

# NEW SOUTH WALES PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES.

## TWENTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT—FOURTH SESSION.

### OPENING OF PARLIAMENT.

THE Third Session of the Twenty-fourth Parliament was prorogued by Proclamation dated 19th December, 1918, until 3rd February, 1919; thence to 17th March; thence to 28th April; thence to 9th June; thence to 7th July; thence to 28th July; and thence to 19th August, 1919, for the despatch of business; and the Fourth Session commenced on that day.

Parliament was opened by his Excellency the Governor.

### Legislative Council.

*Tuesday, 19 August, 1919.*

Governor's Speech—Members Deceased—Petitions—The Late Sir G. H. Reid—Leave of Absence—Assent to Bills—Ministerial Statement (Reconstruction of Ministry)—Law of Evidence Bill (*Formal*)—Governor's Speech: Address in Reply—Special Adjournment—Adjournment.

The PRESIDENT took the chair.

The Clerk of the Parliaments read the proclamation convening Parliament.

### GOVERNOR'S SPEECH.

His Excellency the Governor entered the Chamber, and was escorted by the President, accompanied by other members and officers of the House. A message was forwarded to the Legislative Assembly, intimating that his Excellency awaited the attendance of hon. members of that House, who, being come, his Excellency was pleased to deliver the following speech:—

HONORABLE GENTLEMEN OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, AND GENTLEMEN OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,—

1. It is with pleasure that I call you together for the opening of the fourth and final session of the twenty-fourth Parliament of New South Wales.

2. Since Parliament last met, representatives of Great Britain and the Powers associated with her have met in conference in Paris, and the Government of Germany has now accepted the terms of peace which have been handed to her. The other Governments allied with Germany during the war are now in turn being offered terms of peace, which it is probable they will accept.

3. The terms of peace which have been and are being imposed upon the Central Powers, and the establishment of the League of Nations, will reduce to a minimum the possibility of further war, and make for that enduring peace on which it is possible to base reasonable hopes for the future happiness of mankind.

4. It is with great satisfaction that I record the fact that the number of recruits enrolled was, in proportion to the population, greater in New South Wales than in any other State of the Commonwealth, with the exception of Western Australia. This may be justly regarded as the direct result of the constant devotion to this vital issue displayed both by the Government and the Parliament of the State.

5. The cessation of hostilities has been accompanied by the abandonment on the part of the Commonwealth of the many special powers which, under the Constitution, it exercised in war time. These powers now revert to the jurisdiction of the State Parliaments and Executives. With regard to some of these, of special interest in the State of New South Wales, my advisers have already taken action. Proposals will be brought before you forthwith with respect to others.

6. The work of making provision for the settlement of our returned soldiers on the land, the responsibility for which lies principally upon the State Government, is proceeding satisfactorily. Up to the present home-maintenance areas have been provided for over 2,500 soldiers, and it is anticipated the number will be increased to 4,000 before the end of the year.

7. The Department of Education is co-operating with the Commonwealth authorities in connection with the vocational training of returned soldiers, over 1,200 of whom are at present receiving free tuition at the hands of the State.

8. The State Government has deemed it desirable to set up a State Bureau, at which not only is information afforded to all returned men, but they are also supplied with railway passes free of charge. In this connection considerable sums have so far been spent. It is confidently expected that Parliament will not only ratify this expenditure, but authorise its continuance so long as it may be regarded as necessary.

9. Drought conditions unhappily prevail over large areas of the State, particularly in the western and south-western districts, where the population continue to conduct their productive operations under increasing difficulty. The Government are giving close consideration to their needs, and have already met the more urgent of them by

making large advances to necessitous farmers, and by carrying starving stock, fodder, and water at nominal rates.

10. The recent epidemic of influenza was the cause of profound distress throughout the State, and of deep anxiety to my advisers. Acting under the highest professional advice the Government of the State took all necessary steps for combating the plague. The citizens were organised to meet exceptional demands for hospital treatment, medical skill, nursing, and relief of consequential poverty and suffering. My advisers acknowledge gratefully the services of the medical profession and the hospital staffs, as well as the admirable work done by the administrative committees and voluntary workers throughout the State during this trying time.

GENTLEMEN OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,—

11. Estimates of revenue and expenditure for the current financial year, which have been framed with the utmost regard both for economy and for efficiency, will be laid before you at an early date.

12. While the financial difficulties which have beset the public works policy of the State during the closing years of the war have not altogether disappeared, my advisers, acting in conjunction with the Commonwealth Government, have been able to arrange for the construction of certain railways, calculated to facilitate the provision of land for returned soldiers. Other lines will also be constructed for the purpose of completing a chain of cross-country railways and for further developing the productive areas of the State.

13. My advisers have been in communication with the Federal Government in the matter of the completion of the Federal capital at Yass-Canberra, and with it the opening up of a valuable port at Jervis Bay. They are also in correspondence with the Government of Queensland on the vital question of further railway connection with that State.

14. An additional portfolio has been created recently, under the title of Minister of Housing, and it is proposed to seek authority for a general scheme which, it is believed, will relieve the shortage in housing accommodation existing to-day.

HONORABLE GENTLEMEN OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, AND GENTLEMEN OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,—

15. Bills will be submitted for your consideration, securing for returned soldiers preference in all employment, and providing unemployment insurance both for returned soldiers and for other workers.

16. A programme of public works will be submitted, including railway construction, irrigation, a scheme for generating electricity by water power, the serving of forest areas by light railways, and the provision of proper harbour works in the Clarence River.

17. Measures to prevent profiteering and to control monopolies will be laid before Parliament.

18. A comprehensive measure for the future control of the liquor traffic will be laid before you. This will provide for the extension for a further period of the present closing hour of licensed premises, and for the replacing of the present method of local option voting by a more satisfactory system of license reduction.

19. Further measures, providing for Greater Sydney and Greater Newcastle, for town planning, for the regulation and reconstruction of slum areas in cities, and for a better control of our main roads, have been prepared, and will be brought forward at an early date. A bill to provide for the registration of architects will also be introduced.

20. The industrial situation of to-day calls, in the judgment of my advisers, for an amendment in certain particulars of the Arbitration Act and the Workmen's Compensation Act, for the introduction of industrial councils in all important

industries, for a reform of the law affecting apprenticeship, and for better technical education. Your sanction will be sought for proposals covering all these matters.

21. The plans of my advisers in connection with the public health of the State include the establishment of hospitals and rest homes for maternity cases, better organisation of the work of child welfare, the payment of compensation to persons who suffered losses as the result of the precautionary measures taken during the influenza pandemic, and an organised campaign against the scourge of tuberculosis. You will be asked to confer such legislative authority as is necessary to give effect to these proposals.

22. Important measures of law reform have been prepared, and will be laid before you, including the limitation of usury, the amendment of the Companies Act, of the Crimes Act, of the law relating to conveyancing and real property, the law governing the regulation of marriages abroad, more especially in the case of soldiers, and the relief of interstate destitute persons.

23. Two important measures of land reform, one relating to share-farmers and the other giving further facilities for soldier settlement and settlement in general, will also be forthcoming.

Your consent will be asked to an amendment of the Government Savings Bank Act, and to provisions for the compulsory education of certain afflicted persons, and an amendment of the Public Service Act and the Superannuation Act.

24. I now leave you, gentlemen, to the discharge of your important duties, with the earnest prayer that, under Divine guidance, your labours may conduce to the welfare and happiness of all.

The Assembly then withdrew.

House adjourned at 12.31 p.m. untill 4 p.m.

The PRESIDENT took the chair at 4.30 p.m.

#### MEMBERS DECEASED.

The PRESIDENT reported the decease of the Hon. W. C. Hill, the Hon. E. W. Fosbery, and the Hon. Sir Samuel McCaughey.

#### PETITIONS.

The Hon. W. T. DICK presented a petition from the council of the municipality of Carrington, praying that there should be inserted in the Local Government Bill a provision giving to councils wide power to control hoardings and advertisements, and that such provision be in the form in which it appears in the Local Government Bill, 1918, when it was introduced into the Legislative Assembly, subject to such modifications as to the House may seem proper.

Petition received.

The Hon. J. A. BROWNE presented a petition from Osborne Henry Reddall, of Randwick, medical practitioner; George D'Arcy Reddall, of North Sydney, Esq.; John Ernest Reddall, of Katoomba, Esq.; Thomas Aubrey Reddall, of California, solicitor; and Eliza Charlotte Lucia Gowing, of Wahroonga, married woman, praying for leave to bring in a bill to make effectual an indenture of partition, dated the 22nd day of September, 1851, prepared for the purpose of carrying into effect a decree of the Supreme Court of New South Wales in its equitable jurisdiction, dated the 12th day of December, 1850, whereby the said court confirmed a partition of certain lands devised by the will of the late Darcy Wentworth, situated in the districts of Illawarra, Appin, and Bankstown, in the State of New South Wales.

Petition received.

#### THE LATE SIR G. H. REID.

The PRESIDENT reported that he had received a communication from the Hon. J. C. L. Fitzpatrick, for the Premier, stating that he had received the following letter from Captain Douglas Reid, in reply to the Chamber's message to Lady Reid:—  
10, Brendon House, Great Woodstock-street, W. London, 3rd January, 1919.

My Dear Sir Charles Wade,—

My mother has asked me to write to you and express her sincere regret that an earlier

reply has not been returned to your three letters of the 28th November and 10th December, 1918, forwarding messages of sympathy through the Premier of New South Wales. The letters were mislaid with other papers and have just been discovered. Lady Reid would be very grateful if you would convey to the Premier, and through him to the Legislative Assembly, the Legislative Council, and the municipality of North Sydney, an expression of her appreciation of their kindness in sending the message of sympathy which, together with many other messages from Australia, have been a great comfort and consolation in the great and sad loss which we have suffered. Lady Reid would also be glad if you would convey her thanks to the Premier for the brochure containing a resolution of the Legislative Assembly, which we all value very much indeed.

Yours sincerely,

DOUGLAS H. REID.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

The PRESIDENT reported that leave of absence had been granted by his Excellency the Governor to the Hon. John Meagher for twelve months from the commencement of the present session; to the Hon. Patrick Thomson Taylor for six months from the 12th June last, and to the Hon. Alexander Brown during the current session.

#### ASSENT TO BILLS.

Royal assent to the following bills reported:—

Companies (Registration of Securities) Bill.  
Permanent Trustee Company of New South Wales Limited (Amendment) Bill.  
Industrial Arbitration (Further Amendment) Bill.  
Irrigation (Amendment) Bill.  
Parliamentary Elections (Amendment) Bill.  
Special Deposits (Industrial Undertakings) Amendment Bill.  
Mining (Amendment) Bill.  
Truck (Amendment) Bill.  
Venereal Diseases Bill.  
Liquor (Refund of Rent) Bill.  
Superannuation (Amendment) Bill.  
University Amendment (Exhibitioners' Fees) Bill.  
Closer Settlement (Amendment) Bill.  
Women's Legal Status Bill.  
Pastures Protection (Amendment) Bill.  
First Offenders (Women) Bill.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.

##### RECONSTRUCTION OF MINISTRY.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: As hon. members are aware, certain Ministerial changes have taken place since this House last met. The Minister for Labour and Industry, Mr. George Stephenson Beeby,

M.L.A., has resigned his portfolio, and a number of other changes have taken place. The Ministry is now constituted as follows:—The Hon. William Arthur Holman, M.L.A., Premier; the Hon. Sir George Warburton Fuller, K.C.M.G., M.L.A., Colonial Secretary; the Hon. David Robert Hall, M.L.A., Vice-President of the Executive Council and Minister for Housing; the Hon. William George Ashford, M.L.A., Secretary for Lands and Minister for Forests; the Hon. John Daniel Fitzgerald, M.L.C., Solicitor-General, Minister of Justice, and Minister for Local Government; the Hon. John Garland, K.C., M.L.C., Attorney-General; the Hon. Augustus George Frederic James, M.L.A., Minister of Public Instruction and Minister for Labour and Industry; the Hon. Richard Thomas Ball, M.L.A., Secretary for Public Works and Minister for Railways; the Hon. William Calman Grahame, M.L.A., Minister for Agriculture; the Hon. John Charles Lucas Fitzpatrick, M.L.A., Colonial Treasurer and Secretary for Mines; the Hon. David Storey, M.L.A., Minister for Public Health; the Hon. Charles William Oakes, M.L.A., member of the Executive Council without portfolio.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS HUGHES: May I be permitted, on behalf of hon. members of this House, to offer congratulations to the two Ministers in this Chamber on their elevation to the respective offices of Attorney-General and Solicitor-General. We are all exceedingly glad to see that those who already represent the Government in this Chamber have been promoted to offices consonant with what we consider to be the dignity and importance of this House. Until comparatively recently it was the custom to have the Attorney-General representing the Government in this Chamber, and I am glad the practice has been reverted to. I am also pleased to see that the mantle of the Solicitor-General and Minister of Justice, which has fallen from the shoulders of the hon. member Mr. Garland has now descended upon our hon. friend Mr. Fitzgerald, and we offer them both our hearty congratulations.

The Hon. J. A. BROWNE: As a member of the bar which the Attorney-General graces, may I be permitted to

offer him my congratulations on his acceptance of the office of Attorney-General, and to state that it is a great pleasure to the bar to see both the Attorney-General and the Solicitor-General members of this House.

The Hon. J. GORMLY: During my thirty-four years' experience in Parliament I must admit that I have seen few men who have shown greater ability or given more earnest attention to their duties than the two gentlemen to whom the hon. member Sir Thomas Hughes has referred.

The Hon. Dr. NASH: Perhaps I may make a second layman, to balance the legal gentlemen who have spoken, and join with the hon. member Mr. Gormly in congratulating the Attorney-General and the Solicitor-General on their elevation to the positions they now occupy. We have all been much obliged to them in previous sessions for the way we have been able to get through our business in this Chamber, and I feel sure that only added dignity in greater measure will result from their conduct of whatever duties may await them in this House.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: I desire very sincerely to thank hon. members for their congratulations and kindly expressions towards myself.

The Hon. J. D. FITZGERALD: I should like to add my thanks for the congratulations which have been heaped upon me by the hon. members who have spoken.

#### LAW OF EVIDENCE BILL (*Formal*).

Bill presented and read a first time.

#### GOVERNOR'S SPEECH: ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Termination of the War—Repatriation—Soldiers' Pensions—Influenza Epidemic—Social Legislation—Railway Construction—Liquor Reform—Industrial Unrest—Parliamentary Government—Profiteering—Increase of Production—Unemployment Insurance—Luncheons at Parliament House—Peace Day Procession Arrangements—Art Gallery—Lady Edeline Hospital—Government Housing Schemes—Land Resumption—The Public Service Board—Admiral Jellicoe's Visit to Walsh Island—The Abattoirs—Appointment of Public Servants at High Salaries—Bell's Pension.

