hon. P. Collier: Big fish.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: They were prominent residents of Beverley, and they were fined. The second case was a legitimate gathering at an hotel and the member for the district was there. A number of people were meeting in a room not connected with the bar. They were not drinking and the constable summoned them for being on licensed premises after closing hours. That was a case where a police constable should have used his discretion. The successful policeman is the man who uses discretion. If a constable were to act on the police regulations, the force would be utterly impossible; it would break down. The powers of the police are enormous and it is imperative that the members of the force should be discreet.

Mr. Hickmott: Was this not the superior officer's fault?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: Yes, to an extent.

Hon. P. Collier: Has the superior officer been transferred?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: It was known before the matter went into court that there was no case against those people and Constable Johns knew he could not win, but he had to bring them up because he thought that having prosecuted the others when he was right, he must prosecute these people when he knew he had no case.

Mr. O'Loghlen: The inspector approved of the second prosecution.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: No, the inspector admitted he was wrong.

Mr. O'Loghlen: He urged Johns to go on.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: Constable Johns went on against the inspector.

Hon. P. Collier: I think you are mistaken.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: So far as the removal of police from one district to another is concerned, whenever that happens, an officer is not reduced in grade. In this case the constable was told that he was indiscreet and not to do it again. There has been a good deal of talk about the member for Beverley (Mr. Broun). It is not necessary for me to defend that hon. gentleman, because everyone will admit that perhaps there is no more law-abiding citizen in the Commonwealth.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Is it on the file that the constable was reprimanded for being indiscreet?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: The hon. member has had his say; let me have mine.

Mr. O'Loghlen: I am only asking you for information.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: The member for Forrest is not going to dictate to me. I shall take what action I think is best, and I have a majority behind me to do it.

Hon. P. Collier: Use your majority.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: I am not going to be dictated to.

Mr. O'Loughlen: No one was dictating to you; I only asked a question.

Hon. P. Collier: You have a beautiful majority; let us see how far you can go with them. Don't you come any bounce.

Mr. Holman: It is just what a worm would do, use his majority.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: You are only a grub. This constable was guilty of an indiscretion. There was no case against the people he prosecuted, and there was no occasion to prosecute men who were not committing some offence. That is the duty of a policeman.

Hon. T. Walker: Why persecute a policeman who did his duty?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: He was guilty of an act of indiscretion.

Hon. P. Collier: He prosecuted a member of Parliament who is one of your majority.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: He prosecuted where a prosecution was not necessary.

Mr. O'Loughlen: I agree with you there.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: What was the result? We said we would remove him from Beverley as an indication that the Commissioner did not agree with his action.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Would not a reprimand have served the purpose?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: Now with regard to the other phase of the question. It is somewhat dangerous for deputations to wait on Ministers about the actions of individual policemen. This is a matter that members of Parliament should take into consideration. Then the public should not prepare petitions to retain a policeman in a town. A policeman may possibly be trying to curry favour where he should be doing his duty. If he did his duty fairly and fearlessly he might offend somebody, and in doing that he would not have a petition prepared requesting that he should be permitted to remain in the town. Therefore, the Commissioner must look askance at such petitions. These petitions come too often in regard to public servants, and they encourage officers to give way to the public, and at times an officer may be lacking in his duty in order to become popular.

Hon. P. Collier: It cuts both ways.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: Yes, but it cuts pretty hard the way I have described. The case of the constable in question was well considered, and the Commissioner arrived at the conclusion that the constable was indiscreet.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Could he not have been reprimanded?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: I do not know that anything more than that has been done.

Mr. O'Loughlen: You have broken up his home.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: Three Springs is just as good a place as Beverley.

Hon. P. Collier: Three Springs may be better, but it is often punishment to transfer a man to a better place.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: All officers of the Government service, police, railway men, and others must always expect to be transferred. It is not right that one man should

settle down in a town for ever and that others should have to remain at places like Hall's Creek and Port Hedland for years at a time. The removal of Constable Johns is a reprimand for indiscretion; that is all it amounts to, and there is no doubt in my mind that he was indiscreet because he prosecuted people unnecessarily. With regard to members of Parliament, I am of the opinion that each member in this Assembly is one of 50 people picked from the residents of the State, and I do not know that a policeman or anyone else should not give some consideration to his respectability and honesty when he meets him in circumstances like those which occurred at Beverley.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [7.30]: In venturing a few comments on the work of the Police Department, I feel somewhat dismayed at the threat of the Minister in charge of the Estimates that in their passage he would bring to bear the weight of the powerful majority behind him. Having regard to the very severe set-back which the doctrine of might over right has sustained during the past week or two, I did not expect its introduction into the peaceful atmosphere of this Chamber. However, notwithstanding anything of that kind, I feel impelled to say something in regard to the administration of the police force by the officer at the head of the department. In doing so I think I can claim to be entirely free from bias, prejudice, or any feeling of the sort in regard to that officer. I can claim that, because the Commissioner of Police was appointed to his present office by the Government of which I was a member. Not only that, but I think that I, as a member of that Government, exercised some influence with my colleagues in securing his appointment. Therefore, as I say, I can claim that in any discussion regarding his work my remarks will be characterised by absolute impartiality. But I hope we have not yet arrived at the stage when Parliament shall be content to set up an autocracy within any section of the public service. I hope we shall never arrive at the conclusion that men occupying high positions of influence and power in any department of State are not to be questioned by the representatives of the people in this Chamber, that such officers are to be more or less permitted to exercise their own sweet will in regard to the administration of their departments, particularly when the administration of those departments so vitally affects the freedom and liberty of the people as does that of the Police Department. I do not think any Minister is called upon to defend an officer of his department whether right or wrong.

The Colonial Treasurer: They do it, though.

Hon. P. COLLIER: There appears to be a feeling growing up that if any member dares to comment on the work of a public servant the Minister must of necessity, right or wrong, uphold the actions of that officer. It is the duty of a Minister to see that an officer gets a fair deal in the House, and to see that his side of any question which may be raised is fairly and adequately placed be-



fore the House. Further than that, however, I do not think any Minister is called upon to go. For some time past I have not been satisfied with the manner in which the Commissioner of Police has discharged his responsible duties. But, first of all, let me take the question of expenditure. There is shown in the Police Estimates this year a reduction of £3,000 as against the expenditure of last year. I do not know how that reduction is to be effected or what justification the Commissioner can put forward for the expenditure last year if, this year, he can carry on with £3,000 less.

Hon. R. H. Underwood: There are fewer members of the force.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It may be so, but the reductions that have taken place in the membership of the force are very few indeed, certainly not sufficient to account for a reduction of £3,000 in the expenditure. It appears to me to be *prima facie* evidence that the expenditure last year was greater than was warranted. Anyhow, that is a matter between the Minister and his Commissioner, although I think I am justified in pointing to expenditure which does not appear to be justified, for the taxpayers are concerned in a matter of this kind. The first instance I would give is one I have mentioned before in the House: Owing to an action of the Commissioner, which I will deal with later on, in promoting an officer when there was no higher position for him to fill, in creating a second inspectorship in the Criminal Investigation Department, he perforce has had to find something for the officer in charge of the department to do other than his ordinary duties. So in these times of financial stress we have the spectacle of a scandalous waste of public funds. No other words adequately describe the position. We see Inspector Walsh, the head of the Criminal Investigation Department, travelling around the country in order to conduct comparatively trivial prosecutions. Down at Fremantle—where there is an inspector of police who has for many years past conducted prosecutions in the principal police courts of the State, including Perth, and where there is, in addition, a sergeant of police—Inspector Walsh spends his time conducting comparatively trivial prosecutions. The same thing occurs at Northam, where there is an inspector of police who for many years was a prosecuting officer in the police courts of the State. Inspector Walsh is sent to Northam to conduct prosecutions, while the inspector in charge of the district apparently remains in his office. The same thing occurs in Kalgoorlie, where Inspector Duncan is stationed. Inspector Duncan has been for many years a prosecuting officer in our police courts, notwithstanding which Inspector Walsh, at heavy expense, journeys to Kalgoorlie to conduct comparatively trivial prosecutions, while Inspector Duncan sits back in his office, and the police sergeant, who conducts the ordinary prosecutions in the police court from day to day, is also pushed into the background. I want to know why the Commissioner of Police has permitted this unneces-

sary expenditure in times of financial stress. I can certainly tell the Committee why, in my opinion, it has been done. It is because there is not sufficient work for Inspector Walsh and Inspector Mann to do in their capacities as inspectors of the Criminal Investigation Department. That is the position. If Inspector Walsh were allowed to take a prolonged holiday, at least the country would be saved his travelling expenses. Why is it that Inspector Walsh is sent out to do this work? In my opinion it is because of the friendship that exists between the Commissioner of Police and Inspector Mann. I have nothing to say in regard to Inspector Mann. I make no insinuations, I do not say he was not qualified for his promotion. But I do say that, in the circumstances in which it was obtained, it was not justifiable. In September of 1913 this order was issued at the instance of the Commissioner of Police—

The hon. the Colonial Secretary having approved of the introduction of a system of examination for promotion in the police force, it is hereby notified for general information that the first examination will be held in 1914. The examination will be held for candidates desirous of qualifying themselves for promotion to the rank of commissioned and non-commissioned officers respectively, and will be of such a nature that any man of ordinary intelligence should pass after a little preparation.

In 1915 it was further ordered—

On and after the 1st July, 1915, no member of the Force will be promoted unless he has passed the qualifying examination. That order concerning the police force was issued from the Colonial Secretary's department. On the 20th April, 1917, two years afterwards, this appeared—

Notwithstanding anything contained in C.O. 30/1913, the Governor may specially promote any member of the police force recommended by the Commissioner for exceptional ability and merit.

This was a cancellation of the previous order. That is to say, notwithstanding the previous order the Governor might promote any officer without calling upon him to pass the examination, if he possessed exceptional ability and merit. The only officer who has been promoted under this has been Inspector Mann. This reversal of the Commissioner's order was made for the specific purpose of enabling him to promote Inspector Mann from the position of sergeant to that of inspector. I think I am right in saying that Inspector Mann was promoted a fortnight before that order was issued, and in that respect the Commissioner was guilty of breaking his own regulations. If, as the Commissioner says, any man of ordinary intelligence should be able to pass that examination, why was it necessary to cancel that regulation in order that a man of exceptional ability might be promoted without having passed the examination? Presumably he could pass the examination because he possessed exceptional ability and merit. If this is so, why did he

not pass the examination? This was done, notwithstanding the fact that there was no vacant post in the Criminal Investigation Department. In this State with two inspectors the C.I.D. is over-manned tenfold as compared with any other capital city in Australia. In Brisbane there is only one head of the C.I.D. When I left Melbourne 14 years ago the population was four or five times that of the population of this State, but there was only one head of the C.I.D., the next in rank to him being sergeants. In Adelaide, a city that is much bigger than Perth, there was until quite recently only one officer in charge of the C.I.D. In Brisbane, Melbourne, and Adelaide there are hundreds of detectives, while in Western Australia there are only 28 all told, in charge of whom we have two inspectors. The result of the promotion was that there was no work for those who were in charge of these men. In order to keep Inspector Walsh employed, he had to be sent to Fremantle, Northam, Kalgoorlie and other places to conduct prosecutions. In this case the Commissioner was guilty of two acts which he cannot justify. He broke his own regulations in promoting Inspector Mann without examination, and, secondly, he promoted a man to an office which did not hold enough employment for him, and this was done notwithstanding the fact that there were sergeants in the C.I.D. who had passed the qualifying examination with credit. These sergeants were set aside in favour of Inspector Mann. As far as I know, that officer is a very excellent, capable and clever one, but no man in charge of a department is justified in exercising favouritism and practically breaking his own regulations to promote an officer and create a post for which there was no justification. What kind of discipline can he expect to have amongst his other officers, who have seen a regulation set aside in this manner? Is this not likely to create dissatisfaction and discontent, and lead to the general inefficiency of the force? There are other matters in which I think the Commissioner has failed to hold evenly the scales of justice. These matters have arisen out of the excited state of public opinion during the last year or two. Whenever I find going on the matter to which I am going to refer, I shall, as long as I can stand on my feet, resent it, no matter who may be concerned. It is unfortunately true that some officials placed in high positions in the State, believing during the political excitement and turmoil of the last year or two that they would curry favour with those in authority for the time being, have been guilty of gross political partisanship. They have allowed themselves to be swayed and influenced in the discharge of their duties by political considerations. I say deliberately that the members of the police force have, in some places, been guilty of that kind of conduct. It is bad enough if this kind of thing creeps into the Electoral Department, or some other department, but if there is one department more than another whose administration should be absolutely impartial and free from considerations of this kind, it is the Police Department, and the Justice Department, through which

the freedom and liberty of our citizens are so often involved. I know nothing of the case which has occurred at Beverley.

Hon. R. H. Underwood: There should not be anything political in that.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I know nothing about the merits of that case, but I do say that the Commissioner has transferred capable and efficient officers from one district to another for no other reason than that complaints were lodged against them because of their political views. The administration of the law in this country has, in some places, been coloured by political considerations. In Kalgoorlie and Boulder the administration of the licensing law during the past 12 months has been an absolute scandal. Members from the goldfields know that a certain amount of trading is done after hours and on Sunday on the goldfields. This has been more or less a recognised practice. Is it merely a coincidence that during the past six months or so, amongst the hotel-keepers of Kalgoorlie and Boulder who have been prosecuted for breaches of the Licensing Act, not one has been a supporter of the National party, but everyone has been a supporter of the Labour party? I make this definite charge, and can prove it, that the officer in charge there of the administration of this Act has carried out his duties scandalously and entirely from the point of view of political partisanship. There are hotels in Kalgoorlie which are known to be kept by men who are supporters of the other side of the House, at which officers of the police force will have their drink on Sunday; and yet across the street, and down the street, another officer of the police force is engaged in catching and getting evidence for a prosecution against, and prosecuting, publicans who were known to be supporters of the Labour party. I know of the case of a constable who, on the way up to the Boulder block, where there are six hotels, called in on a Sunday morning and had a drink at a so-called National house, and half an hour later passed by the other hotels and deliberately entered that hotel kept by a man who makes no secret of the fact that he is a supporter of the Labour party. The other hotels, I may mention, were kept by men who supported Nationalism. He caught the house kept by the supporter of the Labour party for Sunday trading, although there were only two men in the bar, and he summoned the licensee and prosecuted him. This amounts to a prostitution of justice. I do not say that the Commissioner of Police knew that this was going on. He cannot be acquainted with the manner in which his officers are carrying out all their duties in these scattered and remote portions of the State, but it was the duty of the inspector in charge of the Kalgoorlie district to know what was going on. He must have known, and yet no action has, apparently, been taken. I could quote many other instances regarding the transfer of constables who have not known why they were transferred. Correspondence written by active political partisans in a district has been sent to the Commissioner of Police regarding certain officers, and to that extent

these officers have been stabbed in the back. They have also been transferred without knowing the reason why. No constable should be penalised for discharging his duties if he acts honestly, or unless a charge can be proved against him, no matter what his political views may be. It is the clear duty of the Commissioner if any citizen, high or low, member of Parliament or bottle gatherer, complains to him against a constable for him to say, "Lay a charge against him." The Commissioner has about 500 regulations to enable him to deal with cases. It is his duty to say "Lay a charge against the constable and it will be inquired into." Let the officer be given, that to which any citizen of any British country is entitled, a chance of meeting his accusers before a tribunal, and answering any charge that may be made against him. Files are built up in the Commissioner's office out of letters from so called prominent citizens. We know what some of them are. We know, too, that in times of political excitement men will make statements and make charges which, perhaps, in cooler moments they would not make. But the constable does not know of these charges, although they stand as a black mark against him. He is transferred to some other part of the State without understanding why. It is idle to say that transfers of this description do not constitute punishment. The Honorary Minister laid down the doctrine this afternoon that an act of indiscretion on the part of a constable was worthy of punishment. I do not know how many of us would get on if acts of indiscretion were to merit punishment.

Hon. R. H. Underwood: I said he was reprimanded.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I will say "reprimanded" then. Let us say that a transfer is not a punishment, but a reprimand. Acts of indiscretion, we are told, merit reprimands. If that is going to be a principle adopted by the Police Department, let it be administered and carried out impartially, no matter whether the officer be high or low in the service. Let us compare a few cases which will occur to one's mind. The constable at Beverley, let us say for the moment, was indiscreet and deserved a reprimand. The reprimand took the form of transfer to another district, which I, differing from the Honorary Minister, say is a punishment, even though the constable should not lose any salary at all. That transfer will always stand against the constable in the records of the department. It will be recorded against him that he was transferred from one district of this State to another on account of some conduct of which he ought not to have been guilty. That record will stand against his advancement in the force. Now let us see how the Commission deals with men who have been guilty of acts of indiscretion in other directions. Let us take the case of a Fremantle citizen, a man named Plowden, which occurred two or three months ago. In this case a member of the detective force went to the man's private residence to make a search, suspecting that he would find there some motor car tyres alleged to have been stolen. In making the search, the detective found no motor car tyres, but he did

find about 20 yards of flannelette, which might reasonably be found at any time in any domestic household. Thereupon the detective arrested the man without warrant—a most outrageous interference with the freedom of the citizen. He was not content to issue a summons, he arrested the man. He was not looking for stolen flannelette; he did not know of any flannelette having been stolen at all. Upon the man's being brought before the Police Court, the resident magistrate, Mr. Dowley, according to the newspaper report, indignantly dismissed the charge, saying there was no justification whatever for the man's arrest. Will the Honorary Minister not agree that this was an act of indiscretion on the part of the detective officer? Has that officer been reprimanded? Not a bit of it. He goes on his way gaily, having been content to take away the liberty of a citizen without cause. I venture to say that the Police Department's records contain no reprimand for that officer. Again, let me take the Jeffrey case, where a young woman was arrested and committed for trial, the prosecution being subsequently abandoned—abandoned because on further inquiry it was found that the case rested upon the correspondence, a correspondence which did not in fact exist, between the measurements of footprints and measurements of the accused's shoes. The detective concerned admitted then that he had made a mistake of half an inch in measuring the footprints, which, instead of being eight inches long, were in fact only  $7\frac{1}{2}$  inches. And the whole case rested upon those measurements. What was the detective's explanation? He said, "I used an old rule that was much worn, and no doubt I made a mistake in reading the figures." But he made the measurements on two occasions, on two different days, and then puts himself in the position of saying, "If I made a mistake of half an inch yesterday in reading the measurements, I must of necessity make the same mistake to-morrow." What does the Commissioner say to that? It is on record that the Commissioner, when the matter was brought before him, actually complimented the officer. He says that the officer is to be complimented on the fact that he admitted having made a mistake of half an inch. The Commissioner further said that it would be a sorry day for the police force if any member of it should be punished for admitting that he had made an honest mistake. The Commissioner says this, notwithstanding that the mistake might have landed a citizen of this country in gaol for two or three years, or at all events a lengthened period. Was that officer reprimanded? He was complimented. Contrast his treatment with that meted out to the Beverley constable. It would be a very mild term to apply to that detective's conduct to say that it was merely an act of indiscretion. In my opinion a reprimand would not meet a case of that kind, which I consider calls for something in the nature of severe punishment. It is all very well for the Commissioner to talk about encouraging frankness and truthfulness in police officers,

but this officer was guilty of something that, in a police officer, almost amounted to a criminal mistake. If a toddling schoolboy made a mistake of half an inch twice in reading a rule, there is hardly a teacher in this country but would cane him for it. And yet a full grown member of our detective force is encouraged by the Commissioner to believe that he has done nothing wrong. Has any reprimand been placed upon the record of that detective? I could go on to give other instances. In Boulder we have a detective named Pitman, a big, stout, ignorant, illiterate individual. He is a member of the gold-stealing staff. During the time of the excitement of the conscription campaign, when it was necessary to secure convictions whether there was a case or not, the Commissioner of Police brought this Pitman specially down from my district, Boulder, in order to attend meetings here in Perth and take notes of the speeches made at them. The Commissioner has explained that this officer, happening to be in Perth for two or three weeks, was put on this duty. I say that that is not true. The officer was brought down from Boulder to Perth in order to do this particular work. And I will tell hon. members why. Apparently, the Commissioner was afraid that he had not in the department here an officer upon whom he could rely with absolute certainty in a matter of this sort. This man Pitman has been notorious during the last two years for his outrageous bias in all things relating to politics. I myself have seen him at public meetings, running amok and threatening everybody whom he suspected of being a supporter of the Labour party. He has threatened Labour supporters with arrest if they should dare to open their mouths. I have myself seen him at meetings where wholesale disturbances were going on, and if the disturbers were on the side which he favoured, he looked on smiling and taking no action whatever. He went into the bar of the publican whom I mentioned as having been fined, and threatened him if he would not change his politics, until the publican told him if he did not get out of the bar he would pelt him out of it. Those who were present at the trial will remember that counsel read to this man Pitman, slowly and deliberately, a few sentences of simple language, and that Pitman was unable to write down ten words of those sentences in long hand—of course he knows no more about shorthand than a pig knows.

Mr. Mullany: A man named Pitman ought to know something about shorthand.

Hon. P. COLLIER: He is not one of those Pitmans. I am glad to say he is not a descendant of Isaac Pitman. However, he made an ass of himself in this respect. And this is the man the Commissioner brings down from the goldfields. Even if what the Commissioner said was correct, that the officer was here for two or three weeks' holiday, why should the Commissioner have put him on to do the work when the regular metropolitan staff were available for it? I say deliberately that the Commissioner put Pitman on the work because he knew him to be a reliable tool who

would get just the kind of notes the department were anxious he should get. As soon as he had done that work, he was sent back to Boulder, to carry on the same old game. All over the State members of the police force have been transferred and punished. If a constable cannot rely upon the support of his superior officers when he is honestly and faithfully endeavouring to discharge his duty, what is to become of the discipline of the police force? Can we expect any constable at Beverley in future to do his duty fearlessly, especially if he is a man of discretion—and we have it on authority that discretion counts for a lot. A discreet constable stationed at Beverley will be very careful as to whom he takes action against.

Hon. R. H. Underwood: But do not forget that the constable lost the case, that the case was dismissed.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I am not dealing with the case. Of course, there are innumerable cases dismissed in which the prosecution, all the same, was justifiable. Even though the Beverley constable may have been guilty of indiscretion, contrast his punishment in being transferred to another part of the State with the treatment accorded to men around him. That is the kind of thing which is going on, and has been going on, and is continuing. I say that the Commissioner has failed to display sufficient strength of character and sufficient set purpose to stand up for what he believed to be right, irrespective of any political considerations whatever, during the stringent times of the past two years. That, in my opinion, is where the Commissioner has failed. The failure may be due to weakness in not desiring to incur the enmity or displeasure of the ruling political party of the day. But that is the most dangerous principle which could be permitted to enter the public service of this country. If it is going to be generally recognised among our civil servants that they are to colour their actions and their administration so as to meet the wishes, or what they believe to be the wishes, of the ruling party of the day, then we are going to land ourselves, within a year or two, in a condition which has made some other countries of the world famous or infamous. I have experienced it. I was in office five years and during that time, because we were the ruling party, there were officers who would have been willing to get on the mat and permit me to walk over them. That was while I was a Minister. But when I went out of office and they believed that Labour was smashed for all time, I could not get civility from them.

Hon. R. H. Underwood: There are not many like that.

Hon. P. COLLIER: No, not many, but the few I do know are highly placed men. I am not making this as a general charge. The rank and file do not come into touch with Ministers. It is the highly placed officer who is in the position of interviewing his Minister and comes into frequent contact with him and who feels that preferment will come to him according to the manner in which he shows his humility, his approval or his endorsement of the political views of the ruling party. I

have made a mental note of some of these men, and if the time should ever come that I should be in the position to exercise any influence in high places, I can assure hon. members there will be no room in the public service for sycophants of that character. We do not want such men in the service; we want men of independence, men who will stand up for what they believe to be just and right, and it is in that respect I say that the Commissioner of Police has failed. I do not want the police force to be run on those lines, and so long as I am in the House I shall protest against the administration of the police force in that way. I do not intend to give names, because I would only injure the people concerned. But there are many instances which could be referred to. We know the disgraceful action against Constable Campbell and the appointment of a Royal Commission subsequently to investigate it. There is evidence to show that the Commissioner of Police has on other occasions failed to discharge his duty, and there are other instances. With regard to the Pitman case alone, if the Commissioner is going to bring an officer from one end of the State to the other because he finds him a reliable man who will take action along lines which it is believed will suit the ruling party of the day—

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It was an insult to the other officers.

Hon. P. COLLIER: No, it was a compliment to the other officers, in that the Commissioner knew that they would not take action of that kind. He found ready and willing to do the work an illiterate, ignorant individual like Pitman. Then only a week or two ago there were prosecutions conducted for betting. What took place? The police, in order to secure a conviction, put into the witness box two well known criminals. The magistrate scornfully dismissed the case, remarking that he would not accept the evidence of such men. I know very well that the explanation will be offered that it is difficult to get reputable people to act as spies or pimps.

Mr. Pickering: What about those who obtained copies of letters from officials?

Hon. P. COLLIER: The hon. member does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. Pickering: Where did the letter come from?

Hon. P. COLLIER: How does the hon. member know that it did not come out in a perfectly legitimate way? Do not let the hon. member make an insinuation in regard to a matter about which he knows nothing.

Mr. Pickering: I only asked for an explanation.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The hon. member should not make any insinuation until he knows the facts.

Mr. Pickering: The letter ought not to have been available.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The hon. member does not know whether it should have been available or not. If the Police Department send a letter to an officer, is not that officer entitled to pass it on? Talk about files! I

could make many revelations about files and letters. This country is putrid and corrupt so far as the manipulation of files and letters is concerned. No one can say that I have ever manipulated a file during the time I was in office. I am not making any charge against the Minister or anyone else, but I know that files to-day are not worth much, and we have had recent evidence of that. Reverting to the betting case, the magistrate dismissed it contemptuously against the police. No honest citizen should have his liberty endangered by police pimps who have spent half their lives in gaol.

