

bound to bring this matter up whenever possible before the Estimates are dealt with, so that a reasonable sum may be provided. There has been a great loss on the Newcastle tramways, and there has been great expenditure in preparing for the electrification of the system. I recently went through the figures to ascertain the cost of the alterations that have been made in anticipation of the electrification, and I found that £880,000 had been spent. The sheds have been built for over two years. There is an electric power-house on which perhaps £200,000 has been spent. Despite that the completion has been hung up. I trust the Minister will take cognisance of what has been said and see that a substantial sum of money is provided for the work.

With regard to education generally, we know that it is the intention of the Minister to do away with free education in certain cases. Whatever is done in that direction, it must be the duty of the Government to see that technical education and domestic science is properly taught in a great industrial centre like Newcastle which is destined to become the Birmingham of Australia. Travellers who reach Newcastle go out to view the great industrial undertakings there, and all acknowledge there is a bright future for the Newcastle district. Provision should be made for technical education to be properly imparted, not only in Newcastle itself, but in some of the outlying suburbs such as Cessnock and Kurri Kurri. Those are growing places where the population is enormously increasing. I trust that the Ministers will give serious consideration to those three matters, namely, technical education, electrification of the tramways, and the extension of the sewerage system. If Ministers give those matters speedy attention they will not only be serving a local cause, but will be doing their duty to the State as a whole.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Resolution reported and agreed to.

Bill founded on resolution of Committee of Ways and Means presented and passed through all its stages.

House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Wednesday, 4 October, 1922.

Printed Question and Answer—Assent to Bills—Picture Show in Parliament—Petition—The late Sir Charles Wade—Gun License (Amendment) Bill—Supply Bill—Public Accounts Committee Election Enabling Bill—Encroachment of Buildings Bill.

The PRESIDENT took the chair.

PRINTED QUESTION AND ANSWER.

BEE INDUSTRY.

The Hon. J. M. CREED asked the VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL,—In reference to question No. 2, of which notice was given to be asked in this House on 2nd May, but which was not answered by the representative of the Government, will he please reply to it as now put,—In view of the importance to the wellbeing of numerous smaller settlers of the production of honey and beeswax, will he please inform the House,—(1) How many inspectors dealing with diseases or other matters affecting this industry were employed on 1st January, 1920; on 1st January, 1921; on 1st September, 1922, respectively? (2) Whether and what, if any, steps are now being taken to prevent or, if existent, to eradicate malignant diseases fatal to bees? (3) Do not several vacancies exist in the positions of inspectors, whose duty it was to deal with such diseases? (4) What was the reason for their retirement, and the omission to appoint others in their place?

Answer,—(1) The normal strength of the staff is five, two of whom are full-time officers stationed on Government apiaries, and the remaining three are appointed for the honey season (October to March) to travel the western, southern, and northern districts to ensure that apiaries are maintained as required under the Apiaries Acts. On 1st January, 1920, four inspectors were employed, and the fifth took up duty four days later. On 1st January, 1921, there was one vacancy which was left unfilled for the remainder of the season, mainly owing to the absence of a suitable applicant for

employment. On 1st ultimo, the three itinerant positions were vacant. (2) The department is devoting considerable attention to bee diseases, apart from inspection of apiaries, including special research work in laboratory and field, and is urging the Federal Government to restrict importations of bees and bee materials likely to convey disease. (3) The three vacancies for itinerant inspectors are now being filled, applications having been invited some time ago. (4) See replies to questions 1 and 3.

ASSENT TO BILLS.

Royal assent to the following bills reported:—

Coal-mines Regulation (Amendment) Bill.
Wrightville Municipality Abolition Bill.

PICTURE SHOW IN PARLIAMENT.

The Hon. JAMES WILSON: I would like to ask the leader of the House by whose authority has Parliament House been turned into a picture show? Is it correct—

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: Is this a question or a statement?

The Hon. JAMES WILSON: A question up to now, a statement afterwards. There is no reason for hon. members to smile; I think the matter is serious. I understand that the President of this Chamber has been invited to-night as an artist—

The PRESIDENT: Order! Is the hon. member asking a question?

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: I cannot understand his question!

The Hon. JAMES WILSON: I will put it clearly. I want to ask who is responsible for the invitation that has been issued to members of this House to attend a picture show in this building to-night?

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: Sit down and I will answer!

The Hon. JAMES WILSON: No, thank you. I have another question to ask.

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: I will answer one at a time!

The Hon. JAMES WILSON: I desire to ask the leader of the House if it is

true that, in connection with the proposed exhibition of pictures to-night, he intends to introduce women with fig leaves on.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: I think the hon. member will get a decent entertainment if he accepts the invitation which has been issued on the authority of the President and myself.

PETITION.

The Hon. B. B. O'CONOR presented a petition from the council of Newington College, Stanmore, praying for leave to bring in a bill to incorporate the council of Newington College, and to vest certain lands and other property in such council, and to confer certain powers thereon; and for other incidental purposes.

Petition received.

THE LATE SIR CHARLES WADE.

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS moved:

That the hon. the President be requested to communicate to Lady Wade the profound sympathy and sorrow of the Legislative Council of New South Wales at the decease of her distinguished husband, Sir Charles Gregory Wade, K.C., K.C.M.G., Justice of the Supreme Court of New South Wales, and a former Premier of this State.

He said: I am sure every hon. member was deeply grieved when he heard of the death of one of our most distinguished citizens, Sir Charles Wade. To me especially it was a matter of great grief, he having been a colleague of mine for very many years. Shortly after he entered Parliament as the member for Willoughby I invited Mr. Wade to become Attorney-General in the Government which I was commissioned to form in 1904, and for three years he was a loyal, valued, and trusted colleague. And as Attorney-General of this country I think it can well be said of him that we have had no man occupying that office superior to him. On my recommendation, when I was compelled to retire through ill health, Sir Charles Wade, then Mr. Wade, was sent for by the late Sir Harry Rawson, then Governor, and commissioned to form a Government in continuation of the Liberal administration of the time. He did excellently well as Premier of this State.

