

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 7th November, 1911.

	Page
Commission for swearing in	26
Question: Railway Advisory Board reports	26
Papers presented	26
Sitting days and hours	26
Government business, precedence	26
Committees for the session	26
Address-in-reply, second day	27

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

COMMISSION FOR SWEARING-IN.

The SPEAKER announced that he had received from His Excellency the Governor a Commission authorising him to administer to members of the Legislative Assembly who might have to be sworn, the oath or affirmation.

QUESTION—RAILWAY ADVISORY BOARD REPORTS.

Mr. FRANK WILSON (Sussex) asked the Premier (without notice): Will he lay on the Table the reports of the advisory board in connection with proposed new railways?

The PREMIER: Yes.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Premier: 1, Sixth annual report of the Public Service Commissioner. 2, Annual report of the Museum and Art Gallery.

SITTING DAYS AND HOURS.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan) moved—

That the House, unless otherwise ordered, shall meet for the despatch of business on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays, at 2.30 p.m., and shall sit until 6.15 p.m., if necessary; and, if requisite, from 7.30 p.m. onwards.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Would the Premier make the hour of meeting 3 o'clock instead of 2.30. It would give members a chance to get up from town.

The Premier: Oh, no.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: It would be more convenient to members, on the Opposition side at any rate, and he believed to members on the other side also, if the House were to meet at 3 o'clock instead of at 2.30. The latter hour was all right for members who lunched on the premises, but if one was lunching in town or at home it was a bit of a rush to get to the House at 2.30. He threw it out as a suggestion to the Premier that the House should meet at 3 o'clock.

The PREMIER: The Government had given the closest consideration to this question, and had really granted a concession to members when deciding to meet at 2.30. If necessary the House would be asked to meet earlier before the session closed. He did not think that meeting at 2.30 was asking too much of members, because it was not of much use going back to office after lunch, and in the circumstances it was just as easy to get here at 2.30 as at 3 o'clock.

Question put and passed.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS, PRECEDENCE.

On motion by the PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan) resolved:—"That on Tuesdays and Thursdays, and on Wednesday, November 8th, and each alternate Wednesday thereafter, Government business shall take precedence of all Motions and Orders of the Day."

COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION.

On motions by the PREMIER Hon. J. Scaddan) sessional committees were appointed as follow:—

House Committee.—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Underwood, Mr. Male, and Mr. Monger, with leave to sit during any adjournment and during the recess, and with authority to act jointly with the House Committee of the Legislative Council.

Library Committee.—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Turvey, and Mr. Wisdom, with leave to sit during any adjournment and during the recess, and with authority to act

jointly with the Library Committee of the Legislative Council.

Printing Committee.—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Price, and Mr. Allen, to assist Mr. Speaker in all matters which relate to the printing executed by order of the House, and for the purpose of selecting and arranging for printing returns and papers presented in pursuance of motions made by members, and all papers laid upon the Table, whether in answer to addresses or otherwise.

Standing Orders Committee.—Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of Committees, Mr. Hudson, Mr. Nanson, and Mr. Lefroy, with leave to sit during any adjournment and with authority to confer upon subjects of mutual concernment with any Committee appointed for similar purposes by the Legislative Council.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Second day.

Debate resumed from the 1st November.

Mr. FRANK WILSON (Sussex): The mover of the Address-in-reply to the Governor's Speech on the opening day of the session made a very pertinent remark when he stated that the elections had given such an overwhelming majority in favour of the Labour party that he thought they might be forgiven if they did a little gentle crowing. At least, he suggested that he would not do the crowing himself, but that some of the other members to follow him would do all the crowing necessary on this occasion. Since the general elections we have had, I am sorry to say, two other elections for another place, and on both occasions labour has scored again. Therefore, I am open to admit at once that the members on the Ministerial benches have every reason to crow and be proud of the victory they have scored at the hands of electors, and I for one am not going to take any offence if they do crow a little. They may flap their wings as they like, and crow as well.

Mr. Heitmann: Long and loud.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Yes, long and loud, and I am not going to take any offence because the people have given a

decision in their favour. The Government have every excuse for saying that they have received a mandate from the people, because the large percentage of votes recorded at the recent election shows that the people, whether they voted rightly or wrongly—of course, I think wrongly—at any rate gave a decisive mandate to the Government to carry out their policy. It is an extraordinary policy to my mind, a policy which I think will work ill to this country if carried out to its full extent.

Mr. Bolton: Not many agree with you.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Yes, a good many. Outside of the hon. members who were returned unopposed, just as many people voted liberal as voted labour—perhaps the hon. member is not aware of that—and those who voted liberal agree with me that the policy of the Labour party will work ill to the country if carried out in its entirety. I think that policy is remarkable for its inconsistency, and for its insincerity. No stagnation, we are told by the Premier, is to take place in Western Australia, no confiscation is to take place, no interference with existing land titles; and yet the first action of the Minister for Lands was to promulgate certain regulations which could only be construed into bringing about all three of these to some extent. These regulations which stop transfers have been introduced by the Minister, I am fully aware, according to his statements, with the object of endeavouring to put a stop to what he termed land speculation. It is easy to talk about land speculation, and if we see land speculation pure and simple I think anyone of us will agree with the Minister that every effort should be made to put a stop to it, but it is very hard to draw the line of demarcation between legitimate land dealing and land speculation pure and simple, and there I think the Minister has made a mistake and has formulated regulations which are not going to have the effect that he thinks they will have, and are certainly going to injure the small man, the small farmer, who may get into a tight corner and cannot deal with his land. It seems to me that our one object should be, in this great

country of ours with so many millions of acres at our disposal, to get those acres peopled as quickly as we consistently can, to get them put under cultivation in order that we may bring forth from the earth that wealth which goes towards building up so largely a prosperous country and a prosperous people. That, at any rate, I claim has been the object, and the one object, of the late Government. If we do anything now that is going to interfere with the carrying out of that policy, then we are injuring the people and injuring the State, we are not assisting forward the country as a whole; and it appeals to me in this way, that while we may be legitimately setting a trap to catch the one great thief who deals in land for the purpose of reaping the unearned increment, we may be hurting the 50 legitimate settlers who, from one circumstance or another, have failed to make a success of their undertakings and are wishful of transferring their properties for a consideration to others. So far as the State is concerned, I cannot get away from this aspect of the question, that it matters not who improves the land so long as the land be improved; and whether it is Tom Jones who has taken up a block and gone on as far as he can with the funds at his command with improvements, and then has to pass it over to Mr. Brown, whether it be Jones or Brown that cultivates or improves the land, it matters not one iota to the State as a whole. What we want is the national estate improved, and made to produce the wealth which it undoubtedly possesses, and it is of less importance who is the man, the humble instrument who carries out that work. I notice the Premier, with his usual facility, when addressing a body of business men at Fremantle the other night, immediately begins to trim his sails to the wind. He did that on several occasions during the elections.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): He was very foolish to do that at Fremantle.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: That may be so, but he did it. He made use of some very remarkable words to the members of the Chamber of Commerce whose hos-

pitality he was enjoying at the time. In connection with these land regulations he said—

The Government had no desire to interfere with genuine land settlers, with the men who were really desirous of cultivating their land, whether by their own hands or by their capital. They did not intend to interfere with those institutions which had helped them on to the land. If their proposals were going to have the effect of interference they would bring about alterations.

There you have the complacent Premier, the pliable Premier, trying to palliate the man with capital at Fremantle, trying to tell him, "It is all right; my colleague has put these regulations on which are interfering with the legitimate transfer of land."

The Premier: I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Did you not use these words?

The Premier: Yes; but not the words you are using now.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I am putting on them the construction your audience put on them when they applauded so loudly. "But if these regulations were going to have the effect of interfering they would bring about alterations."

The Premier: "If."

Mr. FRANK WILSON: "If"; of course.

The Premier: I do not think they will.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: They have already; no doubt about it; you can hear it in the street every day in the week, every hour of the day.

Mr. Heitmann: In St. George's-terrace; the St. George's-terrace farmer.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Exactly; in St. George's-terrace, the centre of business and commerce in Western Australia. I suppose the hon. member would do away with it, and with all who therein dwell.

Mr. Heitmann: We could do without a few of them.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Some of the hon. member's colleagues have offices in St. George's-terrace; even the Minister

for Justice has; but the hon. member would sweep them out of existence.

Mr. Heitmann: The Minister has a better one in the Supreme Court building.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: That is not his; it belongs to the State. While I am very wishful of giving the Government every credit for the best of intentions, I want to drive the point home, that, while they are experimenting with their legislation and their regulations, the country is suffering. It is very easy to stop the country's progress, and even the Premier will admit that during the past six years, at any rate, Western Australia has enjoyed very considerable prosperity. It is very easy to put a spoke in the wheel of progress and prosperity, and very difficult to get the State coach started once more if you do so. I speak from considerable experience.

The Premier: Did you put a spoke in?

Mr. FRANK WILSON: No; I came in to remove the spoke that the Labour Government put in. As the hon. member knows, six years ago when their finances were indeed in a mess, and they did not know which way to look, and had to throw up the sponge, we came along and set the coach going and brought prosperity on the State; we renewed confidence in the individual, we directed the efforts of the people in the right channel, and the result was progress and prosperity. We removed the sprag that had been placed on the wheels of the coach and got it going again. I do not wish to explain the reasons for the result of the elections; they do not bear explanation any further than that evidently the people wanted a change and they got it with a vengeance; but as kindly as possible I wish to protest for a minute against some of the public statements of my opponents during the recent elections. I wish to point out to the Premier, who issued a circular which bears his own name with these words in it—

Contrast the Labour party's policy with Premier Wilson's proposal to grant the freehold on millions of acres at present leased to cattle kings and mining and absentee owners, and corrupt timber cobines.

When he issued this and spread it broadcast through my electorate it was playing it very low down, and I think the least he could have done was to have withdrawn that leaflet and apologised for it when his attention was drawn to it. Then we have another lovely thing here in the name of Mr. Alec McCallum, Trades Hall, Perth.

Mr. Heitmann: A good man.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Mr. McCallum said,

Every resident, whether land-owner or not, whose income is £2 a week will pay 10s. annually.

This was headed "Government's proposed income tax," taken from a statement made by the Premier. I denied it, and pointed out where he had made the mistake, but he had not the manliness to own up to it. I was rather surprised at this because I have always found the Premier has been, as far as my experience goes, ready to correct a misstatement. This was a very grievous misstatement, because my proposal was nothing of the sort, as the hon. member knows. The mistake was made in taking the wrong Queensland Act. However, this pamphlet was spread through my electorate, and other electorates, and left there until after election day and never contradicted. Here is another misstatement—

The Wilson Government propose to remove taxation from the land on to the people and to the food of the people. That is a gross misstatement; it is playing the game low down. Let us fight and fight as bitterly as we like when on the hustings, but let us stick to facts.

Mr. Heitmann: "The pot calling the kettle" now.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: It is just as well to let the hon. member know where his mistakes are, so that he will not commit them in future, so that his party may not be guilty of such fighting in the future. We have had considerable excitement in the past few days over the re-appointment of the Public Service Commissioner, and the Premier has asked what I think about it, and has suggested that I might say something in the House this afternoon. I have already given my

statement to the Press, but I want to know from the Premier if he will kindly let the House know whether it is the intention of the Government to fulfil the agreement that was made by the late Government in connection with this matter.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): An agreement that should never have been made.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: If it should never have been made then perhaps reasons will be given for this vindictive outburst, which looks to me, and to the public, as if the Public Service Commissioner had to be sacrificed. If the Public Service Commissioner is not to be reappointed then, I take it, the people of the State will want to know the reason why.

Mr. Bolton: They will want to know why he was reappointed.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: They do know why.

Mr. Bolton: They are asking yet. There is something behind the gun.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: No. The hon. member has not read the newspapers lately evidently. The public want to know what understanding there was between hon. members opposite and the Civil Service Association, that the Public Service Commissioner would not be reappointed.

The Premier: Did you see the remarks of your late colleague in the *West Australian*: do you indorse them?

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Yes; I gave my own interview. Now, I can quite understand that people do feel a bit concerned over this matter, because when the Premier uses strong language, when he talks about a monstrous thing, an unwarranted thing, an unheard of thing, it is presumable he feels very keenly and that it is something at any rate he did not wish to see carried out. The justification for the appointment is on the file, and although I am aware it is not customary to put personal files on the Table of the House, I would suggest to the Premier there is no harm in removing the letters and correspondence from that personal file and putting them on the Table. It seems to me that while we all suffer very considerably—at any rate the public does

—and talk a good deal, a section of it, the section which I represent here, about the tyranny of caucus and the Trades Hall, it is undoubted in this State—

Mr. Swan: "McCallum and his Trades Union mob."

Mr. FRANK WILSON: The hon. member is ungenerous, because he knows I did not make use of that expression.

Mr. Swan: I certainly understood it was your expression.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: The reporter who was at the meeting said there was no such remark made.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): That was the reporter you used to take about with you.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I took all the reporters about with me, and the hon. member will probably take reporters about with him.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): I know it was done in some places.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I was pointing out that we are fighting against the tyranny of caucus as being inimical to the general weal of the people, and if we are going to bow to the tyranny of the Civil Service Association and the public service it will be much worse. Once the public service gets control of this House and the Government, we shall have trouble in Western Australia, and as sure as fate the time will come when the rest of the public will rise in protest and do what was done in Victoria years ago; they will have a Black Wednesday and take away the franchise from the Service.

Mr. Green: And restore it again.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: If that is not done the public will do away with the Premier and his colleagues.

The Premier: If you are going to wait for that time to come you will be a long time in opposition.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: We shall have three years to wait in opposition, that is if hon. members opposite can keep peace amongst themselves. If they exercise that care and discretion which the Premier is renowned for, possibly the difficulty will be avoided.

