

**Legislative Assembly,***Tuesday, 18th November, 1913.*

	PAGE
Papers presented	2667
Petition: University Site	2667
Question: <i>Journal of Agriculture</i>	2667
Bills: Electoral Districts, &c.	2667
Supply (No. 3), £687,770, all stages	2667
University Lands, &c.	2728
Annual Estimates, Votes and Items discussed	2673

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

**PAPERS PRESENTED.**

By the Minister for Works: By-laws of the Gingin Road Board.

By the Premier: Report of the Commissioner of Police for the year ending 30th June, 1913.

**PETITION—UNIVERSITY SITE.**

Mr. ALLEN (West Perth) presented a petition, signed by the mayor and councillors of Perth, praying that a previous petition in behalf of Convocation of the University of Western Australia praying that a portion of King's Park be set apart for the University be not granted.

Petition received and read, and ordered to be printed.

**QUESTION—JOURNAL OF AGRICULTURE.**

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, What was the net cost to the State of the *Journal of Agriculture*, after deducting receipts from advertisements, etc., during the 12 months immediately prior to the discontinuance of its publication by the Liberal Government? 2, In view of the fact that our farmers have to contend with special problems in the various agricultural districts of the State, requiring constant advice and guidance from the professional officers of the Agricultural Department, is it the intention of the Government to again issue the *Journal of Agriculture* monthly, with the object of bringing that department into closer and more regular touch with the producers, and of making

the special knowledge and assistance of the experts more freely available to our settlers? 3, If not, why not?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, £434 16s. 7d. The *Journal* ceased issue with the September number for 1909, and consequently the figures for the financial year immediately preceding its discontinuance, and for the three months ending September are given, namely 15 months in all. 2, The matter is receiving consideration. 3, Answered by No. 2.

**BILL—ELECTORAL DISTRICTS.**

Introduced by the Premier and read a first time.

**BILL—SUPPLY (No. 3), £687,770.**

*Standing Orders Suspension.*

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan) moved—

*That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable resolutions from the Committees of Supply and Ways and Means to be reported and adopted on the same day on which they shall have passed those Committees, and also the passing of a Supply Bill through all its stages in one day.*

Question passed.

**Message.**

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriation in connection with the Bill.

**In Committee of Supply.**

The House having resolved into Committee of Supply, Mr. Holman in the Chair,

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan) moved—

*That there be granted to His Majesty on account of the services of the year ending 30th June, 1914, a sum not exceeding £687,770.*

It was not necessary to make any statement to the Committee except to say that this was in accordance with the Revenue

Estimates which had been introduced and to some extent already considered by the Assembly. He had hoped that those Estimates would have been dealt with finally ere this, so that it would not have been necessary to ask for further supply.

Hon. Frank Wilson: How much have you had already? Can you give us the total?

The PREMIER: As it happened, he had not made up the totals. However, this was in accordance with the Estimates, and the expenditure might be greater or less than the proportion in accordance with the total amount for the year. In any case this supply was in accordance with the Estimates as presented. When those Estimates were finally adopted it would be necessary to keep within the authorisation of Parliament. The supply asked for was for the purpose of carrying on, pending the passing of the Estimates.

Hon. FRANK WILSON (Sussex): Of course he had not the slightest intention of objecting to the Treasurer obtaining necessary funds.

The Premier: You usually do.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: That was not so. Possibly he had objected to the way in which the Treasurer spent the money, but certainly not to the way in which he got it, except, perhaps, when the Treasurer wanted to raise it by taxation, which might be inequitable in its operation. He thought the Treasurer ought to be prepared to give the Committee a little more information. When he (Hon. F. Wilson) was privileged to ask for supplies, his friends on the Opposition benches were not so ready to grant a vote of this description unless they got some information as to the position of the finances, and as to the total amount he had already received authority for. It was desirable that the Committee should know the proportion this sum bore to the public expenditure of the year. The Treasurer had told us that it was in accordance with the Estimates. No doubt it was. We had already agreed to two Supply Bills of a total of £1,101,370 from Revenue, and this would bring up the amount to £1,439,140. Presumably that was in proportion with the

Estimates.

The Premier: It is five-twelfths of the total.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Then from Loan we had granted £1,147,760, and now we were asked to vote £250,000 from Loan, which meant a total of £1,397,760, in addition to which the present Bill provided £100,000 from Loan Suspense Account. We had not had the Loan Estimates before us yet, and did not know how the money would be expended, nor did we know what the total amount of those Estimates would be. Presumably the Treasurer would spend this money to carry out works which were included in last year's Estimates; if not he ought to let hon. members know. If he was including any extra or new works in this expenditure it would be well to give members an outline of the new works and the expense to which the country would be committed. It was all the more necessary because we had the fact staring us in the face that the Treasurer, according to his own admission, was financially hard up at present, and did not know which way to turn, and with his recent experience on the loan market in London it was necessary to go very carefully and cautiously to work. This was not the time to spend large sums of loan money lavishly as the Government had been doing during the last two years or to spend this money when money was exceptionally dear.

The Premier: What do you suggest, close up work?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It was not for him to suggest to the Premier. The Premier ought to take the Committee into his confidence and say what he suggested. He (Mr. Wilson) knew what the Premier did, but he did not know what the Premier suggested because he was not in his confidence. He knew the Premier would borrow at any price, according to his own words, and on any terms to carry out his proposals.

The Premier: That is what you said.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: No, the Premier said he would have money at any price and he was now getting money at any price.

The Premier: I wish you would remember sometimes to keep near the truth.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: That was an offensive remark, and if the Premier had any sense of decency he would withdraw it. The Premier had no right to come to the House—

Mr. Underwood: You are hot stuff on decency.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Compared with the hon. member, he should think he was. The Premier came to the House and said, "Here is the Bill; I do not think it is necessary to give any information."

The Premier: You are the only leader of an Opposition in Australia who would ask for it with the Estimates before the Chamber.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Nonsense.

The Premier: I say so absolutely.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Estimates of loan expenditure were not before the Chamber, and he wanted to know what the million and a half of loan money would be expended on. Would there be new works; was it intended to carry out works already in progress which were provided for on last year's Estimates. These questions were fit and proper ones to put to the Premier before being asked to pass this motion. The Premier should give some information on the subject.

The PREMIER: In the first place the attitude adopted by the leader of the Opposition ever since the present Government had been in office was one which lent colour to the fact that he was not desirous of knowing exactly the condition of the finances so much as he was desirous of attempting to prevent business of this nature from being passed. He could draw attention to numerous instances. In connection with the Federal Government with a majority of one and depending on the Speaker to keep them in power, there had been no inclination on the part of the Opposition to detain the Government when they asked for Supply, but depended on the Estimates as all Parliaments did to decide how the money should be expended. The leader of the Opposition knew that this was merely a temporary supply and that

the whole of it would be covered eventually by the Appropriation Bill, so far as revenue was concerned by the Estimates now before hon. members and the only other items representing expenditure under the Loan Act. He was not in a position to say what new works were in hand. He would guarantee that there were new works in hand, and that the Government were not standing still.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Tell us what they are.

The PREMIER: There were water supplies in all parts of the State. The Government were keeping within these votes. The Government were constructing new railways. These were new works, but did not represent new expenditure.

Hon. Frank Wilson: What about the £100,000 from Loan Suspense Account?

The PREMIER: That was for financing the Agricultural Bank and the Workers' Homes board. Did the hon. member object to that?

Hon. Frank Wilson: Why did not you tell us so before?

The PREMIER: The hon. member stated that he wanted to stop this expenditure of money, and he would like to know in what way the leader of the Opposition was prepared to do that. The hon. member, however, merely made a bald statement. At Geraldton the other day he was talking about extravagance in connection with the Government's finance.

Mr. Male: Was not it true?

The PREMIER: And the hon. member forgot that the electors were aware that he had put about a dozen railway Bills through Parliament prior to the last election. The electors knew that he could only construct these railways by the expenditure of money, and the Government had not been able to construct them all yet, and the electors knew that the late Government were not in earnest or that they never intended to construct these railways. This was merely opposition on the part of the hon. member who had no concern about the condition of the money market. The hon. member attributed to him a statement that he would get money at any price. He had

never made such a statement, and he challenged the hon. member to produce it.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I will produce it.

Mr. Carpenter: The reporter made you say so.

The PREMIER: Let the hon. member produce it. According to Mr. Teece he was responsible for the Bank of England rate going up to 5 per cent. Mr. Teece forgot that in 1906 when there were Liberal Administrations throughout Australia the Bank of England rate went up to 6 per cent. Evidently he (the Premier) was of more importance to the community than he thought he was. But this gave an idea of the absurdity of the statements one heard. The leader of the Opposition was not satisfied to make absurd statements on the public platform where one could not reach him at the time, but repeated them in Parliament. He would not pursue the matter any further. The amounts were in accordance with the Estimates at present before the Chamber and with the loan authorisation obtained last session.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You did not explain that.

The PREMIER: It did not need explaining. The hon. member knew that the Government could not exceed that authorisation. The Government did not intend to stand still, but intended to complete the works authorised. From the point of view of new expenditure there was little or none asked for in connection either with the amounts from Loan Fund or from Loan Suspense Account.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier as usual waxed wroth and attempted to bluff the Committee with the statement that he was attacking the vote. The Premier was a pastmaster in the art of secrecy as everyone knew, but it had cost him rather dearly at the recent Geraldton election. The Premier had lost his Whip and now he was losing his temper.

The Premier: I have not lost the crack.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: No, the Premier was all sound; now he was losing his temper. The Premier said he was

carrying out railways which the leader of the Opposition left him to build and then the Premier had accused him of extravagance. He accused the Premier of extravagance, not in carrying out works for which the previous Government passed measures, but in connection with the money he expended on those works. His railways were costing hundreds of pounds a mile more to construct than those constructed by the previous Government. During the last 12 months railways had cost £1,000 a mile more.

The Premier: We will give you all you want about railways on the Estimates.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier was very modest in his expressions and should attempt to give some information instead of bluffing hon. members. The Premier was extravagant and his friends backed him up in that extravagance, extravagance which would cost this country very dearly in the end.

Mr. Bolton: Do not lose your temper, old chap.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier said he must be of more importance than he thought he was. The position was important, but personally the Premier was not of much importance excepting that he was showing how badly the finances of this country could be administered. The Premier was paying an increased price for money and had helped to increase the price of money in Australia by rushing on to the local market with his loans. Any financial man would tell him that. The Premier was not absolutely responsible for the whole of the increased price.

The Premier: I had to meet some you put on the market to get over temporary advances.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier had rushed the money market in Australia, and every time he had been in the van to raise money in Australia, and he now had to pay for his extravagance.

The Premier: What about your £650,000?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: That was a renewal of a previous Labour Administration's Treasury bills, or £500,000 of it was.

The Premier: I did not add another £150,000 as you did.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Why did not the Premier do so?

The Premier: I do not agree with your methods.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier had added seven millions to the public debt. Why should not he add another £150,000?

The Premier: By short-dated Treasury bills?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Yes.

The Premier: You were in financial difficulties.

Mr. Bolton: Hard pushed.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier would be hard pushed before he was finished. To talk about his (Mr. Wilson's) extravagance was to talk like a school-boy. The Premier had borrowed seven millions of money, and increased the national debt by £12 a head in two years and then attempted to talk to him about his finances. The Premier would condemn him to outer darkness for all time if he had financed the State as he himself had done it, and he knew that was so. The Premier pleaded that he could not expend money without authorisation, but did not hon. members know that he was always doing that? What was the £100,000 that the Premier wanted from Loan Suspense Account? He dared say it was expenditure which had already taken place. The Premier bought the steamers without authorisation from Parliament.

The Premier: That is not correct.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It was absolutely correct. The Premier was always spending money without authorisation. He committed the country to expenditure on sawmills without authorisation.

The Premier: That is not correct either.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier was doing this, and every Government must do it, though not to the same extent and not in the same direction as the present Government did.

The Premier: That is the difference.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Yes, it was all the difference in the world. No one took exception to work which was already in progress being carried on. Although the funds were not authorised by Parliament Parliament knew about the work, but when the Premier launched out into new and speculative ventures it was necessary for someone to take heed how the money was being expended, and ask for these explanations. It was the first time he had heard any Premier occupying such a responsible position objecting to being questioned as to his financial proposals. The Premier said this was not done in the Federal Parliament, well knowing that his statement was wrong. It was done in every Parliament. If the Premier turned up *Hansard* he would find that so long as the Labour party occupied the Opposition benches in this House, they queried every request by the previous Government for Supply and asked for information on every point, so much so that it became necessary to put a schedule to the Supply Bill on more than one occasion in order to give the information. When he now asked the Premier for an explanation as to whether new works not already authorised by Parliament were proposed in connection with this expenditure he was entitled to a courteous and gentlemanly reply instead of a bitter personal attack. He did not care twopence for the Premier's personal attack, because he could always respond to that as he had had pleasure in responding at Geraldton the other night when the Premier was telling pleasing yarns as to what he (Mr. Wilson) had done and the Attorney General was airing his eloquence somewhat luridly to the people.

The Premier: You had a very poor attendance.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: There were just as many at his meeting as at the Premier's. The only thing was that he (Mr. Wilson) was speaking in a large hall and the Premier was speaking in a small hall. However, he (Mr. Wilson) had the intelligence of the whole of the district at his meeting and he convinced the people that what the Premier was telling the public in the tin hall on the jetty

was wrong. The charges which the Premier was making were brought up to him (Mr. Wilson) and answered on the spot, and he proved the Premier to be in error. He was sorry the Premier was very often wilfully in error.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: You made most scandalous statements.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: No, they were truthful statements, and he made truthful statements on all occasions. The hon. member was judging him (Mr. Wilson) by his own standard. He did not know if members were satisfied with the Premier's explanation, as he called it, of the proposed expenditure, but he (Mr. Wilson) was not satisfied altogether. He accepted the statement that the Premier proposed only to carry on such works as already had been authorised by Parliament. He asked again what were the absolutely new works not already considered by Parliament, on which it was proposed to expend money. If there were none let members know, but if there were new works members were entitled to know what they were. There might be 50 different works not in progress. There might be railways which had been sanctioned by Parliament, and not yet started. The expenditure on these works was justifiable until the Estimates had been passed. But it was not justifiable to purchase new steamers without Parliament knowing, or starting new sawmills with moneys passed in a Supply Bill like the present without Parliament knowing such was the case. It was not justifiable to start a new harbour at Bunbury without word from the Premier, although the Premier had promised such works if the finances allowed. It was not justifiable to commence the harbour at Geraldton as the Premier had promised, and then the promise was withheld if a member was returned who would not support the Government. Those were the lines on which he asked for information and he did so respectfully.

The Premier: There is no respect in it. You never stick to the truth.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Mr. Chairman!

The Premier: I withdraw.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Whatever his opponents said of him they did not accuse him of lying as a rule.

The Premier: Yes, as a rule!

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member had withdrawn the statement.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Probably the Premier, without any heat, would give the information which would enable the Supply Bill to go through. He would no doubt tell members if there were any new undertakings included in the Supply Bill. If not, then it was all right.

The Premier: If there are, what then?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Then members would want to know something about them.

The PREMIER: It was highly amusing to hear the leader of the Opposition, evidently buoyed up by the win he had had at Geraldton, by the casting of a number of illegal votes.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I think that remark ought to be withdrawn—"casting of illegal votes."

Mr. Bolton: Who did he accuse?

Hon. Frank Wilson: The Liberals of course. "of the win we have had." I ask that the remark be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think it is a reflection on any member of the House.

Hon. Frank Wilson: It is a reflection on members sitting here.

The CHAIRMAN: The Premier may have knowledge that we have not. It is no reflection on members of the House.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I was in the thick of the election.

The CHAIRMAN: But the leader of the Opposition did not record a vote.

The PREMIER: The leader of the Opposition, buoyed up by the result of the election, desirous of being heard by the Liberals of the State, has started to discuss the Supply Bill, yet on nearly every occasion in every Parliament of Australia, and even in the Parliament where the Government was dependent on the Sneaker's vote, a Supply Bill was passed without discussion. He (the Premier) did not propose on every occasion that he came to Parliament for supply, to give a Budget speech. Supply was asked

for from time to time as the authority of Parliament became exhausted, and naturally, he had to come to Parliament and ask for that supply. With regard to the statement that he went to Geraldton and promised the construction of a harbour there, that was absolutely a mis-statement.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Read the Press reports.

The PREMIER: No such statement was made by him at Geraldton. He had refrained from making any statement in regard to works that were under construction or any proposed works. He had the information in his pocket and could have made reference to what it was proposed to do to the Geraldton Harbours so as to deal with this year's harvest, but he refrained from saying anything, because if the Government desired the electors to return a member to support the Government it should be on the general policy of the Government, not on the question of roads and bridges as the deputy leader in another place spoke. In regard to the statement made by the leader of the Opposition that he, the Premier, made reference to the Geraldton Harbour, he had to say he did not, except in this way, that Geraldton, Fremantle, Bunbury, Albany, all our ports, had been neglected in the past, and the Government were up against a pretty stiff proposition to provide the facilities for each of the harbours—and there he stopped. He never even left the impression that it was proposed to do anything with regard to harbour facilities at Geraldton. Therefore he hoped the leader of the Opposition would stand corrected.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I do not.

The PREMIER: That was the position. The hon. member could look up the papers as much as he liked. He (the Premier) knew what he had stated. In any case, that matter had no bearing on the point under discussion. There was nothing in the Bill dealing with Geraldton particularly. It dealt with the general progress of the State, and the leader of the Opposition must admit that the people were to-day enjoying better prosperity than at any time in the history of

the State, by the wise expenditure of public funds granted by Parliament.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported, and the report adopted.

#### *Ways and Means.*

The House having resolved into a Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Holman in the Chair,

The PREMIER moved—

*That towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty for the services of the year ended 30th June, 1914, a sum not exceeding £337,770 be granted from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, £250,000 from the moneys to the credit of the General Loan Fund, and from the Loan Suspense Account £100,000.*

Question passed.

Resolution reported, and the report adopted.

*Supply Bill introduced, etcetera.*

In pursuance of the foregoing resolutions, Supply Bill introduced, passed through all its stages and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

#### ANNUAL ESTIMATES—1913-14.

*In Committee of Supply.*

Resumed from the 14th November; Mr. Holman in the Chair.

Department of Attorney General (Hon. T. Walker, Minister).

Vote—Crown Law Offices, £17,602:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. T. Walker): The Crown Law Department is one which occasions very little excitement, and I take it that in its Estimates there is not much which will be of a debatable character. It is probable that my friends opposite may have something to say when we reach the Electoral Department, but I do not think it is essential that I should anticipate any debate on the items. With a view of economising time, I propose to be as brief as possible. I may remark that my friend the leader of the Opposition a little time

ago, when debating some matter in the Chamber, stated that even the Crown Law Department showed an increase. It is true that the Department shows an increase of £18,836, but that increase is due in the main to £14,450—a sum of money required to anticipate the cost of the Legislative Council Elections which will take place in May next, and to anticipate also a possible Local Option poll in March of next year. There is a sum of £3,081 which represents a saving we effected last year. That amount was saved by the study of economy to the utmost possible extent, consistent with efficiency of administration. Of course we cannot anticipate that we shall save a similar sum this year, but there can be no question that wherever it is possible to effect economies, that will be done. In the meantime we have not asked for more than we asked last year. In fact, we show a lesser sum upon the Estimates than was asked for in the total last year. For instance, last year we had on our Estimates £78,653, whereas we only spent, of that amount, £72,798, so that, taking off the £14,450 necessary to meet the expenses of the Legislative Council elections, and of possibly a Local Option poll, the Estimates show that this year we are asking less than we asked for last year. I venture to think that is a very creditable position. In the Crown Law Offices proper an increase is shown of £851. That increase represents salaries, and it is simply due to the fact, as I have said before, that we did not spend last year all that we were authorised to spend. We are granting automatic increases to officers who are paid under £204, and the excess here is £114. Last year some payments were undermade, and in that direction now we have an increment of £216. The actual increase is only £276, and that is for increased work. We have provided £200 for emergencies, and possibly this sum will not all be required, but we are at all events compelled to make that provision. There is an increase, too, in "Contingencies," and "Miscellaneous" of £528 over the actual expenditure of last year, but only on the expenditure of last year. The only increase, as a matter of fact, is in connection with the item

"Workers' Compensation Fund." Therefore there is no actual increment in the cost of the administration of the department. I may say of the Crown Law Department that the work compares exceedingly favourably in volume with that of the previous year. There were about the same number of criminal matters, and, if anything, they were slightly less. I can give particulars, if the Committee require them. This, I think, is a symptom in the right direction. Magisterial work has considerably increased, but we have reduced the cost of conveyancing, owing to the fact that all simpler matters of conveyancing are now entrusted to the Agricultural Department and to the Agricultural Bank, and other offices, following the practice that is universal in our banks. In civil matters there is a slight falling-off. There were last year 5,640 cases, as against 6,252 in the year before. This to some may indicate that the citizens are becoming more law-abiding. To others it may appear that our citizens are not so confident of an appeal to law. There is a diminution of work in the civil section of our courts. In the accountancy branch we have had an exceedingly busy time. This item on the Estimates will show something of the growing prosperity of the State. Last year the staff dealt with accounts to the amount of £1,392,260, as against £1,051,900 of the previous year. The District Court work too, has improved, and we have an increase of £100,593, as compared with £82,382 of the previous year. In the Revenue department the figures are £103,223, as against £65,665 of the previous year, and the expenditure in this department has been reduced—and I want the leader of the Opposition to note this—from £81,600 to £72,789.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Which staff was that?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The accountancy staff, and the reduction of the expenditure was due to improved methods of administration. I can give the hon. member details, if he desires them, when we reach the items. I presume the Electoral Department, which comes under the shelter of the Supreme Court and the Crown Law Department,



may meet with some criticism, but I do not know that I ought to anticipate it. All I can say is that that department has been zealously and, I consider, efficiently and honourably worked in the best interests of the electors of the State. Of course this will be a more expensive department this year than it was last year, due to what we may expect will happen in 1914. There is a sum of £8,000 set aside for the taking of the Local Option poll. If this poll be taken in 1915, instead of 1914, then that sum of money will be saved to the State for next year. The increase in my Estimates for this year, with the exception of the automatic payment to salaried officers due to the regulations, and some increases in salaries on account of classifications, are due to the anticipated elections next year. It must be satisfactory to hon. members to learn of the extremely busy state the Land Titles Office is in. That office is more or less the pulse which indicates the national health. The business transactions there being healthy, show that the country is not standing, and that there is a genuine and keen enterprise in dealing with property, in transfers from hand to hand, and in natural exchange, which is always a symptom of prosperity. Last year's transactions in that department show a profit of £14,028. That, compared with the previous year, will give us an idea of the increased business. In the previous year the profits were £9,341. This is an index of the vast number and the value of the transactions amongst the citizens themselves. The increment in profits was realised in spite of the fact that we increased our expenditure in that office from £13,076 to £14,076.