When he retired from office he was succeeded by the Labour Government of Mr. McGowen and afterwards by that of Mr. Holman. It will be admitted that he was a generous opponent, and that during the war he set a splendid example by co-operating with the Government to which he was opposed in other things, in the task of carrying on all that was necessary in order that this State, in common with other portions of the Empire, might play its part in that great conflict. He treated Mr. Holman with the utmost chivalry. Later on when the Government called the Nationalist Government was formed, Mr. Wade was invited to join it. He consulted me with regard to accepting office with that Government, and we both concurred in the view on which he acted—that is to say he preferred at that time not to join a Government which might be in the nature of a coalition. Afterwards he took the office of Agent-General for New South Wales, and from all accounts rendered just as eminent service in that position as he did in the offices which he held in the Government of this State. At any rate visitors who went to the Old Country all agreed in speaking highly of the way in which Sir Charles Wade filled that office and performed his duties. He was in every respect a good Agent-General. During the time he was there I was in correspondence with him, and I know that relatives of mine, and others who were in England on war service could never speak too highly of the aid rendered to them by the then Agent-General whenever they visited the Old Country on furlough. In 1908 when he was Premier there came within his reach the highest office of the great profession to which he belonged, that of Chief Justice, and I know, because at the time he consulted me, that the whole and sole reason why he did not take that office, to which he was entitled, was that he would not leave the party which had trusted him and put him in the leadership. Not even when there was an opening for him to justifiably retire and to serve the State in an office of even greater distinction, would he take advantage of it. I feel sure every member of the House will be glad to have the opportunity of joining in this last token of respect to a man who has rendered such eminent service to the country.

The Hon. F. H. BRYANT: I endorse all that has been so ably said by the leader of this Chamber in regard to the demise of one who has earned the respect of the community of the State which he so well served. During my occupancy of the Presidential chair of the Sydney Labour Council I was brought almost daily into touch with the late Sir Charles Wade, who was Premier in those stirring times of industrial activity, anxiety, and unrest. I allude to the period at which the Industrial Disputes Act came into operation. That its effect upon the industrial world of that day was electrical is well known to most hon. members present, but despite the fact that our political opinions were as divergent as the two poles, the Premier's door was ever open to me and my executive for all our interviews. Whenever we sought his presence we were not kept standing three minutes outside the door. Though our views did not coincide I always left his presence with the idea firmly established in my mind that confronted as he was with a very difficult situation he honestly endeavoured to do the right thing, according to his view, in the country's interests. I am always prepared to meet any gentleman on such terms as those. We cannot always agree even in politics. After watching his rise from that date until he was called to a higher position, I agree with the leader of the House that the late Sir Charles Wade well earned the respect of the community. I have much sympathy with Lady Wade and her family now that Sir Charles has entered into the shades of that bourne from which no traveller returns. I have the extreme satisfaction of knowing that what I have said is re-echoed by most of those who fought with me in the industrial world at the time to which I have alluded.

The Hon. W. BROOKS: I should like to say a word or two on this occasion, as I had opportunities as great as most men, of being brought into contact with the late Sir Charles Wade for a great number of years. I had the opportunity of meeting him even before he entered public life, and I knew him well during the whole period of his public life. Summing up his public life, looking at his entrance into it and his attaining the prominence which he did, I can only say

that his public career was meteoric. That was due to his very considerable ability. His retirement from the public life of this State was the result of an act of self-abnegation and self-sacrifice which has rarely been equalled in the public life of this country. The leader of the House has referred to the part the late Sir Charles Wade played in the formation of the present National party. I should like to say that but for Sir Charles Wade and his sense of duty and spirit of self-sacrifice there would not have been any National party. At that time Sir Charles took up an attitude which, as I have already said, has been unequalled in the annals of the public life of this country. The late Sir Charles Wade was as a man often misunderstood. He was looked upon by many as a cold man. As a matter of fact, he was one of the most warm-hearted, generous-hearted, and genial men it has been the privilege of many of us to meet. I had the privilege of knowing him in his family and private life, and I say unhesitatingly that both in his public and his private life he was one of the greatest citizens this State has known. I pay tribute to his memory.

The Hon. A. E. HUNT: I feel I cannot allow the opportunity to pass without saying a word in memory of the late Sir Charles Wade. What first operated to give him a high place in the estimation of the people of this country was his conduct as Crown Prosecutor in his early life. That position afforded him peculiar opportunities of studying human life in its varying phases. Sir Charles was a man who could feel for those whom it was his duty to prosecute. He showed himself to be so just and established such a high standard of conduct as Crown Prosecutor that even those who came under his condemnation felt he was giving them a fair deal. That element in his character was manifest throughout his life; his great effort was to act fairly towards the public whom he served. He was one of the most honorable men we have had in the public life of New South Wales. I have never met a man more honorable in all his dealings. When he appeared before the Farmers and Settlers' Conference that immense gathering of men from all over the country extended to him their respect because they felt they

The Hon. W. Brooks.

were listening to an honorable and upright man in whom they could have faith. They had thorough confidence when they submitted their difficulties to him for adjustment. His would be a great loss to any country; it will be severely felt here. No public man who has been removed from our midst could be more regretted.

Hon. members rising in their places,

Question resolved in the affirmative.

GUN LICENSE (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Bill presented and (on motion by the Hon. W. T. Dick) read a first time.

SUPPLY BILL.

Bill received from Legislative Assembly and (on motion by the Hon. Sir Joseph Carruthers) read a first time.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS.

Motion (by the Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS) agreed to:

That so much of the standing orders be suspended as would preclude the passing of a bill, intitled, "A bill to apply certain sums out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund towards the services of the year 1922-23, and out of the Public Works Fund, and out of the General Loan Account, for services to be hereafter provided for by loan," through all its stages during the present sitting of the Council.

SECOND READING.

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS moved:

That the bill be now read a second time.

He said: As hon. members are aware, supply has been granted, under the provisions of the Audit Act, up to the 30th September of this year. We are now in the month of October, and some of the commitments of the Government which will have to be met this week require that supply should be granted to meet them. The bill submitted proposes to appropriate the sum of £2,218,800 out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the purpose of meeting the estimated expenditure during the month of October in salaries, wages, supplies, services, and recurring charges. The amount is based on a sum equivalent to one-twelfth of the expenditure for the year, as per the Estimates laid upon the table of the Lower House. This sum is made up as follows:—The total amount of expenditure estimated for the

year 1922-23, as per page 2 of the Estimates laid upon the table of the Legislative Assembly, is £35,101,219. The vote for advance to Treasurer is £150,000, making the total £35,251,219, and against that we have to deduct amounts appropriated under the special Acts of Parliament, provision for which has no need to be made in the Supply Bill. These amount to £8,624,473, so that the balance required for the departments of the public service for the twelve months will be £26,626,746. One month's supply, equivalent to one-twelfth of the balance required for the departments, is £2,218,895. Out of the Public Works Fund it has been proposed to appropriate £26,800 for works and services of a non-productive nature, as detailed in schedule A of the bill. On reference to the schedule it will be seen that this is principally required for schools and educational buildings. The sum of £400,500 is proposed to be appropriated out of the General Loan Account, to meet public works and services, as in schedule B of the bill. This sum is in addition to the credit balance brought forward from 30th September on duly authorised loan votes, and is considered to be sufficient to meet the estimated loan expenditure during October. A numbered copy of the Supply Bill is available, with explanations of the individual items mentioned in schedules A and B.