The PRESIDENT reported that he had received a copy of the opening speech delivered by his Excellency.

Speech read by the Clerk (*vide* page 1).

The Hon. S. R. INNES-NOAD moved :

That the following address be presented by the whole House to the Governor in reply to the speech which his Excellency has been pleased to make to both Houses of Parliament :—

*To his Excellency Sir WALTER EDWARD DAVIDSON, Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, 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 Council 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.

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.

He said : In rising to move the address to his Excellency, I was in hope that it would have been my privilege to extend the congratulations we have heard to the two gentlemen who lead the Government in this House. I am quite sure that I need only mention the matter, and that there is no further need for me to dilate on the subject. They know that I as heartily concur in the sentiments expressed as any member of this House.

This is, or should be, a peculiarly happy occasion on which to make such a speech, because we have emerged from the clouds of war which have depressed us, and made everything seem so hopeless during the past few years, and we are now able, or should be able, to look forward to an era of progress and advance for New South Wales which will satisfy us that the time when we had to withhold our hands, to a certain extent, has not been altogether lost. It is to be regretted that this great war has not, perhaps, found us in that condition of returning patriotism and hopefulness which we thought the termination of the war would bring. Unfortunately, all over the world the war has left an aftermath of social unrest and industrial strife. Therefore, I feel it is a matter for congratulation for us that it

has now been made possible to enter upon a resumption of the various matters of administration which had to be set aside during the war, and to which we can now turn with added knowledge of the public requirements.

I am glad to notice from the speech that the Government has left no stone unturned in its efforts to make easy the path of the returned men. Of course, repatriation, first of all, is the duty of the Commonwealth Government, and those who attend to such matters have attended to them in a way which, I am sure, has met with the approval of the great bulk of the people. But this Government has not been content with that. It has, if I may say so, gone out of its way to add to the efforts of the Commonwealth Government in making easier the paths of our men who went from New South Wales. There seems to be, especially in the country, a sort of idea that every returned man should be put upon the land, in a general sense. There seems to be an idea that every returned soldier wants to be put upon the land. There are many men who are fitted for agricultural and pastoral pursuits, but there are many who are not; and, therefore, I am glad to see that the Government, recognising that particular difficulty, has provided a system of vocational training for the men, of whom 1,200 have already availed themselves of the opportunity. I think that system will provide those men with the means of earning an independent living, and it will have a great effect for the benefit of the country, inasmuch as it will, I hope, obviate the possibility of those troubles that have taken place in other countries after every big war—that is, bands of men wandering about the country idle and discontented, for whom no niche can be found in civilian life. I think this vocational training will put within the reach of every man who is willing to earn his living the chance to earn it in a manner that will fit him to fight the battle of life, whether he be fully capable, or only able to do so by engaging in lighter employment than he had followed prior to his going to the war. Another proof of the sincerity of the Government is furnished by the fact that the pension payable to returned men has been increased to a decent living amount.

I hope that that system will be faithfully followed out, because since the Government made up its mind to augment the allowance paid by the Commonwealth Government to the returned men, the cost of living has gone up so much that the resolution comes with added force, and is a benefit which was perhaps not foreseen at the time, but which is now an absolute necessity.

The Government, I also notice, proposes to proceed with a comprehensive programme of public works as mentioned in paragraph 16. That programme may appear to some to be optimistically large; but the activity and watchfulness of the Government will, I think, enable most of these works to be achieved. They have not been allowed to lie dormant. The wheels have been kept going, and I believe that the Government will be able to complete the greater portion of the work it has set itself to do.

I would like to refer to the matter of the influenza epidemic, and particularly to the administrative work of the Government. We are all at times inclined to be captious, not only in regard to this, but other matters. But in connection with this epidemic we have to remember that the Government has had to grapple with new and unknown difficulties; it has had to grapple with a disease protean both in its origin and its possibilities. Therefore it has had to be met both by the Government, the medical profession, and the administrative staff with methods which were largely of an experimental nature. There were no known rules by which to deal with this great plague, and knowing the circumstances of the case we must be prepared to make allowances. I think it is universally acknowledged that the Government in what it did acted boldly and decisively.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: They muddled it delightfully!

The Hon. S. R. INNES-NOAD: The hon. member tells us that the Government muddled it delightfully. Unfortunately no prophet arose in the land who could tell the Government how to do it better. It is easy to say that the Government made a muddle of it. I say that the Government did all that could be done, and did it admirably, with the knowledge it had, acting always upon the

latest information given by the learned profession of which the hon. member is so distinguished a member. I think the Government saved the country from a much greater calamity; I am sure it reduced the evils of the epidemic to a minimum.

It will be pleasing to hon. members generally to notice the Government's acute appreciation of the necessity for social legislation at the present time. Social unrest and industrial discontent are rife throughout the length and breadth not only of this country but of the world. To my mind the proposals of the Government will make for national contentment and industrial peace, and lead the people to take a broader view of their duties as citizens. The question of housing is to receive attention. The reconstruction and reorganisation of the slum areas in the city, with the object of preventing a recurrence of these evils, is a matter for congratulation, and one which should be far-reaching in its beneficent results. The intention of the Government to provide rest homes for maternity cases will bring peace to the minds of many and relieve a great deal of needless suffering which takes place to-day. This and the better organisation of the work of child welfare, which I hope and trust means an entire reconstruction and co-ordination of the existing agencies in the various departments, will constitute a great work worthy of a great Government. I would press upon the attention of the House that this work, as it is being carried on at the present time, is involving the country in an expenditure of £300,000 per year. So that it is not a small matter.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: Child welfare costing £300,000 a year?

The Hon. S. R. INNES-NOAD: Child and maternity work. We are spending that amount now on the various branches of child-work carried on by the Government—State children relief, the various departments, and the children's hospital and subsidies.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: Is the society of which the hon. member is president spending that amount?

The Hon. S. R. INNES-NOAD: No, not 300,000 pence. I am speaking of the subject broadly, and I say it is one

which is receiving attention in all parts of the world. Although we are spending this large amount, our work in completeness of design and extent of expenditure is not to be compared with what is being done in America, Canada, and other places in the old world. After a war such as we have gone through, this is a matter which, to my mind, is of pre-eminent importance. I suppose that the programme laid down by the Government will be criticised as containing the usual number of visionary projects; but those who know the great preparatory work the Government has carried on, not only during the recess but at every available opportunity since it has been in office, will feel confident that if it is not unduly obstructed the Government will be able to place most of its programme on the statute-book before the close of the session. I recognise that it is a great programme, and if it is earnestly entered upon it will have my entire sympathy. I shall give all the assistance I can to help the Government in carrying it out. I believe that all parties in the State should assist in securing these remedial measures, because there is throughout the community, apart from party politics, a spirit of unrest and—I do not like to use the word—revolution against all that we have hitherto held up as our standard, which will require to be firmly handled. It cannot be handled by merely ignoring it. It must be dealt with in a statesmanlike way, and I believe that the programme which has been put forward includes some great and statesmanlike proposals which will be of benefit in allaying that trouble.

Question proposed.

The Hon. J. H. WISE: In seconding the motion moved by the hon. member Mr. Innes-Noad, I would invite hon. members to throw their minds back to the opening of the last session when we were involved in a clash of arms and confronted with the horrors of the most deadly war that has ever been waged in history, and contrast the position then with the position to-day. Peace has now been signed, and with the knowledge that the war is practically over—though some of the smaller nations have not yet signed the peace terms, they will do so at an early date—we are in a position to devote our energies to the making

and perfecting of laws for the benefit of this, our State. There are some matters brought forward in the Governor's speech which if carried out in their entirety will redound to the credit not only of the State but also of the statesmen responsible for placing the measures before us. I am very pleased, indeed, to see the attention that has been devoted to the brave boys who have been fighting our battles. Let us hope that the unrest which, so far as the Repatriation Department is concerned, has, I am perfectly satisfied, been created by misunderstandings, will die away when our soldiers recognise that not only is the Commonwealth Government treating them fairly, but that our own Government is bending all its energies and lending all the capital that it can get hold of to assist the soldiers to build up their future lives. The scheme to place our returned soldiers on the land is an admirable one. A country like this requires producers. A great many of the boys from outback having tasted the delights and pleasures of city life are determined, so I am given to understand, to remain in the cities. Therefore it behoves all Governments—and I am glad that our Government is already taking the course that it is taking—to try to induce others to replace these boys. It is only by producing that we can maintain our national wealth. Those who have been injured are to be trained in different vocations where they can become producers. This is another scheme which redounds to the credit of the Government. Another scheme which to my mind is excellent is the proposal to assist those who are at the present time handicapped by the widespread drought. If the Government can render assistance in such a manner as to give heart to those who are fighting Nature in the back country, it will not only induce credit but it will bring produce into the markets of the world, both of which are required for our future advancement.

There is one paragraph which I think is worthy of very serious consideration and approbation. The Government has now been in communication with the Commonwealth Government, and is prepared with its assistance to go on with the construction of railways which will make

[*The Hon. S. R. Innes-Noad.*]

things more easy and "get-at-able" for everyone who goes on the land. The outcry at the present time is for means of communication, and thousands of pounds' worth of railway material is lying in various parts of the State deteriorating. If the money can be found to make these railways and their connections complete from one part of the State to another it must assuredly open up markets and give heart to those men who are already on the land. Another thing which to my mind is very important is the liquor reform which the Government is proposing to bring before Parliament. One thing which we, as temperance reformers, have been fighting for for many years is to do away with the three-fifths majority vote which we have to obtain in order to gain a victory. I see that the Government is prepared to allow whatever decision is arrived at by a majority vote at a referendum to be carried out. That is a step in the right direction.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: With compensation, of course!

The Hon. J. H. WISE: I understand the compensation is coming along also, but I am speaking now of the, to my mind, most important fact, that instead of handicapping these reformers by saying that two of them are only equal to three others in the community, we are all to be placed on the same footing, thus practically carrying out the democratic principles which we are supposed to follow.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: Do you accept the principle of compensation?

The Hon. J. H. WISE: On the same lines they are doing away with the local option which we have had in the past, and allowing publicans and brewers to create central funds to compensate themselves in respect of any houses that may be closed in the future. I am satisfied in my own mind that Victoria has been ahead of us so far as that particular class of legislation is concerned. They have closed, I think, about three houses to one that has been closed in this State. With their scheme of self-insurance they have insured themselves, and the person who is put out of one particular house is practically compensated from the advantage that is given to the houses that remain. In our scheme,

which has been carried on for years, a house passing out by a vote leaves the others to reap the benefit, without any expense to themselves, but with loss to the one who has had his house closed.

The industrial situation is to my mind the most serious problem we have now to face. Employers and employees will both have to face the fact that one cannot do without the other, and if employers in the past have been rather domineering, or arrogant in their attitude towards their men, let us hope they will realise that it is utterly impossible, in the face of the turmoil now existing the world over, to maintain such an attitude. They must meet the men in fair and honest conference, and let each have a fair share of what is being made. We know it is very difficult indeed to place all men on the same footing; we are not all formed with the same constitutions, the same dispositions, and the same capacity for certain classes of work; and men must be made to recognise that. There may be two businesses running at the same time, one of which, through some fortunate circumstances, can make large profits while the other cannot. There the difficulty comes in with men all requiring the same remuneration. I think that in the near future some scheme will be evolved which will materially assist to bring things down to a fair level for all individuals—masters as well as men. If once we can get them both to look through the same glasses it will be a bright day for the State.

There is another thing which we have to seriously realise, and that is that we are on the verge of troublous times, and that it is only by the reins of Government being in the hands of capable men, and men who will look carefully ahead and think seriously of the results of their acts before attempting anything definite, that we can glide by the shoals and quicksands and keep the ship of State from running on the rocks. I am perfectly satisfied that our present Government is one that will do its best in that respect. To my mind the measures which it is bringing before Parliament this session—although I feel dubious as to their all being carried during such a short period—show earnestness of purpose on the part of the Government.

An Hon. Member: Do they?

The Hon. J. H. WISE: To my mind they do, and I am perfectly satisfied that every bill is founded on earnestness and a determination to try to place them on the statute-book. Once they are placed there I am satisfied that they will enrich the wealth of legislation we already have.

The Hon. A. SINCLAIR: I wish to compliment the Government upon the exhaustive programme which it has placed before us. I do not, like the mover of the address, think that it is by any means visionary. I think that public opinion will rather be that it is not visionary enough.

The Hon. S. R. INNES-NOAD: I said it might be accused of being visionary!

The Hon. A. SINCLAIR: The hon. member seemed to think that there would be some people who considered the proposals visionary, idealistic, and too much "in front," and that the people were incapable of acting up to them. The picture, I am afraid, is quite the other way. References have been made by both the mover and the seconder to the fact that there are ahead of us troublous times. The term "revolution" has been used, and there seems to be an idea that there is general discontent outside which may menace the safety of the State. I am not concerned to dispute that, but I wish to refer for a moment to what I consider would be one safeguard at least. That is that something should be done to strengthen our parliamentary system of government, which I think is undergoing a process of decadence. The fact that it is eight months since Parliament sat at all is to my mind an evidence of that. There is no reason, because of the troubles that have been referred to, why Parliament should not have been sitting and doing the work which it is now undertaking. Much of that work could have been done. This is a wide question, and it does not apply only to New South Wales or to Australia. Historically we find that during the nineteenth century all those forces aiming at reform have placed their confidence in parliaments. Those seeking for the betterment of the condition of the people have placed their faith in parliamentary systems of government. Within the last few years—during the war period

and since the armistice was signed—what have we found? We have found the disappearance of parliaments. All the Rhineland Parliaments are gone; the Russian Parliament is gone, the Hungarian Parliament is gone, and so is the Austrian Parliament; and there is a loud voice clamouring throughout the Continent of Europe, and to some extent beyond Europe, for the abolition of the parliamentary system. There are people now who propose to set up quite other systems of government. They have been set up in Russia—with very little success, I think; but at all events it belongs to us to make Parliament as effective as possible, and to put as much time into the necessary legislation as our case requires. There is this other aspect of the situation which confronts us, just as it confronts Great Britain—the gradual assumption of power by cabinets. Parliamentary power has largely passed from Parliament itself into the hands of the ruling Cabinet. That is extremely dangerous, and I think we are not entirely free from that sort of thing ourselves. This State has incurred during the last eight months very large financial commitments without parliamentary consent at all. That does not go to strengthen parliamentary government, but to weaken it, and to weaken it very much. I wish to sound that note because it does seem to me that there is a danger underlying this general devolution of power from Parliament to Cabinets. It is one step from parliamentary rule to Cabinet rule, and it is only another step from Cabinet rule to personal rule. Well, we want to avoid that, and the way to avoid it is for Parliament to assume its real power, to control its finances, and to exercise the whole of the functions which the community desires that Parliament should exercise. Parliament is, or should be, the governing body.

