

The Honorary Minister: Has not there been an amendment since 1909?

Hon. J. CORNELL: Not according to the wording of the clause, because it specifically amends Section 2 of the 1909 Act.

Hon. G. W. Miles: This House could not increase the amount.

Hon. J. CORNELL: No, but this appears to be an Irishman's rise for the two trustees apart from the managing trustee. It will mean their receiving five guineas per sitting for a smaller number of sittings, but once they have reached the maximum, they will be unable to collect anything further. I feel sure the Honorary Minister will investigate the point because it is important. The trustees sometimes hold three, and four, sittings a week.

The Honorary Minister: And sometimes sit all night.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Yes, and I think I am safe in saying that they have sat on an average more than once a week. If an alteration of the clause is necessary, I hope it will be made. I support the second reading.

On motion by Hon. V. Hamersley, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 8.12 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 6th November, 1929.

	PAGE
Questions: Migration Agreement, suspension ...	1373
Road construction, engagement of labour ...	1373
Bills: Loan £2,250,000, 1R. ...	1373
Miner's Pthisis Act Amendment, 2A. ...	1373
Land Tax and Income Tax, recom. ...	1380
Royal Agricultural Society Act Amendment, Council's message ...	1389
Appropriation, all stages ...	1394
Agricultural Products, Council's amendments ...	1406
Annual Estimates, report ...	1389
Loan Estimates ...	1389
Annual Estimates: State Trading Concerns ...	1394
State Brickworks, State Ferries, State Hotels ...	1394
State Implement and Engineering Works ...	1396
State Quarries ...	1404
State Shipping Service ...	1404
State Saw Mills ...	1406
Wyndham Freezing Works ...	1406

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

QUESTION—MIGRATION AGREEMENT SUSPENSION.

Mr. THOMSON asked the Premier: 1, Has his attention been drawn to a statement appearing in the "West Australian" of the 4th inst., wherein it is stated that Mr. Scullin, Prime Minister, proposes to suspend the Migration Agreement? 2, As the suspension may have disastrous results on the progress of Western Australia, will he give the House an opportunity to express its opinion on the proposed Federal action?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, I intend to await advice from the Prime Minister before committing myself to an ill-considered decision.

QUESTION—ROAD CONSTRUCTION, ENGAGEMENT OF LABOUR.

Mr. SLEEMAN asked the Minister for Works: 1, How many men are at present employed on the Forrest-road job? 2, How many men were engaged at the Labour Bureau open pick-up? 3, How many were picked up quietly at the bureau on a letter from the foreman? 4, How many of these men were registered at the bureau prior to date of being picked up? 5, How many are working on the job who were put on at the scene of operations, and never went through the bureau for this particular job?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, Twenty-nine. 2, Five. 3, No men were picked up quietly, but four specially qualified men were selected through the bureau by the foreman. 4, All, as far as known. 5, Two (one ganger and one horse driver). In addition to above 18 men were transferred from the Coogee job.

BILL—LOAN, £2,250,000.

Introduced by the Premier and read a first time.

BILL—MINER'S PTHISIS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. S. W. Munsie—Hannans) [4.35] in moving the second reading said: This is a short Bill and only two principles are contained in the four clauses. Members know the

conditions under which miners have been granted compensation under the Miners' Phthisis Act. I am not going into details as to the amount of compensation. At present we have annual examinations of all men working on, in or about a mine. Any man found suffering from T.B., irrespective of whether it is complicated with miner's phthisis, is prohibited from working on a mine and comes under the Miners' Phthisis Act for compensation. Each examination has revealed a fair number of men affected. At the first examination there were 141, second examination 139, third examination 40, and at the fourth examination, which is not yet complete, there were again 40. Quite recently officers of the Audit Department, in auditing accounts of the miner's phthisis branch, questioned the right to pay some of the men whom we were paying. They contended that the Act allowed us to compensate only men who were employed on a mine between the 7th June and the 7th September, 1925. Section 9 of the principal Act reads—

(2) Any person whose employment is prohibited as aforesaid, and whose name is registered in the register to be kept by the Mine Workers' Relief Fund, Incorporated, shall have the right to receive from the Department of Mines compensation equal to the ruling rate of pay in the district in which he was employed at the time of such prohibition for the class of work in which he was engaged until other suitable employment is found for and offered to him by the Department of Mines.

The preceding subsection stipulates—

It shall be the duty of the Mine Workers' Relief Fund, Incorporated, to keep a register, and on application by any person employed on, in or about a mine at the commencement of this Act, and whose employment is prohibited under Section 8 of this Act, to insert the name of such person in such register.

I direct attention to the words "at the commencement of this Act." In 1925 the Act was amended at the instance of the then Minister for Mines (Hon. M. F. Troy) by the insertion of a new section as follows:—

9a. A person shall be deemed to be "engaged in mining operations" or "employed on, in or about a mine at the commencement of this Act" within the meaning of those words in Sections 8 and 9 hereof respectively, if he were so engaged or employed within three months before the commencement of this Act, notwithstanding that at such time he may have been temporarily out of employment.

The Crown Solicitor has ruled that on the strict interpretation of the Act we may legally pay only the men who were employed

between the 7th June and the 7th September, 1925. If a man happened to be working on a mine for 10 or 15 years and left on the 6th June for a holiday and returned to his job on the 8th September, 1925, and was then found to be suffering from T.B., he could not be compensated because he was not actually employed between the 7th June and the 7th September.

Hon. G. Taylor: Would that interpretation exclude new men?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes; the Crown Law authorities say we cannot legally pay men who have been employed on or about a mine subsequent to the 7th September, 1925.

Hon. G. Taylor: Then the Act does not operate?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Strictly speaking, no, except for the men employed between those dates. I do not think any member ever contemplated that the Act would be so interested. Regulations have been gazetted and tabled and no member has objected to them, and they make it compulsory for all men seeking employment on a mine to be medically examined and declared free from any of the diseases specified in the Third Schedule of the Workers' Compensation Act. Consequently we have protection as regards outsiders.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Everybody must be protected by the Third Schedule.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: They must have their choice of this or the Third Schedule.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: We are not interfering with that.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I am referring to men who have entered the industry since the Act came into operation.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I want to give the man who has entered the industry since the proclamation of the Miners' Phthisis Act the same privilege as the man who was then working in the industry.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What about the Third Schedule?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The Third Schedule was not proclaimed until after the Miners' Phthisis Act was proclaimed.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But if a man goes into a mine to-day, can he have his choice between the two bases of compensation?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: A man cannot enter a mine to-day unless he is free from all the diseases specified in the Third Schedule, but we have to protect the men who were already in the industry. Under the Miners' Phthisis Act we have issued a regulation which compels every man entering the industry to undergo an examination. That is a protection to the public.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: A man who goes into a mine now does not come under the Miners' Phthisis Act?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes, he does.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Even if he has not worked in the industry before?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes. If he is certified to be free from any of the diseases specified in the Third Schedule and subsequent examination reveals that he has contracted any of the diseases, he should be entitled to compensation.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: He would get compensation, but he would not come under the Miners' Phthisis Act.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member is wrong. Such a man could not come under both Acts; he must accept one or the other. The first clause of the amending Bill provides for amendment of the section to make it so that anyone now employed in the mines can come under the Act if subsequently found to be suffering from tuberculosis.

Hon. G. Taylor: There would be a close examination beforehand?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Of course. As I mentioned the other day, some 700 men applying for work on the mines during the past 12 months were examined, and 10 or 12 tuberculosis cases were discovered among them. These, of course, did not come under the Workers' Compensation Act. We do not know how they contracted the disease; they came from the Eastern States and elsewhere. Before a man can be employed on the mines, he has to produce a medical certificate. When the Miner's Phthisis Act was first introduced, the Leader of the Opposition was, I think, just as enthusiastic in its favour as any other member.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I am still.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: When an amendment Act was put through by the member for Mount Magnet (Hon. M. F. Troy) the Leader of the Opposition was

emphatic that those men should be compensated.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But I thought we finished then.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: I thought so too, but the law authorities have ruled that we cannot legally compensate those cases.

The Premier: We all thought we had finished, but we got a ruling to the effect that we have not.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: The Parliamentary Draftsman tells me definitely that when the original Act was drafted, the then Minister for Mines, Mr. Scaddan, had a long interview with him and said specifically that he only wanted the measure to apply to the men then employed, and not to men to be subsequently employed. The Parliamentary Draftsman says he framed the Bill in such a manner that the first examination would take out all workers suffering from tuberculosis, and so that from then onward any further compensation had to be obtained under the Workers' Compensation Act and not under the Miner's Phthisis Act. This is the ruling which has been furnished—

(1) Any miner may be prohibited, but only those who were engaged or employed at any time between the 7th June and the 7th September, 1925, and registered. (2) Only those registered can be compensated. (3) A miner must be engaged in the mining industry when examined. (4) Act does not apply to those out of employment on or before the 6th June, 1925, and so continuing beyond the 7th September, 1925, nor to those coming into the industry after the 7th September, 1925.

That is the Solicitor General's ruling as to the position under the present Act. We cannot sit down and allow a ruling of that kind to prevail, as it would mean that we would get into trouble for doing what every member of the Chamber thought there was a perfect right to do, and what I say the Government have a right to do, namely pay compensation in those cases. The clause merely provides for that position. Compensation has been paid all along, but the Auditor General can object to these payments unless the Bill passes. Two other proposed sections, 4c and 4d, make the Act plain, and also remove an anomaly. The Act as it stands provides—

A person whose name is registered shall not have any right to compensation under this section (4c) if such person is, or becomes, entitled to receive compensation under Section 7 of the Workers' Compensation Act, 1912-1924:

Proposed new Section 4d deals with the dependants of a person subject to that condition. From the very commencement, we have recognised any man shown by a previous examination to have advanced miner's phthisis, and by a later examination to have miner's phthisis plus tuberculosis. Then that man receives a notice prohibiting him from working in the mines. Upon examination, 90 per cent. of such cases are declared totally unfit for work. While the section remains as it is, they are not entitled to compensation under the Miner's Phthisis Act, because they are entitled to compensation under the Workers' Compensation Act. They are compelled to claim under the latter measure. As a matter of fact, we to-day pay them under the Miner's Phthisis Act if they have contracted tuberculosis.

Hon. G. Taylor: Do you want to continue to do that?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes.

Hon. G. Taylor: That is the object of the amendment?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes, to make it clear that those cases have that right under the Miner's Phthisis Act.

Mr. Mann: If the cases were ill, but not to the full extent of phthisis, how would you pay them?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Under the Workers' Compensation Act. They cannot be paid under the Miner's Phthisis Act unless they have developed tuberculosis. Under the Miner's Phthisis Act only men suffering from tuberculosis are being compensated to-day.