The Hon. Dr. NASH: On looking through the items in the Supply Bill for the amount of £2,218,800 I note that in schedule A, under the heading "Miscellaneous," there is an amount provided for technical education. During the last month I have had something to say, here and in other places, about the building of a school at Newcastle. Yesterday I spoke to a gentleman whom I asked whether anything was being done to prevent the erection of that school in the swamp at Newcastle. He had been interested in some way in the matter, and he said, "It will be erected within a month." I said, "It is rather unlikely a Government department to exhibit such expedition. There is an organisation in this State called the Public Health Board, and that board is entitled to respect." Even Ministers of the Crown and State departments should treat it with respect. That board includes one member who has had forty

years' practice and experience in matters relating to the health of children, and there are other members of the board with very long experience. The president of the board is a trained man, with high qualifications, and in addition there are two other members who have presided over the Board of Health, and have been the medical advisers of this and preceding Governments for the last thirty-five years. Yet their whole opinion is flouted without a word being said by the Department of Public Instruction. A layman, outside the department, and without any expert knowledge, said to me, "The building will be up in about a month, if work goes on at the present rate." And that, in face of the protest that has been made. Since I spoke on this subject in the House the other night when I brought it under the notice of the leader of the Government here, I have had an opportunity of perusing some official correspondence in the matter. Strangely enough, in that correspondence there is evidence bearing on a point which I then made, and that is the relationship of the Railway Commissioners to the site upon which this technical school is being erected. After perusing the correspondence I wrote the following letter to the hon. the Minister of Public Instruction:—

The Hon. the Minister for Public Instruction,
Public Instruction Office,
26th September, 1922.

Dear Mr. Bruntell,—The Hon. Sir Joseph Carruthers allowed me to read to-day the information placed at his disposal by you in regard to the school at Broadmeadow, near Newcastle.

Your department does not appear to have at any time consulted its medical advisers in regard to the suitability of the area for a school. Had this been done I fancy that no skilled medical officer would have approved of the site.

The Railway Commissioners want the site, and for them it appears to me to be an ideal position for mar-halling yards and other purposes for the Newcastle district, and as the city grows they must require the whole area. The people they employ will be adults, and they do not want so much care as do the growing boys who will be at the school. In my opinion it will be well for the health of the coming generations of technical scholars in Newcastle that the railways should have the land. As against ample growth and good health for the children money should not be allowed to count. We want the mentally and physically best of men and women, and if the Public Instruction Department does not see to this, above all else, it may be said that they

are not doing all that is their duty for those under their charge. The initial error now will prejudice at least two generations of children.

There are several dry elevated areas equally, if not more, central for the Newcastle district than the Broadmeadow site.

If you can spare the time I should like a talk with you upon the subject.

Surely some consideration should be given to the experts of the Board of Health. Raising the floor above flood level will be but playing with the trouble.—I am, yours faithfully,
JOHN B. NASH.

Since I came into the House this afternoon I have received a letter from the Minister of Public Instruction in which he states :

The Hon. J. B. Nash, M.D., M.L.C.,
Legislative Council, Parliament House,
Sydney, 4th October, 1922.

Dear Dr. Nash,—I have your further letter regarding the Junior Technical School, which is now being erected at Broadmeadow. I note what you say regarding the desirability of securing a medical opinion, and am giving this matter further consideration.

I shall communicate with you later.—Yours faithfully, ALBERT BRUNTELL.

I had the pleasure to-day of speaking to one of the leading aldermen of the city of Newcastle, who said that the council were entirely opposed to the erection of the technical school on the chosen site, and he knows the place well. Mentioning four or five centres in the Newcastle district, including Lambton, Waratah, and New Lambton, he said, "Why, there are heaps of good sites around about those places for such a school." I too say there are, as I said in the House the other night. Yet the Hon. the Minister of Public Instruction says he is going to get some further medical opinion in the matter. He has had the opinion of the members of the Board of Health. You cannot get a better medical opinion than that of the Board of Health. The Minister of Public Instruction has one or two medical experts on his own staff, but they do not know the country like the medical men who are members of the Board of Health. Something more in this matter should be done than has been done up to the present time. The Railway Commissioners have written to the Department of Public Instruction stating that they want this land for railway purposes. If we can transfer the seat of government for industrial affairs from Goulburn-street to

Macquarie-street in the years to come and if Newcastle can be pushed on, as it should be, and becomes the Manchester of Australia, then every bit of that land in the vicinity of this school will be wanted by the Railway Commissioners within not very many years, too. The Public Instruction Department, in replying to the letter of the Railway Commissioners, said, "You find us another site. We have already spent so much money on the place. Then we might consider it." But it is not the business of the Railway Commissioners to do that for the department. Their business is to conserve the land in the locality where they are to put their marshalling yards and workshops, and where they can have plenty of room. The site on which the school stands is the sort of place they want. How can youngsters work in comfort alongside the Railway Commissioners' marshalling yards and other activities of the Railway Department? I hope that on further consideration the Minister of Public Instruction will do something in the interests of the health of these children. I have no personal interest in the matter, or anything like that. I believe that the first consideration is that of the public. The Vice-President of the Executive Council wants this country peopled with the best classes of men and women. I agree that the best immigrant we can have is the healthy child, reared in the country—that is, the child reared in the country who is mentally sound and physically fit. You cannot beat him. Next to him, of course, are immigrants of our own breed from the Old Country. The hon. member, who represents the Government in this House, is doing much to settle people on the first-class lands of New South Wales, and, in conjunction with the Commonwealth Government and those of the other States, to place immigrants on the land throughout Australia. Or the great work which the hon. member has done for this country nothing will stand more to his credit.

I see many items which are old friends in the bill before the House. How long we have seen them in similar bills I am hardly prepared to say, although I do not think any of them go back further than the time I have been a member of this House. It is wonderful how these items

[The Hon. Dr. Nash.]

stick in Supply Bills from year to year. Take any one for fourteen or fifteen years and you see the same thing.

The Hon. E. J. KAVANAGH: That is why your one speech does for the lot!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: No, that is not so, because there are different circumstances each time. My hon. friend smarts a little at what I have had to say occasionally in this House. The taxpayer from year to year has had to pay up in order that the Government of my hon. friend and other Governments might waste the funds of the country. He is to blame and other Ministries of the past are to blame also for my reiterating these facts. Look at the North Coast railway. Once again this Supply Bill shows an amount for the North Coast railway. Whose fault is it? It is the fault of Governments which have not attended to their duty and completed these works during their regime of office. In that way millions have been thrown away. As to the North Coast railway, it is fifteen years since Parliament passed the bill authorising its construction, at the instigation of the hon. member Sir Joseph Carruthers. He was responsible for bringing in the bill, but he did what was right. He let the work to a contractor and said, "You must finish it in such a time." Since then a series of muddlers have had to deal with it. The construction of the line was transferred to the Public Works Department and an attempt was made to carry out the work by day labour. Then it was transferred to Norton Griffiths. Then another crowd came along and transferred it to the Railway Commissioners. What a pretty muddle they have made of it. And we all have to pay for it. If the North Coast railway had been constructed within a reasonable period it would have been running during the war time and since, and it would have been earning some money. There it is to-day still uncompleted, and it is not likely to be completed for a long time.

