

rate than they are now going. Members on the other side have to be shoved by the people before they will do anything. Ever since the Labour party went out of office we have had a Government which has done nothing but talk. We have a Premier now who, if talk is any good, has talked enough to save Western Australia, and who, if he did what he says he is going to do, will put us out of our difficulties by the end of the financial year. When the end of the financial year comes, however, we shall find that what has happened in the past will happen again. Members of the Government say they are the only people who possess the necessary business acumen. As a matter of fact, they have not been as good administrators by half as the Labour Government. They had more revenue, and though they spent less money they went further into debt. They are beginning to admit now that they know nothing about administration. When the Labour Government were in office they were criticised because of the amount of money they spent. They did spend money, but work was being carried on in Western Australia because of that expenditure. The expenditure last year was even more than was the expenditure in the last year of office of the Labour Government, but where are the works going on in Western Australia? There are none.

The Minister for Works: Nonsense.

Mr. MUNSIE: Nothing has been done by the Government. When he sat on this side of the House the Premier was one of the most bitter critics of the Labour Government, and said that the whole of the money borrowed by them and spent on public works had been wasted. At the sitting before last he said that the whole of the money that had been borrowed and spent in Western Australia was a good asset for the State. That shows how his attitude changes when he crosses over to the other side of the House. I hope the Government will make a genuine endeavour to reduce the cost of living. I warn them that if they neglect to do this their political existence will be brief. They will never survive the next election if they fail to effect an improvement. In spite of their talk about the matter I have no faith in their intentions.

On motion by Mr. Robinson debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 14th August, 1919.

	PAGE
Questions: Sodium Nitrate	168
Education, Secondary School attendances	168
Nationalist Workers, Royal Commission	168
Fruit Canning, subsidy to Company	169
Point of Order: Papers laid on the Table	169
Leave of Absence	169
Bill: Pearling Act Amendment, 1A.	169
Address-in-reply, seventh day	169

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

QUESTION—SODIUM NITRATE.

Hon. H. STEWART asked the Minister for Education: What restrictions or regulations are in operation or are likely to be brought into operation with reference to the use of sodium nitrate in nitro-glycerine explosives?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied as follows: Regulations are now being framed, and will be gazetted on Friday next, permitting the use of sodium nitrate in mining explosives, provided that the presence of that compound is indicated in the marking on the cases.

QUESTION—EDUCATION, SECONDARY SCHOOL ATTENDANCES.

Hon. J. E. DODD asked the Minister for Education: 1, What number of children over the age of 14 years left the State schools in 1917 and 1918? 2, Are any figures available as to the percentage of scholars leaving the Primary Schools who passed into the Technical or Secondary Schools?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied as follows: No statistics are kept which would enable me to answer these questions, but steps are being taken to collect the information.

QUESTION—NATIONALIST WORKERS, ROYAL COMMISSION.

Hon. H. CARSON asked the Minister for Education: 1, Has a Royal Commission been appointed to inquire into the recent Fremantle trouble? 2, If so, who are the gentlemen to act on the commission? 3, What is to be the scope of the commission's inquiry?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied as follows: No. The delay is due to protracted negotiations with the Federal Government, which is jointly concerned with the State Government in the matter. Finality will be reached on the visit, next week, of the Acting Prime Minister.

QUESTION—FRUIT CANNING, SUBSIDY TO COMPANY.

Hon. A. SANDERSON asked the Minister for Education: How much money has been contributed by the Government to the A.F.L. Fruit Canning Company (a) up to the time the Government receiver was appointed, (b) since the Government receiver took charge?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: (i.) £4,866; (ii.) £3,300.

POINT OF ORDER—PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: The Minister for Education has this afternoon laid on the Table of this House a balance sheet of one of the State trading concerns. On a point of order, I should like to ask whether when a paper is laid on the Table in another place, it should not be laid on our Table at the same time?

The PRESIDENT: I think the hon. member's question scarcely involves a point of order so much as a point of custom. It is customary, as the hon. member has suggested, that returns and balance sheets and other papers of that kind should be placed on the Tables of the two Houses simultaneously, unless such a paper is laid on the Table of one House by the individual order of that House.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: If my attention is at any time drawn to the fact of a paper being laid on the Table of another place and not at the same time on the Table of this House, I shall give the matter attention.

Hon. A. Sanderson: I have in mind particularly the State Implement Works balance sheet.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. H. Millington (North-East) leave of absence for three consecutive sittings granted to the Hon. J. Cunningham (North-East) on the ground of ill health.

BILL—PEARLING ACT AMEND- MENT.

Introduced by the Minister for Education and read a first time.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Seventh Day.

Debate resumed from the previous sitting.

Hon. J. DUFFELL (Metropolitan-Suburban): In common with previous speakers on this motion, I desire to endorse the remarks of the leader of the House regarding the lamented death of our esteemed late President, Sir Henry Briggs, and also to express my congratulations to yourself, Sir, on your elevation to the Chair, and to Mr. Panton on his return as member for the West

Province. Further, I am sure all members are delighted to see Dr. Saw back after his services to the Empire in the great conflict. May I also add my congratulations to Mr. Allen on his appointment as Chairman of Committees in this Chamber. It is generally admitted, I think, that the Governor's Speech is fairly comprehensive, outlining measures of great importance and also indicating, at the outset, the occasion we have for thankfulness that the titanic struggle in which the Empire has been engaged for nearly five years has terminated successfully for Great Britain and her Allies. The Speech is very happily phrased in that respect. It then proceeds to deal with what is admittedly one of the most important and most humane duties we can perform—the repatriation of our returned soldiers. I am sure we all admire the work which has been done in this respect, but at the same time we must regret that so much has been left undone. Taking into consideration the fact that disabled men have been returning from the battle fields since 1916, we must conclude that there is something lacking in the matter of repatriation. Some means ought to be devised whereby more rapid consideration could be given to the cases of the men who are anxious to begin life under normal conditions again, and to avail themselves of the avenues open for securing a livelihood. We have read of the journeyings of the Premier through various parts of Western Australia, seeking land suitable for the purposes of soldier settlement. We have also been informed that vast sums of money have been expended in repurchasing estates. Whether that is the right or the wrong course, I shall not argue to-day. However, I cannot but think that not sufficient attention has been paid to the men who have returned maimed, having lost an arm or a leg, many of them married men. It would be the height of folly to expect those men to go out into the back blocks of this State to seek a livelihood. The experience of members of this Chamber who have toiled on the land for many years has informed us of the difficulties which lie in the path of even those in the full possession of their health and limbs. On the subject of disabled soldiers, I feel that a few remarks are worthy of the consideration of the House. We have only to go round the suburban areas, within five miles of the general post office, to find thousands of acres which could be utilised to great advantage in this direction. One need only look around Belmont Park, Victoria Park, Queen's Park, South Perth, Bayswater, and Maylands to see for oneself large areas suitable for cutting up into five-acre blocks to be settled by these maimed soldiers. There they would have tramway facilities convenient for getting into and out of the city, school conveniences for their children, and a copious water supply for domestic and other purposes; and thus the disabled soldier would be able to earn something to augment his pension and be able to keep his wife and children in fair comfort.