Mr. Moore: And now it is undermanned.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: As the hon. member says, it is still undermanned. The increment in expenditure is due to the attempt to keep pace with the increase in the volume of work. We have not been entirely able to cope with it. We have made provision on the Estimates for an increase in salaries so that we may cope with that additional busi-

ness which we may expect will accrue during the coming year. Last year the fees, including deed fees, amounted to £28,004, as against £22,427 in the previous year. It is a clear mark of the business health, if I may so say, of this community. As to the salaries, they have been re-arranged, and it will be noticed, I doubt not, by those observing the Estimates closely, that there is an increment of £3,000 for clerks, but I do not wish hon. members to understand that that represents entirely new clerks. The increment is really due in the main to transfers from the temporary staff. Hon. members will remember that some time ago it was resolved to put temporary men into their positions as permanent officers. There is an increase of £201 paid to officers receiving £204, and although we have increased the clerks' vote by £3,351, we have only effected a saving of £1,500 on the temporary staff, and this meets the objection of the hon. member for Irwin. He will see there that we anticipate the interjection he made, namely, that we are undermanned, and cannot as expeditiously as could be wished carry out the work in this great and growing department. Therefore, we have not transferred all the temporary officers to the permanent staff. In other words, we have made provision for getting increased assistance as the business makes it necessary, and we have provided no less than £2,000 to meet this difficulty. We are paying at the present time only £1,200, but in anticipation of an increase and in order to get level with the work, this sum of £2,000 has been provided. I think it is scarcely necessary to draw the attention of hon. members in any special manner to the magistracy. It is going along on the usual routine, and there is nothing that I have to say on that subject. As to clerks of court, the Estimates show an increase of expenditure due in the main to two new items, Moora and Sandstone. Our effort has been, and will be, to as far as possible, distribute the administration of justice and establish new courts wherever these are deemed to be necessary, and only the limitation of funds prevents us already acceding to the requests that come to me from new

centres of population all over the State for new court houses and their accessories. We have increased the expenditure, however, by these two establishments at Moora and Sandstone. There is one increase of £42 to a junior, and the balance of the apparent increase—which is not an actual increase—is due to the fact that last year we saved no less a sum than £1,298 by not filling vacancies where we could keep the machinery going without doing any specific injustice. There is an item on the Estimates which hon. members may want to know the meaning of, that is, £50 for court houses. That is only a sum placed there annually for the purpose of meeting contingencies of this description. A magistrate comes into a new township and the buildings usually available for a court of justice are not available; a new building has to be found and temporarily furnished; in the hiring of furniture, expenses of an unforeseen character arise, and we have provided this modest sum of £50 for that purpose. In the Supreme Court there is a decrease this year of £167, but there is an increase in the central office of £480. This increase is due simply to the fact that provision had to be made for the long service leave of the deputy registrar and taxing master. I am hastening through these matters with as little elaboration as possible in order that we may get more directly to the debate on the items. In the sheriff's office there is a decrease of £538, due to the fact that the sheriff was retired, and we have not replaced him up to date. The work in the central office has varied little from that in the previous year. There were 126 writs issued as against 139 in the previous year, and 2,910 bills of sale registered as against 2,213 in the year previous. The business in that part of the Supreme Court is normal and healthy. In the Official Receiver's office there is an apparent saving of £384, but this is only an apparent saving, because last year the Official Receiver had his long service leave and, according to custom, his salary is paid in advance. In such event it has not to be paid this year. In the office of the Curator of Intestate Estates there is an in-

crease of £206, and this is also due to the fact that for portion of the previous year the position was occupied by an officer on the temporary staff, who has now been put into a permanent position. I do not think hon. members wish for any further details on the general introduction of the Estimates, and as I am anxious that we shall have free, frank, and fair discussion when the items are reached, I move the first item.

Hon. FRANK WILSON (Sussex): One could quite agree with the Attorney General that this was not a department which one could enthuse about, nor could very strong exception be taken to the votes included in this portion of the Estimates. Members knew that the Under Secretary for Law was a man who was renowned for his economical ideas of administration. Having had some little experience of Mr. Hampton, he could honestly say that he had never met a man who was keener in watching expenditure than that gentleman was, and although he had on many occasions been dubbed mean, perhaps offensively by some who wanted to get something they could not persuade him to grant, yet he desired to take this opportunity of saying that there was a vast deal of difference between a man who was careful in the expenditure of public funds—indeed we wanted more of them, and Ministers might take example in this respect from their subordinate—and a man who exercised meanness in his own individual transactions. Therefore, he commended the Under Secretary for Law for what was termed meanness when he was administering the financial affairs of his department. He did not propose, at this stage at any rate, as the Attorney General suggested members of the Opposition might wish, to criticise the Electoral Department in view of what had happened at Geraldton. Some questions were being asked and information being obtained in another place, and it would be time enough when that information was given to criticise, if necessary, any laxity on the part of the department. It was gratifying to know that the Land Titles Office had been so busy during the past twelve months, and

he could have understood a Liberal Attorney General using the language which the Minister had used this afternoon. The Attorney General had said that he was pleased that so much activity had been shown in the transfers of land and property during the year, and he looked upon it, giving the Committee his true opinion, as a healthy sign. The Minister called it healthy activity. Some might term it a feverish desire to get rid of property, but he quite agreed with the Minister that it was a good sign, because, even if some were anxious to unload their property in land, yet it was evident there were others who were equally anxious to purchase it. That was indeed an excellent sign, but he could not understand the Attorney General being delighted, when he knew that a good portion of the revenue of the department came from transfers of agricultural lands held under conditional purchase conditions. Hon. members knew that was against the Minister's pronounced theory that land should not be transferred at all.

The Attorney General: You do not understand it.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Ministers did not want any transfers of this description. They wanted transfers stopped, and were under the impression that they had been stopped, yet we had the Attorney General congratulating himself upon the increased dealings in land and the revenue so derived. The Minister had also congratulated himself on the increase in the bills of sale. He had never looked upon that as good business, but the Minister considered it a healthy sign.

The Attorney General: No, I read two things together.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: One was inclined to wonder where was the healthiness in the fact that there were 500 more bills of sale registered during the past twelve months than during the previous year. Bills of sale usually pointed to people being hard up and having to raise the wind by mortgaging what they possessed.

The Attorney General: I said 126 writs as against 139 of the previous year. I

read these together. Generally it is normal and healthy.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The idea he had was always to keep clear of bills of sale if he possibly could. He did not like them, and as a rule had nothing to do with them, and certainly would only resort to a bill of sale as a last means of financial help if he was hard up. Taking the whole of this department he did not know that we had much at which to cavil. The local option poll which the Attorney General anticipated and which was estimated to cost some £8,000, he (Mr. Wilson) trusted would not take place so that we could save that £8,000. He did not think it was necessary to have it, as he anticipated that this local option was not due until 1915 under the existing measure.

The Attorney General: In 1914 under the existing legislation, but if the new Bill is carried we postpone it a year.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: That meant that we were providing the money, but we were asked to legislate so as not to spend the £8,000. So far as he was concerned then, he wanted the existing legislation to be carried out so that this expenditure would take place. He believed the Attorney General had a good body of officers around him, men who were anxious to study the interests of the department as though it was their own. That being so, one was entitled to commend them for their attention to duty and for their faithfulness in looking to economy. He hoped that the Attorney General's anticipation in regard to some of the expenditure not being required would be fulfilled, and did so more on behalf of the Treasurer than on his own behalf. It was to be hoped that all the Treasurer's colleagues would assist him in the matter of saving money wherever possible. The majority of electors were beginning to look with extreme anxiety at the way the State was spending money at the present juncture and, although we did not feel the pinch just now, it would come as surely as fate. It was only a question of a year or two and the extravagance of the past two years would be felt very severely indeed.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Would not you like it to be extravagant; it is genuine expenditure.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: One had never come across a body of men who were so utterly extravagant as the present Ministry, and he was commending the Attorney General for putting the brake on somewhat, and for his endeavour to instil some ideas of economy into his colleagues who, at any rate, were the greatest spendthrifts this country had ever seen.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—*Electoral*, £18,951:

Item. Chief Electoral Officer, £432:

Hon. J. MITCHELL: In view of the responsibility attaching to the position occupied by the Chief Electoral Officer one would think that some of the increase of £14,450 shown in this department might be in the way of an addition to his salary. Upon this officer rested the administration of this important department, and it was never so important to the State as at present. As the State grew the Chief Electoral Officer's responsibilities increased. We had to trust to him to see that the rolls were kept up to date, and an officer having such responsibility and with his work fairly well done should receive some consideration when the next Estimates were brought down. He should be paid fairly for the responsibility we thrust upon him. The Attorney General knew there were many complaints to-day about the state of the rolls and of names that ought not to be there.

Mr. O'Loughlen: We have reason to complain.

The Attorney General: Where do the complaints come from?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: From himself and from members sitting on this side and from members sitting opposite if they did their duty. He had no doubt the Attorney General had had complaints made to him and that the addresses which appeared on the electoral roll of Geraldton would cause him to make inquiry. The same might apply to all our rolls. These were small matters of detail which should be looked to, and for which we

were entitled to hold a Chief Electoral Officer responsible. However, no doubt the fact that there had been some discussion on this matter lately would make the Chief Electoral Officer and the officers serving under him more careful in future. He had nothing to say against Mr. Stenberg and believed he was a very excellent officer, needing only the loyal support of his Minister to see that the officers throughout the country did their work thoroughly. He did not want on this item to discuss the method of collecting claim cards, but there seemed to be room for improvement. Claim cards were not always transmitted to the Chief Electoral Officer as speedily as possible. It was to be hoped the Attorney General would see into the matter of the delay which often took place. He merely rose to point out that £432 was an inadequate salary for an officer controlling such an important department and having such responsibility.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It was quite right to say that the office of the Chief Electoral Officer was a very important one, and one that required assiduous attention and ability. This officer had to fight some of the quickest witts and sometimes the most unscrupulous of persons; he had to be constantly on the alert in regard to accusations of a most unfounded character that were blowing about concerning stuffing of rolls and the influences of the party in power upon the electoral machinery for political purposes.

Hon. J. Mitchell: We used to hear that, but we do not now.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member lived at Northam. Did he have the last issue of the Northam paper the proprietor and editor of which was a member of another place? In the last issue of that paper the accusation was distinctly made against the electoral officer that he used one class of action one species of conduct towards the Liberals, and quite another towards the Labourites who supported the present Government, and the inference was that he used the electoral machinery for the purpose of carrying out unjustly and

dishonourably the interests of the party in power.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Can you take action against that paper?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: What he hoped would happen and what he would advise, if he could do so from his place in this House, was that the electoral officer would take action, as it was a serious matter, against the writer and publisher of that article.

Mr. Turvey: What article was it?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It had appeared in the *Northam Advertiser*.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Are you referring to the Fremantle incident?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Not at all. There had been several items absolutely untruthful and absolutely perverse, and he could hardly understand an honourable man lending himself to the accusations that had been hurled about.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Blind prejudice.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: We would call it blind prejudice. The electoral officer had to contend with all kinds of folly from the highest places in the land. We had been led to believe that that other place was of Olympian purity, in other words that that place had no party, no passion, and none of those weaker and human motives which sometimes might be permitted to stir the members of this Assembly.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Surely they are permitted to inquire and ask questions?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Hon. members should be told what was done in that place, showing one of the things with which the Chief Electoral Officer and those associated with him had to contend. Another place passed a resolution that—

In the opinion of this House it is desirable that instructions be given to the Chief Electoral Officer that in compiling new rolls for the Legislative Council provinces the names of all persons who are shown by the municipal or road board lists to possess the necessary qualifications be placed on the new rolls.

Hon. J. Mitchell: That is surely reasonable.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: It is an illegal instruction.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The Chief Electoral Officer had to contend against this stupendous and, he said it with all respect, magnificent ignorance. It was absolute ignorance.

Hon. J. Mitchell: To whom are you referring?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: To all who endorsed that resolution.

Mr. Male: It is a reflection on members of another place.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It was not all a reflection on them. In the first place the hon. member, himself a great constitutional authority—

Hon. J. Mitchell: Certainly.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Knew that that body had no right to interfere with the executive functions of government.

Hon. J. Mitchell: They have a right to express an opinion.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: But they had no right to give orders to instruct the Chief Electoral Officer. They arrogated in a resolution of this kind a power that had no place in the Constitution. It was indecent, it was forgetful of their power. Supposing they had the power, and had given this instruction, and the Electoral Officer had carried it out, if this had been done and the municipal council and roads boards rolls had been taken as lists of qualified voters for the Legislative Council, this would have happened: The late Dr. Haynes, whose funeral he had regretfully and sorrowfully attended, would have been qualified for a place on the East Province roll. To go still further, Beatrice Day, an actress who had never lived in the State, would have gone on the South-East Province roll. Again, Mr. Ellerton Brown, who had been living in Tasmania for years, would have gone on the roll. The order was to put these men and women on the roll, and that order had been given by the Legislative Council. The Chief Electoral Officer had to contend against such arrogant instructions as these, to put dead men and absentee actresses and residents in Tasmania on the rolls. More—

over, there was one W. Y. Hassan ; he did not know of what nationality that gentleman was, but he knew that the individual in question was on the roll for these local bodies, and therefore if the Legislative Council instruction had been carried out, this man would have been put on the Metropolitan-Suburban roll, notwithstanding he had never been naturalised. The roll would be filled with dead people, absentee actresses, people living abroad, and aliens of all classes and descriptions. Under these circumstances it could well be understood that a gentleman in the position of Mr. Stenberg required to be exceedingly acute. The hon. member had said no one could deny that Mr. Stenberg was an very able officer. He (the Attorney General) agreed with this, and appreciated that officer's great mental abilities, his methods, his power of organisation. Wherever possible he had utilised that officer's services. Nor had the Government been forgetful of those services, for they had, on more than one occasion, given that officer some special recognition of those services. The hon. member had referred to the imperfections of the Geraldton roll. These imperfections were to be admitted. If the Geraldton roll had been perfect—that it was not was in no wise ascribable to Mr. Stenberg—there could have been no Liberal victory there.

Mr. Allen : How do you know ?

Mr. Lewis : It is a very poor old victory.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL : It was not a victory at all. There had been 12 informal votes, and these were all for Labour. Some of the postal votes cast had been illegal, as would subsequently be proved.

Mr. Allen : That happens in every election.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL : It had happened in this election. One of those fighting for the Liberal movement, and who also ran the local paper at Northam—a paper that lent its soft, downy influence to the hon. member and took him under its special wing and protection—had referred to a number of claims re-

ceived with imperfect addresses. This number was not the number which an hon. member in another place had stated, but was 137. Some of these claims had been made out, "Care of V.D.G.W.U., Geraldton," while others were simply addressed "Geraldton." This was the total received since the publication of the roll in 1911, since the Act came into force. Out of that number no fewer than 107, or 80 per cent. had been put in, authorised and approved by Mr. Udy, a Liberal who was also secretary for Mr. Elliott.

Hon. J. Mitchell: What has that to do with it?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL : The Government were accused of having stuffed the roll and acted illegally.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Who accused you?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: As he had previously stated, they had been accused by a gentleman who owned the newspaper that treasured the hon. member. That gentleman had made the accusation upon a public platform at Geraldton, and it was understood that he was making the accusation elsewhere. However, that was no accusation against the Chief Electoral Officer, or the Electoral Department. The law provided that there should be a scrutiny or examination by the local officer, with whom was left the responsibility of deciding the admittance or rejection of a claim before it was forwarded down to the central office. The Liberal who had approved those 107 claims had been formerly in the Electoral Department, and notwithstanding his being an electoral officer and a true Liberal supporting Mr. Elliott, his name stood upon the roll as "Udy, Geraldton."

Mr. E. B. Johnston: Could we not get a non-party man for electoral officer next time?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL : There were many men who while true to the colours of a party could still be impartial. There were honourable men on both sides, and those men could be trusted by both sides. He was not casting any aspersion whatever upon the electoral officer. He could not call to mind any instance where electoral registrars had abused their posi-

tion. He believed we could honourably trust our fellows with a position of that kind. All he objected to was the same old insinuation that the Electoral Department was corrupt, that the machinery of that function of State Government was utilised to bolster up and strengthen the party in power and to humiliate its opponents. The inference was there all the time. He objected to this inference. The bulk of the accusations were hurled, not for the purpose of besmirching the electoral officers or the Electoral Department, but the Scaddan Government. The whole machinery used in this attack was composed of half truths and whole faults. There was no magnanimity, no sense of justice, no clear-cut principle of honour in their utterances for party purposes. He could only say for the Chief Electoral Officer that his position had been under consideration for a long time, and only the fact that the Government had to deal with the Public Service Commissioner in accordance with the law, and the fact that they could not spend too much on administration, that was to say, could not pay all in accordance with their deserts—only those facts prevented a speedier recognition of the services of the Chief Electoral Registrar. However, those services had already been recognised in other ways than were shown upon the Estimates. All appreciated the services of the Chief Electoral Officer. The Government had received from that officer valuable help on important matters.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: So far as he was concerned, he had not reflected on the Chief Electoral Officer. When hon. members asked the Attorney General a question the Attorney General became rude.

The Attorney General: Nonsense.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: It was not nonsense at all.

The Attorney General: That is your stock argument every time you get up. Why do you not say something new?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: By way of variety he might say that the Attorney

General's impertinence, like his ignorance, was colossal and complete.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member would be required to withdraw that.

The Attorney General: It is not new, anyhow.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The remark would be withdrawn. When the Attorney General was asked a question the Minister ought to be at least as civil as was the questioner. He (Hon. J. Mitchell) had said nothing against the work of the Chief Electoral Officer, notwithstanding which the Attorney General had declared that the owner of a newspaper had levelled some abuse at Mr. Stenberg. He (Hon. J. Mitchell) was not responsible for anything thus said.

The Attorney General: Did I ever accuse you of being responsible?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Yes, the Attorney General had endeavoured to connect him with the newspaper which had cast accusations at Mr. Stenberg. If those accusations could be proved the Attorney General would have to take them into account, and if Mr. Stenberg was at fault that officer would require to be called upon to answer his fault. So far as was known, Mr. Stenberg had done his duty well and fairly. He (Hon. J. Mitchell) was not concerned whether the imperfect claim cards had been sent in by Liberal or by Labour representatives. In such matters he had never made distinction between the two parties, nor had he taken into consideration the politics of the gentleman in charge of the Electoral Department. Every claim card should, of course include the permanent address. It was not sufficient to say that a man lived at a boarding house when perhaps there were ten such houses in the town.

