

to-day in the Legislative Assembly. Yet the King said "I will accept the will of the people."

Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett: Not quite that, accept the advice of his Ministers.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: I am quoting from the hon. member's own newspaper or the cablegrams that were sent out and I was very careful on the point. The King said he would accept the will of the people.

Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett: That is not what was said in London.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: If the hon. member will look up the cablegrams of that particular time he will see that that was what was cabled out. When the King himself and the House of Lords accepted the verdict of the people as expressed at a general election I am quite sure that this Chamber will accept also the verdict of another place as regards general principles. Of course this Chamber may possibly, in matters of detail, occasionally differ, but where general principles are concerned the people have spoken at the last general elections and I am confident that this Chamber, which prides itself on being a non-party House, will show that it is a non-party House in the true and real sense of the term.

Hon. J. A. DOLAND (Metropolitan-Suburban): In addressing myself to the question before the Chair I would like at this stage to thank members for their congratulations in reference to my success during the recent by-elections, and also for Mr. Davis. We appreciate very much those references, and can only hope that the kindly feeling will prevail throughout the time we shall sit here and that we shall be able to get on together. There is one thing that struck me as peculiar during the time I have been sitting here, and it is the constant reference by members to the fact that this House is a non-party Chamber, and it appears to me to be somewhat of an anomaly. Particularly so is that to me, because just recently having been returned to this House on the particular issue as to whether this House assumed a party attitude or not, I am somewhat of opinion that party politics must prevail

to some extent. Again we have members in this Chamber, Mr. Moss for instance, with a very strong personality, and very firm political convictions, and I am afraid he would not like to sink his own personality or set aside his political convictions when dealing with measures that come before this Chamber. I think it should be distinctly understood that Mr. Davis and myself have come into the House absolutely pledged to a political party who now have the reins in another place, and as I have said before we have come into the Chamber on an election in which the issue was whether this House adopts a party attitude, and amongst other things, whether the franchise of this Chamber should be reduced in order to give a wider expression of opinion to the people. If this Chamber is a non-party Chamber it is only reasonable to expect that members would reduce the franchise so that that wider expression of opinion would prevail, and the accusation would not be thrown at the Chamber that the restricted franchise only admitted one section of the people. That is a phase that has appealed to me, and I am somewhat of the opinion that members here cannot sink their political differences because they are sitting in this particular Chamber. In coming to the Speech itself, exception has been taken by some members to some of the measures contained in the Speech, and exception has also been taken because of some omissions from that Speech. To those who object to the measures or proposals that are not included in the Speech I would say this, that we know the Government do not intend to have a long session, consequently it would be useless to put into the Speech matters which would have no chance of being dealt with this session, and perhaps during the next session, therefore they were not overlooked in the Governor's Speech in that regard. Those questions contained in the Governor's Speech can be given the fullest consideration to by members of this Chamber. Contained in the Speech are many proposals, and to every one of them I give my whole soul support. One proposal that appeals to me particularly is that dealing with the establishment of



homes for the people, and wrapt up in this question is, I think, a solution of what we have been looking for, the high cost of living that obtains. It was interesting to notice the process of reasoning that Mr. Moss adopted in connection with the high cost of living. He has said that it is owing to the increase in wages that the cost of living has gone up. I think that is altogether a wrong foundation on which to argue. We know full well—sensible people must know this—that in order to meet increased demands workmen must have increased wages, and Mr. Moss—I think he has studied the question and is fully conversant with it—must recognise that other factors are at work besides working men in a particular industry, that go for making the high cost of living. For instance Mr. Moss referred to the Federal referendums which were submitted to the people in last April, and assured members that he was opposed to them. If Mr. Moss was desirous of reducing the cost of living to the people in the State he should have taken a stand to see that the referendums were given effect to. As a State he may argue that we are robbing this Parliament of certain powers, but still there were wrapt up in the question the existence of industries this State cannot deal with. I have only to instance the sugar combine that operates over the whole of Australia. It was impossible for any one particular State to deal with a combine or monopoly of this nature. Had the Federal Government been given the power on April 26th to deal with this particular monopoly then one phase of the high cost of living would have disappeared. The only way to have dealt with the sugar industry was to have given to the Federal Parliament power to nationalise this monopoly if they desired and there was the solution of the trouble. There are of course other industries that have the same effect on the life of Australia as the sugar combine, and Mr. Moss in opposing the referendums has shown no desire to solve the problem of the high cost of living. I contend that in this measure for establishing homes for the people we have a basis whereby we can bring about a re-

