

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 26 August, 1925.

Question Without Notice—Governor's Speech : Address in Reply (Seventh Day's Debate) — Adjournment (Procedure Regarding Formal Business).

Mr. SPEAKER took the chair.

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE.**STRANGERS IN HOUSE.**

Mr. ARKINS: I desire to ask you, Mr. Speaker, as the custodian of this Legislature, whether you will have full inquiries made into an allegation that is being widely made with respect to an incident in this House yesterday. Will you ascertain whether it is a fact that two men who are now under threat of legal action under the Federal laws, namely, Mr. Walsh and Mr. Johannsen, were located in this House behind locked doors with a Minister of the Crown? Will you make—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Some time ago I made an announcement that I would only permit hon. members to ask questions, and would not allow them to give information.

Mr. ARKINS: What I want to know is whether this place is to be made a sanctuary for criminals and violators of the law?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must not speak or interject while Mr. Speaker is on his feet. I shall now go through the business-paper.

Mr. ARKINS: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member resume his seat!

Mr. ARKINS: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask you a question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member sit down!

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: I do not want to create discord, nor am I fully acquainted with all the features associated with the conduct of your office, but I am sure that when an hon. member civilly addresses you, even though he

may have transgressed at an earlier stage, you will realise it is a fair thing to allow such hon. member to ask his question.

Mr. SPEAKER: I had already commenced to go through the business-paper with a view to formal business.

Mr. ARKINS: You know very well that Mr. Willis was harbouring these two men in the House yesterday!

Mr. SPEAKER: I shall now go through the business-paper with a view to allowing hon. members to place their business.

Mr. LEVY: Might I point out, Mr. Speaker, that it is only the motions for the appointment of select committees that you do not go through. The other motions on the business-paper are read to enable hon. members to see whether or not they can more conveniently place their business.

Mr. SPEAKER: I may inform the hon. member Mr. Levy that I am perfectly right in my course of procedure.

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH: ADDRESS IN REPLY.**SEVENTH DAY'S DEBATE.**

Marketing of Products—Sydney Water Supply—City and Eastern Suburbs Railway—Country Railways—Country Towns Water Supplies—Sydney Harbour Bridge—Women in Politics—Legislation for Women and Children—Administration of Public Health Act—Nationalists and Country Party—Forty-four Hours Working Week—Class Hatred—Pensions to Widows—Retirement of Mr. Stevens—"Spoils to the Victors"—The Labour Party and Communism—British Seamen's Strike—1917 Railway Strike—Public Service Administration—High School Fees—Workmen's Compensation—State Insurance Department—Housing Scheme—Local Government: Adult Franchise—Metropolitan Water and Sewerage Board—Appointment of State Governors—Appointment to the Legislative Council—Floating Dock for Newcastle—Mr. Ackhurst—Mrs. Kate Dwyer—Mr. T. J. Smith, M.L.C.—New States Commission—Appointments by the Fuller Government—Dismissal of Taxation Department Employees—Government Printing Office Employees—Unemployment—Safety of Coal-mines—Price of Coal—Public School Teachers—Conveyance of School Children—Deputy-Leader of the Opposition—Returned Soldier Settlement—Prickly-pear Eradication.

Debate resumed (from 25th August, *vide* page 358) on motion by Dr. Evatt.

That the following address in reply to the Speech which his Excellency the Governor has addressed to both Houses of Parliament

Seventh day.

on opening this session of the Parliament of New South Wales be now adopted by this House:—

To his Excellency Sir DUDLEY RAWSON STRATFORD DE CHAIR, *Admiral in the Royal Navy, Knight Commander of the Most Honorable Order of the Bath, Member of the Royal Victorian Order, Governor of the State of New South Wales and its Dependencies, in the Commonwealth of Australia.*

May it please your Excellency,—

We, his Majesty's loyal and dutiful subjects, the members of the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales in Parliament assembled, desire to express our thanks for your Excellency's speech, and to assure you of our unfeigned attachment to his most gracious Majesty's throne and person.

2. We beg to assure your Excellency that our earnest consideration will be given to the measures to be submitted to us, and that the necessary provision for the public service will be made in due course.

3. We join your Excellency in the hope that, under the guidance of Divine Providence, our labours may be so directed as to advance the best interests of the State.

Upon which Sir George Fuller had moved by way of amendment:

That the address be amended by the addition of the following words to stand as paragraph 4: "We also desire to inform your Excellency that the Government does not possess the confidence of this House."

Mr. BALL (Murray) [10.39 a.m.]: There are two or three other matters in the Governor's Speech which, in addition to those already dealt with, I desire to briefly refer to. One is the proposal put forward for a conference between primary producers and consumers. The idea is to see if some arrangement cannot be arrived at by which the producer will get more for his products while the consumer will get his commodities for less. I do not know of anything more important to the farming districts than the price of wheat. Wheat is a very important product and provides a large amount of revenue for the coffers of this country. The Government is now going to attempt to make the farmer believe he is going to get more for his wheat, and at the same time to provide the consumer with a cheaper loaf. How that can be done I am at a loss to understand. I can remember the time when the Federal Labour party when in office was trying to get power to fix prices. It put before the

people in country districts the argument that if it got power to fix prices it would be able to fix such a price for wheat that the farmer would be able to rely upon getting a good return. At the same time it told the people in the towns that if they gave it power to fix prices it would be able to fix the price of bread at such a figure that the consumer would get a cheap loaf. How one can expect to get the two things to work together I do not know. Unless you can make bread of something else than wheat, or else accept a lower price for wheat the consumer will have to pay a reasonable price for his loaf. I am satisfied that the grower of wheat wants to be able to handle his crop in his own way and get the best price he can for it without interference by the Government or anybody else. Of course the matter is at present only one for submission to a conference, and we are not yet told whether or not we shall have an opportunity to legislate on the subject.

Another matter comprised in the Speech is the proposal to amend the Local Government Act to provide for adult suffrage in all local government districts. I want to say that that will receive my strenuous opposition. I look upon it as a most retrograde step for Labour or any other party to take to try to give an advantage to the floating population of the country by enabling it to control local government. What is the object of local government? It is of course, to provide for roads, bridges, and other conveniences necessary to the residents of particular districts. The property taxed for that purpose is the property which is served and improved in value by those works. The only people who have a right to a voice in this matter are those who pay the taxes for these improvements. To my mind this is a most iniquitous proposition, and I hope that when it comes before the House it will be defeated.

I now come to what I consider the most important item in the Speech. It is stated, towards the end, it is true, that

A comprehensive programme of public works has been prepared, and the necessary bills will be presented for your deliberations.

This proposal is a very important one. I think hon. members will agree with me when I say that I know of nothing more important to this country than a progressive policy of public works, and we have a declaration from the Government that a comprehensive programme has been prepared. But I want hon. members to note what follows: "and the necessary bills will be presented for your deliberations." There is a large number of public works now in progress. Some have just been started, some are half-way through, and some, possibly, are near completion. They will, of course, necessitate the provision of a large amount of money from the loan funds. Reference is made in the Governor's Speech to this "progressive policy," as if the legislation providing for all these public works were not actually in existence, for in the Speech it is stated that bills will be prepared to give effect to this "progressive policy" of public works. In addition to the public works already being carried on, many of them of great magnitude and importance, there is a number already authorised by Parliament for which there is no necessity for further legislation. What is going to happen to such works? Are the large works already in hand included in the Government programme?

I have before me a long list of public works, which have been passed by Parliament, and which, therefore, require no further authorisation. It is only necessary for the Premier to provide the money for them. There is the Armidale water supply scheme, a very important matter for country districts. There is the electrification scheme for South Coast towns. Does the Premier include, in the "new" public works policy of the Government, border railways which are now being carried on, and bridges over the Murray River, which require only a certain amount of money for their completion? Does the programme include the Byron Bay jetty, which has been already started and merely requires money to carry it on? Does it include the railway from Camurra to Boggabilla and the Haberfeld-Dobroyd Point tramway, both of which have been autho-

risied by Parliament? Then there are the Lee wharf at Newcastle, the isolation ward at Prince Alfred Hospital, and the Regent's Park to Bankstown railway. The Premier ought to know something of the lastnamed work, and should be able to say whether that is in the Government's new progressive policy. Does the programme include the Murray water-works, including the large dam which is now being constructed, and to carry which to a greater height authority has already been given? All that is wanted there is more money. Is that work included in this great public works policy referred to in the Governor's Speech? Then there is the Sydney water supply amplification scheme. The Premier knows that although we have handed the control over to the Metropolitan Board of Water Supply and Sewerage, there are two portions of the amplification scheme which still remain with the department to complete. They are the dams on the upper reaches of the Nepean. Is this very important work, the extension of the water supply and sewerage system of Sydney and suburbs, which has already been authorised, part of the Government's new progressive policy? Are the Urangeline to Narrandera railway and the Uranquinty towards Moon's Siding railway, both very important works, also included?

Mr. McTIERNAN: In what electorates are those railways?

Mr. BALL: They are all over the State.

Mr. McTIERNAN: In the Murray electorate!

Mr. BALL: I have just been talking about one that is in the Premier's electorate—the line from Bankstown to Regent's Park. But I am not picking out any particular electorate, though, of course, the most important of these works is one in my own electorate. There are a large number of these railways all over the State, and pretty well every electorate is included. There are the Uranquinty railway, and the railway from Wyalong towards Condobolin, which latter is a very important line. Money for those railways has already been voted.

Seventh day.

Then there is the proposed tramway at Lyons-road, and there is the railway line that is to be built from Kyogle to South Brisbane. This line was the subject of an agreement between the Federal Government and the Governments of Queensland and New South Wales. The three Governments have entered into an arrangement to construct that line, and no member of this House was more persistent than the Premier, when he was in opposition, with regard to the necessity for pushing on with the ratification of that agreement. The agreement has now been ratified, and is law in the two States, and I hope the line will be built. I should like to know whether it is included in this vigorous public works policy, which has been referred to in the Governor's Speech. Then we have the various country towns' water supplies.

Mr. Mutch: Read out the whole catalogue!

Mr. Ball: No, I have missed a lot of them, and am referring only to the most important. The matter of finding money for country towns' water supplies is a matter of great importance to the people of this country. During the life of the last Parliament I provided more money for country water supplies than was ever provided before, in the history of this Parliament. I look upon it as a very important matter, and I have left behind me, in the Public Works Department, a scheme which, if carried out, will mean a great improvement in regard to country water supplies, including not only the provision of supplies for a number of country towns which have no supplies at present, but also the amplification of supplies in a number of towns which already have them. I should like to know whether that scheme is included in this vigorous public works policy which the Premier refers to in the Governor's Speech. The matter of water supply and sewerage for country towns is a most important question, and should receive all possible consideration at the hands of the Government. I wish particularly to refer to the Molong water supply, and there are several others almost equally important. There is the matter of the construction of the Tod-

man-avenue tramway, which has already been passed by this House. Then there is the Tempe-East Hills railway, which has been authorised by Parliament, and which is a very important proposition. I want to know whether these, also, are included in the Government's vigorous public works policy. Then there is the Moss Vale to Port Kembla railway line, which has been authorised by this House, and the first sod of which was turned by Sir George Fuller a little while ago. I understand that that work has been closed down because of a proposed arrangement with Messrs. Hoskins Limited, in regard to the construction of steelworks, not having been completed.

Mr. Frank Burke: That was an absolute condition on the part of the Public Works Committee, and you know it!

Mr. Ball: I am aware that the Public Works Committee said that Messrs. Hoskins Limited should give some proof of the *bona-fides* of their intention to go on with the work, but while that may have been the case in regard to the Public Works Committee, and while they may have placed that condition on their recommendation, still, there are a great number of persons who, like myself, look upon the proposition as a very necessary cross-country railway line, which ought to be constructed, even if Messrs. Hoskins never erected their steelworks.

Mr. Frank Burke: Bosh!

Mr. Ball: It is all very well for my friend to say that, but the question of it being a cross-country railway to serve the producers in the southern portion of the State is far more important than the construction of a steelworks. A steelworks, although constructed, may close down at any time after the completion of the railway. What we have to rely on more particularly is the development of the southern portion of the State, and getting the produce of that district to the nearest port. The question of decentralisation is associated with the construction of this railway.

Mr. Frank Burke: If your Government came back into power, and you were faced with a deficit of £50,000 per annum on that proposition, would you construct the railway?

[Mr. Ball.

Mr. BALL: I am aware of the condition of which the hon. member speaks. Then we have the question of the Tarce water supply, a very important matter, and the railway from Jerilderie towards Deniliquin. The Minister knows of all these propositions. I would also like to know what is to be done with the Canowindra to Gregra railway proposition. All these have been passed by Parliament.

Mr. FRANK BURKE: What about it?

Mr. BALL: I want to know why the necessity for asking us to consider other bills in connection with the Public Works policy when we already have all these works passed to go ahead with. I also want to know what is going to be done with the water supplies for the towns of Cootamundra, Murrumburrah, Stockinbingal, Temora, Barmedman, Wyalong, Young, and Grenfell—what is known as the south-west tablelands water supply scheme.

Major CONNELL: What did you do with them?

Mr. BALL: I brought down a bill for the purpose of giving those towns a water supply. That scheme has been authorised by Parliament, and it is a question of carrying out the work—that is the responsibility of the Government of to-day. I have referred to these matters in connection with public works because there is nothing more important to this country than the development of our various public works. May I also remind the Premier that we have very many important works already in hand. May I refer to the great work which is now in course of construction, the bridge over Sydney Harbour. That work has already been started, and the work is progressing very satisfactorily. I do hope nothing will interfere with the progress of that great national work. May I be permitted to remind the Premier that he has indicated he is going to bring in a forty-four hours week bill. If such a bill becomes the law of this land, and the people associated with the building of the bridge are compelled to comply with these new conditions, it is going to mean additional cost for that work because, as the

Premier knows, there is a rise and fall clause in the contract which provides for any increase in wages brought about by awards or Act of Parliament. On the other hand, if there is any reduction, the contractors have to suffer such reduction. It is a give-and-take clause, such as is provided in every big contract to-day. It will undoubtedly mean an increase in the cost of that work, but what I think is more important is that it will delay the completion of the work. If the hours of labour are reduced to forty-four we will find the completion of the work delayed, which will be a very serious matter in connection with such an important national work. There are other big and important works which are proceeding to-day, and for which I hope the Premier will be able to make provision. The completion of the city railway is a very important matter, and a very large sum of money will have to be apportioned to this work. Then there is the construction of the eastern suburbs railway and other important works to be considered. Already nearly two months of the current financial year have passed, and yet up to this time every attempt made by deputation and otherwise to find out what is to be done in regard to public works has been met with a reply that the Government is not yet prepared to say what it will be able to do in connection with public works, in regard to which its intentions will be disclosed later on. There has not been any indication of increased expenditure on public works for the current year. Nothing has been done to push on any more speedily with the construction of the city railway. Not an extra man has been put on these works, nor has any attempt been made to hasten the construction of other works. The Premier has intimated that he is quite satisfied he will be able to find in the Old Country all the money he wants to enable the Government to carry out a vigorous public works policy. I acknowledge that if the Premier can get the money he requires from the Old Country on the same advantageous terms as are being offered elsewhere he will be quite justified in going there. But we do not

Seventh day.

know what money is obtainable from the Old Country by the present Government. As Sir George Fuller has indicated, the financial position had so improved before we left office that we could see our way clear to spend no less than £14,000,000 upon public works during the twelve months now current. That would have represented an increase of £4,000,000 over the expenditure of last year. If we had been in a position to go on with our public works policy with the increased expenditure we could have arranged for, by borrowing money at much more reasonable rates of interest than those previously prevailing, we could have carried out a vigorous practical public works policy. We had not been in such a good position at any time previously during our term of office. The reduction in the exchange rate from £3 15s. to about 10s. would have enabled us to obtain larger sums of money than were available previously. I claim that by the administration and legislation of the National Government we were able to build up the financial standing of the State to such a point that we could go on the money market and get money more cheaply than any other country in the world. This condition of things was due to our businesslike administration. At no time did the credit of this State stand on a higher plane than when we left office, and if we had been able to go on with our public works policy as contemplated we would have been able to do much more than in the past. During our term of office we were able, even with the limited amount of money available, to do what had never been done before. We obtained legislative sanction for and commenced some of the largest works which have been embarked upon in the Commonwealth. I refer particularly to the Sydney Harbour bridge, which is now being vigorously proceeded with, and which has been the subject of agitation for fifty years past. We were in a position to start this great work under favourable conditions, and I hope there will be no interruption of the progress of this great undertaking. Then there are the border railways, for which arrangements have

[Mr. Ball.

been made, and which together represent one of the biggest works that has ever been authorised by Parliament. We accomplished this notwithstanding that we were hampered in regard to finance, and we had every expectation of being able to do better still if we had continued in office. I thought it only fitting that I should make special reference to the public works policy of the Government. I hope the Premier will be able to provide the money which he is satisfied he can obtain for the carrying out of the various important public works which have already been authorised by Parliament, and that he will not wait as indicated in the Governor's Speech until Parliament has sanctioned the construction of still further public works.

MISS PRESTON-STANLEY (Eastern Suburbs) [11.7 a.m.]: In rising to address this Assembly for the first time one is necessarily conscious of a thrill of enthusiasm for the echo of issues long settled are still here, the romance of great personalities long silent still linger—the traditions of a century that is gone are still evergreen and inspiring, making this Chamber the most historic spot in all Australia.