*Sitting suspended from 6.17 to 7.30 p.m.*

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Everyone who had a right to be on the roll ought to be on the roll and he was concerned only to have clean rolls. He was not blaming the Chief Electoral Officer for the present situation.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: Who are you blaming?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: If he blamed anyone it would be his duty to blame the Minister. The Minister, of course, was not responsible for entering the names on the roll but he was responsible for what his officers did. It was unfortunate that names appeared on the roll without the proper addresses. Names appeared similarly on many of the rolls but no doubt this would be rectified. It did not matter whether they were put on by the gentleman representing the Electoral Department at Geraldton, or by anyone else; it did not matter whether the people concerned were likely to vote Liberal or Labour; his concern was to have a perfect roll showing the address of each person.

The Attorney General: What would you do with those living outside of municipal boundaries or in town sites where the lots are not surveyed.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The best address possible should be inserted. Farms had their names.

The Attorney General: Many farms have no name.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Then it would be possible to indicate Mr. Jones's farm. It was possible to indicate the locality just as in addressing a letter it was possible to give a direction which would ensure delivery.

Mr. Gill: How many thousand have their letters addressed to the post office in Perth?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Many letters were addressed there temporarily. What he desired to point out was that this carelessness was likely to lead to trouble in future.

The Attorney General: It is not all carelessness.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: There must be some carelessness. If a man was living at a boarding-house or at an hotel, the address could be stated. The trouble might have arisen through ignorance of the requirements of the Electoral Act, and it was now for the Attorney General to see that the rolls were put in order.

Mr. Underwood: To see that there are not too many on them.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The only desire on his part was to see clean rolls. The Attorney General referred to a resolution of another place sent to the Chief Electoral Officer. Of that he knew nothing. Last year he understood a resolution was carried protesting against the making up of the rolls, and the Attorney General agreed that another place was right in demanding that certain ones should be disfranchised unless they sent in a fresh claim card.

The Attorney General: I did not agree with that; they misunderstood my policy then as they do now.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Attorney General had pointed out that the resolution of another place could not be put into effect because it was against the Act. That was quite right, and a dignified reply to another place would meet the situation. He was not concerned as regarded the newspaper which had been mentioned. The editor of that paper could take care of himself. As regarded the salary of the Chief Electoral Officer, the Attorney General said he had received special recognition, presumably for special services rendered to the Attorney General.

The Attorney General: Services to the State.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Yes, for special work, and while that added to the amount actually drawn by this officer, it was for special services outside of the service which he was called upon to perform as Chief Electoral Officer.

Mr. Dwyer: He is not getting sufficient salary.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: It was his contention that the salary was inadequate for the position.

The Attorney General: I did not say that was all; be fair.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: But it was not by way of payment for his services as Chief Electoral Officer. The Minister stated that the total amount was in excess of the £432 shown on the Estimates. Presumably the Chief Electoral Officer was paid for his report in connection with



proportional representation and other work. He had no objection to that, but the £432 was all hon. members knew about. The Attorney General, however, had promised to take the matter into consideration. The Chief Electoral Officer would have a fairly busy time during the current 12 months and he hoped the Minister would see his way to increase his salary. It was better that the Chief Electoral Officer should be paid a fair salary, and that his services should be available not only in connection with elections and electoral rolls, but in connection with all electoral matters upon which the Attorney General might require his services. It was preferable to have a substantial, fixed salary to payment for special work, though he did not want the Attorney General to imagine that he was objecting to special payment for special work.

The Attorney General: Would that be economising?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Minister must treat the officers fairly.

Mr. Underwood: You are opposed to extravagance, are you not?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Absolutely, but he was not opposed to fair treatment and this officer would be unfairly treated if £432 was all he was to draw during the current year.

Mr. FOLEY: It was not right that a charge made against the Chief Electoral Officer on the public platform, and in a section of the Press, should reflect on the Chief Electoral Officer. Much or little as the hon. member of another place desired to speak disparagingly of this officer, he evidently wished to show that there was something wrong in the administration of the Electoral Department other than that portion of which the Chief Electoral Officer had charge. In regard to the late election, there was no one who would blame the Chief Electoral Officer for names not appearing on the roll. The Attorney General had put the case for his administration. The hon. member for Northam had touched upon a phase of the question, which had called forth some remarks from the Attorney General, on the action which members of

another place had taken. As far as his knowledge of the work done by the Chief Electoral Officer was concerned, that work was really good, and no one could conscientiously say that the officer was biased towards one political side or the other. The statement made recently at Geraldton by the hon. member in question practically put the Chief Electoral Officer in the position of being a party man while holding a public position. He wished to resent that and to say that the Chief Electoral Officer was a capable man. The fact of so many names having been left off the roll was not the fault altogether of that officer. A great amount of work must be left to the divisional officers. If the divisional officer in this case was wrong the Chief Electoral Officer could not be blamed, and consequently the aspersions cast at the Government were groundless. As far as the names that had been placed on recently were concerned, those with insufficient addresses, in places like Geraldton or other remote places in the State, the name of the town ought to be sufficient address for anyone. There were many men who followed employments which took them to different parts of the State, and even in a town a man might move from one part of it to another, and the fact of that man shifting in this way should not disqualify him from enrolment. The name of a town like Geraldton ought to be sufficient address to comply with the provisions of the Electoral Act. No matter what the result might have been, no charge could be laid at the door of the Chief Electoral Officer, but he believed that if the names that were already in the hands of those who were organising the rolls had been accepted the result would have been very different. Of course, members opposite would not have cared to see a different result brought about, but there was a marked difference between the conduct of the recent election and a similar election at Menzies, where the then Minister for Mines was concerned. If the Electoral Act of to-day had been as it was at the time of the Menzies election there would not have been any difficulty in upsetting the Geraldton election. The then Mini-

ster for Mines at the Menzies election found that a sufficient number had voted illegally to enable him to upset the election. In connection with the recent election, the fault lay at the door of the Opposition for having altered the Act so as to allow corrupt practises to take place. The Minister might be urged when electoral reform was being brought in to consider the matter from the point of reform rather than from the point of view of retrogression, as had been done when the present Act was dealt with.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: This question of the voting or the voters on the roll at Geraldton appeared to have caused some little discussion. He was surprised to hear before the tea adjournment the Attorney General declare that all the informal votes at Geraldton were Labour votes. As a matter of fact of the 12 informal votes seven were for Mr. Elliott.

The Attorney General: How do you know that?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Mr. Elliott was near the scrutineers and saw the ballot-papers and they were thrown out for the reason that the returning officer or whoever was responsible for issuing them had not initialled the backs of those papers. Did the Attorney General know anything to the contrary?

The Attorney General: I presume they were for the Labour candidate.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: What right had the Attorney General to presume that the informal votes were for the Labour candidate.

The Attorney General: You are only speaking from hearsay—from an interested party.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It was from the successful candidate who saw the ballot-papers and that gentleman had told him that seven of those votes bore his name. That would be good legal evidence if it was taken to a court, and the Attorney General knew it. The Attorney General presumed that he knew differently. To make a statement like that was not dignified and was not compatible with the high office he occupied, but the Attorney General had not learned dignity and he was too old to begin now. There had been a lot of talk about the 100 odd

voters whose addresses were insufficiently given.

The Attorney General: One hundred and thirty-seven.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The number, he had been told, was 180.

The Attorney General: Hearsay again.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Attorney General had only presumed in regard to what he had stated, and he admitted that now, although he did not admit it when making his speech.

The Attorney General: Yes, I did.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Nothing of the sort. The hon. member made the assertion.

Mr. Foley interjected.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The member for Leonora did not know what he (Mr. Wilson) was talking about.

The Attorney General: That is a sample of dignity.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It was a sample of debate and it was a fact also. The Attorney general had presumed that the informal votes were Labour votes, but the fact could be repeated for the hon. gentleman's information that seven of the 12 bore Mr. Elliott's name. We wanted clean rolls and we wanted pure rolls, rolls that were accurate.

Mr. Thomas: You ought to be satisfied.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: No, he would never be satisfied if there was anything wrong with the rolls. These 137 names were wrongly on the rolls because, according to the Electoral Act, they did not have the right addresses.

The Attorney General: That is not correct.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It was so. The addresses were given as care of the secretary of a Labour organisation.

The Attorney General: And their addresses were there also.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: But their living place was not there.

The Attorney General: It was in some instances.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It was not on the roll at all. Exception was taken to the address being as care of the secretary of a Labour organisation.

The Attorney General: That was the postal address.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: They crossed that out and left in the word "Geraldton."

The Attorney General: That was the postal address.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The residential address was not there. The Attorney General was playing the goat.

The Attorney General: Another example of beautiful dignity.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Attorney General knew that that was so.

The Attorney General: If I am playing the goat, you are playing the pig.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: And the hon. member is playing the fool.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Hon. members should not indulge in such personalities.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Attorney General ought to learn to control his temper.

The Attorney General: So ought you.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: A painful example he was setting us.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Before the interruptions he was referring to the 137 names which did not bear sufficient addresses. The mere address, care of some union or other was objected to, and the department struck out care of the secretary of the union, and left it plain Geraldton. No one would object to a man or a woman having a vote if entitled to it, and surely if the Electoral Act stated that the place of abode must be defined that place of abode should be on the roll.

Mr. Thomas: Why not upset it then?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The hon. member could upset it if he liked.

Mr. Foley: You know very well you cannot.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It was known very well that the hon. member would.

The Premier: We will next year.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier now was squirming because of the result of the election. He took the whole of his Ministry up there, as well as about half a dozen members to assist in the fight and he got beaten. He did not like that

because of the violent efforts he put forward and the promises he made to win the seat.

The Premier: I kept you busy.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: And the Premier was kept busy to some purpose by him (Mr. Wilson). Now he (Mr. Wilson) could afford to be satisfied with the result, but what he wanted to point out was that a mistake had been made in this respect. The Attorney General admitted that in regard to these 137 names someone was responsible. It did not matter a rap who sent the names in, the officer who put the names on the roll in that manner was responsible. The Attorney General had to admit that those names should not be there. It did not matter whether they were names of Liberals or Labourites. The fact remained that these people were wrongly enrolled because it had to be clearly stated where the residence was. If that was the case, why should there be trouble about it? Why should the Opposition be accused of making a wrong complaint? Why should an hon. member in another place be taken to task by the Attorney General because he was trying to get information?

The Attorney General: Nothing of the sort.

The Premier: It is desired to make the public believe that there was an irregularity from our point of view.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: So there was.

Mr. Foley: Whose fault was it?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The fault of the department.

Mr. Foley: And who is the head of the department but the man you are discussing.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Attorney General was the head of the department, and he was the man who should be held responsible.

Mr. Foley: Why do you not be manly and discuss it from that point of view?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: From what point of view? The hon. member was biassed; he was blind. Even the Premier was biassed, because he assumed something ulterior; he said "You did it, you put the man on the roll irregularly in

order to get the votes, and we can upset the election."

Mr. Foley: You fixed it up under the Electoral Act.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Nobody wanted any hon. member to be wrongfully in this House, and he challenged the Government to upset the election. Apart altogether from that, why should both parties not join forces and get the roll purified. If those 137 names were wrongfully on the roll, they should be struck out, and why should hon. members abuse a member of another place because he was taking steps in that direction? So far as the 400 votes were concerned, the Minister said that if they had been on the roll the Government would have won the election in a canter. He ventured to say that those 400 votes would have dwindled into a very small number indeed when they were examined. They had been collected in the usual method of representatives of the Government by a man standing in the street and asking passers-by "Are you on the roll? If you do not know, fill in a claim card." He made bold to say that the majority of those people whose names appeared on the 400 claim cards were already on the roll and had exercised the franchise at the last election.

Mr. Dwyer: There were over 60 new names lodged on the 10th.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Probably the Liberal candidate would have received about 40 per cent. of them. If Ministers were so sure of their own ground they must have some inside information. What did the Ministers know about those 400 claims? If they knew anything why should not other members have the same information, and why should Mr. Colebatch be abused for asking for that information? Was it not in the interests of all that Parliament should know everything about the rolls and expunge those who were not entitled to vote? Was it likely that the Liberal organisers would be a party to having a number of voters wrongfully placed on the roll as was insinuated by the Premier and the Attorney General?

The Premier: I have not spoken.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier was always speaking even when he was sitting. The hon. member had remarked that the secretary of the Liberal League had sent the claims in.

The Premier: I did? You must have been drinking.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Even if the secretary of the Liberal League had sent them in, what difference did it make? That gentleman was not likely to be sending in names, the address of which was care of the Secretary of the Workers' Union. The bulk of those names must have been sent in by Government supporters because the address of the majority of them was care of the union secretary.

The Premier: What about Udy's own address?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: If Mr. Udy's address was wrong it should have been put right or his name struck off the roll. Two wrongs did not make a right. He objected to this discussion being made the excuse for an attack on a member of another place who was endeavouring to obtain information with a view to bringing about the purity of the rolls.

The Premier: That was not his idea.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Of course it was the idea. Members on the Government side interjected that the Opposition should be satisfied with the result of the election. He was satisfied with the result of the election, but he was not satisfied with the condition of the rolls. The rolls ought to be made as perfect as possible and when they got the rolls perfect it would not be a majority of 12, but of 200 or 300 votes, by which the Liberal candidate would win.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The Committee must be very grateful for the little sermon on dignity delivered by the leader of the Opposition. He did not know that members on the Government side of the House required such a lesson, but he hoped it would be appreciated by the members of the Opposition.

Hon. Frank Wilson: It was addressed to the Minister himself.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: No such lectures were required from the hon. member.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I say you do require it.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member could not forbear his usual course of trying to cover the Government side and him (the Attorney General), as Minister controlling the department, with opprobrium and with insinuations of dishonorable conduct.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Oh, dear no!

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Undoubtedly. The Minister controlling the Electoral Department was accused of doing things which no gentleman, let alone an hon. member of a dignified assembly, could with rectitude to himself be guilty of. The leader of the Opposition had found fault because he (the Attorney General) had chosen to allude to a member of another place and had made it appear that he had attacked a member of another place, simply because that gentleman had asked certain questions. As a matter of fact the whole discussion had arisen out of the speech of the member for Northam who had been following on the lines of a member in another place and making allusions to the omitted votes under the description of purity of the rolls. In the course of those remarks he had occasion to draw attention to what the hon. member of another place had said publicly in his newspaper—

The ground of complaint is that when it is a matter of enrolling property-owners and ratepayers, the majority of whom may be safely assumed to be supporters of the Liberal party, they are required to prove their qualifications with the utmost exactitude, whilst, on the other hand, the loosest methods imaginable are permitted in the enrolment of casual workers without any fixed habitation, who, for the most part, are supporters of the Government in power.

That statement was made by the editor of the *Northam Advertiser* who was known to every member of the House. Insinuations of the same kind had been made at Geraldton during the election. He

had drawn attention to those statements because they reflected upon an officer whose salary was under discussion this evening. The Chief Electoral Officer was there accused of putting restrictions on Liberal supporters, of placing intentional difficulties in the way of their getting on the roll, whereas in the case of a Government supporter the loosest methods were adopted. To make an accusation of that kind was to accuse a distinguished public servant of absolute dishonour. That might be dignified, it might be the very height of political rectitude to make accusations of that kind, but to his mind that kind of conduct revealed a character lacking not only chivalry, but also that dignified respect for one's fellows that characterised a man, not to say a gentleman. He was protesting in defence of the officer in charge of the Electoral Department, and the method adopted was seemingly the course usually adopted by members opposite of trying to cover the Government with blame. The Chief Electoral Officer, they said, was an honorable man, a good man, a faithful man, and a true man, but his rolls were imperfect, they were wrongly compiled, and were compiled to the detriment of the Liberal party.

Hon. J. Mitchell: We did not say that.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Your imagination is running riot.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: There was no necessity for imagination. The statement was contained in the article in the *Northam Advertiser*, and that article and the gentleman responsible for it had been defended this evening by members of the Opposition, whilst he was accused of forgetting his dignity because he dared to challenge a statement of that kind.

Hon. Frank Wilson: What is the paper; is it the *Worker*?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The *Worker* would never soil its pages with ink of that stench. This was the paper published in the aristocratic quarter represented by the member for Northam. It was published by an hon. member of another place who had been sent up to Geraldton in order to malign this Government. It was a Liberal organ.

Mr. Bolton: The organ of the new leader.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes, the organ of one who was aspiring to be and might be the new leader of the Liberal party. That statement was a distinctly libellous one, and if Mr. Stenberg would follow his advice he would test the matter in the law courts, bring those gentlemen to book, and let them try to prove what was so glibly asserted by them in the Press and on the platform. The Leader of the Opposition had stated that the Government had put people illegally on the roll, and that those names with the address, care of the secretary of the local union, were all illegally upon the roll.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I did not say so.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: That was the inference. As a matter of fact they were not illegally upon the roll. The Act did provide that there should be an address given, the place where the person wishing to vote resided; but it also provided that the postal address should be given as well, because there was a good deal of correspondence in reference to these claims.

Hon. Frank Wilson: That has nothing to do with the roll.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: All that had been done wrong had been in the printing; the address had been given and the postal address was given also. The residence was given and that complied with the law.

Hon. Frank Wilson: But the residence is not on the roll.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The reference was to those whose residence was on the roll and whose postal address was given in addition. As to those names whose address was not given except as Geraldton, it by no means followed that all of them, if any of them, were illegally there, as was so glibly asserted. As a matter of truth, those people whose addresses appeared as Geraldton might live on the outskirts of Geraldton, beyond the borders of the municipality, where streets were not delimited, and where there was no real address that could be put in phraseology. They lived on blocks

where they had lived for years and the address had never been given, and it was only now when members of the Opposition sought to cover him (the Attorney General) with insult and contumely that these names were said to be wrongly on the roll. The Liberal secretary, Mr. Udy, who had helped so much at the fight at Geraldton, and who had been the right-hand man and spokesman for the candidate, gave his address as simply "Geraldton." It was his address, "Geraldton," and nothing more. There it stood. He had here a copy of the postal claim card. It provided that the surname should be given in the top, then full christian names, sex, and occupation, usual permanent place of living, and full postal address, and because the postal address had been published on the roll as well as the place of living, we were accused of corruption. This was a sample of the parliamentary dignity of the chief god of Olympus. Marvellous dignity. Where was his pedestal? Let the hon. member try and teach dignity. He needed to learn it in all his remaining years. He (the Attorney General) asserted that in this instance—he did not mean that there were no exceptions—

Hon. Frank Wilson: You were wrong about the 137 names.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The 137 names were just given as Geraldton—he admitted that, but 107 of these were collected by Mr. Udy, who was then the electoral officer and a member of the Liberal party. That gentleman was responsible for these names, and sent them down to the Chief Electoral Officer. He (the Attorney General) wanted to correct the statement made by the leader of the Opposition that the responsibility for these names rested entirely with the Chief Electoral Officer. It was the established duty of the local registrar to satisfy himself as to the veracity and correctness of each claim, as to its admissibility from a legal standpoint. The local man to satisfy himself as to the validity of these claims now so much complained of was Mr. Udy, the electoral officer of the Geraldton district, and a member of the Liberal League. He (the Attorney General)

wanted to draw attention again to the unfair tactics of the leader of the Opposition in telling half truths, and leaving it at that, when the inference was against his opponents. The hon. member said that the Premier went up to Geraldton and took with him half his Ministry.

Hon. Frank Wilson: So he did.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: That was half the truth.

Hon. Frank Wilson: It is the whole truth.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: What did the other side do? There was Mr. Colebatch—

Mr. Foley: The leader of the Opposition in another place.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The aspiring leader—member of a non-party House—a member of the placid house of review—a member of that House which had no politics—a member of that House which considered all measures on their merits. That hon. member left the serenity of the calm review chamber, went to Geraldton with all the fires of vituperation and the inspiration of vapid accusation. That was what he did. Who was with him? Another member of that placid chamber—Mr. Connolly, also another member of the non-party House, Mr. Patrick. Then there was Sir Edward Wittenoom—all of them beautiful democrats; magnificent specimens of the people's friends.

