

was to be made, or on what it was based? If the Premier had only taken a sixth of the actual expenditure of last year he would have been perfectly justified in coming to the House to ask for that amount; but the Premier had been understood to say that it was in proportion to the expenditure of the last four months. Perhaps the Premier would favour the Committee with some further explanation as to how he arrived at this expenditure, and what were the figures of the last four months which he had based it upon.

The PREMIER: If the leader of the Opposition would take the returns published in the *West Australian* of even date he would discover that, exclusive of moneys expended under special Acts, the sum worked out at a total expenditure of something like £230,000 per month since the 1st July last. Including expenditure under special Acts it would amount to over £300,000; thus it would be found we were asking for sufficient to carry over two months, and that it had been based on the actual expenditure for the four months of the financial year which had already expired. He was not stating that that would be the actual expenditure, but we had to face the position as we found it, and we wanted funds to carry us on to December on the basis of expenditure of the period already expired. It might not amount to that; it might amount to more.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: There was no objection to the granting of supplies to the end of the current year. He realised that we could not hope to have the Estimates here and passed much before Christmas, and it was necessary that we should have supplies to carry on to the end of December.

Question put and passed; Resolution reported and the report adopted.

Supply Bill introduced, etc.

Resolution in Committee of Ways and Means having been passed, a Supply Bill was brought in providing for the expenditure of £460,000 out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Bill passed through its remaining stages and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

House adjourned at 4.43 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 7th November, 1911.

	PAGE
Election returns: Metropolitan-Sudurban Province	21
Papers presented	21
Address-in-reply, second day	21
Supply Bill, £460,000, all stages	25

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

ELECTION RETURNS—METROPOLITAN-SUBURBAN PROVINCE.

The President announced the receipt of the return to writs issued for the election of two members for the Metropolitan-Suburban province, showing that James Alfred Doland and Frederick Davis had been elected.

The Hon. J. A. Doland and the Hon. F. Davis took the oath and subscribed the roll.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY laid on the Table reports and papers similar to those presented by Ministers in the Legislative Assembly on the preceding Wednesday; also annual report of Public Service Commissioner.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Second day.

Debate resumed from 1st November.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN (South-East): I wish first to congratulate Mr. Drew on the position to which he has attained and to assure him that in common I am sure with all members of the House I will give him all possible assistance. The ideal Upper House is a non-party House, a House which calmly and maturely reviews the work done in another place. The best legislators, even in the calm atmosphere of this House, may occasionally be betrayed beyond bounds of calmness, but I am sure it would only be in the heat of debate and that every member of the House will endeavour to maintain the ideal of a non-party attitude. Through

that attitude we can have nothing to do even with recent history on the hustings. I take it that our duty is to deal with the actual programme of the Government, generally as it is submitted to us in the Governor's Speech, and concretely and in detail as each measure may come down. I am certain this House will maintain this ideal and deal with each measure on its merits. There are three great factors in the progress of a civilised people. They must have land to use, they must have labour wherewith to work it and they must have the necessary capital. I would like to impress on the Government the need for these three factors. They are dealt with in the Governor's Speech and one can hardly say from the necessary brevity of that document whether they are going to be worked out on sound lines. Land for a civilised people is a primary necessity, and I think the lesson of all history amongst civilised peoples is that land is best utilised as freehold. It is the instinct of civilised people; it is in every civilised land that, once a man gets beyond the nomadic stage and settles down, the instinct develops and becomes part of his being to hold land of his own. Then comes the need for labour, and I trust the Government will continue the liberal and wise policy of immigration pursued for some years past with such manifest success. I notice that His Excellency's Speech plainly says that the third factor will be borne in mind, and that the Government will submit proposals for the authorisation of the necessary loans to supply the capital wherewith to develop this country. Whatever may have been the discussions of the recent campaign in the country, with which we have nothing directly to do, and whatever influences the Government may find operating to hamper them on these three great issues, I trust that they will see to it that there is continuity in the policy of this country. Ministers have only to look to the great example of British Parliamentary history. Conservatives come in with, say, a two-thirds majority, and they have their four or five years; Liberals come in with perhaps a greater majority. On the hustings two parties could not be