It is a privilege to share in the traditions of this House—it is a greater responsibility to maintain them unsullied. I feel also that I have cast on me the great responsibility of helping to maintain and preserve these traditions unsullied. I trust that I shall ever be conscious of the tremendous responsibility which undoubtedly rests on every member of this Chamber. I hope that no acts of mine will violate or sully the best traditions of this Assembly, or that I shall in any sense degrade the high and noble traditions of this honorable House. I am deeply conscious that the advent of a woman in the Parliament of this country is not exactly to be considered as a popular innovation. Some hon. members have been kind enough to suggest that women should be protected from the hurly-burly of politics. This attitude of mind may do credit to the softness of their hearts, and I think it may also be taken as *prima facie* evidence of a little softening in

their heads. What I mean is just this: Women are in the hurly-burly of life and if they are in the hurly-burly of life they are necessarily brought into contact also more or less directly with the hurly-burly of politics. Every turn of the political wheel touches them. As women taxpayers and workers, they are subject to the laws you make, the inadequate wages you impose, the taxes you collect, the injustices you perpetuate, the anomalies you tolerate, and they suffer under the many vital and important matters you forget to handle. They are also subject to the many unfortunate results which follow from the neglect of the Legislature to handle effectively many of the great questions which may be considered to be of vital importance not only to women, but to the entire nation. Therefore, to say that women should be protected from the hurly-burly of politics is to say that they are lacking in a realisation of their responsibilities to the State, and to the effect of the legislation which surrounds and touches them at every angle. I have been told that women are not fit to sit in Parliament. I acknowledge that a great many of them are not fit to do so, but the same thing is true of many men. But nobody would suggest that because some men are not qualified for public life that all men should be disqualified. It would be an extraordinary acknowledgment of the lack of logical faculty if one were to say that because some men are so obviously disqualified from serving the people in the political life of the nation all men therefore should be disqualified. I realise that the reason at the back of the feeling of the majority of men with regard to women taking a place in political life is that for centuries men have proclaimed that women are entirely lacking in the capacity for reason and in the logical faculty. They have denied our ability to think and have credited us with intuition and instinct and written us down because we are able to take these short cuts to many things over which men wonder, ponder, construe, and deduct and then often miss the bull's eye. It is a very extraordinary thing when one reflects upon

it. I never heard a man say that he did not appreciate in his horse what is known as "horse sense." An animal cannot reason, but it frequently shows extraordinary intelligence. The fact that women have intuition and instinct and can take short cuts to arrive at conclusions is a strong reason why, when they have the education, they may acquit themselves as well as men in the political life of the nation. However, we are told that Parliament is no fit place for women. I am not prepared to admit that such is the case, otherwise I would not be here; but if it is so it is the most serious indictment which can be lodged against men, because Parliament up-to-date is an institution entirely of their own making. For many years I have had the opportunity of "looking down" upon hon. members from above. I have often wondered how it came about that so many "old women" managed to get here, and not only managed to get here, but to stay here. I want to be quite clear; I am not referring to the physical age of the old gentlemen in question, but to their mental age and to their obvious vacuity of mind and the lack of political ability which characterises rather than distinguishes the gentlemen to whom I have referred. It seems to me that woman is a force of great importance to the future of the race. I know there are men in this Chamber—unhappily I am sorry to say some of them in control of my party—who consider that there is no sphere for women in politics. There are many men who believe that the tremendous change which has taken place in the world's affairs is merely a passing phase. I am prepared to say that those who hold this view are enwrapped in the moth-eaten trappings of an age that is gone. They are blinded and poisoned by their own prejudice. I believe that women have a contribution to make to the life of the nation which is essential to the completion of men's work. No intelligent person can look unmoved upon the fact that to-day in the greatest democracy of the western world with a population of 120 millions—I refer to the United States—there is a woman assistant Attorney-General. Again when we realise that a

Seventh day.

woman is handling the greatest educational grant of the world, in the State of New York, amounting to £8,000,000 sterling, it must be admitted that women have come to stay in the political life of nations. One has only to take a brief survey to ascertain the present trend of affairs. It is remarkable that during the last ten years no less than thirty countries have enfranchised women. It is even more remarkable that no less than twenty countries have sent them into Parliament, and that women are filling such high offices of State as Speakers and as Ministers of the Crown and that they are holding those offices with dignity, credit, and power. Most men, of course, I realise, think that women may do many things quite nicely, but should have power never. The position is clear to us that there is a sign of a new and better order. Women have a contribution to make to the life of the nation which they only can make. It is an extraordinary thing that men claim that they can interpret women's legislative ambitions better than the women can do it themselves. We say it is extraordinary and, what is more, it is an extraordinary illustration of the illogical logical faculty of which men have for so long claimed a monopoly.

Although I am keenly interested in the questions which vitally affect women and children and although I am extremely proud of the fact that 10,000 electors of the Eastern Suburbs placed their confidence in me, I accept that responsibility with humility. But I want to make it clear that I am not here merely as the representative of one sex. I believe that women's questions are national questions, and that national questions are women's questions, and it may be shown that woman can take her place amongst the representatives of the people in the Parliament of the country and play her part in the political life of the nation. So far as my brief experience in this House goes I have received the greatest courtesy from the Speaker, from the officers of the House, and the staff, and if that courtesy is

[Miss Preston-Stanley.

maintained Parliament clearly is a fit place for woman provided she is fit for Parliament.

Turning now to the Governor's Speech, it seems to me that hon. members supporting the Government have very definitely, warmly, and enthusiastically complimented the Premier and the Cabinet on the fact that the Speech embraces practically every promise made by the Premier, when leader of the Opposition, to the people of the State. If that is so, I am prepared to say that the Government is absolutely lacking in a realisation of the crying needs of the State. For instance, we see in the Governor's Speech a passionate and earnest desire to reintroduce a forty-four hours week. Do you mean to tell me that a forty-four hours week is half as important to the future of this State as that the Government should realise that we are losing a vast number of child-bearing women in this State and that it is its imperative duty to do something to prevent that loss. Compare, from the point of view of national importance, those two matters—a forty-four hours week and the saving of the lives of almost 300 women every year, lives that are the most valuable lives in the entire community. To compare those two matters is to compare a mill stream to the falls of Niagara. Another thing about which the Government seems in earnest is the protection of the seniority of the 1917 strikers. That may be important from the point of view of the Government. But, apart altogether from political considerations, when a Government gets the opportunity, which every Government has in a free democracy, of translating its principles into action, it should awaken to the fact that this State at the present juncture is losing hundreds of children every year, and that their deaths are unnecessary and preventable. Yet we see no evidence in the Governor's Speech of a realisation of the national importance of saving the lives of those children. From a woman's point of view, if not from political considerations, I claim that the Governor's Speech is lacking in those things which this State has a right to expect a humanitarian Government to attend to. To

compare the two matters I refer to is like comparing Mount Lang with Mount Vesuvius. The Government intends also, we notice, to appoint women to the Upper House. I believe this to be a genuine desire on its part, and so far as I am concerned, being a woman who believes that women have indeed the qualifications and the right to serve their nation, I think this should have been done long ago. I am extremely sorry that my own party was not sufficiently interested in women to see that it was done long ago. Unfortunately this Government makes it a barren honor, by virtue of the fact that it has decreed that the Legislative Council shall go. Apparently women are to be placed there to chop their own heads off, as it were. But where in the Governor's Speech is the evidence that the only really great promise which was made to the women of this State, that some effective scheme of child endowment would be provided, is to be fulfilled? I understand the Premier did not actually use the term "child endowment." What he did say was that provision would be made, and made right early, for those women who had children in excess of the number already provided for by the basic wage. That is a crying necessity in this State, and is of infinitely more importance than the seniority of the 1917 strikers, and the other matters to which I have just referred. Where in the Governor's Speech is the evidence that these major promises—for the others are absolutely minor in comparison—are to be redeemed by the Government? There is none. It seems to me that from those points of view alone the Government is to be condemned. The Government is very much concerned with all sorts of flimsy things, but where in the Governor's Speech is the evidence that it recognises that the preventable deaths of women from puerperal fever should be obviated? That is the business of every man in this House, as it is of every woman in the country, and of every intelligent citizen, whoever, whatever, and wherever he or she may be. Where is the evidence that the Government cares that the lives of 300 women are needlessly

lost every year in this State? There is no such evidence. Considering that that is so the Government, undoubtedly, from my point of view has entirely missed its great and wonderful opportunity to show that it possessed those humanitarian ideas which, notwithstanding the disclaimer of my hon. colleague Mr. Hill, it claims to possess. It seems to me that humanitarian considerations should be the vital principle of every Government, provided the people are not rendered parasitic by foolish, uneconomic and stupid schemes.

These are the points I desire to bring forward. During the past thirty years we have lost between 9,000 and 10,000 mothers in childbirth, and during the same period we have had a deficit of almost 15,000 children. Is not that a loss which any Government should stay? Here is a question that so far transcends all party considerations that we should take the very first possible opportunity of inquiring into the causes underlying this great loss. It means that over 300 women die in this State every year whose deaths are preventable—and, mind you our figures have been stationary during a period of thirty years. During that period science has made remarkable advances, and its advances so far as the preventability of deaths in childbirth and deaths from puerperal septicæmia are concerned, have been marked by a decrease in the mortality statistics of many other countries. Think of it! Even Japan—upon which we are foolish enough from many points of view to look down—can show us a lesson in this respect. We find that in Japan, Switzerland, Ireland, England, Wales, and many other countries, Governments have been alive to the importance of this grave question. They have recognised the facts, and instituted great educational campaigns, with the result that instead of losing hundreds of women every year from these causes they are losing only a very few. Is it of no importance to the Government that if the facts known to science in this State were applied to the situation we should be losing not 300 women a year, but only twenty-seven? If all the legislation of

Seventh day.

this House relating to trade and commerce were to be entirely suspended for a period of three months, and we were to devote ourselves to those matters which would improve the human asset, New South Wales would be immeasurably better off. I know that is making a very sweeping statement, but it can be amply substantiated by facts.

Mr. ARKINS: Are not many of the causes prenatal?

Miss PRESTON-STANLEY: Of course. I am coming to that in a few moments, if the hon. member will allow me to deal with the matter in my own way. I do not know whether hon. members are aware that in other countries this matter has been handled with—I was going to say superb skill, but that is not the term. We know the facts of science; we have them at our command to-day, and they can be applied to-morrow. If the Government is aroused on this matter we can apply facts and figures which will have an immediate result. Only a little while ago, at the annual meeting of the British Medical Association, in Bradford, England, one of the medical men present gave particulars of 2,000 maternity cases with one death only. The women concerned were the wives of soldiers in the British army. What a wonderful achievement in comparison with our own! The same in Scotland and other countries. In one case 618 women had passed through the dangers of maternity, with only one death. I claim that it is a paramount duty on the part of this Government to appoint a commission at once to inquire into all the causes of deaths of the class referred to. Hon. members may say, "We have already established a chair of midwifery at the University." That is so, and I am delighted to say that the National party half awakened to the importance of this great matter. Only £1,500 has been allotted to the chair, however. We say that a University which can boast of the third largest medical school in the world ought to have the finest equipment for dealing with obstetrics, because the lives of human mothers and children are at stake. What is more, these are the most valuable lives in the community. Therefore, at a later

[Miss Preston-Stanley.]

stage I am going to ask the Government whether it will not consider appointing a commission to inquire into all the causes underlying these two great avenues of loss. Hon. members may say, "We have recently passed the Midwives' Registration Bill." That is true. Both these things are steps in the right direction, but neither of them is nearly sufficient. What we want is first of all the better training of medical men in obstetrics; secondly, better training and supervision of midwives; and thirdly, a great educational campaign to educate mothers themselves, as well as the general public, in these important matters.

There is another matter. Is it of no concern to the Government that over in New Zealand, practically at our door, they are saving over twenty more children per 1,000 than we are saving in New South Wales? There they planned a great educational campaign, conducted along the best scientific lines. There they have cut the child death-rate in halves. There they are beating New South Wales by saving more than twenty children more every year out of every 1,000 born. These seem to me matters of supreme national importance, and I hope the Government will consider, as I think they should have considered, them, before all other matters. I sincerely hope the Government will invite Dr. Truby King to visit New South Wales. New Zealand is only next door to us. We waste much money. We might expend this money in a way which would be of immense profit and benefit to the nation.

I realise there are those in this community who are not very much concerned about the problem of the feeble-minded. That is another question of paramount importance. We have the Ministers of Justice tinkering, and I use the word advisedly, with the question of the responsibility of criminals. We have them chopping a little off this man's sentence, saying that man should have better treatment. What we want is complete reorganisation of the whole method of the treatment of our criminals. What we want as the first step in this direction is a State plan for the care and control and segregation of mentally feeble

persons. We have a State Children Relief Act on our statute-book. Under that Act a child up to the age of 18 years of age is protected by the State, even although such child may be known to be a mental or moral pervert, a moral imbecile who is bound to make shipwreck of life, it passes out of the permanent custody of the State at 18 years of age, even though these facts may be known to those in charge of the State Children Relief Department. The public does not realise that a person once feeble-minded is always feeble-minded, and no matter what care may be taken of him is always a potential criminal. A feeble-minded person produces feeble-minded children to the third or fourth generation, and, in our present state of knowledge, he is incurable. Further than that, we know that feeble-minded stock produce an endless progeny of feeble-minded stock. We protect them up to a certain stage and then turn them loose on the community. Only when they have become a socially destructive force does the State take the slightest notice of them. Then we draft them to an institution where they do not belong and cannot be adequately treated. The Government has the opportunity to institute entirely new methods. It may be said that past Governments have not done it. I am not upholding them, but I say that all Governments that have missed the great and wonderful opportunity of dealing with this matter in a comprehensive and national fashion have been guilty of serious neglect to the taxpayers and people generally of New South Wales. When it is realised that we have gone so far as to secure a committee of experts to deal with the matter and draft a bill, and that the bill was presented to the Government, but nothing was done in this important matter, no wonder that the women of New South Wales realise that "first things first" must be attended to in this Legislature. There may be some, and I have heard there are some intelligent people—they ought to be ashamed of it—who say, "This question of the feeble-minded—where does it get you?" I will tell you what becomes of the

feeble-minded persons you deliberately allow to be propagated. Feeble-minded girls invariably become mothers of feeble-minded children, shortly after they are physically able to do so. Generally, too, the children are illegitimate. If a man or boy animated by the passions of an adult and with the will of a child has energy which he cannot control and which society does not direct, he becomes a grave problem to society. In some cases if he is of a phlegmatic temperament he gradually drifts till he falls on the human scrap-heap. But society has to keep him; that is the point. The taxpayers have to keep him whether in a hospital, a gaol or an asylum. He inevitably becomes a grave problem to society because he is guilty of petty delinquencies and we have really no scientific way of dealing with children who come before our children's court. Our attitude towards them is paternal, kindly and superior to our attitude to the grown criminal. But the fact remains that we do not do anything really great and lasting in a scientific way to mend the character of the child who comes before our children's court. In this question is wrapped up the whole problem of child delinquency, and it seems to me there is an exceedingly great opportunity for any Government to do a great and vital national work.

I said a few minutes ago that in my opinion the Minister for Justice is tinkering with this great question. In saying 20 per cent. or 25 per cent. I am understating the case, according to the experience of other countries; at any rate we have a large percentage of persons who are irresponsible for their crimes, by reason of mental defect. They are put in gaols, and we pay to keep them there. We know nothing of their mental condition. We know they will produce their kind. We do nothing to stop it, and we yet say we are carrying out the great work of government in this matter. We are not doing it at all.

I notice that the Government made a very great cry during the elections of the necessity for taking the very first opportunity of building homes for the

Seventh day.

people of the State. I am not going to say whether it is sound or unsound that the State should advance 90 per cent. of the money required, through the Government Savings Bank, for the purpose of home-building. The Government has stated it is going to improve the facilities for people to secure their own homes. Surely a Government which said that should have considered it to be one of the most important questions. We women view it as more important than men do, because those who suffer most from the almost insanitary, unhygienic, and improper dwellings are the women and children of the community. We see nothing in the Government programme about improving the housing of the people. There are many other matters to which I could refer. The reason I feel keenly on the question of child endowment and the whole question of housing is because I feel that a child in a degrading environment may possibly escape degradation of character, but the risk is too great for an enlightened society to hazard. We ought to know that a child with a capacity for decency soon becomes degraded, a child with a capacity for knowledge grows up in ignorance, a child with a capacity for virtue soon becomes vicious, if the environment is wrong. All this represents a human tragedy of a terrible character that no democratic community ought to be prepared to tolerate.

There are other matters about which I feel keenly. Before going on with such mundane matters as the Stevens case and so on, there is one reform most vitally necessary in this community, namely, an Act to consolidate the Public Health Acts of this State. We are working to-day under three Health Acts, or, rather, under the Public Health Act and two amending Acts. Some of the diseases that are notifiable under the Public Health Act are not notifiable under the other Acts, and some that are notifiable under the other Acts are not notifiable under that Act. For instance, measles is not notifiable under the Public Health Act, but it is notifiable under the Dairies Supervision Act. Then, again, what should be the most supremely important department

of the State, namely, the Department of Public Health, is the "Cinderella" of the public service. In addition to that we have to recognise that this department has come so sporadic that the health of the school children is now a matter that is under the Education Department, and not under the Department of Public Health at all; the health of children dealt with by the State Children Relief Department is under the Department of Public Health; the health of men in industries is under the Minister for Labour and Industry; and the baby clinics section of health is under the Chief Secretary's Department. It seems to me that, although we have a Minister for Public Health, if he can find his department, and understand all its ramifications and limitations, he is a very clever and ingenious man. What we want is a consolidating Public Health Act. We are in the same position as they were in New Zealand and England, with branches dealing with various aspects of public health all over the State, but nothing co-ordinated or co-related. They decided upon a consolidating Act, and they created a Ministry of Health, such as we undoubtedly need in this State. The Department of Public Health here should become a Ministry for Health. I think that is a very important matter.

Now, man is the nation's greatest wealth. He is the greatest staple we can produce. It is not wheat, nor meat, nor wool, nor mutton, but man himself which is the most important product of any community.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MISS PRESTON-STANLEY: I must remind the hilarious gentlemen of the House that the generic term "man" includes "woman." It seems to me that it is infinitely more vital that we should breed—and I use the term advisedly—a thoroughbred race of men and women than that we should breed thoroughbred horses, or dogs, or cattle, or hogs. It is profoundly more important that we should learn how to control the pests which are blighting the tree of life than that we should learn to control the pests that are blighting our potatoes, or our

[Miss Preston-Stanley.]

tomatoes, important though they may be. But up to the present we have done very little in that direction. It is important that we should learn how to control the codlin moth, and other pests which affect our fruit trees, but it is much more important that we should learn to control the pests which are undermining the tree of life. We should plan, because we cannot do it unless we do plan, how to bring about a better breed of human beings, rather than of potatoes or tomatoes.

Hon. members of this House who support the Government have been talking about its "unequivocal mandate." I am prepared to say that the reason they have received a mandate at all is because we, on this side of the House, are hopelessly split asunder on trifling and contemptible issues. A party which stands for country interests is no more to be desired in this community than a party which stands for city interests, nor is a party that stands for city interests any more to be desired than a party that represents one section of the community only, be that section who they may. That is why I sit on this side of the House, profoundly as I am interested in questions affecting women and children, not as a woman's representative only, and I believe the time is swiftly coming, unless we are absolutely incapable of handling our affairs, when the two wings of this great party must be brought together. When you come to think of it, what is the difference between us? It is only "the difference between Tweedledum and Tweedledee," so far as big and basic principles are concerned. We graduated in the same school of political thought, and we probably belong together. We represent the same policy in regard to the tenure of land. We represent the same system of economics, and we represent the same policy, only whereas the National party represents all sections, the Country party sees only its own affairs, or its own side of affairs, and is satisfied to represent only one section. It is not an uncommon thing for legislators—I hope I will never be afflicted with it, though, of course, I may—it is a very serious thing, and a very common thing, for Governments and legislators to suffer

from a kind of political astigmatism—they see the small things large, and they see the large things small. However, what I was about to say was that we have to plan for a better breed of human beings. Important as country questions are, the interests of man himself, including woman, are more important. Brains are born, and not made, and human society will go down unless the inferior breeds are checked and the superior breeds are increased. So far as I am concerned I hold the very strongest views on the imperative necessity for the segregation of the unfit. We want marriage between science and politics. It is a scandalous thing to think that science knows these things, that science tells us about these things; that science gives us all manner of facts about how we may prevent this waste of human life, and how we may reduce preventable diseases and improve the race to which we belong, but we go blindly on, doing nothing. It seems to me, further, that the programme which should be placed before the community—the great national political programme—should not be the result of the poisoned, blinded prejudice of any political party, but should be a reasoned programme based upon the discoveries of science. If we are prepared to do this it will bring about the greatest and richest crop society has ever gathered in.