Hon. G. Taylor: They can only draw under one Act?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes; they cannot draw under two. Thus the Bill proposes to alter two principles, in order to render legal the payments that are being made now. The object of Clause 4 is to bring district and workmen's inspectors under the Miner's Phthisis Act. All the inspectors, both departmental and workmen's, have petitioned the Mines Department to be brought under that Act. Further the representatives of the employees and the representatives of the employers have also requested that the inspectors should be brought within the scope of the Act.

Hon. G. Taylor: Have the inspectors ever been examined?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Up to date, none of them. They do not even undergo an examination prior to appointment. That position is unfair to miners working underground. I am proposing the clause more for that reason than with the object of bringing inspectors, as inspectors, under the Act. It is utterly unfair to allow a man to go underground day after day for the purpose of inspection, if he has not been examined, since he may have tuberculosis. A workmen's inspector, even if he has tuberculosis, can nevertheless continue to go underground year after year, as long as he is able to walk—probably disseminating the germs of the disease and infecting fellow workers. The Government cannot prevent him, as he has never been examined.

Mr. Sampson: Would the inspector be examined before he was appointed?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Certainly he would now.

Mr. Sampson: And it would be impossible to appoint an inspector already suffering from tuberculosis?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: If the Bill passes, it will be impossible. There was the unfortunate case of an inspector who died about three weeks ago, after an illness of about four months, and who was affected with miner's phthisis—Byfield was the name.

Mr. Marshall: Incidentally, any inspector discovered to be suffering from tuberculosis will be excluded from the mines?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes, debarred from continuing in his occupation.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: He should be.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: And he will be compensated accordingly. Certainly the inspector I refer to had miner's phthisis badly; he was badly dusted. Possibly he also had tuberculosis. It is only fair that inspectors who go day after day amongst workmen underground should be subjected to the same examination as the ordinary mine employee. I hope hon. members will accept the Bill in the spirit in which it is introduced. The Government merely wish to continue in a legal form payments that are being made. The only additional feature of the Bill is the inclusion of district and workmen's inspectors, who I think the House will agree ought to undergo the same examination as wages employees. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL (Northam) [4.52]: The first Miner's Phthisis Act was passed in 1922. An amendment Act was passed in 1925. Now we are asked to undo what we did in 1925. Thus we are not gaining much in wisdom. We thought in 1925 that we had provided for miners who sacrificed their health. Beyond that, we thought they were provided for under the Third Schedule to the Workers' Compensation Act. Now, without a full explanation of the reason why, the suffering miner is to be given the choice between the two measures—the Miner's Phthisis Act and the Workers' Compensation Act.

The Minister for Mines: He has that choice now.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: No. Under the amendment Act put through by the present Minister for Lands, that choice does not obtain. The miner ceased to have any right under the Miner's Phthisis Act when he became entitled to compensation under the Third Schedule to the Workers' Compensation Act. The choice now is to be with the miner, or with the person who is claiming. That is the difference. The wording is merely changed round. It provides exactly the same thing, except that the choice is left with the miner. To-day if the miner is entitled to compensation under the Workers' Compensation Act, he is not entitled to compensation under the Miner's Phthisis Act; but if the Bill passes he will be entitled to compensation under the Miner's Phthisis Act until he has claimed under the Third Schedule to the Workers' Compensation Act.

The Minister for Mines: Not unless he has tuberculosis.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Minister proposes to give him the choice. That is the position the House is asked to set up for the future. The Minister tells us that this is the custom to-day, and that the law is not being obeyed.

The Minister for Mines: It is being obeyed as we thought it really was.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is better to ask the House to agree with what the Government desire to do. That Ministers should act in defiance of the law is a very bad thing, and quite unnecessary, since Parliament is sitting to deal with matters of this kind.

The Minister for Mines: We did not know of the illegality until three weeks ago, and the Bill is introduced now.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Three weeks is a long time. The position is that we all cheerfully, and I believe the people of the country, too, cheerfully undertook to compensate these miners. All of us admitted quite frankly that we had been remiss in not fixing the responsibility upon the mine owners when gold was being won and when the health of the miners was being destroyed in the process of winning the gold. We were inexperienced in the matter, and so year after year we drifted along. Finally we said, "The country has to take the responsibility now." The country did. But the other cases we thought were provided for under the Third Schedule to the Workers' Compensation Act. Now the Minister says that apparently the Third Schedule does not cover all that is required.

The Minister for Mines: There is nothing in the Third Schedule about tuberculosis.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Minister finds that the Third Schedule does not cover all he desires. There are many people who are not miners but are suffering from tuberculosis, and they are not compensated in any way. If I remember aright when the Government submitted the Third Schedule to Parliament, they excluded that disease because phthisis is an occupational disease whereas tuberculosis is not.

The Minister for Mines: Any man who contracts phthisis in any degree is more susceptible to tuberculosis than any one else.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I should imagine that was the position. Let us be quite clear as to what we are doing. We are going to include men who are not now included under the operations of the Miner's Phthisis Act.

The Minister for Mines: No.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, we are.

The Minister for Mines: Not one.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Are we not to include the inspectors to whom the Minister referred?

The Minister for Mines: Yes.

The Premier: But there are only eight of them all told.

Hon. G. Taylor: They should have been included before.

The Minister for Mines: Of course they should have been.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Surely we have the right to understand what we are doing. We are asked to include at least

eight people who have not been included. There are eight now, but as time goes on there may be more of these inspectors. We hold that they should be examined, and if a man moves about mines as these inspectors do, it is certainly more important that he should be examined than the ordinary miner who may work in one part of a mine for months at a time. The next thing the Minister wants us to agree to is that the miners may exercise their choice between the Third Schedule to the Workers' Compensation Act and the provisions of the Miners' Phtthisis Act.

The Minister for Mines: No.

The Premier: Of course, that is not so.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I am not permitted to read the clause.

The Premier: The man will come under one or the other, according to his condition.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: To-day he does.

The Premier: And he will under the Bill. He cannot take his choice; it will all be determined by the condition of his health.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Under the amending legislation that was introduced by the present Minister for Lands when he was Minister for Mines, it was provided that a man suffering from tuberculosis would have the right to compensation under the Third Schedule to the Workers' Compensation Act, as he has to-day, and would cease to have that right under the Miner's Phthisis Act. That was what we agreed to in 1925. The present Minister for Mines proposes a further amendment which is in fact a transposition of words, and now he says that the claimant may receive payment under the Miner's Phthisis Act until he is in receipt of compensation under Section 7 of the Workers' Compensation Act. The meaning of that, of course, is that the man will have his choice. If a man is suffering from miner's phthisis in the manner described by the Minister, we should provide him with compensation sufficient to enable him to live in comfort for the rest of his life. From one standpoint the Third Schedule to the Workers' Compensation Act has been most unfortunate because the mine owner has never paid any part of the premiums, so far as I am aware. The gold mining industry is the one industry that has not paid for the protection of its own employees. The Government pay about £24,000 for that purpose; and that is a large

sum. I suppose the Government will continue to pay it.

The Minister for Mines: I do not know about that; we are not making any promises.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: But Parliament is supposed to control the finances, and the Minister should make his proposal to us. Formerly we suggested that the whole of the people should accept the accumulated responsibility of the past. They have accepted that responsibility, but now we are doing more than that; we are paying the premiums under the Third Schedule to the Workers' Compensation Act irrespective of mines that are now being opened up. We will take the responsibility for the men employed at Wiluna. There is a mine that promises so well that we agreed to the construction of a railway to give the mining company a chance to open up the proposition. If every other industry is required to carry its own load under the Workers' Compensation Act, then the mines must sooner or later do so too. I think the Minister will agree with that contention. I do not think it would be right to pay the premiums under the Workers' Compensation Act for the Wiluna mine, should it turn out to be the proposition we believed it would be when we agreed to the construction of the railway. The whole position will have to be faced, having regard to our responsibility to the people as a whole. We have let the mining companies off payments in every direction possible. We reduced their payments to the Water Supply Department by about £45,000 a year, and we took that from our loan funds. The mines have been relieved to that extent. Then again we have paid £34,000 for the mines under the Workers' Compensation Act, irrespective of whether the mines affected were profitable or not. Apparently we shall continue to pay those premiums. I do not know that we need bother so much about legislation if that is to be the position. We should pay and have done with it. It is a shocking thing that men should sacrifice their lives in the winning of gold from the earth, but the fact remains that they do so. Apparently it is an attractive calling and so, notwithstanding the risks, the men continue to undertake the work. Having undertaken it, many of the men married and now have families. Then comes ill-health and finally death, the State being left to do its duty by the dependants. That is what is happening regarding mining operations now, and it is be-

coming financially expensive to the Government in one way and another. Apart from that, the industry is expensive in its toll upon human life. I have looked into the Bill, and it seems to me that it is intended to do what I have indicated. I have no objection to passing the legislation but I do want to know, and I am sure the people of the State will desire to know, if this is to be a continuing liability in connection with the people in the mines now, as well as to those who will be employed in the mines from now henceforth. We examine the men before they go into the mines and we take full responsibility for them. It costs us about £40,000 a year to meet the responsibility that has accumulated over many years, but we pay £34,000 a year to meet a recurring responsibility. Thus we pay by direct means as well as by indirect means.

The Minister for Mines: If it were not for the accumulated trouble, there would be no necessity to pay a £4 10s. per cent. premium, or anything like it.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Probably not, but all those who were affected were taken away from the mines and placed in other jobs, or else came under the provisions of the Miners' Phthisis Act.

The Minister for Mines: No.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: That is what we thought would be done.

The Minister for Mines: Some were notified, but they refused to leave the mines.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: And they stayed there at their own risk, beyond certain payments. If a man were affected by disease to the extent of 20 per cent., he would receive smaller compensation than another man who had contracted the disease in a more severe form.

The Minister for Mines: But he receives no compensation under the Workers' Compensation Act at present.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: No, under the Miners' Phthisis Act.

The Minister for Mines: He does not receive it under either Act.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Not while he is at work. The Minister knows what I mean. If the man is examined and is found to be slightly affected, but continues work, he may do so until he becomes incapable and then he receives compensation.

The Minister for Mines: Yes.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Let us be frank. I want to do what is right, and the Minister should make it easy for us to

understand the position as clearly as possible.

The Minister for Mines: That is so.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: What was in my mind, but which I may have expressed somewhat incoherently, was that if a person, who was slightly affected—and this was shown when he was examined—continued to work and became badly affected, he would be retired from the mine and would be paid compensation.