Mr. Monger: Where was Mr. Drew?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Never mind. Those he had mentioned were all members of that Chamber and they did not go up for a day and give one speech as he and others did, but went all over the country fluttering in and fluttering out, hoisting all kinds of quasi-sectarian flags. Going from house to house and from street to street was that magnificent paragon of wisdom, the hon. member for Claremont. All these had been meandering in Geraldton.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member was getting away from the question of the Chief Electoral Officer.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: What he had been doing was only replying to the attack of the hon. member, and giving

a *quid pro quo*. He wanted to correct the statement that special efforts had been put forward on the side of the Government, and no special efforts by hon. members opposite. It must be admitted that there was nothing in this out-of-the-way discussion affecting the Chief Electoral Officer. He had said and repeated that that officer was a pattern to all men engaged in similar professional work in the Commonwealth. He was a gentleman who had faithfully done his duty in regard to electoral matters, whatever side had been in office. He (the Attorney General) appreciated what had been said good of this officer. Every good word said of him, and in testimony of the work performed by him was an answer to the arguments of the Opposition, that there was corruption or under-hand methods or any mean course of conduct on the part of Ministers and on the part of himself (the Attorney General). Wherever hon. members praised the Chief Electoral Officer for his work they cast a shadow of that praise on himself, and he felt proud of the officer and the work done in his department.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Attorney General, with his wonderful gift of eloquence, and, as usual, with his vivid imagination, which had had such a beautiful effect on the electors of Geraldton, had attempted to draw a picture which never had any existence, except in his own imagination. He had talked about corruption, but we had never mentioned corruption. The Attorney General had talked about the reflected glory he was entitled to, and of the reflected glory he got from his department. We had never suggested for a moment that there were ulterior motives underlying this question of certain names being wrongly on the roll or on the roll with insufficient evidence, according to the Electoral Act. We simply pointed out the error to the hon. gentleman, and he rose up in his seat and flooded the Chamber with a tirade of abuse, and, to some extent, a glorification of himself and his department. He (Mr. Wilson) was satisfied to let the matter rest at that. He had no concern in the newspaper

the Attorney General had been reading from, whether it was published in Northam, Perth, or Kalgoorlie, but he had a duty to perform here, no matter how the Attorney General reiterated, exaggerated, or condemned. That duty was going to be performed on every occasion, without offence, he hoped, but if the Attorney General was so thin-skinned as to take offence, we could not help it, we could only regret it. The Attorney General wanted to make out that hon. members of the Upper House had no right to be seen in Geraldton in connection with this election, and yet the hon. member had his own colleague, the Colonial Secretary, who resided there, doing his best as an active member to return the Government Whip for that constituency, and he had his paper behind him all the time, and because the editor of that paper dared to reflect on the Government candidate he was unceremoniously sacked, and the member for Albany sent to take his place.

Mr. Harper : You don't mean to say that ?

Hon. FRANK WILSON : The Attorney General said that the Colonial Secretary was a Minister, Mr. Connolly, however, was an ex-Minister, and Mr. Colbatch was Vice-President of the Liberal League, a political organisation. Had not he the right to be heard ?

Mr. Turvey : Why does he claim to belong to a non-party House ?

Hon. FRANK WILSON : Sir Edward Wittenoom was an ex-President of the Liberal League, and why also should not Mr. Patrick work for the Liberal party, which he believed in, and supported ? Be that as it might, he was glad to think that the efforts of these gentlemen, combined with the feeble effort he (Mr. Wilson) was able to put in on his own part, were successful, and that the wisdom of the member for Claremont, referred to in such tones of contempt by the Attorney General, added no little to the victory which was won on Saturday at Geraldton. He was not concerned with the Attorney General's dignity, but was concerned about the dignity of this House, which appeared to be becoming a thing of the past.

The Attorney General : I agree with you.

Hon. FRANK WILSON : If the Attorney General agreed with him, let us join forces and uplift it once more. Let us uplift it once more from the mire into which the Attorney General had drawn us, notwithstanding his life-long experience and the fact that he ought to know much better.

Item, General Election, £3,000 :

Mr. MALE : If a local option vote was going to cost £8,000 then £3,000 did not seem sufficient for a general election.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL : The hon. member would see that the total contemplated expenses for the election next year was, not £3,000 but £14,450. This item of £3,000 was only one feature of that expense. The total cost was made up of different items, and divided into parts, aggregating £14,450. Again, it was not for a general election, but simply for a Legislative Council election.

Mr. MALE : Then the Estimates were misleading in their description. How could it be called a general election if it was merely a Legislative Council election ?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL : Certainly the item might have been more clearly defined. It alluded merely to the Legislative Council election. It was always called a general election for the Legislative Council, and a general election for the Legislative Assembly, by way of distinguishing such elections from by-elections.

Item. Extra assistance in the preparation of electoral rolls; fees to returning and presiding officers; payments to police in connection with electoral census; advertising, printing, and other expenses in connection with by-elections, etcetera, £4,000 :

Hon. J. MITCHELL : The preparation of electoral rolls had been pretty fully discussed. In his opinion it would be found that the laxity complained of in connection with the recent election was a result of years of growth. The Electoral Act clearly required that full names



and addresses should be given on the claim card.

The Premier: Suppose the claimant is not living in a street.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: If in a town he would be living in a street.

The Premier: No, there were many instances in Geraldton of residences not on any street.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: However, the same irregularity had been in evidence on the rolls for years past. He was now asking that sufficient money should be placed on the Estimates to enable the registrar to see that the proper addresses were obtained. These irregularities should cease now that they had been pointed out. The Act provided that the name of the street should be stated.

The Premier: Or alternatively that the address given must be such as will satisfy the registrar.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: At any rate the Attorney General should see that the rolls were brought into order so that a repetition of the discussion which had taken place this afternoon might be avoided.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: With others he could endorse what had been said about the necessity of getting the fullest possible particulars. That was the object of the existence of the Electoral Department. The hon. member was somewhat at sea as to the possibilities of carrying out his proposal. In the Act a "municipality or townsite" was mentioned, but there were townsites in the State which had no street, which had not been surveyed except by way of preliminary survey.

Mr. Male: Where is there a townsite without streets?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: There were many of them, only newly thrown open. Even in a place like Geraldton there were voters living just outside the surveyed streets.

Mr. Wisdom: But not within the municipality.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: At all events they were only just outside the municipal boundary. He could assure the Committee that every effort would be made to get a complete reliable roll, as

indeed had been done as far as practicable in the past. Hon. members should not forget that in outlying districts it was necessary to depend upon officers, some of them honorary, who were not strictly trained to the exact work they had to do. Some errors were bound to creep in, but so far as human foresight could avoid that he could trust the officers of the department to do it.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: There might be one or two living on the outskirts of a municipality, but they could not be in appreciable numbers. All that was required was that the roll should be made as perfect as possible.

The Premier: In quite a number of municipalities on the goldfields there were people squatting within the area but not on any street.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Then the Act should be amended.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Subsection 3 of Section 44 of the Act provided that if the residence of a claimant was not within a municipal district or townsite, his residence should be stated with such particulars as were in the opinion of the registrar sufficient.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—*Land Titles*, £16,017—agreed to.

Vote—*Stipendiary Magistracy*, £28,188:

Item, Magistrates, £7,870:

Mr. FOLEY: Some magistrates were apt to exceed their duty. All that the State required of them was that they should well try the cases brought before them. When these magistrates took up the position of school-masters they were overstepping their duties. Any magistrate who went out of his way to say that he knew for a positive fact that stealing was rampant and was being practised in all big firms in the City, when he had not a vestige of evidence to prove it, was overstepping his duty. If he had evidence, such evidence should be made available. The Attorney General would be wise to instruct the magistrates that if they did the duty expected of them and did it well, they would be doing a service to the State, but if they overstepped the mark and insulted the workers the Government should place them in the

oblivion which they would adorn much better than a magisterial position when they adopted such an attitude.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Did not the Minister think it time that another magistrate or two were appointed?

The Attorney General: What about economy?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Let the Government sell some of the motor cars or their steamers. Last year it was pointed out that the State was growing rapidly and that many new centres were springing up which should be supplied, and which could not be supplied by the present magisterial staff. In the Katanning, Northam, Geraldton, and other agricultural districts, and probably in some of the gold mining districts, many fresh centres of considerable importance were growing up. Magistrates had to do a tremendous amount of travelling and the administration of justice must suffer. Magistrates should take a greater proportion of the work, particularly in the country districts where there were few leisured people. In the southern districts the Minister had had to supply motor cars to enable magistrates to get from court to court because of the increasing work. It was undesirable that they should be rushing about practically day and night to hear cases. It meant an added expense to the litigants, because cases had to be adjourned to enable the magistrate to keep other appointments. He hoped that next year the Minister would provide for one or two additional magistrates.

The Premier: They are not doing so badly.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: They could do only a certain amount of work and the public were suffering.

The Premier: They are doing it and are not complaining.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: It was utterly impossible that the staff of magistrates could do the work which they were called upon to do owing to the new centres which were opening up.

The Premier: They will have to, for a time at any rate.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: It was his hope that the time would not be long. Hono-

rary justices should not be called upon to do so much work.

Mr. LANDER: Something should be done to provide more courts. People living on the Dowerin-Goomalling line had to go either to Northam or to Merredin. Persons living at Bruce Rock, which was becoming an important place, had to go to Merredin and pay 1s. a mile for a summons served from Kellerberrin or other places. The Attorney General should arrange to have courts conducted by honorary magistrates wherever constables were stationed. Settlers should not have to drive 30 miles to attend a tinpot court.

Mr. GARDINER: It was his desire to elicit a little information from the Attorney General in regard to the system whereby men were compelled to occupy the dual position of resident magistrate and district medical officer. For some time he had advocated that this system should be abolished, and he thought he had brought ample proof to show that the system was iniquitous and unfair to the men, but the Honorary Minister and the Attorney General, whom he had consulted, did not seem to know whether they were on their heads or their heels. The Attorney General said that although he paid magistrates, he had no control over them, and the Honorary Minister said that, seeing the Attorney General paid them, it was impossible for him to take action. The Roebourne district was an immense one and the district medical officer acted as magistrate. Although the population was not large it was scattered, and the district medical officer should be at the service of anyone who might require him, but his magisterial duties compelled him to stay in Roebourne, and he was giving greater attention to that branch of his work than to the more important medical part. The Attorney General should say who was the Minister responsible for this state of affairs and inform him how he could set about remedying an anomaly which undoubtedly existed.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The preceding speaker practically put the difficulties of the Government clearly. We

were short of the means of doing all that was desired.

Mr. S. Stubbs: He said you did not know whether you were on your head or your heels.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member meant that metaphorically. In some of the far out districts the Government were compelled to allow officers to amalgamate the duties of different offices. Many clerks of courts had to work for the Treasury, the Lands Department and the Savings Bank, and perform multifarious duties because salaries could not be augmented to a considerable extent without creating another cry from opponents. He would always prefer that a magistrate should be purely and simply a magistrate and if the means were available that he should have a legal training. When changes occurred he would endeavour to put that policy into practice. He was surprised that the hon. member for Northam (Hon. J. Mitchell) should accuse the Government of not doing enough. The hon. member complained that the Government were wasting money, but he never spoke without asking the Government to spend more money. Apart from any accessories of justice, the vote for the payment of magistrates in 1912-13 was £21,565, and the actual expenditure was £20,640. The vote this year was £22,276 and the vote could not be increased, more particularly as there had been no extensive complaints of lack of service to the public by the paucity of magistrates, or from the magistrates themselves of being overworked. There was a good staff of magistrates and they did their work uncomplainingly and there was no evidence that they particularly desired assistance; in fact he had found them most willing to assist the Government when the occasion arose to open up new local courts as was the case at Sandstone, Moora, and other places. Those who accepted the positions of honorary justices of the peace and were within the ranks of magistrates should be more willing to deserve the honour by the work they did for the State.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Some are called upon to do too much.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The willing horse was always most worked, but there were many justices who simply put the tag to their name as an ornament and nothing else. They refused to assist the police in forming a court. It was unnecessary to increase the magistracy at present. He admitted that more courts were required.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: But that could not be done with a wave of a magic wand. The Government must first of all get their taxation proposals passed in order to secure the money.

Hon. J. Mitchell: More money!

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Was not the hon. member advocating an increase in the number of magistrates and how could that be done without money?

Hon. J. Mitchell: A reduction of Ministers' salaries would pay for one or two.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Additional money was necessary. The Committee should consider the vast area which had to be administered through the agency of justices. So far as was possible we were carrying justice and education to every hamlet in the country and considering the area. The people of this State had nothing whatsoever to complain if in the direction of inadequacy of the administration of justice. Western Australia was at the top of the rank in this respect, and considering the small population, it was marvellous, not that there was so much to do, but that we should have done so much.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: This system was not inaugurated by the Attorney General, but during the previous Administration, and he protested that too much was being asked of magistrates. There was ample money for every proper function of government. We were not hard up because we paid our civil servants so much, but because the Government undertook things which did not come within the scope of their proper functions. If we dropped the trading concerns we would be able to appoint more magistrates. There was no desire on his part to further burden

the people, but with proper administration there could be a better civil service and a reasonably paid service. The districts between Geraldton and Midland Junction should be supplied with one magistrate. At the present time the magistrate went by train from Midland Junction to Moora and returned, and in this way occupied a whole day. That was not economy.

The Premier: They have not much to do now.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: They had too much to do and the result was that the work was not properly done. It was not right that honorary justices should deal with important cases.

Item, Clerks of Court, £9,670:

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: A little information might be given with regard to this item which showed an increase of £1,707 over the figures of the previous year. What he wanted to find out was something about the methods adopted by the Government in regard to the payment of clerks of courts whose time was not fully occupied with court work. He had brought under the notice of the Attorney General three or four distinct instances of lack of duty on the part of some of the clerks of courts. In one case the officer at Pinjarrah had kept back documents for a month at a time before forwarding them to the department. These consisted of applications under the Pensions Act, and the result was they had not received the attention of the officer-in-charge. On lodging a protest he was informed by the Crown Law Department that this officer was only employed on two days a week, and it was contended for him that he did not receive sufficient remuneration to permit him to give more time to court work, and the officer himself also contended it was not part of his work to attend to pension claims. The Attorney General in his reply should state how the increase of £1,707 was to be distributed. The clerks of courts, when they had Commonwealth work to do, allowed it to stand aside.

The Premier: That is not part of State duty.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Then the position ought to be more clearly defined. There was no desire to overload the clerks of courts with work, but he wanted to see them paid for the services they rendered, and the clerks who undertook to receive documents should inform the people whether it was their intention to deal with them.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member had referred to a difficulty which had been experienced in more places than one. The State was large and there had to be employed many clerks of courts, some of whom were only partially employed in such a capacity, and other duties were put upon them by other departments. There were so-called clerks of courts who had more work to do for the Lands Department, while others did more work for the Treasury than they did for the Crown Law Department.

Mr. O'Loughlen: And for the police.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes, and for other departments of the State. The matter the hon. member had alluded to had occasioned considerable correspondence, not only with the officer at Pinjarrah, but with the Federal authorities, and it had been pointed out to the latter that the work could not be adequately done for them under existing conditions in places like Pinjarra.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Should not that officer inform the people that he was not able to deal with those documents?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: One could not too severely blame the officer under the circumstances for having neglected what he thought was the most foreign of his actual duties. The increase in the vote was due entirely to the fact that last year a number of the offices were vacant and in that way the salaries were not paid. The vote did not make provision for any big additional payments. It was admitted that if we could get the work adequately done, without placing too many duties on clerks of courts, it should be done, but in some places under existing conditions that was not possible.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Supreme Court, £10,876:

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Would the Attorney General explain what had become of the sheriff?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: An acting sheriff was carrying out the duties and in that way the amount of the sheriff's salary was being saved. The officer who was performing the functions of sheriff was in the department.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Is it the under secretary?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: No, the officer was in the central office.

Item, Official Receiver in Bankruptcy, 8 months, £384:

Mr. MALE: Why was the Official Receiver to draw only eight months' salary?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: This officer had in the previous year been paid four months' salary in advance when he went away on leave.

Vote put and passed.

Education Department (Hon. T. Walker, Minister).

Vote—Education, £319,312:

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. T. Walker): This department is in no sense of the word a revenue department.

Mr. O'Loghlen: It is the reverse.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: As the hon. member interjects, it is the very reverse. But I believe, notwithstanding the money which is spent by the State to support the educational institutions, the people of the State gladly agree to the expenditure of that money. It follows that in a State which is constantly increasing in population, not only by natural increment but also by additions from the sister States of the Commonwealth, attracted by our magnificent resources and attracted from far over sea by the inducement there is here for settlers, for those who desire to start a new life, we must of necessity by enlarging our sphere of education be constantly increasing the cost, and the figures I wish to draw the Committee's attention to clearly show the extent of the increment within the year that has passed. During the last financial year, 1912-13, there have been added to our list of attendances at schools no

less a number than 3,493, and we have had an average attendance amongst them of 3,428. This speaks volumes, not only for the increment of scholars, but for the increase of interest and the spirit that is abroad among those embracing the educational conditions that the State affords. We have increased the number of schools practically at the rate of one a week, for we built 50 new schools last year and all those of necessity cost money, and we have not only built new schools, but we have added to our old schools. We have increased the number of class-rooms and attended to renovations of every description. We have now a total in this State of no less than 566 schools, and last year the increase in the attendance necessitated appointing and employing 150 extra teachers. I want to say here a word about the teachers. I shall be told that this State has not yet done everything that should be done and might be done for the teachers' benefit.

Mr. S. Stubbs: By whom?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I do not know by whom, but I hear it occasionally. I am constantly told that we do not always do the correct thing towards all our teachers. But I am satisfied of this, and I say it with a feeling of conscious pride, that the great bulk of teachers, if not absolutely content with the conditions provided since this Government came into office, are at all events disposed to do their utmost in their zeal for education, and are grateful for such help as the present Government have been able to afford. Hon. members know that prior to this Government taking office, £80 and £90 for unclassified teachers was the highest to which they could rise.

Mr. Lander: Sweating wages.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: As the hon. member truly remarks those were sweating wages. Since the present Government came into office—and it represents part of the extravagance alluded to by our political opponents—the salary of £80 was raised to £110 and that of £90 to £120, and now very few are getting less than £140 per annum. But it is not only the increase in money; where it is necessary we give them quarters in addition or

we give them an allowance, so that there is now some species of content; those members of the public who have charge of the rising generation and have to make citizens of the future of our little ones have a tolerable wage and they can live on it. We increased the amount of money to be spent on education of this character by no less a sum than between £13,000 and £14,000. In 1912 we first put into operation the increment to unclassified teachers, and in 1913 we have put into operation the increments to those teachers who are classified and are on different rungs of the ladder of progress. I heard it said only a week ago where I was in a place at which political conflicts were raging that the Government had really done nothing for the teachers and their betterment.

Mr. Lander: Did you tell them it was a lie?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I have, therefore, prepared a statement covering the years from 1908-9 up to the present time, and I wish hon. members to notice the increment year by year. I will admit that before we came into office there was bound to be a increment because in a new country that is becoming settled new schools must be erected and new teachers appointed. In 1908-9 the amount spent for teachers' salaries was £131,550; in 1909-10 the amount had increased to £138,343, and in 1910-11 it was £146,315. Now in 1911-12, the year in which this Government took office, observe the jump; it is enormous. The amount rose then to £165,071. In 1912-13 the jump continued to £194,600, and this year I estimate there will be paid from the Treasury for salaries alone a sum of £220,840. That sum by no means represents all that the State is doing by way of education. In addition to these salaries there are always expenses of administration, expenses that come through the Works Department for the purchase of school sites and in building schools of all kinds, and all that additional burden the State has to carry.

Mr. Turvey: Even then they are not properly paid.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: That is what we admit. What is the object and aim of our party? To as far as possible lift all up to a level, not only of existence, but of comfort and enjoyment. The only thing I sometimes feel about it is that the more we do and the more we awaken the consciousness of want in them, the more they want. It is perhaps a proper thing; the desire for betterment is a natural impetus to the improvement of mankind, and it is not that I complain of, but it is disappointing when doing all we can at the risk of being criticised for extravagance and waste to always hear the cry, "Not enough, do more." I am pleased to think that throughout the teaching staff of the State there is very little of that manifest. There is a spirit of grateful content that I am proud to mark, and it is what is to be expected from the teachers—those whose minds are trained, whose intellect is developed, whose characters are broadened, whose finer senses are cultivated, and who, therefore, can appreciate what is being done, and who from their knowledge and experience of life understand the efforts that must be made to advance their lot at all. I look upon the staff of teachers, the great army of people who have charge of the youth of the State, as I look upon the old missionaries, as men who are willing to sacrifice something for the good of their fellows, men and women who love their work, who take intense pleasure in the acquirement of knowledge and in the expansion of their own minds, and a still greater pleasure in distilling that knowledge, whose sweets they have sipped and whose benefits they have enjoyed, to those about them. Those people are to me the most elevating element within a State. We may have the glories of our armies, or the pride of professional achievement, we may have the attainments of arts and industries in special grooves, but this body of workers day in and day out for the purpose of disseminating light throughout the whole community, knowledge that does not rest in the mind of the child, but through its tiny lips helps to brighten the home and bring refinement and comfort throughout

the whole of the family—this army of teachers represents to me a body, which, were it not for conventional secularity, I should call sacred in its aims and works. I recognise that they are not sufficiently paid, but I want them and the public to realise that they are better paid on the whole than those in other parts of the Commonwealth, that they are paid better at least in the primary ranks than they are paid in any other part of the world, and I want them to further realise that if they are not paid all that their merits, their qualities, their self-denial and their labour demand, they are paid all that can be spared for educational purposes from the total revenue of the State.