However, I want now to speak for a few minutes on the various matters the Government has brought forward. One of them, for instance, is the question of the forty-four hours working week. First of all, I would like to say that the man who says that the Nationalist party is opposed to the forty-four hours week merely out of sheer cussedness simply does not know what he is talking about. What is the Nationalist party's position in regard to the forty-four hours week? Why does it oppose it? Simply because the Nationalist party believes that the forty-four hours week will be detrimental to the workers themselves, and detrimental to the prosperity of the community. If there is not something in their argument, I ask you this: Why does not the Labour party, unless it recognises that there is a law governing

Seventh day.

the amount that the workers can take out of the pool of the national wealth, say that it is not satisfied that workers should receive £5 a week, but wants £10? It is simply because the members of the party know—they surely must know—that there is not enough wealth produced in Australia to-day, according to the Commonwealth Statistician, to pay even £4 a week to every man, unemployed and employed, in the community. You may say, "We do not accept it," but do not forget Professor Meredith Atkinson, one of the most humane men in our community, a man who has the deepest possible sympathy for labour, a man who has been suspected on many hands of the strongest socialistic tendencies, says the greatest mistake the Australian working man is making is that he is demanding more and more wages merely at the expense of profits. He is not concerned with the point of production, he is only concerned with getting more and more at the expense of profits. Professor Meredith Atkinson pointed out that the Labour movement is swiftly approaching a point past which it could not go. If that is the position, if there is not enough wealth produced in Australia to-day to give to every worker, irrespective of whether he is employed or not, £4 a week, then obviously there is a law governing these matters. In the same way you all know, whether you acknowledge it or not—and I know a great many will not acknowledge it—whether you say official sanction has been given it or not, that "ca'canny" and "go slow" has been largely practised in many industries in this State.

Captain DUNN: No!

Miss PRESTON-STANLEY: You say it has not, but let me say right here I have been through a good part of Australia and I saw the introduction of "ca'canny" in Queensland, in the copper-fields, the cane-fields, the meat-works, and the works generally.

Captain DUNN: It is easy to say that!

Miss PRESTON-STANLEY: And it is very easy to prove it. I shall take the opportunity, when the forty-four hours

[Miss Preston-Stanley.

bill comes before this House, of proving it to such an extent that Mr. Dunn will feel jolly uncomfortable.

Captain DUNN: I will not feel uncomfortable; I know it is untrue!

Miss PRESTON-STANLEY: I think you will. However, whether it has been practised or not in this State, I will tell you why I know it. I have discussed the matter with hundreds of working-men. They simply say, "If we go slow on the job we lengthen out the work," and in some way they think they have to get home on the boss. This is what they see—they see action and they do not realise the reaction. They do not realise that the man who goes slow in his work, whatever he is engaged in, is putting up the price of every article produced in the home market. But he is doing something more. He is putting up the price of every article produced that comes into this market from abroad, because they are decreasing the national pool of wealth, which means we have less goods and less services to exchange for goods abroad. Therefore we get less goods and less services for our produce, and the price of every article produced in the home market, as well as every article which comes to this country from abroad, is put up by the worker going slow. If that is so, and it obviously is so—and many a working-man will say he believes it is the only way of getting home on the boss—if the decrease of production means increase of price, as we know it does—we know that the labour cost of an article is the real cost that governs its price—it is very obvious, if we are going to begin to work eleven months instead of twelve months a year in the State of New South Wales with other States working twelve months, it is going to have the definite effect of putting New South Wales at a very grave disadvantage with other States, whatever Mr. Lang or his Ministry have to say about it.

Captain DUNN: That is untrue!

Miss PRESTON-STANLEY: Mr. Dunn says it is untrue. If any man has common sense he knows it is true. I want to explain my attitude.

Captain DUNN: It would take explaining!

Miss PRESTON-STANLEY: Yes, and I think I can explain it. I believe that high wages are sound economics.

Captain DUNN: Hear, hear!

Miss PRESTON-STANLEY: I thought you would say that.

Captain DUNN: And low wages are no good!

Miss PRESTON-STANLEY: Very well, high wages are sound economics, but a wage cannot be economically sound if it closes the doors of industry. I say in this matter that forty-four hours is a very desirable thing, but forty-four hours is no good if 50 per cent. of your workmen are working forty-four hours and the rest are on the streets. That is my argument.

Captain DUNN:

Miss PRESTON-STANLEY: I do not know where you get your figures from, but they are not taken from an authentic source. It is an unfortunate thing there is so much class bitterness in this House and in this community. It is a very unfortunate thing that one is never credited with a really fair point of view. Now, I am going further than any member on the Opposition side of the House, and I am going to say I believe the time is coming when we will work a forty-four hours week. I believe that will be when we see capital more efficiently used than we are using it to-day, when we use the best machinery, when we scrap obsolete methods and obsolete machinery, and when management, which is such a big factor in the matter of profit, is able itself to improve the conditions of industry. But while any other State in Australia works a forty-eight hours week, we are at a disadvantage. I have never heard a whisper, nor a suggestion or statement from Mr. Lang or in the press, or even from the humblest member on the Government side, that the workers of the community are prepared, in that forty-four hours week,

to try to keep up to the point of production at which they are to-day. There is no doubt in the world what Government members are doing is really throwing a sop to the great body of workers from whom they believe they get the most passionate support, without regard to the economics of the position.

An HON. MEMBER: You are playing up to the people now!

Miss PRESTON-STANLEY: Someone says that I am playing up to the people. Who put me here? The humblest in the community as well as those very much better off. Electors of all classes, of all sections, and all creeds put me here. I tell you no one stands in this House with a more democratic vote than the vote that is behind me as I stand here to-day. I say that, and I will tell you why. The people are asking for sincerity in politics, and they will not get it from the Government.

Mr. CANN: They won't get it from your side!

Miss PRESTON-STANLEY: I am bound to say I am not holding a brief now for any party, but I do say sincerity is the thing which is most wanted in the life of this community.

After having listened to the speeches of many members on the other side when speaking from the platform, I believe that if they were to put their economic theories into practice in this State we should be bankrupt within a month. Furthermore, from the woman's point of view, has the Labour party ever thought of even an eighty-eight hours week for women? Goodness me! the average woman works 112 hours per week, and she is lucky if she gets through her work in that time. I never heard of Mr. Lang or of any member of his party saying they were out to see if it was not possible to make the lot of women measurably better.

Mr. BADDELEY: We will do that!

Miss PRESTON-STANLEY: Very well. There is not even a prospect of an eighty-eight hours week for women in the homes. Look at the lot of the wife of a working-man. What has the ordinary wife to do? She has to knit, bake, sew, mend, plan, organise

Seventh day.

in the household, and in the evening put up with a bear of a husband. If you put the most brilliant man on the Government side of the House into a home for one week and required that he should look after half a dozen children he would be in a lunatic asylum at the end of the week. If the Government is so concerned about women, why was not some provision for child endowment projected in the Governor's Speech? It may be asked what did the Nationalist Government do? I say that the Nationalist Government made the only serious attempt that has been made to bring about a basic wage in this State.

MR. BADDELEY: We will give you an opportunity!

MISS PRESTON-STANLEY: The Minister says he will give me an opportunity. He suggests that I do not stand four-square for the principles I enunciate, but you will never catch me napping on any of the principles I hold or any promises I make. I stand for certain things and will vote for them because I believe there are considerations which transcend all party politics. I shall always vote for proposals when I believe in them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Will you vote for pensions for widows?

MISS PRESTON-STANLEY: Yes. Thousands of votes were gained by the Labour party at the last election on the unqualified promise made by the Premier to provide pensions for widows; but now we find widows' pensions are to be granted with every possible qualification. I congratulate the Government upon even the shred of the promises that it is going to keep and I shall vote for the granting of widows' pensions provided there is no really serious objection—

HON. MEMBERS: Ha!

MISS PRESTON-STANLEY: I am not trying to make hurdles or difficulties of a character which the Ministry have so cleverly put up in connection with widows' pensions. I stand for every measure of relief that can reasonably be given to women. In regard to the forty-four hours week, I have said already that the Government must know, or, if it does not know, it will learn that the forty-four hours week cannot be worked satis-

factorily in this State except by placing this State at a serious disadvantage as compared with other States, unless some effort is made to keep up the present point of production, or unless the Governments of the other States are prepared to agree to legislation of a like character.

I have been very much interested in the attitude of hon. members opposite, who have insisted that Mr. Stevens was not dismissed, but that he resigned. But why should we play with words? The fact is that Mr. Stevens' position was definitely and deliberately rendered untenable by the Premier. If Mr. Lang found it necessary for any good reason to dispense with the services of Mr. Stevens, or anyone else, this House and the country are entitled to a clear and definite statement of that reason. Furthermore, British justice should be accorded to every man in the service. We are told that Mr. Stevens' action was voluntary and that he resigned of his own free will and accord. All I have to say on that point is that it was the kind of voluntary action that a man is guilty of when he meets a footpad who holds a revolver to his head and demands his money or his life. Under such circumstances a defenceless individual may put his hand in his pocket and hand over his watch and chain and money, but he certainly does it with the persuasive eloquence of the revolver pointed at his head. Mr. Stevens' action was deliberately and definitely brought about by the Premier. So far as one can see, the cause of Mr. Stevens' dismissal was really that he was in the confidence of the late Treasurer and the late Government. I cannot think of any other reason at the moment. There may be men in the service who are glad that Mr. Stevens has gone, but surely no one of them will ever dare to say that he has been treated with fair play and British justice. I do not care whether he is the highest or lowest in the service, or what his offence may have been, he is entitled to justice. I am not in a position to know the internal facts as Ministers are. I am not taking the case from their angle. All I can say is that if I were a public servant and Mr. Lang or anyone else had

[Miss Preston-Stanley.]

meted out to me the kind of treatment which was meted out to Mr. Stevens, I should consider I had a very deep grievance indeed, and I regard Mr. Stevens as having a deep grievance. What happened? First of all, there was a masterly silence on the part of Mr. Lang. When the press reported that Mr. Lang would not see Mr. Stevens Mr. Lang had no comment to make. The next stage was a stage of sophistry and casuistry, and up to date this House and the country has not been furnished with a clear, definite, straightforward statement as to the reason why Mr. Stevens was dismissed. If it is to be taken that a public officer, simply because he is suspected of being associated with a former Government, is to be dismissed, it is going to be a serious thing for the future of this State. In the course of the debate members have asserted that Mr. Stevens dismissed certain public servants and that they are getting home on Mr. Stevens by hitting him back. But what about the twenty-six public servants Mr. Lang dismissed? In Queensland, when I was there, Mr. Theodore was in power. Mr. Theodore came into office when the Labour policy in Queensland was flowering, when every department was over-staffed, when in every department the output was lowered, and departmental costs were mounting high. Mr. Theodore recognised that it was necessary for him to retrench. The workers did not like it. They did not expect retrenchment, because they had always been told it was unnecessary. But let me show you the speciousness of Mr. Theodore. When the unions objected to the great number of men who had been retrenched Mr. Theodore replied, "That is not retrenchment, that is deflation." When Mr. Lang explains to the twenty-six men who are to be dismissed from the Income Tax Department that they are not dismissed or retrenched, only deflated, I suppose they will accept the explanation. But it is mere ridiculous nonsense. Mr. Lang dismissed these men. In regard to Mr. Stevens I submit that if it is to be put to the House as a reasonable proposition that Mr. Stevens had earned or incurred the displeasure, dislike and

unpopularity of this Government merely because he, as a servant of the Government, carried out the instructions of the Government, then it is a desperate thing for the future of this community. This is merely further evidence of the policy of spoils to the victors. I am bound to say I was amazed to hear an acknowledgment from two men like Mr. Davies and Mr. Gosling that they had confiscated certain tickets.

HON. MEMBERS:

Miss PRESTON-STANLEY: This is not a laughing matter; I will tell you why. I was amazed to hear an acknowledgment from two responsible representatives of the people that they had confiscated certain tickets belonging to the entire House, and declare that it was only a case of spoils to the victor. I do not care what those tickets were. I do not care if it was only a packet of pins.

Mr. GOSLING: Your knowledge of the facts is only equalled by your knowledge of the logic dealing with the situation!

Miss PRESTON-STANLEY: I am told that my knowledge of the facts is unsound. I say that what I heard with my own ears in this Chamber is quite sufficient for me to accept as evidence.

Mr. DAVIES: I believe in spoils to the victors. I do not apologise at all!

Miss PRESTON-STANLEY: In case I am taking an unfair advantage of the position Mr. Davies acknowledges that he believes in spoils to the victors. Mr. Gosling acknowledged that the tickets were confiscated, and he even went so far as to say—

Mr. GOSLING: No, I did not!

Miss PRESTON-STANLEY: The hon. member went so far as to say the Opposition got ten and next time they would get none.

Mr. GOSLING: I agree with you there!

Miss PRESTON-STANLEY: I do not care what the value of the tickets was; I say that a party that is prepared to acknowledge the principle of spoils to the victors under any circumstances is a danger to the country.

Mr. DAVIES: Your party practised it, too!

Miss PRESTON-STANLEY: Mr. Davies says that our party practised it.

Seventh day.

If our party practised it it is no more creditable in our party than in yours. I do not believe our party did. However, whoever may practise it, it is not in the interests of the community. Carry the thing to its logical conclusion, what do we find? After all the matter I refer to is comparatively unimportant. But what is not unimportant is you will find this same principle being carried out right through by the supporters of the Labour party. The other day there was a demand that the Water and Sewerage Board should be scrapped merely because its policy did not happen to agree with certain planks in the platform of the Labour party. Nothing but chaos, loss, waste, muddle and inefficiency can result if boards of an important character of this kind, whose work very often runs for ten or fifteen years and even longer, are to be subject to the changes of every change of Government. Then we saw the other day that some workers up north were asking—what for? That Mr. Justice Edmunds should be removed from the bench. That means that the judiciary is no longer going to be sacrosanct.

Mr. ALLDIS: I can give you some information!

Miss PRESTON-STANLEY: Mr. Alldis says he can give me some information. The only information I want is that certain northern unionists have demanded that because a judge gave a judgment or expressed an opinion which they did not agree with, he should be removed from the bench. That is only another and logical development of this policy of spoils to the victors, and it is a dangerous and menacing thing to this community.

An HON. MEMBER: It is almost as bad as Mr. Hughes and Judge Higgins!

Miss PRESTON-STANLEY: I am rather amused at the attitude of some hon. members. They appear to imagine that they have only to hit back and tell me that some Government somewhere, at some time, did something and I shall immediately collapse. That is why we are here, because we are not satisfied with past Governments and we believe that women can assist to make a better job of it. That is the only reason we

[Miss Preston-Stanley.

are here. I am afraid you will have to make the best of us. We have to make the best of you and rumour says it will prove a very difficult task.

I am glad that the irresponsible Independent for North Sydney is present in the House.

Mr. KAY:

Miss PRESTON-STANLEY: I am inclined to think that is evidence of the hon. member's irresponsibility. I know Mr. Kay rather well, and I watch, perhaps more closely than most, his point of view. I have heard his speeches more often than have most people, and I know that, notwithstanding his disclaimer to Mr. Ball yesterday, it came as a bombshell to his own electorate and to the members of this House, that a man, who for seven long years has by implication if not by direct utterance, opposed the Labour Government in every possible aspect, should vote and speak as he did here the other day. However, this is my point. Mr. Lang has stated, and very definitely, that the Labour party has not the slightest sympathy whatever—is not friendly and not even slightly acquainted with the communist party, and the irresponsible Independent for North Sydney gave his sanction to that very important announcement, so far as the Labour party is concerned. Notwithstanding what Mr. Kay has said, I say there is a wealth of evidence and a wealth of facts to the contrary, though I do not propose now to weary the House with them. But I do consider that any man who will get up in this House or in any other place and tell us that a party which selects Donald Grant—mind you, I am not attacking Mr. Grant. [Interruption.] Some hon. members are apparently suffering from a sort of muddled head. One asks me why I refer to Donald Grant if I am not attacking him. I am not attacking him just now. Was not Donald Grant a member of the I.W.W? Undoubtedly he was a leader of the movement, and an extremely capable leader, too. He has stated many and many a time from the public platform that he did not believe in political action nor in the efforts of the

reformist branch of the Labour movement to try to secure representation in Parliament. But he changed his policy the moment word came out from Russia —

Mr. GOODIN: Donald Grant was never a communist!

Miss PRESTON-STANLEY: The young hon. member on my left is evidently somewhat of a Rip van Winkle. Apparently he does not know the facts of his own case. He challenges the suggestion that Grant was ever a communist. Very well, then, he was a member of the I.W.W., which is worse.

Mr. GOODIN: I will grant you that!

Miss PRESTON-STANLEY: That is all I want. Seeing that Grant won, as he did by a very large majority of primary votes, the Labour party's selection, that shows clearly more than an *entente cordiale*. It shows a very decided friendship between the revolutionary elements and the Labour party. However, I shall leave that on one side.

An HON. MEMBER: Mr. Oakes was a Labour man once!

Miss PRESTON-STANLEY: Yes, he was when the Labour party had a soul, but to-day it has none. But what Mr. Oakes was and what he was not is no business of mine. He was a very wise philosopher who said, "Let every herring hang by its own tail." My point is this: You have eloquent evidence of the Labour party preferring Grant to a very great number of solid, capable moderates. They preferred him, they selected him, and they sent him forth to carry their flag. We say, "Very well, if what we say is not true, and the Labour party is not friendly with the communists, we now want Mr. Lang to put his fair words into practice, and go down and deal with the position on the waterfront, which is now controlled by communists." You say women are not wanted in Parliament. If you had a few high-spirited women in Parliament, and in power, let me tell you that Johannsen and Walsh would not be running the waterfront of this city to-day—they would be dumped out of the country. If better evidence could be adduced, if more eloquent testimony

could be elicited, as to the sympathy between the wild, unruly, demagogic, dangerous communist element which is ruining the trade and industry of this country, and will inevitably ruin the Labour party, make no mistake about it, it is to be found in the fact that now the party has secured responsibility these people are beginning to realise that it must be undone, just as every other existing organisation must be undone. I say, if Mr. Lang is prepared to accept the responsibility of refusing to help the National Government in Federal politics to handle the situation on the waterfront, then he stands disgraced and condemned in the mind of every intelligent, respectable, and decent citizen.

Mr. CANN: Bruce is incompetent!