duction of the cost of living to the people. We know full well in many instances the landlord has been responsible for a very large increase in the cost of living, and if the Government give to the people an opportunity of becoming their own landlords this phase of the difficulty will disappear.

Hon. M. L. Moss: You may take this for granted, that anyone who puts his money into residential property can only get 4 per cent. on it.

Hon. J. A. DOLAND: That is a query. I will relate one instance. I myself have been paying rent at the rate of 12s. 6d. per week for the last 12 months, in fact for a period of four years that was the rent. During the last six months that rent has risen to 17s. 6d. and is still going up. Do you mean to tell me that the profits are only 4 per cent.? Here it is increasing beyond all reason. That is the position. Landlords are only human beings and when the demand for houses increases they take advantage of it all.

Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett: Would you make it freehold or leasehold?

Hon. J. A. DOLAND: Where the Government are providing the land for the people I think that they should retain the ownership of it. It is the policy of the party that, where they provide homes for the people and provide the land as well as the home, they should retain the ownership of the land. There is another proposal contained in the Speech to which some exception has been taken, and that is the proposed establishment of a works committee in Parliament. I think that it would be a wise step, and I do not see any of the dangers surrounding it that some members seem to see. We have this advantage in a committee appointed by Parliament, that in reporting on any proposed work there will be not only a majority report from that committee, but also a minority report. If the committee were not unanimous in regard to a work the minority would have an opportunity of submitting a report, and Parliament would thus have the two sides to the question. I understand that the present advisory board take action only when the Government direct them to do so.



Hon. M. L. Moss: I do not think that is so.

Hon. J. A. DOLAND: Be that as it may, we should have the opportunity in connection with these works of listening to a minority report as well as a majority report from a properly constituted parliamentary committee. If on that ground alone, I think it would be advisable to establish this committee. Some exception has been taken to the action of the Government in regard to the public service in the direction of granting full political rights to the civil servants. I do not think any great exception can be taken to this. Every citizen should have as wide a scope for the expression of his opinion as can possibly be given. There is no comparison between the employees of the State and the people employed in a private capacity; totally different sets of circumstances govern the two. The civil servant at the present time has not the full privileges that he should enjoy, and if we pride ourselves on being a democratic community, giving the widest possible privileges to every citizen, why not let us take this opportunity of extending this privilege to the huge body of public servants? Some doubt has been expressed by members as to the attitude which the Government will adopt in reference to their land policy, but, as Mr. Kirwan has pointed out, the people have adopted this policy, and on general principles I think this House should agree with a policy which the people have accepted. The land policy was made an issue at the recent general elections and it was an issue also at the elections of Mr. Davis and myself, and that policy was adopted overwhelmingly by the people. The broad principle was accepted by the electors, and, as to the fear raised by some members of the possibility of insecurity of tenure, and of those having leaseholds not being able to borrow money, I should say we should endeavour to keep the lands free from the clutches of financial institutions and money lenders. Under a leasehold system we would be doing more to keep the lands out of the hands of these people than by taking money from the selectors in the early stages of develop-