The Premier: If we can bring the tyranny of caucus to bear like you did.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: We never had anything to do with caucus. I want to point out that His Excellency's Speech, although couched in excellent language and bearing the trade mark of the Minister for Justice to some extent, is very meagre in the way of definite pronouncements. The first thing that catches my eye is the question of the political rights of citizens. I want to point out to the House that if it refers to the public service, as I believe it does, and if it means that they are to have absolute freedom, just as an ordinary citizen, to go on to the platform and criticise the Government of the day, whether it be my friends opposite or members on this side of the House, should they be in power, then I shall oppose it tooth and nail, and I hope the Government will think twice before they introduce such a proposal. Once you permit the members of the civil service to take the platform and criticise the Government they are serving and the heads of the departments, and then allow them to go back and take their old positions, then you are going to have the corrupt times in Western Australia which were brought into vogue in America. Then if the Government goes out, their friends in the civil service will go out with them, and the new Government will bring in their friends and supporters. This system stands condemned in every State in the Commonwealth, in fact I think in every part of the British Empire. I do not think that is the desire of the Government, although I am afraid it is, because the public servants have all the rights we possess so far as exercising the franchise is concerned; they have perfect freedom of conscience to vote as they like, and the only thing is that they are prohibited by regulations to go on the platform and take an active and public part in elections or assist any special party.

An hon. member: That is only as it should be.

The Premier: Unless they are engaged by Ministers as special correspondents.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I do not know of anyone having been engaged by a Minister as special correspondent.

The Minister for Mines: Ask the ex-Minister for Lands whether he had one.

The Premier: Who did you take around with you in the Ministerial car at election time?

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I only took my secretary just as the hon. member does now. The references in the Governor's Speech to the goldfields and to the result of the geological survey between Mount Jackson and Lake Barlee are certainly a tribute to my late colleague, Mr. Gregory, and I am happy to think that at any rate his successor has been able to find some good work which the late Minister for Mines did in the Mines Department. I hope that the expression contained in the Governor's Speech that the result will be the opening up of a comparatively new district, and that new life will be given to that great industry to which we owe so much, will be fulfilled. The absence of any mention of Railway Bills for goldfields or proposals for railway construction must, I think, be a bitter disappointment to the *Kalgoorlie Miner* for instance, and to those members who received the confidence of those electorates at the general elections. The Marvel Loch locality is referred to as showing very hopeful signs of a bright future, but we do not hear anything about giving the Marvel Loch facilities for railway communication which the Advisory Board recommended so strongly.

The Minister for Mines: We gave them a water supply in a week, which you hung up for six months.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: The hon. member completed the water supply which we started. The Minister for Works has given water supplies to the agricultural districts and takes credit for having done so whilst, as a matter of fact, the department had been working on these water supplies for months past, and finding the position just ripe when he goes into office the Minister carries it into effect. I was pointing out that although there is a report from experts which fully warrants the construction of a railway from Southern Cross to Marvel Loch and beyond, yet we have no word in the Governor's Speech that the railway is to be under-

taken. It seems to me that notwithstanding the loud protestations which have been made by Ministers to the country, we are shelving these important works and we are drifting back to the mark-time policy of the previous Labour administration. I should like to know whether it is the intention of the Government to shelve all public works until they can get their Public Works Parliamentary Committee appointed.

Mr. Bolton: That will not be long.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: It will not take long to appoint the Committee, but it will take a good time for that Committee to get the hang of the necessity for public works throughout Western Australia. The Advisory Boards have been working on these for the past eighteen months.

The Minister for Justice: They would be at the service of the Committee.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Of course, but what is the good of the Committee relying on the Advisory Board. Had we not better take the reports which the Premier has promised to lay on the Table of the House to-morrow and consider whether the recommendations contained in them are justified or not.

The Premier: Do you know that we are not going to do that?

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Of course I do. This is the hon. member's speech I suppose. We have it here that in the first session a Bill will be introduced for the appointment of a Parliamentary Standing Committee for Public Works with the view of undertaking a vigorous and at the same time an enduring public works policy. Can anyone read that and say whether the Government will do anything until they have appointed the committee? It means that the Government are going to hang up everything and hang up the country. I have a big interest in this matter because I represent a portion of Western Australia which is renowned for its fertility and its sparse population, the great South-Western corner of this State.

Mr. Bolton: It is suggested that is why you are here.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: If the hon. member does not look after Jandakot a little better than he looked after North Fremantle when he represented that constituency, I am afraid that at the next election they will vote against him down there. I represent as I said this vast South-Western corner which has great possibilities. I should say that I represent the entrance to it, because I believe a good portion of it is now represented by my namesake, the member for Collie. It is none the less valuable for that and it is certainly a country that should be developed and developed promptly. It does not suffer from the excessive droughts which a certain portion of the eastern districts is suffering from at the present time, and it should be opened up by a railway in order to settle there those dairy farmers that the country wants so badly. We have the recommendations of the Advisory Board to construct a railway in the district, and more especially did they recommend a railway from Busselton southwards towards the Margaret River. I want to see the work carried out promptly. I do not want to wait until next year or until the appointment of the Public Works or Parliamentary Committee which can only go over the work already done so well by the Advisory Board.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Is that the most urgent work

Mr. FRANK WILSON: It is so far as I am concerned. If we are to advance this country we must do it promptly, it will brook of no delay. The works which have been outlined, and especially the railways must be pushed forward. I do not care how many Parliamentary Committees there may be appointed, they must come to the one conclusion, that this South-Western district must be tapped by railway construction, and if it is tapped a profitable result will follow from the settlement which will take place there. But the Speech makes no mention of railways such as I describe except in general terms and it makes no mention of other railways which Ministers have referred to during their election speeches. I do not see any mention with regard to the Esperance railway which was promised, I

believe, by the Premier on one occasion on the goldfields. I wonder what the hon. member for Narrogin is thinking now about this question.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: I was just thinking about the parochial dodge you tried to play. You tried to draw a red herring across the trail. You tried to bluff the farmers but they were too broadminded.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: There is no mention of the railway in the Speech; is that not a red herring?

The Minister for Justice: It is a lively herring.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: It is a very smoky herring and it will remain smoky so far as the member for Narrogin is concerned, and let me assure him so far as the life of this Parliament is concerned. Then what has become of the Bunbury harbour? The member for Bunbury made a definite promise that if the Labour party were returned it would be immediately gone on with.

Mr. Thomas: With your assistance it will be.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I will give the hon. member every assistance that I can, for it is a good work. These are all big works which should have been mentioned in the Speech. There is no Wagin-Darkan railway to be constructed in order to tap the wheat country and bring the produce of the farmers direct to Bunbury, the natural port for the district, but instead, we have a statement from the Premier that this Wagin-Darkan railway will have to be referred to the Parliamentary committee. See how the whole business is being hung up. They are not going to make any progress. I think hon. members on the other side of the House, who have criticised the late Government, will shortly have to be repelling attacks from within their own boundaries.

Mr. Walker: Wouldn't you like to see it?

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Yes, because I want to see the country progress, and if the Government are stirred up they will probably get some of these works going. The Bills mentioned in the Speech are mainly, I think I may claim, the measures outlined by the Wilson Government. For

instance, there is the Bill for the Homes for the People, which will have my hearty support, the amending of the Agricultural Bank Act, the Public Service Appeal Board, and the Early Closing Act amendment, exactly on the lines which we outlined in the policy speech. Then we have a most remarkable Bill for the reduction of Ministerial salaries, and of the salaries of certain Parliamentary officials. I can only characterise that measure as a piece of arrant humbug. It is gross hypocrisy on the part of Ministers to bring in a measure of this sort and to grant interviews, such as the Premier did the other day, in connection with the Bill. To my mind it shows a somewhat mean spirit, if I cannot call it anything stronger, simply playing to the gallery and humbugging the public. Hon. members who were in the last Parliament will remember that not the slightest opposition was offered when the proposal was made to increase Ministers' salaries. Now I am not going to object to Ministers placing their own value on their services. The Minister for Justice during the last session of Parliament was very wrath because hon. members on the Government side of the House at that time would not agree to raise members' salaries to £400. He asked "What are you afraid of? Have you not the honesty to express your conviction in this matter, although you think we are worthy of £400? Why not support it, why not make it retrospective, why not do anything so long as you are convinced that you are right?" I want to point out where, to my mind, this latest attitude seems somewhat cowardly. I do not like to use that word; perhaps I had better not use it; I will say it is mean to bring in a Bill of this description, because when speaking on the motion to increase the payment of members I clearly stated that it was intended to increase Ministers' salaries. The subsequent debate did not bring any word of protest from the Opposition side of the House, and when, three months later, the Bill was brought down, the same explanation was given; and again not one word of protest was raised. Is it not mean now thus to try to gain the ear of the public?

Mr. Swan: You cannot produce the first reference you speak of.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: On the 19th October Mr. Underwood moved—

That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that members' salaries be increased from £200 to £300 per year, that increase to have effect as from the commencement of the present financial year.

I said I would like to make further inquiries into the matter, more especially as the hon. member desired to make the motion retrospective. I further said I would oppose the motion that the increases should date from the beginning of the financial year. Continuing I said—

I admit the principle of payment of members, there is little argument against it, yet in practice I do not think it has panned out too well. Nevertheless it has become an established practice almost throughout the British Empire that members of Parliament should receive payment for their services. Indeed I see in the Press that even in the Old Country the matter has been mooted, and the chances are that in the near future steps will be taken in the British House of Parliament to pay their members as is done throughout Australia. If we are to pay members, as we do in this Assembly and have done for many years past, I am not one to advocate a starvation wage. I believe in members being paid an adequate remuneration for their services. I say also that Ministers should be paid an adequate remuneration. I do not consider they get anything like a reward for the hard work they have to do and for the long hours they have to work, and also for the severe criticism they are subjected to from time to time by members of the Opposition. There is another aspect of this question I have been thinking about considerably for the last few months; that is that the Leader of the Opposition should receive some extra remuneration.

And so I went on. It is needless for me to read it right down.

Mr. Swan: Is that the foreshadowing you spoke of?

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Certainly, what else is it? I said Ministers should be paid an adequate remuneration. I strongly protested against it being made retrospective, and said that if any steps were taken it should be from the next financial year, if not from the new Parliament. I said I would prefer it to date from the beginning of the new Parliament. Then we amended the resolution, and the then member for Swan proposed a referendum on the question; that was defeated, and a motion was then made simply affirming the desirability of increasing the payment of members. Now from all that the Premier knew full well that I intended not only to increase the salary of the leader of the Opposition, but also the salaries of Ministers.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): I do not believe any person in the country thought so from that.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I am quite sure they did, because there was an article in the Press against it.

The Premier: Your Government promised to reduce the salaries.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Nothing of the sort. On the 2nd February we introduced the Bill, when in the course of some remarks I said—

I must admit that the leader of the Opposition is not adequately remunerated at the ordinary salary of a member of Parliament; and I have provided in this Bill that, in addition to the ordinary salary of £300 per year, he shall receive extra remuneration to the extent of £200 a year, giving him a salary of £500 a year. Then we have put in a clause in which we have looked after Ministers of the Crown also, and we provide that Ministers shall in addition to their salaries be able to draw their salaries as members. This will increase their salaries by the amount of £300 per annum, which they will draw after this Bill passes.

And so I went on. And in the subsequent debate, and right through Committee, there was not one word of protest. Surely it is the duty of hon. members, if they do not approve of anything, to voice that disapproval in the House. This is

the place where you take objections, and if you do not take objection to a particular measure, and are present—as hon. members opposite were—when it is being discussed, you must be considered to have acquiesced. They say now that because it was not mentioned absolutely in the resolution, they must, of course, play to the gallery, even if it means reducing their own salaries. The member for Bunbury spoke of it as the “Ministerial grab.” I moved to make it payable only from the date of the new Parliament, but they beat me, and the Premier moved to make it retrospective from the 1st January last. If Ministers want to reduce their salaries let them do it by all means; if it is desired to repeal the Bill, let it be done; I will help them to do it; but for goodness’ sake do not let them try to humbug the public by posing as men above suspicion, as men who will not take the salary because they were opposed to it last year, when, as a matter of fact, there was, as I say, no word raised against it.

Mr. Swan: A nice chance we had of offering any successful opposition to it.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: The very least opposition in the world would have prevented that clause being carried. The only members who made any demur about it were on our side. The hon. member could easily have prevented that clause from being carried. Only lately does the Premier think this is a good part to play; but he will find the public will put his own estimate on Ministers, and, as he appreciates their value, the public will agree with him, and the whole matter will recoil on his own head. I think that I and my colleagues were perfectly entitled to the money we provided in that measure. I am certain the public, no matter whether they supported or opposed us, agreed with me that £1,500 a year was none too much for the Premier to draw. But if hon. members think they are worth not more than a sum £300 less than that provided, by all means let them reduce their salaries to that extent. I want now to say a few words on the question of finance, because that is another matter which has been touched upon and, I think, un-

fairly. I am glad the Speech itself recognises in no uncertain words that the finances are sound, inasmuch as it acknowledges the surplus at the end of the last financial year, a surplus which the Premier and his colleagues have been disputing right through the general elections, and trying to prove to be a bogey. And I think, also, it is recognised that the position when we handed over was perfectly sound, notwithstanding the statement of the Minister for Works, who is an expert and an authority on all subjects, and who has the unfortunate habit of attempting to coerce his leader, the Treasurer, in the matter of finance. It is the Treasurer who has to show how rotten is the state of the finances when he took office; the Minister for Works never attempts to do that, but I notice that he puts the burden on the shoulders of the poor Premier, who is given the responsibility of justifying his colleague’s rash statement on the public platform. I would not mind if the statements had been only those used during the election campaign, but since the Minister for Works has been in office he has repeated them, and at a social at Midland Junction a few nights ago he again asserted that the finances were unsound. This is a sort of parrot cry throughout the country that something is unsound—“We do not know what it is but something is wrong”—and this is repeated so often that the people at last begin to believe it. It would not matter if the statement stopped there, but it goes abroad, and drifts home to the financial market of London, where the Premier hopes to raise funds shortly to carry on his undertakings. These childish remarks injure the credit of the State. If there is reason of any kind to make a charge of bad handling of the finances then make it, but do not let us have these innuendoes and insinuations. Let me explain the position when I left office. On the 30th September last we had an accumulated deficit of £29,000, and notwithstanding the fact that the Premier during the elections quoted that fact and that the deficit has increased during the succeeding month to £79,000, let me point out that at the same period of the prev-

ious year the deficit was £84,000, but at the end of the last financial year we had a surplus of £13,000. So that it is reasonable to suppose that anyone handling the finances of this State in an ordinary way and with ordinary care and caution would be able much more readily to effect a balance this year than last year. On the date on which I handed over, the 6th October, the rough daily estimate, of which I do not take much account, showed a surplus of £27,000, so that to all intents and purposes the finances were practically balanced on that date. The estimate which the Premier rushed into print about—the rough estimate prepared by the Under Treasurer for my use before I left office, and taken from the estimates of the several departments—showed that on the 31st December next the revenue and expenditure would leave a surplus of £16,000. That is, if we carried on as we were then carrying on, and provided sufficient money for the advances which we had already made in the wages of the railway men, we would show a surplus of £16,000 at the end of the calendar year.