more diametrically opposite, but in the actual administration of the affairs of Great Britain the incoming Government begins where the outgoing Government left off; there is no digression. There we have examples of Conservatives even outdoing the liberal policy of their predecessors. I trust it will be so in Western Australia, that the Government which has followed the progressive Government of the past four or five years, will be even more progressive, that is to say that it will build upon the foundations laid, and that there will be no violent break of policy which in itself must necessarily be an evil. In this connection I would like to impress upon the Government representative in this House that, even where there is no danger, fear may be as bad as danger. If by any act or speech of responsible Ministers of the Crown any condition of unrest or apprehension is created, it may have just as pernicious an effect as actual danger. The value of continuity of policy, the value of maintaining public confidence cannot be overstated in words. Now, coming to a few of the prominent points of the programme laid before the House, the Government propose to sweep away the present railway advisory board and create in its place a Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, that is to say a committee filling a more comprehensive place, dealing with public works in general as well as with railways. There is a good deal to be said on both sides of this proposal; and as one who has had to do with the new proposal, with the scheme which the Government propose to adopt, I want to point out some of the essentials. In New South Wales for twenty years past there has been a Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works dealing with all matters involving the expenditure of £20,000 and over, the Government retaining the power to deal with small works. It is really a Parliamentary committee; it represents both sides in the Legislative Assembly, and represents the Council as well as the Assembly. I am sure the Government in pursuing their proposal would do well to make their committee equally broad. Otherwise it would not be a Par-

liamentary committee. If it represents one side of the Assembly it would be a Government committee, if it represents the Assembly only it would not be a Parliamentary committee.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: The Premier said at Fremantle that it would be for both Houses.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: The idea is an admirable one; that a small committee light enough to travel where any public works must be carried out, and take evidence and come to their respective Houses with impressions as well as evidence, should be appointed is an admirable idea; but there is the danger. Like all human committees, it may fall from the intention of its proposers and become, not a committee of the fittest and best men, but largely a committee of place seekers who will electioneer even in Parliament itself and ask for work to get votes. The idea of getting five or seven of the picked men accustomed to deal with works, representing the best elements of Parliament, is a grand idea if it can be carried out; but if it comes to a member going to a Minister and saying, "You did not give me a portfolio, and you have not given me a Chairmanship of Committees; do nominate me for this committee," and going around and saying to his friends, "I am a candidate, I ask you to vote for me," it will be bad. If this committee is made to represent the most capable men in Parliament it will work well; but at the same time it is only fair and just to say that the present advisory board has done admirable work. I have been amazed at the industry and the apparent impartiality of that board; and it would be wrong to jump to the conclusion that a board constituted of permanent officials is necessarily hampered by its relationship to the Ministry of the day. I say that the gentlemen now carrying out the duties have done wonderfully well. Still there is a great deal to be said for the new proposal, and I think it is capable of being exploited with advantage. Another proposal worthy of notice is that to assist people with limited means to secure homes. It is an excellent proposal, and it does not come from only one side

in politics. But I want to impress upon the Government that "home" is a very sacred word, and I defy any logical or practical mind to dissociate home from freehold. How absurd it would be to think of a home on some other body's land. I do hope the Government will carry out this proposal on the permanent, solid, satisfactory basis of freehold. That will secure every improvement the owner may make, and will encourage him when he is tired after his ordinary day's work to still do something to make his home a sacred shrine for his wife and children, with all the innumerable associations he will gather around him to sanctify it. Let that home be the freehold of the person who has to occupy it. Another proposal contemplates the undoing of one of the last works of the former Parliament. The Government propose to reduce not only the salaries of Ministers, but also the salaries of certain Parliamentary officials, and it is no secret that that means the salaries of the President and the Speaker. This, to my mind, is a foolish proposal. It may be said why should Ministers not do what they like with their own salaries? Why not indeed? But in the light of their share in raising those salaries how can they face the people of the country and say, "Now we are going to have the kudos of giving up part of our income; look how patriotic we are; we are going to reduce our own salaries." I am not going to suggest they are not worth their present salaries, but I want to ask them is it the part of men who have come to years of maturity, men of responsibility, men who a few months ago acquiesced without a word of objection to the raising of those salaries, now to turn round and say, "We are the men to reduce those salaries." I am sure the representative of the Government in this House will agree with me when I say it is a very dubious proposal. Of course, it may be said that they have a right to surrender part of their salaries. If the country was in a state of stress, if some serious emergency had arisen, I could understand Ministers and members saying, "We will come to the rescue." But there is no suggestion of such emergency..

If Ministers persist in this, and I hope they will not, in the name of all that is rational why should they propose to reduce the inadequate salaries of the Speaker and President? These salaries are essentially low as compared with corresponding salaries paid in the other States, and in view of the onerous and dignified positions these officials hold. It would be utterly unworthy of the State of Western Australia to begin cutting a piece off the salaries of these officials. Look at the work of the Speaker. His work is never done. I admit the work of the President is lighter, but the position is a higher one before the country. Let it be remembered that these officials are not only working while in the Chamber, or in the committee rooms, but they are the official representatives of the country when visitors come, and on all State occasions. If the House will pardon me I would like to add here a word I took the opportunity of uttering when the Estimates were before the House, namely, that instead of reducing these two officials' salary it is to be hoped the Government will seriously consider the raising by £200 of the salary of the Clerk in each House. Their remuneration is utterly out of keeping with that of their colleagues in the other States, and with the duties of the position. I would urge upon the representative of the Government in this House that he prevent this retrograde step. It is an unwarranted rebuke to the Parliament which has gone out, and in which responsible Ministers of this Parliament played an important part. It is a rebuke to that Parliament, and is open to be construed into a call for kudos as patriotic surrenderers of money. I warn Ministers that the effect of it on the country will be that the majority of the people will say "It is a posing; it is a mere placard unworthy of responsible Ministers of the Crown."