Hon. R. H. Underwood: This is due to legislators passing laws which cannot be carried into effect.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It will be better for the police to say, "We are not going to secure convictions against citizens by procuring criminals to give evidence against them." We have had evidence of this also from the other States during the past year, but the word of these people would not be taken anywhere. It seems to me to be a growing practice not only here but elsewhere that any kind of a scoundrel is good enough to be used as a witness to secure a conviction. Whether a man is conducting an illegal business or not, at least he has the right to have evidence given against him by men of repute and not by criminals. Better let shop betting go on for ever than do things of that description, because it may apply to a shop bettor to-day, and to other citizens to-morrow. I protest strongly against the manner in which the Commissioner is acting, and I hope during the coming year he will not be influenced by letters such as we have heard read to-night. I hope he will even decline to transfer a constable unless that constable has had the opportunity of being faced with his accusers, and a definite charge laid against him. That is the common birth-right of every citizen, be he policeman or anyone else. A letter was written to the Commissioner of Police making a charge against a constable on the goldfields, and what do hon. members think that charge was? It was not a charge of improper conduct; it was a charge of being a supporter of the O.L.P. and a request was made for that constable's transfer. We know in times of passion ignorant people believe that the most trivial charge is likely not only to secure the transfer of a constable but his execution as well. In this case I do not think he was transferred.

Hon. R. H. Underwood: Quite a number of them are supporters of the O.L.P.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I am pleased to say it has always been recognised that the police force are an intelligent body of men.

Hon. R. H. Underwood: That is why I am defending them.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I am not attacking them; I am attacking the administration. I hope that in the peaceful times that seem to be approaching there will not be so much cause for complaint as in the past. There are no officers in the service who have a more

difficult task to perform than the police in times of excitement, and in many cases it is unavoidable for them to come into contact with the rival political parties. It is possible they will be accused of being influenced by political motives, but there has been a display of partisanship in the administration of the police force during the past 12 months, which will not make for the good government of this country, or for the good administration of this important branch of the service. I hope in the future there will be less cause for complaint.

Mr. HOLMAN (Murchison) [8.30]: I did not intend to have anything to say on the Police Vote because I realise the police force of Western Australia, generally speaking, is composed of the finest body of men in the Commonwealth. But the remarks made by the Minister in charge of these Estimates has necessitated some debate. He has practically said that because he had a majority behind him he was going to ram anything down the throats of members on this side. It did not matter if the criticism was right or wrong, because he had a majority, because he had sufficient useless tools behind him he was going to rush this vote.

The CHAIRMAN: In using the term "useless tools" the hon. member is not referring to members?

Mr. HOLMAN: Having a majority.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not quite right.

Mr. HOLMAN: If members support such a proposition, whether right or wrong, then they should be so called. I do not think there is that class of man in the House, but if there is the sooner they are outside the better, and the sooner they justify their position the better. I never knew a more unwholesome proposition come out of the mouth of any man than that put forward by the Minister to-night. For the Honorary Minister to make the statement that because he has a majority behind him he can force anything through the Committee, is most dangerous. Is truth and righteousness to prevail, or is a brutal majority going to carry the sway.

Mr. Hardwick: The people behind him.

Mr. HOLMAN: The Honorary Minister was dealing with the Estimates before the House, not the people, and the very attitude of the Whip shows that he is one of the majority that will do these things.

Mr. Hardwick: Mr. Chairman, that is rather a reflection on me.

The CHAIRMAN: What is?

Mr. Hardwick: The hon. member said that I was one of a majority who would brutally carry things through the House.

Mr. HOLMAN: The intelligence of the hon. member will not carry him very far.

Mr. Hardwick: If I were you I would keep off intelligence.

Mr. HOLMAN: I have not much use for donkey riding, therefore I will keep off. There have been causes for complaint in some directions. I remember constables being removed from places in my district because they were alleged to be strong supporters of the Labour party. The same reason has been the cause of disturbances in

other parts of the State. In connection with one case, I heard the words in Perth myself from those who are on the opposite side of politics to me, and they said the constable was going to be removed. I say the same rotten corruption almost brought about the downfall of the British Empire, and the same system is being adopted in Western Australia to-day. The same rotten system is being carried further in this country to-day than ever before, and so long as people belong to that section, there is a chance of it being carried on. The sooner we realise that it should be stamped out, the better for all of us. Unfortunately, there was a constable who made damaging statements in a letter to the Commissioner in his own defence which prevented me from taking action I would have otherwise taken. This constable admitted that certain things prevailed and he made remarks which he should not have done at the time. If that had not been the case I would have taken the matter up and thrashed it out in the House, by moving a direct motion. So far as the police are concerned, I am pleased to speak a word in their defence, if necessary, or in approval of the methods of our police. I have travelled through a great portion of this country, and the farther one goes out the better the police are. We have them in the back country travelling hundreds of miles, out for weeks at a time, and these men are willing to do anything to safeguard the people of the country, undertaking dangerous duties, and I am of opinion that the police are not treated, generally speaking, in as good a manner as they should be. The charges made to-night should be thrashed out, and I have no reason to doubt many of the statements made. We should have some strong explanation from the Government side. We should be told that action has been taken. We heard of the case of the constable mentioned by the leader of the Opposition a little while ago, and the action taken in connection with that man's politics on the Eastern goldfields. I have yet to know that the people of Western Australia pay the police force or any section of the police force or any individual member, to ram their politics down other people's throats. Any police constable, whether an officer or not, is entitled to hold what opinion he likes or to express his opinions as his conscience dictates.

Mr. Duff: Not to express them.

Mr. HOLMAN: Why gag a policeman?

Mr. Duff: He should be gagged. He is a public officer.

Mr. HOLMAN: I say not. When a policeman is off duty, he has a perfect right to express his opinions.

Mr. Duff: He is never off duty.

Mr. HOLMAN: Because a man is a policeman he should not sacrifice his position in civil life. We know what politics are in a country like Western Australia where everyone is supposed to be equal, and no one section should be deprived of the rights of citizenship. Because a policeman is a supporter of the Labour party he is not to be ostracised or kicked out. It is disquieting indeed. If

a policeman makes a false accusation and brings charges and succeeds in getting those charges through the police court, he is in all probability turned out. But so far as the police are concerned, they have a perfect right to take what political action they like.

Mr. Duff: The silent vote is best.

Mr. HOLMAN: It may be. If a policeman happens to express an opinion he is to be ostracised or removed. Surely in a civilised country, where education is supposed to prevail, a person can hold what political views his conscience dictates. I have fought as strong political fights as anyone in this country, but I have no bitter grudge against any opponent of mine. I have no desire to hound him out of the country so long as he is not a hired tool. A man who has political ideas, is entitled to as much respect as any member of this House. He should not be crucified because he holds certain political opinions, but it is a remarkable thing how a debate of this character has worked round the political opinions of the members of the police force. As far as the Estimates are concerned, there is not a great deal of difference between the expenditure of this year and previous years. The proposed expenditure this year is about the same as that of last year. But surely there should be some means whereby a little of the expenditure could be curtailed. We have had striking examples where special constables have been sent to districts where alleged troubles are taking place. Men are sent to certain quarters for certain purposes involving the country in an expenditure of many thousands of pounds which should not be spent. That money in all probability comes out of the police vote. That expenditure should cease for all time. We had the example at Fremantle; constables were sent there when there was absolutely no need for it. If the men had been indiscreet; if the constables were not of a high class character and duties are forced on their shoulders, the result might have been serious. That should be prevented. Members can hold their own opinion about the appointment mentioned by the leader of the Opposition, but I say that so far as I am concerned, speaking of the actual work of the police force, my experience in this country and in the Eastern States is that we have reason to be proud of the police force. I see no reason to criticise the actions of the police, but I strongly object to their not being allowed to hold certain political views. I consider them respectable citizens and they should be allowed to speak and vote as they desire. There was a time when they were prevented from forming an organisation for their own protection. I see no reason why they should not be allowed to bring forward their grievances, and I hope it will be a long time in Western Australia before any attempt is made to curtail the liberties of the police force. We have about 500 members of the police force and surely a body like that should have some rights and I hope they will band together for their protection, advancement and education. There is no greater education for men than in forming an organisation and incidentally advancing the interests of the people of the country.

Mr. HICKMOTT (Pingelly) [8.44]: I do not say anything against the police force and at present I do not know why they should be run down. The chief reason for discussing these Estimates is to see if we can arrive at some way of reducing the expenditure. Going through most of the items I notice that there are increases, but I see that the expenditure for the year is reduced a little on the items. Still I am going to move that the amount be further reduced by £693.

Hon. P. Collier: We are not on that at all. You are too far ahead.

Mr. GREEN (Kalgoorlie) [8.45]: There are one or two points in these Estimates requiring explanation. The circular of 1913, setting forth that all policemen who desired to qualify for promotion should first pass a qualifying examination, was excellent in itself. But when the Commissioner can veto the finding of the board, and place another man over those who pass the examination, it is a state of things that should be removed by the Minister in control. I have before me proof that a certain very well advanced officer in the department passed the necessary examination, but because he had fallen out with the Commissioner, his examination was not considered; and not only was he not notified of the result, but even when he inquired in writing the information was denied him. Against a decision of the board there can be no appeal, except that the Commissioner has power to override the finding of the board, which is a very dangerous position of affairs. In any other branch of the public service examination papers are given out and the candidate can very readily learn whether or not he has passed the examination. In the Police Department, however, this provision is entirely omitted and, in consequence, when an officer, perhaps by his independence of character, has been unfortunate enough to come into collision with his chief, he has not the slightest chance of securing promotion, no matter what merit or ability he may possess. I trust that the Honorary Minister, so far from taking my remarks in hostile spirit, will see that the objection is removed, and that a policeman, after having sat for his examination, shall be notified of the result and, if successful, shall be duly promoted. Again, I have known of policemen who, on retiring from the service, have been kept waiting five or six weeks before receiving their payments from the Police Benefit Fund. I have particularly in mind one policeman who was thus detained on the goldfields five or six weeks. He had the offer of a profitable little business in Perth, but, because of the delay in receiving his money from the Police Benefit Fund, the opportunity for closing the deal was forever lost, and, additionally, in the meantime he had to bear the expense of maintaining himself and his numerous family on the goldfields. The board, it seems, meets only once a month; but surely some arrangement could be made under which, in the case of a policeman retiring between meetings of the board, his claim could be considered and the payment from the fund made forthwith. Another thing: it always seems to me absurd to see policemen on point duty in Perth,

clothed in heavy uniform in hot summer weather, without even the shelter of an improvised umbrella—

Hon. R. H. Underwood: It makes them hardy.

Mr. GREEN: That is not sufficient excuse for subjecting a man to the extreme discomfort imposed by such conditions. If a policeman can do his duty just as well in more comfortable conditions, I think those improved conditions should be provided. I cannot conceive of the Honorary Minister undertaking to go on point duty himself without any shelter on a blazing day. I have nothing further to say at this stage, although there are certain items in respect of which I may have some comments to make later.

Mr. JONES (Fremantle) [8.45]: Many people are wondering whether the Federal Government intend to establish a branch of their own police in this State. The people of Western Australia are paying Federal taxation in order to maintain the Federal police force.

Mr. Duff: There is nothing on these Estimates for Federal police.

Mr. JONES: I am not prepared either to allow myself to be gagged by the member for Claremont, or to accept his proposition that members of the force should be gagged. The methods of the ancient Caliphs of Bagdad are required to suit the wishes of some hon. members in regard to the police force. What those hon. members really require are policemen whose tongues have been removed, and who have been dealt with in other ways, according to ancient law and custom. I suggest that a policeman has as much right to citizenship as any other member of the community. To endeavour to take away one iota of his liberty, to say that because he happens to be a public servant he shall not be free in conscience, speech, or thought, is to endeavour to push back the great dynamic forces of Nature, the great wheel which would be carrying us on if some hon. members were not continually endeavouring to use the brake on it. Reference has been made to the growing practice of pimping. For some time past I have noticed with considerable apprehension the attempt which is being made throughout Australia, and also in other countries, to Prussianise the police force. We find that here, perhaps for the first time in the history of Western Australia, the police force is being used as much for political purposes as the Honorary Minister is prepared to use the brutal weight of the majority behind him.

Mr. Thomson: Rubbish!

Mr. JONES: We find that in the Electoral Department the police are being used to further the interests of a particular political party. The imputation which the member for Boulder has brought forward in that regard, particularly in reference to the goldfields, has not been disproved even by the Honorary Minister. We find that, in addition, the police are being used as reporters at public meetings, are being constrained to blackleg on the Australian Journalists' Association. They are taking notes of what various speakers say at public meetings, and are giving evidence on

those notes, in order to bring some particular speaker to justice. The ordinary policeman may be able to take notes; but I suggest that it is only in furtherance of this Prussianising of the police force that the police are sent along to take imaginary notes of meetings, notes, not of what is being said, but of what the prosecution intends shall be said. These notes are probably handed to them at the police station before they give their evidence in the morning. We cannot help contrasting the case of Constable Johns at Beverley, and the treatment accorded to him, with that of the officer in charge of the notorious Jeffrey case in North Perth, and the treatment accorded to him. Constable Johns had dared to prosecute a member of Parliament, a member of the brutal majority which sits behind the Honorary Minister, and which he is prepared to use, as the member for Murchison would say, as the humiliated proposition of a degenerate mind. And because this constable dared to do this he is removed to another place.

Mr. Thomson: You have no proof of that.

Mr. JONES: The plain clothes constable, however, who had so faultily used his rule, and had taken different measurements of footprints in connection with this Jeffrey case, is commended by the Commissioner for having been honest enough to come forward and say, "I used an old ruler."

Hon. P. Collier: Which amounts to saying "I am a fool."

Mr. JONES: Or to saying "I am an ass." The woman who was prosecuted in this case was a member of the working class, but the member of Parliament who was prosecuted by Constable Johns was not, hence the difference in the treatment meted out to the constables by this sycophantic crawling Commissioner of ours. We cannot hide from ourselves the Prussianising methods of our police force. Preference is undoubtedly being given all along the line in Western Australia to plain clothes men, and in everything that is going they take the plums. We have the instance of Inspector Mann, who is practically the only man since 1913 to be promoted without examination. The member for Boulder pointed out how this Commissioner, this protector of plain clothes service men, caused a new regulation to be added to the police regulations to the effect that in the case of particular merit or ability man might be promoted without examination. That regulation was made solely and wholly for the purpose of allowing Mr. Mann to be promoted to the rank of inspector. Surely a person who possessed exceptional merit and ability, such as would permit of his being promoted to the position of inspector, would have been able to pass the examination which the Commissioner himself referred to as being one which any man of ordinary ability could pass. Surely, as a Premier of the State once said, he could have passed it standing on his head or with his eyes shut. This is another indication of how plain clothes men are getting all that is good to be got out of the service. Recently every one of them, without passing any examination, was promoted to the position of sergeant, over the heads of some men who had been in the service for 30 or 40 years. Let



me take the case of a man who was a second class constable in 1908. He was promoted after nine years' service, in 1917, to be a constable at 12s. 6d. a day, and to be a detective sergeant in April, 1918. These are the only two promotions which have been made in some 15 months, and it was not necessary for the officers concerned to pass any examination.

Mr. Piesse: It was for special ability.

Mr. JONES: If there was special ability in the case the examination which was laid down could have been passed. The service is full of cases in which plain clothes men, who are the particular pets and favourites of this crawling Commissioner, have been promoted over the heads of men whose bootlaces they were not fit to tie.

Mr. Hardwick: That is not fair.

Mr. JONES: The hon. member is no better judge of fairness than is the man who has lived in the dark all his life. Let me take the case of another constable. I have no desire to mention names, because I know full well that victimisation will take place if there is a possible chance. This was the case of a constable who passed amongst the highest in the examination which was laid down under the regulations for promotion. This man had been for about 20 years in the service, but he is still a constable. Alongside him there are plain clothes men with seven or eight years' service who have been made sergeants, whereas this constable who passed his examination four years ago for that position is still doing a constable's work at a constable's pay. What inducement is there for the uniformed men to pass the examination in order to get promotion? If a man happens to be a member of the particular branch of the service which is petted and loved by the Commissioner, he is jumped up over the heads of the uniformed men who are the pillars of the service, and the only men for whom, so far as the police force is concerned, one can have any real respect. I desire to draw the attention of the Honorary Minister to a rather unusual case. We have recently been indulging in many eulogies as to that late great Australian, Lord Forrest. We have heard much of his magnificent exploits in opening up the country, and of his exploring trips, as far back as 1874, into what was then the heart of the desert. Amongst those who accompanied the late Lord Forrest was a man named James Sweeney. Sweeney, I believe, accompanied the late Mr. Alec Forrest in 1871, but he also went on the overland trip in 1874 with the late Lord Forrest. He was a farrier and blacksmith, and in charge of the important work of shoeing the horses, and seeing that their feet and legs were kept in such a condition that the animals could carry the necessary food and water for the party. Sweeney carried out this important part of the work faithfully and truly, and returned with that great explorer to settle in Perth or the locality. He joined the police force, and for more than 30 years was a constable in various parts of the State between Kimberley and the Leeuwin, upon a salary the highest point of which, until 18 months ago, was 9s. 6d. a day. Notwithstanding this, he managed to rear a large family

of good Australians. Of the boys one has died for the Empire, while the other three are still in the firing line. The girls have married and in their turn are bringing up young Australians. By a strange coincidence, the day after Lord Forrest's death was announced in Perth, his old companion, James Sweeney, was informed that he would have to look for another job outside the Police Department. True, he was over the age, I believe, being 66.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: His age did not matter much for the job he was doing.

Mr. JONES: As the member for North-East Fremantle has pointed out, this man who had taken part in the notable exploit of crossing Western Australia to the South Australian border, and who is therefore entitled to the respect of the people of the State, was performing a job which did not require very much energy, and which a man of 66 or 67 could well and faithfully perform. I submit in the first place that special consideration should be given to him, at any rate, the same consideration that is given to the chief inspector in the police station in Perth. Or, if it is necessary in the interests of the service to abstain from creating a dangerous precedent by extending a privilege to one of the uniform constables—Sweeney was not a plain clothes man, or I have no doubt he would have been promoted to sergeant and allowed to remain in the service as long as he chose—he must expect to be retired at some date or other. But in spite of the fact that there is no police regulation governing the matter, in spite of the fact that under the rules he is only entitled to the usual gratuity of a retired constable, this is an exceptional case. Out of respect for the memory of the man under whom Sweeney served, out of respect for the historical nature of the services rendered by Sweeney to this State, he is entitled to some special consideration, not from the Police Department, from whom I expect no consideration for anyone except the plain-clothes man, but from the Honorary Minister and the Colonial Secretary. For the sake of Western Australia's honour, do not let us stint the old man who has done such wonderful work for the country, do not let us lose our self-respect by depriving him of a few miserable pounds. There is much to be said on the various items of these police Estimates, and in spite of that exercise of the majority which the Honorary Minister intends to impose upon us, we shall still be able to have some little voice in the management of the Police Department's affairs.

Mr. THOMSON (Katanning) [9.17]: I would not have spoken on these Estimates but for the matter brought forward by the member for Forrest (Mr. O'Loughlen), namely, the removal of Constable Johns from Beverley. I regret very much that the member for Beverley (Mr. Brown) is not present—

Mr. O'Loughlen: So do I.

Mr. THOMSON: Because I think that hon. member would have been able to satisfy the Committee even more than the reading of his letter by the member for Forrest must amply

have done. The member for Forrest alleged that that letter had been the means of bringing about the constable's removal.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Quite so.

Mr. THOMSON: I sent a messenger twice to obtain that letter, so that I might have an opportunity of reading it.

Mr. O'Loughlen: "Hansard" has it.

Hon. P. Collier: The member for Kataning has no right to have that letter, and no right to complain because he has not had it.

Mr. THOMSON: Perhaps so; but when the honour of a friend of mine, and a member of this Chamber, is at stake, I have every right, in his absence, to defend his character.

Hon. P. Collier: Go ahead, then.

Mr. THOMSON: I intend to do so. It is most remarkable that a copy of a letter sent by the member for Beverley to the Attorney General's Department should be produced in this Chamber.

Hon. P. Collier: It is not remarkable at all.

Hon. T. Walker: You do not know much about it.

Mr. THOMSON: Possibly I do not. But it is a matter for inquiry why that letter should be here.

Hon. P. Collier: You can have an inquiry. The letter is here legitimately and fairly.

Mr. THOMSON: That may be so in the hon. member's opinion. However, the member for Forrest repeatedly made the charge that the member for Beverley had been responsible for the constable's removal. After being repeatedly asked to read the letter, he eventually did read it.

Mr. O'Loughlen: I did not want to read it at all.

Mr. THOMSON: The member for Forrest was endeavouring to convey to this Committee and to the people of Western Australia that the member for Beverley had used his influence to bring about the constable's removal. That statement was also made by the last speaker. It is not fair to make such charges unless they can be proved. I consider that in our police force we have a body of men of whom we have every reason to be proud.

Hon. P. Collier: Hear, hear!

Mr. THOMSON: I regret that owing to an indiscretion of which this constable is guilty—and he was unwise in the action he took in the particular circumstances—

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I would not have expected that from you.

Mr. THOMSON: The action may have been unwise; but the hon. member interjecting and the leader of the Opposition know full well that the men who were subsequently prosecuted were gathered together as a committee in connection with repatriation work.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They should not break the law.

Mr. THOMSON: It is public property that these leading citizens—

Hon. P. Collier: Leading citizens!

Mr. THOMSON: Of Beverley had met to discuss the subdivision and allocation of the Avondale estate.

Hon. P. Collier: What time was it?

Mr. THOMSON: After nine o'clock. In reading the letter of the member for Beverley, the member for Forrest sneered at the statement contained in it that members of Parliament would be liable to be charged with being on licensed premises after hours—

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Members of Parliament should be the same as everybody else.

Mr. THOMSON: Ministers, and even members now sitting opposite, have been in my town, and will be there again; and if I am desirous of calling upon them after nine o'clock at the hotels where they are staying, I am liable to be prosecuted, exactly as these men were, for doing a public duty in endeavouring to do their best for the returned soldiers and to assist the Government.

Mr. Holman: They ought to be prosecuted for that.

Mr. THOMSON: That may be the opinion of the member for Murchison.

Mr. O'Loughlen: You said I sneered at the letter of the member for Beverley. I did nothing of the kind.

Hon. P. Collier: Even if the constable's action was indiscreet, does it merit the transfer?

Mr. THOMSON: In my opinion the Police Department should inquire how it comes about that a letter of this nature, written by a member of this Chamber to the Attorney General, is produced here. It is not in the interests of the State that information sent by a person to the Police Department for the public advantage should be copied from the files of that department and divulged in this Chamber. It is scandalous.

Hon. P. Collier: Yes, especially when it is the first time such a thing has ever occurred.

Mr. THOMSON: I hope it will be the last time.

Hon. P. Collier: The letter was come by legitimately.

Mr. THOMSON: May be, but it did not come from the member for Beverley.

Hon. P. Collier: No, it did not.

Mr. THOMSON: It would be very interesting to know where it did come from.

Hon. P. Collier: It came through official channels.

Mr. THOMSON: In that case there is something pretty rotten in the Police Department.

Hon. P. Collier: It is quite all right.

Mr. THOMSON: The integrity of a member of this Chamber is at stake. I know the conditions under which the prosecution took place, and know the reason why those men were gathered together.

Mr. Holman: How do you know? Were you there?

Mr. THOMSON: I am prepared to believe good of a man, in preference to evil; and that is more than the member for Murchison is prepared to do.

Mr. Holman: If I judged all men by you, my opinion of them would be absolutely bad.

Mr. THOMSON: The statement is made by the member for Fremantle that a crawling Commissioner—

Mr. Jones: Undoubtedly.

Mr. THOMSON: But the party which the hon. member supports to-day placed the present Commissioner in his position.

Mr. Jones: But I did not do it.

Mr. THOMSON: I want to draw the hon. member's attention to the fact.

Mr. Jones: Thank you.

Hon. P. Collier: I mentioned the fact earlier.

Mr. THOMSON: The member for Fremantle should give credit to his party for a certain measure of wisdom and discretion.

Mr. Jones: They had not wisdom and discretion always.

Mr. THOMSON: I rose in justice to the member for Beverley. I regret that there should be any suggestion that if a constable does his duty fearlessly and irrespective of personalities, he is liable to be penalised. I do not wish to indulge in recrimination. I could do so if I desired, as regards the actions of a certain section of the community who at the particular period, when they had the power, saw fit to remove an officer because he also did his duty.

Mr. Holman: You are making a dirty insinuation. Say straight out what you mean. Be fair, and make the charge definitely, like a man.

Mr. THOMSON: I have no desire to indulge in recrimination.

Mr. Holman: You have not the manliness.

Mr. THOMSON: People who live in glass houses should not throw stones.

Mr. Jones: Whom do you mean? Out with it.

Mr. THOMSON: If the cap fits the member for Fremantle, he can wear it. He seems to have a good deal to say.

Mr. Jones: Undoubtedly. But I do not like to hear you make dirty insinuations. Out with it, if you are not ashamed to say it.

Mr. THOMSON: I am not addressing the member for Fremantle. I am addressing you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: You are discussing the Police Department Estimates.

Mr. Jones: I am going to listen to you, and I am going to pull you up if you make any more insinuations.

Mr. THOMSON: It is for the Chairman to pull me up, and not for the member for Fremantle. A searching inquiry should be held as to how a copy of that letter was obtained from the Police Department's files.

Hon. P. Collier: It is a terrible thing.

Mr. THOMSON: If at any time I lay charges against any man before this Committee, I shall be prepared to submit the whole of my information to every member of the Committee. The member for Forrest if he was sincere in his desire to assist this constable—

Mr. O'Loughlen: What other motive could I have?

Mr. THOMSON: I honestly believe that the hon. member's object was to embarrass the Government.

Mr. O'Loughlen: The member for Beverley is one of my best personal friends.

Mr. THOMSON: The member for Forrest should not have read that letter unless he was prepared to place the whole of his information at the Committee's disposal. No man in this House has greater confidence in the integrity of the police force of Western Australia than I have.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [9.29]: When the member for Forrest said that certain letters had been written, the member for Katanning was one of the first to interject, "Why don't you read them?"

