

that the right to compulsorily purchase should continue for 12 months after the opening of the railway as a whole. In view of the opening of the first section, a doubt has arisen in the minds of legal persons responsible for advising the Crown in construing the meaning of the Act, whether the period during which compulsory purchase of land on either side of the railway could be made did not commence to run from the date of the opening, that is to say whether the 12 months would date from the opening of the first section or of the opening of the line completed for traffic. Such a construction of the meaning would undoubtedly be contrary to the intention of Parliament; and this amending Bill has been introduced to remove the doubt that possibly would arise if the matter were left undecided. It is all the more necessary in connection with this line, as there are four or five large blocks which it is possible the Government in their wisdom may consider it advisable to resume: and the advantage of resuming the land, against the repurchasing of it under the Agricultural Repurchased Estates Act, is that we are able to acquire the land at the value that would be placed on it prior to the construction of the railway, instead of having to pay an enhanced value given to it by the construction of the line. Four or five of the blocks were alienated in the early history of the State, and contain a large percentage of first-class land which might be subdivided into reasonably sized holdings, which I am satisfied would be taken up eagerly by intending settlers. There is a regular rainfall, in a temperate climate, and the land is within easy distance of the port; and these are reasons for the Government exercising the power conferred upon them by the original Act. I have much pleasure in formally moving the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. T. H. BATH (Brown Hill): In view of the necessity of getting this amendment through at the earliest possible moment, I promised to give the Premier every facility for getting the Bill passed.

Question put and passed.
Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at nine minutes to 11 o'clock, until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 10th September, 1907.

	PAGE
Motions: Public Service Classification, Professional Division	1346
Payment of Members, to Reduce, debate resumed	1348
Assent to Bills (3)	1348
Bills: Port Hedland-Marble Bar Railway, 3a.	1348
Land Tax Assessment, 1r.	1351
Collie-Narrogin Railway Amendment, 1r.	1351
Vaccination Act Amendment, 1r.	1351
Workers' Compensation Amendment, 2a. concluded	1351

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4.30 o'clock p.m.

Prayers.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: 1, Mining Act, 1904—Return of exemptions granted during the year ended 30th June, 1907. 2, Pharmacy and Poisons Act, 1904—Amended Regulations Nos. 34 and 35. 3, Public Works Department—Roads Act, 1902—*a.* By-laws of Plantagenet Roads Board. *b.* By-laws of Upper Irwin Roads Board.

MOTION—PUBLIC SERVICE CLASSIFICATION.

Professional Division.

Hon. M. L. MOSS (West) moved—
That in the opinion of this House the

delay in the completion of the Classification of the Professional Division of the Public Service is prejudicial to the best interests of the State.

He said: Members are aware that in 1904 Parliament passed a Public Service Act, and in that Act the public service was divided into four divisions, the administrative, the professional, the clerical, and the general divisions. The Public Service Commissioner commenced his duties under that Act, for it is outlined in Sections 9 and 10 and the succeeding sections, that it became his duty under the Act to inspect the various departments and frame a scheme of classification to be submitted for the consideration of the Governor, which is of course the Ministry, and by Section 9 it is provided that if the Governor did not approve of any proposal or statement it should be the duty of the Commissioner to reconsider such proposal, and within a time to be specified by the Governor submit another proposal, and such fresh proposal should be considered and dealt with by the Governor, and that every proposal of the Commissioner relating to the classification or reclassification should, before it was finally dealt with by the Governor, be published in the *Government Gazette*. I understand that the classification of the clerical division has been completed, with the result that there were a large number of appeals from the decision of the Commissioner, and probably that branch of the service has been dealt with more or less satisfactorily to those concerned. A great delay seems to have taken place with regard to the classification of the professional division, and there is no doubt that branch of the service is seething with discontent over the delay which has taken place and the treatment meted out on all hands to those gentlemen in the professional division. It is surprising to me, since I have given notice of this motion, to find the number of men in high positions in the service, coming within the professional division, who have spoken to me in terms of commendation for my action in giving notice of the motion. I, however, was chiefly con-