The Premier: That was before you made the increases to the railway men.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: No, I think not.

The Premier: But I am certain of it. That estimate was given on the 16th September.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I am under the impression that it includes the small increase which I authorised the Commissioner to make, namely 8s. 6d. to the loco. men and 8s. to the porters. I think the estimate included either one or both of those increases.

The Premier: That estimate was before you made that concession, and before you made the increase to the temporary hands.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I do not remember about the temporary hands.

The Premier: Well, it would be interesting for you to look at the file again.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I would be glad to do so, and to look at the other file also, but I am under the impression that the increase to 8s. was included by the Commissioner of Railways in his es-

timate of receipts and expenditure to the 31st December next. We are supposed to have left the Treasurer without any funds. I take it that the finances cannot be unsound when the Treasurer has money to go on with. On the 6th October the Treasurer had on ordinary account £132,000, a small Agricultural Bank redemption fund of £1,600, and standing to the credit of the Savings Bank £806,000, or a total cash in hand of £942,000, and he had cash in London at the credit of the Agent General to an approximate amount of £500,000, making a grand total of £1,442,000 to work against. I am fully aware that he cannot work against the savings bank deposit; he cannot work below a safe liquid asset, he must leave about £400,000.

The Premier: How much would that be in the pound?

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I think about 2s.

The Minister for Lands: He cannot work against that balance, because provision has to be made for the Agricultural Bank.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: That is included in the estimate of expenditure. When the Treasurer makes up an approximate estimate of the cash required it is not only of revenue, but all the finances of the State put together. He has to state how much is required for various things, and bring them all into one joint forecast for cash requirements. The Premier had over £1,400,000 to work against, or if we allow 10 per cent. on the deposit which would meet the requirements of the Savings Bank, there would still be left a million pounds which he could handle by arrangement. In addition to that he had a balance of loan authority for £1,315,000. I want to know what better position the Treasurer could want. If the Treasurer wants more than that, with all the facilities he has for raising money with the authority of Parliament, with the large amount of cash in hand, with a thriving country, and with the revenue coming in every month, he is only advertising his own incompetence to handle the finances of the State. Of course, I can quite understand that the action which has been

taken recently by Ministers will alter the financial aspect of the State, but for that they must be prepared to take the responsibility. If they stop land sales as the Minister for Lands has thought fit to do, if they advertise abroad that no one need pay rents or conditional purchase payments throughout certain districts till the end of the next financial year, they must expect the revenue to drop very suddenly, because no one is going to pay money, even if he is able to do it, when he is invited not to do so. If they place a check on land settlement and raise the wages of Government employees without any regard to the ultimate cost to the State they must expect to have their finances disordered, and the result, of course, must be a huge deficit. I hold that the Government have no right to interfere with the ordinary avenues of revenue until they have gone thoroughly into the matter and devised other means of raising revenue or of cutting down expenditure. It is idle for them to say that their predecessors are responsible and left the finances unsound, when it is their own actions that are causing the disturbed state of the finances. They must be prepared to take the responsibility for their own actions, and I, at any rate, do not intend to carry the baby on their behalf. I do not wish for one moment to say that I disagree with the policy of giving assistance to the settlers who are suffering. I have always held that opinion, and I promised the settlers in the dry regions that we would give them every consideration, but each case was to be considered on its merits.

• The Premier: That is what we state.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: No. I have not much more to say, excepting to assure hon. members that they will have all their promises brought home to roost: they will have to face the promises made in their behalf and by their authority, and I hope that they will be as good as their promises, and see that they are all carried out. I want to know why the price of food has not come down since the advent of a Labour Government?

The Premier: It has.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Bread is no cheaper, and my baker is talking about increasing the price by $\frac{1}{2}$ d. a loaf. Sugar has been going up for months past, and meat has not come down at all. I am paying just as much for meat, notwithstanding that I understand a large consignment of bullocks was sold at Owen's Anchorage the other day for 30s. per head. Potatoes are as dear as ever; in fact, we cannot afford to eat them in our house. I want to know why there is no mention about freezing works in the North. And what about the abattoirs at North Fremantle and Midland Junction?

Mr. Heitmann: Who promised them?

Mr. FRANK WILSON: The last Government promised them, and the present Government supported them.

Mr. Heitmann: Well, you erect them.

Mr. George: You give us a chance and we will do it.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: These are all matters that closely affect the question of food supply, yet there is not one word in the Speech in connection with what concerns the people most. It requires no legislation to push on with the erection of the freezing works at Wyndham. It might have been mentioned in the Speech that the contract would be let shortly, or that the Government would do the work departmentally under the department controlled by the Minister for Works, notwithstanding he is such a strong advocate for private enterprise, as I have proved on many occasions. But these are works that have no place in His Excellency's Speech. The Wickopin-Merredin railway is practically shelved, according to the reply to a deputation the other day. It is to be carried to a certain point and left there until a Parliamentary Standing Committee is appointed. The member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. E. B. Johnston) is asked to fulfil his promise that it was to be carried out immediately, and carried east. Is this railway to be pulled west in order to serve land owned by the Minister for Works and by the member for Collie (Mr. A. A. Wilson)? Why cannot that railway be constructed in accordance with the law?

Mr. A. A. Wilson: It is to suit your friend, Mr. Hedges, and not me.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Mr. Hedges is a friend of mine.

Mr. A. A. Wilson: He is no friend of mine.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I am sorry to hear that remark. I am sure if the hon. member knew Mr. Hedges he would be a friend of his.

Mr. A. A. Wilson: You are trying to hang my name to a thing that is not to suit me but is to suit Mr. Hedges.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: If the line is to be between your land and that of the Minister for Works it will suit you.

Mr. A. A. Wilson: You said it was to suit my block.

The Premier: The less the hon. member says about that line the better.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I want it absolutely ventilated and made public, every inch of it. Do not let us have any of "the less you say the better." I have nothing to hide.

The Premier: Surveys and re-surveys have cost this country too much.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Why is not the railway constructed in accordance with the Act passed by the House? There is a schedule and a plan.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: How many surveys did your Government make for that line?

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I could not say; but I say—carry out the railway in accordance with the Act. The Act lays down the route. I do not know where it goes.

The Minister for Works: The trouble will be it will go right through my property if you do.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Then put it through your property.

The Minister for Works: It all points to the necessity for a standing committee.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Not at all. You can always have the battle of routes every time you have a railway, especially if you encourage a deputation by saying you will carry the railway only so far because there is no dispute to that point. If the line is dragged west it will go through the Minister's land; it will go be-

tween his land and that of the member for Collie; but if it is carried out according to the Act it will miss their land altogether and go east and serve a large number of settlers, including Mr. Hedges.

The Minister for Works: That is absolutely incorrect, and you know it.

Mr. Bolton: It is a serious statement.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Let the hon. member inquire into it. The Act is in print; let him produce the maps and plans, the Public Works plans as they were laid on the Table when the Bill was passed.

The Premier: And let us have the Minister's promise which was given to Parliament when the Bill was here.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: The Minister's promise does not affect the Bill one iota; it only affects a small portion to the north of Wickiepin, and does not affect the chief part of the country at all. I am sorry I am not quite myself this afternoon, therefore I do not propose to continue my remarks any further. All I want is to see a fair deal given to the country, and I want to see the policy which we had the honour of inaugurating here six years ago, and which has been carried out persistently until recently, continued; I want my friends to continue it.

Mr. Heitmann: I do not.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Of course, the hon. member does not want anything. He does not want policy, he does not want progress, he does not want any prosperity at all; he simply wants caucus rule and others not to have a word to say. But I promise him that so long as we have a voice in the House we are going to explain our views, and I promise him that the people of Western Australia are going to hear us. We are the remnant, with a little addition of new blood, a sturdy remnant of the old party, and Ministers must expect to hear us, I hope always in fairness and always with a desire to assist them in their responsible duties.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan): I appreciate to the full the uncomfortable position my friend, the leader of the Opposition, finds himself in to-day. His quarrel is not so much with the Govern-

ment or members on the Government side of the House, as it is with the electors of the country; and that being the case, of course I am not called upon to defend the Government, but to defend the people of the State in their wisdom in deciding that there should be a change of Government. Irrespective of what my friend may try to make himself believe, it was not because they desired a change in personnel so much as a change in the policy that was in operation in the State. That was what the people of the State really desired. Moreover, the very part of our policy the leader of the Opposition is now complaining most about was really made the issue of the election by that gentleman himself, and there is no doubt about the verdict of the people on that part of our policy.

Mr. Frank Wilson: Why are you backing down on it?

The PREMIER: We are not backing down on it one iota.

Mr. Frank Wilson: What about the Fremantle speech?

The PREMIER: I am coming to that later. As a matter of fact we have taken the earliest opportunity that has presented itself to put that part of our policy into operation so far as the law of the land will permit us. Of course, it will be necessary at a later stage to ask the House to agree to an amendment of the land laws to put our policy into complete operation; but in the meantime we are going to take every opportunity that presents itself, as far as the law allows, to bring the land regulations into line with the policy in favour of which the people undoubtedly gave their verdict, irrespective of what the leader of the Opposition may think in regard to the ill that may be brought about in the event of our policy being brought into operation. The people of the State had a fair opportunity during the elections of hearing the policy of both sides on public platforms. At previous elections we unfortunately found we had not candidates in all the electorates, with the result that a good number of the people of the State were not able to hear anything with regard to the policy of the Labour party; but on this occasion

we were more fortunate, and had candidates in every electorate but two; and the people having the opportunity of hearing our policy as well as that of our opponents, gave their verdict in an emphatic manner in favour of this side, which then sat in Opposition. As my friend has said, I have pronounced, both during the election and since, that so far as the Government are concerned there would be no confiscation and no stagnation. I want to repeat those words. There will be no confiscation and no stagnation so far as this Government is concerned. We had a very busy time in going from place to place in the State during the elections repudiating some of the statements of my friend opposite, together with those of some of his colleagues, in regard to that part of our policy which they termed confiscation. We have heard from the leader of the Opposition something with regard to my statements on the policy proposed by the then Government to amend the Income Tax Act, and I want to say in justification of my statement that I did not take the trouble to look up the Queensland Act, because I had before me in the columns of the *West Australian* a statement made by a follower of the then Government in the person of Mr. Quinlan, the ex-Speaker. I took him as a guide, because he spoke in the plural. He did not say, "I favour"; he said, "The Government--we propose to do certain things"; and he used figures which we afterwards used. When Mr. Quinlan made this statement it was not contradicted by the Premier. It was not until we had assumed the position taken up by Mr. Quinlan that the Premier denied that it was proposed to amend the Income Tax Act on the line spoken of by Mr. Quinlan and myself; and the leader of the Opposition is incorrect in saying that I did not correct my statements when he said they were incorrect. The member for Williams-Narrogin can tell this House that when I spoke at Narrogin, as well as at other places, I took the opportunity of telling the people that apparently I was wrong with regard to my interpretation of the proposals of the Government in this direction. I went on to say, however,

that when any Government proposed to change the incidence of taxation they should make their statements full and complete in order that the people should fully understand how the taxation was going to bear on them; but the then leader of the Government merely made mention of the fact that they proposed to amend the Income Tax Act on the lines of the Queensland Act. He did not say it would be on the lines of the existing Queensland Act or on the 1902 Act. Of course, he was afterwards justified in asserting it was on the lines of the later Queensland Act that they proposed to amend the Income Tax Act of this State. I said, moreover, having been corrected, I was prepared to accept the position made clear by Mr. Wilson, and I made that announcement after he had denied it. But what do we find? He talks about manliness in accepting a denial. I took the first opportunity the newspapers would give me of telling the people something with regard to the lying statements of some of our opponents in connection with our land policy; but when I did that, the present leader of the Opposition was not manly enough to withdraw his statements when I gave them denial, but went on repeating them to the eve of the election. I have a leaflet issued by the Liberal League of Western Australia; it is No. 9; it was issued fairly freely in the Sussex electorate, and the statements contained in it were never denied by the then Premier. It says—

The nationalisation of all lands implies that in some way or other the existing titles will be seized by the State, nor have you any security that there will be just compensation or any compensation. Ultimately all farmers will be tenants of the State.

Again, we have a statement made by the ex-Minister for Lands, when he was supposed to have first of all outlined the policy of the then Government, and these are his words with regard to the Labour party—

They were pledged to the non-alienation of Crown lands and the nationalisation of all lands; they were pledged to take every man's farm from him, to

take from the owner of the smallest building block the land which he occupied.

That was said early in the campaign, but on the eve of the election the following appeal was issued to the people by the Premier—

Voting the Labour ticket means financial chaos and stagnation throughout the State, the undoing of the good work that has been done and consequent commercial depression, the despoiling of the people of their rightful heritage by substituting leaseholds for freeholds.