The Hon. T. STONEY: What is the reason for it?

The Hon. Dr. NASH: Loafing on the part of everybody, and the neglect of spendthrift Ministers to carry out their business. The reason is quite evident. If hon. members look at the Estimates for this year they will find we are still

paying money to Norton Griffiths. That is a fine state of affairs. When the Estimates come up for consideration we shall have something to say about that. Only the other day I was talking to a gentleman from Grafton about the scandalous waste on the North Coast railway. He said, "It is not a circumstance to the waste on the Dorrigo railway." Everyone knows of the damage done to that line by washaways, because of the delay on the part of the constructing authorities, under the supervision of the Minister. After all the Minister is primarily responsible. It is the business of the Minister for Railways and the Secretary for Public Works to see that this work is carried out. He is the person who represents the people and who is responsible to Parliament. He is in that position supposed to protect their interests and to see that the work is properly carried on. There are a number of other old friends in the list—Dubbo to Werris Creek, Molong to Dubbo and Sydenham to Botany. Think what that line has cost; it should have been finished long ago. Canowindra to Eugowra, Westmead to Castle Hill, Regent's Park to Cabramatta, and Tarana to Oberon. The rails are all rusting on some sections because no trains are running. The works should have been completed and the lines made useful. If these public works cannot be used, and something cannot be got out of them, it is a dead loss to the country. Though they may not be able to pay interest still they should pay something, and in that way help the revenue of the country. But there they stand year after year simply wasting away, and they are nothing but an encumbrance on the State. The city and suburban, Barmedman to Rankin's Springs, and Gilmore to Batlow railways—all these lines have been under construction for years. Then there is our very old friend, the Burrinjuck dam. I notice there is an item in the schedule "For the construction of Burrinjuck dam." When you, Mr. President, and I visited that dam many years ago, we were told that it was to be completed within a certain time. You can multiply the time and the cost many times, and you will find that it has more than exceeded the 10 per cent. allowance which is provided for in all

these bills authorising the construction of public works. I do not know whether it is true, but lately the papers told us it was questionable whether the dam would stand up. To look at it one would think it would stand for ever and a day.

The Hon. A. SINCLAIR: I wish to make brief reference to one item provided for, and that is the item dealing with education. Hon. members are aware that the Ministry has determined to depart from the system of free education which has been in operation in this State for a considerable number of years, and to charge £2 2s. a quarter for the secondary or High schools. The Ministry, of course, knows its own business best, but this is an important public question. It is only right and fair that on a matter of this kind the Government should deal fairly with the public. I submit that in this change a section of the public is not being treated fairly at all. A very large number of parents have their children attending our High schools to-day because that class of education is free. If it had not been free the children would not have been sent to the schools, for the simple reason that the parents were unable to pay fees.

The Hon. G. F. BARR: If they cannot afford it they will not be asked to pay!

The Hon. A. SINCLAIR: I pay no attention to that. The parents are not of that miserable type who would advertise their poverty to the Department of Public Instruction or to any other department. They will simply withdraw their children from the schools. The people who send their children to the High schools are doing this State a service, and they ought to be encouraged instead of penalised, as is proposed at present. The result of the Government's action will be that towards the end of the year the education of many children will be broken up. Some have been a year or two years in a four or five years' course. Those children will be withdrawn from the schools, and their education broken up half way. That is a mistake and a misfortune. Again, I am informed that a very large number of children in our primary schools who would have gone on to the High schools are not going to sit for the qualifying examination which is to be held at the close of the year, simply

because the parents are not able to pay for the course of instruction at the High school. The result will be that a very large number of children, who would otherwise have received a secondary and valuable education will not now receive it at all. Unfortunately the matter does not end there. It will mean that at the close of the year there will be a considerable influx of children upon the labour market. All those children who upon leaving the primary schools would, under ordinary circumstances, go into the High schools, will be forced into the labour market, and in addition those children who will be withdrawn from the secondary schools will also be forced to seek employment. In the abstract there may be nothing wrong in that, but this and previous Governments have criminally neglected to provide any apprenticeship regulation, or any law whereby those children can be absorbed in legitimate avenues of trade. Those two things taken together form a tragedy in the history of our State. As I say, this and previous Governments have absolutely neglected to deal with the important question of apprenticeship. There is a shortage of tradesmen in almost every branch of industry. Take the building trades. There is, and there has been for a very long time, a shortage of tradesmen. You can scarcely get a bricklayer anywhere if you want one. There is no training, no encouragement to train, and no legal regulation with regard to training. That is absolute neglect, and in conjunction with the throwing of these children into the labour market it is a tragedy. I think it is wrong on the part of this or any other Government to lessen the educational resources of this State. I do not blame this Government more than previous Governments, but I do submit that it is opportune at the present time to deal with a question of this importance. I do not know whether the Government intends to persist in charging the fees which press heavily upon so many estimable citizens, who have no £8 8s. a year beyond what it takes to keep them at the present time, but considering the Government has entered into a kind of contract with these people it is wrong to violate it. I want to impress upon the Government the absolute necessity for

[The Hon. Dr. Nash.

dealing with this question of apprenticeship. I do not know whether I am correct, but I understand that the Board of Trade has forwarded a scheme of apprenticeship to the Government, though up to the present the Government has not dealt with it. I have nothing to say with regard to the scheme itself, because I am not conversant with it, but apart from that scheme the Government ought at once to deal with this very important matter, and make some provision for carrying on the industrial education of our children and provide for the stimulation and increase of our industries. I hope the Government will take this question immediately into consideration. It is a pressing question. Nothing can be more tragic than to see the youth of this State running to seed as they are doing, now that there is no opportunity to be taught trades, and school education is to be shortened. This is a question which requires to be dealt with and dealt with at once.