cerned in giving it, not so much as to the professional division of the service, but as to the delay which has taken place in regard to the stipendiary magistracy. This session I have almost tired members in regard to this matter, but I think the whole position is serious. There are gentlemen retained in positions in connection with the stipendiary magistracy totally unfitted for the performance of their duties, and the objections pointed out by Mr. Pennefather as to the district medical officers of health holding the dual position of medical officer and magistrate, show that the administration of justice throughout the State is anything but satisfactory. If it were part of my policy to indicate matters which have come within my own professional knowledge I could surprise the House with something which is going on in one or two centres of the State. I do not propose to bother the House or the country with matters that I obtained information in regard to in that direction, but I think I am justified in referring to instances given by Mr Pennefather on the Address-in-Reply and referred to on subsequent occasions in this House. Before coming in the House to-day the Colonial Secretary told me that in all probability this classification will be made public within the next few days, therefore there is not that necessity for moving the motion that there would have been had I not received that information. But I do certainly hope that something will be done in connection with these magistracies. I would like to draw the attention of the Government to Section 30 of the Public Service Act which provides that—

“No person shall be permanently appointed to the office of magistrate unless he has passed the prescribed examination in law, or he is a legal practitioner duly qualified under the Legal Practitioners Act 1893: Provided that on the certificate of the Commissioner that it is desirable for the economy of the Public Service so to do, the Governor may appoint a district medical officer or may temporarily appoint any other officer a magistrate without examination.”

I hope the provisions of that section will be kept prominently in view, in making fresh appointments. The country generally looks with eagerness for this classification. It is not to be hoped that those comprised in the professional division will be satisfied with what takes place; there is no doubt there will be complaints; but there is ample power for appeal under the statute, which is getting pretty old now. It was passed in 1904, and one would have expected that before 1907 the whole of the divisions would have been classified and all the appeals made and heard, and that the service would have been put on a satisfactory basis. I do not propose to waste the time of members in debating this question, when the Minister tells us that we shall have the classification in a few days. Then we shall be able to form our own opinions as to its justice.

Hon. J. T. GLOWREY: I second the motion.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. D. Connolly): I presume the hon. member does not wish to press the motion now. The Public Service Commissioner, who by the way is entirely responsible for the classification—no responsibility rests on the Government, and it is entirely the duty of the Public Service Commissioner to carry out the classification and to carry out the general management of the Public Service—sent me a message this afternoon that he had the classification of the professional division complete, and in all probability it would be gazetted in this week's *Gazette*. That being so, no doubt the hon. member will not press the motion, but will ask leave to withdraw it.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: Now by the leave of the House I will withdraw the motion.

Motion by leave withdrawn.

MESSAGE—ASSENT TO BILLS (3).

Message from the Governor received and read, assenting to the following Bills:—1, Permanent Reserve Revestment; 2, Education Act Amendment; 3, Statistics.

BILL—PORT HEDLAND-MARBLE BAR RAILWAY.

Bill read a third time, and *passed*.

MOTION—PAYMENT OF MEMBERS, TO REDUCE.

Debate resumed from the 28th August, on the motion by Mr. Glowrey to reduce the salaries of members to a sum not exceeding £100 per annum.

Hon. J. W. LANGSFORD (Metropolitan-Suburban): When I secured the adjournment of this debate for a fortnight, it was with a view to enable members to have the opportunity of calmly considering the whole question and deciding whether it was in the best interests of parliamentary government that salaries of members of Parliament should be reduced. I hope members have in the meantime informed themselves thoroughly on this important question. We must admire the motive which prompted the mover of the motion, that is in the interests of economy; but the question arises whether it is good economy or false economy. The plea is often raised that we should have economy, certainly, but with efficiency; and if we can obtain efficiency with the economy proposed equal to that we have at present, there is something to be said in favour of the motion; but on the other hand, this may be looked upon as somewhat of an attack on the principle of payment of members. The hon. member has not mentioned the sum of £100 specifically in the motion. He leaves himself open to submit a farther motion stating the sum. The motion says it shall not exceed £100; it may ultimately be brought down to 25 guineas or a smaller sum. I think it cannot be said that an amount of £3 16s. 11d. per week—because I understand arithmeticians work it out at that—is an exorbitant price to pay our legislators for their services. However, if this is really an attack upon the principle of payment of members—and I am inclined to believe there is something of that idea in the motion—we have to approach the question from a different standpoint alto-

gether. It has been held that it is necessary in a democratic country such as we claim this to be, that payment of members is one of the essentials of democracy, in order that we may give to all classes the opportunity of being represented in the Houses of Parliament. I confess it seems difficult to get enthusiastic over a motion of this character. We must remember it is not only to apply to representatives of this Chamber, but it is to apply to the whole of Parliament; and I believe nothing that this House could do would have such an effect in this country as to agree to the motion. I think we would show ourselves utterly out of harmony with the feeling which exists in the country at the present time.