The matter is one to which I have given some consideration, and the more I think of it, the more certain I feel that those areas should be bought up for the sake of our disabled men. In settling the men on those blocks it will be necessary to provide tramway facilities. We have heard a good deal of the need for improved means of transport for people living within $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles of the post office. Time after time have those people appealed for such facilities. I remember that when Mr. Scaddan was Premier I accompanied him to South Perth, where the people were pleading for an extension of the tramways. They even suggested that, in the event of the Government not seeing their way clear to carrying out the work, a company was prepared to construct the tram line for a certain concession. Only a few days ago a deputation, representing a number of local authorities, waited on the Premier to urge the necessity for tramway extensions, and the extension of water supply to Belmont Park and Victoria Park East. I do not know what the Government intend to do in that respect, but I am convinced of the necessity for the extensions asked for. The Government have control of the tramways and the railways. With the increased power they now have at East Perth, they should be able to extend the tramways. Their plea is that they have not the necessary rolling stock. But clearly, if they cannot do the work required, it is about time they handed the tramways over to some local authority.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: To the Perth City Council, for instance.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I am not wholly in favour of that, but the Government will have to find the money to provide the required facilities. The Perth City Council have said they are prepared to do it. If the Government are to retain possession of the tramways, it is necessary that they should lose no time in getting to work to meet the insistent demand for extensions, and so help to relieve the existing unemployment among not only the returned soldiers but also those who could not go to the war. If the vacant properties I have referred to were utilised in the manner suggested, men who have lost limbs in the war would be able to raise poultry and grow fruit with happy results, both to themselves and to the State. The Speech goes on to say that—

Whilst the State Government are at all times anxious to assist and to co-operate with the Commonwealth Government in the work of repatriation generally, its direct duties are to afford the widest scope for land settlement by returned soldiers, and to extend to them practical and effective preference of employment in the public service.

I heartily approve of that. Returned soldiers are, in many instances, disappointed with the treatment extended to them. In hundreds of cases men have taken the wrong track through that very disappointment. With the co-operation of the Commonwealth Government,

we should be able to satisfy all our returned soldiers. I regret to say that the Commonwealth Government have not kept faith with Western Australia. On two occasions we have had to go to the people and preach conversion, and on each occasion Western Australia voted in favour of the proposal, and so expressed perfect readiness to make all sacrifices necessary to the salvation of the Empire. And when it came to the silver bullets, how splendidly did Western Australia respond! In view of this, I think it is a shame that we should be treated in the manner we have been by the Commonwealth Government, in regard to repatriation in Western Australia. We hear of much that is going on in the Eastern States, but, as has been said by previous speakers, unless one is in Melbourne one has but a very small conception of the amount of repatriation money being spent there. During the war very little of war expenditure came to Western Australia. To-day we are appealing to the Commonwealth Government to assist us in the carrying out of our duty to the returned soldiers. We have very little to thank the Commonwealth Government for in this respect, but I hope that, before long, the Government will realise that we are out for what is right and mean to get it. We frequently have to listen to Mr. Sanderson on unification. To my mind unification is the very last movement we should encourage. We are a sovereign State, we understand our duties and we carry out those duties. But, seeing how often our rights are encroached upon, and remembering the famous speech made by the leader of the House some 18 months ago, it seems to me we shall be lacking in our duty if we do not bring pressure to bear on the Commonwealth powers to recognise our rights. The present is our best opportunity, and if we fail to take full advantage of it we shall be deserving of scant courtesy in the future. I was very pleased yesterday with a paragraph in the "West Australian," which bears out what I have been advocating for a very long time. It deals with the question of industrial unrest. In passing, let me say it has been extremely gratifying to hear the speeches of hon. members representing the Labour party and to note the moderation of those hon. members, urging their colleagues in the House to use every effort to secure an early return to normal conditions. It may be something in the atmosphere of the House, for it not infrequently happens that candidates on the hustings freely advocate recourse to drastic measures but, on reaching here, show themselves prepared to listen to the views of other hon. members. I was pleased to note the attitude of the Minister for Mines towards the system of wages boards. Five years ago I strongly advocated the creation of wages boards, which I think would serve to avert such bitter industrial struggles as we have had during the last four or five years. By means of wages boards the employers and the employees are brought together for a round table discussion under an independent

chairman. Employees with a case for the Arbitration Court frequently have to wait for months before they can be heard. Then, when the case is brought on, it often happens that the representatives of the respective parties find it impossible to make themselves thoroughly au fait with all the industrial conditions which they wish to put before the court. In my opinion the system of wages boards is infinitely preferable to that of the Arbitration Court, and I was pleased indeed to see that the Minister for Mines promised to have a dispute referred to a specially constituted wages board. If we reverted to the wages board system we would have less trouble in the way of prolonged strikes than we have had in the past few years. It will be generally acknowledged that in the new Commissioner for Public Health we have a gentleman of whom we ought to be proud. He is a man of whom any country should be proud. We have only to consider what he has done. I have before me the last annual report of the Medical, Health, Factories and Early Closing Departments. I wonder how many hon. members have taken the trouble to read it. I have read it, and assure them that it contains information which would enable them to view the position held by the Commissioner with satisfaction so far as that gentleman is concerned. If we take the amendments to the Health Act of a few sessions ago in regard to venereal disease, and compare this report with them we can see what has been done as a result of those amendments. We shall also see the replies to the suggestions made by the British Medical Association. This association is an authority well worthy of consideration and has a standing beyond dispute. Its ability to deal with such questions is also beyond doubt. When we compare the recommendations of the British Medical Association with the amendments to our Health Act we cannot but be proud that we had something to do with the framing of that Act and the results achieved.

Hon. J. E. Dodd: What is the date of the report?

Hon. J. DUFFELL: It is the annual report for 1917. I wish to call attention to the report of the inspector of factories, on page 29. Dealing with the staff he makes the following remarks—

The staff of inspectors engaged in the administration of this and other industrial Acts is comprised of five persons, viz., Chief Inspector, one Inspectress, and three Inspectors. Of these, three are now rendering service to the Empire in professional and military capacities. Inspectress L. McNeill, who is an experienced qualified nurse, after unsuccessfully making several efforts to secure an appointment on the A.I.F. nursing staff, was so earnest in her desire to relieve the sufferings of the sick and wounded that she applied for and was granted twelve months leave of absence without pay, and, early in the year, pro-

ceeded to England at her own expense. She is now, I am pleased to record, in charge of a British Red Cross Hospital at Shrewsbury, England.