Miss PRESTON-STANLEY: I know you have never been too comfortable amongst your friends. First of all, we are told that Mr. Bruce is incompetent. That is Mr. Bruce's business and not mine. Mr. Cann has just now asked, "Why does not Mr. Bruce act?" If Mr. Bruce attempts to act what happens? Mr. Lang blocks the way. Do you mean to tell me the people of this community are willing to believe that the Labour party is not sympathetic, and deeply so, with the communistic element, when we have the position which has been published in our newspapers to-day? Then, I say, you are playing with words. The facts are so eloquent that nobody can misunderstand them. As an evidence of what this Walsh crowd really stand for, I heard Adela Pankhurst use these words—and she is the power behind Walsh, make no mistake about that. I want to quote, because I think it is so interesting, a statement by this demagogic philosopheress. She says:

Thrift is not a national virtue; it clogs the wheels of industry, causing unemployment, want and suffering.

What Bedlamic theories! She continues:

When the workers are thrifty, they deprive themselves and their children of the necessities and comforts of life, and hand their savings over to financiers to gamble with. Out of the savings of the workers, voluntarily and compulsory, kings, courts, nobles, prisoners, politicians, and all idlers are maintained. Commercialised vice, with

Seventh day.

its army of prostitutes and procurers; and Imperialism, with its army of slaughterers, are paid for by means of thrift. The worker who is thrifty betrays his own wife and children.

I tell you that if the economics of Labour were applied to this State the wheels of industry would cease to revolve. Whatever may be the reason for their being in the Labour party, the hon. member Dr. Evatt and certain others know full well that if the whole economics of Labour were sought to be applied to the State of New South Wales, or any other country in the world, there would be absolute bankruptcy, starvation, and misery.

Let me say something about the 1917 strike. The inconsistency, the insincerity of the Labour party in regard to this matter is shown most excellently by what is now going on. At the present moment the Government is pursuing what is practically a vendetta against the loyalists in the railway and tramway service simply because they were—

Mr. MURPHY: Good luck to them!

Miss PRESTON-STANLEY: That is your point of view; it is not mine, and that is why I am expressing mine. At the very same moment a very important wing of the Government, led by Mr. Willis and Mr. Baddeley, are recorded in the daily press as urging the formation of loyalist unions on the northern coal-fields in order to compel the members of their unions to pay a levy to the *Labor Daily*, that paper of which Mr. Lang, Mr. Willis, and Mr. Baddeley are directors. I say emphatically that if this movement goes on loyalty is to be placed at a premium when it is to serve the ends of the Labour party, but at a very serious discount when it is to keep the flag flying, when it is to keep the industries of this country moving, and to maintain the soldiery who, whatever you may say about it, were fighting for those things which free men value very much more than they value the ordinary things of daily life. Those loyalists were fighting at a time of national peril and yet the Government is prepared to pursue them with vindictive and bitter class hatred, at the same time encouraging the formation of loyal unions in order to secure funds for

the newspaper on the directorate of which are the three gentlemen I mentioned. It is a bad outlook for the future of this community and one which I exceedingly regret. I think it a very great pity from every point of view that there should be this very intense and bitter class and sectional hatred not only outside in political circles, but here in this Chamber.

I have noticed for years past that one could hardly express oneself on some important humanitarian or moral principle, as to which there might reasonably be a different point of view, unless the opponents of one's own point of view at once screamed out something about capitalistic classes. The economics of Labour are false and are not in the interest of the community, and therefore, though I favour legislation which is in the interest of the people whatever party it may come from, I can never favour legislation evolved from the false and extreme theories of a Labour party. I ask no privilege, no consideration in this House other than that accorded to every hon. member. I did not, during the elections, nor do I now, ask for any consideration other than the general consideration towards a full representative of the people. At the same time I shall demand every reasonable right which a representative of the people undoubtedly should have in this House. I feel, as I said earlier, that in times past those great questions which are of supreme importance to women have not been considered in this Chamber, nor have they been considered in practically any Parliament in the world, as they should have been considered, until women took their place in the Parliament. As evidence of that look at the Scandinavian countries where women have held political responsibility for many years past. Where women have held the biggest and widest responsibility legislation has been of the best character. I only hope, realising as I do that every woman's question is a national question, that every national question is a woman's question, I shall be able to make a slight contribution to the bettering of the conditions of the people of this State as the result of my sojourn in this House.

[Miss Preston-Stanley.]

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK (Bathurst) [12.38 p.m.]: I do not intend to occupy much time, because I feel so much has been said by my predecessor, the lady member of the House, who has held the attention of hon. members and large gallery for a long time. Miss Stanley has spoken upon such a multicentricity of questions that I who have some kindly regard for the lady folk of the community and appreciate their lectures when they are not delivered at 11 o'clock at night, find it impossible to add much on general questions. I can only reiterate statements which have been made by hon. members on this side of the House and to some extent replied to by hon. members on the other side. I must say, after a long and lively experience in this House, and without any party political feeling, that many of the statements that have been made during the last few days have not been answered by members on the other side of the House.

Mr. DAVIDSON: You have not made up your mind!

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: My mind is always made up, and while the Labour party is on the other side of the House and I am here it will be made up, until the crack of doom. Having been so long a member of this Assembly I have my own views, and those have never been changed nor altered, no matter how the political barometer may change. I do not think the position of affairs as we find it to-day is likely to change during the next three years.

Mr. McCLELLAND: Or for ten years after that!

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: I am neither "a prophet nor the son of a prophet," and I will not suggest what changes are likely to take place in any party beyond three years hence. Mr. Kay used to trounce and denounce this Government.

Mr. KAY: I never did!

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: I have often heard him denounce the party which is now the Government on the little triangle in Macquarie-place. I have heard him denouncing the laziness and lack of interest in their employers' business shown by many men in this com-

munity. Of course, it was then not necessary for him to do anything but talk himself into Parliament. I have heard him denouncing employees who did not give to their employers the services for which they were paid. He would commence to talk shortly after mid-day, and would keep on talking until about 3 o'clock in the afternoon, while office boys neglected their work to listen to him. One day I saw him in the Commonwealth Savings Bank, no doubt for the purpose of lodging the collection, and I suggested to him that it was unfair and illogical for him to take up that attitude in connection with the employees while he kept them away from their offices, and I suggested that he should at least knock off at five minutes to two, so as to let them go back to their various tasks. His answer was that he would not do that, because he wanted to get them all as supporters as he intended to run for Parliament at North Shore at the next election. I have no quarrel with the hon. gentleman, but what has happened to him has happened to many others, who have come into this House on the vote of one section and have supported the other section, with the object of ingratiating themselves with those who happened to be in power for the time being, thinking that that party was going to remain in power for many years.

Mr. KAY: I rise to order. Is the hon. member in order in referring to his own personal career in this House?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! That is not a point of order.

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: If that is the best the hon. gentleman can do I am not very much afraid of him. I am not afraid of him in any circumstances, but with the experience of thirty years in this House I challenge any hon. member to say anything against my personal or political character, and this hon. gentleman, who only gravitated into this House from Heaven knows where, and who is going to gravitate in the near future to where he will be forgotten—came into this House at the last election by the support of a number of Nationalists, who will take good care that they will not again be taken in by a

Seventh day.

political cheapjack. He will find that he is not in the Sydney Domain or Mort's Park, and that he will not be able again to hoodwink the people who were his supporters at the last election.

Mr. HOAD: They may have been Labour supporters!

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: They may have been anything. I am merely exercising my right in putting the position, and I do not know that Mr. Hoad was sent here to look after the interests of Mr. Kay.

Mr. FRANK BURKE: Why be sore about it?

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: There is not the slightest soreness about me, but when a man is sent into Parliament one at least expects him to remember the supporters who sent him here.

I have no quarrel with any hon. member of this House except with regard to political matters, but I will denounce their political views, when I do not agree with them, in language as strong and as effective as I can choose. There is not an hon. member of this House with whom personally I am not on terms of friendship, and however long or short may be the period for which I remain here I hope I shall be able to retain the same kindly feeling as exists at present.

Mr. HOSKINS: Mr. Kay will eat out of their hands, presently!

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: There is a statement going about that the hon. gentlemen will get something which will be very tasty, and I hope he will.

Mr. HORSINGTON: It may be something better than you gave him when you placed him tenth on the list!

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: Possibly it may. I remember when Mr. Speaker, who is my colleague in the representation of the most important country electorate in this State, was contesting an election with me, and an old lady came to wish me success. She told me she had done all she could to help me, because she had only given Mr. Dooley one vote, and had given me eight. She thought she had done me a service. As a matter of fact, she gave my distinguished rival the vote that counted most,

[Mr. J. C. L. Fitzpatrick.]

the No. 1 vote, and gave me the 8th, which did not come into requisition at all.

I do not want to go into a discussion of the many debatable matters which have already been dealt with. As to the Stevens case, I have heard it discussed times out of number to such an extent that it has become almost nauseous.

Major CONNELL: Who is he?

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: The hon. member has been here, a careful and attentive listener, as he always is, with no interjections. If there is one hon. member in this House who pays careful attention to everything said from this side of the House without attempting to interfere in any shape or form with the speaker or to throw him off the track of his argument, it is my hon. friend Major Connell. As he has treated other folk on this side of the House in that particular fashion, I know very well he will go far as I am concerned. I am not going into the Stevens matter, save to personally express the kindly regard I have for Mr. Stevens. I believe I was one of those who knew him best and earliest in connection with his association with the Treasury Department. Whatever Mr. Stevens may have done to excite the anger of the present Premier or anyone else associated with the public service, I am quite sure he did it because he believed it ought to be done. I am not going to make any apology for him, because I am quite convinced he is a man possessed of many very excellent qualifications. If he made rapid strides in the public service of New South Wales he has, at any rate, shown a way that a lot of lazy loafers connected with the public service ought to take advantage of. He did too much, that was the trouble. If the great bulk of those who at the present time use such strong words in attacking Mr. Stevens, and who claim that he received too rapid promotion in the service, had only followed his example, or preceded him by showing him an example, in place of being amongst those who are now complaining so bitterly, they might at the present moment be occupying a higher position than even he attained. The public service to-day has

degenerated as compared with what it was in years gone by. Under existing conditions encouragement is being given to men not to do their best but to simply go along in the old slipshod fashion that they have followed for so many years. Is it to be looked upon as a justification for a man being maltreated by a Minister or a Premier because he did not linger and loiter along the track? To-day in the public service encouragement is being given to the non-ambitious by reason of certain arrangements which were made only a few short months ago whereby certain men, after they have reached a certain stage of their existence in the public service and have passed a certain examination, can rest assured that they are provided for for life without doing anything further or making any legitimate attempt to increase the chances of their further promotion.

Major CONNELL: You mean the heads of departments?

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: No. The whole trouble about the Labour movement is that it has made the effort, and is still making the effort after it has been proved fallacious, to please everybody. There must be someone at the head of affairs. My hon. friend Mr. McKell was, I am sure, moved by the very best of intentions in relation to his treatment of those who are not public servants except that they are his Majesty's guests at Long Bay and elsewhere. He is going to wear out his soul case for the purpose of following what he considers to be the right course of action, that is, to give help to those poor devils who happen to be behind the bars. All these efforts that are being put forward by the Labour movement at the present time to ingratiate itself with a large section of people by giving them advantages are going to be wasted.

Mr. HORSINGTON: Yours is the only dissatisfied party. We are not trying to please the Nationalists!

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: I know that my hon. friend who has come from Broken Hill and discovered what a beautiful club Parliament House is, does not intend to allow his privileges to be taken from him without the hardest and most

vigorous fight. The hon. gentleman thinks that simply because he and I and others are in Parliament at the present time, we are here for the rest of our natural lives.

Mr. HORSINGTON: I know the Labour party is!

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: The hon. gentleman knows nothing. After a brief sojourn within this particular circle, although he may think he has acquired a knowledge of everything in the wide world, he really is still only in his political swaddling clothes, and is not in a position to say what will happen in the near future.

I do not want to go into the Stevens case because it has already been sufficiently ventilated, and I am not prone to repeating the stereotyped arguments of those who precede me.

Major CONNELL: Not in the same way, anyhow!

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: When twenty speakers have gone through a subject until they have threshed the very scales off the little fishes associated with that particular discussion, I have seen the hon. gentleman take the strongest possible exception when, with the idea of helping forward legislation, I have come along and made the shortest speech that could be made in a House constituted as this is. For three solid years, from 1922 to 1925, except when I was in charge of a bill or two in this House, I absolutely refused to make long speeches. My speeches were the most effective possible by reason of their brevity. The times when I came along from the Government rooms and moved that the hon. member be no further heard, or that the question be now put, were the only occasions when I ever saw on his visage a look which closely approached anger, and he is not generally that way inclined.

[Mr. Speaker left the chair at 1 p.m. The House resumed at 2.15 p.m.]

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: I have no desire to occupy the time of the House at any great length, although there are many things one might talk about with beneficial results. As I believe the debate will close to-morrow at something like a reasonable hour, I do not intend

Seventh day.

to occupy more time than I am fairly entitled to. The Governor's Speech is a very interesting document—it always is. It invariably makes reference to the things that are not going to be done, and omits to mention many of the things that will be done. For instance, I am given to understand that we are to have a new regime as far as this Chamber is concerned—that the oratory of many members is to be cut short in the flower of its youth. I am not going to object very strongly to the introduction of any scheme that will prevent long-winded members from speaking upon mere trivialities at unconscionable length. If the speeches of such members are curtailed, opportunities will be afforded to many other hon. members on both sides who will be able to offer valuable information to the House and the country. We have found it necessary in the interests of the country generally to make alterations in our standing orders from time to time, and I do not object to this being done so long as the rights of hon. members are not unduly interfered with. In days gone by hon. members had ample opportunities to express themselves, and were allowed to put their case before the House without interruption or interjection. I am not going to say that Parliament has degenerated in recent years, and I will admit that if the Government comes in with the object of doing business and of carrying out a scheme of legislation that will be advantageous to the people as a whole, it has the right to lay down the basis on which discussion shall take place, and if hon. members on the Government side are now prepared to do what they refused to do when they were on this side of the House—cut their speeches short and only speak when they have something to say—well, and good.

There are only two or three matters in which I am concerned at this stage. The first subject is the protection of our native flora, and among other subjects are fair rents and capital punishment. I notice that the Governor's Speech states, "My Ministers have taken certain action with a view to restoring confidence and contentment within the

[*Mr. J. C. L. Fitzpatrick.*]

public service." I will not attempt to criticise the actions of the Government which have been prominent subjects of comment for some weeks past, but I am under the impression that never in the history of the public service has there been more discontent than at present. Of course, we know that unless we give the public servants all they want there will always be a certain amount of discontent. Mr. Wills, the secretary of the Public Service Association, in his interviews with Mr. Bavin, made it clear that if the Nationalist Government was prepared to give the public servants all they asked for there would be contentment in the service. But no matter what the public servants got, they were not content.

Major CONNELL: They were not happy when you gave them all the "sack"!

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: We did not give them the "sack"; we only did what we conceived to be right in the interests of the people. We are informed in the Governor's Speech that Ministers are going to look after the public service. Do they know what they have undertaken. Do they know that there is no public servant who, unless he is dead, has ever been perfectly satisfied. I do not say that there are no "civil" servants. In the main the service is comprised of men with splendid qualifications. But having gravitated into the public service their ambition has been destroyed, and men who would have done well in other walks of life and become excellent manufacturers and successful men in connection with productive enterprise and industry, have degenerated by reason of the fact that they have got into a rut and imagining that they have a job which will last for ever have allowed things to slide. Since the Labour Government has been in power, which is a comparatively short space of time, it has put up a record. It has disposed of some of its alleged political opponents indiscriminately and thrust them into outer darkness. Men who were considered to be dangerous and who were not willing to see eye to eye with the party at present in power have been sent to the right about.

I notice my good friend Mr. Murphy just back from his honeymoon. If I am not out of order let me congratulate the hon. member. May his days be long in the land and in the days that are to come may he bring his bairns along to the House to learn the means by which they can become useful members of the community. Mr. Murphy was absent for a week or so. I was quite willing to pair with him during his absence and in the future if domestic duties call him away from the House again I shall be prepared to adopt the same course as an indication that whilst mountains may stand between us politically individually we entertain no feeling of antipathy in this House.

I know something of the trials and troubles which confront the members of the Government, but I was recently asked why it was that the Premier, having agreed to attend a little function at Gosford in company with other members of the Government, failed to turn up. Instead, I understand, they had a family reunion at the Zoo, where they fraternised with their friends and then returned to their Ministerial offices. One of the newspapers published a picture showing Mr. Lang opening the gate—he was standing very far off, I admit—which admitted into a cage a tigress just brought from Java. But as regards the invitation to Gosford, I believe Mr. O'Hearn invited the Premier, together with Mr. Baddeley and several other aristocratic members of the Labour party, to attend a function of great interest to the producing section of the community. But the Premier and his colleagues were conspicuous by their absence. They preferred to stay in Sydney and discuss matters of public moment with the inmates of the Zoo and show that they were infinitely more interested in the well-being of the animal life of the community than in the welfare of human life. This is not a matter upon which I would be prepared to move an additional vote of censure. I do not think I would be entitled.

MR. LANG:

MR. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: After the censure motion is over the Premier will

find that I shall be ready to assist him to carry out certain portions of his programme—to carry them out on a shutter. The constituents of the hon. member Mr. O'Hearn said it was no use asking him to take exception to the attitude of the Government on this matter, because no matter what the Government did in connection with his constituency, he would offer no objection. So I was requested to bring the matter before the notice of the House, and I have done it, for the simple reason that I always carry out a promise—so long as it does not involve too much obligation.

Yesterday I came across, in a newspaper, a reference to a matter in which I am very definitely interested. The paper used to be the *Daily Mail*; to-day it is the *Labor Daily*. It dealt with a question in relation to which several inquiries have recently been made from my side of the House, as to whether it was not a fact that the Premier had taken up a certain attitude regarding the appointment of future State governors. Up to the present we have not been able to obtain a satisfactory answer from Mr. Lang. The idea is that in place of State Governors being appointed by the Imperial authorities, they shall in future be appointed locally. Well, I do not know that it makes very much difference. I do not know that there is much to cavil at in any proposition of a reasonable character in that direction; but I do know that as long as we have vice-regal representatives of the type of Governors de Chair, Davidson, and others, we may feel reasonably assured that we shall get something in the shape of a fair deal. But assuming this system were brought into existence straight away, while the present Government is in power—

AN HON. MEMBER: Willis as State Governor!

MR. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: I have no desire to say anything against any hon. gentleman, whether he is the Vice-President of the Executive Council or any other person associated with the Labour party, but I would like to know what object hon. members who are so silent at the present moment have in

Seventh day.

view. The newspaper I refer to, which is the Bible of my hon. friends on the other side of the House, said, referring to charity:

The social butterflies who thus use that honorable word are pleased to know that St. Peter said, "Charity shall cover a multitude of sins." They supply the sins in full measure. The charities of Australia can be maintained without the aid of governors who bring with them the bias, arrogance, or snobbery of the British ruling class. Our cities are already infested with as much snobbery as some British provincial towns. Audiences of the so-called "smart set," and the shoddy, self-styled "intelligentsia," have bayed with adulatory admiration of the invisible alleged "talent" of members of the families of governors from Britain. Fawning, flattery, flunkeyism, falseness—all these are fostered by bringing into this country those who desire to transplant still more snobbery into Australia.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is not that disloyal?