This was notwithstanding the fact that I had publicly denied it was not the intention of this party to interfere with any existing rights or any contracts entered into by the Crown with citizens. And yet Mr. Wilson in the face of that told the people that we were going to despoil them of their rightful heritage by substituting leasehold for freehold. If it was not reported that I corrected my statement it was not my fault; the fault was with the newspapers. In this case my quarrel is with the leader of the Opposition because he could not have failed to see my denial. I want to take this opportunity of saying that if there was any lack of manliness during the elections it was shown by the leader of the Opposition and his former colleagues. Let us now deal with the interjection made by the member for Murray. "What does nationalisation mean?" I have here a letter which was supposed to have been written to the Press, or a statement which was supposed to have been given to the Press by the ex-Minister for Lands. I say "supposed" because I know that during the election his closest friend was a civil servant who was paid from the funds of this State, an ex-journalist or newspaper reporter of one of our metropolitan journals, and I cannot disbelieve that most of the interviews which were given to the Press were supplied by that ex-journalist. This is what Mr. Mitchell is reported to have said—"Mr. Kirkwood says that they will be ultimately nationalised. Ultimately, Webster, notwithstanding"—the member for Northam puts himself forward as a greater authority—

"will certainly mean within three years if the Labour party get into power, as the candidates now standing are pledged to the nationalisation of land." I took the opportunity of looking up, during the elections, what was meant by the various terms according to Webster. I do not look upon the member for Northam as an authority on the English language any more than I consider myself one, so I went to Webster and I found that "non-alienation" means, "not to part with or transfer, convey or give away lands possessed by the Crown—the people." "View" occurring in the sentence, "With a view to ultimate nationalisation" means "the act of seeing or beholding; something looked towards or forming the subject of consideration." The word "ultimate" means "furthest, most remote, or final; extreme; such that we cannot go beyond; incapable of further resolution or analysis. "Nationalise" means "to make the common property of the people as a whole." It seems to me, too, that this is the correct interpretation, namely, not to give away any lands possessed by the Crown and to look towards the final result of making all lands the common property of the people as a whole. As we were told to keep to the proper interpretation of the English language, I am justified in using Webster in preference to accepting the meaning put upon the words by the member for Northam. I have also been taken to task for my reference to the alleged proposal of the Government to hand over freeholds of land at present leased to the pastoralists in the North-West, the timber combine in the south-west, and the mining companies on the goldfields, but, having been asked to keep to the correct English I think it is only fair that our opponents should also keep to the correct English as well. I discovered that the former Government believed in the private ownership of lands and that they were opposed to the leasehold system. I then took the opportunity of pointing out what it meant if that policy were put into operation. I did not say the Government were going to do it in three years as some of our opponents have declared, I merely as-

serted what would happen if they put into operation private ownership instead of leasehold. We have 166,000,000 acres held under pastoral lease, 515,000 acres held under timber lease, and 100,000 acres held under mining lease. This makes a total of 168 million acres at present leased to the various companies. That being the case, I contend that I was justified in making that statement and the Minister was only called upon to do what I have had to do, namely, to deny the statement, and when it was once denied I took the opportunity to say that I never for a moment believed that any Government would be foolhardy enough to submit such a proposal. If we are to be kept to the correct interpretation of the English language with regard to the effect of our policy, I hold that our opponents should also be compelled to do likewise. I am not going to refer in my reply to the remarks of the leader of the Opposition with regard to the present land regulations, I am going to leave that to the Minister for Lands, and may I say the same with regard to the criticism levelled at the construction of certain railways, which criticism will be replied to by the Minister for Works. I do, however, take exception to the statement made by the leader of the Opposition that I have in any way trimmed my sails on the question of the land regulations. It is true that I made certain remarks at Fremantle, and I have them here because I anticipated that the leader of the Opposition would make some reference to them. I said that if our proposals were going to have the effect of interference we would bring about an alteration. Surely that is a fair statement to make; there is no trimming of sails here. We believe that our policy will not interfere with legitimate land settlement: we believe it will bring about legitimate land settlement and if it does not do so, we will take the necessary precaution to make alterations. This is not trimming our sails in the slightest regard. I told them at the same time and it was not reported, that the policy would not interfere with the existing institutions or the effective settlement of our lands. Again we are told that I have made a

promise regarding the re-appointment of the Public Service Commissioner. I have here a statement given by Mr. Gregory to the Press. Mr. Gregory was Acting Premier at the time this appointment was offered to Mr. Jull. He says—

In reference to Mr. Scaddan's remarks about "a monstrous thing," it would seem that he was under some promise that Mr. Jull would not be re-appointed, and after reading the Premier's statement I can only come to the conclusion that this is one of the many promises which it was well known he made prior to the elections.

Let me challenge Mr. Gregory or anyone else to show me in any newspaper or bring along anyone who heard me from a public platform or even privately make the statement that we proposed not to re-appoint Mr. Jull. I may go so far as to say that I have heard it said it was part of our policy that Mr. Jull should not be re-appointed. I absolutely refused to adopt any such attitude. I said all we were obliged to do was that the public service should not be called upon to appeal from Mr. Jull's decision to Mr. Jull himself. That is the only statement I, or even any of my colleagues, made during the whole of the campaign in connection with the Public Service Commissioner. I am not aware that any member on this side of the House ever made any different statement. In the statement that I gave to the Press I expressed astonishment because I was not aware at the time what had happened. The first intimation I had was through the medium of the *West Australian*, at 9 o'clock on the evening of Thursday last, the day of the Legislative Council elections. I was communicated with by telephone and asked to confirm a statement that Mr. Jull had been re-appointed Public Service Commissioner. I told the *West Australian* that I had no knowledge of the matter and I got into communication with my secretary through the medium of the telephone and he confirmed the statement that the appointment had been offered to Mr. Jull for a further term of seven years, and that, so far as he knew, Mr. Jull had accepted it. I said that it was a monstrous thing that

the Government, on the eve of a general election should offer a re-appointment for a period of seven years to the Public Service Commissioner or to anyone else, and moreover, which is the most outrageous part of it, that during the whole course of the general elections and especially during the elections when the Acting Premier was standing for a seat in the Legislative Council, no reference was made to the matter, and that it was not made public until after these elections had been held. Had the matter been made public earlier it might have had a different result in connection with these elections, that is, so far as increasing the majority of one of the candidates was concerned. I still hold that no Government should offer re-appointments practically twelve months before the expiration of the first term and right on the eve of a general election when there might be a change of Government. I am not called upon to express any opinion as to the advisability of appointing Mr. Jull when his term of office expired. I do not propose to do so. I have made no statement whatever about Mr. Jull's suitability for the position, and I am going to repeat here that the action of the past Government in making that appointment when they did, under the conditions they did, and without having referred to it in any way, was an outrageous action on their part. The leader of the Opposition said that he trusted the Government did not propose to give full political and public rights to the civil servants. Let me assure the hon. member that we do propose to do so when given the opportunity. I have always held the view, and every member on this side of the House has held the view also, that the civil service should have the same rights, political and public, as every other individual of the community. If the members of the service, however, misuse their positions as public servants then the Government will have the opportunity of dealing with them in a proper and emphatic manner. But we have no right to prevent the civil servant from expressing his opinion on political topics any more than we have the right to ex-

clude the man who may be working in a mine or in a factory from doing so. The leader of the Opposition complains that there is no reference in the Governor's Speech to certain railway proposals. Let me say at once that when we met Parliament we had only been about a fortnight in control of the various departments and we came to the conclusion that it was desirable owing to what had transpired in the past to give the closest possible attention to the railways already authorised before committing ourselves in any way. Unfortunately this State has been compelled to find thousands of pounds to make surveys which have not been of any use, because it has often been found that a survey after having proceeded a certain distance has been stopped and the route changed. We hold that once having made a survey, the line should be constructed over that surveyed route. We are not going to commit the State to any survey until we are satisfied that the line will be in the best interests of the district and the country as a whole. Therefore, the leader of the Opposition need not complain. We will bring down Bills for the construction of certain agricultural and mining railways during this session, but I am not inclined at this stage to commit the Government to any one or more proposals. It is our intention to declare public works only when we have established a standing Public Works Committee. We are going on with that, and I may say we are pressing our engineers in the Public Works Department, as perhaps they have never been pressed previously. Is it not a fact that while our opponents were boasting in the agricultural districts of what they proposed to do for the people of those districts, they had not done anything at all beyond putting minutes on the files? We have been in our departments only about four weeks, and we have not put very much on the files in those four weeks, but we have commenced the supply of water in districts which have been languishing for water ever since last summer, whilst the other Government talked about it from public platforms and did nothing else. We are doing other things also to relieve the

agricultural districts, and when the public recognise what we are about in this respect they will realise that they have put into power a Government determined to conserve the best interests of the State generally. There are many works which have been brought under our notice during the last few weeks, works which have been promised by our predecessors, in some cases for three years, while all that has been done has been to write minutes and build up large files. We have already shelved a number of files by deciding to do the work, but while our predecessors boasted about their public works policy of the past, it has been largely one of making work for clerks by building up large files. I could mention works which have been held up for two or three years, and on which nothing has been done during that time; yet already we have put them into operation, and others will be attended to as quickly as possible. The leader of the Opposition complains of our proposal to introduce a Bill to reduce Ministerial salaries back to the old level, that is, by providing in the Payment of Members Bill that a Minister shall not draw his salary as a member. Let me explain here that when the motion for increase of payment of members was carried on the 19th October I was told that, as leader of the Opposition, I would be consulted with regard to the amount to be provided in the Bill. I did not see that draft of the measure, but the then Premier and the Minister for Lands approached me, not once but on several occasions, and told me what they proposed to do in that measure, namely, to provide £300 for members and £500 for the leader of the Opposition; but they never on any occasion mentioned the fact that they were going to provide also an increase of £300 on their own salaries. It was not until the Bill had passed the second reading—I happened to be out of the Chamber when the Premier made the statement about increasing Ministerial salaries also—that my attention was drawn to the point by my colleague, the Minister for Lands. One can easily understand how it was arrived at; there was no mention of it in the Bill, but the section from the

old Act, providing that Ministers should not draw salaries as members, has been dropped, and so the thing was done. I am not going to discuss the question of whether Ministers are adequately paid, but our object is to deal fairly with the taxpayers in this matter. Moreover there is no need for the leader of the Opposition to be proud of the fact that he did this thing, or of the manner in which he did it. It was done by using the positions of certain members of the House who had pledged themselves to the increase of members' salaries, and who, in effect, were told that they would get the whole Bill or nothing at all. The Ministers increased their own salaries because they imagined that members would not complain, as those members would be afraid of losing the Bill altogether. I made no reference to it except when I was asked the question during the campaign. Then I said we were going to give the ratepayers an opportunity of saying whether or not Ministers were adequately paid, and that we were going to introduce a Bill to reduce Ministers' salaries, whether it was advisable or not.

Mr. Harper: Why not have a referendum on the subject?

The PREMIER: The hon. member can move for that. We are going to introduce the Bill, and we are not going to take up the attitude of increasing our salaries, or members' salaries, until at least the people have a full knowledge of what is being done. It was generally anticipated that the first Bill to come down after the 1908 elections would be one to reduce Ministerial salaries; because that was a definite promise given by the then Premier, and repeated by his colleague, the present leader of the Opposition. I say again, the leader of the Opposition repeated, during that election campaign, that Ministerial salaries would be reduced. The mere opinion expressed by the leader of the Opposition when speaking on the Bill last session, and quoted by him this afternoon, was not a definite statement, but merely an expression of opinion that Ministers were not adequately paid. I hold that it was a breach of faith between

the Government and the people to permit that Bill to pass, as they did last session. With regard to it being made retrospective, it is true I did that. I took the opportunity, as leader of the Opposition, of causing that increase to be paid from January last.

Mr. S. Stubbs: The people did not want an increase of members' salaries.

The PREMIER: Let me tell the member for Wagin that we took the responsibility of moving the resolution for the increase of salaries, we took the responsibility of supporting the Government when they brought down the Bill, and I took the responsibility, as leader of the Opposition, of making the whole thing retrospective. Yet here we are to-day with 34 members on this side of the House and 16 on that. That is the people's answer to the hon. member's interjection. I hold the opinion to-day that members of this Chamber are not overpaid with £300, if they attend to the business of the country.

Mr. Bolton: They are underpaid.

Mr. Harper: What about the Legislative Council?

The PREMIER: If the hon. member requires explanation in regard to the Upper House I can only say that we agreed with the Council that they should take the responsibility of increasing their own salaries, the same as we did here. They took that responsibility, and we have not to answer for their action; the members of the Legislative Council can answer for it themselves. Let me say further I do not propose to-day to deal with the condition of the finances. It will not be long before I am called upon to deliver my first Budget Speech, when I will take the opportunity of dealing fully with the question. Let me say, too, that they are not so buoyant as the leader of the Opposition and the newspapers would have the people believe; if so, I would like to know why each month of the present financial year, except one, has shown a deficit on our revenue account. Many days had not expired after the general elections before the leader of the Opposition himself was inquiring about the possibility of placing a loan in London. That

gives an impression as to the state of the Loan Account, as well as of the Revenue Account. I have here an exact copy of a minute put up by the Under Treasurer on the 15th September for the information of the then Colonial Treasurer. In it the Under Treasurer, basing it on revenue and expenditure for two months, estimated that for the four months ending 31st December next the revenue would be £1,357,657, and he said the revenue for the last six months of last year had been £1,934,458, and that, therefore, the revenue for the current financial year might be estimated at £3,773,642, and, consequently, there would be a shortage of £129,995 on the year's transactions, or a net deficit of £116,697. That was an estimate based on the revenue and expenditure of the then expired months, and anticipating about the same amount of revenue as in the last six months of the previous year, and not taking into account the increases we have had to pay, which were granted by our predecessors.

Mr. George: It is nothing to what you will have to pay.