The Hon. T. WADDELL: I must confess that I cannot altogether approve of all the hon. member Mr. Sinclair has said. We hear a tremendous lot about education in these days. What would happen if the Government did not do all it is doing? I can look back forty years, and I can remember that when I was a boy we had nothing like the opportunities the children of to-day have. Our parents had to pay for our schooling. There was not the same class of teachers. Teachers were not trained as they are to-day. But whilst we had not the opportunities which are the lot of children now, so far as my experience goes, the young men of that day turned out just as good citizens and they were just as able to fight their way through life as the young men of to-day who are treated like hothouse plants and have so much of the State money spent on them. I entirely agree with the action of the Government. You might just as well ask the Government to bear the expense of educating boys to be doctors or lawyers as to ask it to give them this higher class of education. We do, as a matter of fact, through our assistance of the university, bear a good deal of the expense of training youths for the professions, but we do not bear it all. The State has gone too far in spending money on

education. I say without hesitation that the Government should never have made education free. The hon. member now representing the Government was responsible for that. Some small charge should always have been made. Many people say that the country would be ruined if we had no free education; that boys and girls would grow up ignorant, because poor people could not educate their children. In the days when it was harder to get money and harder to make a living parents were able to pay the small sum which was asked from them. There are to-day a large number of people in this State who pay for the education of their children. Not only denominational schools but many private schools take over from the State the burden of educating a large number of children. I suppose, without knowing the exact figures, that one-third of the children are educated at the expense of the parents. Yet notwithstanding that, the cost of administering the Department of Public Instruction has been increasing by leaps and bounds. Only a few years ago the sum of £1,200,000 would pay for the education of all children; it is now costing the State between £2,000,000 and £3,000,000.

Many persons are complaining because the Government is going to make a charge on the parents of children who want higher education. I have never been able to believe that education has the wonderful effect on the community that some people believe it has. Looking at the question from its moral aspect I believe there is more crime in this country to-day than there was twenty-five or thirty years ago. For very many years, until within the last few years crime was diminishing to such an extent that the Parramatta gaol, the gaol at Port Macquarie, and some other institutions of the kind were closed. Those who prate about education being needed for the children and who claim that it will do so much for them will have to change their view now because of the increase of crime.

The Hon. A. SINCLAIR: Do you say that is caused by education?

The Hon. T. WADDELL: No, but parents are more and more apt to lean on the Government of the country. The

silly idea of making life in our prisons so easy for the prisoners has brought about such a condition of things that many prefer to be in gaol than to be out of it. The First Offenders Act is now being carried to the wildest extremes. All those factors tend towards increase of crime. While no one for a moment would say that education is causing crime to increase, I say without hesitation that it is not causing crime to decrease. If children have too much done for them they become hot-house plants; they do not have the stamina and metal of youngsters of days gone by who had far less nursing and pampering. I would ask of those who think that education is going to do such wonders, who are the men who have made the greatest names in this country? Are they those who have been pampered up? The man who towers high above all statesmen in Australia was a man who was at school only for a fortnight—the late Sir Henry Parkes. The fact that that man had not all this hot-house treatment made him more self-reliant, and when he came here, an unknown young man with a wife and family, with no one to help him, he started right away to cut his path to the front rank of politicians. Sir Charles Dilke, when a member of the British House of Commons, was asked who he considered were the three greatest men in the British Empire. He said they were Gladstone, John Macdonald, of Canada, and Henry Parkes of New South Wales. Yet Parkes never had any of this pampering. Take Lincoln, a man whose name is now revered by Americans more highly than that of the great Washington. He was brought up in a cabin surrounded by poverty, and without any of the advantages of life. His name to-day stands out in America far above those of men who were pampered. He was a self-reliant man. He was not one of those who had to be nursed by the Government. He studied and eventually passed his examination as a solicitor. Then take Charles Dickens, a man who has made his name immortal in literature. He was the son of a poor woman and had to earn his living by pasting labels on mustard tins. Nowhere in the world have those who have been most conspicuous and done most for

[*The Hon. T. Waddell.*]

mankind had this hothouse training that many think should be given to our children to-day.

Whilst making these observations I do not say we should fail to pay some attention to the education of children. Every reasonable person will agree that it is only proper for the Government of the country to see that the children get fair education, but once you go beyond the ordinary rudimentary education it is questionable whether better citizens are obtained by giving free education. A difficulty is now occurring with reference to the Arbitration Court which will not permit the employment of more than a specified number of apprentices. The result of that dictation is there are thousands of young men in this country who instead of being skilled artisans are only labourers, able to do work that does not require special training. If we want to help our people and make our country free and self-reliant we should sweep away a lot of our rotten laws. Some of the money asked for to-night is required to pay for the upkeep of Arbitration Courts which give expression to the view of those interested in limiting the number of young men who may become apprentices.

With reference to the proposal that our Government should join with the Federal Government and spend £21,000,000 to secure a uniform railway gauge for Australia my view is, that though uniformity of gauge is highly desirable and though it is a great misfortune that we have not had it before, it would be a very serious mistake, at a time when it is very hard for the Government to get money, and when taxation is excessive, for this State to be plunged into such an expense. I do not know what the Government intends to do; I should like to hear from the Vice-President of the Executive Council what has been decided upon. I strongly hold the view that there is at present no justification for this Government to join with the Federal Government in bringing about uniformity of gauge if the cost is to be £21,000,000. The urgency of the change is not so great that the work should be undertaken at a time when the country has an enormous war debt.

upon which to find interest. There are other far more important works awaiting. The Broken Hill railway line is now constructed considerably beyond Condobolin. That work should be completed but I understand nothing is being done there. The North Coast railway has been hanging fire for years, but very little work is being done there now. The Treasurer stated only a few days ago that £10,000,000 will have to be raised by loan this year for railways and other urgent works. To-day it costs about £55,000 to pay the annual interest on every £1,000,000 borrowed. The Treasurer when presenting his budget statement referred to the difficulty of abstaining from increasing taxation in view of the fact that we have to pay interest on enormous sums of borrowed money, much of which has been spent on works not yet reproductive. Some persons may say it is not a matter of much concern whether we have heavy taxation or not. To such persons I would point out that every pound taken from the pockets of the people to pay for an expensive form of government is £1 taken from the funds out of which the workers of this country must be paid if we are to give them employment. There is nothing more deplorable than that there should be considerable numbers of men—many with suffering wives and families—anxious to get work but who cannot get it. That is undoubtedly because we have the highest taxation we ever had. There is only a certain amount of money in this country, and a certain amount of credit, and the more you take for the government of the country, and for carrying out these fanciful ideas of higher education, and so on, the more unemployed and the more misery you will have. Anybody who thinks that we can go on with a form of government that means increasing taxation is not alive to the best interests of the country. With regard to gauge unification, I want to point out that that will not make the people of this country grow one more pound of wool or one bushel more wheat; one more bag of potatoes, or one more cabbage. It will not increase production in the slightest degree, or at any rate, in any appreciable degree.

This spending of £21,000,000, about which the Federal Government is talking, will neither increase the production nor the wealth of this country. Of course it will, to a certain extent, facilitate the transport of goods from one State to another, but when you calculate the interest on £21,000,000, the mere facilitation of the transport of goods from one State to another hardly justifies it. Some people say that the work will be wanted in time of war. They say that there may be war with the Japanese. Of course there is a possibility of war, just as there is a possibility that any of us may meet with an accident through a train being wrecked. But we do not take that risk so seriously that we insure our lives every time we get into a train. In any circumstances, I say that this is not the time for the unifying of railway gauges to take place, but that, on the contrary, any money which can be spared should be used to extend the line to Broken Hill, or to finish the North Coast railway, or to build any important railway or other public work which will give employment and at the same time will assist production.