The Minister for Mines: Yes, under the Workers' Compensation Act.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Now we propose that such a man will have his choice. As there is no compensation contributed by the mine owners, the State has accepted the responsibility. If that is the position, we had better say so, and let the transaction be done in accordance with the law. I agree with the Minister that it is bad to transgress the law, even for a Minister to transgress the law, and a dangerous thing, too, I should imagine. However, this is really a Committee Bill, and we can go into it more fully in Committee and question the Minister more closely as to his intentions and wishes, and as to the advice he has had from the Solicitor General. I have no objection to the Bill, if it is as I understand it to be. It seems to me we have a very great responsibility and that we had better face it.

MR. THOMSON (Katanning) [5.16]: When one reads the Auditor General's report, he finds the reason why the Minister has introduced the Bill. I was very much impressed by the Minister's remarks when he said that Mr. Scaddan had had a long interview with him, and that it was his intention that we should compensate only those who were affected at the time the Act was brought into being. The figures supplied to us by the Minister certainly caused every member sorrow to think that the industry is giving rise to so much suffering. I am not offering any objection to the Bill, but while we are making provision for the protection of the men by a medical examination and telling them that at a certain period they must retire from the mines, I should like to know from the Minister whether any new regulations or conditions have been imposed with a view to minimising the toll this industry is taking of those following that occupation. If, after all the years of experience we have had of the in-

dustry, we are going to carry on under the same conditions as in the past, and are going to accept so heavy a toll on the health of the men in the mines, the sooner the House legislates as it has done in other directions, the better. For instance, we have the Shops and Factories Act, which prescribes conditions to be complied with. The Leader of the Opposition reminded us that we are spending a considerable sum of money on the construction of the railway to Wiluna, and we have been told that the Wiluna mine, if successful, will be carrying a population of some 6,000 people. If in the opening up of the Wiluna mines we are going to bring about a fresh outbreak of the disease, I say it is not in the interests of the State to perpetuate an industry taking such a toll of the health of the community. Those suffering from the disease have my deepest sympathy. Those working in the industry are more favoured than those who have contracted the disease in other walks of life. In the Shops and Factories Act it is provided that nobody suffering from the disease may follow any occupation in the preparation of foodstuffs. No compensation is available for those unfortunate people. We recognise that those engaged in mining are worthy of the assistance and consideration that has been extended to them, but since we have been insistent in endeavouring to prescribe healthful conditions in shops and factories, I think that, as far as possible, we should take the same precautions in the mining industry. I will support the second reading, and trust that, whoever may be Minister for Mines next year, he will be able to bring down a report that will make very much happier reading in respect of the health of the miners than did the one presented to us a little while ago.

HON. G. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret) [5.22]: The Minister thought that under the Act he was in order in making certain payments. But this was queried by the Crown Law Department and, I suppose, by the Auditor General also. Now the Minister wants to make legal what he thought was legal under the existing Act.

The Minister for Mines: The money has been actually paid.

HON. G. TAYLOR: That is the sole object of the amending Bill. I will support

the second reading, but I hope the Minister will not take the Bill into Committee this evening, for we require an opportunity to further consider the measure which has only just been distributed. The Leader of the Opposition emphasised the fact that the Bill will make it possible for the affected miners to claim under either the Workers' Compensation Act or the Miners' Phthisis Act. That is not the intention of the Bill, although the Leader of the Opposition was perfectly satisfied that the measure would have that effect. So I hope we shall not have to consider it in Committee to-night, although I understand the Minister wishes to get away to visit a new mining field tomorrow. I will support the second reading because these miners need all the assistance we can give them. I am sorry the obligation rests on the people of Western Australia. Provision should have been made in the early days for the industry to carry the cost of the ravages the disease has made amongst the men. I hope some such provision will be made in respect of the new mines at Wiluna.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—LAND TAX AND INCOME TAX.

Recommittal.

Order of the day read for consideration of the Committee's report.

The **PREMIER**: I move—

That the Bill be recommitted for the purpose of further considering Clause 2.

Question put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	21
Noes	11

Majority for 10

ATTS.

Mr. Chesson	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Collier	Mr. Millington
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Muzzle
Mr. Cowan	Mr. Rowe
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Steeman
Miss Holman	Mr. Troy
Mr. Johnson	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Willecock
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Lamond	

(Teller.)

NOES.		
Mr. Angelo	Mr. Sampson	
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Stubbs	
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Taylor	
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Thomson	
Mr. Mann	Mr. North	
Sir James Mitchell		(Teller.)

PAIRS.		NOES.
AYES.		
Mr. Richardson	Mr. Pantou	
Mr. George	Mr. Lutey	
Mr. Barnard	Mr. Corboy	
Mr. Teesdale	Mr. Withers	
Mr. J. M. Smith	Mr. Kenneally	

Question thus passed.

In Committee.

Mr. Lambert in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Clause 2—Grant of land tax and income tax for the year ending 30th June, 1930.

The PREMIER: I move an amendment—

That in Subclause 1 the word "one penny" be struck out, with a view to inserting "two-pence" in lieu.

Hon.^d Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment. We considered this matter the other night. Ample notice had been given, and the Government suffered defeat. I thought they had accepted it. They did not consider it an important matter. At least three Ministers were away from the House, and out of 26 members sitting opposite, only 14 were present on that occasion. I do not know why the time of the Committee should be taken up in this way. When Ministers can be away while important business is being considered, the Government should not expect other members to be present. Ministers should not be away from the House when members are discussing questions of importance. This is an inconvenience to members, because information is not available as a consequence. I do not know why the Premier has not allowed the amendment made by the Committee at a previous sitting to stand. He has now recommitted the Bill and proposes to reinstate the subclause as it originally stood. I hope members will not agree to the amendment. The £99,000 which the Federal Government paid last year comes from the people of the State. We should be reducing our land tax by that amount. Is it right that the people who have been paying to this Government should now pay to the Federal Govern-

ment and continue paying also to this Government? Of course not. We should relieve the people of the amount they would be paying to the Federal Government towards our sinking fund. There is another good reason why they should be relieved from taxation. We are no longer contributing to the sinking fund. The advantage this year to the Treasurer is £360,000, because we have cancelled our London sinking fund. Under these two items the advantage to the Treasurer this year is £459,000. What I ask is that the people be relieved of taxation to the extent of £99,000 out of the £459,000, leaving to the Treasurer £360,000 he did not have until last year, and no other Treasurer had before. In the past we have had to contribute to the sinking fund, but now it is contributing to the Treasury. There is, besides, an estimated surplus of £105,000. I might have said we are making use of the Sale of Government Property Fund. It will be remembered that consequent upon the Financial Agreement we cancelled the Act requiring that the proceeds from the sales of Government property should be paid into this fund. Every year we endeavoured to allot to loan or revenue an amount equal to the amount of the sales of Government property bought either from loan or revenue fund. Now this fund is used for the most part to save revenue. It amounted to £184,000 last year, and £150,000 this year. That is a tremendous advantage to the revenue, and the people should be considered. There are other advantages. Something is left of the special grant of £300,000 which the Commonwealth gave us. Some of it was taken to reduce the income tax. Then there is the advantage of cheap money from the Commonwealth. Above all we are getting about £2,000,000 more in revenue than we had a few years ago. It is very little to ask that the taxation of land be reduced. I was delighted to hear the Premier the other day at Narrogin say that the cost of production would be reduced by every possible means. The cost of production to the Government is increased by taxation, by the high tariff of the Federal Government, by other taxation imposed by the Federal Government, and by taxation imposed by the State Government and by local authorities. We can do our bit. It ought to be possible with all these advantages for the Government to do something also. If it were not for these unforeseen advantages we should have

to-day an enormous deficit, the largest the State has ever known. We are enjoying these advantages, and the people should benefit from them. I am told that the people benefit by the expenditure of money in the hands of the Government. That is not so to any appreciable extent. In these days of unemployment it is better to leave money in the hands of the people than to take it into the Treasury. One pound in the hands of the people will do as much as £2 in the hands of the Treasury. That is not a reflection on this Government; it is common to all Government expenditure. If the people know of these Treasury advantages they will naturally resent having taxation continued on its present scale. We are but one of the taxing authorities, and the Premier may say, having regard to the indirect taxation imposed by the Federal Government, that we are the greatest of the three. We are taking now more than we need to meet the requirements of government, and more than would be necessary to meet requirements under economical management. This Committee has no right to agree to the Premier's amendment having regard to the situation as we find it. There may come a time when these advantages will disappear. In 1931 I think the Federal grant will cease. The advantages that we get from the cancelled sinking fund will gradually grow less. There will not be a rapid elimination of the £360,000. There is a tight time, and an unpleasant and difficult time ahead of the people because of the falling off in exports due to bad seasons in the Eastern States, and the drop in the price of wool. I do not see why Governments should refuse to be inconvenienced by this tightness and why the trouble should be left to individuals. Although the people have to suffer, the man on the bottom rung of the ladder always has to suffer. There is no escape for him. If the people are in financial difficulties, work is not done, and if work is not done the wage-earner finds himself out of a job. We ought to consider the wage-earner when imposing taxation. There was a time when he was persuaded to believe that the best thing for him was to impose a crushing tax upon the man who employed him. I remember years ago a Labour member urging that a land tax be imposed sufficiently high to make the land a useless asset to the owner. No Labour man believes in that to-day. People know better now, and realise that Govern-

ments are unwise if they tax more than is necessary to carry on their services. There is enough for hospitals, health, education, police protection and the other things which it is our duty to provide for by taxation. No one objects to sufficient taxation for these services, but we do resent the continuance of taxation in the circumstances. We have been taxed to meet this expenditure, and the tax that is imposed for the purpose is to continue. We are also to suffer taxation imposed by the Federal Government for precisely the same purpose. It would be possible for the three things that for the moment are giving us great advantage to be in the end a great burden on the people. I refer to the advantages under the Financial Agreement, for undoubtedly we are getting advantages at the moment; to the money we are getting under the Federal Aid Roads grant, and the cheap money under the Migration Agreement. Properly handled all three might be a lasting benefit, but I am afraid that will not be the case. They will not even be of great benefit at the moment. Our interest bill is naturally increasing. We ought to see to it that the money is put into reproductive work. This is not the time to ask that the special advantages that have come to the people of the State shall be left entirely to the Treasury, and that nothing shall go to the individual taxpayer. I may be told that not a great number of persons are paying income tax. The number, however, is considerable, and those people are worthy of consideration. When we come to the land tax, we find that many thousands of people are paying it, and all are paying it because the exemption has been removed. I urge the Premier to withdraw his amendment and to leave the Bill as it was. When a Bill is introduced it is for the House to deal with it as seems wise to it. As we have done that I do not know why the Premier should ask us to think a second time and to deal with the clause again. Let us show some consideration to those who are employed in this country as well as to those who are out of work and let the money remain where it will be wisely used. It has been possible for us to use the money that has been made available under the Financial Agreement. Again, we have accumulated, I think, about £800,000 of Federal money and we are entitled to use that plus the money that we shall find ourselves. All that must be of advantage

to the Treasury. Every bit of expenditure brings money into the Treasury and enables us to improve the revenue position year by year. What we are asking for now is very little when we remember too that we are saved the payment of £99,000 on account of sinking fund. I hope the Premier will reconsider his determination to reinstate the clause as it was when he brought down the Bill, and that he will give the people the benefit of reduced taxation.