It has been argued from time to time that we are not getting the best out of our Public Service. Doubts have been raised as to whether we were getting good value for the money we were paying for the maintenance of that Service. Reports like this should dispel anything in that direction. You, Sir, with Mr. Ewing, Mr. Millington and myself have had some experience of the staff engaged in the State Children Department. We have also had occasion to extol the services of those officers. It was my painful duty to follow one of those experienced officers, Mr. Servante, to his grave at Karrakatta. He did yeoman service and had the welfare of the children at heart, especially those poor little ones on whom the world frowned. Mr. Servante was always on the spot when required to render what aid and assistance he could. We have had experience of his services, and it is with deep regret that I have now to say that this officer, who a few days ago proceeded to Kalgoorlie to serve rations to those poor families who were suffering as a result of the woodline strike, contracted pneumonic influenza there and passed away, leaving a widow and children to mourn their loss. One question of great importance is in regard to the sanitary sites in and around the city of Perth. Let us take the municipality of Subiaco, for instance, where there is a population of 12,000 people. Let hon. members imagine a sanitary site on the borders of that municipality, with residents within a quarter of a mile and families being raised there. This state of affairs has been going on ever since Subiaco became a municipality. To-day it is even worse than ever. Unless the Government step in it seems that there is no way of relieving the situation. The municipality cannot expend any of its money outside its boundaries, and there is no place within its boundaries for a new sanitary site. It would, therefore, be necessary to go out some distance towards the North Beach and construct roads to a new site there at great expense. The sewerage system has now been in existence for a number of years in the metropolitan area, and some of the more remote suburbs have already been connected with it. It seems beyond comprehension why the municipality of Subiaco, which has a proper contour of country and where the treatment works could be erected and the effluent turned to advantage without disability to the inhabitants, should be allowed to remain in its present state for so long.

Hon. J. Ewing: Whose fault is that?

Hon. J. DUFFELL: The gentleman who was Minister for Works in the Scaddan Government, Mr. W. D. Johnson, is the one upon whom the blame must rest. At that particular time the Minister for Works, realising the necessity for sewerage the municipality of Subiaco, made arrangements for a piece of land known as Thomas's farm in the south-

west corner, and exposed to the prevailing winds commonly known as the Fremantle doctor, to be used as a sanitary site. We knew what it would mean if the treatment works were placed on that land, although I believe a deposit was paid upon it so that it could be utilised for treatment works. It would have been the finish of Subiaco if the works had been carried into effect on that land. Realising the danger I, as mayor of Subiaco at the time, and others, raised a storm, with the result that after several deputations, Mr. Johnson said, "I will agree to a referendum and if the result of that referendum is in favour of the site, you will abide by that result." We replied in the affirmative. He then said if the result of the referendum was opposed to the site the works would not be placed there. We agreed to that, and a referendum was taken, and by an overwhelming majority the ratepayers voted against that particular site. Mr. Johnson then said, "You must wait until we are in a position to sewer that municipality." Without further ado he went out towards North Perth and Guildford with the sewerage system. This is the reply to the interjection by Mr. Ewing. There is also another site to which I desire to call attention which is equally bad. I refer to that in North Perth.

Hon. J. E. Dodd: It is disgraceful.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: Less than $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles from the General Post Office, and less than half a mile from the present tramway terminus, and in the midst of a thriving district and a vast residential area, we find this sanitary site. How long will this state of affairs last? The Government must do something and find ways and means whereby these sites can be moved, and the necessary improvements made. There is a difference in the two sites I have referred to. In one case, the municipality can go nowhere else unless the Government find the money for a road out towards the North Beach. In the other case, it is possible for the municipality to go two miles further back, and this would relieve the situation. The land could then be utilised for a park or for other purposes in a few years' time. There is also a great risk being run in Subiaco as a result of the flies which are bred on the sanitary site, and which find their way throughout the municipal area. I bring this matter forward now so that the Government may go into it at the earliest possible moment, and before the session is closed we may have the satisfaction of seeing that the work I have mentioned is well in hand. I desire to refer to a remark made by Mr. Dodd yesterday. Before doing so I would congratulate him on the magnificent address he delivered, and in managing fairly accurately to prove that most members of this Chamber were socialists. That is the kind of socialism I approved of and am glad to be associated with. Mr. Dodd referred to the milk question. I do not think any member will say that there is not room for improvement in this direction. We have only to see the number of milk carts that are

overlapping each other in the streets, and rattling along before daylight, to understand that this must mean an increase in the cost of an article which is so necessary to our domestic life. I do not object to the State control of the milk supply, and I think the State could handle that matter very well if it set about doing so in the right way. What I would suggest is that they should buy the whole of the milk rounds and begin by getting the milk taken to one dépôt, where it could be properly chilled. It would be possible then for the Government to sell one round to one man, who could take certain streets, another round to another man who could take another section, and so on, and the Government would get such a price for those rounds that they would come out with a substantial profit. The people themselves would have the satisfaction of knowing that they were getting pure milk, and they would also be saved the racking noise created by the carts tearing around the streets from four o'clock in the morning to breakfast time. That is my reason for being a socialist in that direction. I come to a matter which is of more than ordinary interest to hon. members, and it is the liquor question. Five years ago I strongly advocated that those who were taking a live interest in this question, instead of trying to make the people sober by legislation, should employ their time more profitably by going about and endeavouring to inculcate into the minds of the young the evils of intoxicating liquor. I am pleased to know that something has been done in that direction, but I also say without hesitation that much remains to be done. If we did now what was done in the days of old, when I was a boy, and established societies such as bands of hope, and provided entertainments for the young where the evils of intoxicating liquor would be taught, much more good would be the outcome, and the benefit would be lasting, and it would also be fulfilling the prophecy "Cast thy bread upon the waters and it shall return unto thee after many days." A great deal of tinkering has been going on since 1914 on the part of so-called prohibitionists and temperance reformers, and it makes one stop to ask what are we coming to. I am a believer in temperance in all things, but I am not a believer in total prohibition. I believe in the rights and liberties and freedom for the people. A certain amount of credit is due to myself in connection with the existing nine to nine liquor law. The introduction of that legislation was the result of some remarks which I made in this Chamber at the end of September or the beginning of October, 1914, a little more than a month after war broke out, and when the first liquor emergency legislation was introduced. It was then that I moved for the deletion of Clause 3 of the Bill which was before us, with the object of inserting a new clause to limit the hours for the sale of intoxicating liquors, that is to say, to fix the hours for the sale of liquor between 9 a.m. and 9 p.m., with severe penalties for any breach. On