The Hon. G. A. DEWAR: I rise to support the remarks which have been made by the hon. member Mr. Sinclair. The hon. member Mr. Waddell has spoken as though the idea of free education in New South Wales was something new. I went to school in Victoria, and I first went to a Presbyterian school. Perhaps my parents shared some of the snobbish ideas of that period as to what were known as "State schools." However, in a short while the Protestant denominational schools were wiped out, and we were all going to State schools. My father was a supporter of the old Liberal and Reform party, and I remember being taken, as a lad, to their soirees. The backbone of those gatherings were the old diggers of the fifties, who came out in search of fortune upon the gold fields. The plank of their education policy at that time was "free, secular, and compulsory education." They fought against clergymen even being permitted to go into the schools, and they wanted rich and poor and children of all creeds to be educated together.

With his usual cleverness, I have no doubt that the Vice-President of the Executive Council will show how this charge is going to be placed upon the shoulders of those who are best able to bear it. But my point is, that it is introducing a discrimination between the children of the rich and the children of the poor. That was my objection to the charge of 3d. a week, which made some children appear as paupers. In regard to the high schools, some of the parents may be fairly well off, still they may be at considerable expense in cases where they have to board their children. I think that most of the objections raised by the hon. member Mr. Waddell may be said to be against our educational methods generally. If we are going to drop behind the continental nations in regard to the matter of higher education, then in my opinion we have lost the war. We shall have to deal with the problem of usury, for we have had to pay double pre-war rates of interest for money which had only half of the pre-war purchasing power. If we are going to repudiate our platform of "free, secular, and compulsory education," we certainly shall have to do something with regard to the matter of usury.

There is one incongruous thing about this charging of fees. I noticed that at the laying of a foundation stone in connection with a Roman Catholic church at Kandos the action of the Government received the hearty approval of the Roman Catholic Bishop of Bathurst, and he rather reflected upon the Labour Government for not having done something similar. Well, the supporters of this Government are welcome to all they can get out of that. I believe that there is something wrong with our education matters in regard to the lack of vocational training. We perhaps do turn out too many theoretical pupils, but I believe that our technical schools are finding it necessary to refuse students. I know that one of my girls cannot go to the millinery classes there, and they are refusing students in regard to more important classes. It applies, I believe, to agriculture. These are things which should be taken in hand. Mr. H. W. Potts, after travelling through the world,

[*The Hon. G. A. Dewar.*]

said that he considered that the great defect in our system was the want of means for vocational training.

In regard to the University, I have noticed latterly that the sons of maintenance men have been able to reach some of the higher positions, which formerly were a close preserve for the sons of the moneyed classes. I know a young doctor who has gone upon a tour, whose father, apparently, is well able to keep him, and who says that there are too many students trying to be doctors. He added that they were, however, going to squeeze them out. The University was making it so hot for them in the first twelve months, he said, that a lot of them would be "frozen out." I suppose that means that only the sons of poor men will be frozen out, because the sons of wealthy men will be able to stand being plucked for three or four years. I want to support the remarks that were made by the hon. member Mr. Sinclair, mainly upon the lines that the Government is introducing discrimination by charging these fees. It was to prevent this that we wiped out the charge of 3d. per week, and it was always the aim of the old party to which I have already referred that there should be no discrimination amongst our school pupils, either in regard to the charging of fees, or social position.

The Hon. G. F. EARP: I wish to express my approval of the policy of the Government in the action it is taking with regard to charging fees in High schools. Were the education real education I might hold a different view, but in my opinion the education of the day is on an entirely false basis. The imparting of information should not be regarded merely as a means for passing examinations; it should be a means of developing the faculties, but I am afraid that the developing of the faculties is lost sight of. It becomes a secondary consideration to that of cramming, in order to pass examinations. There is a perfect mania amongst people to-day to get a label stuck on their backs, in the shape of some certificate or other, and in order to do this we find the children in our schools cramming to pass these examinations. It is a curse, rather than a blessing, because its value is only temporary, and it is all forgotten in after life. The system has

been of no use in training men to develop their faculties, and that should be the real end of education. I am entirely in accord with the proposal to limit higher education to those who will use it for the purpose of developing their minds.

The Hon. A. SINCLAIR: The hon. member means those who can afford to pay for it!

The Hon. G. F. EARP: Whether they can pay for it or not is another question. In any case, the present system often has the effect of turning men who otherwise would be good bricklayers or plumbers into bad doctors or lawyers. That is of no advantage to the community. Many children who are not really suitable for higher education are induced to go in for it, and their only purpose is to pass an examination, so as to get a tab on their backs which enables them to become doctors or lawyers, although their minds are not really developed in such a way that they are suitable for those vocations. I say that that kind of education is perfectly useless, and therefore I entirely support the Government in its policy of not making higher education free to everybody. Those who want higher education should be able to pay for it, and while the labouring class is as good a class as any other in the community, it is often a curse to their children, and not a blessing, when they are brought up to follow a profession instead of following a trade.

The Hon. JAMES WILSON: I do not intend to detain the House very long, but I must say that the speeches I have heard delivered to-night are worthy of any thoughtful chamber. I listened not only with interest, but also with sincere regret, to the statements of the hon. member Dr. Nash on the thoughtlessness of building schools in marshes thriving with disease. I believe that the effect of his speech to-night will be good. The speech delivered by the hon. member and ex-Premier Mr. Waddell was particularly interesting, because he spoke not only as a good old honest Conservative, but as a man of brains.

I never had the privilege of an education. I worked from 6 o'clock in the morning until 6 o'clock at night, for 4s.

a week, and I did grooming on Sundays. At 14 years of age I had to carry 200-lb. bags of flour. When I heard the hon. member Mr. Sinclair speak about the disadvantages we suffer under in connection with our education system, the thought occurred to me that I do not know where on earth so much kindness and consideration has been shown in connection with the education of children as in this country. In the cases of ordinary men, like myself, who have three children, it often occurs that we want to make something of them which is impossible. We may have one who does not know the difference between the cock crowing in the morning and Melba singing at night, but we want to make a musician of him, and we spend our money to do it. We know what the result will be, and we can apply that generally to quite a number of parents in regard to the rearing of their children. I do not want to labour that. I believe I have spoken plain facts. If this were not the pay-bill of the public service, which has to be met to-morrow, I could easily have spoken on the measure for two hours without saying anything. I only want to say one thing more, and I speak as one of the pioneers of the labour movement. I speak as the bedrock—almost as the foundation—from which it was reared. We hear the public servants now crying out to get the privileges of arbitration. When the first Arbitration Court was formed, you could not find a civil servant in the country who would dare associate himself with it, or even with anything that was connected with labour. Yet, look at them to-day. At that time the platform of the Labour party was to create industries, and to make every man, woman, and child in the community a public servant in connection with State enterprises. Is there a sane man to-day who would say that any enterprise the Government has handled is well handled? Would you give the trawlers over to the Government again? Go through the history of any undertaking which the Government has handled and you will find that it is rotten—if not corrupt. I recognise the difference between the two. It is due to incapacity on the one hand, and to lack of energy, properly used, on the other.