Mr. THOMSON: When the Bill went through last evening I confess I was optimistic that the Premier had agreed to accept the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I was considerably impressed by the statements the Premier made when he said that the people of the State and the Commonwealth would have to economise. It seems to me, however, that everybody, with the exception of the Government, is expected to economise. Returning to the figures submitted by the Taxation Department we find that in 1923-24 the total amount raised by way of land tax was £70,879 and the latest figures before us show the return to have been £192,402. So we find that the Treasurer has benefited by over £121,000 from land tax, and that he is effecting a saving through the Financial Agreement of £360,000, a total of £481,523. He now has that much more money to spend than he had in 1923. We also know, as has been pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition, that we are saving £99,000 in connection with the sinking fund, the amount being contributed by the Commonwealth. Thus, taking it all round, the position from a State point of view justifies our asking that the land tax should be reduced. I was one who did expect to see a reduction in taxation this year as a result of the benefits we are deriving from the Financial Agreement. On turning to the figures supplied by the Government Statistician we find that wool has decreased considerably in value since 1923-24. In that year the product was worth £3,731,330, in 1927-28 it was worth £4,962,000 and in 1928-29 the value was £3,910,886. In view of the falling prices the primary producers are receiving for their commodities, the Government can reasonably be expected to reduce taxation. At least we should have had an amendment somewhat on the lines of that which I moved last night, that those whose incomes are being depleted as a result of falling prices should not have to

pay double tax. Quite a number of people are optimistic to-day as regards the value of wool. They cheerfully point out that in days gone by the growers received 1s. a pound and did very well. As a matter of fact, at one stage they received less. But this fact is forgotten, that when the price was 1s. a lb., there was no Federal land and income tax, there was no State income tax and certainly we did not have the high tariff that exists to-day and the cost of production in every way was nothing as compared with the position at the present time. It does seem to me to be futile for us who occupy public positions to urge the people to economise, while so far as we can judge, the Government are not making any effort in a similar direction. At the same time we have to accept our share of the responsibility of the Government's failure to reduce expenditure. I have no doubt that the Premier will be able to show reductions in respect of his own Estimates, but I suppose he will also argue that because of the falling prices for wool and other commodities and the consequent depletion of taxpayers' incomes, he will not be able to collect as much as in better circumstances he might be expected to gather in. From his point of view then that will be his justification for asking that the tax should remain as it is. Against all that, however, we must realise the benefits the State is deriving from the Financial Agreement, the Commonwealth grant and the saving to the State by our not having to contribute to the sinking fund. Thus, in fairness to the people, the reduction that was made the other evening should stand. I am strongly in favour of exempting rural lands, those areas that are producing income and if the Government cannot see their way to permit the reduction to remain, I hope they will consider the exemption of the lands I have referred to. I agree that incomes will be seriously depleted this year. The returns submitted last year show that our exports were considerably reduced. Perhaps I am unduly optimistic but I wish to support the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, and urge the Premier not to persist in his desire to extract more money than he can possibly help from the ratepayers. If we desire to encourage people to come here and invest their capital, we want to show them that we are the lowest taxed community in the Commonwealth. We could with justice reduce the

amount of taxation by £99,000, and on the figures submitted by the Premier he should be able to balance the ledger seeing that he has budgeted for a surplus of £105,000. Whilst I would like to see the finances of the State as nearly square as possible, it is not healthy for the State to have a surplus. It seems to lead to extravagance.

The Premier: From that aspect, this State is not very unhealthy. It is 20 years since we suffered from the ill-health of a surplus.

Mr. THOMSON: We are told that one of the reasons why the late Federal Government became so extravagant in their administration was that they had so much money available and did not know what to do with it. I do not suggest that the Premier is in that fortunate position, but in view of the enormous savings effected by the Financial Agreement, the Premier might very well give the reduced rate a trial for at least this year. As is often said of measures submitted to the House, if the lower tax did not do very much good it would not do very much harm, and whoever was Treasurer after the next elections, if he found it essential to reimpose the higher rate, would be in a position to do so. I hope the Premier will not insist on the higher rate but will allow the Bill to stand as amended.

The PREMIER: Fairly long experience has taught me that there is no task so easy as urging the other fellow to reduce expenditure. It seems so easy to do when the responsibility is not with the person urging it. The Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Country Party have stressed the great benefits derived by the State because of the Financial Agreement and in other ways, but I could easily show that not only have those benefits been wiped out, but a great deal more money has been required to meet the increased expenditure which was inevitable and which has been sanctioned by this House.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You cannot.

The PREMIER: I could show that the interest charges alone have increased considerably.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It would not be very wise to do that.

The PREMIER: The expenditure has been approved of by the House.

Mr. Thomson: We recognise that you have to face increased interest charges.

The PREMIER: All the advantages that have accrued to the State because of the Financial Agreement have been stressed, but those advantages have been more than balanced by the increased payments of interest year by year.

Mr. Thomson: Surely not!

The PREMIER: What do the interest payments on an expenditure of £4,000,000 amount to? Such an expenditure has been going on year after year. Let the hon. member work it out and he will find it runs into a couple of hundred thousand pounds a year.

Mr. Thomson: Some of the expenditure should be reproductive.

The PREMIER: Some is, but a great deal is not. Loan expenditure on railways, as a rule, is not reproductive for a few years. Of the seven millions—speaking from memory—spent on group settlement, not one penny has been directly reproductive.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It includes interest and you have not paid the full interest.

The PREMIER: It is easy to talk of the increased revenue coming to us, but members know perfectly well that an increase in the revenue also brings increased obligations with regard to expenditure. In the past increased revenue has almost always meant a much greater increase of expenditure which over long years has been responsible for successive deficits. While our total revenue may be £2,000,000 more than it was a few years ago, our total expenditure is also greater, and the increased expenditure cannot be avoided. The hon. member said that no effort had been made to economise, but the greatest trouble I and most Treasurers have is to resist requests by members of the House as well as the general public for increased expenditure.

Mr. Ferguson: You always say "No" when I ask for anything.

The PREMIER: If I did not, there is no telling where we should be. Night after night the general trend of members' remarks is for increased expenditure, greater facilities here, and more accommodation there. Then they tell us we are the only ones that are not economising.

Mr. Thomson: We can only judge by the figures showing the increase you have received under the Financial Agreement.

The PREMIER: But that has been wiped out in other ways. One would imagine that the expenditure had remained stationary.

Mr. Thomson: Not at all.

The PREMIER: Taxation in the last six years has shown an increase of only £169,000, but I could mention five or six departments in which increased expenditure quite unavoidable and on services that are not revenue-earning has amounted in the same period to well over £300,000.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But revenue generally has increased.

The PREMIER: Of course it has, but I am emphasising that expenditure also has increased. It is all very well to argue that because revenue has increased there should be a surplus, but members know perfectly well that the obligation rests upon the State year by year to provide services that mean increased expenditure. In the last six years there has been an increase in the education vote of £110,000.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That is not as great as was the increase for the previous six years.

The PREMIER: It is.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: No.

The PREMIER: Well, what does that mean? One would imagine that in the previous six years the ledger had been balanced, instead of which the State went to the bad to a considerable extent.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Be fair about that or I shall have something to say on it.

The PREMIER: When members have quoted figures to show the benefit derived from the Financial Agreement, surely I am entitled to point out the other side and show where unavoidable increases of expenditure have been very large. No one would claim that the increase on education could be avoided. Medical and health shows an increase of £37,000.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That is not much. There was a special tax for that.

The PREMIER: A special tax!

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The amusement tax producing £36,000 a year.

The PREMIER: That is not included.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Yes, it is.

The PREMIER: On lunacy the increase is £26,000 and on police £71,000. Under two awards the wages of the police have been increased by about 4s. per day in the last three years, thus increasing the expenditure

by £70,000 as compared with what it was six years ago. The increase on gaols has been £8,000 and on charities £23,000; and under the Miners' Phtthisis Act, which has been in operation only three years, a payment of £40,000 a year is involved.

Mr. Thomson: That £40,000 is an enormous impost.

The PREMIER: Yes, and it has to come out of revenue. We cannot establish agricultural colleges in the country without increasing the expenditure. Ten thousand pounds has been provided for the maintenance of the Agricultural College. If we establish experimental farms in different parts of the country, they cost money so, through services rendered in one form or another, the people have had the benefit of the expenditure. A reduction in the rate of land tax simply cannot be made if we are going to balance the ledger. I again remind members that though they have stressed the increase of land tax, people who pay income tax have had a reduction of almost 50 per cent. and this is the only State in the Commonwealth where there has been a reduction of taxation in the past six years. In the other States, on the contrary, there have been increases during the same period, and in some States enormous increases. During the past three years South Australia has more than doubled both its land and income tax, and its railway charges have been enormously increased. In this morning's paper I read that the Premier of Victoria had announced an increase of taxation there.

Mr. Mann: Do you doubt the wisdom of having reduced the income tax last Parliament.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The Premier did not do that. The Federal Government gave us the money.

The PREMIER: I do not doubt it, but all the States have found it necessary to increase taxation. This year South Australia is receiving a Federal grant of half a million.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: No, £330,000.

The PREMIER: I thought it was half a million.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It is a million spread over three years.

Mr. Thomson: South Australia has had a cycle of bad seasons.