Hon. B. C. O'Brien: A good many who supported the Bill did not know that Ministers' salaries were going to be raised.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: It was in the Bill, yet not a word of protest was uttered against the Bill. It is too late now, unless some great emergency arises calling

for an undoing of what the House unanimously and deliberately did. There is in the Speech a mysterious reference to a probable augmentation of the revenue. Of course, in plain language that will be interpreted to mean increased taxation. Yet West Australians are plucky descendants of Britishers. They are not afraid of taxation. But I would like to say to the Government that it is just one of those things which should not be touched unless there is need. Do not raise taxation for the mere fun of it. Do not alter the financial situation unless there is absolute need. If reasonable economy and administration will meet the case, that is the way to meet it, but if it does not, then of course the country must submit.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: You cannot economise when you make all-round promises of increases.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: I would impress upon the Government first of all to be very careful about increasing liabilities, and to be very careful how they augment taxation. Of course, when necessary the country will bear it. Another somewhat cryptic reference is the granting of equal political rights to all citizens. Now I hold that all people should have fair play, and I believe that those who are working for others, whether for a firm, for an employer, or for the State as a whole, should be fully considered and fairly dealt with. But I think it is just possible to be a little too hasty in assuming that what has been under a previous administration is wrong. I would take a broader view. Depend upon it whatever is, has a reason for existing, and the historic relation of the civil service to the Administration of the day must have some warrant or it would not have waited for a new Government in a flush of victory to alter it. The only restriction on the civil servants is that they cannot publicly criticise the administration of which they are a part. Is that an unreasonable restriction to place on the servants? Is it a restriction that you can take away without inevitable confusion and error? Imagine for a moment that a civil servant becomes a candidate for Parliament and freely criticises the administration of his own

department. Is the thing for a moment conceivable? It is utterly impossible. Now the only restriction on the civil servants to-day is, "You cannot criticise the administration of which you are a part. You may have your opinion and you may go to the head of your department and place your opinions before him, but you must not publicly criticise the administration of the State of which you are a part." Surely when Parliament studies this situation members cannot possibly pass any such proposed amendment.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Do you think that is the only meaning of the phrase?

Hon. J. E. CULLEN: I think that is the centre of the meaning—that civil servants may become candidates for Parliament and criticise the heads of their departments to their hearts' content. The candidate for Parliament must have the right of criticism; his candidature would be a mockery without that right. The civil servant to-day has, all other rights of citizenship, but there is this one restriction, that if he becomes a candidate for Parliament he must resign. If he succeeds well and good; if not he must be content to leave it to the Government of the day to do right by him. Surely that little restriction is a small thing compared to the utterly false position in which the service would be placed if it were allowed to become the critic of its employers. Here again I hope the Ministry will be guided by reason. I for one will do all I can to assist the representative of the Government in this House in his very responsible and onerous position, and I know that he will say with me that that is quite consistent with a careful consideration and free criticism of the measures he introduces. I wish him every success in his new position.

On motion by Hon. M. L. Moss, debate adjourned.

BILL—SUPPLY, £460,000.

All stages.

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

Second Reading, etc.

The Standing Orders having been suspended,

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew), in moving the second reading, said: This Bill is a periodical visitor to this Chamber, and although its sponsors frequently come in for a certain amount of criticism, the measure itself very seldom meets with any extreme opposition; in fact, I am not aware of an instance in which it has suffered through the shortcomings of those responsible for its introduction. In the first place, there should be no ground for criticism of the present Government in connection with this measure; the Bill is necessary through no fault of the present Government or the previous Government. The general elections were held on the 3rd October, Ministers took office on the 7th, and it was not until the 17th they were re-elected, and as soon as possible after their re-election they called Parliament together. With regard to the Estimates, it is the intention of the Government to submit them for the consideration of Parliament at as early a date as possible. The Supply Bill for £1,683,700 passed during the last session of Parliament was obtained to cover the expenditure for the first four months of the present financial year, and comprised £829,700 from Consolidated Revenue and £854,000 from General Loan Fund. The appropriation from Consolidated Revenue is exhausted and there is a balance of £557,640 of the General Loan Account, which will be sufficient to carry us on till the end of December. The Supply Bill which is now submitted to Parliament is to meet the expenditure from Consolidated Revenue for November and December, and is based on the actual expenditure for the past three months, exclusive of expenditure under special Acts. I beg to move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment; and the report adopted.

Read a third time, and *passed.*

House adjourned at 5.28 p.m.

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