The Hon. G. A. DEWAR: The public servants are always being run down. They are never encouraged to do the right thing!

The Hon. JAMES WILSON: That is true. It is a strange thing that directly you make a man a public servant you seem to make him a loafer.

The Hon. G. A. DEWAR: They say he is. The anti-Labour press traduce him instead of encouraging him by saying he is a servant of the whole of the people!

The Hon. JAMES WILSON: My philosophic friend says that the public servants of this country are being maligned.

The Hon. G. A. DEWAR: Yes.

The Hon. JAMES WILSON: I say, as far as my knowledge goes, that I know of no body of working people in the history of the world who are so well paid as the public servants of New South Wales, and it is not too much, on any account, to expect from them the best that they can produce. Big public works have been started without any intention on the part of the Government of finishing them. That state of things should cease. The hon. member Mr. Waddell has referred to railway lines which are not only lying unused, but which are decaying. That is a crime. Instead of the system we have now of making a blacksmith a medical man, or of making a man, who has no idea of figures, a Treasurer, responsible for the expenditure of Government money, is it not time that we had a different system? The position is serious enough for the best men to be selected for the positions for which they are most suitable. Fancy making a Chief Secretary a man who has never travelled a mile of New South Wales, and who would get tired if he were asked to go to the post office to put a letter in the box. Fancy making a Premier of the State a man who did not know how to control himself, let alone the destinies of the country. It is time that we produced suitable men for these positions.

You cannot make a Labour man; you cannot make a Premier; you cannot make a musician. All you can do is to utilise and make the best of what Nature has given you. Take the Eight Hours Day procession. Fancy a public holiday to celebrate an eight hours day when you

[The Hon. J. Wilson.

have half of them growling because they have not a forty-four hours week! Behind lovely banners in a majestic procession, there were three, four, or five men representing labour wending their way. It was a hideous offence against all that has gone by. In the old days it was nothing for a man to work his ten hours, and to post bills for a candidate for Parliament up to the time of cock-crow in the morning. And if you asked men in those good old days to accept any payment for services rendered they would have felt insulted. Fancy asking men to-day to do anything for nothing. What a lovely chance you would have! It is pitiable to talk about education from the standpoint of a man who does not know how to give Nature a chance. It only seems yesterday when, at the Town Hall, there were more than 4,000 people assembled there. I remember Mr. Holman, who was there, trembling like an aspen leaf because he was to be the next speaker. "Oh, Jimmy," he said to me, "do not ask me to speak until you have spoken." When he had spoken we saw that he was an orator. You cannot make orators. You can improve them; but they are born. In our education system that practically comes into operation in our homes, the great mistake is made that we do not find out what our progeny is best adapted for. I am sorry to detain hon. members so long. My intention was surely not to have prevented the holding of a picture show. I would not prevent hon. members of this House from going to the Arctic regions. I am satisfied that the leader of the House without a smile threw the responsibility of holding the picture show upon the President. If it ever happens again the lights of this House will go out. I do not mind a picture show once by accident, but I object to its being held here by design.

The Hon. T. STOREY: I desire to support the remarks which have fallen from the hon. member Mr. Sinclair, who raised his voice in protest against the Government charging fees for attendance at the High schools. I do not propose to detain the House very long. The remarks made by the hon. member Mr. Earp and the hon. member Mr. Waddell came as a great surprise to me. I think it

will be a surprise to the general public when they hear of hon. members of the standing of the two hon. members to whom I have referred opposing higher education. It is admitted that Australia is generally praised for the manner in which education here is taken up by the State. The Labour party proposed, as soon as it was possible, to make education free from the primary school right on to the University. Unfortunately the Labour party was never in the position to be able to do that. I regret to have to say that during the regime of the Labour Government, in the last couple of years, it was found necessary to raise the fees of University students. After they had taken up a course of study at the University they were suddenly informed that, owing to the state of the public finances, they would have to pay higher fees, and, if my memory serves me right, the fees were raised about 50 per cent. Representation was made at the time to the Minister of Public Instruction and it was pointed out that the condition of the public finances had compelled the authorities to do that. The statements of the hon. member Mr. Earp and the hon. member Mr. Waddell appeared to me to be an attack on our education system. Whilst there may be something to be said in favour of those who carry the hall-mark of having passed a particular examination, and whilst we know the cramming which takes place not only in this, but in other countries, we have not been able to devise any means of doing away with examinations. It seems to me that there is a feeling that only the sons of the better class and of affluent people should be allowed to go to the university. The boy of a working-man should be put to some trade, or he should go on the land; in other words, he should stick to his last. The argument used by the Minister of Public Instruction when proposing to charge fees for secondary education was that a number of people drove their children to school in motor-cars, and that people of that type were well able to pay fees. That may be so. Some discrimination should certainly be shown. A system of bursaries might be established to assist the sons of poorer people. Persons who are in a position to pay the fees should be made to pay, but poorer

persons who are not in this happy position should be exempt, and their children should be given the free opportunity to take advantage of the secondary educational system to enable them to turn their brains to the best account.

The Hon. J. H. WISE: They are entitled to it now!

The Hon. G. F. EARP: If parents cannot pay they do not pay. That is all.

The Hon. T. STOREY: You have to say that you are a pauper.

The Hon. G. F. EARP: You need not say anything at all!

The Hon. J. H. WISE: The position is the same to-day as it has been in the past!

The Hon. T. STOREY: I disagree with the hon. member. Under the old conditions, when a boy in the primary school passed the qualifying examination, no question was raised about the financial position of his parents.

The Hon. J. H. WISE: If that boy won a bursary there was a question!

The Hon. T. STOREY: Before he was allowed to sit for the bursary examination his father had to sign an affidavit that he was only receiving a certain salary.

The Hon. J. H. WISE: That is all that will be required under this innovation!

The Hon. T. STOREY: I shall be glad of the Minister's assurance that such a regulation is in existence.

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: That is all it is!