Coming to the proposals which have been laid before us, I do not think, as I said, that they are visionary. The speech itself contains mention at least of most of the legislation that we seem to require. Whether it is successful or not will depend upon the form in which it is passed. It is proposed to legislate to abolish profiteering. We have the naked statement that that is to be done. How

[*The Hon. J. H. Wise.*]

it is to be done we have no indication whatever, but I should have thought that that would have been given the very first place on the Government's programme. It is the most important question before the public at the present moment. It does not matter where you go—enter any home, and you will hear the cry going up. In most of the churches the cry also goes up against this system of profiteering. Carlyle at one time referring to a certain eminent English statesman said that the most contemptible thing in nature was an eloquent speaker who did not speak the truth. We know how contemptible that type of man is, but it does seem to me that something more contemptible than that has come upon us now. That is profiteering. I cannot conceive of anything more contemptible than a man or a woman who seeks to make unreasonable profit out of starving children—out of the children of men who have laid down their lives for us. Nothing, to my mind at least, could be more contemptible than that, and the sooner we lay violent hands upon the profiteer the better. They are doing it in the United States of America, and they are laying violent hands on his goods as well. The sooner we do that the further we shall be from the revolution that my hon. friend has referred to. There is no doubt about the existence of this profiteering.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: What is a profiteer?

The Hon. A. SINCLAIR: A profiteer is a man who makes undue or unreasonable profits out of any manufacturing or selling transaction.

The Hon. W. BROOKS: What are undue profits?

The Hon. A. SINCLAIR: It is a hard thing that an ordinary citizen like myself should be asked to educate the hon. member Mr. Brooks as to what undue profits are. I expect that will be defined in one of the bills we are promised.

The Hon. R. D. MEACHER: We have already defined by statute what usury is!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: When you use the word "undue" you should be prepared to tell us what you mean!

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: Is 10 per cent. undue profit?

The Hon. A. SINCLAIR: John Ruskin maintains there should be no

profit in trade at all. If I have £100 worth of stuff to exchange with another man for something else, I should get £100 worth for it. That is fair trading.

The Hon. W. BROOKS: Producing for use, not for profit!

The Hon. A. SINCLAIR: I am telling the hon. member Ruskin's proposition—that the trader is not entitled to profit in the sense that he is now getting profit; that £1 worth should bring in a pound's worth, as a matter of exchange—

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: That is syndicalism!

The Hon. A. SINCLAIR: No, it has nothing to do with syndicalism. It is political economy according to John Ruskin. As I have mentioned Ruskin, let me refer to him again on this same question. He says that the word "trader" is synonymous with the word "traitor." I leave it to these traders to choose for themselves what term they like to be called by—whether they are prepared to be called "traders" or "traitors." But there is no doubt that a profiteer is a traitor.

The Hon. W. BROOKS: A trader is not necessarily a profiteer!

The Hon. A. SINCLAIR: No, I do not think that necessarily he is. I am not prepared to go to the same extent as Ruskin, but his view was that a trader was a traitor in his time, and it is possible that many traders were traitors then, just as they are now. The man who seeks to make profit of any kind—I am not talking of undue profit—out of the misfortunes of the people brought about by the war, I say, is a traitor.

The Hon. Dr. NASH: By increasing the price of pianos?

The Hon. A. SINCLAIR: I do not care what it is—whether it be pianos or drugs. I congratulate the Government on dealing with the question of profiteering, because I consider it is the one question that requires to be dealt with at the present time. To show that there is no doubt about the thing going on, I may say that the deposit credits in the banks in 1914 amounted to £240,000,000, and to-day they are £350,000,000. That additional sum has been made during these four years of war. That I think in itself shows excessive profits. While that addition is

deposited to the credit of certain people in the banks, £180,000,000 has been advanced to the Federal Government as war loan as well. So that the deposits in the banks and the war loan together amount to more than double what they were in 1914.

The Hon. Dr. NASH: But is that anything except paper?

The Hon. A. SINCLAIR: It is no use saying that. I am stating what is a fact. I am speaking about the credit at the banks. It is immaterial to me whether the hon. member calls it "paper" or not. I am not concerned to quibble about words. It is an important question. It may seem funny to the hon. member, but there is more than fun in it to a large number of people. It has been said that our remedy lies largely in increased production—that we shall have to produce more. We should have been producing more long ago. What are the reasons why we are not producing more?

The Hon. Dr. NASH: The whole world is tired—that is the reason!

The Hon. A. SINCLAIR: No, the whole world is not tired. I think one of the reasons we are not producing more here is that those engaged in production do not enter into it or carry it on with that efficiency and skill that we find existent in other countries. In America, with a higher degree of management and a wider application of machinery, the labour unit produces three times more than it does in Australia.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: Still they complain that it is not producing enough!

The Hon. A. SINCLAIR: All right—let them complain. I am glad to get some light for our own benefit. It has been customary to put down this solid reduction to one only of the elements engaged in production, namely, the wage-earner. It is put down to the fact that he goes slow—and we know that this going slow is a thing that has come upon us—but it is just as much due to inefficiency in the direction to industry as it is to any go-slow element in the wage-earner. I do not know that the Government can do very much to stiffen up those engaged in productive industry, but I think it ought to be pointed out to them at least that if we are to increase production we must have higher and

better direction of industry than we have now. The fact that one nation of our own kith and kin can so direct and manage industries that the labour unit can produce three times as much in America as it does here is proof that we are a long way from being up-to-date.

The Hon. W. BROOKS: Not necessarily!

The Hon. A. SINCLAIR: I could not give any stronger proof. If my hon. friend can advance any other proof I shall be extremely willing to listen to him.

The Hon. G. BLACK: Certainly our machinery, for one thing, cannot be up-to-date!

The Hon. A. SINCLAIR: If what I am stating is not correct, how can those gentlemen who tell us we should produce more imagine that we can do it? They surely do not argue that we can toil harder, or work a greater number of hours. If we are to produce more, it must be on the lines that I suggest. It must be by a wider and better application of machinery, and a higher direction of industry.

The Hon. G. BLACK: And better scientific training for the worker!

The Hon. A. SINCLAIR: Yes. That brings in the educational aspect of the question. The speech before us proposes to deal with that to some extent. We are to have legislation with regard to the question of apprenticeship, for instance. A real Apprenticeship Act might help us very much to stimulate production. There are many trades which do not require very much skill in the artisan. Nevertheless, a youth has to spend five years in learning a trade. I could enumerate a number of trades in connection with which two years, at the utmost, would qualify a fairly average youth to take his place in them as a man. We are entering now upon a large house-building scheme. For the ordinary house it is proposed to build, 90 per cent. of the labour is only partially skilled. Take the putting on of tiles. All a tiler has to do is to nail the tiles on to the roof of the house. Anyone can realise that if we are to build houses cheaply, and there is a danger of a dearth of labour, we ought to utilise all the labour we have available. It is no use making a strong healthy youth serve five years in learning a simple process like that.

[The Hon. A. Sinclair.]

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: Does he only learn tiling in five years?

The Hon. A. SINCLAIR: The man who puts on tiles does not do anything else. The man who lays bricks does not do anything else. What stands in the way of these things being done differently is that there is a belief amongst artisans generally that if we travel along other lines they will somehow suffer. We must have legislation giving a guarantee against any skilled artisan suffering from a rearrangement of these matters. Once we can guarantee to the working-classes that when changes are made they do not stand to suffer, but that they stand to gain, we can go on producing more, and as a consequence, have more to consume. I believe that in the United States of America there is no apprenticeship at all, and no indentured apprentices.

The Hon. J. S. T. MCGOWEN: Does not the hon. member think there ought to be?

The Hon. A. SINCLAIR: All I contend is that there are a number of trades in connection with which it is not necessary to indenture a youth for five or seven years. If we are to get the best service out of the labour at our disposal, we will get it in other directions if we guarantee that no one stands to suffer from it. I think that guarantee can be given easily enough. Let us utilise the labour at our disposal.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: In medicine the tendency is to lengthen the term a young man serves before he gets his diploma, from five years to six!

The Hon. A. SINCLAIR: A very necessary thing, I think. But my hon. friend will admit, perhaps, that while it may be necessary in the medical profession, it is not necessary in other lines of industry. It is one of the outstanding facts of our industrial system that with the introduction of the factory system work has become differentiated. The subdivision of labour is so acute now that a single individual does only a small part in the production of any article. I have given instances with regard to the building of houses, but what I have said also holds true with regard to work inside a factory. So we must adapt our apprenticeship system and our industrial

laws to the conditions with which we are now confronted, and that I think can be done.

With regard to the other proposals before us, they are all important, and, I think, all very necessary and urgent at the present time. There are some which I confess I do not quite clearly understand. There is the proposal to reconstruct and to regulate slums. Why slums should be reconstructed or regulated I cannot understand. I should imagine the best thing would be to abolish them entirely. There is also legislation foreshadowed with regard to the promotion of public health. The promotion of public health is closely allied to the industrial question. Wherever you have poverty you have disease, and wherever you have disease you have poverty. Under a wiser and better industrial system you would have less poverty and consequently less disease.

The Hon. G. BLACK: And more efficient workmen!

The Hon. A. SINCLAIR: More efficient workmen, as my hon. friend points out. So in travelling along these lines the Health Department should keep that other aspect in view. You cannot get either clean thinking or anything like reasonable conditions in the slums. Wipe out the slums.

There is one other matter I should like to refer to—that is, the proposal with regard to unemployment insurance. I must confess it is not clear to me how we are going to derive very much benefit from unemployment insurance. But it does seem to me that one form of insurance that should come first is sickness insurance. I think every workman should be insured against bad health. In sickness it is more important that a man should have the means of recovering his health, if anything happens to it, than that he should be paid if he is unemployed. An unemployed man, provided he has health, can possibly do much. But the man or woman who is stricken with sickness is helpless, and it should be a cardinal thing in any of our industrial legislation that every worker should be guaranteed that, if sickness overtakes him, then, so far as money can do it, his health will be recovered as soon as possible. I confess I should favour that form of insurance, to begin with, rather than unemployment

insurance. It is extremely difficult always to differentiate whether a man is unemployed through force of circumstances or from some other reason which I need not mention.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: A man who has been sick a long time is necessarily unemployed!

The Hon. A. SINCLAIR: I am pleased to know that what I suggest is included in the unemployment scheme. I know the two things have been legislated for separately in other countries. If sickness insurance is included in the scheme of the Government I am pleased.

I do not propose to trespass any further on the time of the House. Although I am not optimistic enough to think that all the proposals in the speech can be put through this session, still we can at least put some of them through.

The Hon. G. BLACK: I view with what the late David Buchanan would have called surprise bordering on consternation the tremendous programme which has been laid before us at the fag-end of this Parliament. We have a programme which I venture to say would take the next ten years to carry into effect, and I certainly hope that I shall not live long enough to see it made law. The programme seems to be a sort of collection of all the things which have been on the programme of every Government during the last ten years and not passed into law. They have been taken down from the shelves and dusted and embodied in the Government programme. Some are old friends under new names. I am reminded of a story told by the late Mr. John Haynes about a stallion that used to travel about the country, and who had outlived his usefulness. His name was Jolly Roger. They pared his hoofs, hogged his mane and tail, and sent him into a district where he was not known. He was then called Honest Tom, and began again to earn his livelihood.

Before I proceed to deal with the Governmental programme as embodied not only in the Governor's speech but in the speech made by the Premier at Lismore, there are one or two small grievances to which I would like to refer, not only public grievances, but grievances affecting members of this House and of the other House. One is the continual use of that

room which was lately improved—presumably and pretentiously for the use of members of this House—its continual use as a luncheon hall. It has been thus continuously so used during the last few months that it is difficult to enter it without the odour of consumed banquets and beverages arising to one's nostrils. Members of this House who use that room—and there are about ten of us, I think, who use it for public correspondence, and sometimes, perhaps, for private correspondence and for the study of Acts of Parliament and literature of a lighter character, such as the evening newspapers, sometimes so light that they resemble froth—find themselves almost one day in every week unable to enter the room by reason of the fact that from an early hour in the morning the messengers and waiters are engaged in preparing it for a luncheon, and late in the afternoon they are dismantling the preparations they have made.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: Who gives the luncheons?

The Hon. G. BLACK: Ask me something easy. In addition to that, the room alongside this Chamber is often used as a cloak-room. So we are shut out from all accommodation in the House which is needful to us for the purposes of writing and reading. And during the last few months it has also happened that because of the fact that the front and back libraries are in course of reconstruction, owing to the extension of the premises underneath for the storage of books, we are, practically, like the dove ere returning to the ark—we have no rest for the soles of our feet nor for any other portion of our anatomy. I suppose, Mr. President, you are paid the compliment of being asked whether they may use that room or not, and, attached to that compliment, the further compliment also of being invited to take part in celebrations to greet the coming guest or speed some citizens going to travel abroad. It appears to me it would be an act of courtesy on the part of the Government to do so. At all events, there should be a periodical distribution of invitations to these luncheons, so that in their turn other members of this House, apart from the two dining delegates, whose names I see continually appearing in connection

[*The Hon. A. Sinclair.*]

with these luncheons, should have a chance of being present. The Hon. W. Brooks and the Hon. H. D. McIntosh seem to be the diners-in-chief or the dining delegates for the Legislative Council. Mr. McIntosh the other day expressed to me great grief that his adiposity continued to grow upon him to such an extent that he feared it was becoming dangerous. Mr. William Brooks is still in a state of leanness tending to tenuity. I think that at least the Government should strike Mr. McIntosh off the list and put on the Hon. J. A. Browne, who is also one of Pharaoh's lean kine. However, I suppose that now that the session is opened we shall be able to enjoy the use of our own room, as we have not done up till now.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: I may tell the hon. member that occasionally I get invitations to functions ordered by the Government, but I usually get them four or five days after the function has taken place!