that occasion, however, the amendment was lost on the voices, but in the next session I had the satisfaction of seeing that Bill go through this House with my suggested amendment, and without a dissentient voice. I have lived to see the result of the operation of that reform and I have come to the conclusion that it is the best measure of its kind in any of the Australian States or in the Dominion of New Zealand. Two years ago I travelled through the Eastern States and New Zealand to note, among other things, the effects of the liquor reform, which was being carried out in those places. In South Australia and in New South Wales they had then what was known as the six o'clock closing. They have it still, and, as I stated last session when the nine to nine measure was being re-enacted, we were on the right side. The hours fixed by this State were a long way ahead of what was known as the six o'clock closing in the Eastern States, and I proved by quoting excise figures that the six o'clock closing had resulted in the breweries doing an increased trade in bottled beer to the extent of 50 per cent. That clearly proved what I stated at the time, that if six o'clock closing came into operation in Western Australia it would be the means of encouraging the consumption of liquor in the homes, under the eyes of the children, from whom we wish to keep it away. That has been proved to be the case in South Australia and it is still going on. I went to New Zealand and I saw there the results of what is known as the Anti-shouting Act. I very soon fell in. I entered a hotel with some fellow-passengers and before going to dinner I asked my friends to join me in a sherry and bitters. The lady who was there said, "You are pretty bold" and I replied "What do you mean?" She stated then that she happened to know some of the gentlemen who were with me, and added "I would have been liable just as much as you, if I had taken your money." She knew the men and, of course, supplied the liquor and took the money. I am convinced that the nine to nine legislation is good, and I am going to do my level best to keep it on the statute-book as a permanent measure. But we must be careful what we are doing. Instead of bringing in a new Bill having for its object the same hours of trading, I want to see the existing law re-enacted from year to year, just as we re-enact the Land and Income Tax legislation. I gave my reasons when the measure was introduced in 1915. It meant then a tremendous amount of money, loss of time and great inconvenience to the licensees and the people who were the owners of property, and it has taken over two years to bring matters to a satisfactory position. If the Act is repealed and another one is introduced, it will mean that the whole of the trouble will have to be gone through again. I hope when the proper time arrives hon. members will look into the matter and will realise the necessity for re-enacting the measure and adher-

ing to the nine to nine law. Even with the existing law, however, there is room for improvement, and the amendment which I wish to indicate is in the direction of providing for increased penalties to be imposed on those who supply an intoxicated person with liquor. Under the present system a good deal of drunkenness is brought about by the attendants serving persons who already show signs of intoxication. We have inspection of liquors, but we want increased vigilance, and it is through lack of that that trouble arises. If the person serving the liquor to a drunken individual were punished, as is done in New Zealand, there would be less temptation to commit a wrong of that description. Before I close there is another matter to which I wish to call attention. Hon. members will remember that a few months ago we had a number of visitors who were known as the French Mission. Those gentlemen came amongst us to see for themselves what were our industries and what were the possibilities of doing trade with Australia. The Government of this State went to a fair amount of expense in showing those visitors our industries and our possibilities. Among other things the visitors were shown our vast timber areas at Big Brook and elsewhere. I know as a result of that visit those gentlemen went away with great ideas of the possibilities of establishing a trade with Western Australia. But, speaking with one of them, Mr. Siegfried, just prior to his departure, he made the remark to me "It is all very well for us to report the great possibilities of your State. When we get back to France we shall make our report and there it is likely to stop unless you people in Western Australia will send a commissioner of trade to France and back up the work we have done, and further the objects of the Mission." This remark can also be applied in other directions. Last session I asked that the report which you, Sir, made on your trip to the Federated Malay States should be printed as a Parliamentary paper. As a result of that, the information which was contained in that report was sent to those controlling various primary industries in this State, and particularly the fruit industry. I am satisfied if a trade Commissioner were appointed, much could be done to open up avenues for export trade. The opportunity is open for us and if we do not get in now, we shall wake up later on to find that we are too late. I hope that, during the coming session, these and other matters voiced by members during the Address-in-reply will be taken into consideration by the Government and that the Government will leave no stone unturned to carry into effect those works so necessary for the expansion of the country, works which will provide facilities for the people to get away from the metropolitan area to those lands to which I have referred. I trust that at the close of the session we shall be able to say we have at least done our duty.

Hon. J. F. ALLEN (West): I deplore the loss this House has sustained in the death of our late President, Sir Henry Briggs. Although I had not the privilege of having sat under his control for a great number of years like you, Sir, and other members, yet during my short period I have realised to what extent his knowledge of procedure and debate and his ability to control the House made for the successful work which was done here. During the last 23 years, as a resident of the province he represented, I had frequently come into close contact with our late President. He was not what is commonly known as a roads and bridges member; he was not a member who simply considered it his duty to look after the small things required by the people he particularly represented. He had a wider vision, and his experience and energies were expended more in the direction of the national improvement of our people than in the smaller affairs of his own province. In him I have lost a personal friend. When first I entered this Chamber, a novice in political affairs, I received from his hands that most necessary assistance which new members require. He pointed out errors I was committing and gave me advice from which I hope I have profited and, if I have profited, I hope this Chamber may have received a proportion of the benefit. I have to congratulate the House upon having, to succeed Sir Henry, one with the experience and ability you, Sir, possess. I congratulate you on being elected to the office of President. I believe your knowledge of Parliamentary procedure and constitutional matters, of the rules of debate and of the Statutes of this State, will be of vast advantage to members and to the State generally. I join with other members in welcoming back Dr. Saw. He has been engaged in a much nobler and greater work than he could have performed in his seat in this Chamber and, the necessity for his services abroad having ceased, we are glad to welcome him back. Members have already extended a welcome to my colleague from West Province, and I join with them in welcoming him. Fremantle has a reputation for sending men of quality here, and in the hon. member we shall have an acquisition to the Chamber. Mr. Panton and I differ in politics, and, although the people of Fremantle sometimes sidestep in their political opinions, they never make a mistake in the quality of men they send here.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: What about the grass eater?