Mr. Thomson: That is correct.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The member for Katanning would not sit quiet, but continually interjected until that letter was read. He was repeatedly told that the member for Forrest had no desire to read the letter.

Mr. Thomson: But the member for Forrest was insinuating that the member for Beverley had used his influence to get the constable removed.

Mr. Munsie: The member for Forrest never mentioned the name of the member for Beverley until you had mentioned it.

The CHAIRMAN: We are not discussing the member for Beverley.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We are discussing an action affecting the police force. In view of the actions of the member for Katanning during the years he has sat in this House, I say he is the last man one would expect to join any combination against a member of the police force who enforces the provisions of the Licensing Act. That Act lays down definitely and distinctly that no person, except a bona fide traveller or a lodger, may be on licensed premises during prohibited hours. If the constable brought a prosecution for breach of that provision, he only did his duty. Why therefore should we condemn a man for doing that. The constable only carried out his duty. A member of Parliament is no more exempt from the law than anyone else. Business people should know that a hotel should be the last place in which to hold their meetings. They should know also that they are not only injuring themselves, but the licensee, and that after a certain number of convictions, the licensee is liable to lose his license altogether. There are plenty of buildings in Beverley in which the meeting could have been held. The member for Katanning said that he had no desire to indulge in recriminations, but he went a certain distance all the same, and then stopped. The Honorary Minister implied by his remarks that if a petition was presented to the Commissioner of Police requesting that the services of a constable should be retained in a certain district, it might be assumed that that constable had failed in his duty in order to curry favour with the people of the district. Those people know the man better than does the Commissioner. In the district I represent we have always been blessed with good policemen.

Hon. R. H. Underwood: Why should not a policeman take a turn at Marble Bar?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If a constable in a district is doing his duty faithfully and well, I would be one of the first to sign my name to a petition to keep him there. If I knew that half a dozen people were making an effort to get a man removed, I would take counter steps to have the man kept there. There are very few policemen with whom we can find fault. They have a difficult duty to perform, but they are bound to run up against someone. I have had complaints made to me at Fremantle about the manner in which certain duties have been carried out. But when inquired into it was found that the constable against whom they were made was merely doing his duty.

Mr. Thomson: I did not condemn Constable Johns. I said he committed an indiscretion.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not think he did. I hope the debate which has taken place to-night will be the means of preventing a repetition of what took place at Beverley.

Mr. HARRISON (Avon) [9.35]: I did not intend to take part in the debate, but I feel it my duty to say a few words on behalf of the member for Beverley. Years ago when I was in York, Constable Johns was one of the members of the police force in that town. I knew him personally, and was aware that he was a man of good character. The member for Beverley and others were engaged on patriotic work in connection with the Avondale estate when they were holding the meeting at the hotel on the evening in question. Before furthering the prosecution I understand that Constable Johns asked his superior officer, whose residence is at Northam, for advice, and the reply was that he was to take action.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The Minister denied that.

Mr. HARRISON: That is what I have been informed. The outcome of the prosecution was that there was a movement in Beverley and three residents of the district came to town as a deputation to see the Colonial Secretary. The member for Beverley was going into the country and asked me to introduce the deputation, which I did. It consisted of Mr. Wansbrough, a former member of the district, Mr. Pilmer, and Mr. Bateman. They afterwards saw the Commissioner of Police but what eventuated I do not know. There has been a good deal said about the letter, a copy of which the member for Forrest happened to have. Since I have been a member of this House I have had many copies of such letters, and they have been legitimately obtained. If a member of the police force is accused of certain conduct by a superior officer, he is generally sent a copy of the letter containing the grievance against him. It would not be fair unless that were done. If the officer did not have it he would not be able to defend himself. Suppose Constable Johns got such a letter and he wanted to get redress, he would naturally show it to the member for Forrest or someone else, and he would be perfectly justified in doing so. I have had such letters shown to me.

Hon. P. Collier: Do not worry about the letters. They were got legitimately and fairly.

Mr. HARRISON: I only wish to add that during these strenuous times the members of the police force have carried out their duties in a strikingly admirable way, with remarkable credit to themselves and advantage to the State in general.

Hon. T. WALKER (Kanowna) [9.42]: I congratulate the member for Avon on the fair speech he has made on a subject which has given rise to a lot of feeling. I have listened patiently all through and tried to get the hang of the case, as they say, and it seems to me we have heard no adequate defence of the Commissioner of Police and the police force generally from the champions who have spoken. If there is anything by which we can condemn the Commissioner of Police, it is such a speech as we have heard from the member for Katanning.

Mr. Thomson: Thank you.

Hon. T. WALKER: We are dealing with a constable who has an exceedingly good reputation and who is respected by his superiors and by the people of the district. The police force is not under consideration, but that any one should have had the temerity to cite a letter of the member for Beverley and that anyone should have dared to accuse him of rashness or indiscretion, or exercising influence or anything else, is a crime that cannot but be strongly condemned by members who take such a disproportionate view of facts as the member for Katanning. The constable acted similarly in connection with another case.

Hon. R. H. Underwood: The other was different.

Hon. T. WALKER: In both cases the law was being broken. Section 103 of the Licensing Act provides that—

Any person found on any licensed premises, at any time when such premises should not be open for the sale of liquor, shall, unless he satisfies the court that he was at the time when he was so found, a bona fide lodger, inmate or traveller, or that his presence on such premises at such time was not in contravention of the provisions of this Act, be deemed to have committed an offence.

Hon. R. H. Underwood: That is the point.

Hon. T. WALKER: This is a terrible offence that has been committed by this policeman. He has used impartiality towards a select coterie that were holding a repatriation meeting in a public house at Beverley, after hours. He has treated those people just as if they were common people. He has impartially carried out the law. And the apology offered by the Minister is that it was an indiscretion, for which the policeman was reprimanded by being removed with disgrace from the district.

Mr. Thomson: The Minister says he is not disgraced.

Hon. T. WALKER: There is the letter which we have heard read to-night, trusting that immediate action will be taken. The letter was addressed to the Attorney General, who transmitted it to the police.

The Attorney General: No, to the Colonial Secretary.

Hon. T. WALKER: Who is the Ministerial head of the police. And immediate action was taken. The policeman was removed from the district, and the removal is termed a reprimand. According to the Honorary Minister the man who was carrying out what he is by law commanded to do is indiscreet; and his removal for carrying out his duty is called a simple reprimand. Before the policeman took action in the case of the men who were drinking he consulted his superior officer who instructed him to proceed. In this latter case, also, he consulted the inspector, and the inspector ordered him to proceed. The inspector was consulted, and the inspector instructed the policeman to proceed.

Hon. R. H. Underwood: On the policeman's report of the case.

Hon. T. WALKER: Which was what the policeman knew of it. Surely the inference is not now that the report of the policeman was a false one?

Hon. R. H. Underwood: No, merely that it was a misunderstanding.

Hon. T. WALKER: These men were committing an illegal act.

Hon. R. H. Underwood: No.

The Premier: The court decided they were not committing an illegal act.

Hon. T. WALKER: They were illegally on the premises.

Hon. R. H. Underwood: They were not.

Hon. T. WALKER: However they got out of it, the very fact of their being there, under the circumstances, was in contravention of the Act.

Hon. R. H. Underwood: No.

Hon. T. WALKER: The Act makes no provision for the holding of a repatriation meeting in a public house at midnight. Had those people been common, ordinary people, I question whether they could have satisfied the court; and certainly the constable would not have been punished. There was a prima facie case. They had to go before the court to prove their innocence. All that the constable did was to take them to the court. That is the offence he committed, an offence for which there should be no reprimand at all, but rather a word of praise. Indeed, it was necessary that he should do so, because there had been talk that he would not treat some men in the way he had treated the first lot; and he showed that he had the same sense of duty regarding men in high station as he had in regard to the common herd. Because of that he is guilty of an indiscretion. I agree that there should be discretion, but I want discretion used all round. I do not want discretion to be synonymous with partiality. What reprimand has been administered to the inspector? Will the Minister answer me that?

Hon. R. H. Underwood: I am not prepared to tell you just now; go on talking.

Hon. T. WALKER: We cannot submit to being treated in this disrespectful manner. We want to know what reprimand has been administered to the inspector.

Hon. R. H. Underwood: You cannot demand it.

Hon. T. WALKER: But we can demand respect.

Hon. R. H. Underwood: I cannot reply to you by way of interjection while you are speaking. I am taking notes of your speech.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Kanowna may proceed.

Hon. T. WALKER: The Committee have a right to an answer to this question. I venture to assert that no reprimand of any kind has been given to the inspector. He is still the inspector of that district, but this constable has been removed. He is removed because of the performance of his duty, and because he obeyed the instructions of his superior officer. Although this man goes to another place at the same salary there is fixed upon him the stigma of disgrace. According to the Honorary Minister, he is removed for having been indiscreet, although he was carrying out his duty.

Hon. R. H. Underwood: It was for bringing forward an unnecessary prosecution.

Hon. T. WALKER: A prosecution which the inspector endorsed. The prosecution was unnecessary simply because a member of Parliament was there, and other little nabobs of Beverley. Had it been an ordinary man in the street nothing more would have been heard of the case. That is the heinousness of it, to apply the same law to the member of the district that is applied to the ordinary citizen of Beverley. That is something which merits a reprimand. A reprimand means simply a reproof, a resentment in verbiage, a correction taken down in public, and never means an action such as has been taken in that case. That is not a reprimand, but is an actual wrong committed upon a member of the force. How can we expect the force to do its duty if we treat it in this way. To the man who has no money, standing, or friends, apply the law every time, but to the man who has friends in court and who can write to the Minister and say, "Trusting immediate action will be taken," the law must not be applied. What kind of policing of the country is that? Put in its plain meaning it is favouritism and corruption. How shall we run the country in that form?

Hon. P. Collier: It has been run by the Commissioner in that form for twelve months.

Hon. T. WALKER: Does this kind of thing induce respect for the law? We are led to believe that the British law is no respecter of persons, but here we must use discretion. Policemen must ask who the man is before they dare to lay any action against him. If they do not use discretion they must be reprimanded by being disgraced. That kind of thing will never make good policemen, faithful and just policemen, or good citizens. We cannot suffer this unequal and partial administration of our law. If there were any reprimand uttered at all, it should have been to the inspector and not to the underling, the man who seeks advice and gets it, who receives instructions and carries them out. He is made the victim, but the inspector will have friends to fight for him, and the ordinary policeman of good character will have no friend, and get no voice raised on his behalf. The answer to the charges that

are laid against the Commissioner in this case is that the constable goes to a place where he gets as much money as he did before, and that the Commissioner has a perfect right to shift anyone as he pleases. The Commissioner, however, should not remove anyone without adequate justification. In this case there is no justification. What is the spectacle held up to the country? The police in the present age and the chief of police bow down and humble themselves before men with a little temporary power, before men who are in the upper circles. These people may do as they like. Are we living in an Oriental country, where those of the princely circle are allowed the utmost latitude to infringe the law, the rights and liberties of the people as they choose, or are we living in a British community where every man stands equal before the law? There is no defence for conduct of this nature. With the leader of the Opposition, I say that right throughout we have beheld during the last 12 months or so this unequal administration of the law. On the 10th of this month Percy Brunton comes out of prison, a buffoon, a lunatic, kept in gaol for three months, pursued relentlessly by the police, whose evidence I have reason to suspect. Not one voice is raised to help him, although a large number of the members of this Chamber saw the injustice he was put to by the evidence that was tendered on behalf of this helpless and friendless individual. When it comes to evidence against a man in position, however, a man on one side of politics, on the same side as those who are in power, the law is helpless, and no steps are taken. If there be a voice lifted up in defence of the man who is wronged, the outcry that comes from the Government benches, at the injustice of dealing with a case because the person involved is a member of this Chamber, is heard everywhere. I could keep the Committee for an hour or two showing the way in which helpless people have been pursued relentlessly, and have had evidence manufactured against them.

Mr. Teesdale: That is a serious thing to say.

Hon. P. Collier: It is true.

Hon. R. H. Underwood: Then bring it straight out.

Hon. T. WALKER: When the time comes.

Hon. R. H. Underwood: When will it come?

Hon. T. WALKER: Perhaps too soon for the Honorary Minister.

Mr. Teesdale: Do you mean evidence manufactured by the Administration?

Hon. T. WALKER: No, by the police.

Hon. R. H. Underwood: Let us have a case and hold an inquiry.

Mr. Jones: What is the use of trying to get an inquiry?

Hon. T. WALKER: There have been cases of the kind. That is the evil that we are bringing this State into by administration. We punish a policeman for his fearless, honest, and straightforward conduct in placing all upon an equality before the law, but not a word of reproof is there against the man who is put on special duty to pursue and bring to grief the friendless and the helpless. It is a terrible position to be in. The police force, taken as a whole, is composed of an intelligent, fair, and honest class of men.

The bulk of them are men we should be proud of. There are exceptions, and there will be more if this kind of thing is to prevail, and if we are to degrade or disgrace a man for fearlessly doing his duty in the performance of his work. Nay, more, if we reward a man who curries favour, who scrapes and bows before those in power, who is blind to the faults of those in authority and is only too eager to see and magnify the slips made by those who have no one to help them, we corrupt the entire body; and instead of policemen we get a class which is preying upon the citizens, harassing the lives of the people, and making this State not one of law-abiding citizens, but one in which the police and the citizens stand in the relation to each other of cat and dog.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister—Pilbara—in reply) [10.13]: I must express my appreciation of the manner in which these Estimates have been received. Many faults can be found in a department of this nature. There are bound to be faults and bound to be complaints concerning them. This is the department of all others in which faults can be found, and in which mistakes can be made. We must always remember that there is about ten per cent.—it may be less—of the people of any country which does not want any police at all, and which is always against them, and always prepared to give reasons why there should be none. The leader of the Opposition has been reasonably fair and reasonably mild. All told, about four complaints have been made—as to Constable Pitman, the Jefferies case, the action of the Commissioner regarding the Beverley constable—

Hon. P. Collier: And that case of arrest at Fremantle in connection with the flannelette.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: That makes four cases.

Hon. P. Collier: I referred also to the administration of the licensing law on the goldfields, and to the promotion of Inspector Mann.

Mr. Jones: What about poor old Sweeney?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: I shall come to Sweeney. As to my remark about the majority on this side, the member for Forrest (Mr. O'Loughlen) said that if the Honorary Minister intended to adopt that attitude—

Mr. O'Loughlen: You began to be dictatorial.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: While I am here I shall choose my own attitude, and shall refuse to be dictated to by the other side. When I speak of my majority, I refer to the majority of the people of Western Australia; when that majority is gone, I shall be gone.

Mr. O'Loughlen: I was courteous, and you should be so too.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: Perhaps I was a bit hot. If so, I apologise. There have been a few words regarding the expenditure of the Police Department. As I have said, the expenditure provided here is, in my opinion, scarcely sufficient. The member for Murchison (Mr. Holman) and the member for Pingelly (Mr. Hickmott) asked why we were spending more this year than last year. That is due to the position of affairs to-day. If the force is increased, these Estimates will have to be exceeded. Speaking as a Minister,

I make no apology but simply tell the Committee the Government's position in this regard. The increase in expenditure is merely a natural increase. The leader of the Opposition, and I think members generally, agree with me that the cost of this department must increase.

Hon. P. Collier: I did not complain.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: No; but one or two other members did. As regards the promotion of Inspector Mann, it seems rather unfair that I should be up against that appointment, seeing that it was made while I was not a Minister at all.

Hon. P. Collier: That is so. It was made in April, 1917.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: Yes; and another Minister had charge of these Estimates then. There is no denying that Inspector Mann is a good officer.

Hon. P. Collier: Quite so.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: There was no means of raising his position beyond that of detective sergeant, and for that reason the department, by way of recognising his ability and his work, made the position of inspector for him. He was promoted to an inspectorship because of his distinguished record.

Mr. O'Loughlin: Suppose five other men had equally distinguished records, would you have made five more inspectorships?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: We would not, and there are not.

Mr. O'Loughlin: But if there were?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: Then we would consider the matter. There was no detective sergeant appointed in Mr. Mann's place. Therefore all that is in question is the difference between his salary as a detective sergeant and his salary as an inspector. Hon. members will agree that an exceptionally good officer should be given some special recognition of his work.

Hon. P. Collier: Why did not Inspector Mann have to face the examination?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: It is a very old case, and scarcely mine, and it has been argued before. As regards Inspector Walsh, he not only controls the C.I.D. head office, but also the Fremantle and Kalgoorlie branches and the gold stealing staff. There is ample work for both inspectors, more especially since the outbreak of hostilities. Successive Governments of this State have placed the whole of the Western Australian police machinery at the disposal of the Commonwealth, and in consequence a great amount of additional work has fallen on the C.I.D., more especially in view of the huge area of this State and its large alien population. Inspector Walsh also prosecutes in the Police Court.

Hon. P. Collier: But there were 3,000 fewer cases this year than last year, according to the Commissioner's own report.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: Those figures refer to cases coming before the courts, but there is a tremendous lot of inquiry work that never results in cases coming before the courts. There has been infinitely more inquiry work owing to the Commonwealth being at war. We have passed through the

greatest crisis that any men in the world ever passed through, and the Police Department have had to take all the work connected with that crisis. There is a very great deal of war work done by the department. The times and the people are both excited. The mind is excited. The fact that we have got through as well as we have, without any disturbance, practically, except the Queensland trouble, speaks well for both the ability and the energy of our police force, and also, possibly, for the stoical minds of the people whom the police control.

Mr. Lambert: We can cut down our police force, in view of Billy Hughes's police.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: I do not think it advisable that such a force as Billy Hughes's police should be created.

Mr. Lambert: Hear, hear!

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: At the same time, let me repeat it is only a fair thing that the Federal Government pay us something for the Federal work done by our police force.

Mr. Lambert: We ought to refuse to do it, otherwise.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: The leader of the Opposition contended that we are overmanned in regard to inspectors and officers, in comparison with the other States.

Hon. P. Collier: As regards the C.I.D.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: It is not fair to draw comparisons between things which are not comparable. This State differs entirely from the other States of the Commonwealth in so far as largeness of area and smallness of population are concerned.

Hon. P. Collier: But in the case of the police force the disparity is even greater.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: That may be so, and yet the men may be required. I am not prepared to say that we have the best possible Commissioner of Police, but I am of opinion that we could go further and fare worse. I am of opinion that the present Commissioner is an improvement on his predecessor. I have not yet had a case brought before me which, I consider, would justify the Government in getting rid of the Commissioner and trying somebody else in his place. A good deal has been said—not intentionally, I think, or at least not intentionally in the case of the leader of the Opposition—as to there being gross political partisanship in the Police Department.

Hon. P. Collier: On the part of a few.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: If it is contended that all these complaints which have been put forward are confined to 10 per cent. of the police, that may be correct. I answer by saying that 10 per cent. of "rotters" is a fair average. One must have a small percentage of "rotters." I do not think, though, that it is 10 per cent.

Hon. P. Collier: I made a definite statement as to the administration of the licensing law on the goldfields, not by the rank and file, but by the officers. Gross political partisanship, I say, has been shown on the fields

for the past 12 months. The departmental records will prove that.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: The police, so far as I know, were to a large extent supporters of the Labour party. While the Scaddan Government were in office, political partisanship did not govern in the least. The police then did their work absolutely irrespective of the Scaddan Government, and irrespective of the fact that a Government were in power for whom the majority of the police votes had been cast. The police are just as loyal to the present Government as they were loyal to the Scaddan Government.

Hon. P. Collier: But the excitement of the last two years has altered the position.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: I allow for that excitement, and yet I tell you the police are just as loyal to the Government to-day as they were in the past.

Mr. Jones: They do not agree with your principles, but they are loyal to you just the same.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: I do not care how a policeman or anybody else votes, so long as he does his work loyally. As regards Constable Johns, rightly or wrongly I have the impression that he was a supporter of the National party.

Mr. O'Loughlen: I do not know the man; I never saw him in my life.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: I merely made that remark to prove what hardly needs proving, that there is no political partisanship.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Will you give me your assurance that Constable Johns will not be further penalised as the result of this debate?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: I give that assurance. As a matter of fact, the station to which he has gone is equal in status, grade, and pay to that which he has left. There is no black mark against the man. He has merely been shifted out of one district. As regards the Kalgoorlie police, the leader of the Opposition has made a definite statement that the publicans of Boulder—

Hon. P. Collier: And of Kalgoorlie. It is shocking.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: I am prepared to declare that the Government do not support anything of the sort.

Hon. P. Collier: I do not say you do, and I do not say the Commissioner knows of these cases.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: I give my assurance that the Government do not give a continental how the publicans vote, because, after all, in a year or two we may have changed round again, and the publicans will then be voting for us.

Hon. P. Collier: During the past 12 months not a solitary publican in that district who was known to be a nationalist has been prosecuted. The others have been prosecuted every week.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: Perhaps there are no nationalists up there.

Hon. P. Collier: Or possibly the nationalists up there do not break the law.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: If there is any evidence at all of partisanship, let it be brought forward, and I will undertake to say

the Government will deal with the matter. We are absolutely opposed to any partisanship whatever in our police. As regards betting, the leader of the Opposition has mentioned that there have been betting prosecutions, and that for the purposes of these, we have had to use what is generally or invariably regarded as a rather contemptible person, namely, the informer. The betting laws have been framed by Parliament, and the police have to endeavour to carry them into effect. The only way of carrying them into effect is to obtain cases through the employment of informers. It is certainly up to legislators to think a little when passing this kind of legislation and if they cannot get their Acts administered without informers it would be better not to pass the legislation. The member for South Fremantle would probably have to get one of these persons to beat the poker machine in a club. I do not know whether we should legislate against poker machines or whether it would be wise to legislate against street betting. The member for Fremantle said it was the growing practice to employ informers. The hon. member is quite wrong. The practice is diminishing; I would like to pass it out altogether because I do not like the informer. I do not mind saying here that I have my bet in the street just as anyone else does, but I do not often collect. If we do not want informers we should not pass legislation if it requires informers to give effect to it.

Hon. P. Collier: I said informers with a long criminal record.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: What else would you expect an informer to have?

Hon. P. Collier: There are degrees of respectability even amongst informers.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: All I can say is that if an informer has not a long record he should have one. The leader of the Opposition spoke about files. I think he will exempt the present Government from the charge of tampering with the files.

Hon. P. Collier: I did not make any charges.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: The member for Kalgoorlie spoke about a man who was plucked in an examination by the Commissioner and therefore did not get promotion. This is an individual case. We have 500 men in the force, and after all the man who has missed will always complain. I would not be prepared to say that the Commissioner was fair or unfair in regard to that case, but suppose he was unfair, if the Commissioner is dealing with 500 men, do we expect him to be right in every case?

Mr. O'Loughlen: Suppose there were a dozen such cases?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: Then we would have grounds for inquiry. With regard to the delay in connection with the benefit fund, that fund is managed by the police themselves; it is not a Government fund and therefore that is not a complaint against the Commissioner. The hon. member again spoke about the man on point duty and suggested that he should be given an umbrella. If I could invent some way of putting an umbrella



over him while he was on point duty, I would go into the matter, but I am afraid I shall not be able to do so. So far as standing in the sun is concerned, it is good and healthy. I have stood in a much hotter sun than that.

Mr. Jones: You might give them a lighter uniform to wear.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: That is a matter that can be considered, but I do not know that there is any need to refer to it in Parliament. With regard to Sweeney, there is a regulation that members of the civil service, the police force and the Education Department, shall retire at 65 years of age. Sweeney has attained the age of 65 and if the hon. member can give to the Colonial Secretary, the Premier, or myself any facts which will justify our showing towards that man what might be said to be necessary generosity, we will be prepared to consider the matter. We have every respect for the man who has served us all his life, and if the hon. member will bring Sweeney's case before the Colonial Secretary, I am sure he will, if it is possible, do something for him.

Mr. O'Loghlen: He has not done it in the other case, and if he refuses it in one he must refuse it in the other.

Hon. P. Collier: We can provide a compassionate allowance on the Estimates.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: We can go into the matter. The member for North-East Fremantle took me to task about what I said in regard to petitions for the removal or the retention of police officers in various districts. I say without hesitation that very little attention should be paid to these petitions. As a matter of fact the Commissioner should give very little consideration to a petition from a district to retain a police officer there. All police officers and other officers as well should be moved about occasionally. It is not advisable to keep a policeman in one particular district all his life. I have made some notes of what was said by the member for Kanowna, but I find that there is nothing in his remarks; he only repeated what was said by other members.

General debate concluded; votes and items discussed as follow:—

[Mr. Foley took the Chair.]

Item, Commissioner, £672:

Mr. LAMBERT: It can reasonably be conceded that the police force generally is fairly efficient. The member for Boulder made certain references to the administration of the Licensing Act on the Goldfields, but I do not think that he desired to convey the fact that Inspector Duncan there was acting unfairly, or in a partial way. I think the inspector is reasonably fair. The Coolgardie district is in charge of one officer, and although the Coolgardie district is a law-abiding district, there is sufficient work for two officers. In some directions the district extends over 100 miles. I hope this matter will be gone into because there is considerable hardship on the man in charge at the present time, his health having broken down on account of the hard work he was called on to perform.

Item, Chief Inspector and inspectors, £3,735.

Mr. JONES: It appears that the supply of heads of departments rather exceeds the demand. In many of the small districts inspectors are needlessly employed. There are 11 inspectors altogether and taking the three centres of Northam, Albany, and Bunbury, I submit these are centres where inspectors are really not required. A senior sergeant is quite capable of doing the work. The three inspectors in charge of the stations mentioned are on the boundary line of 60 years of age and it would be good policy to start to cut down the inspectors. The other centres need inspectors. There is no doubt that if the present Commissioner has anything to do with appointments, if inspectors are retired he will appoint plain clothes constables of five years standing in their places. I move—

That the item be reduced by £1,000.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: It is all very well to talk about inspectors. From Geraldton to Wyndham there are only two inspectors. There must be inspectors to control the force. In regard to Coolgardie the department has got down to the minimum, and until the finances improve it is intended to keep on the minimum line until it is shown that police inspection is urgently needed. The enormous area of the State and the multitudinous duties that the police perform necessitate the expenditure.