The PREMIER: Whatever we have to pay we are going to see that public servants receive a living wage, the same as others outside the service. When the leader of the Opposition speaks of the condition of the finances as he left them he forgets to say that he had committed the Treasury to pay certain increases to our civil servants. On the 30th September he wired to the Public Service Commissioner asking would it not be possible to make the increases granted to certain temporary officers apply as from the 1st July, the same as in the case of the permanent officers. And Mr. Jull replied—it was wanted for Donnybrook—that there was no reason why it should not be done. Mr. Wilson announced publicly at his meeting that these increases would be given as from the 1st July. This deficit was based without a knowledge of these increases to be given to the temporary officers in the public service, and we have had to find the money to pay the increases granted by our predecessors, which should have been paid prior to the general elections. Under these circum-

stances it will be urged that the condition of the finances were as we found them; but if we are going to give the true condition of affairs we must take that portion of salaries of public officers which will be paid during the succeeding six months of this year and add them to the deficit we found at the end of September. The Under Treasurer was not aware at the time he made that estimate that increases were to be granted to the men in the Railway Department, nor was it taken into account that there would be a falling-off in our Railway Revenue to the extent of some £50,000. These are all facts the people should know, because it will be urged against us that it has been due to our management of the finances and not to that of our predecessors. I do not desire to deal further with the matter. Let me say at once that the policy of the present Government is as announced at the general elections. We have made no promises that we are not prepared to carry out, but I am very doubtful if that could have been said by our opponents had they retained possession of the Treasury Benches. With regard to the promise made by the member for Bunbury, all that I understand the hon. member to have said is that the improvement of harbour facilities at Bunbury must receive the immediate attention of any Government, and that it would be necessary to get expert advice. That was a perfectly legitimate promise, and the same thing was said by the member for Fremantle regarding harbour extensions there. Let me admit that it is a problem that has to be solved very quickly. We will have to increase the facilities at Fremantle, but as laymen we have no right to express an opinion as to what are the facilities that should be provided. With regard to the other works that have been touched upon, we will have an opportunity of discussing them when the Bills are introduced. Although the proposals will mean a strain on the finances, we will have to face the position boldly. We believe that the State will prosper better under a sound financial policy, for we will have loan moneys expended only on reproductive works, and works which

are for the benefit of the country as a whole rather than for the benefit of a few Government followers. Therefore, we intend to push on with railways and public works in all parts of the State, and not in one particular section of the State. We are not concerned about giving privileges to one port or another, but we want to give to the people who are producing in the country an opportunity of getting their produce to the market with as cheap handling as possible. Let me assure the people of the State that we are going to carry on a progressive public works policy, and it will be on sound lines because we will have a Public Works Committee representative of both sides of this House and of both Chambers. This Committee will be able to deal with these questions as they arise, and the Government will be able to take the responsibility of asking Parliament to give them authority and provide the money. By this means we hope to avoid the opinion that prevailed in the past that a large section of the Government works were undertaken for political purposes. That is not right; these works should be carried out without any regard to the political colour of a constituency. The goldfields in the past have been shamefully neglected because they have consistently sent Labour members to Parliament, and to-day they have shown their disgust with that past treatment by returning a Labour member for every mining constituency. Even some of the agricultural constituencies have come to the decision that the Labour party is the real friend of the producers, and the one which is going to give them an opportunity of getting cheaper access to the market, and they have recognised that policy by returning two or three Labour members for agricultural districts. Although the majority of agricultural members are sitting in opposition, that will not prevent us from assisting our great agricultural industry.

Mr. Harper: Hear, hear.

The PREMIER: We are going to assist that industry in every way possible, and it will be difficult for even the member who interjected to make the people believe the statements made during the re-

cent elections about the policy of the then Opposition. The hon. member ought to be ashamed to sit in his place in view of the statements he published during the election.

Mr. Harper: I am not ashamed of one of them.

The PREMIER: The hon. member ought to be. On one show catalogue issued by an agricultural society he had such statements published that the society took the earliest opportunity of getting them pasted over.

Mr. Harper: I had nothing to do with that.

The PREMIER: All electioneering advertisements must be authorised by the candidate, and the hon. member is either responsible himself or he is responsible through the person to whom he gave authority. He as a candidate must take the full responsibility for what was published.

Mr. Harper: No; I do not.

The PREMIER: Then the hon. member is stating that his agents were guilty of a breach of the Electoral Act, and if he will go along to the Chief Electoral Officer and state to him what he is stating now, that he was not responsible for those advertisements, we will take action to prevent these people repeating such actions in the future, because they were an absolute disgrace. But I do not believe for a moment that the member for Pingelly will go to the Chief Electoral Officer and repeat the statement he is making to-day.

Mr. Harper: Yes, I will.

The PREMIER: Well, if he does so we will take prompt action. Whoever is responsible for making statements of that kind should be brought to account. Let me assure hon. members that we are not here for the purpose of merely making promises to the people without any desire to fulfil them. We are here because the people believe that our policy is in the interests of the State, and we are going to take every opportunity of putting that policy into operation both by legislation and by administration. So far as administration is concerned we have already commenced to do organising work in our

departments. Only last week I had brought before me a file which had grown to a thickness of fully six inches, dealing with a site for the proposed maternity home. It is all very well to put a thing off from time to time, but we are determined to establish a maternity home in the city of Perth, and attach maternity wards to country hospitals. The same thing applies in regard to a site for a sanatorium for consumptives. We are going to establish that sanatorium as quickly as possible. By prompt attention to these and other matters, I think that by the time the three years has expired the people will have such faith in the Labour Government that even our present opponents, if they want to return to Parliament, will have to attach themselves to the party on this side. I am reminded, however, that on a previous occasion it was stated that there will always be at least one member in Opposition for the sake of drawing the salary which is provided for the leader of the Opposition. It is our desire to attend to the interests of the people of this State and not to give consideration to any one party at the expense of another. Hon. members representing agricultural districts can rest assured that those districts will get justice the same as any other portions of the State. I regret to hear of the illness of the leader of the Opposition; I understand that for two or three days after the opening of the session he was confined to his bed. I hope that he will recover in order that his quarrel in future may be with the Government and not with the people. On this occasion he has blamed the people, but if he cannot bring up a better case against the Government than he has brought against the people then I do not greatly admire his chance of success.

Mr. GEORGE (Murray-Wellington): I take this, the first opportunity of congratulating you, Mr. Speaker, upon your accession to the Chair, and I trust that your duties will be not only pleasant to yourself but instructive to the members who sit under you. I am not disposed to fight the election over again; seven or eight weeks of

excitement such as we have had must, I think, be perfectly satisfying to both sides, and the only reference I think it necessary to make at this stage is to draw the attention of the leader of the Government to what I consider was the unsatisfactory state of the rolls upon which the election was fought.

Mr. A. A. Wilson: Whose was the fault?

Mr. GEORGE: I care not whose was the fault, but I am satisfied that the rolls contained names which had no right to be there, and it was not the fault of the possessors of those names that they were not allowed to vote in different parts of the country. So far as the Government are concerned, they can well take into consideration the necessity of seeing that the rolls are what they purport to be, namely, a list of names of persons qualified and possessing the right to vote. I do not think we shall ever have purity of election until the present system is altered and we have some system of electoral rights, and the people thoroughly understand the responsibility they are taking in applying to vote at the polling places. In regard to the Governor's Speech, I am pleased to see that the Government are endeavouring to reassure the people of the country of their bona fides in regard to assisting the agricultural and mining industries, and to reassure the people that they have some abiding interest in those two great industries. So far as agriculture is concerned, we are at the present time passing under a little bit of a cloud in the wheat areas, but I believe that it is only for the season, and that Western Australia in its wheat country has a mighty and successful future before it. In connection with the mining industry, I agree with the Government that they should assist the prospector as much as possible. There is not the slightest doubt that we have not yet exhausted the possibilities of the mining industry. Some little reference has been made by the leader of the Opposition, and also by the Premier, to the present Government's announcement in regard to land settlement. While I quite agree with the view given out by the Minister for Lands that it is

undesirable for the land speculator to have a prosperous career in this State, and while I am satisfied that every cent there is in the land is needed by the man on the land to assist him to make his career, at the same time I am afraid that the regulation which the Minister has promulgated may act prejudicially to bona fide and honest settlers. I know that the Minister has said he is prepared to consider every case on its merits, but I fear that his time will not be sufficient to enable him to do that. A case came under my notice recently in which a settler died and his partner endeavoured to raise money in order to buy the widow and children out, but he could not do that because under the new regulations the security above that given to the bank was not considered sufficient. Lots of people have settled on the land believing that it would be an easy way of making a living and of achieving fortune, but hope does not build a farm. Even money does not make a farm successful; knowledge only comes by experience, and experience takes time and money. Many people settle on the land and find that hope decreases when misfortunes come along, and they may be discouraged and desire to get away, but unless they are allowed to sell their holdings they must leave behind them everything they have expended and go away with empty pockets. The Minister no doubt would make arrangements by which a sale might be effected, but there are not only a dozen cases of that sort; there are hundreds of them in this country, and there will be hundreds more. Farming is no more an industry than any other, in which by merely engaging in it people can make a success. And as in all callings there are people who are successful, so there are people who are not successful. Those who are unsuccessful, even after an honest effort has been made, should not be barred from parting with their holdings if they can do so, and if someone is willing to take on the burden. The Premier spoke about his party's programme with regard to the non-alienation of lands, and the ultimate nationalisation of all land. I hope before the session is closed

it may be possible for us to have a debate on that subject, so that we may really know exactly what is meant. I must confess, after a perusal of scores of speeches made by various members on both sides that I am not clear, even after the quotations from Webster, as to what is the meaning of the Labour party. The ultimate nationalisation of all lands, to my mind, can only mean that at some date, whether it be sooner or later, the State will acquire the possession of all land. If that is what the Premier means let us have it in words that we certainly can understand. It does not matter whether it is to be in three years, or 30 years, or even 300 years, if the objective of the party which the Premier has the honour to lead is the ultimate acquisition of all land from everyone, let us understand it so that we may know where we are; do not let us cloak it with specious references in the way that has been attempted. I notice that the Government intend to go on with the building of railways. I am rather glad to notice that, and, if they will permit me to make a suggestion I would urge them to see that the railways are not handed to the Commissioner merely as lines to be run, but that proper provision should be made for rolling stock when they are handed over. The policy ever since I have had anything to do with politics, has been to ask for an authorisation for a railway line, and there has never been within my memory adequate provision made for engines or rolling stock to run over those lines. It only requires a little consideration to show that if a railway is built close to the capital the work can be done with fewer trucks than would be the case if the railway were say, 200 miles away. For every 50 or 100 miles away from the main centre, allowance must be made for a larger percentage of rolling stock. I am satisfied that if the Minister for Railways will go into this matter with the heads of the department he will provide each railway with its proper equipment of engines and trucks. The Premier made some reference to increases to railway servants. I am not going to enter into a

debate as to whether those increases are correct or not; the Government have taken the responsibility, and the cost of it they will discover as time goes on. I wish to take the opportunity of saying that when the minimum wage is made 9s. a day, the minimum for any man of mature age employed on the railways, they will have to take into consideration those men who have been receiving more than that; those men will expect to receive the same ratio of increase. It will perhaps not be out of place for me to refer to the position of the salaried staff on the railways. The Minister will find on inquiry that there are many officials in responsible positions who are actually receiving less money than the men whom they are bossing. Take, for instance, the station masters. I can give the hon. member a number of instances where it will be found that the station master is working for 10½d. and 11d. an hour, while the porters whom he is superintending are being paid 1s. 1½d. an hour. It will also be found that the porters work eight hours a day while the station masters are doing 12 hours. If we are to have, as we understand from the Premier, an absolute levelling up, this matter should be taken into consideration. There is another matter I would like to refer to and that is with regard to the classification of the officers on the railway. During the course of my career I have always been fortunate in having employers who have recognised any extra duty that I may have performed; that principle has been recognised also in the agreement with the tradesmen of the Railway Department of this State, but, so far as officers are concerned, in not only their recent classification but the classification which preceded it, the classifications were made and the men who had done all the work in the time of stress, and who should have received the reward, were shifted to places where the salaries were lower, and new men were put in their places at the higher salary. I have one instance in my mind, namely, at Collie. It may be known that my place in the South-West

is near Collie and that I have the opportunity of seeing the manner in which the work is done in that particular part. There was a great rush in connection with the shipment of Collie coal some months ago, and the station masters at Collie and at Brunswick Junction worked the traffic admirably, and none could have found fault with it; indeed they could only express admiration at the manner in which the work was done, without trouble and economically. A classification committee went around and arrived at Collie, and decided that the Collie station was worth a remuneration of £220 a year for the work which was being done; yet the man who had been doing the work was receiving £180 a year, and he, in due course, was shifted away from there to another station where he could only get £180, and someone else was brought into the position to receive £220. To my mind the man who had borne the heat and burden of the day should have received recognition.

The Minister for Mines: It may be that the man who was sent there was a senior officer.

Mr. GEORGE: Exactly, but that is not a solitary instance; I am prepared to give others. There is a very good precedent with regard to the question of an officer performing higher duties and receiving pay for it in the agreement with the men; even prior to that the gentlemen who carried on the management of the railways before I became Commissioner in 1902, namely, the present Commissioner, and Mr. Douglas, who carried on the duties as Acting Chief Traffic Manager, received at my hands, with the concurrence of the then Government, a bonus for the time that they performed the duties of the higher offices. To my mind, in private life, if we find a man has carried us through, we recognise his efforts and I see no reason why similar recognition should not be given on the railways. I notice with regard to the water supply of the State that it is considered to be sufficiently important to be made a separate department; I think that is a wise move. I do not know whether it was proposed by the predecessors of the present Government, and though I do not care

who initiated it, I think it is a wise thing, but I hope it will not mean the creation of another portfolio. I think the State has sufficient to pay for the cost of government without adding further to its financial responsibility in that way. There is one thing I regret which does not appear in this Speech, and the hon. member for Bunbury will agree with me when I refer to it, that is the question of irrigation. Irrigation in the South-West is a matter which during the last 12 months has come into prominence, firstly, at Roelands and secondly at Harvey, and I am quite convinced, from my intimate knowledge of the south-west, that this irrigation scheme will well repay the attention of the Government, and any money that may be expended on it. If the Government will carry out the scheme which has already been surveyed they will find that the people will be willing to pay for it; they do not desire that this should be done as an act of charity; they are prepared to pay for it. Under these circumstances I am sure the member for Bunbury will be willing to assist me in bringing this about. I notice too that the Government are going to appoint a Public Works Committee. It is now about 15 years since I spoke on that subject in the old Chamber, and I am glad to see that time has brought about what I consider to be a very proper thing. The Public Works Committee was regarded by some of the former Governments as a body which would take away from Ministers responsibilities which they should shoulder. If it did mean that, I would be against it, but what is the responsibility that a Minister does shoulder? The Premier has spoken about the leader of the Opposition in regard to finance, but where is the responsibility? What can you do? Even supposing that the leader of the Opposition, when Premier, had bungled the finances and lost money for the country, unless he put it to his own private use you could not put him in Fremantle gaol. The responsibility consists of simply sitting in a chair in the House and being bullied and pitched into by members. The people who are responsible for electing Ministers can put them out of public life and that is practi-

cally the end of it. I believe this Public Works Committee will do a great amount of good and they will have an opportunity to investigate matters more closely than Ministers could possibly do or have the time to do. And I think that when that is done and the Public Works Committee have decided on the course that should be taken it will be for the House to uphold them, and not to pull them to pieces as we have seen done in regard to the war of routes, and not to allow outside influence to be brought to bear. The reduction of Ministerial salaries is also mentioned, and when the Bill comes before the House I shall have an opportunity of saying something, and I shall have a few remarks to make on the Premier's Speech, which I desire to reply to. There is another matter I should like to have seen in the Speech, but no doubt it is incubating at the present time, and that is the Licensing Act Amendment, the local option that was talked about, the business that caused the country to be inundated by circulars from intemperate temperance people, that caused candidates on the hustings to be asked questions that should not be asked of them; questions put by the temperance party who did not know how to be temperate in language and temperate in their manner. I received a circular from some of the temperance societies, and it was one of the most impertinent circulars ever sent to a public man. I did not reply to it. The candidate was asked to reply whether he was in favour of this thing or the other, and if he did not reply it would be taken as "no," and they would act accordingly. As far as I am concerned they acted accordingly, but I am here. Both sides of the House could well express an opinion on this matter of interfering with the freedom of candidates and trying to coerce their judgment and views, either by the cold water people on the one side or the beer sellers on the other, who sent out circulars holding a threat over a candidate and trying to force him at the point of the bayonet. No one in the country desires temperance more than I do, but I refuse to be coerced by beer advocates or water drinkers.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): You got a circular from the other side too.