Hon. J. F. ALLEN: The gentleman referred to is not a member of this Chamber. When I first came into this House a little over five years ago, we were a people looking forward cheerfully to the future and to the development of this State, to upward growth and to prosperity. True, we had our difficulties. We had difficulties which had been created by the Government who at that period were holding the reins of office. We had those difficulties which some of us anticipated would produce great problems

for future solution; but the difficulties we anticipated at that time were simply as a shadow cast by a gnat's wings, compared with the overwhelming clouds under which we have been struggling during the last five years. Throughout that period we have been in a condition of chaos. The world has been engaged in the greatest war in history. Civilisation has been locked in the deadly embrace of conflict which from time to time almost filled us with despair. We almost felt that civilisation was going to be wiped out of existence and sometimes we thought that success would not be ours. But as the darkest hour of the night is just before the dawn, so last year, when everything seemed to be at its worst, the light broke upon us and peace was attained. During the period I have been in this Chamber, all legislation we have had to place on the Statute-book has been more or less of a temporary nature, dealing with immediate difficulties and created for immediate purposes, and the great problems which at that time confronted the community had to be placed on one side. Now that peace has returned, we are once more in a position to look forward to a future, I trust, without any clouds overshadowing us like those of five years ago. We have before us such problems as this State was never previously confronted with. The difficulties placed on our shoulders during this period are of such a nature that they call for the exercise by the best minds amongst us of the greatest energy and the greatest optimism. The difficulties before us are not insurmountable. When the war started, we were faced with the greatest work which the world has had to tackle, and yet the success with which those vast organisations were brought into being and carried to fruition have shown that we in our day are capable of grappling with any problems that may present themselves to us. I am not going to deal lengthily with the various questions raised in the Speech. Some of them certainly need to be touched upon. The first is that of repatriation. We have heard it said that this is the duty of the Federal Government; we have heard it said it is the duty of the State Government. It is not the duty of the Federal Government only or the State Government only but of everyone of us. If the Federal Government did their best, they could not successfully repatriate our soldiers unless citizens assisted them, and the opening up of avenues of employment is not solely the duty of the Government but the duty of individuals who are receiving the benefits derived from the sacrifices of our soldiers. During the period of the war, what has been done in this State by citizens to establish industries and absorb our soldiers? The Government have discussed various propositions. Ministers have investigated various possibilities and the suggested industries to be established. One Minister suggested grindstones. I do not know whether we do manufacture them; I think not. In a recent report by the Federal authorities on the

establishment of industries, I find that we in Western Australia have established one industry, a rag doll factory at Narrogin. That is our record during the period of the war, as citizens of Western Australia, to absorb the soldiers on their return. True, the Government to-day are establishing a land policy which they hope will absorb a vast number of our soldiers, but what about the men who do not desire to settle on the land? They can be seen by hundreds in the streets to-day trying to find employment. What is to be done with the man who made sacrifices to go to the war. I have in mind a soldier with a wife and family of four children. When he left for the Front he was engaged in work as a contractor. He had a small plant worth £200 or £300. During his absence of nearly four years, his wife found it absolutely impossible to live on the allowance made by the military authorities and the capital which he had for carrying out his work practically disappeared. To-day he has come back incapable of taking employment as an ordinary worker, and unable to engage in the vocation he followed before he went away. What is to be done for a man like that?

Hon. H. Stewart: They should do as Wagin and Katanning have done.

Hon. J. F. ALLEN: I agree; the citizens of the State should take up the work themselves. The Government should be in the best position to indicate the avenues for the employment of such soldiers. I do not say the Government should establish these industries, but they should be able to direct the lines on which they should be established and assist the people desirous of establishing them. Why should the man on the land be the only one to receive assistance? Why should not the soldier who desires to enter into some occupation be able to borrow the money to do so?

Hon. A. H. Panton: He is able to.

Hon. J. F. ALLEN: To a very small extent as compared with the assistance granted to those going on the land. Recently I, with a number of people from my province and neighbouring districts waited on the Premier to advocate the opening up of certain lands between Fremantle and Mandurah for market gardening and dairying purposes, and the Premier seemed surprised that land of such value existed there. These lands should be investigated by the Government. I believe a large number of soldiers could be settled there. The advantage of settlement there is that the soldiers would be in small communities and, not only would we be absorbing the soldiers to establish the actual primary industries, but we would also establish the small secondary industries and the commercial activities which closer settlement produces. If this were done, we should have a satisfactory settlement of soldiers within close quarters of the city of Perth itself. This project has been followed up by Mr. Duffell in regard to another district and the same thing would apply to that land. I have recently been interviewed by a num-

ber of soldiers who are desirous of trapping opossums. I understand the opossum in this State has been protected for about six years. I do not know why, nor do I know much about opossums. I believe they are destructive to fruit and also to wheat. In any case, if the animals, after six years of protection, are still in need of being protected, the State is just as well without them. The soldiers are satisfied that they can make a living out of the opossum, thus reviving an industry which at one period was of considerable benefit to the State. I have repeatedly referred to the question of education in this Chamber, and I have been twitted by the leader of the House with having advocated economy in education. I have not, in fact, ever advocated that, for I do not think we can spend too much money on the education of our people, education being the greatest asset a nation can possess. But I hold there are errors in our educational system, errors which might easily be rectified, with good results as regards efficiency. There is really not any country which we can take as our model in the matter of education, for we should need a country whose circumstances paralleled those of Western Australia, and such a country is very difficult to discover. In the conversion of steel, for example, a decision has to be taken whether to turn a bar of steel into a rail or into a razor. And so with the education of a child. The educational system of this State must be suitable for the needs of our State. I think we are wasting a lot of money in the establishment of high schools, which money could be much better spent in other directions. The compulsory education age now ceases at 14 years, with the result that numbers of children drift out of the primary schools unfitted, almost, to take up the walk of life which they desire to pursue. The compulsory age should be raised. The difficulty in this respect, apart from the extra cost which would be entailed on the Government, is for poor parents to keep their children at school till a higher age. But that difficulty might be got over by utilising for this purpose moneys at present being devoted to continuation schools and other educational establishments. That money, I urge, should be used to assist parents who are not in a position to let their children attend school to the age of 16 years. Certainly I have no desire whatever to create hardship; all I desire is that our rising generation should have every advantage of preparation for the battle of life. We must realise that our children, coming into competition with the rest of the world, will fail in that battle unless they are as well equipped as the children of other communities. Another error which I consider our Education Department is making lies in the establishment of high schools in country districts. Instead of this, I consider, scholarships should be established, so that boys and girls in any part of the State might have the opportunity of attending one of two or three central high schools. I hear an hon. member say "Centralisation," but central-

isation is believed in by every man to this extent, that if the aim can be best achieved by centralisation, one ought to centralise. The wheat harvest, for instance, is centralised for export, and the functions of Government are centralised in the capital. It would be absurd to decentralise the Government by having one Minister at, say, Kalgoorlie, and another in Perth, and a third at Bunbury. We cannot have a high school in every town of this State. But the benefits of a high school education should be made available to every child in the State, and that aim can be achieved by means of scholarships. I am aware that such assistance is given by the State now, but it should be extended much more widely. There ought to be two or three central high schools, instead of these establishments being scattered all over the State.