ment, as we do under the present system of alienation. Mr. Cullen has referred to the reduction of the salaries of Ministers, and, like other members, I think it is a question of which the Ministers themselves should be the best judges. As a matter of fact, I understand that the previous Government were pledged to the people to reduce their salaries, but, instead of taking that step the salaries were increased. I do not think that any objection can be taken to this proposed reduction, and if the Ministers themselves desire it this House should abide by their judgment. In regard to immigration, some members seem to be doubtful as to the attitude of the Government, but I would like to assure them that the Government are just as keen on populating the State as any other party. I have only to refer them to the attitude of the Federal Government, who have a desire to see the whole of Australia populated, and who are increasing the federal vote for that purpose this year. In the case of our own State Government members will find that they need have no fear about the attitude that will be adopted on that question. Mr. Connolly has referred to the opposition that was shown by active followers of the Government now in power to the policy that previously obtained under the preceding Government. So far as Mr. McCallum's attitude is concerned, I think his protest was a timely one and that his letter was quite warranted, for I, as an employer in the State, know that at that time, when there was a disposition on the part of the Government to import artisans, on the plea that there was a scarcity of them, there was no difficulty in my particular trade in finding plenty of workers. The same state of affairs obtained throughout all the trades and industries. The hon. member referred to figures obtained from the Labour Bureau, and it is interesting to take note of the manner in which vacancies are filled through the labour bureau. If the bureau sends a man to do an hour's gardening that is considered an engagement of a permanent character, and, of course, it does not take many of these engagements to swell the lists of men engaged. But engagements of that kind are not a true indication of



the stability of industry or the necessity for artisans and other labour in the metropolitan area. The bureau also issues tickets monthly, and it is the duty of an applicant to present his ticket every time he appears at the bureau; on his failure to produce his ticket it is taken for granted that he has secured an engagement elsewhere. The folly of that system is that a man may go continuously to the bureau for a period of two or three weeks without securing any employment, and at the end of that time may decide that he will not bother with the bureau any more; but his failure to return his ticket is taken as an indication of his having obtained employment. In this way the records of the bureau are not a true indication of the state of the labour market.

Hon. M. L. Moss: Is there any difficulty in getting employment?

Hon. J. A. DOLAND: Undoubtedly. On one occasion an advertisement was inserted for a few labourers for sewerage work, and hundreds of men applied.

Hon. M. L. Moss: There is no unemployed difficulty here.

Hon. J. A. DOLAND: Not in the sense that perhaps the hon. member would like to see it, but the fact remains that there is always a certain number of unemployed.

Member: Around the City?

Hon. J. A. DOLAND: Yes, and in some places in the country, where the work that is to be had is for such low wages that men will not take it. We come again to the skilled artisans, and it is in this connection that objection was taken to the policy of immigration under the last Government by certain men connected with the Labour party outside of Parliament. In the skilled trades there is no difficulty in securing labour. In the iron moulding industry we had 10 or 12 men take their departure from the State at the very time when the late Government were crying out for the importation of artisans. These men had to leave Western Australia because they could not get employment here.

Member: Were they not out on strike?

Hon. J. A. DOLAND: No, they were not; they could not get employment in the State. Then again the society of en-

gineers paid the fare of eight men to the Eastern States, and these men were assisted immigrants, so that we had not only to give them assisted fares from England to Australia, but we had to pay their fares out of the State again.

Hon. C. Sommers: Good electioneering tactics.

Hon. J. A. DOLAND: They were no more electioneering tactics than the hon. member himself would adopt when dealing with absolute facts. I am only quoting these facts in answer to Mr. Connolly's attack on Mr. McCallum. The letter which Mr. McCallum sent to the English Press was written because advertisements were being published in the old country calling for artisans in industries which had no vacancies whatever.

Hon. M. L. Moss: It was the most patriotic production that ever emanated from the pen of any man in this country.

Hon. J. A. DOLAND: Whether or not Mr. Moss thinks the letter was patriotic, the fact remains that the party which Mr. McCallum was following was returned by an overwhelming majority, and the only two elections for this Chamber since that time have also resulted in the return of members of that party. That is sufficient evidence of whether the people consider that that letter was patriotic.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): In common with some of the other members I desire to offer my congratulations to the two new members, Messrs. Davis and Doland, who have been returned since we last met. It is not my intention to say much this evening as I take it the responsible Minister, Mr. Drew, will reply to some of the criticisms which have been offered. There are just one or two matters which I would like to say a few words upon. A good deal has been said by Mr. Doland in reference to the non-party attitude of the members of this House. While it may be said it is a non-party House, I think the remarks of those speakers who have principally dwelt on that aspect go to show that if we are not a non-party House we are at least a pro-