Amendment put and negatived.

Item, Constabulary, £100,411.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Several sergeants have been retired during the past six or seven weeks on the ground that they are old. Some of them have a record of 30 years, in the early days being stationed in the North-West and receiving 8s. a day. After a long period of service they are put out without consideration. These cases have been brought under the notice of the Colonial Secretary and having looked into the matter he stated that the regulations prevented special consideration being given. The Minister has promised to look into the case of ex-constable Sweeney and if a precedent is set up in that case there are three or four cases similar, worthy of consideration. I object to the method of the retirement of these officers. They are told they have outlived their usefulness. That could be applied to a man of 40 years of age. Really these men have been retired on the score of old age. It is unfair to tell men that they have outlived their usefulness. For that reason I think the Government should take into consideration the cases of the three or four old sergeants who have been retired, and who resent being told that they have outlived their usefulness.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: I think it is agreed that they have passed the age of usefulness. However, if it pleases them we will say that they have passed the age limit.

Hon. P. Collier: As a matter of fact they have not passed the age limit.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: They have at least reached a good old age. All the members of the force, even if passed out on those grounds, will get a full retiring allowance.

I do not know that we can go much further than that. The hon. member does not give me much encouragement to go on with Sweeney's case, because he says in effect "If you are going to deal with Sweeney I will bring along McGinnis." We are prepared to consider any special cases, but, generally speaking, we contend that the regulations provide a fair retiring allowance for the police force.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Let me say a word or two in regard to the system of promotions. It appears to me that unless the Commissioner gives to those several constables who have passed an examination for non-commissioned rank fair consideration in the order of their passing that examination, the Committee will be invited to deal with this matter on a separate motion. Among officers of long standing and good records who have passed the examination high on the list, in certain cases some years ago, there has been very great complaint that time after time when non-commissioned officers are to be appointed, some of those older men have the humiliation of seeing junior officers, who have passed the examination long since they themselves passed it, promoted over their heads. There ought to be a right of appeal to some tribunal. It should not be left to a secret board subject to the Commissioner's veto. I hope the Government will endeavour to see that police constables who have passed the examination are promoted in their order of priority.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: The Commissioner in his judgment has been promoting them in what he regards as the order of their merit. I am not a believer in hard and fast rules of promotion in accordance with the length of service. It does not always work out satisfactorily.

Hon. P. Collier: Except when all other things are equal.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: The difficulty is to get other things equal, or to get a good judge in a position to deal with this. At the same time the system of deadly mediocrity of length of service carrying one into promotion does not give the best results. I will go into the question raised by the hon. member. On the question of examinations, it is generally agreed that some men with good memories can answer anything in the course of an examination; yet those men, when in practice have to use their own discretion, and are not as good perhaps as are other men who failed in the examination. I will bring the matter under the notice of the Colonial Secretary, and see if it is possible to get something a little in advance of what we have to-day.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I thank the Minister for that assurance. In order that the matter may be fully understood by the Colonial Secretary or the Commissioner, I should like to say that in one case the question of the merit of the officer can be formally established. Because the Commissioner has it on his records that Inspector McKenna and Inspector Brophy, on oath in the witness box, gave this particular constable a certificate of merit. Those are two of the highest officers in the department, com-

ing immediately below the Commissioner; and they said they had no better officer than the one I have in mind, who has been for long overlooked, notwithstanding that he passed his examination.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I wish to deal with the position of the gold stealing staff at Kalgoolie and Boulder. For a number of years there has been employed up there a staff of six detectives and a sergeant. Whilst they are of course police officers, the conditions of their employment are really that two-thirds of the cost of their maintenance is paid by the Chamber of Mines, and one-third by the State. I do not want to make any complaint in connection with the general control of this, but I have come to the conclusion that the whole of the conditions require to be altered. It should be so arranged that the State pays the whole of the salaries involved and entirely controls the officers, or alternatively that the State should no longer pay the one-third of the cost, but should allow the Chamber of Mines, if it is desired, to have a special staff to deal with gold stealing, and let the Chamber of Mines employ these officers exclusively. This is what has happened during the past year or two up there. Whilst the Chamber of Mines pay two-thirds of the salaries, the Chamber also provides £100 per annum by way of bonus, which is distributed amongst the members of that staff. It would not be so bad if the work of the staff was confined to gold stealing cases. The vicious thing about it all is that these men have during the past year or so been engaged in political work on the same side of politics as the Chamber of Mines, which virtually employs them. The Commissioner of Police has actually diverted some members of the gold stealing staff to political work. These detectives, who have been associated with the Chamber of Mines for some 11 years, and who have been on the same side as that body in the political turmoil of the past year, have been selected to attend to particularly delicate duties in connection with political strife. Constable Pitman, for instance, has been a member of the gold stealing staff for years, and has been influenced to a large extent by the Chamber of Mines, and has been selected to attend political meetings and take notes of the speeches of those who are opposed to the party with which he is associated. If the Commissioner has no member of his regular staff capable of doing work of this kind he should endeavour to enlist the services of others who are capable. Is it fair to take Constable Pitman and put him to a duty in opposition to another political organisation, which may involve the liberties of the members of that organisation? To my mind this is an outrage upon the common principles of fair play. During the elections the most active men were the members of this gold stealing staff. But for the fact that the Government were not responsible for the formation of this staff I should be inclined to move for a reduction of this item, but I do say it is time a change was made. What is the bonus for? Is it for the purpose of encouraging the men to become pimps? The time has arrived for the State to refuse to keep a special staff to deal with gold steal-

ing. The Chamber of Mines is entitled to the usual measure of police protection, and if more is needed that body should furnish it. The members of this staff should certainly not be called upon to attend political meetings on behalf of another political organisation of an opposite character, by which they are virtually employed. This is only another instance of the unfitness of the Commissioner.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: In my opinion the officers on this staff, who are in the employment of the Chamber of Mines, should not be employed on political work, and I will bring this opinion as forcibly before the Colonial Secretary as possible. The question of whether the gold-stealing staff should be continued or not is also one that is well worthy of consideration.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I should like some information regarding the four extra plain-clothes men who are doing duty in Perth. At present they are not getting any clothing allowance. They are supplied with the ordinary issue of uniform, which they are unable to wear because of the duties they are carrying out. The result is that they have to wear their own clothes and lose 1s. 6d. a day out of their wages. Representations were made to the Minister by the Police Association, who were informed that the anomaly would be rectified. Has this been done?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: I have not the particular information. Plain-clothes constables ordinarily are allowed £7 per annum clothing allowance.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: These particular men receive uniform, which they do not require, and cannot wear during their work, and which hangs at home unused. Moreover, they receive 1s. 6d. per day less than the other plain-clothes constables, while having to wear out their private clothes at work.

Hon. R. H. UNDEDWOOD: I have at present no information on this matter. I will look into it.

Mr. JONES: I was wondering whether the cost of special police service on Fremantle wharf, £1,920 1s. 2d., as stated by the Premier in reply to a question of mine on the 15th October, is included in this item or in some other item. I am utterly unable to understand these Estimates, owing to the manner in which they have been drawn up. These extra police are stationed on the wharf notwithstanding the presence there of Federal naval and military guards, and of barricades. I complain of the utter, wasteful futility of stationing the extra police there. The Premier also informed me, in reply to a question, that during pick-up times at Fremantle the police are not stationed at the pick-up bureaux. I understand, of course, that the Premier answered on behalf of another Minister; and in saying that the answer is absolutely untrue I am not accusing the Premier of untruthfulness, but I do accuse the man who furnished that reply with being untruthful. Every policeman on duty on Fremantle wharf is stationed around the pick-up bureaux for four or five hours every day, as the Honorary Minister can assure himself by going on the wharf at pick-up times, for preference at 7.45 a.m.

Possibly the object of this concentration of police may be to protect the respectable section of the community against the hangman, who is a national volunteer at Fremantle, and who perhaps is liable to turn blood-hungry at times. I do not wish to penalise the uniform police there, who are merely doing their duty. The uniform police are a grand class of men, and I have not the slightest doubt that to stand by and watch Afghans and aliens receiving preference over returned soldiers hurts them as much as it would hurt you, Mr. Chairman. There should be more women police, and I hope the Minister will take that matter in hand. Reading the Commissioner's report, the work that the women police do is really excellent. I would like also to see the scope of their duties increased. With regard to the service generally my desire is to keep it from becoming too much of a secret service. I am also anxious to see that it does not fall to the corrupt level of the forces of other countries. Therefore I do not think I can conscientiously move in the direction of reducing the vote. I hope that if at any time again industrial trouble should arise, the Government will not rush in and fling away money as they have done on other occasions when providing extra police services, notably on the Fremantle wharves, but that they will be guided by sound judgment instead of the hysteria which prompted them to send the men they did to Fremantle on that occasion.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: The hon. member says that if there is industrial trouble again he does not want to see a repetition of what took place at Fremantle, but I can assure him that so far as I am concerned, if the necessity arises I will have the police there again. Whenever I think the members of the community are in danger I will do what I can to see that they have all the protection the State can offer.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I want to assure the Honorary Minister that his fears are not likely to be realised. We know that order prevailed at Fremantle during the difficulty referred to and I will guarantee that if the police reports are read it will be found that nothing of a disorderly nature occurred; perfect order was maintained right through by the men, who, the hon. member thinks, did wrong. As a matter of fact they assisted the police to keep order. The Honorary Minister should be reasonable in dealing with these matters. The delay which has taken place to-night in dealing with these Estimates has been due entirely to the attitude of the Minister himself. That, however, is by the way. In my opinion there is no necessity for such a large expenditure. If there are no policemen there, there will not be any trouble, and when the Honorary Minister talks about the white flag let him remember that the president of the union lost two sons at the war while many others have suffered in a similar way. The police down there have used a good deal of tact. One false move might have made considerable trouble. I think the usual number of police is all that is required in Fremantle at present.

Hon. P. Collier: At least they could give it a trial for a week.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We cannot at this juncture afford the increased cost involved.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: Nobody regrets more than I the incident that led to the employment of the police. I am pleased to say we have very nearly finished with this trouble. I am prepared to go into the matter and see if we can shift the extra police. But I object to the member for Fremantle making a stone-walling speech on the subject. He has not treated it seriously.

Mr. JONES: If there is any matter which I would treat seriously it is the fact that the scabs down there are getting preference over returned soldiers. Wages earned in Fremantle are being brought to Perth, while women and children in Fremantle are being starved. Brothels and shy-poo shops in Perth are flourishing on money earned in Fremantle. I object to the Honorary Minister saying that I do not take this seriously. He is talking twaddle.

Mr. Teesdale: You are talking twaddle when you speak of women and children starving in this State.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I desire to get a reply from the Minister on two subjects which I raised earlier in the evening. One was the utilising of the police barracks, which at present has only half a dozen recruits. It is not paying interest on cost of construction, and the half dozen men, being single, could easily get accommodation outside. Many of our offices could be located in that building. The other point is the necessity for the drill being carried on. From all parts of the suburbs constables, after doing their duty, have to come in and take part in this weekly drill. Is it necessary?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: I had a note about the barracks. Although there are only six constables there now, I do not know that we can make any profitable use of the place. We could house some officers there, perhaps. The question is worth looking into. Although there are only six constables there at present, we shall have more later on. However, we will inquire whether any considerable sum could be earned by leasing the premises.

Hon. P. Collier: It is a fine big building.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: In regard to the drill, I do not know what drill they are doing. They certainly should not be doing unnecessary drill. A policeman ought not to be doing any military drill. Perhaps it is probationary drill.

Mr. O'Loighlen: No, it is not.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: I will bring the matter under the notice of the Commissioner.

Item, Contingencies, £20,500.

Mr. JOHNSTON: There is a motor car included here. I should like to know what that car costs.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: The cost of the motors is in the Commissioner's report. There is a Talbot car and a Ford car, and the average for the two is 4d. per mile. I do not know that the figures prove anything. All I can say is that the police service today necessitates the employment of motor

cars. I do not think they are unduly used. The running costs are not high. We have to take into consideration the present cost of oil and petrol. The Commissioner and the whole of the officers are doing their best to keep down the expenditure of this department, and the Treasurer is continually reminding them that it must be kept down.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I suggest that the Government keep an eye on this item of expenditure. I was in a country town last January, over 140 miles from Perth, when the police car arrived from Perth carrying the chief inspector. The car stopped there for ten minutes or a quarter of an hour, when it returned to Perth. Some time afterwards the file was laid on the Table concerning that visit, and it appeared from the file that a very simple inquiry had to be made of the constable in charge of the station down there, as to why he had issued or withdrawn some summons. It was a special visit to Wickpin for an inquiry that could have been fixed up by letter; and if a letter was not sufficient surely the case could have been met by the chief inspector using his railway pass, seeing that the train stops at Wickpin for 20 minutes. This would have cost the Government nothing. There was a good deal of talk in the town about that rush visit.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: We are having such inquiry made into the use of motor cars as will, I think, prevent their abuse for the future. There is no doubt that the tendency is to go to a place by motor car rather than by train or tram. I am inclined to think in the case just mentioned the chief inspector must have been doing other work on the way. When we get the garage up here we hope to be able to completely check the use of motor cars, and by putting a special brand on them show the public that these are Government cars.

Hon. P. COLLIER: If instead of putting a special brand on the cars they were painted a distinctive colour the public would be better able to see which were Government cars and which private ones, and so more greatly restrict their improper use. I have seen as many as four Government cars filled with men and women going to the races on a Saturday afternoon.

The Colonial Treasurer: The abuse in this respect has been shocking.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That is so. I could quote many instances in which the police car has been used for purposes for which it was not intended. Once a department becomes possessed of a car the tendency on the part of the officials is to at once stop using the trams and trains and to take the car.

The Colonial Treasurer: They think the car belongs to them.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is not an uncommon thing to see the high officials of a department going to their offices in Government cars and the Minister in charge travelling by tram or train. It was formerly the custom in the police department to use bicycles, but that form of transport is given up now in favour of the car. The taxpayers should not be called upon to bear extra burdens of this

kind. I do believe the Government are trying to do something to reduce the abuses which have been taking place in this direction.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—State Children, £69,002:

Item, Payment to women on whom children are dependant, £25,000.

Hon. P. COLLIER: There is a reduction of £573 on this item as compared with last year. It appears to me that there has been a niggardly and cheese-paring policy shown here. The policy has been adopted in this department of reducing the payments to a family by that for one child. I know that the officers concerned have always been sympathetic and courteous towards these women, but they are limited by the funds at their disposal. I hope that wherever the pruning knife is put in this will be the last department into which it is put. If there is any one entitled to the generous consideration of the State it is the woman who is left with the burden of rearing a young family without any assistance except that which is given by the State. Although the payment for each child is only 7s. per week, it is a lot to a woman who has to live on 25s. or 30s. a week and rear her family. I would also point out that this payment was fixed at a time when the cost of living was much below that at which it stands now. Having regard to the purchasing power of the sovereign, it is safe to say that the 7s. of to-day is no more than the 5s. of four years ago. Notwithstanding the condition of the finances, I should have been glad if this vote had shown an increase, and I urge the Honorary Minister and the Government not to be niggardly in the matter of assistance to women with children. A year or two ago, proposals of a social character which involved expenditure were always met with the argument that "the State cannot afford it;" but bearing in mind the experience not only of this State but of the world at large in recent times no one can hope to argue successfully that Western Australia cannot afford to find money to provide for the needs of these women and their children. I regret that, in pursuance of the policy of economy, there has been a tightening up of the assistance formerly given. A matter of £1,000 or £2,000 per annum will hardly be felt in a deficit of three millions, and it means a good deal in the shape of a few shillings extra per week for each of these women. This is the only vote on which I shall argue in that strain, and I hope the Minister will not hesitate to excess this particular vote, if necessary.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: In this connection I desire to refer to boarded out children, or State children placed with foster mothers, in order to be reared. The increase in the cost of food and clothing, more especially boots and shoes, presses hardly on the foster mothers, from some of whom I have had representations that they cannot on the old scale of payment keep the children as they were able to do before the war. They state

the children properly now and keep them respectably dressed. I know that some of the foster mothers take as great an interest in the children as if they were actually their own. Occasionally the foster mother goes short herself for the sake of the child. The increased cost of living should be met in some way for them.

Mr. TROY: A number of children who are provided for by the State have fathers who are able to keep them but who have abandoned their wives and children. Apparently, little effort is made by the State to hold such men up to their responsibilities.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes, there is, when they are caught.

Mr. TROY: I speak now of a case within my knowledge, where a young, strong, perfectly able-bodied man has abandoned his family. The mother has been compelled to accept money from the State for the maintenance of the children. She took action for maintenance against the husband, and obtained judgment. The husband, who was working in the City, left for the country and became lost to the police, and paid nothing whatever. So the woman went to the police, but the Commissioner said he was averse to taking any action whatever while there was a possibility of the parties coming together. She replied that there was no such possibility, that she wanted no money from the husband, but that he ought to be compelled to maintain his children. He was brought to Perth again, and judgment was given against him once more; but he has been lost sight of again, and has paid nothing. Such a man, if he will not provide for his children while he is working outside, ought to be put in jail and made to work there for the support of his children. I have no doubt there are hundreds of such cases. Can the Minister state what legal power there is of compelling a parent of this type to pay for the maintenance of his children?

[12 o'clock midnight.]

Mr. FOLEY: A matter that I wish to bring under notice is that of the children of soldiers who have deserted from the A.I.F. Fortunately there are not many of these cases but I have come across some by the reason of the position I hold as complaints officer. The mothers of these children are in reduced circumstances because the moment a man deserts he ceases to be a soldier and his pay is stopped. Every opportunity is taken to find the man but during that time the woman is in a worse position than a widow. It might be said that this is a matter for the Commonwealth Government to give attention to, but my experience of the Commonwealth Government is that when it is a matter out of which some revenue can be obtained, they will take hold of it, but if there is anything to pay they leave it to the State. It was intended to enter into an arrangement with the State whereby the wife of a soldier who had deserted should not be left in a condition of want, and it was proposed that the Commonwealth and the State should share equally the maintenance of the wife and the children. The

and the result is that at the present time each State is bearing the whole cost of maintaining these unfortunate women and their children. So far as Western Australia is concerned it cannot be said that a deaf ear has been turned to any cases of distress of this nature, but it is to be hoped that some arrangement will be made with the Commonwealth Government to ensure for these women and children more generous treatment than the State alone can give.

Mr. ROCKE: We all deprecate the fact that some fathers are quite dead to all sense of responsibility so far as their children are concerned and it is a pity because of the state of the finances that the children should be compelled to suffer. One of the saddest things I had to do was to try to get some relief for children left in a helpless condition, not because the officers of the department would not attend to the case. They did all they possibly could but their one complaint was that they did not have any money. Therefore I would have been glad to see this vote increased so that there might not have been any possibility of causing children to want. In my electorate there is a woman with three children, the eldest being 11 years old. Her husband was not a deserter; she lost him four years ago and she has been in receipt of 14s. from the State with which to keep herself and her children. Then again if a person saves a few pounds and should happen to go to the department for assistance, the fact that she has a few pounds, which sometimes is not sufficient to provide for sickness, precludes her from claiming help from the State.

Hon. R. H. Underwood: If they have sufficient to keep themselves and their children, we do not assist them.

Mr. ROCKE: If these children of to-day are to be the citizens of to-morrow we must keep their bodies in a healthy condition, otherwise we cannot expect them to have a healthy intellect.

Mr. LAMBERT: I was rather surprised to hear from the member for Leonora that provision was not made by the Federal Government for the wives and children of deserters from the forces, and I am more surprised to hear the suggestion that he would be favourable to the idea that we should be saddled with the expense in this connection. In this State where there is an unequal financial arrangement there should be a violent protest made against further payments by the State Government. It should be within the province of the Minister controlling this department to bring under the notice of the Federal Government the necessity for making adequate provision for these women and children. The time will arrive when a very stern fight will have to be put up against the exactions of the Federal Government from the State. We have as much right to guard the solvency of this State as the Federal Government has to guard that of the Commonwealth, and while they have financial difficulties, we have ours as well. They are making daily encroachments upon our taxable channels, and while

those channels are being limited our expenditure is increasing. I regret therefore that there is one member here who is prepared to concede that we should be saddled with a further financial burden. I hope when members are discussing these matters they will have regard to the financial condition in which the State finds itself.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: I was pleased to hear the leader of the Opposition speak in the strain he did. I can assure him it would be infinitely more pleasing for the Minister to act more liberally in these cases than to act in what might be termed a stingy manner. A rule was laid down by the Seadann Government that women who had children dependent upon them should not want for food or clothing. There are, however, some parents who are prepared to allow their children to be taken care of by the State or anyone else who might care to look after them. I have been associated with two stony-broke Governments and I reckon that the first time a Government comes into power that has an overflowing Treasury I am entitled to a job in it.

Mr. Johnston: I hope you will live till then.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: I took the remarks of the leader of the Opposition to mean that if we find it necessary we will exceed the vote. I will bear those remarks in mind. With regard to the point raised by the member for Mt. Magnet, I can assure him that the department does a great deal in the direction of endeavouring to find the fathers of the children, though very often we do not accomplish what we are after. In the meantime the children and the mothers have to be kept. The police take action in this direction and the Commissioner in his last report has this to say on the subject—

There were 32 cases of this nature resulting in 19 convictions; the remaining cases being discharged or otherwise dealt with. It appears to be a matter for serious consideration whether some sufficiently drastic change should not be made in the existing law to deal with delinquents who deliberately evade their obligations to their wives and families. The circumstances often involving cruelty and callousness. If offenders of this type on conviction, and whilst undergoing imprisonment, were required to set apart a portion of their prison earnings for the benefit of those dependent on them, I believe it would justify such an enactment.

The department is not overlooking this. In regard to the proposition of the member for Leonora, I do not know that we can do much. It is all right to say that the Federal Government should do that. We say the father should look after it. The State takes the responsibility. We want to see the children shall not want for food and clothing. If we can get the money out of the Commonwealth Government, well and good. If not, we shall still look after our children.

Vote put and passed.

This completed the Estimates of the Colonial Secretary's Department.

The Minister for Education, Hon. H. P. Colebatch, Minister—the Premier (Hon. H. B. Lefroy) in charge of the Votes.

Vote—Education, £368,454:

The PREMIER (Hon. H. B. Lefroy—Moore) [12.17 a.m.]: The last time I introduced the Education Estimates was in the small hours of the morning, and I regret it falls to my lot to do so again at this hour. At the same time I shall do my best to place the position before members in such a way as will be satisfactory and meet with approval. It is 21 years now since I first introduced the Education Estimates in this House, and I am at a disadvantage to-day to what I was on that occasion, because then I was administering the department and had a knowledge of its working which I am not possessed of at this moment. It is interesting to know how the education in Western Australia has proceeded during the last 21 years. When I look back on the first time I introduced these Estimates to the House, I think of the progress of Western Australia, and that progress can be gauged by the position as it is at the present moment, compared with what it was in the years I am speaking of. In 1897 there were 167 schools in Western Australia, to-day there are 646 schools. There was an average attendance of 8,976 children in the schools of this State in 1897; to-day there is an average attendance of 41,034. I am pleased to note also that the average attendance at the present day is greater in proportion to the relationship than it was at that time. That, in my opinion, is largely due to the fact that the people have not only become more fully alive to the necessity for education, but also to the fact that education was in 1899 made compulsory in Western Australia. I introduced into this House not only the Bill which made education compulsory in Western Australia, but also a Bill which made education free in this country. I also laid the foundation of the Training College at Claremont, which has been, I am quite sure hon. members recognise, of material advantage to the education of the State. The vote on education naturally is a large one, but I am quite sure that members will agree with me that money cannot be better spent than in the thorough education of the children of the country. The Estimates show a large amount, £368,454, but I think, compared with the amount that is expended on education in other countries, we shall not be considered to be in any way extravagant. The Estimates of the department for the current financial year show certainly a net increase of £14,661, but the bulk of this will go to provide instruction for the normal increases in the number of children, and when we recognise the fact that taking the past year as an index, it is estimated that 1,900 additional children will have to be educated in our State schools, it is not unreasonable to see an addition of £14,661 to meet this increase. The average cost of the education of our children is about £6 10s. per head. But as many of these children belong to the country schools, where the cost per head is nearly double, if not quite double, a higher per capita amount must be anticipated. The estimated increase in the expenditure for this

year is about 4.1 per cent., which, when compared with other States, from which figures are now obtainable, represents Western Australia I think in a very favourable light from the view of economy. The figures of New South Wales and Victoria are not before us at the present time. We have not received them. South Australia has increased her estimates on education by 17 per cent., Tasmania by 11 per cent., and Queensland estimates an increase of 7.5 per cent.

Hon. P. Collier: For the year.

The PREMIER: For the present financial year. Although when we have increased our Estimates at the rate of 4.1 per cent., I think on the score of economy we compare very favourably with any of the other States of Australia, and I would like to say that the educational facilities and the organisation of our Education Department in Western Australia compares, in my opinion, more than favourably with the education in the other schools of Australasia. We have a system in Western Australia which I feel we may be justly proud of. It has been built up most carefully by men who are trained in the work, and by teachers who are full of interest in their work, and I trust the education which we are giving the children of the State will build up not only an intelligent class of citizen for the future, but that it will do more than that, it will build up a character of inestimable benefit to themselves and to the State. The percentage of increases in the number of pupils is higher than in any of the other States, while the percentage of increases in estimated expenditure is, as I stated before, lower. The cost of administration, also, in proportion to the expenditure, shows a still further decrease on previous years. The principal items of increase will be found under the heading of Government schools, which is £12,240 more than last year. This increase is for salaries in our primary schools, and is about 85 per cent. of the total increase. Eighty-five per cent. of the total increase can be charged up to the primary schools of the State. Apart from the number of children I have just mentioned, there are actual increases of salaries in accordance with the regulations. As members know, certain increases in salaries have to be brought about automatically, and those increases are provided under the regulations and must be made a continual charge on the education estimates of the State.