Hon. J. P. Glowrey : You have not been to the country much, or you would not say that.

Hon. J. W. LANGSFORD : The movement is altogether in the opposite direction to that which the hon. member wishes us to take. The movement of all other progressive countries is upwards and not downwards.

Hon. G. Bellingham : You should have been a Federal member.

Hon. J. W. LANGSFORD : I leave that for other honourable gentleman who have more leisure than I have. I have a few statistics of the salaries paid in other countries. In France the senators and the deputies have an increase this year from £360 per annum to £600 per annum. In Germany, in May 1906, an Act was passed paying members £150 for a session, so that I presume if they happen to have any special session during the year such as was proposed some time ago in this country, they would get an extra £150 for a special session, though it might only last a week. In the United States the senators are paid £1,400 per annum, with travelling expenses and I believe a private secretary's allowance also. The salary was £1,000. There has been an increase of £400 during the current year. Then we have the example of our own Federal Parliament where the increase was from £400 to £600. I am almost disposed to think this was in the mind of the hon. member

when he moved the motion and that he has moved this as a kind of counterblast to the way in which Federal members increased their own salaries. It may be said that Ministers of the Crown are in a very different position from the ordinary member of Parliament, but I think the difference is only in degree. The Minister gives up all his time to the duties of the State and is paid something running into four figures, but the ordinary member of Parliament gives up a good deal of his time; and if a Minister is paid, why should not the ordinary member of Parliament? He gives up his time and should be paid accordingly. The principle appears to be the same, only differing in degree. It has always been held that payment of members was to give the widest choice to the electors, and I am strongly in sympathy with that idea. It is not all who have the wealth of my friend who moved the motion; it is not all who are clothed in purple and fine linen, and who recognise that the honour and dignity of the position are quite sufficient to repay them for the services they render to their country. The majority of people are not in that favourable position. I think there are just as good men outside this House in professional and business walks of life who would make equally as good members—I will not say more so—as members who occupy these benches at the present time; but they absolutely will not give up their avocations and afford the time, because it means so much to them. The aspect of this payment of members has altered during the past few years. It was originally given to recoup expenses, but now it is looked upon in the light of an adequate remuneration for services rendered. Mr. Glowrey referred to the fact that we were limited in our expenses in connection with elections and therefore there was not the necessity that previously existed for this payment; but I have been a member of this House for three and a half years, and as a matter of fact I have not made up my expenses yet. I do not wish hon. members to have the idea that I exceeded the amount allotted to me under the Elec-

toral Act, but I have had two elections during the time, and my experience has been that it costs just as much to fight a successful election as it did previously. Something has been said as to the standard of members of Parliament, that we do not compare favourably with the men who have preceded us in the halls of legislature; but although we may not have the isolated cases of excellence we had in the past, I believe that the average political ability is higher to-day in our Houses of Parliament than it has ever been in the past; and I attribute this to some extent to the democratic principle of payment of members. There is one other aspect of the question, especially as it relates to country members. Those whose business keeps them in town are by no means in the same category with those who live in the country. I do not mean those who live in the city; I mean those who live in the country and have to go to and from their parliamentary duties every week. It cannot be said that a sum of £3 16s. 11d. per week is at all an adequate remuneration for them.

Hon. J. T. Glourey: They travel free.

Hon. J. W. LANGSFORD: Yes, but we who are in Perth, including the hon. member, can attend to our businesses every day and almost every hour of the day.

Hon. M. L. Moss: The session does not last the whole year.