The Minister for Education: That system would tremendously increase the expense, because so many more children would have to go away from their homes.

Hon. J. F. ALLEN: Exactly, but at present so many children are deprived of the benefit of high schools. Every country child should have the benefit of the same education as is available to children in the cities.

Hon. J. Duffell: There is too much free education now. Those parents who can afford to pay ought to be made to pay.

Hon. J. F. ALLEN: For my part, I consider that education should be universal and free, and that every child in the community should have an equal opportunity of obtaining the best education. The difficulty now is that children are turned out of the primary schools at 14 years of age very ill-equipped. The same difficulty is experienced by our technical schools as by our University, of pupils coming to them totally unfitted to take up those higher studies in which the State is prepared to assist them. They come to the technical schools and the University without having learnt the alphabet of education, practically. As regards the Traffic Bill, which is mentioned in the Governor's Speech, I do not know what form it is going to take; but there is one thing I should like to see embodied in it—the provision which obtains in the Eastern States, that no person shall drive a motor-car unless he or she holds a license. In this State almost anybody is allowed to drive a motor-car anywhere without challenge, the consequences being published by our newspapers in the form of reports of accidents.

Hon. J. Duffell: In proportion to the numbers of cars, there are fewer accidents here than in the Eastern States.

Hon. J. F. ALLEN: I do not know anything about that, but I believe that by requiring the license we shall reduce the number of accidents. I observe that the Government intend to bring in a Bill to amend the Electoral Act. As we grow older, we change our opinions on many things. Within the last few years the war has caused us to alter many of our views, and I have now come to believe that the principle of compulsory en-

rolment, introduced by the Federal Government, is a right principle. I consider that principle should apply to the State also, and I would go further and make voting compulsory. In this State to-day we already have the principle of compulsory voting. Any voter who goes to the poll when more than two candidates are standing, is compelled to vote for two candidates, whether he cares about the second candidate or not. There is the principle of compulsion in voting. On the other hand, the man who does not vote at all is not compelled to vote for anybody. We should develop that principle of compulsory voting, and compel every citizen who has a right to vote to exercise that right. This is nothing to smile about, seeing that the whole success of our constitutional system depends on the action of the individual. Unless the views of the whole of our people are reflected in Parliament, we shall not get wise legislation or legislation in the best interests of the people as a whole. Therefore I say that the whole of the citizens enrolled should vote. Another question I wish to deal with is not referred to in the Speech. That is the Wheat Pool and the legislation necessary in connection with it. I observe that the Honorary Minister who is in charge of the Wheat Pool in Western Australia, although he did not consider it necessary to foreshadow his intentions in the Governor's Speech, was prepared to go down to the conference of the Farmers and Settlers' Association and outline his policy there. No doubt the farmers and settlers are materially interested in the question, but the first place in which the policy of the Government should be proclaimed in connection with the Wheat Pool is Parliament, and not anywhere outside. I want to know whether it is the intention of the Government to enter into an agreement for the handling of next year's harvest. The Bill which was before us last session provided that power to the Government. However, the provision was deleted in this Chamber, and to-day there is no machinery in existence enabling the Government to enter into any agreement for the handling of next year's harvest. The Government must come to Parliament for authority. But ever since the Wheat Pool has been in existence Parliament has been ignored in this respect, and the necessary Bills have been submitted to the Legislature only after the thing has been done. If that happens in the future, I shall use my utmost endeavours to have any such measure thrown out by this Chamber.

Hon. C. F. Baxter (Honorary Minister): This House last session received a distinct assurance that a Bill would be submitted to Parliament before any arrangement was made.

Hon. J. F. ALLEN: I am glad to hear it. The farmers of this country are paying one farthing per bushel more for the handling of their wheat than the South Australian farmers are paying. In this State we have a monopoly as regards the handling of wheat; in South Australia about six competing bodies handle it. The farthing per bushel

makes a difference of from £10,000 to £14,000 per annum, and I wonder where the money goes. The Westralian Farmers Ltd. are receiving this amount in excess of what the competing agents in the Eastern States are receiving. Are the Westralian Farmers giving that amount back to the individual farmers in the form of bonuses? If so, there is not much to complain about. If not, the farmer of this country is paying too much for the handling of his commodity here. The work should be done for less in this State than in South Australia, because here we have one firm, the farmers' own representatives, handling the wheat. The advantage which it was stressed to us would accrue from giving the work to one firm was that it would be done better and more cheaply. But, as the result of the experience we have had, I now deny that. I have spent three months of this year travelling about South Australia, seeing the way in which the work is done there, and from the knowledge I gained while on the Royal Commission in this State I am satisfied that in South Australia the work is being done equally well as here, although it is costing a farthing less. In view of the experience we have had in the past, I hope that if the Government of the day do enter into any arrangement whatever before Parliament is advised, it will be an arrangement on more economical lines than the last. Mr. Dodd twitted me yesterday with being a socialist on this question. I am a socialist on any question where a monopoly controls the necessities of the people. In such a case the monopoly should be in the hands of the Government. No private owners should have the absolute monopoly of any necessity of humanity. On this question, therefore, I am a socialist, as on other questions of a similar nature. Recently I interviewed the Premier in regard to workers' homes. I have advocated the granting of freeholds instead of leaseholds to the workers, or at least the giving of the option to acquire the freehold if they so desire. Mr. Dodd, referring to the accommodation for officers and for men on the ships, said that the officers' quarters were palaces as compared to the shambles occupied by the sailors. He asked why there should be that difference. I ask why in this State there should be any difference of tenure in regard to one's home? The bulk of our own freeholds of our homes, and the farmers do not all hold the freeholds of their properties they desire to do so. If it is good enough for us and good enough for all people in the larger walks of life, surely the workers also have the right to acquire the freehold of their homes. I trust that opportunity will be given to the workers to acquire the freeholds; not to force them to take the freeholds if they do not desire to do so, but to so legislate as to enable those desiring the freehold to get it.

Hon. A. H. Panton: At all events, they went into the system with their eyes open.