Hon. P. Collier: That only applies the same as in the public service, to under £200 a year.

The PREMIER: Just so. That increase has been brought up; I think, until quite recently the increases had been stopped beyond £150 a year. We have now brought the £12 a year increase up to the salaries of £250 a year. I think the Government thought at the present time the cost of living has gone up so considerably that it was only fair to those engaged in the Education Department that they should have this additional increase.

Hon. P. Collier: There is no increase in the minimum of £110. That is where there ought to be increases.

The PREMIER: Not in the minimum; there is an increase right through.

Hon. P. Collier: The minimum has not been lifted.

The PREMIER: The interests of country schools demand better trained teachers. There is a little difference of opinion about the methods, but there is no doubt about the aspect of efficiency. Therefore it is a source of congratulation that we have more qualified teachers on our educational staff than we had previously. To carry this principle to more efficiently train our teachers there is a small augmentation of the Training College vote. It has been slightly increased and it is proposed to increase the length of courses for training for country schools from six to twelve months. Prior to the present year the course for teachers for country schools was only six months, but the country child needs a fully trained teacher just as much as the town child. When I speak of the country child I mean not only the child in what we call the country and farming districts of Western Australia, but the country children residing on the gold-fields and other places where the people are congregated together.

Hon. P. Collier: Those are the teachers who only take a short course in the primary schools.

The PREMIER: That is all, but we are giving them now a twelve months' course.

Hon. P. Collier: Is this a suitable time to increase the item?

The PREMIER: The expenditure is not very great, and it is thought to obtain efficiency it is better to give these teachers a longer course and make them more fitted for the work they have to engage in. The lengthening of this period of training for each batch of country teachers necessitates an addition of about £240 to the salary vote, and £550 for allowances and advances to students. It may be said that at present we are spending less on the training of teachers in proportion to our population than most of the other States; so there is no extravagance, although we may be expending a large amount on education. Unless we cut down our work, I do not think we can be properly charged with extravagance in this direction. If education is worth doing at all, it is worth doing well, and although we are at present in financial difficulties I maintain that we should use every effort to see that the children of the State, who will make the future citizens of Western Australia, receive an education as efficient as that of those who came before them. There is no increase in the expenditure on secondary schools, but the item for continuation schools shows an increase of £362, which is to provide for new classes. The number of children attending these schools is 3,000, but it is not anticipated that there will be much increase in the immediate future. Some people will argue that there is no necessity for our continuation classes, that the State should not encourage any education beyond the three R's, and should not take children above the age of 14. If we were to adopt such a course we should be going backwards. If we cannot go forward we should at least endeavour to maintain our position, and do our best by the children. It would be highly detrimental to the State

if these continuation classes were cut out. Those children who are able to take advantage of these classes after they have left the primary schools, are receiving almost a greater advantage than they received at the primary schools. By means of these continuation classes many of our children are able to extend their knowledge and develop their intelligence. Now, when greater facilities for day education are provided, the demand for evening classes may diminish. We could do without evening classes if the children could get the necessary education during the day time. The same view cannot be taken of the technical classes, in respect of which the demand is steady and persistent. The number of students at the beginning of the financial year was 3,200, which was an increase of 400 on the previous year, showing that the technical classes are largely availed of. The knowledge to be obtained in that way must be of benefit to the country. Twenty years ago the advantages of technical education were continually being brought before Parliament. The late Mr. Randell, who was Minister for Education for some years, was an ardent supporter of technical education, and he frequently urged it in the House. I believe he was largely instrumental in having the technical classes initiated in Western Australia. Greater progress can confidently be looked for during the present year, although it will probably serve to bring up the question of increased accommodation. The lessons of the war have emphasised the need for technical education, and Parliament is unlikely to place any obstacle in the way of its extension. The provision for manual training, cookery, etc., shows an increase of £1,347, but of this amount £553 represents a transfer, as the salaries involved were previously debited to the Government schools item. Hon. members will be able to see how that increase takes place. The balance is made up of provision for additional teachers and monitors to fill vacancies, regulation increments, increased wages for maids, and allowances for new work and for relieving teachers in case of sick leave or long service leave. There is, moreover, on the contingency vote a net decrease of £3,422. The cause of this will be found in the reduced item for furniture, books, sales of stock, etc. This, however, is not an actual saving, but is due to the new arrangement under which no charge is made by other departments for work done. The item for incidentals shows an increase of £11. Economies have been effected wherever possible. The cost of stationery has very largely increased. The item for driving children to school has increased by £1,500, and now stands at £10,600. In spite of this and the increased cost of many articles, the vote is kept within the bounds of last year and is even less than that of last year. Some hon. members may consider that this driving allowance should not be provided. But hon. members must know that if this allowance were not granted we should not be able to maintain the children in the country schools, and many of them would have to go without education at



all. Personally, I think the driving allowance should remain, for it is wise expenditure which the State should endeavour to maintain for the benefit of our widely scattered country districts and of the children in our smaller communities. The increase of £1,448 in the item of secondary scholarships and bursaries is mainly due to the increased number of scholarships at district high schools at Northam, Geraldton, Albany, and Bunbury, and also to the provision of scholarships for the children of fallen or disabled soldiers, for whom special scholarships have been granted. The district high school scholarships were established to afford country children a measure of education similar to that enjoyed by town children, and the increase in the number of students is, I think, fair evidence that the extension of secondary education to the larger country centres has been greatly appreciated. District high schools have now been provided in every State in Australia. No fees are charged, except in Victoria. Similar schools are provided in New South Wales and throughout Canada. The scholarships for soldiers' children are a part of the plan by which Australia hopes to convince her soldiers that their sacrifices are, at any rate, sympathetically appreciated. At the commencement of next year there will be in our four district high schools about 108 children from the primary schools in the outlying districts. Hon. members will find a small increase of £62 in the item of training college, board, etc., for students in residence. This is due to the rise in the cost of provisions. The salaries of the head office staff are unchanged. The increase of £130 in the item for temporary assistance is to provide for filling the places of officers entitled to long service leave. These are my remarks on the items as they appear on the Estimates. Hon. members have the report of the Education Department for last year, and will be able to gather what the full work of this great organisation has been.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: This report is for 1917.

The PREMIER: That is so.

Mr. Holman: Could you not enlarge on your notes for 1918?

The PREMIER: The hon. member surely does not expect me to stone-wall my own Estimates?

Mr. O'Loghlen: What was the cost of that report?

The PREMIER: It was £57 14s. Considering that the increase in the number of children is expected to be about 1,900, I do not think the increases shown on the Estimates can be considered large.

Hon. P. Collier: We have had some reports from departments for the year ended last June.

The PREMIER: This report is for the calendar year 1917. I do not think we have done badly in having it here at this stage. The departmental reports have not always been before the Committee when the Estimates have been under discussion. I do not think it is necessary for me to discuss the advantages of education. I am sure that hon. members feel

that if we are to make a success of this country we must above all look after the education of our children. In our Education Department we have an organisation which does credit to the many Governments of Western Australia, which have administered it since the days of Responsible Government. It was not until Responsible Government that education made any strides in this State. When we cast off the leading strings the State began to realise that it had greater responsibilities than ever, and entered upon a more complete system of education, which has grown to such an extent that it is costing this large amount of public money. No one in this Chamber can say that the expenditure upon our educational system is in any way extravagant as compared with that which is spent in other parts of the world.

Mr. Holman: Are the authorities going to enlarge the system of correspondence schools in our out-back centres?

The PREMIER: This is being encouraged in every possible way. It is a system which does not cost money, and is of great advantage to the children. The education of children not only in Australia but throughout the British dominions is receiving the greatest attention. Even in the City of London where the population is five million, the cost per head is greater than it is in Western Australia. In spite of the fact that our vote is so large I do not think we can honestly be charged with extravagance. We could make education no longer free, and could raise the age of admission, but this would have its disadvantages as well. In the circumstances I think we might well allow the system of education in Western Australia to proceed along the road of progress, which it has travelled so satisfactorily for some years past.

Mr. Holman: Is the examination of private schools as strict as it is in the case of public schools?

The PREMIER: Our inspectors do not examine all the schools.

Mr. Holman: I mean the private primary schools.

The PREMIER: These have to be examined, and the secondary schools have to be certified to as fit. In the primary schools there is more need for examination, and I believe our inspectors pay close attention to the matter. In 1899 when compulsory education was introduced this was one of the conditions that we laid down.

Mr. Holman: I think you introduced the Bill for this.

The PREMIER: Yes. The condition was that the schools were to be subject to examination.

Mr. ANGELO (Gascoyne) [12.55]: I move—

That progress be reported and leave asked to sit again.

Motion put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes .. .. .	13
Noes .. .. .	18

Majority against .. 5

## AYRS.

Mr. Angelo  
Mr. Angwin  
Mr. Chesson  
Mr. Collier  
Mr. Green  
Mr. Holman  
Mr. Jones

Mr. Lambert  
Mr. Munsie  
Mr. Pilkington  
Mr. Teesdale  
Mr. Walker  
Mr. O'Loughlen  
(Teller.)

## NOSS.

Mr. Duff  
Mr. Foley  
Mr. Gardiner  
Mr. Griffiths  
Mr. Harrison  
Mr. Hickmott  
Mr. Hudson  
Mr. Johnston  
Mr. Lefroy  
Mr. Mullany

Mr. Pickering  
Mr. Plessie  
Mr. R. T. Robinson  
Mr. Roche  
Mr. Thomson  
Mr. Troy  
Mr. Underwood  
Mr. Hardwick  
(Teller.)

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. FOLEY (Leonora) [1.3 a.m.]: There are one or two aspects of our system of education which, if given attention in the directions I am about to indicate, will lead to betterment of the entire system. A good deal has been said concerning the proposal to grant to teachers increments which had accrued before 1915. There must be some point for the increments to start at, and although increments were given only to lower grade teachers the higher grade teachers had the opportunity of securing larger advances in salary than the increments would represent. The higher grades in the Education Department, as in all other departments, have better opportunities to get the ear of authority. In the case of some lower grade teachers the increments would reach £30 per annum. But the classification of schools has caused some higher grade teachers to receive substantial increases of salary, simply by reason of a greater number of children attending their schools. Some of these teachers have received, by reason of classification, as much as £40 per annum additional. There is the case of the Beaconsfield school, where the teacher, without special qualifications, simply because of an increase in the number of scholars, has had his salary raised from £340 to £380.

Mr. O'Loughlen: The members of the Government ought to be in the Chamber to listen to a high-grade discourse on so important a subject as the Education Vote. Therefore I call attention to the state of the Committee.

[Bells rung and a quorum formed.]

Mr. FOLEY: The system, which produces effects like that at Beaconsfield, should be altered. Some members will recollect that on last year's Estimates I brought forward the question of head teachers. I was then twitted with questions as to where I had got my information. To-night we have been told that the source of the information does not matter; and that will be my reply to any questions on this subject. From the source which furnished me with information last year, I learn that the matter to which I drew attention shows no improvement. My belief, like that

of the Premier, is that consideration should chiefly be given to the education of children in the adolescent stage, during which one learns better than at any other time of life. That is the stage at which we should get right down on the child with our educational system. From the sixth standard onward, a boy learns more than at any other time of his life. In the light of my knowledge, I assert that many head teachers do not impart to adolescent scholars that education which they should receive. I regret that the system remains unaltered, in spite of the criticism levelled against it last year. Another subject touched on by the Premier was that of practice schools. A teacher was employed at a practice school at Nedlands, and the school was transferred to Jolimont, the reason advanced being that at Nedlands the school had outlived its usefulness. The change meant the transfer of the entire staff from Claremont to Subiaco. Railway fares and other charges were incurred which did not apply while the school was at Nedlands. Teaching at the school was one of the best teachers in the State. He was transferred to the Capel school. Many people think—I do not subscribe to the view, because I do not know that it is correct—that a position in the Education Department was needed for someone; and therefore, it is said, this excellent teacher was transferred from Jolimont to Capel. There must be something wrong in the department if such things can happen. Why was the man doing good work in the practice school shifted from it? The Government, moreover, now have to pay train fares for 70 persons. They had nothing of this kind to pay while the school was at Nedlands. There were men who, before going away were undergoing the course indicated by the Premier and they were receiving £110 per annum. Those who were fortunate enough to return received their classification and were paid £140. I have no objection to that, but there is another class of teacher not going to the college but who went to the war. On returning he went to the training college to undergo a course and received £110. This teacher has to battle but he gets no classification. If men go to the war and return and are classified for the position, they should get the consideration extended to them which is extended to those who did not enlist. It would seem that for going to the Front these men are being penalised. There was a case mentioned in the "Education Circular," which was referred to as the Walters' case. This man was a school teacher and was absent at the Front for three years, and when he enlisted was head teacher at Jolimont school with an A3 certificate. When he returned he was still marked as head teacher with an A3 certificate on the same salary as when he went away, but another man who did not go—a single man without dependants—received an increase over the head of the man who went and left behind a wife and family. When the war broke out it was stated by the Government that it was intended to see that a man did not lose his status by going away, and it was also said that there would not be any permanent appointments made while the

men were absent at the Front. I will not be satisfied until something is done to put the position right. I am speaking now of the Continuation schools and in connection with which in many instances single men without dependants are being given positions. If there is a possibility of giving the man who has been at the Front the position of head teacher at a Continuation school, this should be done. With regard to the Modern School it is said that there are many children there whose parents could well afford to pay for their education. I believe we have a system of free education and if only merit counts that is all we want. If a student gets a scholarship he may go into the senior division, but unfortunately there are many children of poorer parents who cannot afford, should the child fail to get a scholarship, to allow him to stay there long enough. It is said that the junior portion of the Modern School is being monopolised by the children of the higher men in the Education Department of this State, but so long as children have an equality of opportunity that is all that should be asked.

Mr. PILKINGTON (Perth) [1.27 a.m.]: It is I think unfortunate that the debate on the estimates of the Education Department should be commenced a little after midnight, and that the Government should insist upon continuing under those circumstances. The department is one which deserves the keen attention of hon. members from every point of view. It is important that the discussion should be a full and a free one; the Government have turned it into a farce. When the Premier commenced his speech there were very few members in the Chamber, some of them were asleep, and when he had finished most of the others were asleep. The Premier introduced the estimates of this department in a speech which was very brief; most of it was read from notes evidently supplied by the Colonial Secretary. The rest of it consisted of some platitudinous remarks which threw no light upon the subject. The speech was a characteristic one; it was marked by that want of clarity which usually illuminates the hon. gentleman's utterances. And this is the leader of the Government who comes down to the House and pretends that he and his Government are sincere when they profess to regard the education of this country as a thing of vital importance. They treat it with the utmost contempt and they must forgive us if we do not accept their assurances that they do regard this matter as one of vital importance. For my own part I accept rather the acts of the Government than their words and by their acts I judge them; in fact they regard State education of Western Australia not with respect but with contempt. True they pour upon it eulogies because it is to some extent their own work, eulogies and promises for reasons which are sufficiently obvious, but in fact, they treat it with contempt. I propose at a later stage of the proceedings to move a reduction of the vote by a small sum, not with the idea of reducing the amount but as a protest against further increases in the future. As hon. members know, my own view is that a much stronger and more drastic course should be taken. I propose to ask the Com-

mittee to adopt the milder course because I know that I should fail in asking hon. members to adopt the course which I believe to be the right one. The object of the motion which I shall move at a later stage is to prevent further increases being made in the future, that it may be a direction to the Government that further increases shall not take place. Last year the increase on the estimates of the Education Department was £26,000. I do not think it was all spent, there being a sum of £5,000 unexpended. This year the increase is £14,000, a total proposed increase of £40,000 for the two years, although, as I have said, the full amount of £26,000 last year was not spent. I venture to think that is not a right state of affairs in view of the condition of the finances of Western Australia. The Government do not regard the condition of the finances with sufficient seriousness. Take the head of the Government, the Premier, as an illustration. He has spoken very rarely on the subject of the finances of this State, and so far as I know he has not made any suggestion, good, bad, or indifferent in regard to the manner in which the difficulty should be met. There is justification, therefore, for asking the Committee that direction should be given to the Government not to increase this vote. I propose to go on with my remarks when the members of the Government cease talking.

The Premier: On a point of order, the Minister for Mines was merely asking me a question.

The Colonial Treasurer: Do not worry; I will have a bit of him directly.

Mr. PILKINGTON: I am only waiting for Ministers to stop muttering and talking; then I will proceed.

The Premier: They are not muttering.

Mr. PILKINGTON: Well, they are making noises. Now that Ministers have stopped making noises I will go on. I was about to observe that the justification for asking the Committee to give such a direction to the Government is this: in the first place it will be admitted that they came into office on promises of economy and, secondly, I think it may be shown that in fact economy has not been practised in regard to this department. Of course, I have to deal with a matter which it is exceedingly difficult for any outsider to deal with. It is very difficult to deal with the affairs of the Education Department without knowing the full details, which can only be known to Ministers and the heads of the departments. But, using the best information which I can obtain, there are certain matters to which I should like to draw attention. For various reasons I say that proper economy has not been exercised in this department. In the first place, I venture to suggest that these schools are used very largely, not merely as primary schools, but as nurseries, as places where the children are left for the convenience of their parents. We were told last year that children go to these schools at the age of five. If this is so, I venture to say they go too early. Putting it at the lowest, seven years is quite early enough for any child to go to a primary school. Personally, I would not send a child of mine to school at seven years, not for a year or two later.

Mr. Holman: Some have to go to work at that age.

Mr. Lambert: What chance will he have of being educated when he has to leave at, say, 14?

Mr. PILKINGTON: I say that if you start the primary education of a child at seven, it will have a better education when it reaches 14 years of age than if you were to start it earlier. I venture to say it will be found that many educational authorities hold that view, namely, that seven years is quite early enough for a child to start primary education by going to school. It means, of course, that there must be a large number of children using these schools, between the ages of five and seven, using them, not as primary schools, but as nurseries. I do not suggest that those children are suffering any harm by going to school for that purpose.

Mr. Lambert: What about using the universities as social loafing grounds?

Mr. PILKINGTON: I am dealing with the question of primary education for these children.

Mr. Holman: At what age did you start your education?

Mr. PILKINGTON: I went to school at nine.

Mr. Lambert: And when did you finish it?

Mr. PILKINGTON: At 19.

Mr. Lambert: Many have to earn their bread and butter years before reaching that age.

Mr. PILKINGTON: I am dealing with the question of primary education for any child, and I venture to suggest that you will not do a child any good by starting its primary education at five years, that you will do better by deferring it until the child reaches the age of seven.

Mr. Lambert: If you can continue it long enough.

Mr. PILKINGTON: Whether you continue it or not. In the years between five and seven the children are making use of these schools as nurseries, and not for the purpose of primary education. I will go beyond that and say that these children—I am liable to make mistakes in my facts—I understand the number of hours the children are in school is five per day. It will take a great deal to make me believe that there is the slightest sense in sending children five years of age to school for five hours per day.

Mr. Lambert: No man can determine that.

Mr. PILKINGTON: Five hours a day is an enormous length of time for young children. If those hours were shortened, a great saving might be made. When I went to a public school, boys at ages between 13 and 19 were in school for 2½ hours on three days in the week, while on the other days we were in school for four hours per day.

Mr. Holman: You have had a loafing experience all your life.

Mr. PILKINGTON: I venture to say the hon. member is mistaken, even in that. However, it is unimportant.

Mr. Holman: We had to go to work underground before we were 14 years of age.

Mr. PILKINGTON: I am speaking of the numbers of hours children have to remain in school. I suggest that when we send children

of an age between five and 14 to a school and keep them at school for five hours every day, they cannot be learning ordinary school work.

Mr. Lambert: They are learning discipline and conduct.

Mr. PILKINGTON: Just so. In other words, they are receiving the same care which they would receive in a good nursery. But that is not essential to a primary education. We must rely on parents and friends and guardians for conduct and so forth. What the children should be at in school is primary education. Now those are two matters in regard to which I suggest economy might be effected.

Mr. Johnston: Show us how the economy is to be effected by shortening the hours.

Mr. PILKINGTON: I will do so presently. I am coming to that. There is here an item manual training, cookery, etc., £9,350, and another item, inspectors of needle work £300. I understand that manual training means a training in elementary carpentry and similar instruction, and I understand that it is given mainly in big centres, in special places.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: For half a day per week.

Mr. PILKINGTON: Yes, so I understand. Hon. T. Walker: It is training of the eye and of the sense of touch.

Mr. PILKINGTON: Yes, it may be so.

Mr. Lambert: It is a pity to disparage this class of work in ignorance.

Mr. PILKINGTON: I am not disparaging this class of work. Manual training, cookery, and needle work may be useful methods of education; I am not going to deny it, but what I do say is that not the manual training nor the cookery nor the needlework is an essential part of primary education. One knows, generally speaking, what is meant by primary education. We go beyond that in these three subjects, which are costing a very considerable sum of money.

Mr. Lambert: Well, we ought to blow the University down with guns.

The CHAIRMAN: I especially ask the member for Coolgardie to keep order.

Mr. PILKINGTON: I do not care just now two straws what is done to the University. It does not come within the subject I am dealing with. If I expressed my views about the University the hon. member might be surprised. These three things are no essential to first class primary education. I understand that manual training is not taught in many of our schools, and neither, I think, are the other two. I am not disparaging cookery and needlework as a means of education.

Mr. Duff: It is one of the best forms of education you can introduce into a school.

Mr. PILKINGTON: These are not only unnecessary to first class primary education but I venture to say that under the conditions existing in Western Australia girls can learn both cookery and needlework better in their own homes.

Mr. Duff: What about when they have no homes?

Mr. PILKINGTON: It is not as if we had slums here such as are found in London. I do not think there are many homes in Western Australia in which the girls could not learn both cookery and needlework from their mothers or elder sisters, or some other person or guardian in the home, in a vastly more practical manner than they could in the schools under the Government. There is a tendency in a school, which teaches cookery and needlework, to teach those things which are perhaps more showy than those which are useful. Those girls who learn these things in their own homes will, I think, learn them in a more practical and useful manner than they would do in the schools. There is ample room here for an economy which has not been exercised. I do not suggest that continuation schools should be put an end to, but I am going to answer the question of the member for Williams-Narrogin to indicate how shorter hours may assist in reducing the expenditure in regard to schools generally. The suggestion that I am going to put forward is not mine. It appeared in the "West Australian" some two years ago as part of a discussion at a meeting of the school teachers. If the five hours were kept for the elder children, and the younger children were only kept in school until midday, and the teachers who were engaged in the afternoons were so freed, there would be freed a certain number of teachers who could carry on the continuation schools either during the afternoons or the evenings. There are many objections to continuation schools in the evening, but at any rate this method would be the means of a saving being effected. It is possibly true that those teachers who teach the younger children could not carry on the continuation schools. If that is so, the answer is that those teachers who are taking the younger children in the morning could take the older children in the afternoon, and the senior teachers who would thus be freed would then be available for the continuation schools. That appears to be perfectly feasible, and a suggestion which could be put into effect. I am only pointing out these things as indicating that the economy which ought to be practised at present is not being practised in this, any more than in other departments. Consequently I am justified in asking the Committee to give a direction to the Government that there shall be no further expenditure on this vote. There is another matter which seems to show that there is an absence of that organisation and conservation of man power of the Education Department which there ought to be. In the metropolitan area, I understand, we have not only the director himself, who has a quantity of office work to do, but the Chief Inspector, who also has a lot of office work, and three senior inspectors. We have these highly-trained officers looking after the metropolitan area—a term which I am using in quite

a loose way. To inspect and do the work of supervision in the metropolitan area we have, so far as I can understand, a large proportion of school teachers qualified by diploma or certificate. I think it is something like 90 per cent. In the country districts, however, we have six ordinary inspectors, and I think about 50 per cent. of uncertificated teachers. In the metropolitan area we have a large number of very highly trained and qualified supervisors to watch over the most experienced class of teachers, and in the outlying districts we have a comparatively small number of inspectors, for the area and number of schools, to watch over those teachers who really require most assistance. It seems to me that in the metropolitan area we have an excess of power, and of highly qualified supervision. At the James Street School, for instance, the head teachers are so highly qualified that if there were a vacancy on the inspectorate to-morrow one of them would get in at once. In the back blocks, however, we have teachers who not only require supervision but a great deal of assistance, and the presence of an inspector there would frequently be very helpful. This suggests that there is a want of that organisation which there ought to be. I do not say that what I have said in regard to the inspectors shows a want of economy or extravagance, but it shows a lack of organisation which is likely to exist with a want of economy. I hold in my hand some copies of a publication known as "The Education Circular." I presume it is printed at the expense of the Education Department. The copies I have are for the months of September and October last. I would call hon. members' attention to these—the matter is only a small one—in order to show that there is a want of economy which we are entitled to expect in this department. In the copy for October, we find that the first three pages consist of lists of appointments and transfers, and so forth, which, I take it, are printed here for the information of teachers. We then have the State Schools' Savings Bank deposits, showing on page after page the deposits at the various agencies for the months of July and August. Then we come to the school empire fund, and other odds and ends. There are also several pages of examination papers, extra copies of which could surely have been printed at the outset for distribution to those teachers who required them. The same remarks apply to the September copy of the "Circular." All these matters are printed on expensive paper, the work being carried out by the Government Printer. The publication, generally, indicates an entire lack of any regard for economy. As I have said it is a small matter, and I suppose it would not run into more than £100 a year, or perhaps £200 at the most.

Mr. Holman: How often is it published?

Mr. PILKINGTON: Once a month. It indicates a want of careful economy in the department such as we have a right to expect.

Mr. Holman: It would cost about 8s. or 10s. a page.

Mr. PILKINGTON: This estimate may be a mistake on my part. I do not say it is not. I do say, however, there are pages here which ought not to be published because they are not of sufficient importance.

Hon. T. Walker: The examination papers may be of value.

Mr. PILKINGTON: Yes, but is it worth while publishing them in this form? The printing of these papers was done in the first case, and there would have been no difficulty and little expense attached to printing a sufficient number in addition to send to those who required them. I may be told that the printing and publication of this "Circular" do not come under this Vote. That may be so, but that is immaterial.