Mr. S. Stubbs: No one will object from this side of the House.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I feel confident of that. There is the glory of education—that it levels all ranks. I know no temple of democracy more effective, more complete, than our public school. It is at the public school that the sons and daughters of every section of the community congregate. There the son of the wealthy and proud sits side by side with the son of the toiler.

Mr. S. Stubbs: There are no proud boys in this State.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: There cannot be pride of class or caste whilst we have education. Education annihilates it, but there are those parents and there are those people still existing who, if they could, would make an aristocracy for their boys and send them to exclusive schools and take them out of the channels of State education. There are a few of these people still surviving, but my point is that by this method of education and by the comingling of the offspring of all sections of society, the meeting and gathering, learning the same lessons, sitting at the same fount of instruction, by gathering them in one body we have the very first lesson in democracy. That is the good that education performs for the community, and if hon. members will reflect for a moment it is that very fact, the spread of education, the dissemination of knowledge, the distribution

of the facts of science and noble teachings and of every art throughout the whole length and breadth of this Commonwealth, that has made this country the foremost in democratic ideals. No part of the world stands so high in respect of intellectual and humanitarian achievements as this Commonwealth of ours, and it is due to the spread of education. We have sought particularly in our State to make our Education Department peculiarly democratic, insomuch as one of the first efforts of the present Government on coming into office was to direct the attention of the directing staff to the need for the co-ordination of every section and every branch of education so that there should not be, as it were, an isolated school with particular specialities in the way of education in that direction, and another school of a favoured kind with specialities in another direction, but no matter what school one entered, wherever one started his education, following the paths in that school laid before him he should ultimately arrive at the same goal. That is to say from the simplest infant school in the far backblocks to our central secondary and technical schools in Perth, we are all working together for the purpose of making the educational system a living thing.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Are you aiming at uniformity?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: No, the opposite of uniformity. We teach in our primary schools a curriculum which has been put into good service, having taken away all the cumbersome details of the old curriculum, and more particularly paying attention to the natural talents and disposition of the child, so that the child may develop its individuality whilst acquiring knowledge. The department is not only providing that that shall be done, but that any child when it reaches the sixth standard and completes up to that stage of education should have before it certain possibilities fitting it for its course in after life.

Mr. S. Stubbs: Are you taking all the credit for that on your side?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: What this side is taking the credit for,

and absolutely correctly, is for having altered the curriculum so as to permit all this, the credit for co-ordination and the credit for enabling a child having passed the sixth standard to choose the course it is to take in life. The child has a course of two years either in industrial knowledge or in commercial knowledge or, in the case of girls, in domestic knowledge, and we take credit for this, that we have sought to adapt the instruction to the needs of the child. For instance, in the big cities we train the child in woodwork, in metal work, and in handicraft generally, or we give it commercial studies which include shorthand, commercial history and geography, but at Narrogin, for instance, we train the child in methods of working, such as how it should construct a barn or dwelling or how gates and fences should be properly erected.

Mr. Lauder: You ought to do work on the State farm at Narrogin.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION : We are providing for that. It will be started very shortly. In every part of the State we try to fit the knowledge to be taught to the requirements of the district, and to the work that has to be done by the scholars at the school in future. Moreover, we not only have given them this additional course at the schools, but the completion of this course entitles them to a further course at the technical schools. They can thus fit themselves at the primary schools to enter the technical schools and continue there for four years, fitting them to take their places in almost any avocation in life. The department is fulfilling the work done in old days by masters to apprentices, teaching the children trades and to be useful not only to themselves but to society generally. May I draw attention to the fact that we have, since the present Government came into office, completely re-organised the continuation classes. Now when a child reaches the age of 13 or 14 years and is compelled by the exigencies of its parents' career to leave school, we provide him with classes at night where he can pursue his studies and prepare to enter the technical school. We co-ordin-

ate and that is purely the work of the department since the present Government came into office.

Mr. O'Loughlen The other side stopped the increments to the teachers.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION : We have not only in view the benefits to the scholars but those to the teachers. We have recognised the importance of their work and so have provided facilities for all the teachers taking a six months' course at the training college to attend the lectures at the university. We are endeavouring to extend the facilities to those teachers still further, and are endeavouring to give a chance to them to take their degrees in the university. I think these facts in themselves tell enormously to the credit of the present Government. I am not saying the Government have done all this by their own actual work. I am pleased to say there is in the department what did not always exist, a spirit of amity and respect between the inspectorial staff and the teachers. All barriers of pride and separation have been taken down and now there is not a teacher throughout the whole of the service but, if he has a grievance, has the means of making that grievance known.

Mr. Turvey : They help now to frame the curriculum.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION : As the hon. member reminds me, they are not only teachers but have a voice in deciding what shall be taught and how it shall be taught. They have their own organisation. I believe this very day the teachers were meeting the Director of Education, laying before him their proposals suggesting certain remedial acts in some directions, and some modifications in others, and the director of education and other members of the inspectorial staff come into contact with them, not in the relationship almost of masters and humble servants but rather as equals, recognising that they are all engaged in the one great duty, the spread of knowledge and the cultivation of character all through the State. That is the work that is being



done, and this is not all because on Saturday week I am going myself to meet these teachers or their representatives, who will lay matters they have to complain of and matters upon which they have to advise or make suggestions before me. That is the genuine spirit. That is why I claim our education system is superior to that of any other part of the Commonwealth. It is *con amore*, and a spirit of zeal animates the hearts of the teachers, a zeal which spreads itself like some happy aroma and makes the scholars all feel bound by invisible cords of love to their teachers. That spirit is to me an admirable fact, and it is not only a genuine spirit working through the teachers, but everyone now becomes conscious of the value of education. Parents are crying out now from all parts of the State for the bringing nearer to them of educational facilities. The public at large are aware of the blessings that come from education, and it is a charge against me if I do not at once comply with the cry for a school here or a school there, additions to this place or that place, and from every part of the State comes to me that same cry "We want more facilities for education." Here in the metropolis there is not a school which is not overcrowded, James-street has the phenomenon of classes held in the corridors and cloak rooms. In other parts of the city the same fact exists. I have added class rooms at Maylands and other places and no sooner were these classrooms completed than the cry came "We have not enough, we must have another," or "We must have two more." It is not solely, however, in the metropolis, but to go to Claremont, go to Cottesloe, and we find the same puzzle meeting us as to how we are going to keep pace with the demand for educational facilities. There is not a mail which comes down to Perth but brings requests for schools, additions to schools, or fresh teachers to be appointed. That shows that education is right through the whole community, everyone is afire with the zeal and spirit of education. There is a wholesome thirst for knowledge, a genuine spirit of enquiry, a consciousness of the power that is stirring the whole State.

I take it that the present Government have done something to fortify and cement that spirit existing throughout the State.

Mr. S. Stubbs: No one can deny that.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I am surely entitled to make a speech and to speak it from my heart.

Mr. S. Stubbs: But not to take all the credit.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The hon. member surely does not begrudge any credit that may be reflected on us in that respect. The hon. member surely does not sneer if I speak facts concerning what has been done in the course of two years. I am only telling the history of two years events. I do not care who has the credit. Am I not giving credit to parents, credit to the children, credit to the inspectorial staff, and credit to those who have organised this whole body in accordance with the aims of the Government I represent? Education teaches us we should have no pride in empty vanity. One thing education has taught us is that we are all brothers, and humanity is the cementing force. One cannot elevate the lowliest child of the community without improving to some measure the whole community. It is in the betterment of these little ones that the whole community is purified and ennobled. In education is that force which takes hold of the little mind, and as it were, puts the heart into a mould to fashion it for future aims. In that way do we build the body politic, and that force properly grown and matured in all breasts and all minds, shall sweep before it the remaining monuments of our vanity in days gone by, the gaols, asylums, instruments of torture, and all the elements of that civic government which deserves no other designation; all is swept away beneath its beneficent light. Education, knowledge, and science which we teach in our schools, it is that which has made the bosom of the ocean heave beneath floating cities; it is that knowledge which has swept the forest and the sand plains in to the invisible realms of the by-gone, and has planted the homestead, the township, and the harvest fields of our young and growing State; it is knowledge

which has matured the wealth of the community and converted the one time fishing village of Perth into a splendid city. It is the power called education that teaches man to look for the best in his fellow men. It is that thing called education that teaches man humility, and teaches him that he has more to learn, and it teaches even those pupils in the old schools how to respect the work of others without a sneer, and to admit the good that is being done, without reproach and scorn. I have enlarged somewhat on the subject, but it is not because I wish this Government or myself in particular to take any special praise. No; it is sufficient for me to be one atom in this great force which is elevating mankind above their superstitions, above their vulgar prejudices, above their ignoble artifices, teaching them to recognise the better part of human nature in all their fellows. It is enough for me for a little while, to be part of, or to move within that wonderful and mysterious agency that is transforming the world into the enlightened paradise of the twentieth century. The Government want no praise, but we are obliged to relate that we have done our duty. If, being in that position, I have neglected opportunities presented by a body of inspectors willing to advance the cause of education, devoting their time zealously to their work, allotting their tasks, one taking charge of the continuation classes, as Mr. Clubb has done, another in some other features, co-ordinating the work, I should be deserving of reproach if I did not as far as possible fall in with those plans, and suggest plans of my own. The teachers about me are a body of men who are noted for their zeal in educational matters. I have fraternised with them and sought their advice, and made suggestions to them in connection with this great movement, the same elevation of mankind which is part and parcel of the great movement represented by these Treasury benches. It is the uplifting of the latent conscience of man, and the taking hold of childhood so that the brain may expand and the heart may swell in a purer atmosphere. That movement, I

am proud to work for, but I am conscious of the difficulties because we cannot do all we would wish to do. I know that there are requests for new schools and new teachers, but the means at our disposal will not allow us to do all that we would desire. I know that the teachers would not wish us to spend every increment that the Treasury may be able to collect merely in advancing their selfish ends and aims when we have districts not yet reached, when we have townships not yet settled, when we have far off country folk to whom education has not yet been granted, workers, pioneers of the country, building up this great State of ours. We have all this to do, and therefore we must be conscious of our limitations. We know our difficulties, but notwithstanding all this I can conscientiously say without any accusation of vanity, that during the past two years wonderful progress has been made in educational matters in this State. There has been a marvellous adjustment between the directing staff and the teaching staff, a marvellous co-ordination between all the different elements and factors all leading up to the high temple called the university, making it possible for the lowliest in the land to reach, stage by stage, to that university where one is crowned by the rich laurels of knowledge. Let us go on in this House day by day and year by year, and I assert that it will not be long before all those bitter prejudices that divide mankind heart from heart will be as dead as the strata of the earth.

[*Mr. McDowall took the Chair.*]

Hon. FRANK WILSON (Sussex): After all was said and done any Minister in charge of this great department could always in telling language, if not in eloquent language, such as the Attorney General had used, describe the progress of the good work and the benefits which had been achieved by this branch of the service and the officers connected with it. It was quite true that there was a continual appeal for educational facilities. The schools were all overcrowded and he was glad that the Minister had spoken with all due humility, and had said that he was not anxious for self praise, but

rather that he rendered it to all those who had been interested in the conduct of the department. It should not be forgotten that in addition to the people, the Parliament, the Minister, and the members of the educational staff, that the previous Administration in Western Australia had also given their best attention to the education of the children. The Minister for Education had told the House that the means were not all that could be desired; that he was unable to grant the demands to the fullest extent towards the establishment of schools and providing teachers. This, of course, had always been the trouble with the Minister for Education's predecessors when attempting to meet requirements, more especially in the agricultural areas. No one could forget that some seven or eight years prior to the great policy of land settlement there was not anything like the demand we had at the present time for educational facilities. Notwithstanding that we had of course the goldfields rush, and during later years the children had increased in numbers he was thankful to say in the goldfields centres, and had demanded from Parliament and the Government, schools in which they could receive education, which would fit them for their future lives and occupations. A great demand for education had arisen in recent years from the permanent population, and that of course would mean much for the State. It would mean advancement and wealth to the community and the destinies this Parliament and those who occupied the Ministerial benches presided over. But, whereas the Minister for Education had taken some portion of the credit and praise to his Government, the Opposition could claim, at any rate, that in their day, and during their time, equal demands were made and met. The continuation schools, the co-ordination which the Minister for Education had emphasised, the fitting of the pupil to pass through the technical schools and acquire special knowledge had existed in the time of the previous Government, and were established in many instances by the Government with which he had been connected. The University itself, the Mini-

ster for Education would admit, was largely a creature of the creation of the previous Government backed up by the gentlemen who had been then in Opposition. Not one voice had ever been raised against moderate legitimate advancement in this department. He did not wish to quibble and take exception to the increased expenditure, which, of course, was the outcome of the large increase in our juvenile population, an increase for which, to some extent at any rate, the policy of previous administrations, more especially within the last seven or eight years, had been responsible. If these schools were overcrowded to-day, if the demand for more accommodation and more teachers was ever on the increase, it was due to the fact that it had been possible for people to settle and prosper on the land. His only concern was that the means which the Minister had referred to as lacking were likely to be still further lacking. That was the reason why he was preaching economy to his friend the Treasurer. That was why the Treasurer should take to heart the advice so freely given him, but which as a rule the Treasurer scorned. The day would come when the Treasurer's extravagance and waste of public money in other directions would prevent this department from getting what it justly demanded. The Minister for Education would have had no reason to be fearful of a lack of funds for his grand aspirations had the Treasurer not delved into ruinous State commercial undertakings. The loss last year on the State steamers alone would have provided all the funds which the Minister for Education required to-day for the extension of his school system.

The CHAIRMAN: There was no occasion to go into the question of State steamers. The hon. member would be required to keen within the division.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: All he was doing was to traverse the grounds followed by the Minister, who had complained of the lack of funds. He was pointing out to the Treasurer where these funds could have been saved and how the Treasurer's extravagant mal-administra-

tion was really depriving this department of the necessary means to carry out the noble aspirations of the Minister for Education. In referring casually to the State steamers he was not going beyond the province of a general discussion on the Education Department. He could extend the hand of brotherhood to the Minister for Education. He was glad the Minister's control of this department had at last brought forcibly home to his mind those lessons of humility which the Minister professed to have learnt even at this late hour in life. Hon. members were brothers in wishing to see all the educational facilities that the funds which the Treasurer found so difficult to raise could provide. No hon. member took any exception to the teachers being properly paid for the work which they carried out.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: You would not do it.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The hon. member did not know what he was talking about. Hon. members had had the cruelty to say that he (Hon. Frank Wilson) had stopped the increments to the teachers, inferring that the teachers were the only people whose increments had been stopped in that dark period of the history of the State.

The Premier: Who brought it about?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The hon. member had brought it about, and was now bringing about a worse day of reckoning than ever before experienced in Western Australia. It would not be a question only of stopping temporary increments to teachers, but it would be a question of a black Wednesday, with retrenchments and reduction, if hon. members remained much longer in office. The late Administration had asked the teaching staff to accept the same conditions as every other civil servant was under at that time. The teachers had accepted those conditions and ultimately they were treated like all other civil servants and received their due increments. No one could deny it, and if the Premier went on using Loan funds for his departmental expenditure, then even the Education Department would suffer in common with other departments.

Mr. Lewis: Stinking fish!

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It was not easy to know what the hon. member meant with his cry of "stinking fish." The actions and the administration of the Government were stinking in the nostrils of the people at the present time, if that was what the hon. member referred to, and they were likely to go on getting much worse as the years rolled by. The increase in the expenditure was a natural one, the number of schools having risen from some 400 two or three years ago, to 550. This was in accordance with the policy established in Western Australia for many years past. During the time of the late Administration the schools had increased by more than double. It was always a pleasure if Parliament could back up the efforts of any Government to provide what was necessary in the interests of the future generations. The expenditure must increase, but there must also be due caution in the expenditure even of this department. The teachers must be fairly treated and no favouritism should be shown to any one individual member of that great staff over another. Whilst he commended the Minister for his desire to give increases and for his efforts to better the conditions of those who were employed in this great undertaking, he condemned the Minister's chief, and the Minister himself inasmuch as he did not appear to mete out uniform justice to all in this department. On the Budget debate he (Hon. Frank Wilson) had had occasion to refer to the retiring allowance paid to Mr. Turvey, the member for Swan.

The Premier: It is not on these Estimates.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier wriggled at once. The Premier sneered at all reference to a detail of that description. But there was a principle of justice underlying the matter. It had been ventilated here on more than one occasion. The Minister for Education, with his protestations of fair play, his desire to do right between the officers in his department, should immediately take cognisance of it and see that it was rectified. Last session the Premier, in answer

to a reference to this matter, had given a reply which, to use a mild term, was inaccurate. The Premier had then stated that the allowance paid to the member for Swan on retiring from the service to become a member of Parliament was in accordance with a provision operating in the department. He (Hon. Frank Wilson) had taken exception to the special consideration shown to a member of the Labour party who had given up his billet in the Education Department to stand for Parliament and better his position.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): He was sacked for standing for Parliament.

The Premier: Do not throw stones when you are living in a glass house.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Hon. member was an expert at throwing bricks. The hon. member had made wild statements, wilfully inaccurate at times, in respect to this matter, and had refrained from doing what the member for Leonora would term "the manly thing" and acknowledging his error and granting justice. The hon. member had said this retiring allowance which was granted to the member for Swan—

The Premier: Did Parker dig that up for you?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Was the hon. member referring to Mr. Bernard Parker?

The Premier: I did not mention Mr. Parker.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: To whom did the hon. member refer?

Mr. Lewis: The East Canning teacher.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The correspondence of that gentleman was before him.

Mr. Turvey: He interviewed you to-night.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: That gentleman had written to him on several occasions. Why should he not? On the 21st of November of last year the Premier had said the retiring allowance was the ordinary retiring allowance in accordance with the provision operating in the Education Department. He (Hon. Frank Wilson) had thereupon declared that the

explanation was not too clear and that the established rule should hold good that an officer of the department leaving his position for the purpose of bettering himself was not entitled to a retiring allowance. The Premier had insisted that the allowance was an allowance accumulated during the period of his service. There was not the slightest doubt about the legality of the position. The hon. member for Swan said he had applied for a retiring allowance on severing his connection with the department; it was not applied for after he had secured election but while he was a teacher in the department; he had not severed his connection with the department of his own free will. Then the member for Perth had chipped in and stated that no specially favourable terms had been meted out to the member for Swan; several others who had left the department for the purpose of bettering themselves had been granted retiring allowances. He (the leader of the Opposition) had never been able to find out who those individuals were. The matter had cropped up when Mr. E. M. Dyer, a teacher at Capel, applied to the department for a retiring allowance. He was not leaving the department of his own free will but had been compelled to leave because his eyesight was failing, and he could not continue to do his work satisfactorily. That gentleman was refused a retiring allowance, and when he pointed out that the member for Swan had received a retiring allowance, and that surely his claim was equally as forcible and just as that of the hon. member—he had also referred to the Premier's utterances in the House that all officers were treated alike and that the retiring allowance was in accordance with the regulations—he received this wonderful reply from the Director of Education—

I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 9th inst., and to inform you that the Premier's statement was made in mistake. There is no regulation authorising a retiring allowance of this kind and the instance in question was treated as a special case in which there were special circumstances. Con-

sequently I am unable to arrange for any such allowance as you request. That letter said that the Premier's statement was a mistake, just what we had told the Premier at the time, and yet the Premier would not acknowledge the error and rectify it. There was also the case of Mr. Parker, a gentleman whose letters he had read to the House during the general discussion on the Budget. That gentleman's health was failing him and he had to retire. It was not because the department ordered him to retire but because his medical adviser strongly urged him to get away from the teaching occupation and go on the land. He had 11½ years continuous service since his readmission to the department, or 14½ years in all, whilst the member for Swan had had 7½ years' service since his readmission, or 13 years in all; but the member for Swan got a retiring allowance whilst the other man, who had to go forth to earn his living on the land, and to learn a fresh occupation, was refused an allowance, notwithstanding that he had a record of good service to the State, and had been commended for the work he had carried out. Where did the justice come in? Was the Minister going to see that that man, and others of whom there were numbers in the service, received the same justice at the hands of the Government as the member for Swan had received? He was not making a personal attack on the member for Swan.

Mr. Turvey: It seems to be your nightmare.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It would take something more than the hon. member to give him nightmare. If the hon. member was going to substantiate the Premier's statement as put forth in the Director's letter, he should either return the retiring allowance which had been granted to him by the Treasurer, not in accordance with the regulations, or else—and he suggested this as a better alternative—the Premier should see that he acted justly by the other officers of the department, and treated those other men who had had to leave, not to satisfy their political ambition, but because their health had broken down in the service of

the department, with that even-handed justice which had been granted to a member of the party to which the Government belonged. This matter demanded attention and it did not matter to him a rap how the Premier might squirm, snarl, and fight. It did not matter to him how the member for Swan, and other members on the Government side might accuse him of personal animosity. He had no feeling against them personally, but he had a lot of animosity against their methods of administration and against the injustice that had been perpetrated and had been supported by the Premier and his colleague who had carried his audience away to-night by his eloquence in behalf of the teaching staff and the department over which he had undoubtedly the honour, at the present time, to temporarily preside. He asked the Premier not to treat this matter with his customary larrikinism and levity.