Hon. J. W. LANGSFORD: Hon. members who come from the country must experience great inconvenience in attending to their parliamentary duties, and some adequate provision should be made to reimburse them. In looking up the debates on this question in this House some seven years ago, I noticed that there were many honourable gentlemen who are in the House at the present time, including my honourable friend who moved this motion, who favoured this £200 per annum. I looked up an able speech of the hon. member's in 1900. [*Hon. J. T. Glourey:* You will not find a speech of mine there.] I am sure it was an able speech. It was very brief, about half a dozen lines, but what

the hon. member said was good, though it was somewhat contrary to what he said in his address the other week. There were some stalwart champions of payment of members who are here to-day, who seven years ago on the very question of £100 or £200 were very earnest in their advocacy of being paid the larger amount. How this is viewed by thinkers of other countries is shown in an extract I have before me. Professor Jordan, of the Leland-Stanford University, California, America, was recently visiting Sydney, and among other things he gave his experience of one or two matters that had struck him during his sojourn in the East. He said, "Australia paid its politicians only the price of professional failure." That was his testimony after making inquiries as to the amount of salary paid. One of the leading newspapers commented on that statement as follows:—

"When at intervals we are confronted with the statistics of our political machinery, we marvel at the inertia of a people that can endure them. There are too many Parliaments, too many Ministers, and too many Governors, and, what is worst, there is too much for them to do. Here it is that Professor Jordan indicates the danger that underlies our system of democracy and seems peculiar to it. With all our astonishing abundance of workers the work of Parliament demands even more from a politician than it does elsewhere. It demands in Federal politics, at all events, such a distraction of his energies that he cannot hope for distinction in his profession, and is singular if he preserves his standing in it. In the State Parliament it is scarcely less exacting, for, though the idea of decentralisation has been so far carried into effect that a member is relieved of a substantial part of his burdens, politics cannot be regarded as anything but the chief burden of those who undertake it. The reason of this exigency is, as Professor Jordan recognises, the wide influence in Australia that legislation exercises over our daily lives. Our laws for the protection of

the weak and for the restraint of competition are as strange to American ideas as the stories of mob domination and municipal corruption in California are to us. The contrast shows how important is the work of our politicians, and accounts for this criticism of their character and training. What sort of men, an American naturally asks, do we choose to be rulers of our daily lives, and what reward do we offer them? The parliamentary salary is, as is pointed out, not larger than the reward of professional failure. Popular applause, when it is given, is not a very satisfactory or very reliable asset. What, then, are the men we get, or ought to expect to get, for nothing? And how ought we to supply whatever deficiencies they show? The answer to these questions is part of the lament of many Australian citizens after each general election. The rewards offered are not sufficient to attract the best intellects from one party, but not from the others. Public spirit is a sufficient spur to a few only to ignore the chance of professional advancement or the claims of their home, and the difficulty that is felt in choosing candidates manifests itself throughout the debates."

That article is advocating an adjustment of the parliamentary machinery. It is a very proper question for us to consider whether our parliamentary machinery is not too extensive, and the whole question wants very carefully thinking out. The result of many of the deliberations of the Federal Parliament does not justify the States in seeking to give them more power than they have at present. I am not advocating that the State Parliament should be weakened at all. There may be adjustments made, and I think members might well turn their attention to that point without endeavouring to impair the efficiency of the machinery. Let us have the best machinery we possibly can, but at the same time we might have a little less than we get. In view of the increased cost of living which we are told will result from the operations of Sir William Lyne's tariff, I think this is a most inopportune time to suggest

that salaries of members of Parliament should be reduced. I am in accord with the mover of the motion in this that if we are to have a strict reign of economy right through the whole of the departments, from the top to the bottom, then members of Parliament should be prepared to take their share in that economy. I shall always favour a movement in that direction. In the circumstances, and after consideration, I have concluded that I am unable to support the motion at this juncture.

On motion by *the Hon. W. Maley*, debate adjourned.

BILLS—FIRST READING (3).

1, Land Tax Assessment; 2, Colliery-Narrogen Railway Amendment; 3, Vaccination Act Amendment; received from the Legislative Assembly and read a first time.

BILL—WORKERS' COMPENSATION AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 29th August.

Hon. J. T. GLOWREY (South): I have no desire to take up the time of the House in debating the second reading of this Bill. I have had an opportunity of going very carefully through the measure, and I think it is a great improvement on the existing Act. I shall be pleased to support the second reading, and when the Committee stage is reached I will propose one or two small amendments of which I shall give notice.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 5.15 o'clock, until the next day.