MR. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: That is not regarded as disloyal in certain circles. Anything that can be said in order to depreciate Great Britain and its great traditions and institutions is looked upon not as disloyalty but loyalty to the particular party these gentlemen represent. They do not mind. What was all that row that took place recently about the issue of tickets to the Fleet functions? We had a great number of these gentry complaining through the press that they were left out in the cold, cruel world instead of being supplied with all means necessary, to enable them to take part in the festivities.

MR. HORSINGTON:

MR. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: The hon. member is alleged to have had seventeen tickets for his friends from Broken Hill. I do not object to his friends from Broken Hill being supplied with all necessary means to enable them to take part in the festivities, but I do object to his, and to the paper with which he is associated, perpetually girding at what are regarded in Great Britain and ought to be regarded in Great Britain's dependencies as traditions. Time after time in this Chamber when an officer has come from another Chamber to present a call to the Speaker we have had

[Mr. J. C. L. Fitzpatrick.

the spectacle of hon. members deriding his office. Until an alteration is made in the methods which have prevailed for a long time past that official ought to be received by hon. members, be they socialists or demagogues or mere Labourites, in at least a spirit of decency. We have had that official insulted times out of number even by men who to-day are members of the Government, because in the performance of his duty he has come here garbed according to tradition and has carried a staff—because, in short, he has observed the regulations laid down to be observed, and to depart from which to the slightest extent would probably render him subject to the pains and penalties that Mr. Stevens has suffered. Yet the same people go to a place not very far from here where they see a gentleman wandering about dressed in silk and fine linen and wearing a green hat on his head. They acknowledge that to be proper, but if anyone else pursues the same course they adopt a very different attitude. Several times I have been on the point of bringing this matter up here, but have refrained. Now, however, in view of this newspaper article it is time some one stood up for the traditions and the welfare of British institutions. Every great institution has some method that has been adopted for the purpose of indicating the type or the character of its officers.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Chinese have their Joss!

MR. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: Yes. Those who belong to the order of Odd-fellows or any organisation to promote and encourage good conduct know they have something of the kind. I merely mention these things for the purpose of proving to hon. members on the Government side that their attitude is democracy run mad. There is no need for it. If the occupant of the chair feels inclined to wear the traditional garments that have been associated with the position for ages no one would take the slightest exception to it. You do not make yourself a democrat by girding at everything that is decent. I have always held these views and they have the concurrence and support of every decent man

connected with the Labour party—of course, not with all; Providence has so ordained.

There was a wild, frantic rush, on the part of a number of people who are always decrying snobbery and conservative institutions, for the loaves and fishes that were kicking about at the time. When the American Fleet was here much space was taken up in the newspapers in making public the complaints of a number of my hon. friends on the other side of the House who did not get access here, there, and everywhere. I am not going to say anything against Mr. Cann, whose opportune arrival in the Chamber has suggested to me a few words in regard to the good work he did. He was present at every function.

AN HON. MEMBER: No; he was away ill for a while!

MR. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: Yes, he got sick—too many functions. He looked the part, but he was not asked to “part”—everything came his way. He saw that a fair and reasonable distribution of all the good things of this life was made. With regard to the wild outburst of many of those left out in the cold, if any application was made to him he met it as far as he could. But judging from this paper there was trouble in the Amen Corner:

There was much amused comment at the Trades Hall yesterday, over the fact that certain prominent members of the “red” element have been making themselves prominent, also, at Fleet functions although the Council had decided to boycott these gatherings.

The Trades Hall could not keep them away. They stampeded with a wild rush, into the Town Hall, into the theatres, on to the ships, and anywhere else where there was a free feed and a chance of making merry.

One story told which occasioned much laughter was that a certain man was seen at the Fleet ball on Monday, standing very close to the Vice-Regal party. It is stated that at the Council's meeting to-morrow several “reds” will be questioned upon their temporary change of colour.

I had invitations to all those functions, but I did not go to all of them, and I did not make any noise about it. I kept religiously, or irreligiously, away, and I

was all the better for it, because I never got sick during the whole course of the festivities. The only thing I got sick of seeing was the wild demand to be present at these functions, which was made by those who are our opponents in politics. They say in their newspaper:

Famine, flattery, flunkeyism, falseness—all these are fostered by bringing into this country those who desire to transplant still more snobbery into Australia.

Then we read a statement with regard to the Lord Mayor's ball, which relates to the dresses that were worn. It would be good reading, but I will not mention the names, because they are names of ladies.

MR. CANN: This has nothing to do with the censure motion!

MR. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: I am showing that all this infernal flummery of hon. members opposite in connection with the Labour movement, and against those who occupy higher positions, is so much arrant hypocrisy, and that when the trough is full their snouts are into it earlier than anybody else's. When there is a full pail of swill I will guarantee they will be there first. I have here a list of gentlemen who want to get into the Upper House. No doubt some of them will get there, though there was a time up till comparatively recently when they could not get candidates.

AN HON. MEMBER: How many names are on that list?

MR. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: Three hundred and seventy-eight, and they come from every part of New South Wales—from Thackaringa down to Gypsy Point, on the borders of Victoria. Every chap who ever pasted up a bill for W. A. Holman or anybody else associated with the Labour movement in days gone by considers himself justified in putting in an application for appointment to the Upper House, as a stalwart Labour man. There are three men here who were instrumental in manufacturing the sliding-panels to the ballot boxes. They say, no doubt, that they have put so many men into Parliament that there is no reason why they themselves should not now be appointed to the Legislative

Seventh day.

Council. There is no pay attached to it; but they are confident that they could eke out a living in some way, and that they would be in good company.

I intend to vote for this amendment of censure. If I had the slightest justification for shirking my duty as a representative of the people I might give the Government the benefit of the doubt, but in this case there is no doubt. There is nothing that hon. gentlemen opposite could give me that would enable them to secure my vote. When the time comes I shall have the privilege of giving that vote in a way which, I hope, will relegate hon. members on the other side of the House to that obscurity they are so well fitted to adorn.

Major CONNELL (Newcastle) [3.3 p.m.]: I am sure the House will appreciate the strength of the case against the present Government after listening to the hon. member who has just resumed his seat. He made a telling indictment, in which he covered a very wide range of subjects, from a visit to the Zoo to the staff and appurtenances of office of the Serjeant-at-Arms. He roamed everywhere without accusing the Government of anything at all, and this may well be taken as an indication of the strength of the indictment which his party has to offer against the Government.

This morning we listened to a very eloquent speech by the new lady member of this House, and I should like to make just a brief reference to it. I am sure we are all very much interested, not only from the fact that the hon. member's oratorical ability is far above the average, but that she represents a viewpoint of and puts the case for, at any rate, a certain section of the women of our community. She touched upon matters which she complained had no place in the Governor's Speech—matters which must be recognised by all sections of this House as being very important—dealing with the mothers and the children of this community. As far as the welfare of those is concerned, I say that all members listened sympathetically to what she had to say. It is strange, though, after hearing her plea for the widows and the wives and

children of the working-men of our community, to find her in political company which has done nothing at all for the workers of the State; to find her in company with those who have always fought the working-men when they endeavoured to improve the conditions of those belonging to them. After all, it is not sympathy these people require. We are not going to do away with the ills that were referred to by the hon. member by expressing sympathy for them. The basic root of the whole trouble is economic, and unless we deal with the facts that hit them and cause these conditions, which are a grave economic danger, we are not going to improve their position at all. Reference was made to widows' pensions, and the fact that the Premier is said to be imposing conditions with regard to granting those pensions. I well remember the remark of the leader of the Opposition when that pension scheme was first mooted. The first criticism offered by Sir George Fuller when Mr. Lang made his announcement of pensions to widows was a jocular reference to what old Mr. Weller said to Sam Weller, "Beware of the widows." That, I say, was a very apt reference as showing the attitude of our opponents towards this scheme. The fact that the then Premier could treat a subject of that kind with jocularly exemplifies very well the attitude of the party that gentleman stands for. If Miss Preston-Stanley wishes to improve the lot of those whose case she so eloquently advocated this morning, she is not going to do so by allying herself with those who are not prepared to do anything for them.

Mr. BENNETT: A little heaven will leaven the whole mass!

Major CONNELL: It all depends on having good material to work on. If the good material is not there, the leaven is apt to exhaust itself. I noticed one remark in which the hon. member referred to the hard conditions which the wife of the average working-man had to live under. She referred to the wife of a working-man, a woman with six children, not only having to work long hours every day, having to provide and care for her family, but at night having to put up with a bear of a working-man.

[*Mr. J. C. L. Fitzpatrick.*]

I suppose all men are bears of a kind—at any rate we are told they are—but the question resolves itself into this: that working-man, with his family of six to keep, if he happens to be a bear at all—and I suppose he is neither more nor less a bear than anyone else is—is so because of the conditions under which he works, and because he has to keep that family of eight on the wage of £4 4s. a week, which at the present time the Board of Trade says is sufficient with which to do so. What hon. member who is conversant with the conditions under which the breadwinners on the basic wage have to rear a family can expect anything else, when they know the conditions in regard to unemployment, looking for work, often being out of work, not averaging the basic wage or anything near the basic wage, in their efforts to rear their families? Sympathy is all very well. We want better conditions. We are told that the rate of infantile mortality is too high. What percentage of that infantile mortality is due to malnutrition? What percentage is due to the fact that the mother has not had sufficient or proper food to eat? We are not going to improve conditions merely by regarding the matter from the sympathetic standpoint; we must take steps to remedy the social order of things which allows such conditions to be possible.

The Government has been attacked for many things on this censure motion, and some very interesting explanations have been made by hon. members opposite as to why the late Government was beaten at the elections. The only thought in the minds of a big majority of people outside is why the opportunity to beat them did not come long ago. One of the chief grounds of criticism levelled against the present Government is its attitude with regard to the 1917 strikers. I had been under the impression that this was settled by the leader of the present Opposition who, for the time being at any rate, assumed the role of a Mussolini, a role which he found it very difficult if not impossible to live up to later on. But we find, on the evidence of some of the members of this House, Mr. Sanders and Mr. Stuart, that they were so overcome

by intense loyalty to their country at that time that, regardless of the consequences, whatever they might be, in the face of all the danger that faced our country at that particular time, they decided to stay at home and organise men to do other men's work. They have told us how they broke the strike. Mr. Sanders told us with great gusto how he was one of those who broke the strike of 1917. These two gentlemen assured us that they were among those who rendered this great victory possible.

Mr. SANDERS: He was not alone in it, either!

Major CONNELL: I would say you would need a good many colleagues if you were to do the work of the men who were out. At any rate, these men who were so overcome by patriotic fervour that at all hazards and all risk of danger to life and limb, they had to stay here and tour the country, organising men to do other men's work; these men who took all the risks incidental to that great enterprise, who, at a time when the Empire was in peril, as they have told us, went through the country, and are proud of the fact that they raised so many men, regardless of personal danger and personal consequences—

Mr. SANDERS: We would do it again!

Major CONNELL: Possibly, but if there were 100 men out, you would want 10,000 men like yourself to do the work, and then the work would be very imperfectly done. These men telling us of the great victory which they achieved in 1917 remind us of another great victory which was achieved. Going back over a century, we find that a great victory was won at Waterloo, we are told, by that well-known historical personage known as Bill Adams. These gentlemen who come forward and tell us what they did in 1917 are rather reminiscent of that distinguished gentleman who won the battle of Waterloo.

Mr. SANDERS: There is no comparison whatever!

Major CONNELL: Well, perhaps I am flattering you, we will let it go at that. Sir George Fuller and Mr. Bavin said their Government did not act vindictively.

Seventh day.

Nor is the hangman animated by any such desire, but the fact that he does not act vindictively is no consolation to those who fall into his clutches. Bitter persecution has at all times been waged by men who claim to be acting from the very best of motives—in some cases even under Divine inspiration.

Mr. BENNETT: You would not compare the 1917 strikers with criminals who come within the clutches of the hangman?

Major CONNELL: No, but I compare those who treated the strikers unjustly with criminals. Mr. Bavin went to considerable trouble to lead this House to believe that he and the late Premier had not acted vindictively, but had acted from a keen sense of justice. There is no character in history who has been guilty of any persecution who might not have made the same claim probably just as sincerely. The fact remains they did say, and in their policy they gave effect to their view, that the men who went on strike in 1917 should for all time be punished for what they had done. When the report of Mr. Justice Edmunds was laid on the table of this House, Ministers made a pretense of carrying out his recommendations. They relegated this duty to one of their most sympathetic members, Mr. Bavin, and with that sympathy which has characterised the whole of his activities in connection with labour matters, he did carry it into effect—he carried it outside and did nothing more in regard to it.

Mr. SCOTT FELL: Many of the strikers were incompetent. Those who were repentant went back!

Major CONNELL: The man who does a thing without sufficient knowledge of what he is doing and then goes round squealing for the sake of pleasing the boss, and says he is repentant and sorry for what he did can have applied to him only one word which is used in polite society.

Mr. SCOTT FELL: They had not the moral courage to stand up to the instructions of the union secretaries and president!

Major CONNELL: I am aware that my hon. friend is a very able exponent

[Major Connell.

of moral courage and moral attributes generally, but I would advise him to confine himself to the inculcation of moral principles by means of the crossword puzzles which he has so strongly advocated recently. A point that has not been raised in connection with the reinstatement of the 1917 strikers is that by reinstating these men the present Government will be doing something in the interests of the efficiency of the whole railway service.

Mr. SCOTT FELL: There will be another strike in six months!

Major CONNELL: Possibly so, but as we have a Labour Government in power that is very unlikely. It is well known that in the ranks of the 1917 strikers there were men who were keen advocates of the strike when it was first mooted, and there were also men who were opposed to it, but who were afterwards influenced by the majority vote of their fellow workmen and came into line with them. But apart from this, in the ranks of the strikers were the best men in the railway service. I mean the best men from every point of view, both personally and in regard to their positions in the service. These men were in every way the most reliable and efficient men in the service.

Mr. SCOTT FELL:

Major CONNELL: A number of the men were put back after the strike, but the point is that superior men were put into inferior jobs because inferior men had previously been put into the superior jobs. These men who went back were forced by economic conditions, because they had families to keep, to take what was offered to them. Men who had been acting as foremen were placed in positions of inferiority to others who were not fit to hold their jobs, and we say that the restoration of seniority to these men will be a good thing for the service. The claim is being made by our opponents that they acted justly. They did not act justly, but brutally and without any discrimination whatever. We have been told something about the card system. But after all the question of the

card system is not material to the consideration of the restoration of the strikers.

Mr. ARKINS: It was against the card system they struck!

Major CONNELL: I am not concerned at present with the cause of the strike, and although I know that not only the card system was involved, I am not going into that matter now. The point as to whether the card system is good or bad is not the question at issue, and whether Sir George Fuller or Mr. Bavin acted from a spirit of vindictiveness is not the point either. The point is whether they acted justly in trying to penalise these men for all time. We say they did not act justly, and that it is in the best interests of efficiency that the seniority of these men should be restored. Many of the union men believed that the best interests of the union would not be served by striking, whilst others believed that it would be best to strike. Many men in the different unions were opposed to the view that a strike would be in the interests of their particular organisation, and in their union meetings and by their personal influence amongst members they did their best to prevent a strike from taking place. Whether they were right or wrong is immaterial. The point is, that when the strike took place those men, recognising that the majority had decided in favour of it, saw that the best thing they could do to preserve the essential solidarity of their organisations was to bow to the view of the majority. Yet those men were penalised in the same way as the others. I commend the Premier for what he has done. He has given an assurance that anomalies will be rectified, and by doing that the Government has earned the approval of the men in the railway service and at the same time defined its attitude towards the union movement throughout the State.

I wish to refer for a moment to the negotiations which are at present taking place between the Premier and the Prime Minister. Negotiations were started before this Government came into office for

the construction of a floating dock at Newcastle; and those negotiations are still pending. I would urge upon the Premier and the Cabinet the absolute necessity of pushing forward with that work at the earliest possible moment, and thus help to absorb large numbers of men in the iron trades who are at present unemployed, and at the same time bring to the State work which otherwise would not come to the State or the Commonwealth.

Mr. SCOTT FELL: You will make a great loss. The depth is not there for a floating dock!

Major CONNELL: It is evident the hon. member knows nothing about the matter or he would not make such an absurd interjection. The proposal has been fully considered, it has been the subject of report on more than one occasion, and the consensus of opinion is that the dock should be established in the interests of the State. Many boats which come to load coal are unable to find a berth for a day or two. Whilst they were waiting they would be only too glad to carry out work at the dock if it were there; so that in the interests of large numbers of men engaged in the various iron and steel trades I hope the Government will push forward with the work.

We have heard a good deal during the debate of the Government's alleged policy of "spoils to the victors." It is one of the grounds for complaint against the Government advanced by our opponents, and cases have been cited which were presumed to support the suggestion that the Government had entered upon a policy of "spoils to the victors." One particular case was that of Mr. MacDougal, who was removed from the position of Comptroller of Prisons. We were told that the action of the Government in his case and in insisting upon certain other changes in the public service was viewed with alarm by public servants generally. I have here the *Public Service Journal* of 15th July of this year,

Seventh day.

in which appears a brief reference to the matter. In an editorial article the journal says:

We compliment the Government on the prompt way in which it gave effect to the promise of Mr. McKell, in regard to the position of Comptroller of Prisons.

AN HON. MEMBER: You would expect that from that journal!

Major CONNELL: Knowing that what had been done was a fair and proper thing and in the interests of the service generally, we would expect some commendation for the action the Government has taken.

The association has nothing against Mr. MacDougall. He is an officer whose ability is beyond question, but his appointment as Comptroller of Prisons was a negation of a principle for which the association has always stood in relation to specialist staffs such as the Prisons staff. We pressed the claims of Mr. Steele, for the reason that he had temporarily carried out the duties of Comptroller on several occasions, and that he would never have risen to the high position he holds in the Public Service unless he possessed administrative ability and a thorough grasp of the requirements of the Prisons Department.

One would imagine that this policy which has been described as one of "spoils to the victors" was an innovation, and that hon. members opposite when in power appointed men to positions in the public service regardless of their political opinions. Reference has been made in the course of the debate to the summary way in which Mr. Akhurst was dismissed from the position of secretary.

Mr. LANE: Was he ever a public servant?