Mr. E. B. Johnston rose to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The word larrikinism is not a Parliamentary expression that can be allowed. The hon. member must withdraw.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The word would be withdrawn.

The Premier: I am not satisfied with a withdrawal. He must apologise for that.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The expression had been withdrawn.

The Premier: But I think it is absolutely unfair.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The expression larrikinism had often been used in this Chamber. It meant a boyish disregard of the responsibilities and cares of office.

Mr. Underwood: On a point of order! Has the hon. member withdrawn the expression?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. Underwood: Well, I take it he is not allowed to continue talking about it.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier need not be so thin-skinned. The hon. member was fond of throwing bricks. The expression had been withdrawn because the Chairman had ruled it out of

order, but it was to be hoped that the Premier would not treat the matter with his usual levity.

The Premier: I will not take any notice of you at all.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier was not asked to take notice of him.

The Premier: I do not intend to.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Hon. FRANK WILSON: If the Premier was going to "cut" him henceforth he did not know that he would lose any rest over it. He was asking the Premier, not to take notice of him, but to take notice of those men who had been badly treated.

The Premier: I will do less than that.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier was surely not going to vent his resentment on those men.

Mr. Lewis: Why did you not practise what you preach?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Let the Government practice justice.

Mr. O'Loughlen: You never knew how.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Only one member can address the Chair at a time.

Mr. Underwood: You do not know the meaning of the word.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Injustice had been perpetrated. Either the member for Swan had wrongly received the retiring allowance, or those men who had claimed retiring allowances had been wrongly refused.

Mr. Lewis: Why did you not practise what you preach when you had the opportunity?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Why did not the hon. member support this plea for justice in his own electorate—this plea to protect men from an injustice that was being perpetrated. He was asking for justice, for what the Premier had said did exist, namely that all officers of the department were treated alike. He was asking that there should not be special cases and special circumstances, as mentioned in the Director's letter, referring to a member of the Government party, which convinced the Government that he should have a retiring allowance and that there should be no special circumstances surrounding the retirement of

other officers of the department. The Premier might take this matter ill if he liked; he might take it indifferently; he might decide to ignore these claims, as no doubt he would after his expressions this evening, but he (Hon. Frank Wilson) would not refrain from ventilating the matter and letting the public know that apparently there was something which made a law for one of the Government supporters in this House, which was not applicable to the other employees of the department. That was the injustice which he asked should be rectified, and whilst we were building up a big edifice in Western Australia that was to mould and form the character of future generations, and which, according to the Minister for Education was to make us all brothers throughout the land, let us avoid, if we possibly could, anything which might have the appearance of favouritism; let us endeavour to sink our own hurt feelings and inquire impartially into these claims, and do justice to those who were even worse off, and perhaps owing to their state of health, were more entitled to consideration than the case he had referred to.

Mr. TURVEY (Swan): Hon. members on the Opposition benches had reason to be proud of the magnificent effort put forward by their leader on our education system. He had taken up his time in discussing what to the people of this State was one of the most important divisions of the Estimates in order to tell them two things, first, that the teachers of Western Australia might look forward to a Black Wednesday, presumably when the leader of the Opposition again occupied the Treasury benches, and secondly, and the one to which he had devoted most attention, the item of a retiring allowance granted to him (Mr. Turvey) on his dismissal from the Education Department—a matter of some £79. Since the leader of the Opposition had taken such time to show what an awful waste of money this was, he desired to show that it was a mere bagatelle compared with some of the scandalous waste permitted while the hon. member was Premier. Would hon. members compare that £79 with the sum of

£17,000 which he gave to his intimate pals in connection with our railway construction works? Compare it with the £6,000 which the hon. member gave to Vincent Brothers and with the sums he gave to Mr. Teesdale Smith and others, and then let him talk to the people about a retiring allowance that was granted to a public servant who was incontinently kicked out by the present leader of the Opposition and his colleagues.

The Premier: He would not care if he gave £79,000 to his friends.

Mr. TURVEY: The Auditor General's report commented on the quantity of whisky consumed at a function organised by the hon. member. The value of the whisky consumed at the expense of the public. The cost of the function amounted to considerably more than the sum paid to the public servant who was dismissed.

Hon. Frank Wilson: What was the function?

Mr. TURVEY: Let the hon. member look at the Auditor General's report, where he commented on the fact that a treat organised by the leader of the Opposition, who was then Premier, a Parliamentary trip—

Hon. Frank Wilson: For your benefit, to Rottnest.

Mr. TURVEY: The function and the whisky consumed cost £215 to this State, and the Auditor General commented on the immense quantity consumed.

Hon. Frank Wilson: The Rottnest trip for the then Opposition.

Mr. TURVEY: The hon. member ought to refer to dignity and larrikinism. If he wanted to sink to the same level as the hon. member he could tell him some deeds upon which the light of day dared not be thrown.

Hon. Frank Wilson: The hon. member had accused him of deeds on which he dared not throw the light of day. He demanded that the hon. member should fully explain those deeds or withdraw the expression.

The CHAIRMAN: Then he would ask the hon. member to withdraw the expression.

Hon. Frank Wilson: It would be preferable if the hon. member fully explained it.

The CHAIRMAN: Or to fully explain the matter.

Mr. TURVEY: The hon. member had referred to larrikinism in this Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Did the hon. member intend to fully explain or withdraw?

Mr. TURVEY: The leader of the Opposition was a bigger larrikin than any member of the House.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must withdraw. The remark was applied to the leader of the Opposition and earlier he had made the leader of the Opposition withdraw the remark which he applied to the Premier. The hon. member for Swan must withdraw.

Mr. TURVEY: Very well, he regretted that Parliamentary procedure compelled him to withdraw.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Would the hon. member withdraw the other imputation?

Mr. TURVEY: It had been withdrawn.

Hon. Frank Wilson: No, the other imputation that he had done deeds upon which the light of day dared not be thrown, which was really an imputation of dishonesty.

Mr. TURVEY: That had been withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member stated that he had withdrawn.

Mr. TURVEY: The hon. member had stated that this was not a personal attack upon him. The amount did not appear on the Estimates but was being continually dragged up by the leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Do you object to the other fellows getting the same treatment?

Mr. TURVEY: No, he did not.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Then why not help me to get it for them?

Mr. TURVEY: In his case he had applied for his retiring allowance and had received it.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Then fight for the others.



The Premier: He was prepared to continue in the service, but you would not permit him to do so.

Mr. TURVEY: When the leader of the Opposition found there was a teacher standing for Parliamentary honours and three railway servants, and that the three railway servants were backed up by a strong union he adopted an entirely different attitude towards them.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I did not.

Mr. TURVEY: The hon. member and his Ministers at that time took an entirely different attitude towards the members who were backed up by a strong organisation from the attitude they adopted towards him.

The Premier: He absolutely crawled to them.

Mr. TURVEY: Those men were reinstated.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Because the Commissioner granted their long leave.

The Premier: You made the Commissioner do so.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I did exactly what I would do to-day.

Mr. TURVEY: The leader of the Opposition and his colleagues had adopted an entirely different attitude to those members of the railway union from that adopted towards him as a Government servant in another department.

Hon. Frank Wilson: They did not.

Mr. TURVEY: Those gentleman were reinstated. He had asked to be allowed to continue in his position, but was told that he could not do so.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You were not on leave.

Mr. TURVEY: It was like pouring water on a duck's back to discuss the matter with the leader of the Opposition.

The Premier: He instructed the Commissioner to reinstate them.

Mr. TURVEY: What had the leader of the Opposition to say in regard to the telegrams sent from the Great Southern district on the eve of the election?

Hon. Frank Wilson interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Would the leader of the Opposition allow the hon. member to continue without interruption?

Hon. Frank Wilson: Then he apologised and would leave the Chamber.

The Premier: Crawling out.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Very well, he would remain.

Mr. TURVEY: Telegrams were flashed from the Great Southern district to have those men reinstated immediately.

Mr. Wisdom: What has that to do with it?

Mr. TURVEY: Those men were reinstated, and he was refused reinstatement in his department. It had a lot to do with the matter.

Mr. Wisdom: You have not justified it yet.

The Premier: That is even-handed justice.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Swan was addressing the Chair. Interjections were coming from all sides. One hon. member had interjected that the member for Swan had not justified his remark, and it would be interesting to know how he could do so when so many were talking at one and the same time.

Mr. Wisdom: It was his impression that the Premier was speaking at the time.

Mr. TURVEY: Hon. members ought to refrain from interjecting and ought to take their gruel quietly. He did not interject when the leader of the Opposition was making charges wholesale against him.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Plenty on your side did. Are you going to give these men justice.

Mr. TURVEY: It was his intention to tell the hon. member some truths which he would not like made public.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You have made that threat before.

Mr. TURVEY: The hon. member would be told another—

Hon. Frank Wilson: The hon. member had said he was going to say something that he did not want made public, that was discreditable. It was an insinuation that he had done something wrong, and that he was concealing something. It was an offensive remark and he asked that it be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. member withdraw the remark?

Mr. TURVEY: Then he would withdraw the remark, and make the statement after he had withdrawn. He referred to the Auditor General's comments on the whisky that was consumed. He believed some 68 bottles were consumed by the hon. member and his friends on that occasion.

Hon. Frank Wilson: By your friends.

Mr. TURVEY: On that occasion——

Hon. Frank Wilson: It was his desire to protest against the remark and to deny that he had ever consumed 68 bottles of whisky. The hon. member referred to a visit to Rottneest which he (Mr. Wilson) had organised, and at which he said a great number of bottles of whisky——

Mr. TURVEY: Was the hon. member in order in making a speech at this juncture?

Hon. Frank Wilson: This injured our reputations and he wanted to make a denial.

Mr. TURVEY: It was his intention to refuse to withdraw the expression because he had a statement here from the Auditor General and would read it to the leader of the Opposition. The Auditor General, commenting on an item of £215 2s. 7d., expenditure which was incurred in February, 1911, while the hon. member was Premier, referred to the fact that included in the amount was an item for 68 bottles of whisky. He (Mr. Turvey) asked the hon. member whom that whisky was consumed by, and if it was not consumed by the hon. member and his friends?

Hon. Frank Wilson: The hon. member accused him of consuming it. That was what he asked him to withdraw. He never consumed 68 bottles of whisky, nor did so with the assistance of his friends on these benches.

The CHAIRMAN: The statement should be withdrawn.

Mr. TURVEY: Was he to say the Auditor General was wrong in what he said?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member had read what the Auditor General had said, but there was certain parliamentary procedure which must be observed. The hon. member must speak in some-

thing like reasonable illustrations, and could not go all over the world; there should be some consideration in this respect. While he (the Chairman) gave the utmost possible latitude, he wanted the illustrations to have something to do with the Estimates under discussion.

Mr. TURVEY: The statement that the hon. gentleman consumed 68 bottles of whisky himself would be withdrawn.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Or his friends.

Mr. TURVEY: What he read here was what was included in the Auditor General's report, that in this item of £215 2s. 7d. were no fewer than 68 bottles of whisky, which were consumed on that trip which was inaugurated by the hon. gentleman and his friends.

Hon. Frank Wilson: And the then leader of the Opposition, the Premier.

Mr. TURVEY: If one needed to say that the hon. gentleman was responsible time after time for lavish waste of public funds on himself and those connected with him, one could go on and on. One could refer, for instance, to the number of times State motor cars were used for the hon. gentleman's wife and daughter to do shopping around the city.

Hon. Frank Wilson: His wife and daughter never went shopping in the State motor cars. He asked the hon. member to withdraw that also.

Mr. TURVEY: Very well, he would withdraw the statement and say the hon. gentleman's daughter used a car, and it was charged up to the State, in order to take the hon. gentleman's daughter around Claremont. He (Mr. Turvey) did not wish to proceed, but he could refer to other items of motor coats and other things which were charged up to the people of this State.

Hon. Frank Wilson: What about the motor cars that you are now all using.

Mr. TURVEY: What he had endeavoured to show was that thousands and thousands of pounds had been spent by the hon. gentleman and to-night he was quibbling over an item of some £70 odd that was given to a public servant on his retirement.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Wrongly given.

Mr. TURVEY : Simply and solely because he happened to be a member of the Labour party.

Hon. Frank Wilson : It was wrongly given.

[Mr. Holman resumed the Chair.]

Mr. TURVEY : It was a pity indeed that such a matter as this had had to be discussed and had, so far as the leader of the Opposition was concerned, been made one of paramount importance in discussing the Education Estimates of the State. One would have thought that the leader of the Opposition would have risen above a paltry matter like this in discussing such an important thing as the education of the children of Western Australia. He (Mr. Turvey) desired to refer to a few matters in regard to the Education Department. The Minister had pointed to the fact that the compulsory officers in this State were having less work to do year after year. He (Mr. Turvey) also noted that with pride, but he had also noticed another important matter in connection with the work of the compulsory officers, and that was that notwithstanding the fact that less work was thrown upon the compulsory officers the percentage of attendance to enrolment was the highest last year that had ever been recorded in the history of the State. To anyone who gave attention to educational matters at all this indeed must be one matter that was very pleasing. It showed that our teachers were advancing with the times; it showed that our education system was improving, and that to-day the children looked upon school as something of an attraction to them. Different indeed from the days of years gone by when children, having a mortal dread of attending school, took every opportunity to absent themselves. To-day, however, we found our children discontented if they had to remain away from school, and the fact which he had mentioned that the percentage of attendances for last year was the highest recorded in the history of the State, spoke volumes

not only for the work of our Director of Education, but for his staff of inspectors and also for the teachers throughout the State. The Minister referred to the increasing demands for accommodation in our schools, and also the increased number of schools which were being opened. In the last report, it might be pointed out, out of 53 schools that were opened, 48 of them were country schools. This showed the increased cost that was being entailed in advancing the educational system. These country schools required just as much as the city schools in the way of competent teachers and they had to be paid. The Minister for Education had pointed with pride to the fact that since the advent of the present Government the salaries of teachers had been considerably increased. He (Mr. Turvey) desired to express his hearty appreciation of what had been done by the present Government for the teachers of this State. He desired to emphasise what he had referred to by way of interjection when the Minister was speaking, that much had yet to be done, but he did so without in any way disparaging the good work that had already been done by the present Minister. His good work had been recognised by the teachers throughout the State, and in the last issue of the *Teachers' Journal* complimentary references were made to the Minister for what he had done, and that journal went on to say—

Mr. Walker has shown whole-hearted and practical sympathy for the teachers in their work. He has substantially improved the remuneration of nearly all the grades of teachers and he has placed the inspectorial salaries on a more commonsense basis, and he has made a name for himself generally as Minister for Education.

Then it went further on to say that Mr. Walker had removed many glaring anomalies which had existed in the department for years. Reference might be made to some of those anomalies. When the Minister was speaking the member for Wagin (Mr. S. Stubbs) interjected that no one would object to the increases, and that no one would object to the removal of those anomalies, but what should

be pointed out was that not only had increases been given to teachers, but greater benefits were being derived by our country school children. We had been told from time to time that the child of the poor man in Western Australia had equal opportunities with the child of the rich man, and that the country school child had equal opportunities of obtaining scholarships with the child of the city schools. That position might be analysed for a moment so far as the past was concerned. Looking at the last report which was available, it was noticed that 52 secondary scholarships had been granted, and of those only seven went to what might be termed country schools, or only about 13 per cent., while 87 per cent. went to the city or the large central schools. Several of the secondary scholarships were for entrance to the Modern School. There were 463 entries representing 170 schools, and 61 of these entries were from country schools. At the Modern School the vacancies to be filled numbered 100, and it was found that after the vacancies had been allotted to the winners of the secondary scholarships, there were still 66 remaining and of these only six were filled by children from country schools. What he was endeavouring to show the House was that the child in the country had not anything like the opportunity of gaining scholarships that the child in the city had. Therefore there would always be the tendency on the part of those who desired their children to receive this higher educational facilities to remain or keep about the big centres of population. It was satisfactory to note that alterations in this regard had been made by the present Minister for Education. With regard to the Government exhibitions, some 20 were granted. There were 125 candidates who presented themselves and of that number not a single exhibition was gained by a child from the country schools. With regard to bursaries, 174 candidates presented themselves for examination and not a single one from a country school succeeded. With regard to the senior and junior exhibitions it was found that these were nearly all won by children from the

private secondary schools. One had only to glance at the last report of the Education Department to find there that nearly all these scholarships, bursaries, and exhibitions that were granted, which were supposed to be open equally to the country schools, as well as to the city schools were won by scholars attending the city or the large central schools. The member for Wagin (Mr. S. Stubbs) and others on the Opposition benches, interjected that the Minister was inclined to take a little praise to himself and his Government for reforms in that direction, but the House would be interested to know that in February of this year new regulations were issued at the direction of the Minister governing primary and secondary schools scholarships. Primary school scholarships were granted wherever a particularly bright child was to be found in a country school and some twelve were allotted each year of the value of about £25 each, and they were tenable to such time as the holder of that scholarship completed the primary school education, or won some secondary school scholarship, provided the reports showed good progress and conduct on the part of the child. Under the direction of the present Minister a certain proportion of the secondary school scholarships were now reserved for children attending country schools. The Minister should go still further with his reform in this direction and make a greater number of these scholarships available to the children attending country schools. Our settlers went out and blazed the track, taking with them their wives and families, and unless this special reserve of scholarships were there for the children they would have little or no opportunity of competing with any degree of success against the children attending the larger schools. The Minister had stated that there was a spirit of grateful content throughout the staff of teachers to-day. That was scarcely correct; but there was a far greater content existing amongst the teachers to-day than had existed in the past. Until the teacher was paid a salary somewhat commensurate with the importance of the work he was called upon to perform we could not

expect that spirit of grateful contentment.

Mr. S. Stubbs : When will that come about?

Mr. TURVEY: It would come about in due course if the Labour Government were left in power. The Minister had already given an indication of a desire to see teachers properly remunerated. A comparison of the salaries paid to-day with those paid by the late Government revealed a big increase, although far from what it should be when the important work of the teachers was taken into consideration. Without wishing to detract from the magnificent manner in which the present Government had assisted the teachers, it was to be confessed that there were many anomalies existing in the department. Doubtless these would be rectified through the teachers' union if they presented their case properly to the Director and through the Director to the Minister. The Minister, if he found that a teacher was not getting a fair deal, would at once deal fairly by that teacher. The Minister had also stated that the teachers had the making of the future destiny of the State in their hands, that they were asked to mould the body politic as it were that would sweep away the barbaric monuments of the past. Such a statement was sufficient to show that the Minister realised the importance of the work of teaching. Yet, notwithstanding the immense increases which had been granted by the present Government, the teachers who were asked to mould the minds of future citizens were paid less than those who were asked to mould a block of jarrah or of stone. It would be far better to stop our public works policy than to interfere with the progress of our educational system. It was to be remembered that the children of to-day were the citizens of the future, and after all, the importance of the State would depend entirely upon the manner in which those future citizens were moulded. National prosperity did not depend alone upon a progressive works policy, neither did it depend upon our defence policy; but it depended also upon having well trained, well equipped citizens. By "well trained" he meant not

only mental training but that they should be trained physically and have well developed bodies. He was pleased to know that the teachers in Western Australia were devoting considerable attention to the building up of the child physically as well as mentally. Too much importance could not be attached to the physical welfare of our children. When he advocated an increased expenditure on medical inspection in our schools he knew that the Treasurer would at once say that the money was not there. It had been amusing to hear the member for Wagin (Mr. S. Stubbs) say that no one on the Opposition side would object to expenditure on this department, when it was known that members of the Opposition took every opportunity of going through the country decriing the fact that there was a deficit, that the country was going to the dogs. Then when we asked for increased expenditure in this department we were told that no one would object. Hon. members must remember that the educational system was not a revenue producing concern, but represented a continual paying out. He was prepared to advocate that a system of medical inspection should be instituted in our schools. Unfortunately Western Australia was behind the other States in this respect. A medical inspection had taken place in Western Australia but was not followed up. The acting medical officer for schools had furnished a report of an inspection of the schools, in which it was shown beyond doubt that there was absolute necessity for immediate attention being given to the physical welfare of our school children.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): The inspection is still going on.

Mr. TURVEY: The inspection might be still going on in some of the City schools.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): In the country schools as well.