Mr. Holman: Is it distributed free?

Mr. PILKINGTON: I think it is sent round to the schools.

Mr. Johnston: It is sent to every teacher of every school.

Mr. Holman: Free?

Mr. Johnston: I think so.

Mr. PILKINGTON: I believe that is so. It is, however, marked "Price 6d."

Mr. Holman: It may be a very profitable thing.

Mr. PILKINGTON: It is published and sent free to the schools. It is possible that this is such a popular publication that it is purchased at 6d. a copy by hundreds of people in the State, and that a large profit is made out of it. I think, however, the possibility is a very remote one.

Mr. Johnston: It does not show so much revenue.

Mr. PILKINGTON: We have also the Training College. It does seem to me a curious and anomalous position that any person who is going into the teaching profession in State Schools is taken up by the Government, taught at the Government expense, and kept at Government expense.

Mr. Lambert: Not while our present rotten social system exists.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must obey the Chair. If he does not do so I shall have to take measures to make him.

Mr. PILKINGTON: When for example the Government require an engineer, draftsman, clerk, or shorthand writer, they do not train that person for that particular form of employment before they take him.

Mr. Lambert: The position is totally different.

Mr. PILKINGTON: It is strange, unusual, and anomalous. I find that these persons are taken up at the age of 17 or 18, and remain in the institution, on the long course, for two years. They go to lectures and so forth, and their fares are paid for them. They also receive money for their meals in town. They are entirely taken care of, and are given board and lodging.

Mr. Johnston: That is the only way to meet the demands for teachers. You could not get them otherwise.

Mr. PILKINGTON: That may be so, but it does appear to be very anomalous. I believe that as a fact there are not large numbers of persons willing to go in for the profession of teaching. It may be that the salaries we pay them are so small that some further inducement has to be offered them. This applies to no other class of Government employee, and it does seem strange that for this particular class of work alone the Government have to take charge of the person and to train him in the work in which he is to be employed.

Hon. T. Walker: Because the State has a monopoly of education; it is national work.

Mr. PILKINGTON: It is national work, but there is no monopoly in education. Perhaps this system has grown up from the necessity for offering some extra inducement.

Hon. T. Walker: The object is to get efficiency.

Mr. PILKINGTON: In that case I should have thought that, as in any other employment, the Government would have attempted to induce people to join the service by offering higher salaries.

Mr. Holman: Where would the teachers get their training?

Mr. PILKINGTON: A large number of teachers in this State have not had this two years' training at all. I do not know how many of them take this six months' course. A vast amount of talent is collected in the metropolitan area, through want of that organisation which we have a right to expect. The Training College shows an increase in the visiting staff from £260 to £320. Possibly the staff of the college might be able to do the work without any visiting staff. I do not think the Premier offered any explanation of the increase. There again is an advance without any reason or explanation being offered. When the Government submit an increase, it ought to be explained.

The Premier: It will be explained if you ask for explanation on the item. To explain items when introducing the Estimates is not the usual course.

Mr. PILKINGTON: But the Premier gave an explanation of another item; and it is not usual for the finances of a State to be in this condition. Another subject I wish to refer to is what are called the selected students in the Modern School. I understand that students in the Modern School are chosen by competitive examination. If one of them falls out, say by reason of his parents not being able to afford to keep him there, or for some other reason, then another student is selected, not from State schools but from the private schools. Such a student has to be up to the mark of the second year's course. I am not quite sure as to the terms on which selected students are allowed to enter the school. By the very nature of the selection they must be children whose parents are able to pay for the education of their children because these have already been in secondary schools. Therefore the full amount should be charged them. I do not know whether they pay the full amount or not; but

I hope Ministers will look into the matter. The Premier referred to the foundation of secondary scholarships and bursaries. Part of this refers to soldiers' children. As to this I say nothing, since I know nothing of the scheme. But the other part of it represents merely an increase in the number of scholarships and bursaries, which we cannot afford just now.

The Minister for Mines: Not even for soldiers' children?

Mr. PILKINGTON: I excepted them. I say I do not know what the scheme is. But the Premier stated that scholarships and bursaries had been increased in the ordinary way. This is not a time when they should be increased. I use such information as is available to an ordinary member of the public, and I daresay I have made mistakes in regard to some of the facts. But that is a matter for which I am not to blame, and for which I shall not be ashamed, the facts not being necessarily at my disposal. No doubt a number of explanations will be given, especially when the Colonial Secretary explains. He is extremely skilful in presenting explanations. But the Colonial Secretary does not succeed in dealing with this department. I want at this late stage to ask the Committee to carry a motion reducing the vote by a nominal sum of £25, for the purpose of an indication to the Government that the vote must not be increased.

The COLONIAL TREASURER (Hon. J. Gardiner—Irwin) [2.10 a.m.]: I do not purpose addressing myself for any length of time to this subject, and I do not think I would have spoken on it but for the remarks of the member for Perth, who generally prefaces his speeches by something personally offensive. It is a very poor advertisement for education if an advocate of the high education which the member for Perth has forgotten that it is "Manners maketh Man." On almost every occasion the hon. member seems to single out more particularly the Premier. The Premier may not be a trained speaker like the member for Perth, but when it comes to the fine role of true manliness and true uprightness I know for whom I am barracking. The hon. member spoils good speeches by those things. I do not know whether he thinks they are funny, but they are not funny, and they are rather humiliating to offer to men who have not had the education he professes to have had. In the matter of education, it is rather strange that the men who themselves have suffered from lack of education should be desirous of giving it to other people. I did not go to school at nine years and leave at nineteen. I was working for my living when I was eleven, having had 18 months' schooling. Consequently I have given my sons the best education I could. Holding that view of education, I have to see that the sons of men who cannot pay shall be educated. I have tackled this vote just as earnestly as the member for Perth has, because the question of finance is always with me. But I can admit that there may be men who honestly disagree with me

and say, "You are making what is more vital than finance subservient to finance." What is worrying me is whether we are getting full value for our money. But when we come to criticise the matter from that aspect the question arises how far a layman can attack the educational system, how far he can know whether it is right or wrong, how far this technical education is necessary, whether we have in our technical education that which is generally taught more effectively and more economically than we are teaching it in our schools? Those are questions on which the layman, when he commences to criticise, finds himself at a discount. Very few men can come here with the assurance of the member for Perth that what he says is all there is to be said on the subject. To-day we know it is idle for us to close our eyes to the fact that however hard up the nations of the world are they are spending considerable sums of money in extending their educational systems.

Mr. Lambert: The world to-day is bankrupt in knowledge, otherwise the men would not be fighting each other.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: It is hard for me to meet the arguments when we find that everywhere else they are increasing the expenditure on education. We may be teaching boys the three R's, we may be teaching them higher education, and we may be educating them for professions, but the probable crying need may be for mechanical education. As we look out into the world to-day, right down in our hearts we know that that is going to be the big cry. It is not going to be whether the boy can understand a Latin inscription; it is going to be how far he can make effective those raw products or manufactured products for the nation's good.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: And that plays a small part in our education to-day.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: The mere education of a boy, even if it is only in those things which are outside the mechanical and the scientific, makes the brain more receptive, but the question is as to how far we are to give effective education to our children. The question seems to me to be whether directly there will not have to be a committee appointed possessing scientific and practical knowledge, to see how far we are having our children educated in that direction towards which the nation will have to struggle almost immediately, and when we do that we will not have to cavil at the expense. The education vote will have to be increased, and if it can be proved to me that this will be a just and wise expenditure for the national good, I will be the last to raise any opposition to it. The member for Perth says, "Cut it down £150,000; I do not know how you are going to do it, but do it."

Mr. Troy: It is your place to have that knowledge.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: When we attack any phase of it we are met by the expert who says that this is unnecessary. What I want to be satisfied with is that we are getting the education that is necessary. If that is assured, I am not going to squeal at the expenditure.

Mr. LAMBERT (Coolgardie) [2.20 a.m.]: move—

That progress be reported.

Motion put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	..	..	..	..	11
Noes	..	..	..	..	20

Majority against	..	..	9
------------------	----	----	---

#### AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Pilkington
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Roche
Mr. Green	Mr. Troy
Mr. Holman	Mr. Walker
Mr. Jones	Mr. O'Loughlin
Mr. Lambert	(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Mullaney
Mr. Collier	Mr. Munle
Mr. Duff	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Foley	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. R. T. Robinson
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Hardwick
Mr. Johnston	(Teller.)
Mr. Lefroy	

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. PICKERING (Sussex) [2.25 a.m.]: One must be impressed by the fact that the State is getting much in the way of beneficial service from the sum spent on education. In a State of the magnitude of Western Australia the cost of education must be greater than it is in places like England and other parts of the world. There are one or two items I desire to refer to in connection with which increased costs are shown, and one of these is the maintenance of school buildings. We find in the report of the Director of Education there is a reference to the condition of disrepair into which the school buildings have been allowed to drift.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: On a point of order, there is no item in this vote dealing with school buildings.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Sussex must not refer to buildings on this vote.

Mr. Holman: How can we have the children taught if there are no school buildings; would you have them taught in fowl-houses?

Mr. PICKERING: There must be schools in which to educate the children.

Hon. P. Collier: Provision is made for schools under another vote in another part of the Estimates.

Mr. PICKERING: Another matter referred to in the report is the percentage of female to male school teachers. It is a serious matter that such a large percentage of our teachers should be females. That to a large extent is due to the low salaries that are paid. It is in the best interests of the scholars that they should be taught by male teachers, and therefore I contend that the salaries should be increased. I congratulate the Government on the attempt made to reduce the number of

unclassified teachers, and I welcome the announcement that it is the intention of the Government to extend the period of teaching of these unclassified teachers in the hope that it will result in getting a better class of teacher for the country districts. In the department's report another aspect of child life is referred to, and that is the employment of children of tender years. I have brought this under the notice of the Premier and he has promised to introduce legislation in this connection.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The Bill has been before the Legislative Council for some time.

Mr. PICKERING: There is also the question of medical treatment, and I hope that the Government when they can see their way clear to do so will make provision for medical treatment on the lines followed in the schools in England. Then there is the question of technical education which was touched on by the Treasurer a little while ago. I agree with the Treasurer that it is vital to the industries of the State that we should train mechanics. I do not want to restrict other branches of education, but in many instances primary education is taken to a certain length when it ceases to be of value, and we neglect that aspect of technical education which is essential to our industries. To-day I was privileged to accompany the Minister for Railways on a visit of inspection of railway rolling stock recently completed at the Westralia Ironworks, and whilst I was going through the workshops I was accompanied by a mechanic who said that one of the greatest difficulties they had to contend against was the dearth of men capable of engaging in this work.

Mr. Jones: They only get 9s. a day.

Mr. PICKERING: It is very essential that we should be training our mechanics in this State and not look to other countries to fill the ranks. The tendency of technical schools has been to encourage an increased number of clerks and those to fill professional occupations, a section that is overloaded already. We have only to turn up the reports on technical education to see the argument that I advance is correct. That which should be encouraged is not encouraged as far as it should be. Extra study should be provided so that it should be made more difficult for students to attend schools in professional subjects. It is not undignified to be a first class tradesman, a first class mechanic, and I hope the Minister will do his best to make technical schools attractive in the lines I have indicated. I have not much knowledge of technical schools, but I know I can speak of the absence of mechanics. I should give every possible inducement for boys to go in and learn trades. There is another aspect of this report that appeals to me, and that is the statement by the director that the school teaching cannot be effective unless there is an increased number of teachers. It is often in many schools teachers are called on to teach too many children. This indicates, to my mind, that instead of asking the Government to cut down the vote, it is an argument at least for maintaining at its present strength the lines that I have mentioned. I realise, as most members must, that one of the most vital things in the State to-day is education, but



let it be properly directed. Let us not degrade the trades, but make people realise there is a nobility in work so long as it is conscientious and good.

Mr. Jones: And makes a good profit for the boss.

Mr. PICKERING: Where do the bosses come from in the building trades? They come from the men who work. The majority of contractors in the State to-day were carpenters, and the spirit that actuates them is earnestness in their trade. I make these few points to illustrate that instead of reducing the vote in the interest of outlying districts an increase in the vote is necessary.

Mr. HOLMAN (Murchison) [2.35 a.m.]: I move—

That progress be reported and leave asked to sit again.

The Premier: Has the time elapsed?

Mr. HOLMAN: It was a quarter past two when the motion was moved previously.

The CHAIRMAN: It was twenty minutes past. It is about time now.

Motion put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes .. .. .	8
Noes .. .. .	21

Majority against ..	13
---------------------	----

#### AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Troy
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Walker
Mr. Holman	Mr. Green
Mr. Jones	(Teller.)
Mr. Pilkington	

#### NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Collier	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Duff	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Foley	Mr. Piccse
Mr. Gardner	Mr. R. T. Robinson
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Roche
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Hardwick
Mr. Lefroy	(Teller.)

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. HOLMAN [2.39 a.m.]: I did not intend to have anything to say on the vote for education, but seeing in all probability I am one of the unfortunate men in the House suffering from a lack of education, I should like to make a few remarks. I am fortunate, or unfortunate if you like, to have brought into the world nine children, and I know the necessity for education. Although the amount of the vote for education runs into over £300,000 a year, it has never cost the State one penny for the education of my children. I have endeavoured to give them an education outside the cost to the State. I had to go to work to earn my living almost at the same time that the member for Perth started his education, and when I was 19 years of age I had been many years at work. I had left my home for two years then and taken a lead at mining underground. For six years I worked underground

when the member for Perth was being educated. Four of my children have left school. The others are still being educated. We cannot give our children too much education. There is nothing too high in the State to give our children in the way of education. The education which we get in this House is not a very elevated one. There are members in this House who have had an unfair advantage over me in regard to education, and who can express their opinions better than I can. We are asked to speak at the hour of three o'clock in the morning on the question of education, and I am sure many members require a great deal of enlightenment. We are not to be given an opportunity of expressing our views. I have not had an opportunity of going fully into the items on this vote. The member for Kanowna who has been Minister for Education for some years, desires an opportunity to speak on this matter, but he is not to be allowed, or if he speaks it is at this hour in the morning, which is not a fair thing. Are members of the Government afraid to allow educational matters to be discussed? If they think they will get the vote through by brute force, as expressed by one Minister to-night, they are making a great mistake. Education should be extended in more directions than in the primary schools. I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the member for Perth. But he speaks from the point of view of a man carefully nurtured from early boyhood to nine years of age before going to school. In all probability he had private teachers in his own home, and perhaps one or two nurses. Instead of having to educate himself in his early days, he had the advantage of having nothing more to do than grow big and strong, and so he has to-day an advantage over us in that direction also, as is seen in his gigantic proportions. When he suggests that he had no education until he was nine years of age, I fear he is unintentionally misleading the Committee. He may not have gone to school until he reached that age, but no doubt he was receiving tuition at home at a much earlier age. To-day the law requires that a child shall go to school at six years of age.

[Mr. Lambert drew attention to the state of the House; bells rung and a quorum formed.]

Mr. HOLMAN: The member for Perth would have the vote reduced by a substantial sum. He has made several suggestions for economies, as for instance the reduction of hours during which children should be taught. What method would the hon. member adopt to effect this alteration? He outlined a scheme in which the teacher would devote his time between the day scholars and the students at the evening continuation classes. I am convinced that to ask teachers to take children at nine o'clock in the morning until midday and, after a short break, continue on with the evening classes, would be asking too much.

Mr. Pilkington: It would be only the same number of hours as at present.

Mr. HOLMAN: But it would be extending those hours over too great a period and thus would be materially increasing the fatigue to

which teachers are necessarily subjected. Personally, I hold the view that, so far from reducing the Education Vote, we should be prepared to increase it. I would go further than merely educate the children; I would, wherever necessary, feed the children attending school. If a child of nine years of age is given a certain amount of work to do before proceeding to school, when he gets there he is too tired to learn that which his teacher is endeavouring to instil into his mind. By going through the report of the department I hope to be able to impress upon members the necessity for a reform being made in this direction. The amount set down on the Estimates for carrying out our educational system is £321,924.

Mr. Johnston: It is £368,000.

Mr. HOLMAN: I am not dealing with the contingencies, but purely with the expenditure on education itself. I admit that the total vote is £368,000 odd. That is bordering on half a million a year. In all probability when the population increases, as it will assuredly do, the expenditure will reach the full half million. In 1916-17 the total expenditure on education was £334,132, and for the following year it was £359,908. The expenditure is, therefore, going up year by year. Had the Premier when introducing his Estimates made a more detailed statement it would have prevented a great deal of the discussion which had since taken place. We have to look through the report of the department now to find out what vital reforms can be made. We are told that the enrolment of children for 1917 exceeded that for 1916 by 1,668, which indicates the rate at which we may expect the enrolments to increase as the years go on, and the rate at which we may expect the expenditure on education to go up. What provision has the State made to cope with the situation that may arise in the event of the private schools closing down? I venture to think that this point has not been considered by the Minister. There must be many thousands of children in attendance at private schools which are being carried on at present by various denominations. We should have information on this point supplied to us instead of having to ascertain it for ourselves.

Mr. Mullany: It is all in the report.

Mr. HOLMAN: In all probability I shall come to the figures as I go through the report. We have to make provision for the education of this increased number of children that I have mentioned, namely, 1,668. There should be a table showing how this number of children is distributed over the metropolitan area, the suburban areas, and the rural and out-back districts.

The Premier: It is in the report. I have never heard of any Minister for Education being called upon to supply that information to the Committee.

Mr. HOLMAN: Because the amount of this vote has been questioned we want to know what savings can be effected, if any. It has been suggested that the amount should be decreased by £150,000.

The Premier: Do you expect me to be able to tell you how an economy of £150,000 is to be made?

Mr. HOLMAN: No, but I do expect to be supplied with the information I asked for on the question of correspondence schools, which so vitally affect a portion of my electorate. In every outback centre of the State, and in every agricultural district, where the parents are not able to spare the time to educate their children as they should be educated, these correspondence schools should be established, failing the schools themselves. Possibly the Minister has not yet considered this idea.

The Premier: The hon. member can get this information from the Education Department.

Mr. HOLMAN: If we had adjourned at a reasonable hour I might possibly have been able to get it in the morning, but in the circumstances that is impossible. As I mentioned just now, some provision should be made to meet the possibility of the private schools being closed down and all the children there having to be taught by the State.

The Premier: There is not much chance of that.

Mr. HOLMAN: Possibly not.

The Premier: Then why make provision before hand?

Mr. HOLMAN: What provision would the Premier make if this did happen?

The Premier: On a point of order. We are discussing the Education Vote in connection with out State schools. Is the hon. member in order in discussing schools outside State schools?

The CHAIRMAN: I quite agree with the point raised by the Premier. At the same time I have listened carefully to the speech of the hon. member, and up to the time of an interjection he was well within the Standing Orders. After that interjection he did go a little outside them, and if he had pursued that line of argument I should have had to stop him. Up to that point the hon. member had not contravened the Standing Orders.

Mr. HOLMAN: I would point out that the education of my children has not cost the State a penny. They have been educated at a private school. But if, through increased taxation and cost of living people found it impossible to continue paying school fees and were obliged to send their children to the State schools, what provision would be made to meet such a contingency? Almost every page of this report points to that argument. Many of the men who have gone to fight on the battle fields of the Old World will never return to Western Australia, and although they made provision for the education of their children privately, those children will probably have to attend our State schools, and we must advance our State schools correspondingly. Therefore we shall have to increase rather than decrease the Education Vote. As to the number of children attending the State schools, it is only 121 higher for 1917 than for 1916; and therefore the argument of the member for Perth does not hold much water, that children are being sent to school at too early an age. The average age of the school child is getting higher. The object of the hon.

member could be attained better by improving the economic condition of the worker; not by reducing this Vote. Let us place the worker in such a position that his wife will not be compelled to send her children to school at a very early age in order that she herself may go out to work for money to supplement her husband's insufficient earnings, as very frequently she has to do. The children of the worker must necessarily, under present economic conditions, be sent to school three or four years earlier than the children of moneyed people—at five or six years instead of eight or nine. In the outback mining centres like Mount Egerton, Mount Sir Samuel, Peak Hill, and Wiluna many children are growing up without the possibility of obtaining education until they reach the age of 11 or 12 years. And yet the parents of such children are compelled to contribute their share to the cost of the educational system of the State. And the same thing applies to remote agricultural settlements. Such outlying agricultural and mining centres should receive more consideration. They should have some fair return in the shape of education for their own children, even if it is only by means of the correspondence tuition from which the Premier turned aside so lightly to-night. The hon. gentleman has not realised that there exists in Western Australia a system of tuition by correspondence. Take the case of married men working to-day at Mount Keith, battling away in that Godforsaken country. You, Mr. Chairman, attended a deputation of the men when, years ago, they asked for facilities in the way of public crushing. They have been settled there ever since, and they are prepared to pay for the education of their children. But they can get none at all. They are told they may possibly have the advantage of this correspondence tuition. When I questioned the Premier on the point to-night, he muttered and mumbled something and then said he thought I was joking.

Mr. Johnston: He knew all right.

Mr. HOLMAN: Then it was his duty to give me the information. It is no joking matter to the communities in our outback centres to bring up children under present conditions of an almost total lack of educational facilities. If the member for Perth visited some of those places, he would talk, not of decreasing, but of increasing the Education Vote. Any man representing a backblocks constituency in this House should know the conditions endured by the pioneers outback. They live under God-forsaken conditions from hand to mouth, without any of the benefits or the recreations of civilisation. Are we going to consider these things and insist on at any rate giving their children some education? I myself went on the Murchison in 1893. I had children on the Murchison in 1895. Long before there was a school at all on the Murchison, I was there; and my eldest child was one of the first children to go to school in Cue. As I stated before, my children went to private schools. However, I am not speaking from my own point of view. Here in the metropolitan area, people talk about secondary education and the University, and scholarships and bursaries, about teaching sewing and cooking, and all that kind of thing, and they fail to realise the disabilities of the

child outback. Because I dared to ask a question to-night of the Premier, we on this side of the Chamber are being treated with the same discourtesy as on many previous occasions. We are told that it does not matter what items may be brought forward, as the majority is there to carry them. We have been beaten on the question of reporting progress, so that we shall be unable to hear the views of previous Ministers for Education, who should be in a position to criticise the administration and so place us in a position to judge for ourselves exactly what is being done in the Education Department. We were refused that opportunity and they said "No, the Estimates are to go through." What I am anxious to know is whether any provision has been made for the education of children in the outback centres. I am going to make an appeal to members representing those pioneer constituencies to support me in the effort to secure better facilities for teaching the young in those places, and I am going to ask the member for Roebourne particularly to assist me.

Mr. Teesdale: I am going to reduce the cost of education in the metropolis first.

Mr. HOLMAN: In the metropolitan area we find time after time children are taken over to the Zoological gardens and given instruction there. Studies in Nature these visits are called.

Mr. Teesdale: Studies in cockroaches.

Mr. HOLMAN: And when requests are made for greater facilities out back they are refused. At Mt. Keith there is a State battery. The people there applied for a school, and they asked that a returned soldier should be sent there as a half-time teacher who could at the same time be given charge of the battery. The reply was in the negative and the Department added, "We will give you a correspondence school." What possibility is there of educating children by means of a correspondence school? The people outback are those who pay the piper, yet they receive no benefits. All the same they are prepared to continue to pay so that the children of others who are in the more favoured parts of the State may not suffer as their children are doing through lack of educational facilities. Now I have almost finished with the first paragraph in the report of the Education Department. The rolls at the end of 1917 showed an increase of 1,962 scholars over those of 1916. In 1916 there was a drop, apparently for the first time since 1896.

[Mr. Lambert drew attention to the state of the House; bells rung, and a quorum formed.]

Mr. HOLMAN: In view of the increased number of scholars in 1917 it is seen that, so far from our being able to decrease the Education Vote, we must anticipate a steady annual increase therein. We have here an item for cookery, etc. I should like to know whether the cost of the food cooked by the children is borne by the State. Do the children bring their own meat, flour and other ingredients?

The Premier: No, the department provides all that.

Mr. HOLMAN: Then what is the expenditure involved? Again, seeing that we do this in the metropolitan area, ought we not to render a similar service at country schools? Why could not a certain proportion of the vote be devoted to the snaring of kangaroos and iguanas for the cookery classes at bush schools?

The CHAIRMAN: There is nothing in these Estimates about the snaring of kangaroos and iguanas.

Mr. HOLMAN: Exactly, and I am drawing attention to the omission. Also, I should like to know what becomes of the food when cooked by the class. Is it sold for the benefit of the department, or is it used on successive days for the exercise of the cooking class? Do they cook it again and again? I have visited many of the cookery schools in Victoria and South Australia, and find that an excellent system appertains there, by which at the expense of 1d., 2d., or 3d., the children are supplied with the food which the cookery classes have turned out and are also taught to lay the tables properly. They also have their own meals at the tables they set, and outsiders are encouraged to come in, and by their contributions help to bear the cost of the outlay. Some such system should be instituted here. In the schools that I have visited meals are prepared that are as good as one could get anywhere. If the system was established here there are many people in the metropolitan area who, for the sake of encouraging the children, would also come along and buy a meal. The charging of a fee enables the cost of the produce cooked and consumed to be met. The cost of our educational system to-day runs into considerably over £1 per head of the population. That is all we know on the point, but we should be supplied with information bearing on the cost per head in other parts of the world. I am pleased to note that there has been an increase in the number of children who are attending school after they reach the age of 14. What is to be done with a child to cover the period between his fourteenth and nineteenth birthday in the matter of education? Is it advisable to allow our children to leave school before they reach the age of 19? If the member for Perth intends that every child should have the same advantage that he himself had he should be prepared to move in the direction, not of decreasing this vote, but of increasing it. Every child in the country, of the very poorest parents, if he or she has the brains to attain a high standard, should be afforded the opportunity of doing so. The child of the poorest man should not be placed at any disadvantage with the child of the richest, in the matter of education. The member for Perth tells us that the best education is attained by a child beginning at seven or eight years and going on for a few years. But if we increase the average age of school children, we shall have to increase the teachers' salaries. For example, what would be fair remuneration to a school teacher taking charge of a boy of

nineteen years of the Herculean stature of the member for Perth? Is the Minister prepared to say, moreover, that male and female teachers who have attained the same standard shall receive equal pay? In introducing these Estimates, providing for the expenditure of some £368,000, the Minister has merely given us a few details from a typewritten sheet no doubt supplied to him by an officer of the department. Ought we not to have some idea of the number of teachers provided for in this Vote? Former Estimates invariably stated the number of clerks, teachers, and so forth. The present Estimates, however, evince a desire to furnish as little information as possible. Therefore it is requisite that members generally should, to the best of their ability, seek for every information that can possibly be gleaned. I am anxious to further the speedy passage of these Estimates, but am hampered by the lack of adequate details. The search for these necessary details has impelled me to discuss the Vote at some length, and I feel convinced that I have, at any rate, satisfied the member for Perth. Now regarding the attendance of children at our schools. In large centres the attendance cannot be regarded as too high; on the contrary, it is scarcely high enough. Where schools of large capacity are provided and the attendance falls short of that capacity, the teachers should be given to understand that they must either earn their money or be transferred to outback centres. Consider this case: A teacher may be willing and anxious to teach 25 or 30 children, which would, I take it, be a fair number; but owing to short attendance he has only 17 or 18 pupils. Such a position is unsatisfactory, and savings should be possible in those circumstances. I regret that the Premier should treat my remarks with absolute contempt. If the hon. gentleman will assure me, merely by way of interjection, that he will supply such information as I desire, that will satisfy me for the present. Will he outline the Government's educational policy? The remarks in which he submitted this huge expenditure were very brief.