The PREMIER: Every State has its difficulties. South Australia is an old-settled

and well-developed State and is not under the obligation of spending large sums of money on harbour and railway construction or works of that kind. Its main public works were constructed when loan money was obtainable at a low rate of interest. Granted that we have received benefit from the Financial Agreement and that we have had assistance from the Federal Government, without it we should never have been able to reduce taxation and we should never have been able to get anywhere near balancing the ledger. Now that we have been able to approach balancing the ledger, the time has not arrived for us to reduce taxation. Even now the calculations on which the Budget was based have been upset by the latter portion of the season. The Leader of the Opposition laughs, but he knows that the seasons influence the financial position of the State, and doubtless when he was preparing his Budgets, he took into consideration the harvest prospects.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The PREMIER: South Australia, though receiving a special Commonwealth grant of £330,000, has a deficit of over £800,000 for the year. New South Wales last year had a deficit of a little more than £300,000. However, the New South Wales railways are not included in the accounts of general revenue, and so the loss made on the system does not appear in the Treasurer's Financial Statement. All along the line Western Australia compares more than favourably with other Australian States. Let me repeat something I said when this question was last under discussion: we are not over-taxed either in the way of income tax or land tax as compared with any Eastern State.

Mr. Stubbs: Except Victoria.

The PREMIER: Except Victoria; and Victoria, hon. members may not be aware, is not in the same position as it was in three or four years ago with regard to taxation.

Mr. Stubbs: Quite so.

The PREMIER: Victorian taxation is still below the Australian average. It was announced this morning, though, that Victoria would increase its taxation for the current financial year. Such increases in taxation, particularly those of South Australia, are imposed upon people less favourably situated for payment of taxes than we are.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: No. South Australia is a rich country.

The PREMIER: She is, but she has been living largely on her reserves for the last four years.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Living on other countries.

The PREMIER: See how all her land production has fallen off. For more than three years the agricultural and pastoral industries of South Australia have been badly hit. South Australia is in many respects a wealthy country compared with this State.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Yes. South Australia owns mines here and in other States.

The PREMIER: Not so many now.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: She draws revenue from every other Australian State. She makes motor bodies for the whole of Australia.

The PREMIER: Although she is a comparatively wealthy State, I doubt whether her taxpayers are as well able to pay as ours are. Facts and figures show that our taxation is not excessive. The Leader of the Country Party said that in view of the estimated surplus we ought to reduce taxation. We ought not to anticipate a surplus by reducing taxation, even though we necessarily anticipate it in the preparation of the Budget. We are not justified in reducing taxation because of what is only an estimated surplus; we must wait until we have the bird actually in the hand. Further, because of the increase in the English bank rate of interest our expenditure at Home is greatly increased, since we are working there on a heavy overdraft. If the London money market does not improve in the near future, we shall have to continue upon a very large overdraft.

Mr. Sampson: Does the Premier take the suggested surplus too seriously?

The PREMIER: We can hope for the best.

Mr. Sampson: And prepare for the worst.

The PREMIER: The surplus is not yet realised. I should be as happy as anybody to reduce taxation if it could be done safely; but at present it cannot be done unless some services essential to the people are cut out in order to reduce expenditure. Every hon. member would object to that, at all events for his own district. After careful review of the position I have not been able to discover where services can be reduced or expenditure lessened to enable us to reduce taxes. Certainly our land tax is not above the average of Australian land taxes.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Premier's comparisons will bring little comfort to Western Australian taxpayers. Most of the Eastern States have been spending at a furious rate. Indeed, the Queensland Labour Premier said his State had for years been on a financial jag. Moreover, compared with the population of Queensland we are only a few people—some 400,000. Again, Queensland had not a sinking fund in London as we have; and so to Queensland there was no great advantage from the Financial Agreement in that respect, whereas Western Australia benefits to the extent of £360,000 per annum. I regret the Premier's references to the deficit that accumulated during my term of office. It is true a deficit did occur. I inherited a deficit of £650,000, and in five years brought it down to £229,000—a creditable achievement, according to the Premier; and it was a creditable achievement. Then again, the deficit was not of my making. My highest revenue was £7,865,000, whereas the Premier's highest revenue has been £9,947,000, or over £2,000,000 more. My last deficit was £229,000; the Premier's last deficit was £275,000. The increase in the Education Vote in my time was £214,000.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not wish to check the hon. member, but I am rather afraid he is going a little wide of the mark when he enters upon all the financial ramifications of the State.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: May I not reply to the Premier?

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think the Premier covered quite the same ground. I would be too lenient if I allowed the discussion to continue in this way.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is no argument for the Premier to say that his Education Vote has increased by £139,000 and that therefore he must have this additional land taxation.

The CHAIRMAN: That was merely in justification. We do not want a retrospective review of the entire financial position.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Premier said that as the Education Vote had exceeded his estimate, he must have increased land tax. There is also the additional interest bill calling for increased taxation. The Premier borrowed in five years £21,000,000, as against £15,000,000 borrowed in the pre-

ceding five years; but owing to cheap money the Premier's interest bill was only about £368,000 more than mine. The State now gets money at 1 per cent., and the paying-off of the loan for the goldfields water scheme saves £75,000 a year. Thus the interest bill has not increased as one might well expect it to do in view of the enormous borrowing. Moreover, the £360,000 we formerly had to pay to London comes off the interest and sinking fund bill as well. Whichever way it is taken, we should be in a position to reduce taxation considerably, with the advantages we have. There is room for a reduction of taxes now, having regard to the surplus of £105,000 anticipated by the Premier. The thing is not to compare taxation here with taxation elsewhere in Australia. We have invested our borrowed money more wisely than is the case with other States. It would be instructive if each hon. member would turn up the increased earnings of the railways during the past five years, and compare them with the increased earnings of the previous five years. Everything has come our way favourably to the Treasurer during recent years. It must have been an advantage to the Treasurer to have so much loan expenditure.

The Premier: Not quite everything has come our way. We are now paying 8s. per week more to every one of 8,000 railway employees than was the case a few years ago.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: In my time every railway wages employee got an increase equal to £57 per annum.

The Premier: But the hon. gentleman raised the railway rates.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Not nearly enough to cover the increased expenditure; and the Premier is enjoying those increases.

The Premier: But we have had increased wages on top of the increase the hon. gentleman had.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, with increased earnings. But the strange thing is that the Premier's earnings have increased by only £600,000, whereas in my case the increase was £1,400,000.

The Minister for Railways: You increased the railway rates.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not know that the Minister for Railways has reduced freights since taking office. Probably he has increased them somewhat. I

know he draws more revenue from the refreshment rooms than was the case in my time.

The Minister for Railways: You know we reduced railway rates to compensate the increase in land tax. By that we lose £55,000 this year.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: There are increases all the time. Salaries increase year by year throughout the service.

The Minister for Railways: There are very few business people who do not expect increases.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! This is not a general discussion.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If it were not so, there would be a substantial reduction. There is no justification for a change of front on the part of the Committee. The other day we voted for a reduction in the land tax from 2d. to 1d. Now the Premier asks us to reverse that decision and to allow him to have his taxation at the higher figure. I will not agree to that. I have endeavoured to show that it is not justified, and that we have got money from unexpected sources. That revenue has been clear and has not cost the people much. The people, therefore, should derive some benefit. I have shown that while the Premier will not pay £99,000 into the sinking fund, the Federal Government are taking that from the people of Western Australia to pay it to our account. Surely an equivalent amount must come off taxation. We cannot ask the people to submit to a double tax in order that one payment may be made on our account. I hope the Premier will allow the Bill to pass as it stands now.

Mr. SAMPSON: I regret the Premier's decision to recommit the clause. I had hoped that he would give effect to the optimism he displayed when delivering his Budget Speech, by allowing the land tax to stand.

Mr. Sleeman: You were an optimist!

Mr. SAMPSON: The Premier has practically admitted that he was unjustifiably optimistic in anticipating the surplus he indicated, and now the optimism has turned to a definite indication of pessimism. The Leader of the Opposition, who has a thorough grip of the financial situation, has urged effectively that the land tax should be reduced, but we know that numbers will outweigh the sagacity of his remarks.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Would you suggest that city properties are overtaxed at rate of 2d. in the pound?

Mr. SAMPSON: While the intrinsic value of land, from the standpoint of production, may not have increased, still the Government must benefit materially because of the upward trend of city values. The report submitted by the Commissioner of Taxation shows a record of wonderful increases in values during the past few years and those figures are worthy of consideration by hon. members. That result has been achieved despite the tax being double by the Premier. When the Leader of the Opposition became Premier, the country was staggering under a tremendous deficit.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must ask the hon. member to keep strictly to Clause 2.

Mr. SAMPSON: I desire to do so.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will not be allowed to wander all over the place dealing with past deficits and the ramifications of the financial history of the State.

Mr. SAMPSON: Would I be in order in bringing forward arguments—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will be in order if he discusses Clause 2, otherwise he will be out of order.

Mr. SAMPSON: If I advance figures to enable a comparison to be made between the position when the land tax was halved what it is to-day, with present-day conditions, I shall be within the limitation which you, Mr. Chairman, as a strict Chairman of Committees, would insist upon. I was observing that when the Leader of the Opposition became Premier the country was struggling under a deficit.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not wish to curb the hon. member, but he knows he is quite out of order. I would like to be as tolerant as possible, but I will not allow the hon. member to indulge in a review of past finances. I hope the hon. member will exercise a little common sense.

Mr. SAMPSON: I do not mind exercising that but I shall expect something similar from the Chairman of Committees.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. SAMPSON: In view of all the circumstances, including the rapid increase of land values, there is no justification for continuing the double tax, especially because of the fact that exemptions formerly applied are no longer allowed.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	19
Noes	14

Majority for .. 5

AYES.

Mr. Chesson	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Collier	Mr. Millington
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Cowan	Mr. Rowe
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Sleeman
Miss Holman	Mr. Troy
Mr. Johnson	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Lamond	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Marshall	

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Davy	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Mann	Mr. C. P. Wansbrough
Sir James Mitchell	Mr. North

(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed.

The PREMIER: I move—

That the words "two pence" be inserted in lieu of those struck out.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment. It is not necessary to go over the whole ground again. The Committee realised that 1d. in the pound should be imposed as land tax for the year, and decided accordingly. Now the Committee are asked to change their mind. I hope members will remember what they are doing and that the people will remember what the Committee have done.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	19
Noes	14

Majority for .. 5

AYES.

Mr. Chesson	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Collier	Mr. Millington
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Cowan	Mr. Rowe
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Sleeman
Miss Holman	Mr. Troy
Mr. Johnson	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Lamond	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Marshall	

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Davy	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Mann	Mr. C. P. Wansbrough
Sir James Mitchell	Mr. North

(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Bill again reported with a further amendment.

BILL—ROYAL AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Message.

Message received from the Council notifying that it had agreed to the amendment made by the Assembly on the amendment made by the Council.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1929-30

Report of Committee of Supply adopted.

In Committee of Ways and Means.

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

THE PREMIER AND TREASURER (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [8.5]: I move—

That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the service of the year ending 30th June, 1930, a sum not exceeding £6,634,488 be granted from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, £154,935 from the Sale of Government Property Trust Account, and £700,000 from the Appropriation Suspense Trust Account.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported.