Mr. TURVEY: It was gratifying to hear that this inspection was going on in the country schools, and he hoped that it would be increased. If any hon. member would go into any school and put the question to the teacher he would be told

that there were certain dullards in the school. Possibly whilst a teacher he (Mr. Turvey), in common with others, might have lost patience at times with a dull child and been too ready to blame the child; but in most of those cases it could be proved by medical inspection that it was the fault of some physical deformity in the child. Reports from the other States where these medical inspections were regularly made had shown that in nearly every case of a supposed dullard it was due to some physical defect in the child. If we were to have a well developed body of citizens in the future it was essential that the department should turn its attention to this. Of course it meant increased expenditure. In Victoria three medical inspectors had been appointed by the Education Department, and also a staff of nurses. In Queensland a scheme of instruction had been entered upon. There was a medical branch of the Department of Public Instruction, consisting of a medical inspector of schools, school nurses, and a dental inspector.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): We started before they did in Queensland.

Mr. TURVEY: The Minister was hardly right in saying that Western Australia started before Queensland. But the point was that the start should be followed up and remedial measures instituted. So far as the other States were concerned, he believed that with one exception increased attention was being given to this matter.

The Premier: Every other State is more developed than ours.

Mr. TURVEY: That was admitted. Attention might also be given to the type of desk that was in use.

Mr. Allen: Tripe!

Mr. TURVEY: One was grateful to the hon. member for his interjection. This subject was tripe to some members who occupied the Opposition benches.

Mr. S. Stubbs: Nobody said such a thing. I rise to a point of order. The member for Swan said that an interjection "Tripe" came from this side of the House. Such a remark never came from this side,

and I ask the hon. member to withdraw. It is not fair.

The CHAIRMAN: What is the point of order?

Mr. S. Stubbs: That the member for Swan made a statement which is inaccurate.

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member for Wagin takes exception to a statement made it must be withdrawn.

Mr. S. Stubbs: Well, I take exception to the statement.

The CHAIRMAN: What is the statement?

Mr. S. Stubbs: The member for Swan said that hon. members on this side interjected "tripe." I say they did not.

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member did not make the statement he need not take any notice of it.

Mr. TURVEY: The Minister was to be congratulated on his efforts to deal with the question of an improved desk in the schools. He hoped the Minister would assist in every way possible to put into the schools, particularly the new schools that were being built, desks that had some form of back to them. He wished to draw attention to a new type of desk which was on the market, called the Armstrong desk, which had received the highest commendation from the education authorities in all parts of Australia, and which was the invention of Mr. Armstrong of Sawyers' Valley school, a remote country school in this State. That desk had already been adopted, he understood, in one or two schools of the State, and when one read the Press opinions on the desk, one could not help expressing the hope that it would ere long be found in most country schools. If the desk was as good as the Press notices would lead one to believe, he hoped it would be adopted in the new schools that were being erected. This design of desk gave the child plenty of freedom and support, and the right sitting position as well. If hon. members were asked to sit for five or six hours at a time with no support for their backs they would find themselves with curvature of the spine or some such deformity. He knew the Minister had given some attention to this matter,

and if the desk had met with the approval of the Minister and his officers he trusted that the desk would be introduced as far as possible in all new schools. Before concluding he desired to refer to the work of the teachers. He regretted to say that there were many people in Western Australia who had the idea that teachers were people who went to work about nine o'clock in the morning and finished about 3.30 or 3.45 in the afternoon, but an examination of the curriculum and the regulations would prove to any hon. member that if a teacher carried out the duties devolving upon him under the curriculum and the regulations, the amount of clerical work he was asked to perform could not be done in less than twelve hours per day. He was referring of course to one-man schools in the country.

Mr. Lander: Some of that work should be knocked out.

Mr. TURVEY: If any teacher honestly and conscientiously carried out the duties expected of him under the regulations, and in conformity with the curriculum, he could not do his work under twelve hours per day. He mentioned this fact to remove the misapprehension that teachers had a fairly good time, that they only went to work at nine o'clock and finished before four o'clock. In regard to the supply of books for school purposes, he was pleased that since the advent of the present Government some reform had been made in that direction, and he would ask the Minister to endeavour to utilise the services of a few of his capable inspectors. The Minister had in the department officers who were capable of compiling good school books for use in the department, capable of turning out works which would compare more than favourably with works that were prepared by the officers in the education departments of the Eastern States and were looked upon as standard works. If this were done, probably the Government printing office could be utilised, and if the books were supplied to the children at actual cost price to the Government, it would mean a big reduction in the price of books and a big saving to the children

of poor parents. Another reform to which reference might be made was the abolition of the insanitary system of slates. He did not say that the present Government had instituted it, but it was a very desirable reform and one which had tended to the betterment of the health of the children. The Minister should consider the matter of local school committees. He did not refer to so-called school boards, but to local committees in each little town wherever a school was established. These committees could assist the teacher to a very great extent. Good work had been done through the medium of a few citizens in little communities assisting the teacher by establishing a school fund for beautifying the school and purchasing necessary aids to teaching. The Minister might introduce a system of subsidising such school funds and thereby encourage the people in each town to assist the teacher and the children and to assist education generally by giving donations towards the fund.

The Premier: Provide each child with a decent education first.

Mr. TURVEY: These matters were really a cost upon the Government. If local committees were encouraged the people would gladly avail themselves of the opportunity to provide improved aids to teaching. A slight subsidy from the Government would amount to less than the Government were paying at the present time.

The Premier: Supposing the people in any one centre refused to do that, would you refuse to supply them with free material?

Mr. TURVEY: The policy should be to help those who were ready to help themselves.

The Premier: And refuse to help the others?

Mr. TURVEY: No.

The Premier: The hospitals which help themselves get more than the others.

Mr. TURVEY: Where the people did not help themselves he would not advocate the abolition of free stock, but where the people took an interest in their school the Government should be ready to help them a little more than where parents took no interest in it. The question

should receive the earnest consideration of the Minister. Among other reforms granted by the present Minister was one which had been asked for for many years, and that was an increase of salary to sewing mistresses throughout the State. At last under the present Government a slight increase had been granted.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Their virtues seem to be very slight indeed always.

Mr. TURVEY: The increases might be slight, but they were infinitely more than were granted by the hon. member and his colleagues.

The Premier: You would require a microscope to see them.

Mr. Foley: And the parents had to pay a shilling a week for their children, too.

Mr. TURVEY: In conclusion one could not fail to express the highest appreciation at the splendid manner in which the present Government had assisted the education system. Not only had they assisted so far as the provision of schools and consideration for the welfare of the children were concerned, but they had also assisted the teachers. He did not wish to disparage the work of previous Governments in this respect, but teachers were kept on a salary of £70 or £80 until the advent of the present Government. Now, however, no teacher was in receipt of a salary of less than £110. That was very little indeed—

The Minister for Education: That is chiefly paid to the young girls starting in the service. You do not want to make the beginning too high, but you want to inspire them to rise up.

Mr. TURVEY: It was something for which the teachers had asked for many years and it had been left to a Labour Government to grant it. He thought the teachers of Western Australia would be indeed glad to know that the Labour Government would continue for many years and so would prevent the arrival of that Black Wednesday to which the leader of the Opposition had referred.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON (Williams-Narrogin): Much might be said in appreciation of the work of the Education Department under the present Minister.

Hon. J. Mitchell: There is plenty of time; you have all night.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: It was his intention to occupy as much time as he desired, but as it was rather late he would not eulogise the Minister's work so much as it deserved.

Hon. J. Mitchell: We will take up the rest of the night so you might as well tell us.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Eloquent as the Minister's speech was, the fact that this small population of 318,000 people were now spending £319,000 a year on education, altogether apart from what was spent on building new schools and that this year the increase in salaries to teachers and the provision of salaries for new teachers amounted to no less than £42,757, these facts were as eloquent as the speech of the Minister, and showed that the Labour Government were doing noble work in bringing free education to our children.

Hon. J. Mitchell: That £42,000 does not represent salaries.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: A part of it represented increases, and a part of it was provision for teachers in the new schools which were required all over the agricultural districts under the policy of the present Government. The Premier, in the course of his remarks on the Budget, informed hon. members that it was the intention of the Government to abolish all the fees at the secondary schools and at the technical schools, and he was sorry that the Minister had not enlightened members as to the date when the abolition would take place. That was a point on which he desired information, but he concluded that from the 1st January next our secondary schools would be free. He would like to compare the fact that the present Government had abolished fees in secondary schools and in the Modern school as from the 1st January next with the policy of the Liberal Government a few years ago when they actually imposed a fee of a shilling a week for children over the age of 14 years attending our State schools.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Did we charge the fee?



**Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON:** The hon. members's Government passed a regulation to impose the fee and when a howl of indignation went up throughout the country against that action it was decided not to enforce it. The Liberal policy at that time, however, was to charge poor parents a shilling a week if their children continued at school after attaining the age of 14 years.

**Hon. J. Mitchell:** We did not charge a shilling a week.

**The Premier:** In secondary schools you charged fees.

**Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON:** In the Modern school and in the technical schools fees were charged by the previous Government and he congratulated the present Minister on having abolished those fees.

**Hon. J. Mitchell:** Plenty of money; the Government can afford to abolish them.

**Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON:** More important even than that was the question of building new schools as they were required and he urged the Minister to do something at once to provide schools where there were fewer than ten children of school going age. The regulations at present permitted of a school being established only where there would be an average attendance of ten children; the Government should reduce that average attendance to at most six straight away.

**The Premier:** We have no intention of doing it.

**Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON:** It ought to be done.

**The Premier:** I think it ought to be done, but there is a stage when we can go so far and no farther. There is no country in the world which provides the same amount of education per head of the population as Western Australia.

**Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON:** It was inadvisable to have children grow up in this country without opportunities of learning to read and write, and he urged the Premier and Minister for Education to see whether some scheme could not be devised to give educational facilities to small bodies of children wherever they existed. There were bodies of seven, eight and nine children in some centres who to-day were not receiving any education at all

from the State, and it would be well for the Minister for Education to devise some means of carrying free education to every one of these children, or means of bringing the children to free education so that they could learn to read and write. That was in his opinion the most important thing before the Education Department to-day, to see that not any of these children out back were brought up in ignorance. After that had been achieved he hoped the Government would try to give free books and material to the children in the schools. He noticed that the Government were erecting a secondary school on the Golden Mile of Kalgoorlie. He congratulated them very heartily upon the step. One knew the trouble the Premier had in finding money from current revenue for educational purposes, particularly as the Upper House had rejected all our proposals to raise further revenue from the wealthy, but in spite of this fact, he hoped it would not deter the Government from extending facilities both in regard to free primary and free secondary education.

**The Premier:** Not in the slightest.

**Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON:** The good example set in starting a secondary school at Kalgoorlie should be followed in other centres of the State. In the Great Southern district Narrogin, and not Narrpgin alone, but also Wagin, Katanning, and Albany should have free secondary schools. He urged the Government to do this work as well as to find money where there were only six or seven children to attend, even if it meant increasing the present deficit to a much greater extent.

**The Premier:** Where are you going to get money to make the deficit?

**Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON:** As Treasurer of the State, that was the Premier's business. He (Mr. Johnston) was not permitted to enlighten him as to where that money was to come from when discussing the Education Department, but he did say the Government would have to fight the Upper House and see that just measures were put through, the rejection of which together with bad seasons were responsible for the present deficit. We would have to fight another

place and carry these just measures. In the meanwhile, he hoped the Minister would continue his education policy and extend it in the two directions indicated.

Mr. S. STUBBS (Wagin): Would the Premier or the Minister for Education agree to the adjournment of this discussion as most of the country members had travelled the whole of Monday night in order to be present in Parliament? It was now nearly midnight and it was hardly fair that those who desired to speak should be called upon to do so at such a late hour.

The Minister for Education: It was not possible for him to consent at this stage to the hon. member's request. A lot of time had been taken up and surely there was not much more to be said. We ought to go on and finish this division of the Estimates.

Mr. S. STUBBS: As the Minister for Education desired to finish the discussion at this sitting he would say just a few words in connection with the expenditure proposed to be incurred during the financial year. At all events where reasonable information was forthcoming, he (Mr. Stubbs) did not think any hon. member or any person outside could charge the Minister with having refused to comply with a request for the erection of a school building in order that the children in the outback parts should receive a fair education. He (Mr. Stubbs) believed that any member of this side or the other side of the Chamber who objected to the spending of money from the funds that were provided each year by this House for the maintenance of schools and the education of the young had not the true interests of Western Australia at heart. During the course of the Minister's eloquent address one could not help feeling that it was meant to convey that the party represented on the Opposition side of the Chamber had in the past been neglectful of their duties and had not given the facilities which the present Minister for Education had claimed his party had done. Such a statement should not go forth without a protest. When it went out that the Opposition side had threatened Black Wednesdays and all

other kinds of pains and penalties in the future, he for one would not be a party to permit such statements to remain unchallenged. He assured the Minister, however, that there would not be a stronger supporter in the House than himself in the direction of expenditure of money on education. Therefore, 'he charge, if it was to be levelled, could not be levelled against him.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Nor against me.

Mr. S. STUBBS: The leader of the Opposition had never said one word against expenditure for educational purposes. We, as members, were supposed to represent all sections of the community, and if he were to remain in his place without answering charges such as those which had been made during the evening, of doing anything unfair or treating one section of the civil service differently from another, he would not be doing his duty. The Premier should take the Committee into his confidence and say whether the leader of the Opposition was justified in making the charges he had done that evening.

The Premier: I refuse to take notice of them unless they are respectfully made.

Mr. S. STUBBS: If the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition were so antagonistic to one another that one would not listen to the requests of the other across the floor of the Chamber—

Hon. Frank Wilson: The Premier is going to cut me then?

Mr. S. STUBBS: It was time that sort of thing was stopped in the best interests of politics. Every member in the House was actuated by a desire to be fair. He would be glad to have an assurance from the Premier, who was a fair and an honourable man, that if proper representation was made to him through the member for the district, he would go into the cases of these men, which had been referred to by the leader of the Opposition.

The Minister for Education: Why ask the Premier when I am the Minister for Education?

Mr. S. STUBBS: Because the Premier kept on interjecting that he would

take no notice of the leader of the Opposition. The statements, however, might be passed on to the Minister for Education who, it was felt, would see that justice was done.

The Premier : Through the proper channel, yes.

Mr. S. STUBBS : The Minister for Education would understand that there was every justification for mentioning the Premier's name in this matter, because the Premier made a statement in the House which the leader of the Opposition had challenged, and the Premier had not seen fit to say that the leader of the Opposition was wrong. Therefore, an impression had been left on the minds of members that there was a mistake somewhere.

The Premier : The circumstances are not at all parallel.

Mr. S. STUBBS : The Director of Education had written a letter to one of these so-called aggrieved parties to the effect that the Premier's statement made to the House had been a mistake.

The Premier : It was pretty impertinent on his part to do so.

Mr. S. STUBBS : Yet it was true, and although the Director of Education might have been indiscreet, two wrongs would not make a right.

The Premier : It was not indiscretion, it was impertinence.

Mr. S. STUBBS : It might have been so but two wrongs did not make a right.

The Premier : It is impertinence if an officer challenges the Premier's statement; it should be the Minister in charge of the department who should do so.

Mr. S. STUBBS : Then were these men to suffer because there had been impertinence indulged in by an officer ? It should not go outside the House that any hon. member was guilty of doing an injustice to anyone. As the Minister for Education had declared that he was responsible, that Minister ought now to inquire into these cases, if they were brought properly under his notice by the member for the district. The member for Swan interjected that he (Mr. Stubbs) had not given the Government any credit for what they had done. That was not cor-

rect because it was his desire all the way through to give the Government every credit for what they had done in the direction of educating the young. The member for Swan had also said something about the Armstrong desk. When the hon. member was a teacher did he raise any objection to the style of the forms that he now preached so much against ?

Mr. Underwood : Oh let the hon. member alone.

Mr. S. STUBBS : What had the member for Pilbara to do with what he (Mr. Stubbs) was saying. The hon. member could say what he liked at the proper time but he (Mr. Stubbs) reserved to himself the right to challenge what had been said by any hon. member by way of interjection, and put questions to him which he might or might not choose to answer, and when he did that it was no business of the member for Pilbara. He did not require the member for Pilbara to tell him what he was to do. He knew just as much about the privileges of the House as did that hon. member, and what was more, he knew how to conduct himself. The member for Pilbara was very fond of interjecting when he was not wanted to interject. If that hon. member desired to throw him off the track he had never made a bigger mistake. As a unit of the Chamber he objected to the charges hurled across from side to side. He had never indulged in it. He took exception when hon. members charged the whole of the Opposition with doing things which he had never done. When hon. members declared that unfair things had been done or said, they should pick out the members guilty of these things, and not charge all of a side. He would resent any suggestion that he desired to see teachers ground down. During the last couple of years he had been connected with the school board at Wagin, and had taken a great interest in the welfare of the schools down there. The member for Swan (Mr. Turvey) had referred almost exclusively to male teachers. It should be remembered that there was a large number of lady teachers down the Great Southern doing work of quite as high a value as that per-

formed by male teachers. The point had been raised of subsidies to schools. Recently he, in company with the Minister for Works, had enjoyed the pleasure of listening to an entertainment in the Dumbleyung school, the children of which had, by a series of such entertainments and by personal subscription, succeeded in providing an organ for the school. The lady teacher of that school had also interested the children in gardening and in many other studies not included in the curriculum. The Minister for Education stood for congratulation on the good work he was doing. At the same time, while the Minister was doing that good work, it should not be allowed to go forth to the State that the Labour Government had done all the building of schools in agricultural and other districts. Surely previous Administrations had done their share. It was to be hoped the amount of money asked for would be readily granted. Certainly there would be no protest on the Opposition side against the vote.

Mr. FOLEY (Mt. Leonora): The Government were deserving of thanks for what they had done in respect to the out-back schools. In this regard the present Minister had done more than any of his predecessors. The manual classes and the secondary schools had inculcated a better system of discipline, and instilled into the children the desire to attend school, thus lessening the work of the inspector. On a recent visit he had found the same system in vogue in the metropolitan schools. One splendid system which was being improved upon every month was the making of the children bodily fit, so that they could be mentally fit. The Minister had taken a wise course in abolishing all fees at the technical schools and the Modern School. In this regard the Minister was opposed to the policy of the leader of the Opposition, for during the life of this Parliament the leader of the Opposition had questioned the wisdom of the abolition of fees at the technical schools and at the Modern School. The Minister had accepted wise suggestions, no matter whether they emanated from teachers, from the children, or from laymen in the street. The Minister had placed goldfields

teachers in a better position than that previously enjoyed. In some of the remote districts the school teachers, under the present Administration, could secure an essential trip to the coast. The member for Wagin (Mr. S. Stubbs) was in accord with the Minister in his endeavour to forward the education movement. Although the member for Wagin had said that the Minister for Education would find him a staunch supporter of all educational matters, that hon. member's attention should be drawn to the fact that there were at least three or four other members of the Opposition opposed to the policy of the present Government. Those three or four members had been as loud in their protests against their own party when it was desired to place a tax of a shilling a week on children of the age of 14, and two shillings a week on children of the age of 15. Those gentlemen had stoutly resented this, but the party to which the hon. member for Wagin owed his allegiance made the vote a party one, and those hon. members had voted in direct opposition to their speeches. Messrs. Carson, Veryard, and Ewing on that occasion had voted against their own opinions, but he did not believe the member for Wagin would do that sort of thing. He was glad to support a Government that believed in free and unfettered education, and he trusted that whatever party was in power, a system of free secular education would always obtain in this State. If that were done no individual, party, or institution could ask for more, and then if people were not satisfied with the education which the State was imparting they could send their children elsewhere. He was not going to discuss the subject of the retiring allowance to the member for Swan, except to say that although the Director of Education in a written reply had stated that the Premier had made a mistake in an answer given in this Chamber, that officer himself had on one occasion been indiscreet and made a mistake. He would just as soon take the statement of the Premier or the Minister for Education as that of the Director of Education. Indeed this was a question which

the Minister as head of the department should decide. On one occasion when a Rhodes scholar was to be selected the Director of Education had told one boy a certain thing and had found out afterwards that he had made a mistake, but that mistake had been the means of debarring that lad from using the talents which he undoubtedly possessed. He mentioned that instance just to show that although the Director of Education charged the Premier with having made a mistake, he also was capable of making a mistake. He could not allow this opportunity to go by without expressing the appreciation of himself and of his outback constituents of the good work which the Government had undoubtedly done in giving educational facilities to the men who were doing so much to open up the State, irrespective of whether they were engaged in farming, mining, or any other industry.