[The Chairman resumed the Chair.]

The Premier: The hon. member thinks I am a modern Oedipus, but I am not.

Mr. HOLMAN: The Premier's assurance, even by way of interjection, that in his reply closing the debate he will give a full explanation of the various questions which have been raised, would be received by the Committee with pleasure and satisfaction. What has been the cost to the department of these prosecutions, or persecutions as they should properly be called? And what I would like to know is whether the fines are retained by the court or whether the Education Department collect them. The member for Perth did not suggest in what way revenue could be obtained for the Education department. It is set out in the report of the department that exemption has been granted to a number of children from attending school on the grounds of poverty and sickness. We are told also that a large sum of money is spent in purchas-

ing food for the cookery classes. Surely we could make provision whereby we could utilise some of the results of the cooking experiments in the direction of feeding the poor children.

Mr. Teesdale: That might not be a kindness; it might stiffen them.

Mr. HOLMAN: It might be a kindness to give some of the food to the hon. member for his ungenerous remark.

Mr. Teesdale: And I don't believe there is a single case of real poverty.

Mr. Jones: I will take you to hundreds of them at Fremantle.

Mr. HOLMAN: The report of the department states that last year there were 121 cases of poverty and sickness which brought about exemption from attending school.

Mr. Teesdale: What is the member for Fremantle doing?

Mr. Jones: Doing his bit by protesting against the scabs down there starving them.

[Hon. T. Walker called attention to the state of the House; bells rung and a quorum formed.]

Mr. HOLMAN: We also find that there have been prosecutions of business firms for illegally employing children of school age and that in a number of cases fines were inflicted. Wasn't poverty that drove those children to work? I know the member for Perth has a strong party behind him and it is my intention to bring forward every point showing the direct advantages of education to obtain every convert in support of the Estimates as presented by the Government. Time after time the member for Roebourne has criticised strongly the attitude of the Government, but to-night he will do nothing in their support. I want to draw comparisons between the education in this country and other countries, and before we can entrench on the outlines of the education vote, we must do this. First of all we should take the educational facilities in Western Australia. We make it a boast that we are as far advanced, or further advanced than any State in the Commonwealth in our education.

Mr. Hardwick: You are fairly well advanced in stonewalling.

Mr. HOLMAN: That is a most unfair and ungenerous remark. I ask the Chairman, have I transgressed at all and is not this remark a grave reflection on the Chair? If I repeated myself at all, I should be called to order by the Chairman. I have endeavoured, realising the importance of the position, that the very essence of our civilisation is being attacked, and it is ungenerous on the part of the Government whip to make a remark such as he has done. To return to what I was saying. What facilities are granted in Western Australia? As I said, we make it a boast that our education is the best in the Commonwealth or in any country. Why is it that we are so far in advance of other countries? Have our children shown the benefits of our education? The Rhodes scholars who have left Western Australia have shown that they are equal, if not superior, to other scholars who have gone to the University. They have all made good. We should also inquire into any defect in our

system. Members like the member for Roebourne desire to break down our educational system. I could show on the Estimates where savings could be effected, which would assist the member for Perth. In some countries breakfast is provided for children as soon as they reach school.

Mr. Teesdale: The working man does not want charity for his children.

Mr. HOLMAN: That is an extravagant and unkind remark. I myself have received very little education. No one in the Committee has been so little educated in the milk of human kindness as the member for Roebourne. All the teachers outside of Kingdom Come could not make a decent manly character of that hon. member.

Mr. Teesdale: Give someone else a turn now.

Mr. HOLMAN: There are other members who view things differently from the member for Roebourne. The member for Perth adopts this attitude: "Do not send the children to school until their minds are well developed, and then let them remain at school until 19 or 20 years of age." Under 70 years of this system, where would the British Empire be? We can thank the Australian system of education for the enviable position which Australia has reached to-day. The education system of Russia is one of the most backward in the world, and we see its fruits in the deplorable condition of Russia at the present time. It is only by education that we can develop the best brains in any community. The cost of education per head is higher in Western Australia than in some of the other States. This is largely due to the fact that we are a widely scattered community. The sum set apart for driving allowances is very large, but I doubt if any hon. member would seriously advocate its reduction. Without that driving allowance a very large proportion of our country children would be denied the advantages of education. If those representing farming electorates will not defend this allowance, I myself will look to its defence. Travelling schools are so designed that they can be readily transported on railway trucks from one locality to another. By this means the schools are taken to those children for whom, by no other means, could equal facilities be provided. Bitter attacks have been made upon these Estimates. It is, therefore, my bounden duty to do what I can to assist their passage through the Committee. In order to do that I must show justification for the expenditure which is to be incurred. Unfortunately more schools have been established in the metropolitan area than in the goldfields or agricultural areas. This indicates that there is a tendency for the people to drift towards the City. This state of things is inimical to the welfare of the State as a whole. If Western Australia is to progress the outback districts must be developed, and if they are to be developed educational facilities must be provided for the children of the parents who are engaged in that work. Instead of the Government encouraging population to come to the already thickly populated centres they should think more of the outback centres. The fact that it is necessary to have 10 or 11 children

in a particular centre before the Department will provide educational facilities retards progress. It is absolutely essential that reasonable facilities should be offered to those people who are endeavouring to open up the country. In order to overcome this difficulty I hope the Government will relax the restrictions that at present are imposed regarding the number of children that is required before a school is established. There are numerous cases in which people have had to come to the metropolitan areas for the purpose of educating their children; whereas if educational facilities had been afforded them they would have gone on pioneering the country. A mistake has been made in establishing schools in the metropolitan area adjacent to others which were there already. The money devoted to this purpose could much better have been spent in the direction I have suggested. I am pleased to note so many new schools have been opened during last year. The number is not large, however, when we consider the sparsely populated nature of the country and the enormous area which has to be covered. The provision regarding assisted schools is not altogether satisfactory, for it is very difficult for many of the settlers to obtain the services of a teacher. In many cases, especially in goldfields districts, where the fathers of families are on wages of, say, £4 a week, the settlers cannot afford to contribute half the salary of a teacher.

Hon. T. Walker: A man might be called upon to pay the full amount.

Mr. HOLMAN: That is so, and he cannot afford to do so. It is not a fair thing. How can children be reared if two or three families have to pay a teacher's salary? The system of assisted schools is good, but the cost to the families is too great. Is it fair in this way to penalise the outback settler, who in any case has to contribute heavily towards the cost of educating other people's children? The matter is one we should view with grave concern, as also the cost per head of education, which is increasing year by year. In 1912-13 the average cost per head of attendance was £6 0s. 5½d.; in 1916-17 it had risen to £6 6s. 4½d.—an increase of nearly 6s. Did I think for one moment that the Government were seriously desirous of securing the passage of these Estimates, I should certainly supplement their efforts. But the introductory speech of the Premier left one in doubt whether he intended to support these Estimates or to oppose them. Were I the Minister in charge of these Estimates I would consider it my duty to explain the increase. There are many ways in which the increase could have been brought about. Cost of material or construction of buildings, for instance.

[Mr. Munzie took the Chair.]

Mr. Pickering: On a point of order, is the hon. member in order in referring to the cost of material or construction of buildings. I was ruled out of order earlier in the evening for referring to buildings under this vote.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is in order.

Mr. HOLMAN: We have had no explanation about the increase. If it was caused by the increased cost of material we should take into consideration the advisableness of teaching our children to manufacture many of the things that are required by them, such as black boards, rulers and even pencils. The Minister for Industries who takes a great interest in these things, from the manufacture of grindstones to the building of ships—a very big step we must admit—should see to it in the hope of in that way reducing the cost of the expenditure on the vote. Several new buildings, costing a great deal of money, were erected last year. In all probability that expenditure will be provided from Loan Funds, which means that year after year we shall have to pay increased interest. The whole of this expenditure should be included in the one set of Estimates, so that we might know exactly what education is costing the State.

Hon. T. Walker: It should include the University also.

Mr. HOLMAN: I agree that we should be able to see at a glance the total cost of education in the State. We should pay the teachers adequate salaries, provide them with a reasonable period of annual leave, and do all that we can to render their conditions as comfortable as possible. One form of loss to which the department is peculiarly liable is incurred as the result of lady teachers, who have been trained at considerable cost to the State, marrying and thereupon retiring from the service. The department should devise some means of insuring against this loss which, in the aggregate, must amount to a substantial sum. If it is not desirable to continue with our present educational system by all means let us curtail the expenditure as much as possible, but if the contrary is the case, and I am of opinion that it is, let us all do what we can to help it along and bring about such improvements in the facilities that are afforded as possible. I am sorry not to have received more support in my efforts from members of the Country party. There is a good deal of neglect shown to the children living in the farming districts of the State. Much could be done in their behalf by providing those educational facilities which would in particular help them to follow their calling as producers. They could be instructed in the breeding of animals and the care of poultry, and trained in the best methods of fruit growing, and so on. There are ample spaces in most of our school reserves upon which fruit trees could be grown with great advantage to the children.

The Minister for Mines: That is already being done.

Mr. HOLMAN: Not to the extent that is necessary. This principle was adopted in some measure by a late member of this Chamber, Mr. Turvey, but his efforts were not appreciated by the department.

The Minister for Mines: The principle is followed from Derby to Ravensthorpe.

Mr. HOLMAN: The Department I understand is now taking up the question again, as it is realised there is much of educational

value in it. I am sorry the member for York has not given us the benefit of his knowledge of the conditions appertaining in Canada and the United States. If he will bring forward some of the best methods adopted in those countries I will do my best to assist him in getting them adopted here, if it is deemed advisable to have them. I think I have made it clear that I do not desire to have the amount of these Estimates reduced, and will make room for some other hon. member to support me in this desire. I hope no time will be lost in passing these Estimates. In my opinion our educational system is not as advanced as it should be. No educational system will be complete until such time as the humblest and poorest in the land is afforded the same advantage for the education of his children as the richest man in the country.

Mr. JONES (Fremantle) [6.10 a.m.]: I move—

That progress be reported and leave asked to sit again.

Motion put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes .. .. .	10
Noes. .. .. .	18

Majority against ..	8
---------------------	---

#### AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Locke
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Troy
Mr. Collier	Mr. Walker
Mr. Holman	Mr. Green
Mr. Pilkington	(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Duff	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Foley	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. R. T. Robinson
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Hardwick
Mr. Johnston	(Teller.)
Mr. Lefroy	

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. JONES (Fremantle) [6.30 a.m.]: I cannot say how deeply I regret the necessity for having to address myself to a subject of this great importance at such an hour of the morning. I cannot imagine what the Government are thinking about to continue the debate long into the weary hours of this day. To this Education Vote we should be giving all that is best in us; but our minds are utterly fatigued. I have listened with considerable pleasure to those members who have already delivered themselves of their opinions on the subject. The modern conception of education, we know, is all wrong. The word "education" means a leading forth, or the bringing out of what is in a child's mind, and not the cramming into a child's mind what some in their foolishness call a curriculum. Unquestionably, the system of cramming, quite irrespective of the particular qualifications of the child, is absurdly wrong. It simply turns out wage slaves. Eventually, the young mind itself will come in and take charge, and establish its own system of

education, which will not have for its object the production of wealth for the benefit of the monopolist. Quite recently I saw in Fremantle children of 13 and 14 years going to work in factories, to feed the insatiable modern doctrine of profit and ever more profit. I should have to regard myself as ungrateful if I did not accord the member for Perth (Mr. Pilkington) a certain degree of support seeing how much he has improved upon what he was twelve months ago. His hand is now much less iconoclastic. If he does not make his reduction of this Vote too drastic, I shall support him. I have read the remarks of various members on these Estimates of a year ago, and I have not been able to discover as to even one suggestion then offered to the Government that Ministers have made a conscientious effort to carry it into effect. Now as regards the treatment of country schools. We know there is the six-months trainee teacher, and the two-years trainee teacher. One would expect that the teacher with the longer training of two years would be sent out-back, and that the six-months trainee would be retained in the metropolitan area, where he would have the benefit of supervision from the numerous army of inspectors congregated in the City. But nothing of the sort takes place. The six-months teacher is sent out-back to manage unaided, whereas the two-years teacher is kept here under the eyes of the inspectors. The thing still goes on and if any particular teacher in the country shows a particular aptitude in the direction of giving the bush children a decent education, he is shifted into town, while another teacher in town, who perhaps has been a disappointment is sent out to take his place. Anything will do for the farmers' children; that is the policy of the Government. I congratulate the member for Perth on the manner in which he dealt with the inspectors. The country's crying need for good teachers is accentuated by the manner in which the inspectors are distributed throughout the State. At the present time the senior inspectors are in Perth practically falling over each other. There are three senior inspectors engaged in the metropolitan area. The member for Murchison asked some questions about them a few days ago and the replies he received were interesting. He was informed that Mr. Clubb was engaged on special work in connection with the Continuation classes. But Mr. Clubb is no longer connected with them; a new man has been appointed.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I hope the committee will not pass that item; it is one that can well be done away with.

Mr. JONES: Yes, or else make the senior inspector go out and do some inspecting.

Mr. Griffiths: He had to give them up on account of his health failing.

Mr. JONES: Mr. Klein is engaged on the special work of junior cadet training, so we were informed, but the junior cadet work is controlled by the Federal authorities and an office boy can do all that is required.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They have to train the school children as well.

Mr. JONES: But the inspector is not a drill sergeant. The special reason for keeping Mr. Miles in the metropolitan area was that he edited the "Education Circular." The member for Perth has given that "Circular" sufficient prominence and I do not propose to deal further with it. Is this work sufficient to occupy a man's whole time considering that the "Circular" is

issued only once a month? If so, there must be something wrong with this particular inspector.

Mr. Griffiths: Mr. Miles spends half his time in the country.

Mr. JONES: He goes out as far as Toodyay

Mr. Griffiths: You do not know what you are talking about.

Mr. JONES: He is starting to teach the department how to give agricultural training. The question is not exactly what the various electorates want; the question is what the country requires in the matter of education, and I am astounded that the Country party members have not said more about the starving of the country schools in the matter of inspectors. I want to see the men with high qualifications go out to the country schools to examine them, and not sit down on the doorsteps of the city schools where they are not required. The particular senior inspector who attends to the Subiaco side of the town will not inspect the schools at Shenton Park because he has had a row with the headmaster of that school, and the inspector on the other side will not go down to the Osborne Park school because he and the headmaster are not playing speaks. The inspector from the North Perth and Leederville area has to go to Subiaco to attend to the Rosalie school because the senior inspector will not have anything to do with it. The first thing in education should be self-control and the ability to keep oneself in check, and not be afraid to go into the various schools because the inspectors have had rows with the headmasters. The member for Perth has shown one or two places where the pruning knife can be used. The inspectress of needlework in these days of sewing machines is not needed. The member for Perth did not deal with the nature studies, which is really a joke. The various country teachers do not take this matter seriously. The gentleman who goes round to inspect on this matter is a really good teacher and it is a shame to waste his time in this work, in which he is doing no good whatever. I suggest that the member for Perth add that to his little list. The department should have an opportunity of taking advantage of his services in other ways. The same may be said of the inspectors of the small schools. They should go out and assist the teachers. There should be a two years' teacher, and not a six months' teacher, at these small schools. The time is not far distant when country members will agree with me in fostering the education of the producer. The inspector of small schools is a good man, capable of good work, and his time should not be wasted as it is now. The larger schools have headmasters who would be appointed to the next vacancy amongst the inspectors. Therefore, the schools where these teachers are employed hardly require the services of an inspector. Instead of the country schools being inspected once in 12 months, the inspectors should go there more frequently, two or three times in the year. It would assist materially in bringing up the country schools to a better standard and give country children a chance. In the matter of secondary education, the advantage is largely with the metropolitan children. Our education seems to have shaped to assist the child living in the town. It makes one wonder where the country members have been during all these years. I want to see the interests of the people in the country looked after because their lot is a hard one. They are far away from the towns and the children grow up with few chances. As in the country centres, so in the timber camps. One sees little

children running about with hardly any amusement, and little chance of learning any of the fine arts and graces which make life worth living. I would like to see something done that will bring honour to the children in the bush and a chance of getting something that their brothers and sisters living in the town get. It might be possible to point out where economy has been effected in regard to the training college. Why is the training college not amalgamated with the University? The dual expense could then be cut out.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Would you hand over the training college to the University?

[The Chairman resumed the Chair.]

Mr. JONES: I am not suggesting that, but the teachers who at present require a highly paid staff at the college to receive special training could obtain that at the University. The instruction in teaching could be obtained at the city schools. Whilst attending University classes they could be instructed in teaching by the capable headmasters of the city schools. About 80 per cent. of the highly certificated teachers are located in the metropolitan area and so, as I say, they, with the assistance of the University, should be able to attend to the training of younger teachers.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You know that the control of the University is entirely out of the hands of the people of the State, although we have to maintain it.

Mr. JONES: Yes, it is a mistake which I hope the hon. member will endeavour to rectify when next he finds himself on the Treasury benches.

[Mr. Green drew attention to the state of the House; bells rung and a quorum formed.]

Mr. JONES: Take the Perth Modern School. This could be handled as an argument in favour of forcing payment for the Modern School when we realise that of the 37 students who left the school during the year without finishing their term, nine had completed three out of the four years' course, and seven were in their fourth year, while 22 of them left owing to financial reasons—in other words, their parents could not afford to pay for them any longer. All those children must have shown a certain amount of ability to have gained entrance to the school in the first place. Their educational careers were out short on account of the financial disability of their parents. This is placing a penalty on poverty, and surely poverty is already sufficiently penalised!

Hon. W. C. Angwin: And the child has no chance of becoming a teacher without completing the course at the Modern School.

Mr. JONES: The parents still have to contribute towards the maintenance of the Modern School. Apparently the department is entirely out of sympathy with what is desired by the people.

The Minister for Mines: Then you think the vote should be increased.

Mr. JONES: In certain cases, yes, because otherwise we shall not be getting value for what we do expend. It is an unsound position to carry a student's education right up to and beyond entrance to the Modern School and then have the student withdraw before completing the course. In view of the apparent failure to keep the child at the Modern School up to the time we want to keep him, I suggest that the fully trained teachers should first go to the country in order to put in the first portion of their work there. The department is out of touch with what is required by Western Australia. I wish to deal with that



portion of the report of the Education Department which contains the remarks of the Chief Inspector of schools on the question of transfers. The chief inspector seems to have a most peculiar position. I cannot find out exactly what he does. He must be a sort of glorified office boy. Amongst other things he is supposed to be responsible for transfers. The most important part of his duty seems to me to be to fix up the transfers of teachers from one place to another. The report to which I refer is dated April, 1918. He says—

An endeavour has been made to restrict the number of transfers from place to place, but the exigencies of the department and the needs of the teachers have rendered it impossible to do as much as one would wish to do—Among other causes the transfers are due to deaths, resignation, dismissal, promotions, lack of accommodation, opening of new schools, closing of old schools, increase in average attendance, decrease in average attendance, alterations in classifications of schools, alterations in classifications of teachers, outgoing students from training college—Inefficiency, special qualifications, recommendations of district boards, private reasons, political pressure.

What manner of man is this chief inspector of schools? What manner of civil servant have we carrying out the needs of this State if he allows transfers to be made as a result of political pressure?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The man was stating the truth. He is a very good officer.

Mr. JONES: If he is telling the truth, I know there has been no political pressure from this side of the Chamber.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: There might have been a little of it.

Mr. JONES: Not up to the end of 1916.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We might all be guilty of that.

Mr. JONES: If the chief inspector is telling the truth, it is a bad state of affairs. Are we to believe that the affairs of the Education Department are being run in various styles as a result of political pressure?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: He did not say that, he referred to transfers.

Mr. JONES: If transfers have been effected as a result of political pressure where is this going to stop? How can we put our finger on any part of the Education Department's Estimates, and say that this or that is or is not due to political pressure?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I think this has occurred in any administration.

Mr. JONES: I do not believe it, but I say that a man who puts that in his report is not a fit and proper person to hold a responsible position of this department.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I think he is right.

Mr. JONES: I hope the hon. member will explain that a little more. To me this savours somewhat of corruption.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: There is no corruption about it.

Mr. JONES: It also savours of spoils to the victors. What would have happened if such a report had come out while the Labour Government were in power? Every little country yellow Press, not to mention the metropolitan Press, would have had something to say about it.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Does this not appear in the chief inspector's previous report?

Mr. JONES: No, I get this from his last year's report. It would have been scattered broadcast throughout the land, "Political pressure in the Education Department." What does political pressure mean?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It means that a young girl may like to get to a school near home.

Mr. JONES: That is for private reasons.

The Attorney General: Everyone practically has been asked to do that kind of thing.

Mr. JONES: It does not look very well in print, but between the Attorney General and the member for North-East Fremantle there is not much chance of my carrying the argument any further. I would rather see this sort of thing kept out of these reports. It does not look well. If a responsible officer, such as the chief inspector of schools, allows transfers to be carried out as a result of political pressure, the need of a transfer would have nothing to do with it.

Mr. Duff: It may be a suggestion and not a political transfer.

Mr. JONES: I do not know what it means.

The Attorney General: Even you have had to ask a Minister to do certain things.

Mr. JONES: Admittedly.

The Attorney General: That amounts to political pressure.

Mr. Hardwick: Of the worst form.

The Attorney General: Ministers would be only too glad to please you.

Mr. JONES: I never got what I wanted in the direction of getting men out of prison and that kind of thing.

The CHAIRMAN: We are not discussing prisons.

Mr. JONES: I intended to refer to a teacher who was in prison. I wish to touch upon the particular way in which the trial in this case was ordered by the Director of Education. I refer to the Cunningham case. First of all, Mr. Cunningham was peremptorily dismissed by the Director, and condemned before any case was heard against him. After judgment had been pronounced upon him, an inquiry was ordered.

The Attorney General: He was suspended.

Mr. JONES: He was dismissed. The court consisted of Inspector Hadley, a subordinate of the man who had dismissed and condemned Cunningham before any trial was held. Would it not have been better to have tried Cunningham before an independent tribunal? This is not conducive to justice. I suggest that this unjust treatment preyed on his mind, and caused him to become insane and to write threatening letters to the man who months previously had dismissed him. Subsequently he came before a Supreme Court judge, but that had nothing to do with this matter. Next let me deal with the treatment extended by the Education Department to teachers who have enlisted in the A.I.F. During the course of the war many fit and eligible teachers have enlisted. The treatment they have received from the department is, however, by no means conducive to recruiting. Mr. Blair was headmaster of the Bunbury school when he enlisted, and he had proved himself a most capable teacher. He has been away now for close on three years. Hardly had he come out of his first engagement in France, when he received news that he had been transferred from Bunbury to North Fremantle. North Fremantle is a good place, but the point is that Mr. Blair is very much dissatisfied with the transfer, which certainly does not represent promotion. I have spoken to

many teachers on the matter, and they all tell me they would undoubtedly prefer Bunbury. The Government have not given Mr. Blair a fair deal.

The Minister for Mines: Are you speaking for Mr. Blair with his authority?

Mr. JONES: Yes. Another case is that of a returned soldier who is at present in North Fremantle. When enlisting he was headmaster at Wagin. His position there was filled by the man who is now head of the Albany High School, promotion which came to this man. Had the returned soldier never enlisted, he would have been senior to the present headmaster at Albany. In the meantime the ex-headmaster at Wagin has been appointed to North Fremantle. As regards the speech of the member for Perth (Mr. Pilkington), I dissociate myself from any attempt to cut down the Education Vote by even a nominal sum. I have a whole list of cases that I could refer to and which I would like the Government to take notice of, because lately members on this side of the House have been accused of trying to prejudice recruiting. What is prejudicing recruiting however is the manner in which these teachers who have returned from the Front have been treated, and I want the Government to see that they get a fair deal. I hope I shall not be in the painful position of standing here twelve months hence and finding that all the suggestions I have made have been ignored.

Mr. ROCKE (South Fremantle) [8.3 a.m.]: No State can afford to spend too much on its educational system. The nation which is educated is the one which will win through. But we have the right to ask ourselves whether we are getting a fair return for the money expended. Suggestions of minor importance have been thrown out with the object of reducing the Estimates but, after all, they entirely deal with small matters which cannot affect the efficiency of the system of the finances of the State. With reference to the report which has been dealt with, there are few figures which may be eliminated seeing the class of education we are giving to our children. First, is the primary, which is the most important because we give our children a grounding upon which we hope to build a good sound nation. The question of making our schools into nurseries was dealt with last session and a promise was given that the matter would be looked into and children of tender years prohibited from entering school. The primary education is costing the State £262,600, and the number of pupils is 39,965. That makes the cost per head of the population £6 12s., and the percentage of the population being educated primarily is 1.8. The continuation classes cost £7,313, the number of pupils being 2,610, and the cost per head £2 16s., while the percentage of population being educated is 1.120. The continuation classes should be compulsory and they should be held in the daytime. The question arises, how would some of the children who are engaged in industries through the day be able to attend to those classes? That is a matter for the Government to see to and to force the employers of children to release them for a sufficient period during the day to attend those classes.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You would require school buildings as well.