Hon. J. F. ALLEN: That is quite true, but the fact suggests to me that they have since acquired second sight; that although they at first desired a home on the leasehold system, yet since they have acquired that home, and had some experience of the system, they now see that the advantage is all with the freehold. When those people come to me, as they do from all parts of the metropolitan area—people not politically akin to me, but rather of all shades of political opinion—some of them tell me that they honestly believed in the leasehold system until they tried it, and that they now desire the freehold. I trust the Government will see that they get it. I desire to refer to the industrial unrest throughout the world. Dissatisfaction and class hatred exist on all sides. I attribute this to two things, the first being the lack of adequate education for our children. I think every boy and girl should not only be taught the three R's, but should also be taught the application of knowledge. This is done already in industries in our technical schools, but I think every boy and girl should be grounded in the principles of political economy and constitutional Government. All boys and girls in early life should have an education which will enable them to judge intelligently of the various questions with which they will assuredly be confronted in after years. This is our great difficulty. We have crowds of people led by glib-tongued legislators and agitators, and I think that if our people had education on the two lines mentioned, it would be of the greatest assistance and would lead to a mitigation of the difficulty. The second trouble is the manner in which remuneration is paid to those engaged in industrial and commercial pursuits. To my mind Mr. Holmes was right when he said that the true system of payment should be by results—whether by piece work or by a system of profit sharing. I trust the intelligence of our people will enable them to find out. I am convinced that the method of paying an actual wage, as we might reward an animal, is wrong when applied to human beings, and that the man who places his ability and intelligence at the disposal of his employer should get something more than an actual living wage.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Would you pay the school teacher by results?

Hon. J. F. ALLEN: Yes. Our teachers are underpaid. There is a great deal of dissatisfaction in the education service over this question. I consider our teachers should be better paid. They have said very little during the war, but undoubtedly they have been overworked in a large number of cases. In my opinion the teachers should be well paid. In point of practice they are now paid by results, in that the best teacher gets the promotion.

Hon. J. F. ALLEN: They cannot get it today.

Hon. J. F. ALLEN: No, they cannot.

Hon. J. A. Greig: Having regard to the hours they work, the teachers are the best paid section of the community.

Hon. J. F. ALLEN: Anyone who holds that opinion should keep his eyes and ears open for the next 12 months, observe those engaged in the teaching of our children for the last 20 or 30 years, and compare the condition of those teachers with the health and general prosperity of those engaged in other walks of life. The teachers have not, as others have, definite avenues for improving their financial position; and the strain and worry of covering the same ground year after year with different children is something which we outside that organisation cannot realise. I once had a peculiar illustration given me as to how it affects the teacher. My friend said, "You seem to think we are going over new ground all the time. We are not. I might illustrate it this way: Suppose that on a train travelling from Fremantle to Perth I have to teach a number of children a piece of poetry. I start at Fremantle. At North Fremantle, before I am through more than a verse or two, some of the children get out and other new ones get in. Thus I have to start again. At Cottesloe Beach I am no farther along, when children again get out, passing others scrambling in. So at each succeeding station I have to stop the lesson and start all over again, until at last, when I get to Perth I am doing exactly what I was doing when we left Fremantle. The repetition and the monotony of the work means a strain which you cannot understand." Now let me refer to the recent trouble at Fremantle. I do not wish to say anything at all about the merits or demerits of the dispute. All I want to do is to treat of the facts. In 1917 the wharf workers of Fremantle came out for some reason still obscure. They gave one excuse after another, but the only conclusion at which one could arrive in the end was that they had come out as the result of instructions received from the Eastern States. To meet the situation thus created and carry on the work at the wharf and prevent hardships to the people, both the State and the Federal Governments fostered a condition of national employment on the wharf. A number of men termed nationalists were there engaged to do the work which previously had been done by the lumpers. The nationalists came on to the wharf, not only with the sanction of the Government, but with the authority and at the wish of the Government. If they did wrong the Government who employed them did wrong also, and if they did right those who opposed them did wrong. After those nationalists had been retained on the wharf for two years their position was challenged by the lumpers. What the pretext may have been does not concern us now. Once more the lumpers refused to work on the wharf, and this time it was unmistakably because the national workers were there. We all know the conflict which occurred on that celebrated Sunday down there. We know the result, and we know that those nationalist

workers had to leave the wharf. I understand that a Royal Commission is to be appointed for the purpose of investigating this question. I want to know of what possible benefit such a Royal Commission is going to be? There is not a man amongst those national workers who will dare to give evidence before the Royal Commission if he values his future, because neither the Government who put them on the wharf nor successive Governments are prepared to stand behind the men who assisted them out of the difficulty two years ago. Nor are the Trades Hall authorities prepared to stand by their own guarantee given to the Government that there should be no victimisation and no intimidation.

Hon. A. H. Pantou: You have no right to say that.

Hon. J. F. ALLEN: I have every right, because both victimisation and intimidation exist to-day, notwithstanding which I have not heard any representatives of the Trades Hall in Parliament, on the public platform or anywhere else appeal to the members of the organisations under their control to assist them in carrying out the pledge which they gave to the Government that day. Talk about no victimisation and no intimidation! I say that men are being driven to the verge of starvation. In one case in South Fremantle a family was so destitute that they had not even firewood. A benevolent friend said, "You can have firewood if you can get someone to cart it down." But when the appeal was made, there was not a licensed carter in Fremantle who had the courage to shift that wood along to the destitute family. In the end it was left to the private owner of a vehicle to carry the wood along.

Hon. A. H. Pantou: Why, I have sent carts out for similar purposes myself!

Hon. J. F. ALLEN: I am not saying anything whatever against Mr. Pantou, but I say that no attempt is made on the part of the leaders of the unions to induce their followers to carry out the pledge given at the time. Are they going to treat that pledge as the Germans treated their pledge, merely as a scrap of paper to be torn up at will, or are they going to carry out the pledge they gave the Government as the price of the victory they won? If not, they are unworthy of that victory, just as the Germans are unworthy of being citizens with us. Another case of victimisation has come under my notice. One man went all the way to Meekatharra in search of work. Surely that should have been far enough away to secure him immunity from any victimisation as the result of trouble in Fremantle! But he had not been working on the mine a week before the manager was advised that if that man continued in his occupation, the mine would be closed down! As a result, the man had to leave. Yet a solemn assurance was given that there would be no victimisation. In another case a man, not a nationalist worker on the wharf, had to leave his work because it was insinuated against him that he had been doing something which, according to the