LOAN ESTIMATES, 1929-30.

In Committee of Supply.

Resumed from the previous sitting; Mr. Lambert in the Chair.

Vote — Development of Agriculture, £1,369,530—agreed to.

Vote—Roads and Bridges, Public Buildings, etc., £452,000:

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I presume the amount set out here fore roads and

bridges is the amount proposed to be spent on roads, including main roads, for the coming year.

The Premier: Yes.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Already this session we have discussed the Main Roads expenditure several times, and only to-day we have referred to the money held up in this country during the last two years, and which will be spent this year. The other day I referred to an officer who, under the Main Roads Board, seems to have nothing to do but travel about from contract to contract and see to it that the men's wages are paid. I want to know what this official himself is being paid, also why he was appointed, and what his duties are. It seems that quite a new post has been created; at any rate, we do not find a corresponding official on any other work. I should think this official is not wanted in the position, and I shall be very much surprised if we find that his duty consists solely of going from contract to contract to assure himself that the men are being paid the rate of wages prescribed by the Arbitration Court. Have we any other officer doing similar work? Will the Minister tell us what the justification may be for the expenditure of public money in this way?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No officer has been specially appointed to see that the wages and conditions in the Arbitration Court's award are carried out by the contractors. There has been appointed an officer whose duty it is to go round and see to it that the conditions of the contract are being carried out, and to see also that the plant hired by the department to the contractor is receiving fair treatment. It became a pressing question to make sure that the large quantity of costly plant hired by the department to the contractors was receiving decent treatment, for the cost of repairs has gone up enormously. Consequently a skilled engineer has been engaged to inspect the plant on the job and see that it is receiving proper attention and use. And while he is doing that he is also charged to see that the conditions of the contract are carried out, those conditions including not only that the proper rate of wages is paid, but also that no foreigner is employed. And there are many other conditions, the non-observance of some of which has led to numerous complaints. The question of awards and conditions is only one phase of the work, and would be only a minor phase. He has

to perform other duties. The man selected for the position is an engineer, a fitter by trade, who will be able to pay skilled attention to the plant, and if anything requires adjustment to see that the work is done. There have been many complaints in other directions. The conditions of contract set out that no foreigners may be employed without the permission of the Minister. Only last week I received a complaint from Esperance that contractors there are employing foreigners to the detriment of local people who are out of work. Someone must have a check upon the position to see that the conditions of the contract are adhered to. We have valuable plants in use, steam rollers, power graders, and heaps of other machinery representing a good deal of money. The charges for hire are fixed by the plant engineer. He has complained about the cost of repairs, and it was deemed necessary to have closer supervision exercised over the plant. There is plenty of work for the officer to do. He is receiving £8 a week, and is required to travel all over the State except in the North-West where the work is being done by the local authorities. Contractors are operating between Geraldton and Esperance, and it is necessary that their work should be supervised.

Mr. Mann: Does the officer draw travelling expenses?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The usual travelling expenses that are given under the Public Service Regulations. Even members of the Main Roads Board get only Public Service travelling allowances. It is thought there will be no financial loss over this appointment, and there may possibly be a gain because our plants will be properly looked after. We hope to save the heavy cost that has had to be incurred in repair work during the last 12 months.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The repair account has been tremendous. Whether it has been justified or not is another matter. I thought district engineers were in charge of each district. Apparently this new officer will be superior in some directions to the district engineers. Is he appointed by the Main Roads Board?

The Minister for Works: Yes.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: And subject to them?

The Minister for Works: Yes.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: His duties will principally be to see that the award rates are paid. I suppose he would

also be used to see that union tickets are held by all persons working on the job. I do not think the Government have the right to use an officer for that purpose. It is a strange appointment. I could understand an experienced man being sent out to see that valuable machinery was properly looked after, but cannot understand why someone should be sent out to look into everything that happens in connection with a particular work.

The Minister for Works: A district engineer has a tremendous distance to cover. One district extends from Leonora to Esperance.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: There cannot be much road work going on between those centres. I regard the appointment as unnecessary. It is particularly unfortunate that a man has been appointed chiefly to see that award rates are being paid. Already there exists a law which enables the worker to recover the wages due. I cannot understand any man not knowing what pay he should get under an award. This appointment must mean extra expenditure.

Mr. Ferguson: There is no award covering country districts, is there?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is either an award or an agreement between the men and the Minister.

The Minister for Works: The Public Works Department agreement covers this work.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Where there is an award, that prevails.

The Minister for Works: It is registered with the court. It is the court's decision.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I understand that where A.W.U. men work, they are subject to the award.

The Minister for Works: It is a common rule which is registered. It was fixed as an agreement between the department and the union.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: That means that any employer or man affected may appear before the court. The whole business is strange; I do not like it. We ought to make the cost of administration as low as possible. There are some men doing real work.

Mr. Thomson: And half a dozen seeing that the others are working.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Engineers in control are necessary and others are required to lay out the work. I protest against the appointment of men who are not

necessary and against the expenditure of public funds in that direction. Undoubtedly the taxpayers will also protest against this sort of thing. We are reaching an extraordinary tangle in our financial arrangements and our control of works of this description.

Mr. STUBBS: On page 29 of the Estimates there is a marginal note referring to the Yilgarn district, clearing roads in the Forrestania and Mollerin areas, Lake King districts, etc. On the same page there is a reference to clearing roads in Forrestania, Mollerin, Lake King districts, etc. I understood that the work which has been going on there for the last year or two was to be paid for out of cheap money derived under the Migration Agreement. Is that so, or are we borrowing money specially for this purpose? I understand that about £70,000 has been spent in the opening up of good roads for the development of a large tract of country lying east of Southern Cross. Is this money coming out of the so-called cheap money?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am afraid the hon. member is a little confused in the matter. The money approved under the Migration Agreement still has to be borrowed by the Government. If we receive approval for a loan of half a million or a million we are not given that sum of money. We have to borrow it under our own Loan Bill and pay interest upon it.

Mr. Stubbs: I thought that the money was advanced to the Government.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It comes out of our loans. When approval has been given it is necessary for the money to be raised.

Mr. Thomson: I thought that the sum of £180,000 had been granted specially for that particular work.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The authorities do not go on the market to borrow the money, but it comes out of loan moneys raised for Western Australia. The money is not borrowed separately.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I can understand that in a big contract the machinery is subjected to rough usage at times. As it is not the property of the contractor he may not be as careful with it as would otherwise be the case, and it is necessary to exercise some supervision over it. I do not know that any special supervision is required to see that award rates are paid. The industrial organisations employ men of their own to at-

tend to that sort of thing. No matter what time has elapsed, short pay can always be recovered. I trust that that portion of the officers work is infinitesimal.

The Minister for Works: The Main Roads Board require production of certificates of compliance with award conditions before any advance is made.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The Minister also said a part of the officer's duty was to see that foreigners were not employed on these road works.

The Minister for Works: That is part of the conditions of contract.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: How is discrimination made? A foreigner may be naturalised.

The Minister for Works: He is not a foreigner once he is naturalised. Then he is a Britisher.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: People are apt to regard even a naturalised alien as a foreigner.

The Minister for Works: The naturalisation papers are checked.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Is there any difficulty in that respect?

The Minister for Works: None.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Since the war many foreigners have become naturalised, and intention to apply for naturalisation is frequently advertised. Do many foreigners try to get employment on road works?

The Minister for Works: That used to be the case.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: It is necessary to do something for the protection of our people. The engineer should have no difficulty as to that part of the agreement which refers to observance of awards. The men can look after themselves in that respect, thanks to the legal machinery at their disposal, the financial strength of their organisation, and their representation in Parliament. The State should not be called upon to contribute anything towards the salary of an officer doing that work. Besides, nothing irritates a union steward more than a Government engineer butting in with a different opinion.

The Minister for Works: That matter can be left to the union organiser.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Yes.

Mr. THOMSON: Earlier in the debate we were told that economy was being exercised in every direction. The appointment now under consideration costs the State at least £1,000 a year.

The Minister for Railways: Oh no! Nothing like it.

Mr. THOMSON: Then well over £500 a year. The officer is paid £8 per week, and he must have a motor car. The total of his yearly salary and expenses will not be much under £1,000. It is not necessary to have a special officer going round to see that contractors carry out conditions of contract. The Works Department require a sworn declaration as to observance of the conditions, before any payment is made. An officer of this kind has not been found necessary in other States for checking the correctness of contractors' sworn declarations. Before a contractor gets any payment for work done, he must furnish such a declaration. If the Works Department enforced all the conditions of contract strictly to the letter, no one would ever take a contract from the department—there is no loophole whatever. Western Australia is indeed fortunate in having such capable officers in the Works Department; I refer especially to the outside supervisors, whose services are not sufficiently remunerated. As to looking after machinery, I assume that the great bulk of the machinery lent to contractors is lent to reputable firms, who no doubt have to lodge deposits guaranteeing its safe return. Further the firms have to obtain guarantees. I do not know the person appointed to the position; in fact, I did not know of the appointment until I heard the remarks of the Opposition Leader. Still, the Government have embarked upon a principle which will mean the appointment of additional supervisors. It has been said that on some jobs there are two men doing the work and half a dozen supervising the doing of it. These things go to show how essential it is to have a public works committee to investigate expenditure of public money. Here we are dealing with a proposed loan expenditure of £365,000. All the information the Committee have is that £365,000 is to be spent in certain directions which are briefly enumerated. The Minister has given his reasons for the proposed expenditure. I see no grounds for the appointment of an officer to watch that contractors comply with conditions of contract, especially as we have district engineers.

The Minister for Works: A district engineer might have a hundred jobs in his district at one time.

Mr. THOMSON: The same thing applies to officers supervising the erection of public buildings.

The Minister for Works: It is many years since that state of things obtained.

Mr. THOMSON: Public buildings supervisors have large areas to cover, and frequently have numerous jobs to visit. If the principle involved in the appointment of this officer is applicable to road construction, it should be applicable to other works.

The Minister for Works: All contracts are inspected.

Mr. THOMSON: I fail to see the need for this officer, though it is wise to see that road construction machinery is maintained in good order and condition.

The Minister for Works: Hundreds of pounds have sometimes had to be spent in repairing machinery after its return to the department.

Mr. THOMSON: If valuable machinery is lent to contractors, they should be held responsible for its proper upkeep. Much road work is done by local authorities; and if they receive machinery in good order and condition, they should be held strictly accountable for its proper maintenance and safe return.

The Minister for Works: The local authorities are not free from blame in the matter.