Mr. ROCKE: We could use the present school buildings which are not occupied for the whole period of the day. They are in use for about five hours, which is too much for any child. Technical education is costing the State £10,878 and the number of pupils being educated is 2,532,

while the cost per head is £4 6s., and the percentage of children being educated is 1.128. With regard to the University, the cost is £14,800, the number of pupils being educated 248, and the cost per head £60, while the percentage of the population being educated is 1.1280. These figures make us wonder whether we are getting a fair deal for the money paid. Whilst I have been an advocate of education from the kindergarten to the University, I am not satisfied that the State is getting value for money spent in that direction. For instance I know of two men in Perth who were anxious to join a tennis club and they found they could not get into a first class club because they could not play the game sufficiently well. They therefore thought they would enter the University. They did so by taking a simple course—I think it was English history—and by that means they got into the tennis club. But that entrance on the part of those men to the tennis club has cost the State £120, and that is rather a serious item considering that the matter of education to them was of secondary importance. With reference to the suggestions made for reducing the Estimates, they are very small and few. The first one touched on is the inspectress of needlework. What is wanted there is another officer, instead of cutting down the expenditure. We want a woman inspector of infant schools. If such an officer were appointed she could conduct the inspection of sewing work, as laid out here, and in addition she would release some inspectors now attending to the infant schools, as those inspectors have too much to do. We find that inspectors are being paid, in addition to salary, fees for setting examination papers, and that professors of the University also are receiving fees for setting examination papers. We might expect our University professors, and our inspectors, to be a little more patriotic in this connection, knowing that we are striving to do the best we can by our children and to educate them. These gentlemen might render a little assistance outside of their ordinary work without charging additional fees. The question of the training college has been mentioned and I think the weakness there is caused by the percentage of women entering the college being too high. These women do not remain in the department a sufficient length of time so that the department may recoup itself for the outlay. They just go in, perhaps do a course, and eventually marry, and their services are lost to the department, and the money which has been expended on their training is lost also. If the percentage of men going into the training college were greater, those men, we could safely say, would remain with the department for the remainder of their lives. In connection with the same institution, we have a visiting staff attendant costing us £320 this year. There would be no occasion for that officer if a little forethought were shown in the selection of the permanent staff of the school. They should select a staff capable of doing the work which the visiting staff is called upon to do, and that money could be saved. Someone has suggested that at our schools there are many scholars whose parents are quite capable of paying fees for the education of their children. I am strongly opposed to that course being followed, for the reason that we raise a class barrier which is not good, although we might justly expect some to contribute. But I would prefer to go on as we are doing rather than make class distinctions in the schools. There are some books in circulation in the schools, as well as papers, and these

are being brought from Victoria, although they have the name of the Western Australian Education Department on them. The productions are entirely Victorian, and whilst I think our children should be Australian in the truest acceptance of the term, I cannot understand why we have to send outside for these books and papers. Of course they are retailed to the children, who are made to pay for them, but we have a paper here which deals particularly with Western Australia and in a larger measure with the Empire. That paper has a circulation of 12,000 and if the Education Department would give that paper its approval, its circulation could easily be doubled. It would be of greater educational value to the children without interfering with the finances, and it would be much appreciated by all concerned. The general debate on the Estimates has been very long and full, and I do not think there is any occasion for me to add to it unduly. Even if we knew that it was possible to reduce these Estimates, we do not know where to start upon the task.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [8-17 a.m.]: I desire to bring to the attention of Ministers the payment to those in charge of the continuation classes. Instead of it being a fixed amount they are paid in accordance with the number of children they can get to attend the classes. This is not a sound system, and it leads to considerable variation in the attendance roll. There is a great deal of difference between paying on enrolment and paying on results. In regard to the technical schools, in the first place I wish to protest against the system in vogue under which the teachers at the Perth Technical School not only set their own examination papers for and examine their own students, but also set the examination papers for and examine the students at the other technical school. Human nature will out, and, while this system remains, their own pupils are bound to show the best returns. We should get some outsider to set the examination papers for all technical schools. A new assistant has been appointed to the Director of Technical Education. What is required is, not an assistant to the Director, but additional instructors for the pupils. We have boys and girls turned away because we cannot get sufficient instructors. The number of scholars has greatly increased, while the number of schools has remained stationary. Those at Boulder, Kalgoorlie, Geraldton, Bunbury, Coolgardie, and Albany are the only technical schools outside of the metropolitan area, and so I do not see that the appointment of an assistant director of technical education was necessary or even warranted. It is a new appointment. Take a school like Fremantle; we have a good man in charge there, an enthusiast. Take the Boulder school; there used to be an officer in charge. In Perth there is an officer in charge. Therefore there was no necessity to appoint an assistant director of technical education to see that the schools carry out their work. What is required is an advisory board, as at Fremantle. Before the appointment of that board the school had fallen away to nothing, whereas last year we received applications from 1,000 more than we could accommodate. To-day we have built up the school until it is second to none in the State. As I say, there was no need to appoint the assistant director of education. I hope the Premier will give consideration to this. The examination paper is the cause of grave dissatisfaction. One of the principal teachers in the Perth school stated, "Until you shift that

board from Fremantle, we shall never have successful education." They do not like being interfered with. I hope the Premier will endeavour to rectify this.

The PREMIER (Hon. H. B. Lefroy—in reply) [8-27 a.m.]: I am pleased to have the views of the member for North-East Fremantle, knowing as I do that he approaches the subject with something more than a superficial knowledge. I shall be pleased to represent to the Colonial Secretary the several matters the hon. member has touched upon, with a view to seeing whether something can be done in the direction indicated. In regard to the assistant to the Director of Technical Education, I may explain that this officer was previously paid from the item, "Class Instructor." When the continuation classes were transferred from the head office to the technical school at the beginning of this year, the control of the classes was handed to this officer, who was given the title of assistant to the Director, and his salary was fixed as shown on the Estimates.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Have you rearranged the inspectorial staff of the primary schools?

The PREMIER: I am not in a position to answer that. It is difficult for a Minister, particularly on the subject of education, to furnish all details when he is not actually in charge of the department. I think I have most of the information hon. members may desire, but there are possibly certain details with which I am not fully acquainted. A considerable amount of time has been taken up unduly with these Estimates. I had no desire to force them through the Committee, and I did not think it would be necessary for hon. members to dwell so long upon them while discussing the vote generally. The member for Perth led off the debate. I cannot congratulate him on the way he approached the matter. He really appeared to me more like a police court lawyer when he gets into court and finds he has a bad case, and thereupon starts to abuse his opponent. The hon. member might, I think, deal with these matters without endeavouring to be offensive. It does not seem to me to be playing the game. He pointed out that he had not gone to school till he was nine years old. He wished it to be inferred that because he did not go to school until he reached that age it was, therefore, unnecessary for the children of this country to go to State schools until they too had reached nine years of age.

Mr. Pilkington: You are mistaken. My statement on the subject was merely in answer to a question which was put to me. I did not introduce the matter.

The PREMIER: The hon. member stated that he did not go to school until he was nine years of age.

Mr. Pilkington: Yes, in answer to a question. I was asked at what age I went to school and replied at nine years of age.

The PREMIER: I think the Committee was led to believe that the hon. member intended to imply that as he did not go to school until he was nine it was not necessary for children to go to our State schools until they too were nine years of age.

Mr. Pilkington: Only in answer to an interjection.

The PREMIER: The hon. member went to a preparatory school at nine, and the idea of his not having been to school before he reached that age is absurd. No doubt he was taught by a nursery governess or by some other means, and he went to a preparatory school when he reached that age.

A boy of nine has to be pretty well up when he goes into a preparatory school. The hon. member was probably learning Latin at nine years of age, and a boy cannot be doing that unless he has had some little education before hand.

Hon. P. Collier: What about ourselves? We have not started yet.

The PREMIER: The parents of children in this country are not in the position to be able to afford to give a primary education to their children in the first instance, or to employ a governess to teach them in the second. Although a child may go to school at an early age, it is most interesting to see them engaged in kindergarten work, which I regard as most useful for them. They are very much better employed in that way. It opens their minds and is training the intelligence of the child, and also teaching him discipline and many other things which are useful help later on. I do not think the member for Murchison raised very many points in regard to the Estimates.

Hon. P. Collier: He covered a wide area.

The PREMIER: He quoted from the report of the Education Department which I, in introducing the Estimates, asked hon. members to read. He informed me that he intended to support my Estimates, and I may say he did so for a very long time. I think we shall be able to deal with them now on the items. The member for Perth asked why it should be necessary to train our own teachers. Education is a science. Some time ago in the nineties it was considered that we ought to bring someone to Western Australia from the Old Country who was, what I might call, an expert in educational matters. Mr. Cyril Jackson accordingly came here. He is a man with a wide knowledge of many matters and of considerable attainments. He had been an old Charter House boy as well as an Oxford man, and he came here to organise our education. It is men like Mr. Jackson that we have to get to engage in work of this kind. It was he who introduced the system of training our teachers. He impressed upon me the necessity for this, and said that it was done all over the world, and that if we were to have efficient teachers in our schools we must take in hand the teaching of these people ourselves. They had to be trained for their special duties. Under the educational system in the Old Country, where men are engaged in our great public schools, they do not require to be taught in the same way as a child who is engaged in our State schools here, with the result that those who have a taste for teaching are able to take it up. Here, the teachers have not the same opportunities of being taught the art of teaching unless they go through some special training. That special training they now get at our training college at Claremont. I am certain it has been one of the big factors in the success of our educational system in Western Australia. The idea was brought here from the Old Country by Mr. Jackson, who had been a member of the London School Board for some years and had spent his life in the study of education, and been associated from the time he left College with all those people in England who were most widely versed in all branches of education. He brought out Mr. Andrews, who took up the position of Director of Education as he left it. These men have made a life-long study of the question of education. I do believe at present that education in our State schools is carried out in a way that the country should be congratulated upon. As in all organisations, there may be faults to be found at times;

and hon. members may have criticisms to apply to some of the methods of detail which are carried out in connection with the management of our schools. Hon. members will admit that on the whole the system which has been established in our State schools is one which gives general satisfaction.

Mr. PILKINGTON: I should like to move my amendment formally, that the total of this vote be reduced say by £1. I do not know I am in order in moving for a reduction of so small an amount.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest that you move for a reduction of £20.

Mr. PILKINGTON: It is not my desire to move for any decrease that will affect the vote very much, but merely to, if possible, secure some decrease as a direction to the Government not to further increase the vote next year. I move an amendment—

That the vote be reduced by £20.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	...	...	...	4.
Noes	...	...	...	24.
Majority against				20

#### AYES.

Mr. Angelo  
Mr. Jones  
Mr. Pilkington

Mr. Thomson  
(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Mr. Angwin  
Mr. Brown  
Mr. Chesson  
Mr. Collier  
Mr. Duft  
Mr. Foley  
Mr. Gardiner  
Mr. Green  
Mr. Griffiths  
Mr. Harrison  
Mr. Hickmott  
Mr. Holman  
Mr. Hudson

Mr. Johnston  
Mr. Lefroy  
Mr. Mullany  
Mr. Munzie  
Mr. Pickering  
Mr. Plesse  
Mr. R. T. Robinson  
Mr. Roche  
Mr. Underwood  
Mr. Walker  
Mr. Hardwick  
(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Vote put and passed.

This completed the Estimates of the Education Department.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Progress reported.

#### THE WAR—AN ARMISTICE.

The PREMIER (Hon. H. B. Lefroy—Mooro [8.51 a.m.]: In moving the adjournment of the House, I should like to mention that I have just heard that the Germans have signed an armistice.

Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Holman: That is a complete surrender.

The PREMIER: I hope the information is correct. I have it on good authority, and I trust that peace is not far off. If it is, I shall feel recompensed for having remained here all night. At the same time, I do not look upon it as a hard ship to do my duty in this Chamber during the hours of the night. My son spent four days and

four nights without sleep during the great Russian debacle; and his old father can spend a night without sleep in the interests of the country. I thank hon. members for the manner in which they have dealt with the business before the House during this long sitting. I again express the hope that the information which has come to me is correct, and that it will prove, indeed, more than correct, that we shall learn there has been a complete surrender of Germany, and that before long we shall have peace with honour and freedom to the world.

Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [8.53 a.m.]: I have a pleasure which I am unable to express, in seconding the motion moved by the Premier for the adjournment of the House. I scarcely know what it is that I should like to say. I feel that I should like to make a speech, but my feelings are rather of a mixed nature. In fact, I feel that I should like to make a speech; but, on the other hand, I feel utterly unable to make one. I have a feeling that, perhaps, the news is too good to be true. I understand that we have not the news absolutely officially that an armistice has been signed, although, coming through the channel it has done, it ought to be reliable. This may be the day that will be the greatest day, possibly, in all history.

Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. P. COLLIER: When we think of the tension of the past four years, and when we recall, in allowing our minds to go back to, the terrible crisis through which we have passed, bearing in mind the serious situation with which Great Britain and her Allies have been faced during these terrible four years, and more especially during the present year, well, all one can say is—

“It's good to be British to-day.”

Whilst we all fully appreciate the magnificently loyal and determined conduct of all the Allied Nations which have been engaged in the war, nevertheless we as Britishers are proud to know—and I believe this not to be too boastful to say—that had it not been for the bulldog pluck, tenacity, and determination which have ever characterised the members of the British race, the result might not be so gratifying as at the present moment we believe it to be. While one can look right round the Allied Nations, look to the United States, to France, and to all of them, to every people with whom our nation has been associated in the struggle, one can say that each has done its duty magnificently. But I should like to say just one word in praise and in appreciation of the splendid part which has been played by one of the arms of the British fighting forces which has not come in for so much glory, or so much eulogy, as have our armies; and that is the great, undying, loyal British Navy.

Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. P. COLLIER: No matter what forces we might have behind us, with all the nations in arms marshalling their land forces, had it not been for the might and power and the unconquerable spirit of the men of the British Navy, the result would not have been as to-day we learn it to be. It is the men of the British Navy who have kept the ocean highways of the world clear, who have enabled feats to be accomplished that are unparalleled in the history of the world. Mighty armies have been transported from one end of the globe to the other, purely and solely by reason of the might and power of the British Navy, associated

with the indomitable spirit of the men of the British Merchant Service.

Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is the spirit of the nation, it is the spirit of the men who, after being rescued from torpedoed ships, would not rest twenty-four hours ashore but would immediately sign on another merchant ship. As we know, there are thousands of British merchant seamen who have had the experience of being torpedoed, not twice or thrice, but a dozen times. So long as there was a ship to be manned, those seamen never shrank from facing danger. I do not wish to occupy any more of the time of the House.

Members: Go on.

Hon. P. COLLIER: No. This is not an occasion when one member should monopolise the attention of the House. There are many members here from whom, I am sure, we should all like to have a word on this occasion. I should personally like to hear a word from every hon. member on the opposite side of the Chamber; and, as regards this side, particularly would I love to hear a word from that real, true type of the British bulldog, the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin).

Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. P. COLLIER: And not least, of course, a word from our good Lancashire friend in the person of the member for Kanowna (Hon. T. Walker). And there are others, too, from whom, I am sure, we should all be glad to have a word. In conclusion, Mr. Taylor, let me only say that I hope the Government will, that I am sure the Government will, afford the citizens of this State, citizens small and large, high and low, an opportunity of giving vent to those feelings of joy with which, I am sure, they are possessed in the announcement of this, the greatest victory in the whole wide world's history.

Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. PIESSE (Toodyay) [9.0 a.m.]: May I add my endorsement to the motion before the House, and say on behalf of the members of the Country Party that we rejoice at the good news. Doubtless the news will cause a thrill, one might say, throughout the world, more especially to those inland districts where the people are so anxious about those brave boys who for so long have been at the Front. As the leader of the Opposition has remarked it is a subject which affords the opportunity for a lengthy and impressive speech and I feel my inability, owing to the fullness of my heart, to do justice to the great news that has now reached this country. To-day will undoubtedly be the day of days not only for the British Empire but for the freedom of the world.

Hon. W. C. ANGIN (North-East Fremantle) [9.2 a.m.]: This is a time when one's thoughts go back to those who will not return to us. During the progress of this terrible war, I have often had brought home to me, when I have seen our hospital ships returning, the sadness amongst those who have gone to the wharves to welcome the men who were privileged to return. I have often said that no one could realise the feeling of the parents of our brave boys unless they had a relative who had left our shores to fight for the liberty of us all. Many of us have been placed in that position. When we saw our boys off on the transports, each and everyone looked on them as leaving us forever. But be that as it may, we are all overjoyed to-day as the splendid victory which has been achieved, principally by the British race, aided by the unity of all the nations who

joined with the British, knowing that they were fighting for the liberty of the people of the world. There is not the least doubt that in public and private life we were imbued with the idea that the object we had to fight for was justice for the community as a whole. The British forces and the British people throughout the whole of the dominions, have had only one object in view. That object was not material gain. It was the liberty of mankind in general throughout the civilised world, and we rejoice to-day to know that we have been successful. I, like other members, feel it difficult to know what to say on an occasion like this, and like the Treasurer, I feel more like having a cry than making a speech. We do not know how to express ourselves. This news has come on us suddenly in the last few months, when everything appeared to be dark and when we did not know what the issue would be. We learned for the first time of the seriousness of the position when the conference called together by the Governor General took place in Melbourne, and when the position was placed before the delegates who attended. I felt at that time on learning what had taken place from the leader of the Opposition who was present, that our liberty had gone, but that tenacity which has all through this war been foremost in the races opposing those who wanted to try as far as possible to conquer the world, has been such that to-day we are the conquerors and I trust that none of us will ever again see the sword raised in war.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER (Hon. J. Gardiner—Irwin) [9.6 a.m.] :** This is a time for almost solemn rejoicing. We feel that we have just come from the valley of the shadow of death and that the God of justice is still with us. These are moments of joy when we who have children can feel that their return to us is assured and I desire to give expression of sympathy to those who will never see their boys again. May we in our heart of hearts appeal to the great Christ to extend a touch of His loving sympathy to those who have suffered by the loss of their dear ones. We see behind us to-day so much that makes us glad that good has triumphed over brute force. We see the dawn of a new democracy, a higher and a better democracy. We have been taught that we have been worshipping false idols, only to find that in the hour of the nation's trial it is men that count. The great French Premier, Viviani when asked—“What are we fighting for” said, “We are fighting to make the whole earth habitable for the freedom of man.” Surely that is a charter to ourselves that at the conclusion of this war, we can sign, realising that if we make the world habitable for free men and free institutions, out of this vale of sorrow, out of the anguish of hearts, a greater, more perfect and more glorious nation will arise in which the people for all time shall live in peace and in security and in full possession of those privileges that we have ever enjoyed under the flag which is ours to-day.

**Mr. PILKINGTON (Perth) [9.10 a.m.] :** I confess I feel as others feel, that very little can be said on an occasion like this, an occasion that calls for great gladness and thankfulness.

**Hon. T. WALKER (Kanowna) [9.11 a.m.] :** I feel also that words cannot adequately express either my feelings or the feelings of this Assembly, or the feelings of the Nation and the Empire, on an occasion like this. For a period of nearly five years a nervous tension has been over every citizen, not only of the Empire but every citizen of the

nations of our Allies. There have been those stressful emotions, alternating hopes and fears, the lack at times of clearness of vision, the dread of possibilities which might mean a shattered world. To-day we feel that the travail is over. Let the world give birth, as it were, to a new offspring that shall forever bear the sacred name of democracy. We feel that there has been a terrible struggle between the forces of light and darkness, the forces of an old, effete, selfish, greedy world, and the forces of an aspiring, hopeful, growing, liberty-loving agency. We feel that these two forces are nearing the end of the conflict and that freedom is victorious, but we cannot feel sure of what the actual future will be, and the measure of rejoicing, until every one of the nations of the world, hitherto oppressed, even the weakest, rises up among those who are standing free and independent, and all nations unite as brothers in the great arena of human freedom. I rejoice because from the darkness of night that is past I see the pale of the dawn of the day that is going to lift humanity from its lowest foundations to the free air of a liberty-loving democracy. We have had five years of most disastrous destruction. The treasures of centuries have gone. The cities, the pride of the people, have disappeared. Fair fields and beautiful valleys have been devastated. Disaster, ruin, misfortune, horror, suffering and blood, have covered the sacred shrines of the old world. Now the bells sound forth that the night is over. The dreadful nightmare of humanity is passing. Let us hope from this moment on that we shall start to rebuild, to construct, to beautify, to restore and to make this earth worth living in for the humblest mortal in human form, where the peasant is a king in the sanctity of his rights, where every citizen has the fullest scope for the development of all those qualities that constitute emancipated manhood. That is the future, the building, the construction, the great work that henceforth is ours. Our soldiers have done their great work. The work now is the work of the citizens. Let us look to it that we do it. Let us honour them, as they have served us, by our services to humanity, and in the demonstration of our gratitude for that they have truly won for us liberty for ever, liberty of all nations, of all mankind, of the weakest as the strongest, so that we may say with truth, the evils of war are ended for ever. The joy bells of Progress will ring tomorrow. Not all the forces of German might, not all the strength of ancient despotic and military forms of Government can stop the growth of that spirit that has made the earth fair and worth the living in. No thunder of the cannon, no flash of steel or sword can stop the rising tide of human progress for the future.

Go, bid the ocean cease to heave,  
The rivers cease to flow,  
Bid smiling spring retrace her steps  
And flowers cease to blow;  
Go, chase the wild wind to its home.  
The lightning to its nest;  
Then bid the Car of Progress stay  
Whose boulders never rest.

**Mr. SPEAKER :** Before putting the question hon. members will permit me to say I believe that few Parliaments can feel as proud as we do at this hour of the morning, after our arduous

work, to know we are adjourning a Parliament belonging to the British Empire. We at least should be proud to know that we are able to adjourn our Parliament to meet again under the Empire.

Question put and passed, members standing.

[At the call of the Premier, members joined in singing "God save the King." Cheers were given for "Our Soldiers," "Our Allies," "The Navy," and "General Foch."]

House adjourned at 9-20 a.m. (Friday.)

## Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 12th November, 1918.

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

### THE WAR—PEACE ARMISTICE.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [4.31]: With your permission, Sir, I desire to submit two motions, as follow:—

1. That on the occasion of the signing of the peace armistice, signalling the complete and glorious triumph of the allied arms, the Legislative Council of Western Australia in Parliament assembled expresses its profound gratitude to Almighty God; its deep and abiding loyalty to the throne and person of His Majesty the King; and its proud admiration for the soldiers and sailors of the Empire and our allies. That a message be forwarded to His Excellency the Governor, desiring him to transmit the foregoing resolution to His Majesty the King.

2. That the Legislative Council of Western Australia in Parliament assembled desires to convey to the Australian Army and Navy abroad the thanks of the people of Western Australia for the magnificent services in the cause of freedom, justice, and righteousness rendered by the soldiers and sailors of Australia, and their heart-felt congratulations on the glorious victory, in the achievement of which the Australian divisions have played so notable a part. That a message be forwarded transmitting this resolution to the Minister for Defence and the Minister for the Navy of the Commonwealth.

I feel that no words of mine are needed to commend these motions to the joyful acceptance of the House. It is difficult to realise all that has happened during the last few days, impossible even to imagine the influence of

those events on the future of the world. [The outstanding fact is that the signing of the armistice by the representatives of Germany completes a glorious victory for the allied arms. (Cheers.) In the common, the frequent acceptance of the term, an armistice is merely the cessation of hostilities pending the negotiations for peace; but in this case the armistice was for the enemy the only alternative to a complete and overwhelming defeat, and, properly, the terms were such as to place it beyond the power of Germany to resume hostilities. (Cheers.) This means that the terms of peace will be determined by the allied nations. In such determination the principles of freedom, of justice, and of righteousness, which have inspired our armies through more than four years of bloodshed, will prevail, and it may be assumed that those who have done violence to those principles will be called upon to make due reparation. History furnishes no parallel for the complete, the sudden, the dramatic collapse of Germany. Six months ago her fortunes ran high. To-day her empire has disappeared, the Kaiser, the Crown Prince, and a long list of the minor monarchs have abdicated and fled from their palaces, the army and the navy have been handed over to the control of the Allies, and the highest hope of the German people to-day is that their country may be spared from the devastation of red revolution. It is too early, in any case it may be invidious, to single out names for special recognition; but there are some who, in the hour of victory, must not be forgotten. There is the heroic General Leman, who at Liege stemmed the first fury of the Huns. (Cheers.) There is Lord Kitchener, who organised the British Army. (Cheers.) There is Lloyd George who organised the British nation. (Cheers.) There are Generals Foch and Haig, who have been, in the main, responsible for directing the fighting. (Cheers.) From first to last the British Navy has played a glorious part. It was the one branch of the Empire's defence forces that was ready, and because of the navy the seas have been free to the Allies and closed against the enemy. Even the most ruthless submarining has not prevented the transport overseas of 22 millions of allied troops, with a total loss of fewer than 5,000. Nor has submarining prevented the rigorous blockade that steadily reduced Germany to starvation. Sir Eric Geddes, who may be assumed to be speaking with knowledge, says that the blockade was the main cause of Germany's collapse. He also declares that, a fortnight ago, the German high command had determined upon a naval armageddon, "But the arm that should have made the last desperate gambling stroke was paralysed"—to the everlasting regret, it safely may be said, of the British Navy. That the enemy should have skulked within the shelter of his forts for practically the whole of the period of the war has annoyed and disappointed the British Navy, from Admiral to cabin boy. Lloyd George describes Germany's collapse as the greatest judgment in history. In 1871 there assembled at Versailles a German council of war consisting of the Emperor William I., the