Major CONNELL: He held the position for two years, and did the work attaching to the office. That being the case and seeing he was paid for the work it matters little whether the hon. member thinks he was a public servant or not. Hon. members opposite were indignant, but in spite of the explanation offered by Mr. Bruntnell, I ask why was Mrs. Dwyer removed from the University Senate? He made a certain lengthy explanation. He said she had been removed for this or that reason, but the fact remains that a woman who had spent the best years of her life in doing splendid service, especially for the working

[Major Connell.

women of this country, and whose appointment to that position was a recognition of such service, was removed because she was and always had been a supporter of the Labour party, while a woman who had been a supporter of the Nationalist party was put in her place.

Then there is the matter which was referred to here last session, when a coroner was appointed at Gilgandra on the recommendation of men who did not come from the electorate at all. Mr. Dunn and Mr. Thorby, members for the district, the residents and different bodies there, and the local police magistrates, were all ignored. Mr. Oakes and Mr. Lee, who represented city electorates, were able successfully to press the claims of a man whose principal qualification was that he was a good Nationalist. Great exception has been taken to the fact that one man who was prominent in the Labour movement, Mr. Smith, has been appointed to the Board of Fire Commissioners. What did our friends do? They appointed Mr. Farrar, who is and has been for some years one of the most active supporters of the Nationalist party. Then we had a New States Royal Commission. We have heard a good deal of talk about the present Government offering bribes to the electors. There never was a more deliberate or less justifiable bribe than the one offered by the Nationalists for the support of the Country party to keep them in office. Who were appointed on the New States Commission?

Mr. LANE: You voted for it!

Major CONNELL: Is that so? Did I vote for the people who were on it? There was Mr. Holman, who drew £3,500 in fees from the commission.

AN HON. MEMBER: Lucky fellow!

Major CONNELL: Yes, lucky in that he happened to be a friend of the party in power. The other gentlemen were very lucky also, in the same way. Mr. Nicholas drew a good sum in fees. There was Mr. Yarwood, who has supported the late Government in the city press for years.

Mr. LANE: A very able man!

Major CONNELL: I am not questioning it. I am only saying what a coincidence it is that all these gentlemen who were members of that commission happened also to be supporters of the party to which you belong. Mr. Astley was secretary of the Nationalist organisation at Dubbo.

Mr. FITZSIMONS: There is a great difference between appointing men to a new commission, and sacking men in order to put others in their places!

Major CONNELL: That is all very well, but the cry is "spoils to the victors." By the way there was another appointment—that of Mr. Sinclair, a prominent member of the then Progressive party.

An HON. MEMBER: A good man, too!

Major CONNELL: I am not saying he is not. I am drawing attention to the remarkable coincidence that all these appointments were made by the late Government—far more than they have accused us of making, and that now the cry of "spoils to the victors" is raised. We remember a cement contract which went through this House some time ago, in spite of the bitterest opposition from hon. members now on the Government side. Prominent Nationalists were directors of the cement company, and these, together with their co-directors, were enabled to use the name of the Government to help them float their company—a thing without parallel in the history of this State.

Mr. JAKES: You can still get some shares!

Major CONNELL: Possibly. Evidently the "boost" they got by using the Government's name has not been sufficient. How would the company have got on if the Government's name had not been used?

Mr. SCOTT FELL: There is no suggestion of dishonesty, is there?

Major CONNELL: I will say that it is quite in accordance with the ethics of commercialism. You talk about "spoils to the victors." What about the fact that some of the most prominent supporters of the Nationalist party in this State stood to gain a very large sum by reason of the fact that the name of the

Government was used in order to float that company and induce people to take up shares in it.

Mention has been made also during the course of the debate of a Mr. Stevens. In fact the bankruptcy of the Opposition in its attack upon this Government can be directly gauged by the fact that practically every member of the Opposition who has risen has had something to say about Mr. Stevens. I would suggest that a handsome testimonial should be presented to that gentleman, and that he is entitled to far greater compensation than he got. He is entitled to compensation from hon. members opposite, for so little argument has been brought forward in connection with anything else, that if it had not been for Mr. Stevens we should have had no censure motion. The case with regard to Mr. Stevens was answered very effectively by the Premier and by Mr. Tully. After all, is Mr. Stevens sacrosanct? Are we to take it that what has been laboured so much this afternoon as "British justice" is to apply to Mr. Stevens and to nobody else?

Mr. SCOTT FELL: It should apply to all!

Major CONNELL: Good. I am glad to see that my hon. friend has mended his ways. The hon. member Miss Preston-Stanley, speaking this morning, referred to the fact that Mr. Lang had dismissed twenty-six employees of the Taxation Department. The fact of the matter is that owing to the exemption being raised in the Federal sphere of income taxation from £250 to £300, they were able to do with a smaller staff than they had. Of those twenty-six employees twenty-five have already been found employment in other departments, and the other one has been compensated with £2,000.

Mr. LANE: That is exactly what happened to Mr. Stevens!

Major CONNELL: Then what are you complaining about? We have heard a lot about British justice, and have been told that Mr. Stevens has not been treated properly. I agree to that. He has been treated too well. We have heard that

Seventh day.

Mr. Stevens should have received British justice. But what about all the men he dispensed with. I was in this House last year when the matter was brought up—when Mr. Stevens and his ally, Mr. Spence, were particularly busy in connection with what was called the re-organisation of the Printing Office and the Treasurer's Department. Hon. members then sitting on the Opposition side of the House protested most strongly against the treatment that was being meted out to those employees; but what support did we get from the other side? Not one member of all those who have lashed themselves into a fury over the treatment of Mr. Stevens got up in the House and had one word to say in regard to those employees. They were not put out with £2,000 by way of a consolation prize. They were put out with much less than Mr. Stevens got. The big majority of them, I should say the whole of them, were men in a far worse position financially than Mr. Stevens happens to be, many of them on the bread-line, but we seem to have arrived at the stage that when one man receives treatment which some think is not what he is entitled to there is a great cry from the other side for British justice, yet when a number of men were treated in a far worse manner, not one word was raised in the House by those same members.

MR. SCOTT FELL:

Major CONNELL: I notice my hon. friend is very much annoyed, and yet he took no part by voice or vote in doing anything for those men. We have heard there is discontent in the public service. It may be so, but those who are in the public service do not think so, and those are the men who know. They possibly know just as much about it as my friends opposite. In the last issue of the *Public Service Journal* they say:

Since Mr. Lang became Premier a section of the press and certain politicians have developed an unusual solicitude for the welfare of the public servant. Because Mr. Lang has determined, as far as possible, to undo the mistakes of the last Government in regard to the public service, the cry is raised by his opponents of "Spoils to the victors." Rather should it be "Spoiling the victors."—Victors who gained an official victory at the expense of their fellow

officers. So far the present Government have done nothing to justify this newborn concern for our welfare. Moreover, the Premier has personally assured the association that the rights of public servants are in no way menaced by his Government.

On the other hand, the public service is about to receive, at the hands of the Labour Government, the much prized restoration to the Arbitration Court, and an independent appeals board.

It is quite apparent that public servants have a great deal to gain from the public service policy of Mr. Lang and his Government, and that the present Administration is a cause for congratulation rather than commiseration.

That, I should say, should be an effective answer to those who have had so much to say with regard to the policy of the present Government and the effect on the public service of this State. During the time the present Government has been in office several acts of an administrative character have been attacked. As a matter of fact, an attack has necessarily been levelled against the administrative acts of the present Government because this is the first session. Considerable exception has been taken to the fact that the Government intends to introduce a Forty-four Hours Bill. I do not propose to go into the merits of that bill just now—it will be debated at great length later on—but I merely wish to point out that Mr. Bruntnell said that his party had been accused of having taken away the forty-four hours from the workers of this State and he read a list showing a large number of organisations which had not been deprived by the late Government of the forty-four hours. I should imagine that Mr. Bruntnell would find no difficulty in saying that what his Government regarded as a good thing for a number of organisations should be extended to a large number of others. The ex-Premier endeavoured to show that as a result of the introduction of forty-four hours, unemployment had increased in the State, and he proceeded to show, by reference to the figures of the Commonwealth Statistician, that things had improved considerably since he came into office. The only trouble, so far as the Premier's figures were concerned, was that he did not go on long enough. Sir

[Major Connell.]

George Fuller very wisely read the figures that suited him but neglected to give the figures for the last four or five quarters, which showed that for the first quarter, January to March last year, unemployment increased to 10.6 of members of trade-unions; in the June quarter 11.9; in the September quarter 13.5; in the December quarter 14.3. In 1925, in the March quarter it was 13.2 and the June quarter 12.7. I merely mention these figures because the hon. member was endeavouring to show that during the term of his office much had been done towards the reduction of unemployment, but, as I have said, he neglected to give the whole of the figures in connection with the case.

I just wish to show that the administrative acts of this Government have been such as to earn the approval of those who put it into Parliament. We have had a Coal Mines Commission appointed. Some exception has been taken to the appointment of the Coal Mines Commission and some criticism has been levelled against it. Why, the last Government spent £50,000 on a New States Commission and a Railway Commission, which gave us practically nothing at all. At any rate, the New States Commission gave us nothing and left us just where we were before. Perhaps I am wrong in saying it gave us nothing, because it gave our friends on the Opposition side security of tenure while they remained in power.

AN HON. MEMBER: Have you read the report?

Major CONNELL: No, but I know you did nothing with regard to it and did not intend to. Approximately £50,000 was spent on those two commissions. We now have an inquiry into a matter which is of some concern; that is, the conditions with regard to the safe working of coal-mines. In this respect we stand far behind other countries in the world, in spite of the fact that we have frequently boasted that in industrial legislation we lead the world. As a result of this commission, I hope and believe we will be able to give conditions which will be as good as it is possible to give men in that dangerous occupation.

Mr. JAKES: Can you tell us why Mr. Baddeley asked for the inquiry to be stopped—the commission you have just referred to?

Major CONNELL: He has not asked for it to be stopped. Mr. Jaques is mixing up two things. Mr. Baddeley has not stopped this commission. Mr. Kitching appeared before another commission altogether; he appeared before a conciliation committee which was inquiring into matters connected with the steel works at Newcastle. The commission was going on and is going on at the present time. I hope that later the Government will deal not only with the question of safe working conditions, but with another matter which is of great importance, the question of the distribution of coal once it is out of the mines; the question of seeing that the coal is distributed throughout the State in such a way that it is delivered to consumers at a reasonable price; and, further, the question of the whole control of the industry and whether the present form of control is in the interests of the people of the State or not. Private inquiries along those lines show such is not the case.

I wish to commend the action of the Minister for Education in abolishing high-school fees. Mr. Bruntnell made the claim that his Government had done everything necessary towards ensuring that no child would be debarred from attending a high school because his parents were not able to pay the fees. Let me remind hon. members that Mr. Bruntnell condemned his own policy throughout the whole of his regime. From the time when he first decided to reimpose high-school fees until the end of last year Mr. Bruntnell allowed an exemption of £250. Right at the end of last year, with an election in sight, Mr. Bruntnell increased that exemption from £250 to £312 a year.

Mr. BRUNTNELL: That was long before the elections!

Major CONNELL: It came into operation only this year, when the election was in sight. However, apart from when it came into operation, the fact that the late Minister increased the exemption

Seventh day.

shows that his previous policy was wrong. After having gone on for two or two and a half years with the exemption at £250, he recognised that his policy was inflicting injustice on many children of poor parents and he increased the exemption as I have stated. Another matter of great importance is now receiving the attention of the Minister for Education and Cabinet. As hon. members know, and particularly those representing country constituencies, there is a shortage of teachers throughout New South Wales. The late Minister reduced the allowance to students in training as teachers from £80 to £50. During the time Mr. Mutch was in office previously £90 was the allowance for young men or women who went in for training for the teaching profession, but Mr. Bruntnell reduced this allowance to £50 and in this way has undoubtedly deprived large numbers of brilliant young men and women of the opportunity of entering the education service. I hope the present Minister will restore the allowance to the amount which was formerly paid. If he does this, he will go a long way towards relieving the present shortage of teachers. I am glad to say that Mr. Mutch has also in many cases restored the travelling allowances which were denied to children attending country schools. The policy of the Labour party has been to convey children to schools where schools cannot be taken to the children. Mr. Mutch has restored this subsidy in many cases and has acted consistently with the general policy of the party. Practically the whole of the administrative acts of this Government have been such that they have convinced the supporters of the Labour movement outside that what they were promised by the Premier and the party before the elections will be carried into effect. If these promises are carried out, as they undoubtedly will be, they will operate in the best interests of the State generally, and if the Government only shows the same energy and activity it has so markedly displayed up to the present time in carrying into effect the platform of the party, I am quite satisfied that when its

[Major Connell.

three years' term of office has been completed, it will have earned the support of the great majority of the people.

Mr. WEARNE (Namoi) [3.59 p.m.]: So much has been said during the last week or so concerning mandates, defeats and victories, that I am somewhat tired of the whole thing. So far as I am concerned, as the representative of an important constituency, the people have had an opportunity of expressing their views at the ballot box, the Government which was in office has been placed in opposition and a Labour Government has come into power, and in view of the declaration which has been made here by Mr. Kay, who was elected as an independent member and who has signified his intention of supporting the Government, I am quite satisfied that the vote on the censure motion can result in only one way. I am prepared to accept the position and to permit the Government to go on with the business of the country. I am not for a moment condemning the motion of censure. It was necessary that such a motion should be moved, but I think matters generally have been fairly well discussed, and I do not intend to refer to any questions except those in connection with which the late Ministry and myself have been referred to. I am not suggesting that the debate should be closed, but I am prepared to confine my remarks to matters in which I am personally interested and to afterwards get down to business and see what the Government is made of. I do not think the Government has a shadow of a chance of carrying into effect many of the promises it has made. However, it must be held responsible for that and must be given a chance to carry out its policy.

If the people who come here to listen to our debates have been as much impressed as I have been, I wonder why they come here at all. Mr. McTiernan remarked that when Mr. Bavin spoke I had been cast aside to allow Mr. Bavin to address the House. I was not cast aside either to allow Mr. Bavin to speak or in so far as the position of the deputy-leadership of the Opposition was concerned. It is well known that after the

elections I was not very well, and I was told by my medical adviser that I must absent myself from Parliament for a time, I was not here at the opening of Parliament and when it became necessary for someone to support the leader of the Opposition it was decided that Mr. Bavin should do so, and it was only natural that he should deal specially with the case of Mr. Stevens, who was under the control of his department. Mr. McTiernan tried to make capital out of the supposition that Mr. Bavin had taken my place. It was known that I had not intended to accept any position except that of an ordinary member of the Opposition, on account of the advice given me by my medical adviser. But after having had a rest I felt a little better, and when it became known that I was ready to accept the position of deputy-leader I was appointed with the unanimous approval of the members of the Opposition, of whom no one was more pleased than Mr. Bavin. If Mr. McTiernan, at the end of his term, can command the confidence of his colleagues to the same degree that Mr. Bavin commanded the confidence of his colleagues, he will be a lucky man. If his colleagues can congratulate him upon having had as honorable a career as Attorney-General as Mr. Bavin has had, he will be in a very proud position.

The Premier, in his speech, made reference to matters affecting returned soldiers. I do not in any way wish to attack the Government on this point, but I want to sound a word of warning to the Premier and his colleagues in connection with certain statements he has made. So far as returned soldiers are concerned when I took office three years ago it was certainly not a pleasant task to have to deal with the soldier settlements. The state of affairs which existed was no one's fault, but matters had been allowed to go on and someone had to step in and clear them up. I did the best I could with the help of the officers of the department; therefore I know a good deal about the position. Amongst many other things the Government did to assist returned soldiers was to give them the right to a revaluation of the capital value of their

holdings. That applied not only to soldiers who had obtained land from the Crown but also to those who were settled on purchased land. In cases where land was purchased at the request of a soldier at a price less in many cases than he was prepared to give, the Government still gave him the right, along with other returned soldiers, to a revaluation of his holding.

Mr. O'Hearn: What Government originally did that?

Mr. WEARNE: The Government previously in power gave the right to a revaluation, but I extended it and made it apply not only to soldiers who originally obtained through the Crown but to every other returned soldier. Each and every one was given the right to apply for a reappraisalment of the capital value of his holding. Further a board was appointed to deal with the valuations. I appointed an independent chairman, and although it was not laid down in the Act that returned soldiers should be represented on the board the Secretary of the Returned Soldiers Association was made a member—we could not be more liberal than that—whilst the third member is to be a local resident. That board commenced its work in April or May of this year at Casino on the Dyraba estate—an estate purchased for returned soldiers. Originally ninety-seven blocks were allotted. Of that number, although each holder has the right to apply for the reappraisalment of the value of his block sixty-four lodged appeals against the valuation. The board went to Casino and sat—and it was the first place at which it dealt with these applications. Of the sixty-four appellants forty-two agreed to the valuation. Some accepted the valuation as it was placed before the court whilst others after consideration amicably agreed to the valuation. The remaining twenty-two decided to call evidence in order to try to arrive at a true valuation. A few days after the election and before it was known which party would be returned to power I received a telegram which induces me to impress upon the Premier and the Minister the necessity of proceeding with great caution before

Seventh day.

attempting to deal with these valuations in any way other than is laid down in the Act. The telegram I received was sent by Mr. Kissane, the solicitor who appeared on behalf of the returned soldiers:

Dyraaba Soldiers' Settlement. Hold telegram from Mr. Lang in relation to Dyraaba, that his policy is writing down amount of soldiers' indebtedness to point at which he can succeed, having regard to productivity of land and adoption suggestion that Government stands in patriarchal relation towards settler at forthcoming inquiry. Crown adopting sales and business criteria as standards and assuming attitude of adverse litigants. Instructed ask postponement inquiry pending result of elections. Hope existing administration will not object.

I was considerably surprised when I received that message in view of the fact that the board was duly constituted to arrive at the true valuation; and I was more than surprised at the suggestion that pending the result of the election being known I should take these cases away from the court because of some possible change in the Government. Naturally I wanted to know in what manner the incoming Government, if it was a Labour Government, proposed to act. I therefore wired to the solicitor:

Imperative I should have date and exact contents, Mr. Lang's telegram referred to before I can act.

To that message I received this reply:

Mr. Lang's telegram reads: "Parliament House, Sydney; twenty-ninth, O. M. Kelly, Casino. Policy regarding all soldiers' settlement laid down in Griffith and Leeton speeches. Briefly it is writing down amount of soldiers' indebtedness to point at which he can succeed. Having regard to productivity of land, effect would be similar to scheme outlined by you. Scheme referred to by Mr. Lang claimed that Government stood in patriarchal relation towards settlers, and that standards should be what a prudent parent desirous of settling suitable children on the land, on the basis of their paying a reasonable price therefor, having regard to the modern standards of living would be prepared to pay.

I immediately wired to say that the court had to proceed with its work and that the valuations must be dealt with as laid down. It is quite possible the Premier made that promise. Many promises were made during the elections to

[Mr. Wearne.

which I would not hold him, but it would be better for the Premier to break that promise if he made it not intending to carry it out, than to continue doing something which can only result in placing soldier settlements in a state of chaos and interfering to the detriment of the soldiers upon the land. I submit that Mr. Lang had no right to speak of adopting a patriarchal attitude towards returned soldiers.