The Hon. T. STOREY: These matters require to be ventilated. Only to-day I was told by a working-man whose daughter attends the Cleveland-street High school that scholars attending that school were asked to deposit £1 as a guarantee that they would attend for twelve months. At the expiration of the twelve months, if they have attended, the money is returned. It appears to me that the Government is going out of its way unnecessarily to penalise the poorer classes. I quite agree that those who can drive their children to school in a motor-car should certainly not complain if they are asked to pay fees. But in seeking to bring that about the Government ought not to go to the other extreme of penalising the children of working people, who, if they were given the opportunity, have

sufficient brains to pass the qualifying examination or obtain a bursary to enable them to attend a High school. The hon. member Mr. Sinclair having drawn attention to this matter, I feel impelled to support him and fight to retain this privilege for the children of working people, especially as I deeply appreciate the opportunities which my own children have enjoyed in this regard.

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS, in reply: I do not intend to reply to all that has been said to-night. I suppose hon. members have their grievances to air. I am certainly not going to subscribe to the encomiums on illiteracy and lack of education which some hon. members have passed in this House. There may be a few men who are the exceptions to the general rule, but to get on in this world you need to be educated. Sir Henry Parkes is a notable exception, which proves the rule that education is a necessity. What I want to reply to mainly is the remarks of the hon. member Mr. Waddell in regard to the unification of gauge. If we do not have unification of gauge in Australia we shall not be doing our duty to Australia, and any public man who takes up a hostile attitude to unifying the gauges of Australia is an enemy of Australia. I have no hesitation in saying that. More money and more time have been wasted, more hindrance to trade and more unemployment have really been caused by the break of gauge in the various States than by anything else I know of, Arbitration Court or otherwise. The time that railway trucks are detained at Albury waiting to be unloaded and reloaded is appalling. If there were no break of gauge those trucks could go across Australia and back again. They could be loaded at Brisbane, go through to Perth, be unloaded there and come back again to Brisbane in the time many trucks are kept waiting at the border. At Albury alone in February, 1920, there were 20,000 tons of transhipped goods; in April 25,000 tons, in June 27,000 tons, in July 27,000 tons, and in September 26,000 tons. Taking the traffic for the whole year 258,000 tons of coal were transhipped at Albury. Then with regard to live stock a vast number are transhipped. Take the fruit and vege-

table trade. In one month as many as 834 trucks of fruit and vegetables were transhipped at Albury. In another month 2,765 tons of fruit were transhipped—all perishable produce.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is not that one of the reasons why we went in for federation?

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: One of the reasons, yes. Let hon. members read the evidence taken by and the report of the Break of Gauge Commission, and they will see the tremendous loss there is, a loss which if it could be saved would provide interest on the £21,000,000 expenditure involved in the unification of gauges between the capitals. In the proposal for the expenditure of £22,000,000 there is included the cost of construction on 627 miles of new railway, necessary in order to link up the various lines. Those 627 miles of new railway, built to the standard gauge would cost at least £4,000,000. You have at once a new asset. Then there are 155 miles of railway included in that expenditure, which have to be relaid with heavy rails. That will cost another million pounds. So that the expenditure of £22,000,000 for the unification of the gauge between the capitals would have to be reduced by the sum required for those new lines and new rails, bringing the total down to £17,000,000. And no expenditure of £17,000,000 in my opinion could be better directed than in the unifying of our gauge. We have only a handful of population in Australia. We may have to defend this continent against some invading force. The ease of invasion is multiplied many times by our difficulties in transporting within Australia itself the men to repel the invader. Suppose in case of war an army—it might not be large—landed on some part of Northern Australia. We would have to gather troops from West Australia, South Australia, Victoria, and New South Wales to go there. At every border there would have to be a transshipment of men, equipment and munitions. At the rate it now proceeds, by the time the transshipment had taken place and an army was taken there to face the invader Australia might be lost. That is one of the great dangers, and it

[The Hon. T. Storey.]

is not proper to speak of it in this manner. We spent between £400,000,000 and £500,000,000 in doing our part in the war. It was only our share, but no one carps at that expenditure. Consider what we can get for £22,000,000. The greatest work to be done in Australia. You could get on a train in Sydney and, without transhipment, go right round Australia, if we had a trans-continental railway. What a wonderful saving would be effected if there were no break of gauge. It would conduce to economy in travelling, because the route selected is one which especially lends itself to economy, by getting rid of the heavy haulage involved in going over high mountains and by getting rid of the sharp curves. I have no more to say. I have referred to this matter because I think the importance of the question warrants me in making these few remarks.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time and passed through its remaining stages.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE ELECTION ENABLING BILL.

Bill received from Legislative Assembly and (on motion by the Hon. Sir Joseph Carruthers) read a first time.

ENCROACHMENT OF BUILDINGS BILL.

Bill returned from the Legislative Assembly with amendments.

House adjourned at 6.30 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 4 October, 1922.

Printed Questions and Answers—Questions without Notice—Public Accounts Committee Election Enabling Bill—Police Regulation (Appeals) Bill (second reading)—Supply—Adjournment (Business of the House).

Mr. SPEAKER took the chair.

PRINTED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE: REDUCTION OF POLICE PATROL.

Mr. LANG asked the COLONIAL SECRETARY,—In view of the orderly conduct

of visitors to Parliament House will he reduce the number of police employed at the House, and thus afford relief to the undermanned city division?

Answer,—The present police arrangements within the precincts of the Houses of Parliament are in accordance with the wishes of the hon. the Speaker, who is not desirous of any alteration being made at present.

CO-OPERATIVE BUILDING SOCIETIES.

Mr. RATCLIFFE asked the PREMIER,—Will he inform the House what he intends to do in regard to assisting co-operative building societies, as stated in the Governor's opening speech?

Answer,—Action is now being taken towards the drafting of a bill to remove certain disabilities arising out of the limited scope of the Building and Co-operative Societies Act.

SYDNEY UNIVERSITY: CHAIR OF VETERINARY SCIENCE.

Mr. JAMES MCGIRR asked the MINISTER OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,—(1) Will he state what amount of money has been provided at Sydney University for the establishment and maintenance of the Chair of Veterinary Science since its inception? (2) What number of graduates have qualified since such was established? (3) What number of students are at present in attendance in the various years? (4) What are the salaries paid to the various professors, &c.? (5) What is the total cost of up-keep of such department of the University?

Answer,—I am informed:

(1) £35,250 (to 30th June, 1922). (2) Twenty-four. (3) First-year, 12; second year, 2; third year, 4; fourth year, 6. Total, 24. (4) £3,166. (5) Approximate upkeep per annum:—Salaries, £3,166; maintenance, £577. Total, £3,743.

TAX-FREE WAR LOAN BONDS.

Mr. GOSLING asked the COLONIAL TREASURER,—(1) Will he inform the House what was the largest amount in tax-free war loan bonds in the estate of a deceased within the last three years? (2) Will he also inform the House what amount would have been received by the Income-tax Commissioners had this war loan investment been taxed as ordinary income?