The Hon. G. BLACK: There is another matter to which I wish to refer, that is in regard to the Peace Day procession. For that day I received a card most elaborately got up, gold lettered and glazed, measuring 8 inches by 5 inches, inviting me, with a lady, to the enclosure adjoining the saluting base at Bent and Macquarie streets, to view the procession. The enclosure in question was not even enclosed by a chalk line. It was situated in the very worst position in the city from which to view the procession. In the first place the view of the procession was blocked by the stand erected for the accommodation of disabled soldiers; and in the next place, being in the roadway, it was below the level of the pavement, so the people standing in the roadway must have obstructed the view of those who might have occupied the position. The reason it was not enclosed was because it was the place where the motor-cars which brought the disabled soldiers discharged their cargo and afterwards took it up again. Some papers, such as the *Sunday Mirror* and the daily *Herald*, and possibly other papers, made excuses for Mr. Lewis Deer, the indefatigable secretary of the celebrations committee, who, they said, had reserved a part of the

street near the saluting base for officials and their wives, members of Parliament, and the advisory council, but that the public early rushed and occupied the space so that the cards of invitation proved useless. They proved useless for this reason: that every member I knew, and there were members of the Senate, members of the House of Representatives as well as members of the Council and the Assembly, found, on visiting this place, that it was so useless for the purpose of seeing the procession that they turned their backs on it with disgust, and went somewhere else. When I viewed it it was occupied by two or three boys selling flags, two or three old ladies, a policeman, and several homeless dogs. So I turned my back on it and came back to Parliament House, to find the balconies were all occupied by the constituents of members and their wives and families. A sort of temporary erection which had been erected on the bowling green was occupied by a few people. If it had been desired that members of this House and the officials, and that people from the Federal and other Parliaments should see the procession, why was not a proper stand erected inside the grounds of Parliament? To send out an invitation of this character, which would necessitate people standing in the dusty roadway, where their view would be obstructed by a grand stand, was an insult and an act of discourtesy. So far from Mr. Lewis Deer being indefatigable, I think we might find a more appropriate adjective to describe him.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: He has a good billet now!

The Hon. G. BLACK: Yes, he has got out of the wet. He has been promoted over the heads of a number of civil servants of many years standing. I do not grudge him his appointment, but I think he ought to have exercised a little more discretion and courtesy, and been more regardful of the convenience of those whom he insulted by sending out such an invitation.

There is another matter to which I wish to refer. I am informed that the Government intends to place something like £25,000 on the estimates for the purposes of the Art Gallery. That, I think,

is a very laudable intention. But I desire to say this: that if it is so, the Government should earmark that sum for a national portrait gallery.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: For whom?

The Hon. G. BLACK: A national portrait gallery. You do not put one picture in a gallery. It should contain portraits of all the famous and representative people of Australia, of all those men and women who have done something to build up Australia to what it is, and hand down to posterity a most splendid heritage which will grow with the years if the people of Australia are as true to their responsibilities and duties as have been those who went before them. The other day I had a portrait painted of my dear wife. It cost me 100 guineas. I offered it to the National Gallery. In refusing it the trustees made this statement—the grammar is very doubtful, but I am not responsible for that; in fact it is nearly as bad as some of the paintings they have there:

The trustees desire to express their appreciation of your generous offer and their regret that they are unable to accept same. The trustees have on various occasions expressed a desire to devote a special court for the exhibition of portraits presented or bequeathed to the institution, but until the present building is further extended they must defer the question. Portraits of public men and others have been accepted by the trustees for exhibition as space permits. Several are at present on exhibition; those not transferred to other institutions remain stored.

That is to say, they are stuffed away in a cellar until the trustees think it advisable to set apart some portion of the building for a national portrait gallery. It appears to me that the trustees have been negligent in their duty. We have in that gallery a number of pictures and other things which I think have no right to be there. There is a portrait of Sir Charles Wade which is the most lamentable daub of a public man I have ever seen. There is also a portrait of a poor actor, H. B. Irving, by an indifferent painter I never heard of, R. G. Eves, bought in 1911. Irving is only famous because he was the son of his father. His Hamlet was the most lamentable exhibition I have ever seen on the stage, worse even than the Othello of another eminent tragedian who came from London previously. Certainly I have

[The Hon. G. Black.

never seen such a piece of patchwork as his Hamlet, but because he is H. B. Irving, space in the gallery is taken up by the portrait of a man no one here knows or cares about, while the portraits of better men and women who have done something for Australia are stowed away in a cellar.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: Is his picture by an eminent portrait painter?

The Hon. G. BLACK: It was painted by a man called Eves. I never heard of him before. He is one of those eves that go down in darkness rather than in a glorious sunset. In addition, there is in one part of the gallery a stand of copies, photogravures, of John Sargent's portraits of a number of London, German, and Jewish financiers and their wives. That was purchased in 1911. These things are not of any significance to the people of Australia. There is also a collection, known as the Dickinson collection, of thirty-six or more indifferent copies of the old masters. These occupy a whole gallery, to the exclusion of the portraits of the men and women who have helped to make Australian history. It appears to me that the trustees of the Art Gallery should devote their space and their time more advantageously than they had done up till now.

There is another matter I want to refer to before I pass on to a discussion of the Governor's speech, and that is with regard to something I learned to-day with horror. I refer to the closing of the Lady Edeline Hospital. That hospital was opened some years ago—I think our President was responsible for its being opened—for the care of infants afflicted with gastro-enteritis, and it did very good work.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: Why is the institution closed?

The Hon. G. BLACK: I will tell the hon. member why, so far as I know, it has been closed. I may be wrong; if so I am open to correction. In its palmy days the institution was under the care of a committee of ladies and doctors and others. Dr. Paton was a member of that committee, and he had associated with him a number of enthusiastic women who visited the hospital, I think, twice a week. So many visitors were set apart for so many

days, and whilst it was under their management the hospital flourished. But our President passed away as Minister for Health, and I took his place, and the institution still flourished. Then the present Solicitor-General followed as Minister for Health, and for some reason or the other, during the hon. and learned member's regime, the committee was disbanded, and the institution was put under the care of Mr. Green, who is in charge of the charities.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: That was enough to kill it!

The Hon. G. BLACK: He was a man already overworked, and the matron who had been such a success went away to the war. By-and-by the institution fell into such a state of want of usefulness that it was closed by the Government. Then the Government had an opportunity to reopen it by making it an asylum for people suffering from influenza. The epidemic is over, but the institution remains closed. That is a public scandal and disgrace.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: It will have to be opened in the summer time. It is a most important hospital!

The Hon. G. BLACK: I think this is a matter which should be ventilated. I did not know it until to-day, and I was horrified to hear it.

The Hon. J. GARLAND:

The Hon. G. BLACK: I know it in this way: Last night at the King's Cross theatre there was given an exhibition of moving pictures of the various institutions devoted to the care of women and children. I sat near the Governor and his wife. When the exhibition closed Lady Davidson turned to Mr. Green and said to him, "How is it there was no picture shown of the Lady Edeline Hospital?" He replied, "Because the institution is now closed, and there are no babies there." I think that will be sufficient answer for this doubting Thomas. I do not know, except what I have heard, but that I think is near enough to be a positive fact.

I want to refer briefly to the proposal of the Government to introduce measures on the lines of the Sherman Act to prevent profiteering and to control monop-

lies. I have been reading a good deal of what is being done in America to prevent profiteering.

[The President left the chair at 6.30 p.m. The House resumed at 7.30 p.m.]

The Hon. G. BLACK: I only desire to refer briefly to the Sherman Act, and to its apparent failure. The Premier proposes some adoption of it here with a view to checking profiteering.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: There has been amending legislation in America!

The Hon. G. BLACK: In 1914 it was amended; but still the American papers which I receive and often look at, and the letters I have had from relatives and friends in America, show me that the Act has been a failure so far as the checking of profiteering is concerned, and how a State Act is going to succeed here when a Federal Act has failed in America I cannot understand. I really do not believe that it is possible. I do not desire to dwell on that, except to say that it appears to me that it is very much like a kite flown to catch the breeze of public opinion, and will not achieve anything.

I desire to refer, also, to the apparent neglect of the Dacey garden suburb. On that area, which was laid out for 1,673 houses, there had, on 29th May, been 294 houses erected, while 14 were in course of erection. At that time also there were 484 applicants for houses in that suburb, and it was proposed to build 227 by contract to meet that demand. At the Dacey garden suburb an area of 336 acres had been laid out after such a fashion that there were allotments available for 1,673 houses; main avenues had been made and tree-lined, streets had been formed, kerbed and guttered; sewers had been put down, gas and water had been laid on, and there had been every possible primary expenditure to make the land available to meet the growing demand of houses in that direction. That demand has not been met, and it is incontrovertible that it still exists, from the fact that on the 29th May there were 484 applicants for houses to be built there. In spite of that fact, the Government has gone some miles further, to a place called Matraville—for no apparent reason in the world, except that some bookmakers and the Voluntary Workers' Association have

been building houses there for returned soldiers, on a place which is an absolute Sahara. When there is a wind blowing you cannot see your hand in front of you for dust. There are a couple of sandhills and a gully between. They have been preparing and levelling the ground by wheeling all the sand from the sandhills to fill the gully up; there are no roads made, and no conveniences of any kind; no sewerage, no gas, no electricity, nothing but sand.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: Is this a Government business?

The Hon. J. S. T. MCGOWEN: No, it is not. The Government gave these people that land!

The Hon. G. BLACK: It gave the people the land, but the Minister for Lands proposes to erect 110 houses there, and the allotments on which these houses are to be erected at the Government expense have already been balloted for. Now, why is not the money proposed to be expended in erecting those 110 houses expended some mile and a half or two miles nearer town—on the Dacey garden suburb land, where all the conveniences requisite for comfort exist, instead of sending people out into that wilderness?

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: But Daceyville, I understand, is for middle-class people!

The Hon. G. BLACK: You can make it whatever you like.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: It is not for working-men, is it?

The Hon. G. BLACK: There are any number of working-men there, and plenty more would be glad to go there. It has every convenience. It has a market of its own, there are shops, picture theatres, at least one church, and a school.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: The rents are very high!

The Hon. G. BLACK: But they can lower the rents.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: How can they?

The Hon. J. GARLAND: They are bound to charge enough to make the scheme a paying concern!

The Hon. J. S. T. MCGOWEN: They are 6s. a week cheaper than anywhere else!

The Hon. G. BLACK: The board can build a cheaper class of houses if it

chooses to do so. The only difference I can see between the two schemes is that one is run by a board, and is therefore to some extent beyond the power of the Government, while at Matraville the Minister for Lands is the sole authority.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: Not now. It is the Minister for Housing!

The Hon. G. BLACK: Up to the time I am speaking of, it was the Minister for Lands. Not only is that so, but they are also abandoning the Dacey garden suburb for a place which is to be called the Ashford village, and which is situated near Maroubra Bay road and its junction with the Bunnerong-road, and is in the vicinity of the old labour farm. That is an infinitely better site than Matraville, but why abandon the Dacey garden suburb? It is proposed to erect 102 houses at this Ashford village; 102 houses have already been balloted for, and a further block of over 100 houses is being prepared. Why should this be done? Why should not the Government finish its work at the Dacey garden suburb? Why should it not utilise the splendid natural advantages which are afforded there, and the splendid opportunities which have been created by the expenditure of the State's money in preparing an ideal situation, provided with all that civilisation can now give to the people?

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: But it would not fill the window for the elections!

The Hon. G. BLACK: I do not believe that you are "filling the window" by such madcap proposals as this. It means this: that the few houses which are now erected at Dacey garden suburb are over-capitalised by the sum which has been spent in so developing that portion of Crown lands that over 1,600 houses can be erected there. As it is now, the 308 homes which have been erected—or 294 up to 29th May and 14 then in course of erection—are burdened with the capital cost of preparing allotments for the reception of 1,673 houses. Those people who desire to buy homes there from the Government are unable to do so because the Government is not prepared to make an estimate of the cost of each building, which will be based on the capital cost of the whole settlement. It appears to me that that is a wrong method of procedure.

[The Hon. G. Black.]

I desire to say something with regard to repatriation—not repatriation generally, but repatriation in connection with land resumption. In 1913, when the Government of which Mr. Holman was Premier was going to the country, the policy then enunciated by him and his Minister for Lands was, that instead of following the practice of purchasing lands to sell again—which was in my opinion moving in a vicious circle—the Government should open up the Crown lands of the country by the construction of railways; and thus by sending railways ahead of settlement, encourage settlement by developing that asset which was the property of the people of the country. That has been abandoned, and we have had a policy of the purchase of land for the use of returned soldiers at prices which, in my opinion, are so high that those who take up the land will be saddled from the beginning with responsibilities which in most cases they will never be able to meet. This has also had the effect of raising the cost of land to other purchasers to such an extent that it has become out of the question in many instances. We have had land bought by the Government at the following prices per acre: £9 2s. 6d., £6 17s. 6d.; again £9 2s. 6d., £4 2s. 6d., £5 7s. 6d., £4 17s. 6d., £6 10s., £8 15s., £11 18s., and so on—an ever-recurring increase as the system goes on; the effect being that the Government purchase of land is raising the selling price of land while not improving its use value—in my opinion a very dangerous thing. I am told that the Government has already expended, or is committed to the expenditure of £2,000,000 in connection with the resumption of land for the settlement of repatriated soldiers.

Paragraph 12 of the Governor's speech says:

While the financial difficulties which have beset the public works policy of the State during the closing years of the war have not altogether disappeared, my advisers acting in conjunction with the Commonwealth Government have been able to arrange for the construction of certain railways calculated to facilitate the provision of land for returned soldiers.

If that £2,000,000 to which the Government is committed and the £700,000 which I believe the Federal Government prepared to advance to the State for the

construction of railways for purposes of repatriation had been expended in opening up the Crown lands of the country, the soldiers who have been settled on the land would be settled on it under conditions of being tenants of the State and aided by the State, and subject to a provision of one of the Land Acts under which they need not pay any rental for five years provided that during that term they expend sufficient on the land in improvements to equal the amount of the rental they were expected to pay. If settlement had been carried on under those conditions I venture to say that the problem of repatriation would be very much nearer to solution than it is now; but I am very much afraid that the great bulk of the men who have been settled on the land will be found to have been settled under such conditions that they will be quite unable to meet their obligations, and will be compelled to repudiate the arrangements they have made with the Government; that the Government of the country will be saddled with very heavy losses in these directions, while the unfortunate people who have been thus over-burdened will be thrown on the labour market to be a burden on the community until work in some other direction is found for them.

One of the railways—and there are a number of them—which I think the Government would have done well to complete is that which intersects the Dorriggo country from Glenreagh. That traverses some of the finest land in Australia.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: Some of the finest forests!

The Hon. G. BLACK: Some of the finest land and some of the finest forest country, yes.

The Hon. J. S. T. MCGOWEN: It has a great fall!

The Hon. G. BLACK: Undoubtedly, and it is a very difficult line to construct; but, nevertheless, if that railway had been built, the timber which would have been saved by its construction would have more than paid the cost of the railway. Every man who has been through there has formed the same opinion. I have travelled there two or three times. The most beautiful timber that could be imagined has been burnt, destroyed, and wasted.