Mr. GEORGE: I did, and I treated both circulars alike. I received other circulars as well. One from a social purity society and I replied to that, because it was sent to me by a lady whom I knew and who knew how to write a letter in a ladylike style, giving the views of the society. I do not think it is necessary for me to say more on the Address-in-reply as we have to get through the business of the country. It is well, perhaps, that there should be a change of seats at times, because it leads one to see things from a different point of view. We may get our opinions narrowed if we continually sit on the one side, therefore we congratulate our friends on the other side in having an opportunity of seeing how things look from the other side of the House, and it is to be hoped that their views will be so broadened before the next general election that instead of their being two parties fighting one against the other, that we shall have two parties with one object, and that the best interests of the country in which we live.

Mr. TURVEY (Swan): I rise to support the motion so ably and eloquently moved by the member for Bunbury on the Address-in-reply, and I would briefly at the outset refer to a remark made by the member for Murray-Wellington, who said that he was pleased to think that some of the members of the late Opposition had now an opportunity of viewing from this (Government) side of the House what such a small party look like to them. However, I wish to say that I desire to take the opportunity, and I believe it is customary for new members to rise and add their quota to the Address-in-reply, and while I believe it is desirable that new members should be given the opportunity in this direction, at the same time I do not think it is desirable that the time of the House should be occupied to any great length over the Address-in-reply. I, personally, would prefer to see the Government, whether labour or liberal, in power, do its level best to dispense with this custom of lengthening out the motion on the Address-in-reply, and to settle

right down to the business of legislation as speedily as possible. I am here, returned by the people to give my support to what I consider a progressive policy, a progressive policy indeed outlined by the Labour party, and not a policy that would err on the side of retrogression. I feel this evening somewhat at a disadvantage in speaking after the leader of the Opposition and the Premier. It has been said that the sun shines with a subdued light after the king has gone. We have had two kings this afternoon, therefore, perhaps I am speaking at a disadvantage on this occasion. Dealing with the Speech of His Excellency, I am pleased, indeed, that special attention has been given by the Government to land settlement, and I desire to congratulate the Minister for Lands on the attempt which he has already made to put a stop to what are termed purely speculative dealings in land. I feel sure that though, perhaps, there may be some apparent injustices, I am quite content that the Minister for Lands will deal with each case on its merits, and when a case of injustice is inflicted, or about to be inflicted on any settler and it is placed before the Minister, he at any rate, and I am sure the Government, will give that case earnest consideration, and I will use my best efforts in the House at any time to endeavour, at least I shall use my influence to have the Minister deal as leniently as he possibly can with pioneer settlers. I feel quite sure that it is not the intention of the Minister to deal unjustly with any settler, but it is the intention of the Minister, and he will receive my support at all times, to deal in as harsh a manner as possible with what are termed purely speculative people. In regard to land settlement, it is cheerful to note the healthy optimism displayed in His Excellency's Speech regarding the mining industry, but I note there is but brief reference to the coal mining industry of the State. I hope that the brief reference to that industry does not signify that the Government do not look with any degree of unimportance on the coal mining industry of the State. Perhaps in making a brief reference to the coal mining

industry they have done so in order to keep in unison with the member for Collic (Mr. A. A. Wilson) who is rather of diminutive stature himself. I am pleased also to note that reference is made to the building of homes for the people, and when the Government do take this in hand, or the Minister concerned does place before the people of Western Australia his proposals in this direction, I hope that he will, in framing his scheme, take into consideration the benefits that are to be derived by those who live in what are known as the outer suburban districts, in the hills districts particularly, lying outside the metropolitan area, and in connection with this may I be permitted to refer to the advantages to be possessed by giving opportunities to city dwellers to build homes for themselves in the hills districts, or in what are now known as the outer suburban districts. I refer now particularly to such lines as the Kalamunda district line, the Smith's Mill district line, and the Armadale district line, and I hope the Minister for Railways will take an opportunity of providing an adequate train service for the people of these districts in order to give the city workers, and the dwellers of the city an opportunity, after their day's work, to get away out of the town so as to spend their evenings and their week-ends in these districts and derive the benefit that is to be derived from the enervating atmosphere of the districts I have mentioned. His Excellency's Speech also contains reference to the fact that Ministers have under consideration the routes of several railways. There is one railway I hope the Ministry will give earnest and favourable consideration to when considering these various routes. I refer to the Narrogin or Brookton to Armadale or Kelmscott railway. A report has been furnished by the Advisory Board, and no doubt it will be laid on the Table of the House shortly. I feel sure that the report will bear out my statement this evening, that if this line is built it will open up some of the best agricultural areas in Western Australia. There is one omission from His Excellency's Speech that, perhaps, I may be pardoned for referring to. No reference whatever is made

to the important matter of forestry. I hope that the omission does not signify that the Government intend to neglect, or have overlooked the importance of the reafforestation of Western Australia. There is another matter also that, perhaps, I may draw attention to this afternoon. No reference whatever is made in His Excellency's Speech to the creation of a State Export Department. This is a matter that particularly concerns the electorate which I represent; I refer now particularly to the fruit industry. Any remarks of mine on this subject might, perhaps, be received with a certain amount of opposition from some members on this side and members on the other side, in so far that it is believed by some that it is not at all necessary that there should be any export of fruit from Western Australia at the present time. I do not agree with that contention. I realise that Western Australian fruit has already secured a very high reputation in the London market, and I believe that good reputation should be maintained at all risks, and I believe it is the duty of the Government to bring about the creation of a State Export Department, or in the meantime to see that the Government exercise a greater supervision over the export of fruit so that with the larger expansion of this industry—and I am of opinion that the fruit industry is destined to be one of the biggest industries of the State, and believing that, I should be lacking in my duty to my constituents as well as to the people of Western Australia if I did not attempt to impress on Ministers the necessity for seeing that the Government should exercise the strictest supervision over the export of fruit, because I believe as the industry expands, and with the rush of fruit to the metropolitan area, or in the case of export, with the rush of fruit to the boat side, in all the hurry and bustle it is not at all likely that private enterprise would deal with this industry as the State could and the reputation of the State for fruit will be damaged. Therefore I believe it is in the best interests of the State that the Government should take this matter in hand at the earliest

opportunity. I believe also had the Government taken the matter in hand before and had there been a State Export Department we should not have seen happen what did happen last season, when some of the finest fruit produced in Western Australia arrived in the English markets when the Continental fruit was being brought there, the consequence of which was that growers received for some of their best fruit grown in this State a net return of from 1s. to 2s. per case. In the interests of the producer and the consumer it is necessary that a State Export Department should be created. At the same time I wish to emphasise this fact that I am of opinion that under an effective system of distribution whereby the consumer and the producer can be brought together the population of Western Australia will be sufficient to consume for some time most of the fruit produced in this State. It is necessary that the Government should take in hand the bringing about of a more effective system of distribution, and I believe one thing that would tend to bring that about speedily would be the creation of open markets. I am pleased to note reference has been made to the fact that it is the intention of the Government to bring about the betterment of the conditions prevailing in the public service. There are many temporary hands in almost every branch of the Government service and they received at the hands of the late Government very unjust treatment. Some of these men were in their positions as temporary hands for periods of from five to eight years, and carried out their duties with the greatest ability and credit to themselves and credit to the State; but not only were they kept on as temporary hands for these long periods of five to eight years, but during the whole of that period some of them did not receive a shilling rise in salary notwithstanding the good services they rendered their State. Reference was made by the member for Murray-Wellington to the fact that he knew certain station-masters who had been removed to stations of lower classification. Evidently the classification of the station was carried out and

not the classification of the man. This is a matter that does not only concern the railway service, it also concerns every branch of the civil service. I know of many teachers in the Education Department who have not had a bad report or a black mark against them and who are known as men of skill and ability as teachers, and who to-day are carrying out their work and have borne the heat and burden of the day, but yet are in the humiliating position of seeing some of the pupils they taught in school placed in charge of schools to-day and receiving higher salaries than themselves. I would not wonder at it if they had not proved their ability as teachers. The trouble in the Education Department is that too much attention has been paid to the literary attainments and scholastic abilities of the men engaged in the service and not to their skill and ability as teachers. I hope under the new Minister for Education these anomalies will be removed, and I look to him to effect reforms very badly needed in the department. We have had the leader of the Opposition and the ex-Minister for Education at conferences addressing gatherings of teachers four or five hundred in number, and asking the teachers to accept their word that if they did not get their reward so far as remuneration from the State was concerned, at any rate they would get their reward in the hereafter for the just and noble work they were carrying on. That is all very well, but it is a poor return indeed to offer those men and women who are asked to go out into the backblocks of our country to mould the minds of the rising generation of this grand State of ours. But it is a grand and noble work, and it is a work too high a value cannot be set on, and it is a work for which indeed a higher rate of remuneration should be given.

Mr. HEITMANN: Hear, hear! They will get it.

Mr. TURVEY: I am pleased to hear that, and I hope not only that the Government will make the promise to the teachers and carry it into effect, but also that it will receive the support of Opposition members. The trouble in the past

was the teachers stood still as a body and did not ventilate their grievances. Sufferance has been the badge of their tribe, consequently they have had to suffer for it. I want to refer to the establishment of the State secondary school. It was a move in the right direction, but I hope that the time is not far distant when the fees in connection with that school will be abolished so that when we have our free University we will have the system of education complete. Another matter I may be pardoned referring to at this juncture is the cost of books to the parents. It affects the people of the State, and particularly the poorer people. We speak about free education, but I can tell hon. members, as a teacher lately employed in the Education Department, I know only too well what the cost has been to many of the poorer parents of this State. Many a pound have I as a teacher—and I am voicing what has been done by many teachers throughout Western Australia—many a pound have I spent myself simply because I had my heart in my work and love for the children; I dipped my hand into my own pocket when the parents were poor, and, out of the miserable pittance I and other teachers received, paid for books that the State expected the parents to provide. If we speak of free education to the children of the State, let it be free, and let us abolish these charges that have been made for books; because they are charges that amount to a considerable cost indeed per annum.

Mr. Heitmann: In South Australia they are giving free books.

Mr. TURVEY: I am glad to hear it, and I hope the time is not far distant when that practice will be followed here. I hope the new Minister will pay the teachers the salaries commensurate with the work they are doing, and that in future the teachers will be paid for their skill and ability as teachers and not for their literary attainments. Under the system under which our teachers are asked to work they are carrying out clerical work, instead of carrying out their true work of teaching. We are paying teachers of the State to do work as teachers and not as clerks, yet to-day a teacher of what is

called a one-man school, the smaller type of country school, has to spend as much time in clerical work in the way of preparation of records, charts, etcetera, as in the actual work of teaching. Let us abolish this. I hope the Minister will as early as possible relieve the teachers of the State of the vast amount of clerical work they have been asked to perform. It is altogether too harsh treatment to mete out to them to have them, after their day's work, sitting down for hours and hours up till midnight doing a vast amount of clerical work which is unnecessary and should be dispensed with if the Minister in charge of the department would place a little more confidence in the teachers or in his subordinate officers. Much has been said as to the salaries paid to teachers of the State; but although certain increments have been granted to some teachers, the position is that, out of 853 head teachers and assistants in the employ of the department at the end of 1910, there were no less than 564 in receipt of a salary of £180 per annum or less; and I regret to say many of them are in receipt of a salary of £100 per annum. Again, out of 447 head teachers, 301 were in receipt of £180 a year or less. I hope in the future the new Minister will pay a salary commensurate with the importance of the work the teachers are called upon to perform. The leader of the Opposition made reference to the fact that the member for Bunbury had spoken of certain members perhaps being permitted to do a certain amount of crowing. I hope I will not be guilty of that, and I do not think many members on this side of the House will do much crowing over the fact that the Labour party were returned to power with such a big majority. At any rate I do not intend to do any crowing. I have come here to assist my colleagues in pushing on the legislation of this country. I realise the responsibility that has been placed on my shoulders as an humble unit in this Chamber; and while it is my earnest intention to endeavour at all times to do my duty to my constituents, at the same time it is my intention also to loyally support the Government in carrying

out the grand and progressive policy they have placed before the people and which received the endorsement of the people in such a convincing manner. Reference has also been made by the leader of the Opposition this afternoon to an understanding that is supposed, in his mind at any rate, to have existed between the Premier and the Public Service Association in connection with the Public Service Commissioner. I do not think there is a single member on the Government side of the House who, during the campaign, offered one word against the Public Service Commissioner. As a late public servant, I have nothing whatever to say against that gentleman in his position as Public Service Commissioner; but I quite agree with the Premier and his Ministers that they did a duty to the country in giving an expression of opinion as to the secret manner in which the reappointment was conferred. The leader of the Opposition also referred to the omission from the Governor's Speech of several promised public works and reforms. I am rather inclined to congratulate the Premier and the Ministry generally on the fact that they have displayed sufficient intelligence to see that many of the big reforms and big public works promised were omitted, rather than that they, on taking over the reins of Government, should in a hasty manner rush into legislation and bring these reforms into effect. Better it was to wait until they were acquainted with their offices. When they do bring down these reforms I am sure they will be acceptable and will do an everlasting good to the people of this State. The leader of the Opposition expressed his surprise that the cost of living had not come down with the advent of the Labour Government. I know the Labour Government are capable of great things, and I expect great things from the Ministry, but at the same time I do not think that anyone could seriously expect that they might do anything in this direction so early in the session. I am quite sure that the Government will take the matter in hand at the earliest possible moment. I am hopeful myself that they will deal with this important question at

the earliest possible moment and that they will make inquiry into the cost of living.