tenets of the union, he should not have done. It was nothing more than an insinuation. The man has never been charged with any action against the organisation of which he is a member; yet because of the insinuation brought against him he is passed out of employment and cannot get anything to do. What does the union exist for but for the protection of its members and for the protection of the craft in which it is engaged? Yet to such uses has the organisation been put that apparently it is possible to blackmail and intimidate a member until he has to leave his employment. That is the sort of thing we are up against to-day, and unless it is wiped out it is going to be the curse of unionism. We are living in a country of free institutions and equal opportunities for all; yet here amongst those people, those who are claiming every privilege civilisation has to offer, we find intimidation and victimisation freely practised. All that we desire and all that we enjoy are based on the principle of justice.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. J. F. ALLEN: I have been speaking of the trouble a Royal Commission would have in arriving at any satisfactory finding in regard to the trouble at Fremantle, on account of the difficulty of keeping men's minds free from outside influences, and the effect of their utterances. When I speak of victimisation I do not refer to any individual or individuals, but simply to the system which obtains in industrial circles to-day. Probably no one associated with any of those organisations is in any shape or form to blame so much as the conditions under which we live, for it is these conditions which are responsible for this trouble. In this respect the Governments are not free from blame. We will investigate, for instance, the difficulties which have arisen over this particular trouble, in so far as they affect the Government. Since this House went into recess we have had three Governments, the Lefroy Administration, which was in office at the time; the Colebatch Administration, which came on in the interval, and the Mitchell Administration, which we have with us to-day. It was a distinction for this Chamber, never previously enjoyed by it, that one of its members was selected for the office of Premier. In the circumstances we, as a Chamber, are particularly interested in the history and the doings of that particular Administration. The trouble at Fremantle was begun some two years ago, when the Lefroy Administration was in office. But just prior to the difficulty which occurred this year, a change of Government took place, and the present Minister for Education became Premier of the State. The question of the merits or otherwise of this dispute does not concern me. What does concern me, and this House, is, who was responsible for the troubles which occurred on the Fremantle wharf with such disastrous results? Who was responsible for the fiasco

of that particular Sunday when the trouble came to such a dramatic conclusion? Since I have been in the Chamber, and for many years before, I have, in common with many men in the State, strenuously opposed the principle of the control of our Governments by caucuses, and also opposed caucuses being consulted instead of Parliament, and through it the people. In this particular case, after the difficulty which had been grappled with ineffectually by the Government in the hope of settling the dispute at Fremantle, we find in the dramatic conclusion of that particular Sunday that certain action was taken by the Premier upon which, up to the present, the public have not been enlightened. It is due to this Chamber, and to Parliament and the people, to know what explanation was made to the caucus meeting of National members of another place on that occasion, and why the trouble ended in the way it did, and who was responsible for it. The leader of the House owes to us and the country that explanation. I personally would like to know whether the Premier acted in conjunction with his own Cabinet, or whether he acted on his own initiative, and whether also he had the Government behind him. There is nothing personal in this request, but it is a case of the honour of this House being at stake. It is the first time we have had a Premier selected from amongst our members, and it is due to us that we should know the reason why his colleagues, the members of another place, were satisfied with his actions. We also desire to be so satisfied. The whole of the trouble was the outcome of that struggle which has been and still is taking place not only here but in every part of the world, the struggle for right, which is the fundamental principle upon which civilisation rests. Throughout the ages civilisation has been built up with patient care and loving sacrifice, from the days when men were like animals, when might was right, until the highest type of civilisation was reached, when right became the directing force of civilisation. We believe in the principle of justice, of righteousness, rather than the principle of might. The struggle in the industrial world is due to the struggle for right. We have seen what has taken place recently in Europe, the struggle between the power which believed in the principle of might, against the rest of civilisation, which believed in the principle of right. There is no doubt that unless we are prepared individually and collectively, as citizens, as Governments, and as Parliaments, to uphold the principle of right, these turmoils of the past will be as nothing to the turmoils of the future. For this reason it is necessary that we should have the best brains and the strongest characters in our community to guide our footsteps. This is the essential principle which has to be decided, and the grave question of our day. I cannot say anything further on this matter. It is what thousands of men have died for. It is the principle for which they have

bled. If we in Australia are not prepared to stand behind our Governments and see that this principle is maintained, we are unworthy of the privileges we enjoy. If the Governments are not also prepared to maintain that principle, even to the sacrifice of their personal advancement and ambition, we will fail deplorably, as we deserve to do.

On motion by Hon. H. Stewart debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 7.37 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 14th August, 1919.

	PAGE
Obituary: Mr. H. Robinson, letter in reply ...	180
Questions: Police Department, promotions, vacancies ...	180
Repatriation: Victoria District lands ...	180
Railway Extension, Ajana-Geraldine ...	180
Leave of Absence ...	180
Address-in-Reply, sixth day ...	180

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

OBITUARY—Mr. H. ROBINSON.

Letter in reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received the following letter—

Albany, 12th August, 1919. Dear Mr. Taylor, Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Western Australia. I duly received your letter of the 6th inst. conveying to me the resolution of the members of the Legislative Assembly expressing their sincerest sympathy with me and my family in the loss of my dear husband and father of my children. Will you kindly accept, and convey to the members, my heartfelt thanks for your kindly reference to my late husband, and permit me to assure you, that this added token of respect in which we rejoice to know he was held by the members of your honourable House is, and will ever be, a source of deep consolation to us in the great loss we have sustained. For your personal message of sympathy, please accept my grateful thanks. I am, Yours very sincerely, Meta Robinson.

QUESTIONS (2)—POLICE DEPARTMENT.

Promotions.

Mr. JOHNSTON asked the Minister for Mines: What method is employed in the Police Department for selecting members of

the police force for promotion to—(a) commissioned rank, and (b) non-commissioned rank?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: (a) and (b) A system of promotion by merit and by the aid of a selection board.

Vacancies.

Mr. JOHNSTON asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Are there any vacancies in the commissioned or non-commissioned ranks of the police force that have not been filled? 2, When it is intended to fill such vacancies?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, No. 2, Answered by No. 1.

QUESTION—REPATRIATION, VICTORIA DISTRICT LANDS.

Mr. MALEY asked the Minister for Lands: Referring to the answer given to Question No. 2, of 7th August, in regard to repatriation Victoria District, what is estimated to be the area of Crown lands available for the purpose mentioned, and where is it situated?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: The area available cannot be estimated.

QUESTION—RAILWAY EXTENSION, AJANA-GERALDINE.

Mr. MALEY asked the Minister for Works: 1, Has he received any report from the Engineer-in-Chief in regard to the suggested extension of the railway from Ajana to the Geraldine mines? 2, If so, what was the nature of such report?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, On the 4th December, 1918, the Engineer-in-Chief made an unofficial inspection of the country between Northampton and the Geraldine mines, with a view to the possible extension of the existing Northampton-Yuna Railway, but he was not instructed to, nor did he make an official report regarding the railway. 2, Answered by No. 1

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. Hardwick leave of absence for two weeks granted to Mr. Teesdale (Roebourne) and Mr. Veryard (Leederville) on the ground of ill health, and to Mr. Nairn (Swan) on the ground of urgent private business.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Sixth Day.

Debate resumed from previous day.

Mr. R. T. ROBINSON (Canning): I am found to-day supporting the Government, not because I agree with their policy, or do not agree with their policy, but because repeated changes of Government are not good for the State. It might be expected that I would have something to say