There is a lot of it lying rotting on the ground because there is no means of conveying it to market cheaply enough to make it marketable timber.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: Who opened that part at all? It should never have been thrown open for selection!

The Hon. G. BLACK: I do not know. It was thrown open for selection a considerable time ago. I think it was during the Lyne-See Government's term of office. Then the Dubbo to Werris Creek line should also have been constructed. The Humula-Tumberumba line is one which passes through very fine orchard country—one of the best fruit-growing districts in Australia. In addition to that, there is the Pilliga Scrub line. There are sleepers lying on the surveyed line to the value of £30,000. The construction of a number of earth-works was begun, but they have never been finished. They have been unused and are deteriorating. Some of the finest farming land in New South Wales is to be found there. In my opinion it is as good as anything in Australia. Not only so, but the sub-artesian bore system is the best in the State. The Government has put down bores on the land there. There has been a considerable expenditure by the Government on land which has never been taken up because the farms on which the bores are situated are too far from market. A number of bores have been put down 25 miles from the present terminus at Coonabarabran. If the railway had been carried through the scrub to Pilliga the whole of that country would have been settled long ago. It is rich agricultural land, but it is not settled on from the fact that three or four years ago they had to pay 9d. to 1s. per bushel or from 2s. to 3s. a bag for the cartage of wheat to Coonabarabran. Some of the intending settlers abandoned the country they had taken up on the presumption that, in accordance with the Government promises, the railway was coming along. If the country had been opened up by the construction of this railway something like 500,000 acres of first-class agricultural land could have been made available for returned soldiers. But it is now lying idle, and money has been expended in the purchase of land which is to be sold again

[The Hon. G. Black.

on such terms as make it unlikely that the Government or those who occupy it will ever get a return from it.

I could go through the whole list and deal with them in this way, but there is just one other matter I want to refer to—that is, in regard to the eastern portion of the Western Division. In certain counties there, such as Finch, Narran, Gundabooka, and Cowper, the rainfall is better than that of the greater portion of the Riverina. The rainfall in Finch is, I think, about 19½ inches. That is the average. It runs down to about 17 inches in the county of Cowper. Not only is that so, but the country is intersected by half a dozen flowing streams of water. In good seasons there are three or four large lakes there. It is also in the artesian bore area. Although I am not a pastoralist, I know there are several stations there which have more edible scrub on them than I have seen in any other part of New South Wales I have ever visited. I have never seen such varieties of edible scrubs as I have seen on some of the stations which lie between Collarenebri and Goodooga. Not only is that so, but it is the part of our State from which we used to draw great supplies of cattle. Coming across the border at Goodooga they would come down through Angledool to Collarenebri, there to be trucked. I have travelled through there, and in one day I have seen 10,000 head of cattle coming along. It is because the Queensland Government, by its system of light railways, has made it more convenient for the pastoralists in the vicinity of our border to truck their cattle to the American meat firms who are now doing such business in the Northern State, that we have fewer Queensland cattle coming to our market, the consequence being that beef here is dearer than it has ever been known before. The Government should have carried out the policy which was initiated by Mr. Lee, when Minister for Works, who promised the people of Collarenebri that if he remained in office he would carry the Collarenebri railway to Goodooga. That promise was repeated by the late Mr. E. W. O'Sullivan when he succeeded Mr. Lee. He was so much in earnest that he constructed the earth-works between Collarenebri East, which

is known as Pockataroo, and Collarenebri, at a cost of £40,000. Those earth-works are still in existence, and they are of the height of the gallery of this Chamber. In good seasons they are covered with herbage. I have seen cattle and sheep and horses feeding on the top of them. Mostly there is no sign of growth at all on them, but in one or two good seasons I have seen cattle and horses feeding right along them. The railway would intersect land which is all Crown land held under leasehold. Some of the leases do not expire for twenty years, and some for forty years. It is land of such a character that a man who was fortunate enough to get a 10,000-acre block would make a very good living from it. In my opinion a great deal of the land in the counties I have mentioned should have been thrown into the Central Division long ago. It should never have been taken away from the Central Division, and should have been made available for settlement by the construction of a railway.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: Was it not taken out of the Western Division by an Act passed last year?

The Hon. G. BLACK: They tried to do it, but did not do it. I think the Act gave the Minister certain powers of resumption. We passed an Act in the Assembly, I think in 1914. I think it was the Hon. Louis Treflé who at my instigation introduced the bill to throw that part of the country into the Central Division. I believe the bill was thrown out in this Chamber mainly on account of a speech made by the Hon. James Ash-ton, who had some years previously bitterly opposed that land being enclosed in the Western Division. However, circumstances alter cases.

I might go seriatim through these railways and point out what might have been done by the expenditure of two millions. I have seen in the newspapers that £2,000,000 has been already expended or tied up for resumptions. If that money had been spent as it should have been spent, together with £700,000 which the Federal Government proposes to lend to the State Government or give to it—I do not know which—in order to assist repatriation, if that money had been expended in opening up the country

as it should have been, the question of settling soldiers on the land would have been very much nearer to success than it is now or likely to be.

I quite approve of the Government programme. I should very much like to see it carried into effect. But the thing that puzzles me is, how we are going to get the time to do it, and how to find the money. I do not know how many millions it will cost.

The Hon. J. S. T. MCGOWEN: That is the difficulty with the construction of railways, too, is it not?

The Hon. G. BLACK: Exactly, and one reason is because the Government has earmarked two millions for the purchase of land, which money should not have been so spent when there are Crown lands of equal capacity and productivity which could have been made accessible, and thus prove a great asset to the State.

The Hon. J. S. T. MCGOWEN: That is what you and I always fought for when in the Lower House!

The Hon. G. BLACK: Yes, and I am fighting for it now in the Upper House. I have not found this House so conservative as to make me change my opinions. On the contrary, I find there are some members holding radical opinions who are ready to do the fair thing by the people of the country when a work can be shown to be necessary. But, much as I should like to see the Government programme carried out, I do not see how we are going to do it in the three or four months which remain before this House is closed, owing to the fact that gentlemen of the other House will be sent to their masters; nor do I see where we shall be able to get £30,000,000 to carry the Government programme into effect.

The Hon. Dr. NASH: Once again we are presented with a basis for the work which we shall be expected more or less to undertake during the session which is now opening. Like all other people in the community, I am glad to note the second sentence in the Governor's speech, which deals with the subject of peace, and refers in a way to the fact that this Empire and its Allies have presented terms of peace to other people. It also expresses wisely the hope that there will be a minimum of the possibility of fur-

ther war. I am not one of those who think that this great war will make much difference to future wars. Hardly a day passes but there are threats of war between one nation and another.

Whoever is responsible for this document has shown that there is still a fighting spirit in the race, because in paragraph 4 he makes the justifiable boast that, even amongst the States of Australia, the State of New South Wales has been almost the best in finding soldiers to fight this war of the Empire. It reminds me of that challenge thrown out by Clemenceau when the Treaty of Paris was signed. The old man jumped up and said at once, with the fighting spirit of his race, "I have waited forty-nine years for this day." Was that anything more or less than a challenge to the people whom his countrymen have been fighting for thousands and thousands of years? Paragraph 4 shows the spirit of our race—that we are still a fighting crowd, prepared to uphold the honor and dignity and the freedom of our land.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: Premier Holman takes the credit of getting those men!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: Let him have it.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: Oh, no!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: I mind not, so long as the men went and proved themselves worthy of their ancestors, worthy of the people who came here, and who in 130 years have made this country what it is. Bad as war is, it has its compensating advantages amongst the sons of men.

I am glad to see that the Government is putting forth efforts to help the men who have been abroad, and who, with their failings and their strength, have shown a willingness to risk their lives when occasion required, both on land and sea. As I stepped into the vestibule of this Chamber yesterday I saw a man in uniform with a crown on his shoulder. I took my hat off to that man. He started a few years ago here as a messenger of this House, and comes back now as a major in the great Imperial Forces. He is but an example of the spirit of our race. I honor him for it, and whenever he is in uniform and I am in civilian clothes I will take off my hat in salutation of him.

[The Hon. Dr. Nash.]

With regard to settling soldiers on the land, no thinking man can hold an opinion other than that if these men can be settled on the land, and make a success of it—and some of them will make a success of it—nothing better could be done in the interests of New South Wales, because in New South Wales, as in every part of the world, it is from the land we get everything. There is nothing of value that does not come from the land directly. If these men make a success on the land the war will have justified itself in that matter alone.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: Why does the hon. member suppose that because a man has been a soldier he is likely to be a successful farmer?

The Hon. Dr. NASH: There will be a proportion of these men who will not succeed as farmers. They cannot, because I fear they are being promised too much, and we know what promises with regard to the land mean. Is there any man here who does not remember the promises that were made with regard to Yanco and other areas? Is there any one of us who does not remember or who has forgotten the inquiries that have been held in regard to Yanco on several occasions, and the promises I hope will not be too much. I hope that this Government and succeeding Governments will be able to find markets for the produce which these men will bring forth. At present if you go down King-street you will see oranges for 6d. and 9d. each, and, though this is a great pastoral country, if you want to buy 4 oz. of cream you must pay 10d. for it. That means 3s. 6d. a pint. If those prices keep up and these men can find a market for their produce, they will soon make their fortunes. I am very glad that the State Government proposes to help these soldiers in every way, and I say that, although I am an advocate of economy, and always have been in this House—in fact no man has preached economy in prosperous times more than I have. If you want anything in hard times you must be careful in prosperous times, because if you are not careful in prosperous times then you have nothing left for the times that are hard. If you want proof of what is coming upon the community, you have it in writing in this document,

where in paragraph 9 it says there is drought throughout the land. These soldier settlers, if there be a drought throughout the land, will have to face droughts like everyone else, and droughts are more disastrous to the small man than to the big, although if they be severe enough they destroy both. And our country is a land of droughts, it is not a land of good seasons. If you take one season with another, it is probable that the seasons of drought are more numerous than the seasons of plenty of rain. But, notwithstanding all these things, when the question comes up and we are asked to help the Government in spending money on the soldiers, I for one shall be prepared to help, not without criticism perhaps, but certainly without quibble, at the way in which that money is to be given. I know that private virtues are very often public vices. With regard to money that is more true than of anything else, because in voting public money men are not voting their own and they are liable to look upon their responsibilities with too light a heart. But occasions do come when the State must stand behind its Ministers or other people who for a great cause have to find money to spend upon deplorable events. That has been the case during the war. It may be the case again, when it will become our duty to stand behind the soldiers.

I now come to paragraph 10, which deals with the influenza epidemic. I notice that the mover of the address in reply spoke of the epidemic as if it were something new. I do not know whether the hon. member had in his mind the idea that this epidemic was something new in the world.

The Hon. A. SINCLAIR: It is new to us!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: New! Why this disease has been going round the world for thousands of years in the same way that it has been during the last few months.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: The hon. member never saw the disease before!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: No, because the hon. member and I were not in the world when the epidemic was previously here.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: It is a new disease as far as we are concerned!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: No, it is not. We have to learn, and we can read about it. There is one hon. member of this House who has seen the epidemic before, and he is the only gentleman and the only member of my profession I know of who has seen an epidemic before. I refer to the hon. member Sir Charles Mackellar. When he was a student this very same disease went round the world in exactly the same way as it is going round now.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: What year was that?

The Hon. Dr. NASH: It was over sixty years ago.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: In 1847!

The Hon. G. BLACK: There was something like it in 1890!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: We have never seen anything like it; and I only know one man who has seen it, and, as I say, it is the hon. member Sir Charles Mackellar. But we do know of it from our reading, and we have always known of it as a pandemic disease, which, despite everything, goes right round the world. Notwithstanding all precautions it is now in Tasmania, ready to play havoc there on susceptible people in the same way as it has played havoc in all the other States of Australia. More people have died during the epidemic in New South Wales than in any other State of Australia.

The Hon. G. BLACK: The percentage of deaths here is not as high as it was in Victoria!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: Take it by and large in all probability it will turn out to be practically the same, because all over the world the death-rate is about 6 per cent. It kills off about two men for every woman. I am sorry that the hon. and learned member the Solicitor-General is not here, because I have some things to say about his conduct of this epidemic, with which I do not see eye to eye, and in which I have not seen eye to eye with him.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: We had better adjourn the debate until the hon. and learned member is here!

The Hon. J. WILSON: Neither the mover nor the seconder of the address in reply is present!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: That is a most discourteous act towards the House. I have never known the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to be absent from the House during the debate. I hope the Minister in charge will, under the circumstances, allow me to move the adjournment of the debate until to-morrow.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: What an extraordinary reason for adjourning the debate! The hon. member is addressing the House!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: I am addressing the House on a special occasion. The hon. member Mr. Sinclair in the course of his remarks spoke about the transference of the power of Parliament to the Cabinet. What I object to is individual Ministers jettisoning Acts of Parliament, treating them as if they did not exist, and striking out a course of their own to combat epidemics or anything else. It is becoming a habit with Ministers, both in the Federal arena and in the arena of State politics, especially in New South Wales.

The Hon. A. SINCLAIR: It is an epidemic!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: It is an epidemic which is inflicting greater disasters upon us than this disease. Why, to-day a woman rules in Australia. Her name is Pankhurst-Walsh. Neither you nor I dare travel along the coast of Australia, because she says we must not, and the Ministers of the Federal Government dare not say a word. They temporise and pander and send out messages which no one can understand. Then they growl when simple men like seamen send messages in reply to say, "We know not what you mean." No one can say he understood the message sent by Mr. Millen and Mr. Groom. Where is the Federal Act of Parliament for the Arbitration Court? They have jettisoned it, thrown it to the wind.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: What have we to do with that?

The Hon. Dr. NASH: If the hon. and learned member will allow me, I will tell him what we have to do with it. I am producing this as an example. There is a Federal arbitration law which prescribes the methods of procedure in all these things, yet when the State has a

[*The Hon. Dr. Nash.*]

little trouble of its own, the Acting Prime Minister of the Commonwealth not only insults the State, but he jettisons his own Arbitration Act and fixes up the coal-miners of New South Wales, and precipitates us in a sea of trouble lasting ever since. Here we are to-day the victims of the same Ministerial neglect of responsibilities with regard to an Act of Parliament. Here during this epidemic we have been in exactly the same position. The Minister for Public Health, as soon as there was word about this epidemic, jettisoned his advisers and refused to recognise them, although there is an Act of Parliament specifically making them the advisers to the Minister.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: Not at all. Where is the Act of Parliament?

The Hon. Dr. NASH: The Public Health Act.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: That does not make the Board of Health advisers to the Minister!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: Yes, it does.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: I beg the hon. member's pardon, it does not. They are given certain specific powers with regard to nuisances and other things, but they are not advisers to the Minister. The Minister can take advice from whom he likes!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: The Board of Health is there to advise the Minister.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: That is so, but only to advise. The Minister need not take the advice!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: No.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: Then what is the hon. member complaining about?