The Minister for Justice: They are doing so already.

Mr. TURVEY: I am glad to hear it, because it is a matter that presses heavily on the people, and it is one the Government, I hope, will give effect to at the earliest possible opportunity. I have no more to say on this occasion. I wish to express my pleasure at the patient manner in which my remarks have been listened to by both sides of the House.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY (Moore): It is not my intention to delay the House long on this occasion but we are living under a system of party Government, and I have been returned to this House, as other members alongside of me, as an opponent of the Government now in power. It is not my intention to do anything that may retard in any way the interests or the advancement of this country; it is our duty to the State to criticise and, if possible, to put right the Government of the country, and to put them on the straight path, if we consider they are wandering from it. So far as I can see there are no very great principles involved in the Speech which His Excellency the Governor delivered to this House, and had there been any great principles involved, perhaps much more might have been heard from members on this side. In the speeches which have been made by members who now represent this State in the government of the country, during the electioneering campaign we heard of a great many principles which were involved. No doubt those great principles will be brought before the House before any length of time elapses, and when that time does come of course the Government will hear from this side of the House with regard to those questions. In representing an agricultural community I am pleased to find at any rate that the Government have at once taken steps to relieve some of the temporary difficulties which the agriculturists have gone through during the trying winter lately experienced. I am pleased at this, but at the same time I feel confident that they are merely carrying out the same policy, the

same line of action which would have been carried out by the Government which was lately in power. I am pleased to find the Government at any rate are taking steps in this direction. I represent in this House not only those who are living under the very best rainfall conditions, but at the same time agriculturists who are living perhaps under very different conditions from those nearer the coast. I am pleased to learn from the Press that the Works Department have lately discovered water at Wongan Hills, and I trust the Government, having found this water, will not stand still but will use all means to get it to the surface. I hope at the same time, while the Government are exercising their efforts in that direction, that they will go further north and endeavour to discover water in the neighbourhood of the homesteads of the settlers there, and show them that they may be able to tide over the hard summer now before them. The season we have lately gone through perhaps is an abnormal one to a certain extent, but these times have to be looked forward to and accounted for, and although there are many settlers in this country experiencing difficulties at the present time, still those who have farmed according to the best methods are those who have suffered less, and what good farming will mean under conditions such as we have lately had has been an object lesson to many in this State this season. I represent a part of the State, the people in which have very often been considered by the Parliament of the country as living in an alien State. I hope, now that I am representing this portion of the State that the district will no longer be looked upon by Parliament as an alien one. I am pleased to think that the Government of the present day are showing their sympathy with regard to this portion of the State, and I am pleased to know that they are about to bring it into unity with the rest of Western Australia, and I can assure them that they will have my best assistance in that direction. We hope to have the assistance of the Government and this Parliament, as well as other portions of the State, for the chief town of the districts which I represent, and where at

the present time there is a water famine. This is through no fault of the people and through no fault of mine. During all the time I have been in that district, I have endeavoured to push on any work that might have for its object the discovery of water in the neighbourhood. The Government have been doing this for some time past owing to my endeavours, but I cannot compliment the Works Department on the expedition they have shown in the matter. I trust the Minister in charge of that department will now goad on his officials to put a little more energy into the work of endeavouring to discover some method by which this district can be supplied with water. I am pleased at any rate to think that the Midland Railway Company at the present time have taken the matter in hand; I am pleased to think this because this company have generally been looked upon as a company which was backward in such public matters. I am pleased to think that the company are now about to erect tanks at Moora and that they are about to train water to that town, not only for the benefit of the people residing here, but also for the benefit of the people sending stock away by train. I think this is an example which the Government of the country might well follow.

The Minister for Works: The Government are erecting the tanks.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY: The Midland Railway Company are doing the training but I am glad to think that the Government are assisting in this matter. I was not aware that the Government were taking a hand in it.

The Minister for Works: You are giving the company credit for erecting the tanks; they were supplied by the Government.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY: I am extremely pleased to hear that, and I compliment the Government on the fact and I compliment the Minister for Works. As I have said I was pleased to think that the present Government were showing some sympathy towards what has been looked upon in the past as an alien State. I can understand that the present Government have only lately come into power, and that, as they

are new to the administration of their offices, some time must elapse before they can place before Parliament measures of any great importance to the country. I appreciate this and I appreciate the fact that the Government at any rate must feel its way, and must take hold of the departments and get properly in charge of the reins before they can start on anything very definite. Consequently I do not think that the House and the country can expect them to do much in the immediate future. At the same time I am pleased to think that they are seized already with the importance of these matters, which are of a domestic character, and I can assure them that any assistance I can give them in the House, or outside of it, towards carrying out the policy which may be to the benefit of the country, I shall be only too glad to do so. At the same time, where I feel that the policy of the Government is not in the interests of the country—of course we all have different opinions with regard to various matters—it will be my duty to give the Government and Parliament my reasons for not being in accord with those views. I am pleased to think that the Government are considering the agricultural resources of this country; of course they must do so. The development of agriculture has always been looked upon in the House as of the first importance. I have sat in this House for a great number of years in the past and the question of land settlement has been regarded as one of the great objects that Parliament desired to bring about, and I think no Government has done more than the late Government to advance those interests. I only hope that the Government now in power will carry out the bold and progressive policy which was inaugurated many years ago by the Government I was associated with, and which was carried on by the Government which was lately in power. If that is done the country must progress; at the same time I feel that the development of agriculture in a great country like this, where we have such great differences in climate and in rainfall, has to be carried on with the very greatest caution. I think it is the

duty of the Government, as the advisers of those who have to go out and settle in the back blocks, to be thoroughly seized of what the climatic conditions are before they endeavour to settle people on the land. I hope that will be the policy of the Government in the future. With regard to the money questions we have heard spoken of here to-night, the questions of the decrease in the Ministerial salaries, and of those matters of land policy, they can be better replied to and better spoken on by those who have administered the departments in recent years. I simply rise on this occasion to inform the House that it will be my duty, while I have the honour to sit in the House, to assist the Government in passing all those progressive measures which may have for their object the prosperity of Western Australia. At the same time I shall object with no uncertain voice to any measures which may be brought forward, and which may not be in the best interests of the country. With regard to increased salaries, we have heard a great deal from members on the other side of the House, and members generally appear to be about to urge the Government of the day to increase everybody's salary all round. It is a very delightful thing to be able to increase salaries. I am pleased to think that members on the other side of the House, and perhaps the Government with them, feel that they are in a position to increase salaries. It is a very gratifying thing to all of us to increase salaries. But I have always looked upon this question as a matter of finance, and if we are going to increase salaries all round we are either going to get increased revenue, or that money with which salaries are to be increased has to be taken out of someone else's pocket. I hope if that is done the Government will not come forward with any policy that will deal unjustly with the people settled on the land of this country. There is an impression in the minds of some—it is the doctrine of Henry George and others—that the land should find the money for everything. I am opposed to that, certainly in a new country like Western Australia. We are endeavouring to put people on

the land; we want population more than anything else; the country is pining for people. If we can get them here we have to put them on the land, and it is a bad thing in the interests of this country whilst endeavouring to place people on the land to lead them to believe that further burdens will be placed on the shoulders of those on the land. Because every man that goes on the land hopes not always to remain the holder of merely a few acres. It is ambition that makes the world go round, and it is ambition that is going to make this country. I hope the natural ambition of man, and man's individuality are not going to be smothered by any legislation to be passed through the House. It is the natural ambition of man to go forward, and it is the optimist who makes the country, and not the pessimist; it is the man with a belief in the country, the man who is prepared to go out on to the land and open it up. But that man goes there, not with a view of remaining all his life the owner of a few acres, but with a natural ambition to get on; and if in a few years' time he finds he requires a thousand acres instead of one hundred acres, I say he should have those thousand acres, and should not be at once weighted down by taxation or some other form of oppression. Unfortunately that appears to be the object of many I have heard on the subject. I hope the present Government will never introduce to this Parliament measures which have in view the crushing of the ambition of the individual or the crushing of the individuality of the people of this country. If the Government do not do that, if they desire to forward the progress of this country by helping to push it up instead of pulling it down. I can assure them they will have my assistance, and, I feel confident, the assistance of all members on this side of the House. I would not call it a waste of time speaking on this motion, seeing that it affords members an opportunity of speaking generally on matters referring to the State; but at the same time I think it unnecessary to unduly prolong speeches in addressing the House on this motion. It is not my intention to delay

hon. members any further on this occasion. I trust that their deliberations under your guidance, Mr. Speaker, may be to the best advantage of Western Australia and may be carried on without heat or acrimony.

Mr. DWYER (Perth) : I rise with a considerable amount of diffidence to address this Assembly for the first time. However, I hope to have the indulgence of hon. members, not perhaps with regard to the matter of what I say, but rather the manner, which I hope may be pardoned in a new member addressing an august Assembly presiding over the destiny of Western Australia. As the result of the recent elections we have heard the country pronounce its decision in no uncertain voice. We have had the labour side returned with a huge majority, and the anti-labour side returned with shattered forces. No doubt there are many causes to which we may attribute this crushing defeat of what was the Ministerial party, but I believe the chief amongst these causes was that termed the Redistribution of Seats Act, an Act termed "redistribution," but which really meant retribution upon the heads of those who were the authors of its being. "Built" as it was "in the eclipse and rigg'd with curses dark," deep and profound as were the methods of political engineering which hurried and manouvred that Bill through the Assembly, the persons who were the authors of it reaped at the hands of the electors the just reward of their pains. But in addition to that Bill, which the people looked upon as an outrage of their constitutional principles and liberties, and indeed an outrage of the decency of common Parliamentary usage, another, and a very powerful factor in the defeat, or, to speak more correctly, the manner in which that increase was effected. I have no hesitation in saying that practically all the country was in the dark as to these increases until it leaked out towards the end of the campaign for the general elections just passed. Ministers increased their salaries by the very dubious and questionable method of remodelling an Act and dropping a few sections of that Act,

which to the uninitiated would be left quite unnoticed. The dropping of these sections was really the cloaking of the purpose in hand; because the people themselves did not know that by the fact of Ministers being members of Parliament, as well as occupying the Treasury bench, they were entitled to receive £300 in addition to their Ministerial salaries. When, however, the country found out what had been done a shout of indignation went up, and rang round the ears of Ministerial candidates during the contest just finished. In decent government and decent administration I think the public should always be taken into the full and complete confidence of the Ministry in power. More especially is that so in a matter affecting themselves personally, such as this was. Another matter which I think had a great influence over the result of the recent elections was the high cost of living, which the people attributed, and to a great extent rightly, to the unsympathetic nature of the past Administration. The cost of living is an item which must always be taken into consideration when wages are being fixed, and as such it is almost of equal importance to the daily wage paid to the working man. Because, after all, it is of very little use to raise a man's wages if the increase is to be all swallowed up in the purchase of the necessities of life. The cost of living has been increased, and that not by natural but by artificial causes. If it had been due to natural causes we would have had to bear it as well as we could, but when the cost of living is increased by artificial causes I submit it is the duty of any Government to do what they can, first of all to investigate those causes, and, if they can be removed, to remedy the evil by having those causes removed. The cost of living, or of the necessities of life, in Western Australia as compared with the cost of living in the other States was out of all proportion, and there was no logical or natural reason why we should be paying so much more than was being paid in the Eastern States; in fact the whole of evidence on this question seemed to show that there was some influence at work

producing the artificial cause of the high cost of living. The members of the past Administration did not concern themselves in the least about this artificial cause. They were troubled rather with having the country so mapped out or distributed as to ensure their own return to power; and the people looked at the matter and considered they were being dealt with unfairly by the neglect to take this artificial cause into account. I am glad to hear now that one of the first acts of the present Administration was to institute an investigation into the causes producing this increased cost of living; and knowing, as I do, the gentlemen occupying the Treasury bench, and realising that they have so much at heart the interests of the country, I feel sure that if it be found possible to remove these artificial causes they will be removed, and the people will obtain the necessities of life at something like reasonable prices. I have stated that the cost of living was an item or element to be considered when wages were being fixed or apportioned, and we know, too, that the day is past when the wages were a mere matter of supply and demand. I think it will be conceded even by hon. members on the other side of the House that wages should not be in this country of ours a matter of mere supply on the one hand and demand on the other, and the time has arrived in our conception of economics when the law of supply and demand, as applied to the wages of the working man, must disappear for ever from our school. What really is and must be the basis and the irreducible minimum is not the law of supply and demand, but rather what it costs to maintain in decent comfort a working man having family interests at stake. When this working man with a family to maintain and support finds that he has to pay a good deal more for the necessities of life than he ought to under normal conditions, it is time to call out for an amelioration of the existing set of circumstances, for, after all, if the wages he is getting have not the purchasing power they had a few years ago, and no increase has taken place, he is bound to be worse off; therefore, while it has been