Mr. THOMSON: The Government are entitled to see that machinery lent in good order and condition is returned in the same order and condition, subject to reasonable wear and tear. If that were this officer's sole duty, he might effect considerable savings. The main point is that we ought to do away with what we consider unnecessary appointments, but if the Minister says that this appointment is necessary, we must accept his decision.

Item—Public Buildings (including sewerage and equipment new buildings), £75,000:

Mr. GRIFFITHS: The provision of police quarters for Tammin has been promised for a long time. I would like to know whether anything will be done to meet that requirement. The vote is £8,000 less than it was for last year. I would again mention the request of small country districts for the provision of shelter sheds for the

children. Is anything being done along those lines?

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Other Undertakings, £33,500:

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I understand that we will have an opportunity to discuss the Estimates of the State Trading Concerns later on. In the circumstances, it is not necessary to deal with those concerns at this stage. The money involved in the undertakings mentioned in the vote is not well spent. The expenditure is added to each year and it would be better if we did not have any of these concerns at all. We would not be losing what we are now.

Item—State Hotels and Tourist Resorts, £2,500:

Mr. FERGUSON: Has any provision been made for additions to the State hotel at Wongan Hills? For three years I have stressed the importance of greater facilities being provided.

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member will turn to page 31 he will see that provision is made for the additions he refers to.

Mr. FERGUSON: I would like to know whether the work will be carried out this year. Last week the Minister for Agriculture was at Wongan Hills and he realised the necessity for additional facilities. Twelve months ago the Minister for Works was there and considered the question of additions. When he goes there an effort is made to provide him with a bed inside the building; the average individual has to sleep on the verandah! On that occasion the Minister telegraphed to Perth to ascertain the position and he received a reply that the money was available and that the plans were then before the Chief Secretary for his approval. Twelve months have elapsed and nothing has been done. Will the Premier give me his assurance that the work will be carried out this year.

The Premier: I cannot do that, but it is hoped that it will be.

Mr. FERGUSON: We have lived on hope for the past three years!

The Premier: I know you have.

Vote put and passed.

Resolutions reported, and the report adopted.

BILL—APPROPRIATION.*Message.*

Message from the Lieutenant Governor received and read recommending appropriation for the purposes of the Bill.

Standing Orders Suspension.

On motion by the Premier, ordered: That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as will enable the adoption of the report of the Committee of Ways and Means and the passing of the Appropriation Bill through all its stages at this sitting.

All Stages.

In accordance with resolutions adopted in Committees of Supply and Ways and Means, leave obtained to introduce the Appropriation Bill, which was read a first time.

Second Reading.

On motion by the Premier, Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Angelo in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3—agreed to.

Schedule A:

Mr. DAVY: Merely seeking information, I ask why there should be blanks in this Schedule. For instance, we have it "Under Act No.—" Why are the numbers not given?

The Premier: Because those were Supply Bills passed during this session, and they have not yet been numbered. That omission will be supplied in due course.

Mr. DAVY: Very well. I am content.

Schedule put and passed.

Schedules B to H—agreed to.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES—STATE TRADING CONCERNS.*In Committee.*

Mr. Lambert in the Chair.

Division—State Brickworks, £46,830:

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: These trading concerns absorb a great deal of money. We have £2,820,000 invested in them. We have made a profit of £417,000, and losses totalling £1,543,000. So the loss is greater than the profit by £1,126,000. It is a very serious matter for the people of the country to have to stand such an enormous loss.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must confine himself to the division before the Chair. There can be no general discussion on the State trading concerns.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Very well, I have quoted the essential figures, and I will leave it to the public to determine whether or not the State trading concerns are any good to the workers or anyone else.

Division put and passed.

Division—State Ferries, £9,832—agreed to.

Division—State Hotels, £62,128:

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I should like to know from the Minister why these hotels are charging increased prices. As a rule, the State hotel is the only hotel in the town, and so it is a very serious matter for the farmer's wife and family when the charge for a meal jumps from 2s. 6d. to 3s. It may be argued that the increase has been adopted to secure adequate service; but it is a very bad thing when the State hotels make considerable profit by increasing the charges. Last year we made about £10,000 from the State hotels, and altogether we have made about £30,000 more than the hotels have cost the State. They have been profitable and I think we should give the public the benefit, just as far as we can. Why should the charges against the public be increased?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The charges have been increased, but I do not think anybody can say they are excessive. The tariff was increased last July from 10s. per day to 12s. per day and £3 10s. per week.

Hon. G. Taylor: It is four guineas per week at the Cayes House.

The Minister for Mines: But there you get better accommodation than you can get in Perth for £6.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: There is no other State in the Commonwealth where hotel charges are as reasonable as they are in Western Australia. And that holds good in respect of State hotels. Wherever I have found myself, the charge has been considerably in excess of that at State hotels. So I have no apology to offer for the increased tariff. The point is that proper service should be given, and I do not think proper service could be given at anything below the existing rate.

Mr. SAMPSON: I agree that the rates in other countries for hotel service are higher than in Western Australia. But one must acknowledge that the hotel service in other countries is far more elaborate.

The Premier: It is not more elaborate in the other Australian States, where the rates are double those charged in Western Australia.

Mr. SAMPSON: I know that our hotel rates are low, but one is justified in asking why the Government should take the initiative in increasing the rates at State hotels. In many of the private hotels in country centres the rate is still 10s. per day.

The Premier: And in many others it is 12s. per day.

Mr. SAMPSON: Most of the State hotels are small, yet they adopt the higher rate of 12s.

The Premier: They may be small, but the accommodation they provide is distinctly good.

Mr. SAMPSON: I admit it, but again I question the justification for doing something that actually means an increase in the cost of living. The State hotels have increased their rates although there has been no appreciable increase in the cost of living of late. So why should the Minister raise the rate?

The Premier: There you are again. You want taxation reduced, but as soon as I try to get a little extra from anywhere at all you are all out against me.

Mr. SAMPSON: If I thought the Premier would benefit by increasing the rates of the State hotels, I would not object. But we have a shrewd suspicion that if the hotels were leased the Premier would receive more revenue from them, and would

not have to bear the odium that attaches to running a business for the sake of profit.

The Minister for Agricultural Water Supplies: You had an opportunity to stop it.

Mr. SAMPSON: Had the opportunity occurred, I would have wiped them all out.

The Premier: What prevented you?

Mr. SAMPSON: As the Premier knows, a Minister is not allowed to go his own gait. That is why I did not close up the State hotels.

The Premier: The explanation is accepted.

Mr. SAMPSON: Had I been able to do so I would have counted it for righteousness, and handed over the hotels to private enterprise. I am disappointed at the increase in the rates charged at State hotels. Why have they been increased?

The Minister for Agriculture: Because the dining rooms do not pay.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Minister adopted the easy attitude and said, "We have no opposition; we can turn the screw on the unfortunates who are compelled to patronise our hotels." I am not criticising the conduct of State hotels; the cooking is good, they are well run and cleanly conducted, but there was no justification for the increase.

The Minister for Agriculture: How do you know the charges are excessive?

The Premier: They are not excessive in comparison with the hotels on the Continent patronised by the member for Swan.

The Minister for Agriculture: I am telling you that the dining room does not pay.

Mr. SAMPSON: Hotel charges generally in this State are moderate, but I regret that the State should lead the van in the matter of increasing charges. I regret that Ministers, when dealing with hotels sawmills and brickworks, should do something not in the interests of the struggling proletariat. We must not be led astray by the actions of other people. The Minister has not replied to my question. He has neither reason nor justification to offer, because there is none.

Mr. DAVY: I am not frightfully exercised that the price of board and lodging at hotels should have been raised 2s. What annoys me is that Parliament should be discussing such a matter. We would not be discussing it if the Government had not

poked its nose into things that have nothing to do with government. I should like to hear some sort of defence by the Premier as to why the Government should continue to run hotels and why the time of Parliament should be wasted in criticising the wretched question of whether the hotel tariff should be 2s. or 1s. more or less than it was last year or the year before.

The Premier: The Leader of the Opposition did not dispose of them when he was in office.

Mr. DAVY: The Premier does not really think that is an answer to the point I have raised. Because someone else continued the hotels, that is no reason why Parliament, which should be much more experienced now than it was years ago in respect to an absolute folly, should have to occupy its time with this matter. There cannot be any argument socialistic, Bolshevistic, capitalistic, or any other "istic" in favour of the State running a few hotels. Their only effect is to cause more trouble to the Government, occupy the time of some Minister who might be better employed, and waste the time of Parliament which could be devoted to more important matters.

Mr. Sleeman: Do you think the Government should control the lot?

Mr. DAVY: I can understand the point of view of a man who contends that all hotels should be run by the State. There is a grain of sense in that.

Mr. Sleeman: It is a step in the right direction?

Mr. DAVY: We have half a dozen hotels dotted about the country, and there is no symptom of any Government having moved to increase the number. I do not believe the number will be increased.

Mr. Sleeman: Your complaint is we are not taking them fast enough.

Mr. DAVY: My complaint is nothing of the sort, and the hon. member knows it. There is no point in maintaining a department to run a few hotels in different districts.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not know that the hon. member is in order.

Mr. DAVY: Exactly what we are entitled to discuss I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN: I find no difficulty in deciding, but I do not wish to be too arbitrary. If the hon. member desires to move a motion, it will be quite competent for him to do so.

Mr. DAVY: Then I shall move a motion.

The CHAIRMAN: But the hon. member must do it at the proper time.

Mr. DAVY: I shall content myself with saying that the continuation of this department cannot conceivably serve any good purpose, and if it does nothing worse, it wastes a tremendous lot of precious time, both of the Government and of Parliament.

Mr. Sampson: And it is derogatory to the dignity of Government and Parliament.

Division put and passed.

Division, State Implement and Engineering Works, £62,128:

Mr. ANGELO: It is very disappointing year after year to find the State Implement Works showing a loss. Evidently a loss of £4,496 is estimated for the present financial year. The question will have to be seriously considered before long whether the State Implement Works will be sold or whether some other method of conducting them will be adopted by the Government. I do not wish to see the State Implement Works abolished because they are providing a lot of employment.

Mr. Mann: How many men are employed there?

Mr. ANGELO: I believe the number is 300 or 400. One solution would be to alter the method of conducting the work. I wish to direct the attention of the Government to what has happened in a similar trading concern in New South Wales. I refer to Walsh Island. I have a cutting from the "Sydney Morning Herald" of about three weeks ago.

The Premier: They are engineering works.

Mr. ANGELO: Yes.

The Premier: Has that matter any relation to our implement works?

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot see any great amount of relevance between the matter the hon. member wishes to cite and these Estimates.