The Hon. Dr. NASH: I complain that the men who are entitled to be consulted, and who know this business, were not consulted at all.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: Does the hon. member say that the Director-General and the Assistant Director-General of Health were not consulted? If he does, he knows nothing about it!

The Hon. J. RYAN: Does the hon. member imply that the advice of the Board of Health was overridden?

The Hon. Dr. NASH: The Board of Health was never asked for advice.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: The Director-General and his assistant were in constant communication with the Minister of Health and the Cabinet!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: I know they were. But the Board of Health is a statutory body to advise the Minister, and the Director-General of Public Health is President of the Board of Health. On the Board of Health at that moment were three men who knew more about epidemics than any men in Australia. Those three members of the Board of Health were Sir Charles Mackellar, Sir Thomas Peter Anderson Stuart, and Dr. Paton—three men who during the last forty years have piloted the State through every epidemic that has occurred, and not one of these gentlemen was asked for his advice in this matter.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: Does the hon. member say that Dr. Paton was not asked for his advice?

The Hon. Dr. NASH: As a member of the Board of Health, no, he was not.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: I say that Dr. Paton was in hourly consultation with the Minister and the Cabinet during the whole epidemic!

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: As Director of Public Health, not as President of the Board of Health!

The Hon. J. GARLAND: Are there two Dr. Patons?

The Hon. Dr. NASH: My complaint is that not only were they not asked for their advice, but the Minister went behind them to an irresponsible body, and asked them to nominate men to act as advisers.

The Hon. A. SINCLAIR: What body was that?

The Hon. Dr. NASH: The B.M.A., an irresponsible body. The Board of Health is responsible, and in addition it has knowledge. The three gentlemen I have referred to have more knowledge of these things than all other members of the profession, if you got them all to advise you. Who did the B.M.A. nominate to advise the Minister?

The Hon. J. GARLAND: The best men in the place, I should say. At least they said so!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: They nominated what were known as the British Medical Eleven, including the junior officer of the Board of Health, a gentleman who spends his time making post-mortem examinations, and who has never

held a responsible advisory position. Instead of inviting Sir Charles Mackellar, Sir Thomas Peter Anderson Stuart, and Dr. Paton—

The Hon. J. GARLAND: Why does the hon. member insist about Dr. Paton?

The Hon. Dr. NASH: I say the three of them. Dr. Paton is not only Director of Public Health, but he is President of the Board of Health, and in that capacity he would have the assistance of the other two gentlemen, whose knowledge would have been a great help and would have saved a very great deal of trouble. Do not misunderstand me. Dr. Palmer is a most excellent man at his job. No better have I ever looked at. I say nothing about Dr. Palmer, except that he was not the man to advise the Minister on this occasion. The Minister passed over men of capacity, and chose those commonly called the British Medical Eleven. I have not a word to say about them. They are all first-class men. I am further of opinion that if the Board of Health had been strengthened by the addition of one or two of them the Minister could not have got a better advisory council. But it was a wrong policy to go outside and ask the B.M.A. to take upon itself functions which are no part of its duty. The B.M.A. in its way is a first-class organisation and has done good in every way for the profession, but, like all other organisations, it has its functions and its limits, and this was not one of its functions.

The Hon. J. S. T. MCGOWEN: I thought all medical men were in the union?

The Hon. Dr. NASH: The B.M.A. is not a union. The union of medical men in Australia is the union under the ægis of the Medical Board. I have had to say this often in this House. The board constituted by the Government makes every medical man in New South Wales a member of the medical profession, and gives him his right to practise in the same way that the unions give men the right to work in this country. The B.M.A. is merely an association of medical men for scientific purposes, and, on occasions, of advice to its members. Then, extraordinary to relate, when this advisory council required advice of any kind, to whom did they turn? They

went to the officers of the Board of Health. They got these gentlemen before them, and they gave the British Medical Eleven advice. I am glad to say that that number of members drawn from the B.M.A. was always glad to acknowledge that the officers of the Board of Health were the proper authorities, and many a time they stuck out and told the Minister, "You must take the advice of these men, who are the officers of the Board of Health, for we do not take the responsibility." That is what I object to, that the Minister, having these men all ready at hand, should take no notice of them and should go over their heads to seek for advice elsewhere.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: That is a beautiful romance!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: I am quite prepared to stand by what I have said. Another little thing about this epidemic which calls for mention is this: Great numbers of civilians were drawn into this epidemic business. I have seen them come to the office of the Board of Health, and try to order the officers about and tell them, "We are so-and-so; we have been appointed by the Minister, and we have come here to do so-and-so." The officers of the board firmly but gently told them to go away. But these good-meaning people, given a precedent by the Minister, came along, and it was remarkable and laughable to see how they wanted to dominate the whole show. The places for hospitals and the action to be taken were all thought out and talked over by members of the Board of Health before ever the Minister thought of these things, and before ever the civilians who were drawn in had heard of them. Hospitals were picked out round about the city—

The Hon. J. GARLAND: The Board of Health had nothing to do with that, and had no authority to pick out a single hospital. It was only the Director-General of Public Health, under the direction of the Minister!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: A tremendous amount of public money was squandered which would not have been squandered had the Director-General of Public Health and his advisers been dealt with as is indicated by the Act of Parliament framed for the purpose of dealing with

these epidemics. The second part of the Act deals with the Board of Health and local authorities. The board is composed of certain members; it is an incorporated body of whose directions all courts, judges, justices, and persons acting judicially shall take judicial notice. It is given rights of entry and access to all sorts of documents; it may make regulations and pursue inquiries. It has officers and servants. It has also certain powers of quarantining. Specific authority is given in Part VIII to combat epidemics. The Minister could not declare this an epidemic disease until he got advice from the Board of Health. My hon. friend says that we are only to deal with water and sewerage, and things like that. Yet the Minister himself is specifically forbidden, except on the advice of the Board of Health, to say that anything is an epidemic disease. Then there is provision for the prevention of the spread of infectious diseases.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: Was it under that Act that influenza became a notifiable disease?

The Hon. Dr. NASH: Yes. It is not so now, but it was made notifiable by the Board of Health.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: The Premier scuttled away like a frightened rat from Melbourne!

The Hon. J. GARLAND: I think that statement is unworthy of the hon. member!

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: Not at all; he scuttled away like a frightened rat!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: I do not think the hon. member should say that.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: Why not? I am responsible for what I say in this House!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: Mr. Holman is a great man, at any rate, and I do not agree with any man who says that in the performance of his public duty he "scuttled away." At any rate, I do not wish to identify myself in any way with an opinion like that. Nobody has ever succeeded in preventing the influenza epidemic from going round the world. Even if you had an island, with no ships coming to it, I am not sure, so far as our knowledge goes, that you could stop it; but, at any rate, one good thing was done, and that was the way my hon. and

[*The Hon. Dr. Nash.*]

learned friend and his colleagues stood up against the Commonwealth Ministers, because they gained time for us and gave us a chance to get ready to deal with the epidemic. It was during that time that Dr. Paton and the other members of the Board of Health considered the matter of hospitals and the distribution of the medical profession. The employment of every person engaged was discussed, and it was from those discussions that the Director-General got information which he was able to convey to the Minister and the Cabinet. These matters were brought up from time to time before the Board of Health, and the board always said, "We say nothing; this is a great emergency, and if the Minister likes to flout us, that is his business, not ours." They played their part well, and although they did all the work and got everything ready, they allowed other people to have the kudos. I notice that in this speech everybody is mentioned as having helped except the officers of the Health Department. Throw the Board of Health to the winds, if you like. Civilians who knew nothing about the game, and a great many of whom probably got money out of it, can get credit; yet not Dr. Paton nor one of his officers has a word said for him. These men bore the burden and the brunt of the time. Dr. Paton's officers were in charge of every institution. Dr. McDonald was in charge of that great establishment, the Skating Rink. He and his wife was stricken down by disease, but he held the fort. Dr. Mackay and his wife worked at the emergency hospital on the City-road, and she also was stricken down. Dr. Wallace and his assistants at the Coast stood in the breach, and so did the nurses of the Health Department. Many medical men and women sacrificed their lives.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: Were they not doctors and nurses?

The Hon. Dr. NASH: They were.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: And are not the doctors and nurses thanked there for their work?

The Hon. Dr. NASH: The medical profession and the hospital staffs—yes, of course they are; but I am telling you what they did. But none of the senior members of the Health Department are mentioned.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: Do you suggest that we should set out a list of names in the Governor's speech?

The Hon. Dr. NASH: No, but I say that officers of the Health Department should be recognised, if you recognise anybody. They were in and out of the hospitals day and night during the whole course of the epidemic.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: Of course they were; and magnificent service they rendered!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: Why are they left out?

The Hon. J. GARLAND: They are not left out!

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: *Sic vos non vobis!*

The Hon. Dr. NASH: The voluntary workers everywhere did wonderful work too, and I am quite sure that if this epidemic had been dealt with under the Act of Parliament which provided for the specific purpose of the management of such occurrences the State would have been saved many thousands—perhaps hundreds of thousands of pounds—and there would have been much better and more efficient management of the epidemic than we had.

We are not addressed upon financial matters, but I am always sorry when I see our Government leaning upon the Federal Government, because I am coming not to like federation. Nobody in this country was a more ardent advocate of federation than I was, and I sometimes wondered why I was in disagreement with such great men as Sir Normand MacLaurin and some of his associates. I recognised in Sir Normand a man of super-intellect, of large experience and great knowledge.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: And very narrow views!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: Narrow perhaps in some things. He had some of the characteristics of his race. If he had an enemy he never forgot him. However, he was a great man. He had plenty of knowledge, and was prepared always to give the benefit of that knowledge to anybody who went to him, whether he were friend or foe. He was associated with the opposite side while I was strongly in favour of the federation of

the Australia colonies. I suppose what happened was just as well, because it had to come. It would have come during the Russo-Japanese war, all in a hurry, if it had not come before, and one good thing was that there was a united Australia to face the common enemy in the year 1914. I have always feared the complaisance of State Ministers, however, when they were dealing with the Commonwealth. State Ministers have over and over again not scrupled to give away our liberties. In regard to arbitration, and in regard to all sorts of other things, our liberties as States have been given away, and we are to-day suffering for the acts which gave the liberties of the State into the hands of Commonwealth Ministers. The men from among whom Commonwealth members of Parliament are drawn are not, I think, so far as our experience goes, of very superior calibre to the men who manage the State. In my opinion they have very seldom been, since the first Ministry, men of superior intellect to the Ministers of our own State. As to the rank and file, they have their glory and their positions; but the glory and their seats in the Federal Parliament do not endow them with knowledge. There have been many men running the Commonwealth who have not been men of superior intellect. We have seen in industrial troubles in our own State great Commonwealth Ministers leading unions against the State, leading them up to the very minute when the Premier of this State said to them, "That Act of Parliament is meant to put you in gaol." In this State things which I absolutely disapprove of have occurred. The activities of the State are paralysed to-day because a Commonwealth Minister chose to go behind an Act of Parliament of the Commonwealth, and to flout the State when the coal-miners went to him. I am not prepared to extend the powers of the Commonwealth. They appear to me to threaten the State too far. In their conduct of the great activities of the Commonwealth have they shown any greater power for good than the State? Take Port Darwin and the Northern Territory. Take the Federal Capital.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: Take Walsh Island!

[*The Hon. Dr. Nash.*]

The Hon. Dr. NASH: There was never anything more degrading than the evidence given before the royal commission that inquired into the conduct of affairs at the Federal capital. Was not my hon. friend the Hon. Dr. Doyle, with me and many others, a witness of the Acting Minister of the Navy saying to the men working at Walsh Island, flouting his own Act of Parliament, "Do not stop work; if anything happens to you come to me. I will see that everything is made right for you."

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: Does the hon. member think that was wrong?

The Hon. Dr. NASH: Absolutely wrong. There were the Arbitration Acts of the Commonwealth and of New South Wales, by which these men should have been bound, Acts by which the Ministry should be bound, and by which every individual in New South Wales in these unions should have been bound. But this Minister flouted both the State and the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: There are other things in life than Acts of Parliament, and probably the Minister knew it!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: Whether the men shall work or shall not work is something within the province of the Acts of Parliament which made the Arbitration Courts. Those courts were made for men to appeal to, in case there was any disagreement between them and their masters. But who in Australia takes notice of Arbitration Courts now? They are a byword. We in this Chamber who took part in those Acts, as other people did, in making these Arbitration Courts, wasted our time, because the Ministers jettisoned those Acts of Parliament when the occasion arose and took no notice of them. There is no higher work for a Minister to do than to set an example by obeying Acts of Parliament. A Minister is as much bound by them as any humble man; in fact, more so. If Parliament performed those functions that the hon. member Mr. Sinclair expects of it, Ministers would not be so ready to jettison Acts of Parliament and become autocrats in a free country.

I want to draw the attention of the House to another Act of Parliament which has been jettisoned during the last

year, that is the Public Service Act. We have on the statute-book of New South Wales the Public Service Act, in which it is specifically laid down that before the three gentlemen who had been controlling the public service could be discharged there must be a resolution by both Houses of Parliament.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: Will the hon. member mind repeating that?

The Hon. Dr. NASH: I say that in the Public Service Act, by which the three Public Service Commissioners were appointed, there is a provision that they are not to be discharged except by resolution of both Houses of Parliament.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: Who discharged any of them? Two resigned and one was suspended!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: If it is said that those men were not got rid of by the Ministers, I think it is playing with words. They should have been defended by the Ministers. They were charged or impeached by a gentleman who was appointed to investigate the happenings in the public service. Upon his report these gentlemen were got rid of.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: Was there not a Mr. Marks who wanted a billet, and they made one for him?

The Hon. J. GARLAND: That is an unfair insinuation!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: I dissociate myself from any such suggestion. I do not know anything about that. But I do know that each of these men had had over forty years service in the public service; and whatever they did they should have received consideration from the Minister by being allowed to end their time in the service. They would have done so, if they had had the chance to end their time as public servants, by leaving the country, or living in it as honorable citizens for the rest of their life. One of them left the country because he felt so dishonored that he would not live longer in it.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: Does the hon. member say that is the case?

The Hon. Dr. NASH: Yes, I say so because he told me so.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: I know he told me a different story!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: I know him intimately, and he told me he would never

come back to this country again. I do not know whether he is unlike the other men. The report of Commissioner Allard may have been justified or not, but any Ministry should have stuck up for these public servants who had had forty years honorable service in the State. Now we come to another little business where Mr. Allard makes an inquiry. Before his report saw the light of day a great man from across the seas visited Walsh Island—the Admiral of the British Fleet—and he said publicly of the Minister, “Mr. Ball has not given me the cost of these ships.”