Mr. LOUGHLIN: I do not think he ever used such a term!

Mr. WEARNE: I am informed that he used it at the Murrumbidgee.

Mr. MISSINGHAM: It is a right term to use towards soldiers!

Mr. WEARNE: I submit that Mr. Lang had no right to speak of "patriarchal" relations with returned soldiers. A patriarch, according to the dictionary definition, is one who governs his family by paternal rights. The Premier of this country has no right to alter valuations determined by the court and to deal with them in a paternal way. Mr. Lang is not the parent of the people. He may be Premier, but he has no right to deal with such matters, involving millions of money, in a paternal manner, because he is dealing with something which is not his own property. If he was a parent dealing with his own children and with his own property he would be quite entitled to do as he thought fit. But he had no right as Premier of the State to say that he intended to instruct the courts. If, as Mr. Loughlin says, Mr. Lang did not use the word "patriarchal," I am very pleased to hear it and I hope it is true.

Mr. LOUGHLIN: I must say that this is the first time I ever heard of it. It may be suggested that someone used that term, but Mr. Lang did not!

Mr. WEARNE: If that is so I will not say anything further about it. But the word I received from the soldiers' solicitor at Casino was to the effect that Mr. Lang had promised to deal with the valuation of soldiers' holdings on a patriarchal basis, which really meant as father to son. However, I would point out to the Premier and the Minister for Lands that the valuation of soldiers' holdings can be dealt with only in one way, and

that is by a proper system of adopting the true value in the light of the productivity of the land, and giving the soldier a chance. With regard to reducing it just because of some sentiment so far as the soldier is concerned, a good soldier does not expect it, but he does expect a fair and proper chance, and a true valuation of his property at the start. He wants no more, and, I hope no more will be attempted by the Government, in a paternal or patriarchal manner.

Mr. Loughlin, in connection with "spoils to the victors," referred to the appointment of the Land Settlement Board. If he was in error I know he will admit it. But he said: "I say the board was formed to give Mr. Ring a job, or a position." The Land Settlement Board was appointed by my Government in January, 1923. It consisted of Mr. Fleming, Under-Secretary for Lands, as chairman, Mr. Chesterman, a member of the advisory board, as a member, and Mr. Drummond as the third member. Mr. Ring was not thought of in any way at that time. Later, in July, Mr. Drummond announced his intention of going to England, and his position had to be filled. Mr. Ring, an experienced and honorable man, was brought forward to fill the vacancy. To say that the Land Settlement Board was created for the purpose of finding Mr. Ring a position is not correct, and I feel quite sure that the Minister will admit it if he has made a mistake. Mr. Loughlin says there was no justification for the appointment of that board. I differ from him in that respect. When I took the portfolio of Minister for Lands I was sick and tired of the purchase of estates. The Crown had incurred a debt of some £9,000,000 or £10,000,000 in purchasing estates for soldier settlement, and what I saw during my term of office was quite sufficient to convince me that there was a better way. We decided to make use of the Rural Bank. Hon. members opposite are entitled to the credit of having established that bank, and we made available to it a certain amount of money to enable it to make advances to intending settlers

under our scheme of land settlement. We also appointed the Land Settlement Board to assist it in securing estates. That board, consisting of two Government officials, Mr. Fleming, Mr. Chesterman, and eventually of Mr. Ring, had an office in the Lands Department building. They communicated with the owners of estates throughout the State asking whether they were willing to place their property under subdivision. A great many were quite willing to dispose of their land for purposes of closer settlement, and the work proceeded. To show the justification for the board and the work it did I would like to give the House figures which have been supplied to me by departmental officials. Two hundred and seventeen estates were submitted to this board to be dealt with; 156 of these were inspected by the Land Settlement Board and the bank officials—it was necessary that both should approve of estates, the bank to advance the money and the board to see that they came within the £1,000,000 advanced to the bank. Fourteen estates were awaiting report when I left, and forty-seven had been declined. Eight hundred and forty-one certificates, amounting to £1,898,730, were issued in respect of these estates, covering an area of 615,050 acres. There were only 731 acres to a farm. Certificates to the value of £1,163,100 were taken up by settlers, who were placed upon the land on these subdivided estates without one penny of expense to the Crown, except for the appointment of the Land Settlement Board, of which there was only one member outside the public service. Through the activity of that board and with the assistance of the Government, 109 estates with a total area of 916,547 acres were subdivided into 1,150 farms. Eight hundred and ninety of these were selected by settlers and totalled 748,625 acres, representing a total amount of £3,400,744, and with an average area of 796 acres and an average capital value of £3,820 per farm. That has all been done by the Land Settlement Board, which this House has been told we had no justification in appointing.

In addition, I wish to give other figures. As I said before, they are not mine, but have been given me by the officers of the department since I left it, and with the approval of the Minister. With regard to border railways, we dealt with estates on the Victorian border and agreed to make available some 400,000 acres of land on the New South Wales side of the river Murray. Forty-one estates were made available in that area for mixed farms, containing a total of 415,250 acres; six grazing farms with 279,807 acres; or a total area of 695,057 acres for forty-seven estates, with a total value of £962,616. If the Government of which I had the honor of being a member had done nothing more than bring into effect the agreement between the States of Victoria and New South Wales, for that alone it deserved credit from the people of New South Wales. This Land Settlement Board, which is said to have done no good and had nothing to do, has done this. The estates which they inspected with the Government Savings Bank, for which they issued certificates which were taken up, and against which the Government Savings Bank made advances, totalled £1,163,000. Estates subdivided voluntarily by owners who had the assistance of Government surveyors and officials of the Land Settlement Board, totalled a value of £3,400,744. These, together with the estates on the border railways amounting to £962,616, made a total value of estates dealt with by the Land Settlement Board of £4,526,360. Let me inform the House that not one penny of risk has been taken by the Crown in all that vast area and with that large amount of money. I know that in the Lands Department there are estates on which people have not paid instalments for years, and great losses have taken place because estates have been purchased in less favoured parts of the State, but in the expenditure of this £4,526,360 the Crown has no liability. The liability is taken by the Rural Bank, and the settler himself is working on conditions under which if he does not put forward his best efforts he will pay the penalty.

[Mr. Wearne.]

With regard to the advisory board which Mr. Loughlin says there is no need for, I might tell the House the Act provides for three advisory boards, but there was only one advisory board in existence when this Government came into office. Mr. Chesterman, Mr. Hoare, and Mr. Clonan were the three who constituted the advisory board. Mr. Hoare was continuously engaged in valuing estates for soldier settlers. I decided, so far as estates purchased for soldiers were concerned, that before a soldier went on to the land I would have a revaluation made, so that he might have a reasonable chance of success. That member of the advisory board was occupied in these duties. Mr. Clonan, another member of the advisory board, was used by me in connection with stock purchased by returned soldiers. Thousands of head of cattle, thousands of sheep, and almost thousands of head of horses were purchased, ten here, fifteen there, and less in other places, all over the State of New South Wales. These horses, cattle, and sheep were wandering about and on agistment in all parts of the State. I appointed Mr. Clonan to take charge of this stock, to bring them to market and dispose of them as they became fit to sell. Hundreds and thousands of pounds were saved for the country through having that officer in charge of this work, and he had no time to deal with land settlement. The other member of the board was fully employed in connection with soldier's holdings. If we wanted the Land Settlement Board we could not make use of those members, therefore I had to appoint an outsider, and I appointed Mr. Ring. I regret that Mr. Loughlin has thought fit to disband the advisory board, because I think much useful work could have been done by it, but he has his own ideas, particularly as to the subdivision of the estates. All I can say is that the board we appointed was instrumental in subdividing estates to the value of £4,500,000 and settling over 1,500 settlers on these holdings, without any expense or risk to the Crown other than the advisory board. It is said the present Government intends to pass legislation to deal with estates, and it may

intend to purchase estates. However, if the Minister can bring forward a better scheme than that adopted by the Government of which I was a member, he will get every assistance from me.

As to the Prickly-pear Board, I regret my hon. friend has seen fit to table a motion to do away with the board and appoint a commission. He may be able to explain to the House and to satisfy me why he intends not to carry out the Act as it was passed. I will say nothing about it until he does so, but I regret he has not seen fit to complete the board. I could have appointed the members of the board, I had two men ready for it, but when we came back from the elections it looked as though the Government might be defeated, and, all credit to my Government and, I think, credit to myself, we decided we would not make any appointments to the board in view of the position, although I had two men picked out, and one man had been notified he would be appointed. On that matter again I will have to wait and see what the Government intends to do. I think the Minister will make a mistake if he attempts to do away with the board, because, I think, the problem will be too much for one commissioner to deal with. I wanted an independent board. I made the headquarters of the board at Moree, right in the heart of the prickly-pear country, and I was in hopes that the board would be able to go out to the different farms and deal in a practical manner with the settlers who were troubled with the prickly-pear. The conditions in Queensland for dealing with the prickly-pear are quite different from ours. In Queensland the land is held under lease, whereas in New South Wales hundreds and thousands of acres are held under freehold conditions.

I have expressed my views on the question of my attitude so far as the present Government is concerned. On behalf of the people in the country districts and in my own electorate, I say—and I speak for many who hold views similar to my own—it is immaterial to those who are on the land what the Gov-

ernment calls itself, whether Nationalist, Labour, or any other kind of Government—the name does not count. What counts are the acts of the Government; the legislation it brings forward and the administration of the various departments. As far as I am concerned, if the Government will bring in legislation that will deal fairly with all sections of the people, I for one will have nothing to say against it. I will welcome it if the Government will legislate in the interests of the people as a whole and not for one particular class. As far as my electorate and the people of the class to which I belong are concerned, all we ask is a fair deal from the Government, and there will be no complaints made by me in this House.

Mr. MURPHY (North Shore) [4.35 p.m.]: During the course of the debate I have heard many extraordinary statements made by members on the Opposition side of the House, as well as having had the privilege of hearing the first lady member make her first speech in the Parliament of this State. While I must compliment that lady on the eloquent language she used we cannot be quite fair and just in forming a judgment in regard to the quality of the material she used and say that her conclusions were all stamped with the hallmark of logic and could be deemed to be on a par with those of the male members when debating matters before this Assembly. I may point out that it is one thing to make remarks upon the hustings for the purpose of securing votes from the electors and another thing to make statements in this House. The members of the Nationalist party and of the so-called bob-tailed Progressive party from end to end of this State year after year and election after election have deliberately misrepresented facts on the hustings and may almost be accused of having perpetrated falsehoods in connection with placing matters before the people. Although I would not be guilty of deliberately saying that Miss Preston-Stanley desired to misrepresent facts I want it to be clearly understood that when

Seventh day.

speeches are made in this House we expect the true facts and the true facts only.

Miss PRESTON-STANLEY: You got them from me!

Mr. MURPHY: In what way? We have had misrepresentations hurled against the Government in regard to its treatment of the women and children of this State.

Miss PRESTON-STANLEY: And you deserved it!

Mr. MURPHY: What are the facts? In 1920, when the Storey-Dooley Government came into power, mothers were receiving for their children from the State Children Relief Department an average allowance of 6s. 3d. per week while mothers upon the eve of confinement could go here, there and everywhere seeking assistance without being able to obtain it in their greatest hour of trial and need. Under the so-called bloodthirsty Labour Government referred to by Miss Preston-Stanley and other members, the average allowance for children was raised to 10s. per week and outfits of baby clothing to the value of £5 5s. were provided for expectant mothers who applied for them. Upon the defeat of the Labour Government three years ago the average amount distributed by the Child Welfare Department was reduced from 10s. to 7s. 3d. per week and it was made virtually impossible for expectant mothers to obtain any assistance such as had been previously afforded to them by the Labour Government. The present Government in the few short months it has been in office has removed the disabilities from which mothers suffered under the Nationalist regime and has restored the benefits previously granted. Therefore when Miss Preston-Stanley and other hon. members talk about the Labour Administration not doing a fair and humane thing by the women and children I ask them to come right down to tin tacks and not adopt the miserable, mean, petty attitude of Nationalist Administrations which when approached by women and others in difficulties have told them to go to their Labour representative, because from him and him only could they obtain the assistance they desired. That

[Mr. Murphy.

has been my experience and it has been the experience of many of my colleagues.

I want the country to know that Labour members are not the bloodthirsty bush-rangers that Miss Preston-Stanley would have the people believe. Anyone who is in need of assistance will on representations being made by any member of Parliament, irrespective of party, receive the help required. Some remarks have been made with regard to the relative position of different classes of children in the State. It is well recognised that all the monetary assistance in the world or all the advantages of birth or position will be of no use or value to a child unless it has the ability, education and brains to permit of its becoming a useful member of society. Hon. members opposite have talked about how their hearts have bled for the poor children of this State, but we have found them absolutely violating the principle of free primary, secondary and university education and thus depriving the children of the workers of the opportunities to secure the training necessary to fit them for the higher positions in the land. Miss Preston-Stanley, who has made an attack upon the Labour Government in regard to its attitude towards women and children, is standing by a party which has been guilty of the breach of faith to which I have referred. The first action performed by the present Labour Administration was to remove the embargo which was placed upon the free education of our children by the establishment of high school fees and now we find all the children of the State placed on the same footing so far as education is concerned.

In connection with the proposal to introduce the forty-four hours working week we have been told that the Labour Administration is going to prevent the wheels of industry revolving and that it is merely pandering to the workers of this State. It has been said that in Queensland as the result of this policy universal loafing upon the job is to be found. I think I may claim to be one of the most travelled members in this House, because in every election in the northern State during the last seven

years I have travelled the country from Carpentaria to the New South Wales border. I know that in Queensland to-day a forty-four hours week is in operation and giving satisfaction to the community. And no dislocation of industry and no reduction of wages has followed. The Queensland Labour Government, as the result of legislation passed last session, has made it possible for the workers to enjoy the privileges and fruits of a forty-four hours week. Further, we find that in Queensland they are making locomotives in their own workshops.

Mr. NESS: They never made one!

Mr. MURPHY: They are making locomotives at Ipswich and Gympie. I have seen them in process of manufacture and I can inform the hon. member that the contracts let by the State Government were $7\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. below any of those received from private contractors overseas where they pay lower wages and have a longer working week. If the workers in Queensland are guilty of a go-slow policy and are not giving a fair day's work for the remuneration they receive, how is it they are able to compete with private enterprise in the other States and overseas in the manufacture of articles for local requirements? It is not the introduction of a forty-four hours week which causes trouble in Queensland. What causes trouble there and elsewhere is this: Under the Theodore Administration one of the greatest primary industries ever introduced into Australia has been established. I refer to the cotton industry. And from its inception deliberate attempts have been made by capitalistic interests overseas and elsewhere to ruin that industry; but under the careful and judicious administration of the present Premier and Minister for Agriculture, Mr. Gillies—a brother of the hon. member for Byron—ginneries have been established in important centres where the raw material is dealt with and turned out as the finished article. It is a unique and successful attempt by the present Labour Administration to foster a great industry, which will be a boon not only to Queensland, but to the Commonwealth. From end to end of Queensland a contented and prosperous working-class is

now to be found, protected by the Government against the moneyed class, which hunts them down, as has been our experience in this State under an anti-Labour Government of the type of the recent Administration.

An HON. MEMBER: Population is decreasing!

Mr. MURPHY: The number of people entering Queensland during the last nine months exceeded the departures by 15,000. Those figures were given to me by the Minister for Home Affairs in Queensland only last week.

The present Government has been condemned by the Opposition because in the Governor's Speech a scheme is outlined for the introduction of State insurance and an improved compensation for workers and because we propose to introduce a practical system of housing under which an advance up to 90 per cent. on the cost of each house to be erected will be made to the workers.

Mr. J. R. LEE: You copied that from us!

Mr. MURPHY: There is no copying from the Nationalist party. It is true that a proposal was submitted but no one knew what it meant. I have not heard one hon. member game enough or intelligent enough to submit to us a detailed statement of what was intended by their so-called housing system or any other system with which they tried to hoodwink the workers. I have explained what is the actual position in Queensland and what has been done there will be done by the present Government in this State. In Queensland there is a State Insurance Department with an absolute monopoly of workers' compensation, paying the most liberal compensation allowance in case of injury or death of any insurance department to be found in Australia or any other part of the world. I believe absolutely in State monopoly, and I hope and trust that the present Labour Administration in New South Wales when introducing its workers' compensation scheme will make it a State monopoly, under the control and direction of a State insurance department. The Insurance Department of Queensland, presided over by a very capable

Seventh day.

administrator in the person of Mr. Watson, was able to create a record in insurance business by paying within four years of its foundation a bonus upon each policy. It is the soundest insurance scheme in Queensland, and, with the exception of the A.M.P. Society, transacts the greatest volume of business in that State at the present time—a record which speaks volumes for the foresight of the late Ryan Government when it established that department. Under it and coupled up with it are two systems of housing for workers. One is known as the Workers' Dwellings Department and the other as the Workers' Homes Department. Under the latter we find the Labour Government of Queensland advancing 90 per cent. of the total value of the dwelling to be erected exclusive of the value of the land for a term of thirty-five years. It erects the dwelling; insures it for its full value against loss, pays rates, taxes and interest, and reduces the principal to make it repayable in the period named, all for a total of 17s. 9d. per week. The result is that since the inauguration of that scheme three years ago there have been erected in Brisbane alone over 900 dwellings per annum to house the workers comfortably as they are entitled to be. The present Labour Administration in this State is following in the footsteps of our Northern colleagues. It proposes to introduce legislation for State insurance and workmen's compensation, coupled with a comprehensive housing policy on the lines I have indicated. It is giving practical effect to the Labour party's policy to protect the workers against jerry-builders, rack renting landlords and others who are mainly represented by other members for your constituency, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and others on the opposite side of the House. I ask in fairness to the present Administration, which I have the honor to support, has there been any criticism by our opponents of the Labour Administration of New South Wales which can refute the statement I make regarding the Labour administration in Queensland and our proposed legislation here?

[Mr. Murphy,

We have heard remarks made by Sir Thomas Henley and others in his electorate and elsewhere to the effect that the Labour Administration is not doing the right thing when it indicates its desire to introduce legislation to place municipal councils on the same footing, so far as electoral law is concerned, as the Federal and State Parliaments, and, secondly, that our proposals to liberalise appointments to the Water Board are wrong. It is stated that if a universal franchise is adopted for the election of aldermen we shall cause ruin and chaos so far as local government is concerned. I would draw attention to the fact that in the State of Queensland for the last four years the City Council of Brisbane and the municipal councils have been elected on the same franchise as are members of the Federal and State Parliaments. The only trouble that has arisen has been that instead of having "dead beat" aldermen—nincompoops with their brains in their boots—and the finances being in a chaotic condition, we have there a Main Roads Board working in conjunction with a majority of Labour-elected councils throughout Queensland, constructing roads and giving effect to Labour's policy. We find clean administration there in local government, not under a few select moneyed, property-owning aldermen like Sir Thomas Henley, but under common or garden Labour men who toil eight hours a day to provide the wherewithal to keep themselves their wives and families from feeling the pinch of want. I have no doubt that my aristocratic friends would be very much upset if they visited the city of Gladstone and had to suffer the indignity of being introduced to the mayor, who is just an ordinary labourer at the sawmill in that city. If they had to meet the majority of the aldermen, who work in the slaughter yards and the freezing works of Gladstone, they would consider that Bolshevism in its worst form had invaded the sacred precincts of capitalism in that sunny northern part of Australia. But if Labour has its way in New South Wales they will find we shall have universal franchise for the election of aldermen and shire councillors; and with the

proper exercise of that franchise I hope there will result a sweeping victory for Labour in every sphere of municipal activity, and the inauguration of a period of prosperous, clean local government throughout the length and breadth of the State.