*12 o'clock, midnight.*

Mr. A. E. PIESSE (Katanning): Members were at one in the desire to see this important department progress. Their only regret was that the funds at the disposal of the Minister were not sufficient to enable those in control of the department to do all they desired. He appreciated the effort put forward by the department during past years, and whilst some little complaint might be made in regard to the non-provision of those educational facilities which were desired in country districts, he felt sure that the Director of Education and the officers of that department had done a very great deal, considering the small amount of money they had at their disposal. He referred more particularly to the delay in the erection of some of the country schools, especially in new centres where settlement had taken place during the last two or three years. Considerable delay had taken place in some instances in the erection of school buildings, and he thought the blame could be rightly laid at the door of the Works Department. Vexatious delay took place in the preparation of plans and the calling of tenders, and that retarded the erection of the necessary buildings. He felt sure that the Minister realised the importance of

providing those educational facilities as quickly as possible in outlying places. The people who went back into the new districts were very often forced to leave their wives and families in the larger towns, thereby necessitating the expense of keeping up two homes. Several instances had been brought under his notice of these delays having taken place and he hoped the Minister for Education would endeavour to make his colleague get a move on in the erection of new school buildings. In some instances he knew that the lack of funds had been the cause of delay, and he regretted that during last year for some time there had been a cessation of building in connection with new schools. However, he was glad to know that the Premier had been able to anticipate the vote and was prepared to go on with the erection of schools which were necessary in the new districts. The provision for primary and secondary school scholarships in country districts would be very much appreciated in the outlying centres, particularly when it was remembered that the advantages of the bulk of the scholarships were available mostly to the children attending the schools in the City and in the larger centres of population. He was pleased that the Minister had made provision for the reservation of a number of these scholarships and he hoped he would go further and provide a larger proportion for the country schools. People living in the country districts laboured under a very great disadvantage as compared with those more favourably situated who lived in the City and in other large centres of population. The Minister's first duty should be to these small schools and to provide facilities for the people who were away out in the newer settled districts. The conditions under which schools could be established were very liberal, but the Government might go further, even if they had to suspend some of the privileges and advantages so freely given in the City in order to first of all provide primary education in those districts where only small numbers of children could attend. A great deal had been done for the City by providing secondary school

scholarships, by providing secondary schools and by providing education at the University free, but a little more attention and consideration might be given to the larger towns in the agricultural districts where higher education should be provided and where a little more attention might be given to household management classes. In many of the large agricultural towns there were not even household management classes. The Kataning school had an attendance of over 300 children and there was no household management class in that school. He understood that the department was about to provide such a class, but a school of this size should have such a class and there were schools in other centres, such as Wagin and Narrogin, which ought to have these facilities. He did not see why all these advantages should apply only to the City. It was quite right to perfect the system of education, but the department owed a duty to the large towns in the country the residents of which had not the advantages which their fellows in the City enjoyed, of sending their children to school to secure the very best education possible to obtain in the State free of cost. If country people wished their children to obtain this higher education it became costly and thus children in many cases were precluded from obtaining the higher education which was so easily obtained in the City free of cost. Therefore, the Minister should bear in mind the claims of the larger towns, and besides providing for the continuation schools and secondary school scholarships he ought to use every endeavour to provide the larger towns in the agricultural districts with the other facilities of household management classes for girls. Much had been said about our teachers and too much could not be said in their praise, particularly the teachers in the country districts. A great deal remained to be done by the Minister in the direction of reducing the number of scholars in some of the classes. Many of the classes were too large. In some cases there were classes numbering 50, 60, and 70 children being taken by one teacher. Such classes were too large. It was quite impossible

for a teacher, no matter how good he or she might be, to give the necessary teaching to those children and in the manner which hon. members desired it should be given. He had no desire to delay the Committee more than to say that he gave credit to past Governments for all they had done in the direction of education for the children of this State and also to the present Government. The present Minister had shown a very keen interest in the administration of this department and everyone appreciated his efforts in the direction of perfecting the education system. This department should be too important to permit of the question being raised as to which party had done the most for it.

The Minister for Education: I never raised that question.

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: Or as to which party was doing the most. There was an important and sacred duty on the shoulders of any Government and any Minister controlling the department to see that the very best was done with the means at our disposal.

Hon. J. MITCHELL (Northam): The lateness of the hour and the small attendance of members in the Chamber did not trouble him. He agreed that the Minister was doing good work. It was quite a relief to get away from a department which had involved so much controversy and to get down to a department upon which all so well agreed. The Minister had done a good deal for education; he had increased the vote by a very considerable amount. Parliament had agreed that a certain thing should be done for the people of the State and the Minister should fulfil the obligation thrust upon him. Apart from that, every hon. member realised the value of education to the people. He hoped that agricultural education would receive the Minister's attention. It was probably far more important to get a good agricultural secondary school going than to get a free university.

The Minister for Education: More important.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: With the Minister's remark he agreed. The people who were now applauding our free University

would find that for them the University meant very little indeed because they would not be able to reach it, and they would see the University filled with students who could well afford to pay. It was known that the Government were charged with the responsibility of providing that University with sufficient funds to enable it to carry on, and it would be almost impossible to do what he would like to see done throughout the State, particularly in regard to agricultural education. He felt that young children should be trained so far as possible to fit them for the life they would have to follow. Children in the country districts should be taught about the land, otherwise they would leave the land. It would be a good thing if the Minister could see his way to establish an agricultural college at Northam on lines similar to the agricultural college at Ballarat, where they had practical training on a small farm with classrooms and laboratories, and where the scientific teaching was not confined to the few whom they could put up at their farm building, but was available to the whole of the boys around Ballarat. It should be the same at Northam. If the Minister put an agricultural college at Northam he would find it would have a large attendance, and the same would be the case with agricultural colleges at other large centres. He wanted to impress upon the Minister the necessity for the training of agriculturists just as the Minister was providing free education at the miners' school at Kalgoorlie. The Minister would find, if he turned up the files at the Lands Department, that the matter was looked into in his (Mr. Mitchell's) time. A file was started and the Minister for Education would find a good deal of information in that file which would be useful to him. The hon. member for Swan (Mr. Turvey) had missed the opportunity of his life. He mistook the remarks of the leader of the Opposition for an attack upon himself. The hon. member would have been well advised to have said "I agree with the leader of the Opposition; if it was right that I should have this retiring allowance, it is right that these other gentlemen should have it." That would have

been the correct attitude for the hon. member to have taken up. It was not possible for him to defend the department in its attitude to other teachers who were leaving. One knew the hon. member was conscientious and that when he took that allowance he believed he was entitled to it. He (Mr. Mitchell) believed that others were entitled to an allowance when leaving the department. If a man was entitled at a certain age to draw a certain amount he was allowed to draw it because during the whole course of his service something was deducted so that he could get the allowance later on. Therefore, when a man retired at 40, the portion he was entitled to should be paid to him. He had no objection to it being paid to the hon. member so long as the same was available to others in a similar situation.

The Minister for Education: It is to all in exactly the same position.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: A system which demanded that a man should get into Parliament to get his allowance was objectionable. If one of these gentlemen who had been refused could get someone who had a very safe seat, say the hon. member for Katanning (Mr. A. E. Piesse) to lend him his seat for a week or so, would the Minister for Education pay him his retiring allowance?

The Minister for Education: That is not the position.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: That was entirely the position.

The Minister for Education: No, it is not; excuse me saying so.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The other day someone came to him who had retired from the department and said "What am I going to do, I cannot get my retiring allowance?" He (Mr. Mitchell) said "You had better get into Parliament." The hon. member for Swan had missed his opportunity in connection with this discussion. The point was that there were three officers of the Railway Department and the hon. member who had desired to become members of Parliament. The Commissioner had given the three railway officers leave and they were away electioneering. The present leader of the Opposition, who was then Pre-

mier, had no choice, of course, but to agree that they might stand.

Mr. Turvey: Were they not dismissed first?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: No doubt they were, but had it withdrawn.

Mr. Lewis: I was not on leave.

The Premier: The hon. member for Northam does not know the facts.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: One of these gentlemen got into Parliament and was here now and the other two were reinstated.

The Premier: They were reinstated before the elections.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: They had special leave to contest the election.

The Premier: Yes, leave without pay.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The hon. member for Swan apparently did not support the request of others for a retiring allowance which he himself had enjoyed.

Mr. Turvey: Who told you that?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Because the hon. member attacked the leader of the Opposition who was endeavouring to get for these people a retiring allowance. No attack had been made on the hon. member for Swan.

The Premier: Each time these Estimates are introduced he raises the same question.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Unless there was going to be the same treatment the thing must be brought up time and again.

The Premier: The circumstances are not the same. Parker was leaving for the purpose of going on his land.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The hon. member for Swan left to come here.

The Premier: No, he was sacked before the election.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Then the hon. member might retire, return the £79, and begin all over again. The hon. member for Swan was dismissed but brought about that dismissal himself, he having been told that he could not become a candidate so long as he was serving the department. Then he said, "I will do as I please," and away he went.

Mr. Turvey: I did nothing of the kind. Find out the facts before you speak about it.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: What did the hon. member do then? He stood for Parliament knowing full well what the consequences would be.

The Premier: Supposing he had been defeated. At the time he nominated it was not known whether he would win or lose.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: This gentleman was in the service when he stood for Parliament?

The Premier: Is that an offence?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The hon. member knew the risk he ran. He knew the same thing applied to every civil servant, and the treatment which had been meted out to him should now be meted out to other civil servants similarly placed.

The Minister for Education. When the cases are on all-fours they will receive support.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Then it has been said that the then Government had had a picnic somewhere. The Premier knew well that the members of the House went to Rottneest.

The Premier: I was not one of those who consumed whisky.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: It was surprising that the hon. member should have brought up such a matter in Parliament. Then there was the motor car which the leader of the Opposition had. He had known the hon. member for a long time, and he had never known him to make the fatal mistake he had made on this occasion. His advice to the hon. member was to endeavour to bring the Government to a reasonable frame of mind and to get them to agree that there should not be a preference to members of Parliament.

The Premier: We have done that right through.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: When a man became a member of Parliament he should not get special advantages.

The Premier: Neither he does.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: But that was done in this case.

The Minister for Education: The only advantage he gained was through



being sacked from the Education Department.

Hon. J. MITCHELL : That was not so at all, and the hon. member might have reinstated him if he had not been elected. But after the hon. member for Swan became a member of Parliament he got his retiring allowance.

The Minister for Education : After having been sacked.

Hon. J. MITCHELL : Others had an equal right to such an allowance.

The Minister for Education : Tell me the names of the people who have been sacked and who are asking for this allowance ?

Hon. J. MITCHELL : There was no use quibbling about such a matter. Here was one of ourselves who had received special treatment, and it was treatment which had been refused to others.

The Premier : You do not know the meaning of the words you are using.

Hon. J. MITCHELL : The Minister for Education should treat the others who had been retired from the service just as the member for Swan had been treated.

Mr. Turvey : You acknowledge that I was entitled to it.

Hon. J. MITCHELL : The gentlemen who retired from the civil service should get what was due to them.

Mr. Turvey : What are you crying about ?

Hon. J. MITCHELL : There was no crying about anything. Instead of supporting the claims of others the member for Swan had defeated himself by indulging in an attack upon the previous Administration, an attack which was unfair and uncalled for, and which he would find when he saw it in cold print was no reply at all.

Mr. Turvey : You will find that I said I had no objection to others receiving similar treatment, and the hon. member should withdraw his remarks.

Hon. J. MITCHELL : Anything that might be regarded by the hon. member as offensive would be withdrawn, but he had declared that he had no objection to others getting what he got himself

under similar conditions. Would the Premier lend his very safe ticket to these other gentlemen ?

The Minister for Education : Put them exactly in the same position and we will treat them in the same way.

The Premier : Any public servant who desires to stand for Parliament will get leave with no restriction whatever from this Government.

Hon. J. MITCHELL : But the position was that there were others who wanted this retiring allowance.

The Premier : They will get it if we dismiss them.

Hon. J. MITCHELL : The position should be perfectly patent to everyone, and the Premier's wording would make it clearer than ever that the conditions these others were called upon to fulfill could never be fulfilled. They could not get into the position which was now occupied by the member for Swan.

Mr. Turvey : They were not dismissed by this Government as I was by yours.

Hon. J. MITCHELL : The attitude the Government had taken up in this matter was to be regretted.

The Premier : A lot you care.

Hon. J. MITCHELL : The Premier could be assured that he was distressed indeed.

The Premier : Do you claim that if a person leaves the service voluntarily for the purpose of going into another walk of life we should pay him a retiring allowance ?

Hon. J. MITCHELL : If it was good in the case of the member for Swan, certainly.

The Premier : Answer my question.

Hon. J. MITCHELL : This retiring allowance was part of the consideration to be paid for services rendered, and it did not matter when the man retired.

The Premier : You introduced retrenchment in your time, and these persons had to battle for months to get their allowances.

Hon. J. MITCHELL : If it were right for one hon. member it was right for every one else retiring from the Public Service. Except in this one respect he was in accord with the Minister in the

work being done. The Minister was wrong in resisting claims from gentlemen retired from the service when he had shown so much less resistance to others fortunate enough to be returned to the Legislative Assembly. He blamed the Government for their inconsistency in this respect. He hoped the member for Swan would agree that what that hon. member enjoyed should be enjoyed by every person in the public service.

Mr. LEWIS (Canning): The work performed by the Minister for Education was excellent. The Minister had proved himself to be a whole-souled enthusiast in the matter of education. It would be impossible to get a better Minister for the purpose. The incident of the granting of a retiring allowance to the member for Swan had been misrepresented. He proposed to give the facts of the late general election so far as departmental officers were concerned. There was no analogy in the case presented by the Leader of the Opposition and the case of the member for Swan, because the member for Swan had been dismissed, and therefore was entitled to compensation, whereas the others had retired of their own accord. The Leader of the Opposition had preached a lot about fair treatment, but that hon. member had failed to practice it when he had an opportunity. He (Mr. Lewis), together with the late member for Geraldton, and Mr. Burchell, member for Fremantle in the House of Representatives, then all officers of the Railway Department, had contested seats at the late general election. The then Premier (Hon. Frank Wilson) was at Cranbrook, and fearing a reverse at the elections, and rightly interpreting the writing on the wall "thy political scalp will be required" had proceeded to sum up the chances in the different electorates. There was Canning, Claremont, and Geraldton, three seats being contested by railway men, and it looked as though those railway men were going to win. The question was how to block them. Thereupon the then Premier had wired from Cranbrook—this wire had not been sent through the Railway Department because the then Premier knew that the railway men would soon impart the information.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Is the hon. member in order in reflecting on the railway men?

Mr. LEWIS: The then Premier had sent a telegraphic message through the post office at Cranbrook to the Commissioner of Railways, thus sheltering himself behind the Commissioner who, in accordance with the telegram, had called the three departmental candidates together at 10 o'clock on the Saturday morning and, reminding them that nominations would close two hours later, intimated that if any of the three lodged a nomination his dismissal from the service would follow. The three officers affected thrashed out the matter with the Commissioner, who at first had said he was acting on instructions, but later, when assured by the three candidates that they did not blame him, he had said, "Well, never mind about that." The three officers had duly lodged their nominations and received their dismissals in writing. The railway conference was sitting at the time, and straightway they reported the matter to the conference, and so created a spark which would undoubtedly have fired a train right through the service against the tyranny of the late Administration, the members of which to-night were preaching fair play and justice, and asserting that the present Government ought to treat their officers fairly and squarely. On the Sunday following that nomination day the *Sunday Times* had come out with a strong article on the incident, and on the Monday morning the three dismissed officers received a wire from the department cancelling the instructions issued on the Saturday. The then Premier, realising that his cake was dough, had backed down quick and lively. Yet to-night we had the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Northam talking about fair treatment. Why had they not practised it when they had the chance? A good deal of capital had been made out of the retiring allowance for the member for Swan; but the difference between him and the three railway officers had been that those officers had a powerful organisation to back them up, whereas the member for Swan had nothing of

the sort, and, therefore, the late Administration had taken advantage of him and kicked him out of the service. The circumstances he had related were the true facts concerning the public servants competing at the late general elections.

The Premier: It is doubtful if the action of the Commissioner of Railways was not against the electoral laws.

Mr. LEWIS: The railway organisation had secured legal opinion on the point on the Saturday morning, and that opinion was decidedly against the action of the Government. No doubt the Government also had secured legal opinion on the Saturday or the Sunday for those men were reinstated on the Monday morning. The member for Northam (Hon. J. Mitchell) had said that those officers had been on leave. He (Mr. Lewis) was not on leave; he was working on night shift at the time. Mr. Dooley also had been at work, and his dismissal had been wired from Perth to Geraldton, but on account of the action taken by the men's organisation, which was then sitting in conference, Mr. Dooley had been reinstated on the Monday morning. The Leader of the Opposition, when speaking at Geraldton in eulogy of the late member's services, did not mention how he had treated the late member on one occasion when that gentleman was a railway employee and came forward as a political opponent.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (in reply): In regard to the payment made to the member for Swan (Mr. Turvey), the fact of his being a member of Parliament had entered in no way into consideration. There was the case as related by the member for Canning (Mr. Lewis) and other cases of that character, which at that time were under the consideration of all right-thinking men. An absolute injustice had been done. Railway employees had been sacked, but afterwards the dismissal had been withdrawn. A school teacher had been sacked, but the dismissal had not been withdrawn. Treatment of that kind, absolutely unjust and unfair, required compensation of some kind. It was the usual thing in our world of business. A man was robbed by some action of some person, and he

had a right to some redress or compensation. That which had been given to the hon. member was nothing more than damages for wrongful dismissal—although it took the form of an allowance—a sort of settlement of the case out of court. He (the Minister for Education) had the first consideration of the matter, and those were the grounds on which he had considered it. The payment made to Mr. Turvey, in his opinion, took the form of compensation for wrongful dismissal, and more particularly was that course necessary because the Government had resolved before the election took place, and before ever this case had arisen, that if they did come into power the principle of political liberty for all civil servants should be recognised. He had put up the recommendation and Cabinet had approved of it. The hon. member for Swan as a private citizen had received injury through wrongful dismissal and compensation was given; that was a different thing altogether from a retiring allowance. Having made that explanation he did not think he need say any more except to express pleasure at seeing all members in agreement in praising the good work done by the inspectorial staff, the teachers, and all concerned, to make the education system as successful as possible.

This concluded the general debate on the Estimates of the Education Department: item discussed as follows:—

Item, manual training, cookery, staff. £3,453:

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: What was the intention of the department in regard to the provision of manual training and household management classes in the larger country towns, such as Katanning, Wagin and Narrogin? A promise had been made some time ago that these classes would be extended to places like Katanning.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It was the intention to push forward the extension of the training colleges and secondary schools wherever the growth of population warranted such a course.

Mr. A. E. Piesse: The expense would not be large in connection with these cookery classes.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: All these extensions could not be done at once. Good work was being done at Fremantle, and a start had been made at Kalgoorlie.

Mr. A. E. Piesse: There is an inclination to centralise everything.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: All places could not receive attention together. If the hon. member would see him about the matter when he had the files available he would go into it thoroughly. The hon. member's district would not be slighted, but every case would stand on its merits.

Mr. S. STUBBS: Could not the Minister see his way clear to introduce a system of agricultural classes in country and goldfields centres?

The CHAIRMAN: We are dealing with manual training and cookery.

Mr. S. STUBBS: If it was not possible to discuss the provision of opportunities for agricultural training, he would support the request made by the member for Katanning. He hoped the Minister would see his way clear to bring that system into effect in all the larger schools along the Great Southern from Pingelly to Albany.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: There was already provided on the Estimates a sum of £800 for the extension of manual training and cookery classes, and all the centres would receive consideration on their merits.

Vote put and passed.

This completed the Estimates of the Education Department.

Progress reported.

1 o'clock a.m.

#### BILL—UNIVERSITY LANDS.

Order of the Day read for the resumption from 28th October of the debate on the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

House adjourned at 1.1 a.m. (Wednesday.)

## Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 19th November, 1913.

	PAGE
Paper presented .. .. .	2726
Bills: Supply (No. 3) £687,770, 2R., Com. ..	2726
Land Valuation, 2R. postponed .. .. .	2727
Legal Practitioners Act Amendment, Com., postponed .. .. .	2727
Mines Regulation, Com. .. .. .	2744
West Province Election Select Committee, Consideration of report .. .. .	2727

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

#### PAPER PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: Report of the Fremantle Harbour Trust for the year ended 30th June, 1913.

#### BILL—SUPPLY (No. 3), £687,770.

##### *Second Reading.*

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew) in moving the second reading said: A Supply Bill is necessary to meet the expenditure for the current month, that is up to the 30th November on Revenue and Loan Account, the amounts required being £337,770 on Revenue Account and £250,000 on Loan Account. The distribution of revenue will be in accordance with the Estimates now before another place and expected to be here within the next fortnight, and the £250,000 on Loan Account will be distributed in accordance with the schedule of the Loan Act sanctioned by Parliament. There is £100,000 on Loan Suspense. This money is required for the Agricultural Bank and Workers' Homes. I beg to move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

##### *In Committee, etc.*

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