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: Admiral Jellicoe was making a pure joke!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: I listened to Admiral Jellicoe a few times, and I do not think that he was any more of a joker then than when he commanded his ships off Jutland. This is the first time I have ever heard that way of putting it. When Admiral Jellicoe made that statement it was not made for fun. It was made because, as my hon. friend the Hon. Dr. Doyle knows, money has been chucked away by hundreds of thousands of pounds at Walsh Island. It is a byword and a joke, as my hon. friend has told me when referring to the conduct of things at Walsh Island.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: Nevertheless Admiral Jellicoe's remark was a joke!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: I do not accept it as a joke, but as an impeachment of the people who have expended public money there.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: That is ridiculous!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: Ridiculous! Why, when a child in Newcastle is asked, “Where does your father work?” he says, “My father does not work.” And when he is asked, “Where is he employed?” he says, “At Walsh Island.”

The Hon. J. GARLAND: What has all that to do with Admiral Jellicoe?

The Hon. Dr. NASH: It has nothing to do with Admiral Jellicoe, but I want to tell the hon. member what the people of Newcastle think of the management of Walsh Island. A few days after Admiral Jellicoe made that statement what does Mr. Commissioner Allard say—that is, the Ministry's own Commissioner—upon whose report those public servants

of forty years' standing had to leave the service, and one of them to leave the State? He says of Mr. Ball, Minister for Public Works, things which should make any Minister resign, absolutely.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: He said nothing about Mr. Ball!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: No institution can be carried on where the head of the institution does not set an example by seeing that everything is in first-class order. When Admiral Jellicoe asked how much the ships cost, the man in charge of Walsh Island should have been able to turn up his books within five minutes, and say, "That ship has cost so much per ton up to this moment; so many thousand pounds, shillings, and pence have been spent on that ship up to this very moment."

The Hon. J. GARLAND: How can you tell that if you have not got from the Federal Government, which supplies a great deal of the material, the amount that it cost?

The Hon. Dr. NASH: If that impeachment of the Federal Government be correct, I would have thrown the onus upon the Federal Government, and I would have told Admiral Jellicoe, "I can give you the cost with regard to the work, but not of the material the Federal Government has supplied." How do the men who carry on a business prosperously, such as the men who are now branded as profiteers, make their money? By knowing how their business is going on, by being able to say whether on any particular line they are making one-sixteenth or one-thirty-second of a penny profit, or a farthing or a penny. Why should not the activities of the State be carried on in an efficient manner?

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: Because they employ cheap men!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: It is because they are wanting in efficiency. As one of the public, and as a member of this House, I say that as the Minister for Works was not able to answer Admiral Jellicoe he should take it as a severe censure, and it would be better for the State if he were to resign and hand over his job to someone else.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: He is one of the best Ministers that ever occupied the

[The Hon. Dr. Nash.]

position of Minister for Works. Every one who has come in contact with him knows it!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: I am not disputing that point. My hon. friend can hold what opinion he likes of Mr. Ball. I am only telling him what is a fair deduction from the statement by the Admiral of the Fleet, and the statement of his own Commissioner, upon whose *ipse dixit* the Government dealt with those public servants of forty years' standing.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: It was not a statement!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: Inflation and inefficiency are the two great dangers of the Empire—the inflation of everything, inflation of men by themselves, wherein they think they are great men, inflation of the currency, inflation of the fiduciary currency, inflation of the number of pound notes which are scattered throughout the Empire. One of the great dangers of the Empire is the inflation of our public debt, the £8,000,000,000 that Great Britain owes, inflation of the Commonwealth and State public debts where less than a million workers owe £700,000,000. Is not that load enough for any nation to carry? We have to pay it. Someone will have to pay it some day. I only heard to-night that the cost of money is going up immediately. See the further load of debt we shall have to carry.

The Hon. A. SINCLAIR: That does not trouble us. What troubles us is the price of bread!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: Inflation is one of the causes of the rise in the price of bread. If you have a depreciated currency circulating the price of the loaf of bread goes up *pari passu* with it. In Russia to-day, where the inflation is caused by the making of bank notes in every village, you have to give a fistful of notes to buy anything. A man said he never had so much money in his life, but he could never buy so little.

The Hon. A. SINCLAIR: You just get more money!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: You do not get money. You get paper. Since I was here this afternoon, and told the hon. member that he was talking about paper, I have been talking

to a friend of mine who was instrumental in handing over £500,000 to the Commonwealth. I asked him what he had handed over, and he said that he only transferred a piece of paper from one place to another. That was not giving new money. If you give new money to the Commonwealth, you will be like the people who gave new money to the British Government when it wanted money, they will give you a premium on it. Who ever dreamed that the great British Empire would ever be beholden to an outside country for money? Yet we of the British Empire are to-day beholden to another people for money—£8,000,000,000. It has been said that the demand was made for payment in three days. I am sorry that those who represented the British Government did not tell the men who made the demand, "We will hand over the money to-morrow, and give you solid gold." According to information the demand was made several times in Paris in order to compel the British Government to fall into line in regard to something of which it did not approve. I never thought I should see the day. I wonder if Ministers are going to continue during coming years the inefficiency which has marked their work in New South Wales during the last ten or twenty years? I read in the Premier's speech the other day that the Government proposed to go on with the North Coast railway, and with the railway from Condobolin to Broken Hill. If the North Coast railway had been conducted with efficiency from the head down, instead of being in its thirteenth year of work it would have been completed within the statutory time of four years, and it would have been finished for the amount of money which was voted by Parliament for its construction. What would have been the gain to the country during the last five years if that railway had been built with efficiency? Suppose it had been constructed within the time set out?

The Hon. J. GARLAND: What is the use of supposing that when it was not constructed?

The Hon. Dr. NASH: That is what I impeach Ministers for. It surprises me how Ministers can go round the country and make beautiful speeches about the

progress of this railway, when everyone knows that money has been thrown away in hundreds of thousands of pounds, and that three men used to look after a horse and the horse was not looked after. Everyone knows that. It was like Walsh Island. Everyone knew of these scandals, and in a State which meant business the inefficient Ministers responsible for these delinquencies in both money and material would be made to suffer. I have often told the House that I do not so much value the money as the degradation which the men employed upon these works are subject to by being made the playthings of the people who allow these things to go on. Therein I join with the hon. member Mr. Sinclair, who in the course of his remarks practically said that the responsibility for the loss upon these works rests not so much with the people underneath as with the people on top; because unless the extravagance and waste were connived at by the people on top it could not be carried on by the humble workmen. As I have known him for the last fifty years, the working-man is a decent man if he is given a chance. No one ever heard me say anything against the working-man. I know that the working-man of Australia, whether as an employee or a soldier, is a first-class man; but when he has over him men who spend their time in lighting and smoking a pipe, what can one expect from such an example? Only recently we saw a most degrading sight when a Minister, in front of all the workmen to whom he had been speaking, having finished a speech struck a match, lit his pipe, and puffed away in the presence of the Governor and his lady, the Premier and his lady, and a number of other people. I never was witness to such a degrading exhibition before; and can you expect any single man in a body of workmen looking on to perform his duty when set such an example as that?

There is one other public work I desire to refer to, and that is the abattoirs. I have heard it rumoured that for the future the abattoirs are to be carried on successfully as a great concern. The first thing I learnt by a little questioning, and probing and seeking, was that the capital cost is to be cut down in order that the present board of directors may

make a success of the undertaking. We know there was an inquiry into the abattoirs, and that in the course of the inquiry investigations were made into the insulating chambers. These insulation chambers, as hon. members are aware, are encased with charcoal, and the employees were so careful about themselves that they refused to work in the dust. In order that these chambers might be of any use the charcoal had to be dry, but the men poured water on the charcoal because it was dusty, and the insulation chambers when finished were encased in this wet charcoal. Now the three commissioners are going to perpetrate a fraud on the community by cutting down the capital cost, so that in a few years they will be able to come forward and say, "See what a splendid job we have made of the abattoirs." I hope the Ministry will be no party to this.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: I may tell the hon. member that we are going to be a party to it!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: Then all I have to say is that what may be private virtues are public vices. It is perpetrating a fraud on the community.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: It is not a fraud on the community; it is done publicly!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: The public should know to the last farthing every penny spent on the abattoirs.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: The public do know!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: Then the public should have it kept before them, because the public is forgetful; and these gentlemen should not get credit for doing what they have not done. They should be compelled to return to the public the money wastefully expended.

The Hon. J. S. T. McGOWEN: Did not the Clyde Engineering Works do the same thing?

The Hon. Dr. NASH: That is a private firm, and as I say, a private virtue may be a public vice. When we are dealing with our own money we can do as we like, but when we deal with public money it is a different matter altogether. Every penny should be accounted for. There should be none of this tinkering. What is being done by the Sydney Ferries Commission?

[The Hon. Dr. Nash.

They are finding out what the company did with its money. There should be no call in public concerns for such an inquiry.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: There is no call!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: The hon. and learned member says that the capital is to be written down. If that is the case, then there is call for inquiry. The hon. and learned member knows, as one of the custodians of the public funds, that the public should be informed when it is to get back the money that has been expended on these works.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: They will never get it back!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: An effort should be made by the directors, and the directors of the abattoirs should not obtain kudos to which they are not entitled.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: They will get kudos for all they do!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: The hon. and learned member will reap the reward for what he pretends to think. I know he really thinks as I do. Then there is this wonderful railway from Condobolin to Broken Hill. How much per mile has that cost so far, and how much more is to be expended upon it? Is the capital cost of that public work to be written down, and another sham worked upon the public?

There is a matter which has not been so far referred to, which is of supreme interest to the public, and that is the way in which the Government has been appointing men at high salaries. We have in this State now a number of public servants who are drawing a bigger salary than the Premier himself. We have many men in the service of the State who are drawing a higher salary than any other Minister. Can the public service be carried on efficiently under those circumstances? Is the public service not disorganised at once when Ministers, who are the chiefs of the public service, are working for a lower salary than is paid to the servants over whom they preside?

The Hon. J. GARLAND: The Ministers are not growling about it!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: I know that Ministers are not growling, and I am not fighting the battle of the Ministers; they

can fight it themselves; I am fighting the battle of the State, because disorganisation and inefficiency will reach down to every one of us. You cannot have a service run properly where the chiefs of that service do not occupy the chief position. It is set out in the Public Service Act that it is salary which determines the grade of the servant in the public service, and by the very Act itself you degrade the Ministers of the State by putting them on a lower salary than is paid to the officers over whom they preside.

The Hon. F. H. BRYANT: Raise the salary of the Ministers!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: That is the only way out of the difficulty, and it should be done not in the interests of Ministers, but of the State. It is a well-known business principle that the man at the top should be the chief in money as in everything else. I have been looking through the public service lists of the British Government, and I find that there is not a man who draws anything like the salary of a chief Minister. There are three or four subsidiary Ministers who at the present time are in receipt of a less sum than some of the employees, but hon. members may have noticed the other day that a motion was brought forward in the British Parliament for the specific purpose of increasing the salaries of these underpaid Ministers with the object of making them occupy their proper position in the arrangement of the State.

I hope that a new era is opening up for us, during which we shall try to get rid of this inflation, which is drowning us, and of this inefficiency, which is destroying us, and that during the coming session we shall be able to do good work. I am sure that as I get older I do not know what it all means, nor can I express myself in a single sentence, but if hon. members will allow me to quote from the greatest of all Britons, I would say that, here as elsewhere, "Heaven doth with us as we with torches do. Not light them for themselves."

The Hon. J. S. T. MCGOWEN: Listening to the remarks of the hon. member who has just resumed his seat, I imagined I was back in the other branch of the Legislature where members

are representative of the people, and have to go back to their constituents; and that they were making everything nice and fit for the time of their re-election. I heard the hon. member talk about his great love for the working-man, and for the poorer-paid man. Let me bring a case under his notice. This is the only chance, or possibly it is the best chance, that I shall have to ventilate the matter. I am not going to criticise the Governor's speech, or to enter into those questions which more particularly affect the Federal Government, and do not come within the scope of the State Government at all. The hon. member referred to the Public Service Board and the injustice done to them by the Government, who by the exercise of pressure obtained the resignation of the board. Afterwards one member of the board withdrew his resignation, and the hon. and learned member the Attorney-General stated that that member had been suspended. If that is the case then the hon. member Dr. Nash was quite right when he said that it could only be done by a resolution of both Houses of Parliament.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: That cannot be done until seven days after the sitting of the House!

The Hon. J. S. T. MCGOWEN: That is the explanation; Parliament has been in recess. I want to mention a case which has occurred right at our own door, and I want to say that so far as I can ascertain the different treatment meted out to one of our own parliamentary servants is not by any means the fault of our officers. The President, I understand, has endeavoured to have the mistake rectified, but in view of the attitude assumed by the new Public Service Board, he has not been able to succeed. Robert Bell was cook at Parliament House for twenty-five years. A better, more faithful, and more efficient servant has never been employed by any Parliament in Australia. His health broke down and he was compelled to resign. As chief cook he received £250 a year—not a great salary. He went on seven months' leave of absence. Then the war broke out, and the night watchman, who was drawing £155 a year, went to the front. I believe that

Bell's leave of absence had almost expired, when he was persuaded to return and take up the duty of night watchman. That position he held for three years at £155 a year. Then he was put off. His pension as chief cook would have been £104 per annum; as night watchman it is only £65. I understand that the Public Service Board, when the case came before them, reduced this man's pension by £39 a year from £104 to £65. Is that fair? Let hon. members recall to their minds other cases which have occurred during the last thirty years. I will not mention the case of Mr. Webb, or of Mr. Turner, but I will refer to the case of Mr. Monty Arnold, who for nearly thirty-five years drew a big pension, and no attempt was made to reduce his pension as was done in the case of the cook. The President told me that the Act of Parliament provides that when a man retires his pension must be computed on the basis of his last salary. This man has twelve children—five sons, three of whom went to the war, and he himself came back patriotically to take the place of another officer who joined the military forces in order to get a few pounds a week more. Yet he suffers this reduction in his pension. I have spoken both to the President and the Premier. They inform me—and I presume they have obtained legal advice—that nothing more can be done. A State that can pay so much money to higher-paid men can surely afford to pay £40 a year more for a cook's pension instead of reducing it, simply because for three years out of twenty-eight years' service he happened to be working as a night watchman in order to let the night watchman go away to the war. The President states that the Government's only way out of the difficulty is to put a sum of money on the estimates. That means that every year you will have to vote £40 to supplement the pension of a cook. We were always under the impression, and when Sir George Reid brought in his Act in 1895 we contended, that the servants of Parliament should be under the President and the Speaker. That has always been the position. The President and the Speaker should determine the amount of remuneration to be received by the servants of Parliament,

[*The Hon. J. S. T. McGowen.*]

and we should not trust the matter to the Public Service Board at all or to a Superannuation Board.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: It is not the Public Service Board!