With regard to the Water Board many complaints are being made that Labour's proposals to introduce a broader franchise for the election of members to that board is wrong. In Queensland at the present time they have in operation the same system as in New South Wales for the election of members of the Water and Sewerage Board. It was there found some years ago that on the Water Board there was not one practical man who knew anything about water and sewerage affairs. We found in Queensland, as we find in New South Wales, that there were jerry-builders like Sir Thomas Henley, grocers, and a few property owners elected members of that board by a few selected aldermen in each city. Four years ago they abolished that system in Queensland, and to-day the Water and Sewerage Board in every part of Queensland is under the control of each local governing department, it is elected on the broad universal franchise of adult suffrage and is giving satisfaction in every part of that great State. We do not even find the conservative *Courier* or the *Daily Mail* of Queensland, which is as conservative as Mr. Scott Fell, condemning the administration of the water boards in Queensland, as has been the case in New South Wales, with regard to the present Water and Sewerage Board of the city of Sydney. I therefore welcome with open arms and give my entire approval to the proposal of this Government to liberalise the franchise and to reconstruct the Metropolitan Board of Water Supply and Sewerage upon the basis of the election of members of that board by universal franchise, the same as we hope to do in regard to the election of the various aldermen.

When you place the acid test upon the Governor's Speech, presented by this Government, I cannot see how there can be any logical reasonable objection to the proposals contained therein. Where has

there been one speaker from the Opposition side of the House who has dared to deal in detail with the proposals contained in the Governor's Speech along the lines which I have endeavoured to take in this Chamber? It is for the very reason that my friends on the other side are absolutely ignorant of anything beyond the bounds of their own electorates. Does my friend Mr. Missingham know anything beyond the boundaries of his own electorate? He is an authority on cows, and bunchy top, and prickly-pear, perhaps, but he is not an authority on anything else. What do we find with Lt.-Colonel Bruxner and others in his party? They are restricted, with cramped intelligence and narrow outlook and vision, so far as the affairs of this great State are concerned. They are absolutely unable to grasp the fact that people exist beyond the confines of their own electorates. Because of that narrow vision we have the so-called Country party in this House, a party which is not out for the benefit of the State as a whole but is committed to a selfish policy for the benefit of the hungry greedy members of their own community in parts of the northern rivers and elsewhere in New South Wales. Our friends opposite say that the present Labour Administration will create chaos and will absolutely disturb the evenness of our social order in New South Wales. Then we have Mr. Stuart, one of the members from the northern rivers, in his initial address to this Chamber, after condemning the Government, having the audacity and impudence to ask, as his older colleagues have asked in years gone by, that the present Government should finance the Jackadgery scheme on the northern rivers.

MR. STUART: Did not your Government say it would give fair consideration to any scheme put forward by any party in the House?

MR. MURPHY: Certainly. I am not saying the Government will refuse to finance the Jackadgery scheme. I am drawing the attention of this Chamber and the country to the fact that while Mr. Stuart can use condemnatory language in the worst shape and form

Seventh day.

against the present Government, and whilst he can misrepresent it, he is mean, miserable and despicable enough to come to that same Government and ask it to finance a scheme for his own particular electorate and to debar every other part of New South Wales. He asks that we should grant and finance a new State in the northern part of New South Wales. It is said by these people that they can finance a new State in the northern part of New South Wales, a northern State for which they would select their own boundaries, and which would be absolutely free from any liability for public works constructed under every Government during the last half century.

Mr. STUART: That is entirely wrong!

Mr. MURPHY: It is not entirely wrong, it is a fact. But whilst they are prepared to do that, they cannot get together as local governing bodies and finance their Jackadgery scheme. They must come to the despicable contemptible communistic bolshevik Government. We as a Labour Government will not tolerate and will not in any shape or form entertain this misrepresentation and crawling from the Country party.

During the recent election campaign, I had the honor—a very doubtful honor indeed—of a visit to my electorate by Mr. Lane, the Nationalist member for Balmain, who in violent and unintelligent language endeavoured to get the people of my electorate to vote against me.

Mr. LANE: You did not hear anything of the kind!

Mr. MURPHY: Yes, I did. I absolutely made a hero of myself listening for over an hour and a half to what you said.

Mr. LANE: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I submit the hon. member Mr. Murphy must withdraw that remark. I deny that at any time during the election campaign I was ever in Mr. Murphy's electorate speaking on political matters.

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That is not a point of order at all.

Mr. LANE: I ask that the hon. member Mr. Murphy be asked to withdraw that statement!

[Mr. Murphy.

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I heard what the hon. member said, and I am quite sure he has said nothing to cause me to call upon him to withdraw.

Mr. MURPHY: There is no need to accept the hon. member's assurance, for whilst he says he did not go there for the specific purpose of conducting an election campaign, it is a fact that he went to North Sydney early in the present year and conducted a meeting there, and under the guise of his so-called cold water policy, deliberately tried to misrepresent the Labour party. So remarkable was the hon. gentleman's influence that I received a record vote throughout that constituency.

Mr. LANE: You would not have got here if Dr. Evatt had been selected!

Mr. MURPHY: We do not want gentlemen like Dr. Evatt in North Sydney when we can go and win additional seats from poor lame politicians like Dr. Stopford or Mr. Lane. Dr. Evatt did his work in Balmain, and not only returned himself to this Parliament, but, with the assistance of his colleagues deprived the then Government of one of the seats that Government had accidentally taken from the Labour party three years previously. When one looks at the Opposition benches to-day and sees men like Mr. Lane, whose main policy is condemnation of the Labour party on sectarian lines; men like Mr. Ness, who is absolutely a religious bigot; and men with political kinks, personally not bad fellows, but men like Mr. Fitzpatrick, whose main topic of conversation in this House is his experience in Java—when one finds that type of man occupying the Nationalist Ministerial benches, is it any wonder that Labour was successful at the polls? The greatest political monstrosity in this House whose election it is impossible to understand is our friend Mr. Hill, who comes back to this Chamber to represent part of the northern rivers.

Mr. HILL:

Mr. MURPHY: I do not mind fair criticism. I had occasion some years ago to reply in forcible language to

deliberate misrepresentations of the hon. member, and now he makes some statement under his breath, being afraid to come out with it. I am not in the habit of hurling personal insults at any member of this House. I although a young man, say to you, Mr. Hill, that if your life in all the years you have lived has been as clear and open as that of Cecil Murphy you will have something of which to be proud. But you are dirty and miserable, and a cur as well to throw such personal insults at me.

MR. LANE: I draw your attention, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, to the fact that the hon. member has called Mr. Hill a cur. That is unparliamentary. The hon. member should be asked to withdraw it!

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I did not hear the language complained of. Did the hon. member address that remark to Mr. Hill?

MR. MURPHY: I did use that language.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Then I call upon the hon. member to withdraw it.

MR. MURPHY: Under your direction, I withdraw that remark, but I would say that whilst I am forcible in my criticism of hon. members from a political point of view, I do not indict the personal character of hon. members, and I would ask for your protection, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, against the personal insinuations against me which have emanated from the hon. member Mr. Hill. If he does not want to be hurt and hit hard with personalities he should not himself use them.

MR. HILL: I did not refer to you personally. You referred to me. I did not insult you!

MR. MURPHY: I say the hon. gentleman did. He is a political misfit, and should not be a member of this Chamber. We we find the Opposition represented by men of the calibre and type to which I have referred, what can we expect? No one questions their personal reputation, but because they are decent personally and are not bad fellows to meet socially, it does not follow that they are not full of political kinks to which they often give expression, and it does not relieve them

of the responsibility of that deliberate misrepresentation of which they are guilty of giving utterance to every time they speak on the hustings in any part of New South Wales. If the Labour party is to be defeated, if it is held unworthy of the confidence and support of the people, it will be because it has been actually proved to be guilty of some wrongdoing. We ask that the charges now so often made against it shall exist in reality and not in the fantastic imagination of members opposite. We feel quite certain that if that idea is adopted the Labour Administration will continue in occupation of the Treasury benches, not only for three years, but for many years afterwards.

I desire to refer to the remarks made yesterday by the ex-Speaker, Mr. Levy. The hon. gentleman seems to think that the present Labour Administration should when he rises to criticise it, bow the knee before him, and because he has been in the Chair of this Chamber for four years, and in a bludgeoning and tyrannical way has used the powers given to him, he has the right, now that he has been deposed from that position, to rise and criticise the Government in any way he thinks fit. He referred to the fact that we are allies of I.W.W.-ism and communism. The whole thing is about as real as some of the rulings given by that gentleman when he occupied the high position of Speaker. The Labour movement to-day in every part of Australia stands four-square against its opponents whether they call themselves Nationalists, Progressives, I.W.W. or Communists. We stand four-square against these organisations as political pests and social tyrants, which are a disgrace to civilisation and which are preventing the rise of our social order to a higher plane. The members of the Labour party do not accept orders from the leaders of the organisations referred to in Australia or any other part of the world, and in attempting to identify us with any of these organisations and asking the Government to deal with the deportation of certain members of unions, the hon. member deliberately misrepresents the facts of the case. It.

Seventh day.

is not within the power of any State Government to deport any member of the community. It is entirely a matter for the Commonwealth authorities, and because Mr. Bruce is not game enough or capable enough to deal with the case in the fashion he would have others do, Mr. Levy gets up here and misrepresents the facts and tries to place the blame on the shoulders of the present Government. Hon. members opposite must realise that deliberate misrepresentation has been made by Mr. Levy in his endeavour to build up some sort of concrete case against the present Government. All the hon. member's peculiar talk when dissected and analysed means nothing beyond the fact that he is feeling peeved and upset. He apparently thinks that a very grave injustice was done to him because the electors returned the Labour party to power and deprived him of his position in the Speaker's chair. From the hon. member's demeanour and speech one would gather the impression that he had in his mind the idea that he was Speaker of this Assembly by divine right, whereas he was returned to this House as the result of a political accident. I would remind hon. members opposite that five years ago no hon. member was more bitter in his remarks regarding Mr. Levy than was Mr. Fitzpatrick. If hon. members will read the *Hansard* reports of 1920 they will find that no more bitter abuse could have been hurled at any man than that which was directed to Mr. Levy by Mr. Fitzpatrick. Mr. Levy accepted the position of Speaker with the Labour Government in power, but after a time as the result of the peculiar pressure which was brought to bear on him his conscience pricked him and he saw fit to resign his seat, with the result that the Labour Government, which was on the eve of introducing important measures that would have proved beneficial to the workers of this State, was forced to the country and as a consequence thousands of pounds had to be spent in conducting a fresh election. Labour was defeated at the poll, the Nationalists were returned with a majority and Mr. Levy was appointed Speaker: I say now, as I said three and a half years ago, that Mr. Levy caused the

defeat of the Labour Administration and placed the women and children of the workers in this State under the heel of oppression, degradation and shame for the whole period that the Fuller Government was in office. As the result of his dishonorable action—I should not say dishonorable—peculiar action three and a half years ago we had three years of anti-Labour administration which proved to be very hard and bitter for the workers and which meant suffering, poverty, and shame for thousands of our people. The hon. member was very severe and bitter in his criticism of the Government and took up a high and lofty attitude in his endeavour to impress hon. members with the idea that he was an intellectual genius, but he branded himself as one of the greatest political hypocrites and tyrants who have ever disgraced the political life of New South Wales.

MR. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: I take the point of order that the hon. member has no right to refer to Mr. Levy as a hypocrite or as having been affected by the desire to perform a dishonorable act in connection with his attitude in this House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I heard the language of the hon. member, and I must ask him to withdraw his expressions.

MR. LEVY: Whatever insult the hon. member hurls at me does not make any difference. Nobody takes any notice of him. He is too contemptible for anybody to take any notice of him!

MR. MURPHY: In the course of my remarks I did use the term "dishonorable" and I withdrew it at the time. The other remarks I withdraw under your direction, Mr. Speaker. Whether Mr. Levy believes me to be contemptible or not I care not one straw. The only thing that concerns me is the fact that I have set out the position truthfully and pointed out that during the last six years his conduct as Speaker of this Assembly justifies the interpretation I have put upon it. If any remarks I have made have hurt hon. members opposite it is because they happen to be only too true. If hon. members of the Opposition develop a fierce liking for me politically it will be time for me to

[Mr. Murphy.

get out of the political life of the country. When members of the Nationalist party and the so-called Progressives begin to approve of the political actions of the Labour party then it will be time for the Labour party to vacate the Treasury benches. We intend to fearlessly give effect to the policy of the Premier and we shall do it without any desire to seek the approval of hon. members opposite. So far as the present Administration is concerned its actions meet with my entire approval.

In the course of the debate we have heard a good deal from hon. members opposite of the case of Mr. Stevens. We have heard it said that he has not been treated with British justice, that he has been harshly dealt with and that the Premier was unsympathetic and cold-blooded in dismissing him. The Premier dealt with Mr. Stevens as he deserved to be dealt with. If more salutary treatment could have been meted out it would have received my approval, because in giving effect to the late Government's policy of retrenchment Mr. Stevens showed no consideration for members of the public service who were dismissed without notice after having been for many years in the service of the State. I cannot admit that the Premier has been guilty of any act of maladministration in dealing with Mr. Stevens in the way he did.

AN HON. MEMBER: Then you do not want to see the State properly managed?

MR. MURPHY: Some members of Parliament would deal with the affairs of human beings and the Government of the State as they would measure timber to build houses. They would deal with departments of State as they would give an estimate for the erection of a dwelling, looking on pounds, shillings and pence as the main factor to be considered. It does not matter that a man has worked for thirty-six years as a book-binder in the Public Library, and has given entire satisfaction, and produced work, which could not be equalled outside, more cheaply than it could be done outside. It does not matter that that man was dismissed as a result

of the actions of Mr. Spence and Mr. Stevens, under the late Government, and that since then the book-binding for the Library has been done by private enterprise, outside, and has cost 17 per cent. more than was the case when it was done by that book-binder, for thirty-six years, in the Public Library.

AN HON. MEMBER: Had he not reached the age of retirement?

MR. MURPHY: No, he had not, and his dismissal was one of the acts of Mr. Spence and Mr. Stevens, under the recent Administration. Then we are told that we are harsh in dismissing Mr. Stevens in the way we did. The Premier dealt with him very liberally, and as far as I am concerned I think the Government altogether has done very well up to date. I trust it will continue to act in a similarly liberal fashion towards the workers of this State, and that its three years of occupancy of the Treasury benches will result in beneficial legislation and administration of the affairs of the State for the working people of New South Wales, instead of the supporters of my hon. friends opposite.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

PROCEDURE REGARDING FORMAL BUSINESS.

Motion (by Mr. LOUGHLIN) proposed:

That this House do now adjourn until 10 a.m. to-morrow.

MR. LEVY (Sydney) [5.43 p.m.]: I wish to say a few words in reference to an incident that took place in this House this morning. When Mr. Speaker went through the business-paper I noticed that he only called two motions, and asked whether there was any objection to their being taken as formal. I very courteously intimated to Mr. Speaker that he was in error in doing so, and that it was his duty to go through the whole of the motions on the business-paper, with the exception of motions for the appointment of select committees, and to ask whether there was any objection to their being taken as formal motions. I made that intimation to Mr. Speaker, very courteously. Mr. Speaker then called the Clerk of the Assembly, Mr. Mowle,

and had some conversation with him, and then he said, "The hon. member," referring to me, "is wrong. What I did was perfectly right," giving the House the impression that that was the advice Mr. Mowle gave him. I think it is generally recognised that I know something about the procedure of this House. There is no question that under standing order 127 it is the duty of the Speaker to go through all the motions on the business-paper, with the exception of motions for the appointment of select committees, and ask whether there is any objection to their being taken as formal matters. I certainly object to Mr. Speaker doing what he did this morning—producing the impression that I was wrong and he was right, and that Mr. Mowle had advised him he was right. I do not accuse Mr. Speaker of any desire to humiliate me. All I can say is that he was wrong, as I am sure Mr. Mowle would say if he were referred to. Mr. Speaker misunderstood what Mr. Mowle said. Mr. Speaker was wrong and I was perfectly right. It is his duty to rectify the injustice he did to me, and I am sure he will do so when he reads what I say. If he does not, the only course open to me is to move dissent from Mr. Speaker's ruling.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

House adjourned at 5.47 p.m. until
10 a.m. to-morrow.

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 27 August, 1925.

Procedure Regarding Formal Business — Elections and Qualifications Committee — Governor's Speech: Address in Reply (Eighth Day's Debate)—Sessional Order (Sitting Days: Hour of Meeting).

MR. SPEAKER took the chair.

PROCEDURE REGARDING FORMAL BUSINESS.

MR. SPEAKER: I notice on referring to the *Hansard* report this morning that the hon. member Mr. Levy dealt with a [Mr. Levy.

matter that cropped up yesterday when I was not in the chair. I just wish to state that I believe that it has been the usual practice for hon. members when they wish to say anything with regard to a Minister to pay him the courtesy of intimating their intention to do so. That courtesy was not paid to me by the hon. member who made reference to my interpretation of a standing order. I remember that when I was first elected to the chair I received the congratulations of the hon. member, who said that he was prepared to assist me in every way. The first assistance he gave me was to take a point of order which I have reason to believe he was fully aware was wrongly taken. Secondly, I notice that the hon. member has a question on the business-paper in which he is seeking information as to what are the names of some persons who are helping hon. members with their correspondence, and as to the circumstances of the transfer of a waiter from the temporary to the permanent staff. I think that information could have been obtained by asking a question in the House instead of by putting it on the business paper. However, the hon. member has the right to put it on the business paper, and I am not going to object to his exercising that right. In connection with another matter: I did think, and I have thought for some years past, that the method adopted by previous Speakers of reading through the business paper for formal motions, and, secondly, for the placing of business was a cumbersome method, and I have intimated my desire that the standing order relating to this matter should be altered. In the meantime I have been going over the business paper to the extent I regard as necessary; but as the hon. member Mr. Levy has taken the point I must soothe his feelings by complying with the standing orders, and until the standing order is altered I shall go through the business paper twice.

ELECTIONS AND QUALIFICATIONS COMMITTEE.

— Mr. Walker was sworn as a member of this committee.