necessary to increase the minimum wage of the employees in the railways in order that they may maintain their families in comfort, had the cost of living been taken into account, and had it been recognised that there were artificial conditions existing which should not exist, it would not have been necessary to heap this extra burden on the community. I find also that the Government intend to introduce an amendment of the Arbitration Act, and I hope that the fixing of a minimum wage on some such reasonable or scientific basis as I have mentioned will be taken into account, and that also some power will be given to the court whereby they can grade employees, fixing not only the minimum wage but also increasing the minimum by gradations to correspond with the years of service, experience, and capabilities of the man whose case the court is, for the time being, considering. The Government announce their intention of introducing a measure to remedy the existing set of circumstances as regards the Public Service appeal board, and never was a remedy more needed. Without reflecting in the slightest degree on the present Public Service Commissioner, I do say that it was ridiculous in the extreme and unjust, not only to the occupant of the position but much more to the public service at large, that he should have been compelled to sit as judge on cases which he had already decided. The two others who sat with him represented the respective parties to the appeal, and the Public Service Commissioner occupied the ridiculous position of being arbiter of cases he had already adjudicated upon. I am very pleased to find from the Speech that this, at any rate, will be amended. There are many grievances of the public service which I hope will be taken into consideration at the same time. I think that every large employer of labour—and the Government in their relation to the public service are employers of labour—should make some provision whereby a gratuity, or pension, or monetary consideration of some kind should be paid to an employee on his retirement, or to his widow or dependants if he dies whilst in the service. That should be

done not only by the Government but by every large employer, and I hope that the Government will set an example to others in this matter. Under the Public Service Act as it stands now we find that some provision is made for insurance but this provision is not at all adequate, and I believe that in many instances it is being entirely neglected. The provision for insurance may at the most give a man, who has spent his whole life in the service, a sum of £200 to retire upon and last him to the end of his days. That is altogether inadequate, and I trust that the Government will take this matter into consideration when framing the amendments, and see if something cannot be done whereby either a decent retiring allowance will be paid, or a system of pensions, based on some scientific principle, will be carried into effect. There are many ways of doing that, amongst them contributions from the service and, perhaps, from the Government, but this is a detail which can be left to the Government and their officers. All I urge is that the Government should in this matter set a prompt example to private employers. It is not a mere matter of generosity, but rather a matter of justice to employees who have done long service, or who have died in harness. I notice that the Government intend also to introduce an amendment to the Early Closing Act. This amendment comes not a day too soon. Whilst in the Eastern States it has been customary for some considerable time past, at any rate in the capital cities, that the employees in the shops should get their Saturday afternoon free, the custom here, except for a brief interregnum, has been all the other way about. I have never been able to see any reason why these shop assistants should be treated in this matter in any way different from other wage earners. There is no reason why they should not have their Saturday afternoons free when everybody is having them free. The present Wednesday afternoon closing is a sort of hybrid arrangement, being neither a holiday nor a working day. Both employers and employees are agreed in advocating the abolition of the Saturday opening, and I hope that in a very

short time we will find the shop assistants, and others in similar occupations, conceded this right, so that they can enjoy their week-end holidays just the same as employees in other avocations. Everybody in this community finds it necessary during the summer months, with the hot days and tepid nights, to have a week-end respite for rest and enjoyment. Hitherto the shop assistants have been debarred from this, and I shall be pleased to see a measure introduced by which they will be able to take the same advantages as other people of the natural resources of river and sea which this City possesses. I should have liked to have seen some reference in the Speech to the early establishment of the University, but I understand that matter is being assiduously pursued by the Government at the present time. I am anxious to see this coping stone placed on our educational establishment. We have a large enough population to support a university now; many of the universities at the present time most noted throughout the world were established with small beginnings, and not as great a prospect of success as we have in Western Australia to-day. After all, it is not necessary that we should have buildings in order to establish a university, because a university is not a thing of bricks and mortar but rather of human beings and souls. It will not be necessary for us to wait till we can afford extensive grounds and an elaborate type of buildings. If we have the growing youth of this State to receive education in the higher educational walks, even in such buildings as we have at present at our disposal, and take such other measures to instruct them as we can with our present meagre resources, we will find our university established. Let us leave to the future the elaborate grounds and trappings and dress which belong to university culture of a high order, and let us get together a university of living, palpitating beings, and everything else will come in time. We must have this university in order to correlate all the stages of our present system of education. We have now our primary and secondary schools, and all we want

to complete the educational edifice is the university. We must have that correlation so that a boy beginning at the kindergarten and going through the primary and secondary schools may finish at the university, and, if necessary, go in for research work.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. DWYER: I was referring to the matter of university education. I will just conclude my remarks on that point by stating that I hope when the new University is established it will be made absolutely free to all who can avail themselves of the education there offered. I make the qualification of being able to avail themselves of the education there offered, because I think there must be some limit or other, and the limit I would place is this—that the boy or youth who would take advantage of this free university system should be able to display some mark or characteristic that would indicate that he will be able to reap the full advantage of the expenditure of the State in organising, equipping, and establishing this University. There is a matter in the Governor's Speech which peculiarly and particularly affects me as the representative of Perth in this House, that is, the Bill which is to be introduced to amend the Local Courts Act. This may seem a small matter, but inasmuch as it affects every trader and every business person in Perth, it is a matter of grave and urgent importance; and not only so to Perth, but it extends its ramifications right throughout the whole of the State, particularly in any town of importance. The present Act and the regulations framed under it seem to be peculiarly instituted for no other reason almost but to put every obstacle in the way of a creditor and put every assistance in the hands of the dishonest debtor. In addition to that, the proceedings under the Act are so cumbersome as to make it almost farcical. When it is remembered that for a debt of a few shillings or a few pounds one has to go through the same method of procedure as if the debt amounted to hundreds, with the issue of plaints, summonses, and affidavits and documents of that kind; and when in addition to

that one has to go through a more cumbersome form of procedure and a great many more forms than to issue a Supreme Court proceeding where the amount claimed may run into thousands, it is seen some amendment to this Act is essential. I think when the Act is amended it should be endeavoured to establish if possible a court of summary jurisdiction for very small amounts. To have the time of the magistrate of the local court taken up in deciding claims of a few pounds seems ridiculous and an utter waste of public time and money. I hope the opinions of the business people and of the legal practitioners will be obtained in order if possible to obtain a fair and workable Act that will commend itself to the legal practitioners and at the same time to the business people at large. Under the present circumstances the litigants who go to the court in the form of plaintiffs have frequently, because of the rules there, which give them small costs—practically no costs—when the amount is under ten pounds, and no costs when the amount is under two pounds, to pay the piper every time, and frequently they reap no reward whatsoever from the verdicts they receive. I hope this Act will receive the particular attention of the Ministry so that this anomalous conditions of things may be amended. People have been groaning under it, complaining about it for years—in fact, ever since the new Act was passed and the new rules promulgated—but all to no effect. Now, however, we have a Ministry which has laid to itself the task of remedying the evils which affect the community, but I hope in this case the remedy will be of far-reaching effect and that we will have a local court which is not only conveniently workable but which will also enable the honest creditor to recover the amount due and which will not assist the dishonest debtor to evade his legal and moral responsibilities. In the matter of the proposed Criminal Appeal Bill, we have an effort that is being made to bring our law into consonance with the present law in England. There they have had a Criminal Appeal Act passed and established for some years, and it has been found to work well and very con-

veniently. When hon. members recollect that, while in the case of a small amount recovered in the local court or the Supreme Court it is possible to go to the Full Court for an expression of opinion and, furthermore, to go to the High Court, and even to the Privy Council, and when they also remember that when it is not a mere matter of money but lives and persons that are concerned, personal liberty at stake, there is no chance whatsoever for an appeal from a decision of a judge and jury, then I think members will see it is high time this state of things was put an end to. It seems practically useless to state that a man's liberty is dearer to him than all his personal belongings and possessions; yet while we find that over his personal belongings and possessions the law places a mantle of protection around him in the shape of appeals from the decision of one court to another, where his personal liberty is involved in the highest form of criminal tribunal, in a case heard before the Supreme Court in its criminal jurisdiction, there is absolutely no appeal whatsoever except in a case where a case may be stated by the judge for the opinion of the Full Court. I hope this appeal court will be so established as to remedy some of the glaring effects of the vagaries of our juries. I am glad to see the Government have taken the personal liberties of all the subjects of this State into consideration in establishing beyond all question that they will have the opportunity of bringing on appeal before the highest tribunal in a criminal court of appeal, the question of guilty or not guilty in criminal cases, thereby helping to safeguard the lives and liberties of the citizens of this State. The member for Moore (Hon. H. B. Lefroy) has said that although there were great principles laid down in the speeches delivered by members of this party on the hustings, he did not see any signs or tokens of them in the Governor's Speech. The hon. member must have been rather blinded by his own predisposition in this matter. If he had looked carefully into the Governor's Speech he would have found that the principles embodied in the speeches made on the hust-

ings prior to the general elections have been, so far at any rate as the work to be accomplished this session is concerned, laid down clearly and distinctly as the line of policy in the Governor's Speech. Nothing can be accomplished all at once, or soon; and there is no doubt that Ministers require time to make themselves acquainted with the details of departmental workings; but so far as it goes, the Governor's Speech is an announcement of policy and projected legislation which any Government might be proud of. The hon. member has also said that the agricultural policy of the Government, particularly with respect to water supply, would have been carried out had the old Ministers remained in office. It is all very well saying that; but, unfortunately for the hon. member, facts contradict it. The hon. member must know quite well that the Ministers who vacated their positions could have done much while they were in office to have taken steps to ameliorate the conditions brought on this country by the drought we are now feeling; but they did not move an inch, they did not stir a hand to do so.

Mr. Mitchell: You are wrong.

The Premier: The hon. member spent a lot of money but did very little.

Mr. DWYER: There was much talk of sympathy, but words like everything else are cheap. When it came to the point of doing something and accomplishing something, it was left to the Labour Ministers to bring into effect some remedial measures for the relief of settlers in the agricultural districts. Not only was it left for them to do, but they grappled with it at once, and one of the first steps on taking office was to relieve the settlers in the drought-stricken districts. The hon. member has also said that we on this side of the House were of the opinion that the land should find the money for everything. I do not know why the hon. member should say that. But if he means that the land is the primary source of all wealth, directly and indirectly, he is correct. On the other hand, if he means that hon. members on this side believe that every burden should be laid on the land and on nothing else, then he is merely

talking for the benefit of the settlers in the farming districts, or rather he is merely talking to gain the applause of the unthinking residents of the farming districts; because while the land is the primary sources, directly or indirectly, of all wealth, I am sure Ministers do not intend to relieve any portion of the State, or any class of the State, from their rightful burden of taxation. All must bear the expense in connection with the carrying on of the government of the country; and that every effort will be made, as it has been foreshadowed in the Governor's Speech, to alleviate the distress existing in the agricultural communities, is a direct contradiction of the statement that members on this side of the House say the Government intend to tax all the land and let everything else escape. If fresh burdens of taxation have to be laid, and perhaps they may, I am sure that Ministers will find places whereon to rest them without injuring any class of the community, and that they will have the burden shared equally by all. I trust that it will be found that no member on this side of the House will, as has been suggested, endeavour to crush individuality in any shape or form. We hope to see the best individual traits developed for all they are worth because one of our leading acts and one of our most important principles is that of giving equal opportunity to all, and that means nothing if it does not mean the development in all of that individuality which resides there, provided the individuality is for the good of the community. Any good individual trait which may be characteristic of any person or any body of persons here will be given fair scope to display itself, and if it is commendable to the Government and if it is for the interests of the country at large, it will be given every opportunity to develop. I will conclude by thanking hon. members for the patience with which they have listened to me during this my first speech in this Assembly. We have been singularly blessed in that we possess a land practically flowing with milk and honey, a land where the reward remains to be gained and gleaned by anyone possessing enterprise, and a land to

which nature has been most bountiful in its gifts. I hope hon. members on both sides of the House will endeavour to cultivate and develop the natural resources of this country, and by so doing show that they are true patriots of their country, and are endeavouring so far as they can, and consistent with their position as politicians on either side of the House, to develop all the latent resources of this country and make it the foremost among the States of Australia. Since nature has been so kind it will be unkind on our part not to co-operate with its efforts and not to do what we can to develop them. So far as members on this side of the House are concerned—and I think I may speak even more than personally—we are here representing the people with the fixed purpose and intent of developing all the resources in this country for the good of all classes of the community. That will be our object and we trust that all members of the House will assist us towards that end.

On motion by Mr. Mitchell, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 7.50 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 8th November, 1911.

	PAGE
Committees for the Session	64
Leave of Absence	64
Bill: Game, &c.	64
Address-in-reply, third day	64

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

COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION.

On motions by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, Sessional Committees were appointed as follow:—

Standing Orders Committee.—The Hon. the President, the Chairman of Committees, Hon. M. L. Moss, Hon. R. Pennefather, and the mover.

Printing Committee.—The President, Hon. W. Patrick, and the mover.

Library Committee.—The President, Hon. W. Kingsmill, Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett.

House Committee.—The President, Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom, Hon. J. E. Dodd, Hon. A. G. Jenkins, Hon. B. C. O'Brien.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. M. L. Moss, leave of absence for the remainder of the session granted to Hon. F. Connor on the ground of urgent private business.

BILL—GAME.

Introduced, on motion by Hon. W. Kingsmill, and read a first time.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Third day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. M. L. MOSS (West): Since the last meeting of Parliament there has been a general election, with the result, which is well known, of a new party having come to power to rule the affairs of this country for the next three years, and as a member of a non-party House I congratulate my friend, Mr. Drew, on having assumed the responsible and onerous position as leader, and his colleague, Mr. Dodd, on having attained Cabinet rank. As a result of by-elections we have amongst us two new members, Mr. Doland and Mr. Davis. They come to this Chamber as direct nominees of the Labour party, and I think these gentlemen, after having had some experience of this Chamber, will easily come to the conclusion that every measure that comes to this Chamber for the consideration of members is dealt with fairly and on its merits, irrespective of the party responsible for its introduction. I congratulate both these gentlemen on having become members of this House. I hope when they have the opportunity of knowing more about the methods and business of this Chamber, instead of being advocates for a reduction of the franchise, with a view