The Hon. J. S. T. MCGOWEN: But the Public Service Board fixes the amount. In this instance the Public Service Board has, I understand, either made it a practice or laid it down by regulation that the last salary of the employee shall be the basis on which his superannuation is paid. I want to strengthen our President's hands. I want to impress on the representative of the Government, and, through him on the Ministry, the absolute necessity for doing the same kind of justice to a man who is a cook as to a man occupying a higher position.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: I entirely take the view that the hon. member takes. I think it is a case of shocking hardship!

The Hon. J. S. T. MCGOWEN: The Act should be amended to prevent our employees going before Public Service Commissioners. We have always kept the servants of Parliament entirely away from the Public Service Board.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: That is all very well, but this has nothing to do with the fixing of the man's salary; this is a question under the Superannuation Act. He has to come on the Superannuation Fund, and that fund is managed by the Superannuation Board!

The Hon. J. S. T. MCGOWEN: In other words it is not the Public Service Board, but the Superannuation Board?

The Hon. J. GARLAND: That is so!

The Hon. J. S. T. MCGOWEN: But why should isolated cases of this kind have to be provided for on the estimates?

The Hon. J. GARLAND: Is it not a fairly reasonable principle to lay down that a man's pension should be determined according to the salary he is receiving at the moment of his entering on his pension?

The Hon. J. S. T. MCGOWEN: I do not know that it is, and I should argue against it for this reason: usually he goes up; rarely does he go down, as in this case. This man would not have gone down had it not been for the war. I have always thought it a fair method

of determining the pension that all the years of service should be put together and an average struck.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: The result of that would be that he would get a very much lower pension than if you took only his last two years!

The Hon. J. S. T. MCGOWEN: Generally speaking, yes. I am not saying that I was right in the opinion I held.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: That is the principle of the Railway Superannuation Act, but it is quite different in the other Act!

The Hon. J. S. T. MCGOWEN: I am pointing out what strikes me as so hard.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: I have already told the hon. member that, so far as I am concerned, I am entirely with him as regards the position!

The Hon. J. S. T. MCGOWEN: I think we should evolve the best and safest means of doing justice to men who hold positions perhaps not equal to some of those from which other men retire, and I know that so far as the President is concerned he will help us all he can.

The Hon. J. RYAN: It was my intention to speak for about fifteen minutes, and to deal with three or four items in the speech delivered by his Excellency to-day; but out of consideration for the handful of hon. members who have sat so patiently and so late to-night, I shall content myself with speaking for about five minutes, and with referring to but one subject—that is, the housing question. I refer to that specifically in order to impress upon the Government the grave danger of profiteering, and its influence upon the Government housing proposals. This is not an imaginary danger, and by way of giving some substantial proof of its imminence and its reality, I shall quote from an article which was published in the *Age* on the 9th of this month. It is headed "Exploiting the Soldier. War Service Homes. The Profiteers Busy." The article proceeds:

One would have thought that the profiteer, no matter how soulless his attitude towards the general public, would have had some consideration for the men who shed their blood for them in the great war. But the greed of the profiteer is insatiable; gratitude is unknown to him; he is no respecter of persons. He is trying his hardest now to exploit the soldier

in the War Service Homes scheme. When the Act was passed, it was recognised that the Repatriation Department would be up against the brick and timber combines, and negotiations were entered into to arrange a working basis, so that existing machinery could be used. The negotiations have been made, and are still being made in some cases, but the brick and timber profiteers have no conscience, and they stand unyielding. The price of bricks in Victoria to-day is about 48s.; in New South Wales it is 53s.; yet the State brickworks in that State turn out bricks at about 42s. a thousand, make a handsome profit, and pay their men a 15 per cent. bonus. The actual cost of bricks at the State works is about 33s. Negotiations under the War Service Homes scheme have revealed the fact that the brick profiteers want to make roughly £1 a thousand out of the Housing Commission. In the matter of timber the situation is no better. The sawmillers have conceded something to the Housing Commission, but the dressed timber merchants are out to exploit the soldiers as much as the brickmakers. They have offered a slight reduction, but no more than they give to the contractor who pays monthly for his materials. The Housing Commission is faced with two alternatives. Either it must pay the exorbitant prices demanded by the vampires who are out to exploit the soldier, or it must establish its own brickworks and timber mills. The Commission is already planning the erection of a modern brickworks and an up-to-date timber plant. It must be palpable to the profiteers that nearly all the building activity in the future will be in soldiers' homes, and the opinion is generally expressed that when all the soldiers have been provided with homes, the scheme will be extended to the civilian population. It would take some months to establish brickworks, but this is sure to be done if the building profiteers do not see reason. It is one of the most scandalous things in the history of Australia that the profiteers who stayed at home and let others go out and fight should seek to line their pockets at the expense of the latter. No community would tolerate such a state of affairs.

I have read that so that it may go into the permanent records of this House. The *Age*, as hon. members know, is one of the largest and certainly one of the most representative and responsible papers in the Commonwealth. The statements there made are specific; they are startling, and they are sweeping in character. We in this State will have to face the same condition of things as is set out in that article. If the profiteers are allowed to have their way the result will be that the

tenants who are to occupy these houses, whether soldiers or civilians, will be permanently burdened. If we estimate that the extra cost of an ordinary four or five-roomed cottage will be about £100 as the result of profiteering, that means a permanent burden of not less than 3s. a week on the unfortunate tenant. It is inevitable that either the tenant must bear that unfair charge, or the Government must come to the aid of the tenant. Realising that housing is a national necessity, I fail to see why either the Government or the tenant should bear this unfair charge for the benefit of those greedy persons, the profiteers, who are aptly described as vampires in the article I have just read. I do hope the Attorney-General will impress the seriousness of this matter on his colleagues. I know of no more serious matter, in view of the severe housing congestion that prevails in every centre throughout the State.

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: I had no intention of joining in this debate, but I deem it right that I should say something on the whole question of the administration of the Government in the late epidemic. I am sorry that the former Minister for Health is not here, but what I have to say he is perfectly aware of. It will be nothing new to him probably, and as he is no longer the Minister of Health these matters may come under the new Minister, Mr. David Storey. I said just now that Mr. Holman scurried away from Melbourne like a frightened rabbit when he heard that a disease had broken out there which he thought to be pneumonic influenza. He got as far as Albury. The Minister has said that the Board of Health had arranged everything, but when Mr. Holman got across the border he did not care how many of the New South Wales people were left behind. It took the Government three weeks before it arranged a proper method of quarantine to pass people across the border. The Premier got home, but a large number of citizens of this State were not able to get home. He did not care a rap for what happened to them.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: What has that to do with the address in reply?

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: It has a good deal to do with it, because the  
[The Hon. J. S. T. McGowen.

speech refers to the action of the Government in dealing with the epidemic.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: What had Mr. Holman's coming over from Melbourne to do with it?

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: When he came over he immediately took charge of the epidemic.

The Hon. J. WILSON: Nothing of the kind!

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: I do not want the hon. member to interrupt me. As a member of this assembly I have a perfect right to discuss the attitude of the Government. The Premier having come back from Melbourne, the Ministry, instead of putting the whole of the work into the hands of the Board of Health, who are a properly-constituted board of experts to deal with an epidemic, took the matter into their own hands. They appointed a board of experts, of whom Professor Welsh was the head. This supposed board of experts were to advise the Government as to its action during the epidemic. The board of experts consisted of men who were in ordinary general practice. One was a professor of bacteriology of the Sydney University. There was not a single man on that advisory board who, if he were to put his plate up in Macquarie-street to-morrow, could make his salt as an epidemiologist.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: They were the leading men of Sydney!

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: Pardon me. The Government had an expert board it could have applied to, but it did not do so.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: We had the advice of Dr. Paton and Dr. Armstrong all through!

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: The Government began to flounder. One Minister after another took the matter in hand. Mr. FitzGerald had it in hand for a time, Mr. Holman had it in hand, and Mr. Hall had it in hand.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: Mr. Holman and Mr. Hall never had it in hand!

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: Pardon me; Mr. Holman did have it in hand, because he addressed the people of New South Wales and advised them to get vaccinated. Mr. Hall had the matter in

hand to some extent, and the hon. member Mr. Garland himself was Acting-Minister for Health for a time.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: For two days!

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: And in two days the hon. gentleman did a lot of damage. That was one failure the Government made. The whole thing was muddled. It was a lucky thing for this country that there was a large number of people who sacrificed themselves to assist persons who were stricken down. I am not speaking of the medical profession. I do not want bouquets thrown at the medical profession. The medical profession does its duty, and does not calculate the cost. There is one other matter I wish to refer to in connection with this subject. The Government advised that people should be vaccinated. Medical men were continually being asked by persons to vaccinate them, and the question arose with medical men as to what was the proper vaccine to use. I wrote to the Minister for Health and called his attention to this fact.

AN HON. MEMBER: Which one?

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: The Minister for Health. I was being bombarded with circulars from people who were prepared to sell vaccine, and I wrote to the Minister for Health and asked him whether he would make some arrangements by which I could guarantee the vaccine that was being used. He wrote back saying that he could not, and that one large firm here was making vaccine. It was a firm of veterinary surgeons at Bondi—horse doctors. He said that they were supplying to the drug houses. Mr. Holman advised the people to be vaccinated. I was rather anxious to know what vaccine I was getting. I wrote again to the Minister for Health, and I received from him the reply that he was powerless to prevent anybody from putting any vaccine they liked on the market, that it was a case of *caveat emptor*. In a big epidemic like that, or in any epidemic, the Government should guarantee the vaccine that is being used in the same way that it guarantees the drugs that are sold by a chemist. At least half a dozen people were making vaccines, and I was told that the method of making them was not altogether scientific. They were making them for sale;

but the Minister for Health was unable to do anything to prevent bad vaccine from getting into the people's blood. These are questions which I should like to bring immediately under the notice of Mr. David Storey. I have had some experience of epidemics, and I have never known of such muddling administration as that conducted by the Government in connection with the late epidemic. We are exceedingly fortunate that we did not have a very much bigger loss of life. The hon. member Mr. Garland was Minister for Health for two days in the Newcastle district. What did he do? He came to Newcastle, and a gentleman accompanied him.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: Does the hon. member say that I went to Newcastle?

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: The hon. member went to Cessnock.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: I was never near Cessnock!

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: The hon. member arranged it, then.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: I did nothing of the kind!

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: The hon. member is the man who was supposed to be responsible for the closing of Cessnock.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: For proclaiming the quarantine area!

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: That, I may tell the hon. member, was productive of the greatest farce during the whole epidemic.

The Hon. J. GARLAND: I know there was a great deal of trouble about it, but it prevented a coal-mining strike in that district!

The Hon. MARTIN DOYLE: What I should advise the Government to do is to appoint a royal commission to inquire into the whole administration of the Board of Health. I realise, and I think everyone who knows anything about the composition of the Board of Health realises, that it is not a board which meets present-day requirements. There are a good many things the Board of Health should take in hand. I should advise the Government before another epidemic breaks out to appoint a commission to inquire into the whole of the methods of dealing with

an epidemic. If the Government does that, it will find that the methods lately used were as antiquated as the dodo.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

The PRESIDENT: I desire to intimate that his Excellency has agreed to receive members of the House at 4 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

#### SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT.

Motion (by Hon. J. GARLAND) agreed to:

That this House at its rising to-day do adjourn until 3.45 p.m. tomorrow.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Motion (by Hon. J. GARLAND) proposed:

That this House do now adjourn.

The Hon. Dr. NASH: I hope the mover and seconder of the address in reply will be advised of its intended presentation to his Excellency to-morrow afternoon. They have not been present to listen to the speeches. They have committed an act of discourtesy already, and unless advised they may commit an act of discourtesy to his Excellency.

The PRESIDENT: It is my duty to see that the mover and seconder of the address in reply are made acquainted with the fact that they are expected to be present when the address in reply is being presented to his Excellency.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

House adjourned at 10 p.m.

### Legislative Assembly.

*Tuesday, 19 August, 1919.*

Opening of the Session—By-elections—Commission to Administer Oath to Members—Members Sworn—Resignation of Mr. Speaker—Election of Speaker—Presentation of Mr. Speaker to the Governor—Serjeant-at-Arms—Assent to Bills—The Late Mr. L. J. O'Hara—Election Petitions—Elections and Qualification Committee—Temporary Chairmen of Committees—Papers—Ministerial Portfolios—Questions without Notice—Parliamentary Bar—Leave of Absence—Law of Evidence Bill (*Formal*)—Governor's Speech: Address in Reply (First Night's Debate).

#### OPENING OF THE SESSION.

The House met at noon, pursuant to the proclamation of his Excellency the Governor convening Parliament.

The Clerk read the proclamation.

[*The Hon. Martin Doyle.*

The Usher of the Black Rod, being admitted, delivered a message, "That his Excellency the Governor commands me to let you know that he desires the immediate attendance of this honorable House in the Legislative Council Chamber."

The House went, and hon. members having returned,

#### BY-ELECTIONS.

The Clerk announced the return of writs, with certificates, of the election of Sydney James Shillington as a member to serve in the Assembly for the electoral district of Petersham, of the election of Laurence Joseph O'Hara (since deceased) as a member to serve in the Assembly for the electoral district of Paddington, and of the election in his place of John Edward Birt.

#### COMMISSION TO ADMINISTER OATH TO MEMBERS.

The Clerk informed the House that his Excellency the Governor had been pleased to issue a commission under the seal of the territory authorising the Hon. William Arthur Holman, Premier, the Hon. Sir George Warburton Fuller, Colonial Secretary, and the Hon. David Robert Hall, Minister of Housing, members of the Legislative Assembly, or any one or more of them, to administer the oath or affirmation of allegiance to the King, required by law to be taken or made by members of the Assembly.

The Clerk read the commission.

#### MEMBERS SWORN.

The following members took the oath and subscribed the roll:—Sydney James Shillington, John Edward Birt, Frank Augustus Chaffey, William Fraser Dunn, Ambrose Campbell Carmichael.

#### RESIGNATION OF MR. SPEAKER.

The Clerk read the following letter from Mr. John J. Cohen:—

Speaker's Room, Sydney,  
30 January, 1919.

Dear Sir,

I beg to tender my resignation as Speaker of the Legislative Assembly.

Yours faithfully,  
JOHN J. COHEN.

W. S. Mowle, Esquire,  
Clerk of the Legislative Assembly.