The Premier: They are miles apart.

Mr. ANGELO: Perhaps the Premier does not wish me to read this extract.

The CHAIRMAN: I am not concerned with what the Government wish or do not wish; it is my desire to confine the discussion as far as possible to the State Implementation and Engineering Works.

Mr. ANGELO: I am suggesting that the Government should copy the example set by

the Government of New South Wales. The extract reads—

Speaking at Kogarah last night, the State Treasurer (Mr Stevens) gave some account of the remarkable improvement in trade at Walsh Island since the Government instituted the system of payment by results. Whereas the enterprise lost £42,739 in 1927 it made a profit for the financial year ended June 30, 1929, of over £80,000, and the employees increased from 1,250 to 2,500.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: Who paid that, the farmers?

Mr. ANGELO: I am not discussing who paid it. The system of payment by results, I believe, is likely to be instituted almost throughout New South Wales, and that example will have to be followed here.

The Premier: Then some members here would receive a very small salary.

Mr. ANGELO: I am prepared to start by reducing our salary in this time of stress, but we are not the State Implement Works. The extract continues—

The aim of the management had been to secure a turnover which would meet working expenses and provide for depreciation and interest on capital, said Mr. Stevens. That turnover was not nearly reached during 1926-27. The number of employees at June 30, 1927, was 1,250.

"The Bavin Government," continued the Treasurer, "decided to alter the working conditions of the dockyard as from the end of 1927. In order to arrest the drift and to save the enterprise the Government decided to introduce the system of payment by results. At first the men did not like it, and actually went on strike. The Premier then said that unless they were prepared to assist the management by adopting that method of payment and going back to work under those conditions he would sell the business right out, lock, stock, and barrel. Fortunately for the men and for the Government wiser counsels prevailed, and they agreed to work, and have continued to work under the piecework system.

"The results of the Government's decision first became reflected in the balance-sheet for the year ended June 30, 1928. That year disclosed a gross profit of £42,690. The turnover for the year (£908,038) was the greatest for some time and was £334,000 in excess of that of the previous period.

"There is no room for conjecture as to the cause underlying the conversion of a £42,739 loss in 1927 to an almost equivalent profit (£42,690) in 1928. The official report contains this statement:—'The management considers that the system of payment by results was the principal factor in showing the profit on the year's activities.'

"The results are more remarkable when it is realised that the piece-work system was only in full swing for the second half of the year, and that the interim balance-sheet for the first half was showing a loss of £11,000. Notwith-

standing the loading of the first half-year's loss, the completed year ended in a record turnover for the establishment, a record number of employees, a record profit, and record average earnings per man. This after six months' piece-work.

"During the financial year ended June 30, 1929, during which piece-work was in full swing throughout, a new peak level of turnover was reached, the amount being over £1,000,000, and the record number of 2,500 employees was engaged in the industry. The profit more than doubled the preceding years' profit and the results of the year established record average earnings per man employed. The profits were made after paying full depreciation charges, interest on working capital, and all the working charges of the establishment."

I have no wish to see the implement works sold, but I do not want to see them continue to make a loss. Some 300 or 400 men have a living down there, and why deprive them of it? Still, as the directors responsible to the taxpayers of this State, we cannot allow the loss to continue.

The Minister for Lands: About £70,000 was lost on the meat works at Carnarvon.

Mr. ANGELO: Why bring up that question?

The Premier: That was not a Government concern.

Mr. ANGELO: Do not forget that the pastoralists lost £50,000 odd.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think that is quite relevant.

Mr. ANGELO: Walsh Island provides an object lesson, and I hope the Government will consider it seriously. I do not know the opinion of other members on this side of the House, but while I do not wish to see the works sold, I do wish to see them worked at a profit. If they cannot be worked at a profit under the existing conditions, why not change over to the system adopted at Walsh Island? I met the general manager of the Walsh Island works in the train between Melbourne and Adelaide. He said that after six months not one man would go back to day wages. They were all delighted with the conditions, were doing better, and were throwing heart and soul into the work. It is this co-operation in industry that we want to introduce into our industrial life. Here is a good opportunity for the Government to adopt the same principal at the State Implement Works.

Mr. SLEEMAN: It is regrettable that the State Implement Works should be in their present position. This should be a flourishing concern and employing at least

1,000 men. At present not more than 200 men are engaged, and quite a number of these are working part time. Some of the employees have recently been put off. There is a remedy for the position.

Hon. G. Taylor: What is the cause of it?

Mr. SLEEMAN: On looking back through "Hansard" I find that in 1909 a Bill was passed providing that money advanced to settlers for machinery to enable them to cultivate their holdings must be spent on implements manufactured within the State. In 1912, however, the whole of the clause relating to that portion of the legislation was repealed. Other matters were included in that clause, and the whole thing was wiped out. Nothing has ever been done to restore it. Our tradesmen are second to none in the world, and our material is as good as could be desired. I claim that we can produce the machinery needed within Western Australia. The position is much the same as that set out by the Leader of the Opposition in this morning's paper when discussing the butter industry. He said it was all a matter of prejudice. A box of the same butter could be cut in halves and labelled differently, and one half would be designated as good, and the other, because of the label on it, would be classed as inferior.

Mr. Thomson: You cannot say that about the State Implement Works machinery.

Mr. SLEEMAN: It is a matter of sheer prejudice.

Mr. Thomson: The hon. member does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. SLEEMAN: We can make machinery in this State equal to anything made in other parts of the Commonwealth.

Mr. Lindsay: Can you tell me why people will not buy it?

Mr. SLEEMAN: They are actuated by prejudice. There are too many men like the member for Toodyay decriing the State Implement Works.

Mr. Sampson: Piece work is required there.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Not at all. The Arbitration Court lays down the wages that are to be paid to the men. Every man at the works pulls his weight and earns the money he gets. It is not because the men or the material are inferior, or because the machinery manufactured is inferior, but because our farmers are inferior in their loyalty towards the local secondary industries.

Mr. Lindsay: Now we have it.

Mr. SLEEMAN: If it is logical for farmers to borrow money from the Government to help them to make good it is equally logical that they should with the money they borrow, assist our secondary industries to make good. I listened to the Leader of the Opposition to-night. He said we could not expect Great Britain to lend us money to spend in America.

Mr. Mann: How do you find the State Implement Works drill operates on your farm?

Mr. SLEEMAN: I have no farm, and have no machinery, but I hope when I do have a farm all the machinery will come from the State Works.

Mr. Angelo: I hope so, too.

Mr. Ferguson: I venture to say it will not.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Settlers not far from me swear by the State-made implements.

Mr. Ferguson: You will not get 5s. per bushel for your wheat then.

Mr. SLEEMAN: If we cannot expect Great Britain to lend us money to spend in America, our farmers cannot expect to borrow from the Government and send the money they borrow to Hugh McKay in Melbourne. All the machinery required here can be made within the State. In 1909 the Leader of the Opposition said the same thing, and that it could be made second to none.

Mr. Sampson: Let us take that as read.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I am glad to know the member for Swan agrees that we can make machinery second to none. Some members on the cross benches have been doing their damndest to cripple the State Implement Works.

Mr. Thomson: That is not correct.

Mr. SLEEMAN: It is correct so far as some members in this House are concerned. There are men so disloyal to their State and to our secondary industries that they will say machinery manufactured locally is inferior to that made elsewhere. They know perfectly well, when they say that, they are not telling the truth. They know that the Implement Works can turn out first-class machinery.

Mr. Davy: What is their motive? Why should the ordinary farmer say that the imported article is superior to the State Implement Works article?

Mr. SLEEMAN: The same thing has been said of our jams. When a jam factory was

started, it was said that we could not make jam in this State. When the pulp was sent to Tasmania, however, and returned to this State under Tasmanian labels, it was spoken of as beautiful jam. It is all a matter of local prejudice.

Mr. Davy: Is there any local prejudice against Plaistowe's chocolates? Is there any difficulty in selling them?

Mr. SLEEMAN: There is so much prejudice that the Chamber of Manufactures had to issue a book pleading for the support of locally-made goods. The Chamber had to start out on a campaign to popularise local products. Was it not right that they should do this?

Mr. Davy: Certainly.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Does the hon. member think it is right that his colleagues should decry the machinery made within the State?

Mr. Davy: It is right they should tell the truth.

Mr. SLEEMAN: They do not always tell the truth.

Mr. Davy: I think they try to.

Mr. Thomson: I sometime wonder whether you are telling the truth.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Many people frankly admit that the State plough is as good as anything in Australia, but when it comes to the implements manufactured at the same works, they declare them not to be worth having. At the same time they are not very ready to assert that the ploughs are good.

Mr. Thomson: No one says the ploughs are not good.

Mr. SLEEMAN: They are ever ready to declare that the other implements made by the works are not worth buying.

Mr. Thomson: What about the harvesters?

Mr. SLEEMAN: There are members in this House who for many years have used State harvesters that are still giving good service. How can we expect more from people outside Parliament when such a bad example is set them by members inside the House. Naturally they follow the lead that is given them.

Mr. Lindsay: You are an optimist if you think people outside will read what we say here.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Not many would take any notice of the remarks of the member for Toodyay. Possibly he may be able to influence a few of his own friends.

Mr. Davy: And he may be regarded as being as good an authority on the subject as you are.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I defy any member to say that the State plough is a bad implement. The State Implement Works are passing through a rough time. Some of the employees are only working half a week. If our farmers would only patronise them by buying all their ploughs from that source, instead of only 200 people being employed there, it would not take long before the number was doubled. Even the most bitter opponents of the works will admit that the plough is a good one. If only they would buy these ploughs some benefit would accrue. I hope something will be done to see that when money is advanced by the Government to settlers a condition is imposed that all expenditure on implements shall be incurred within the State. Nowhere in the Commonwealth are the land settlement conditions as good as they are here. A person can arrive without a shilling. He can get a block of land, and be financed by the Government in everything he requires. In return he should be only too glad to play his part in placing our secondary industries on a proper footing. One of the saddest sights we can see is that of boys walking around the streets unable to find any work to do. If we cannot put our secondary industries on a good footing, we shall have no place in which to instal our boys so that they may learn a trade and secure permanent employment. The only alternative is to send them outside the State to learn a trade and get work.

Mr. Thomson: And to bring people from outside to do their work, because of the conditions that prevail.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I have no desire to endeavour to instruct the Arbitration Court, as the hon. member wishes to do when it pleases him. He would not like anyone else to make the attempt. Unless we can establish our secondary industries, our boys will have a rough time. The same thing is said by the Chamber of Manufactures. In their book they ask "What am I to do with my boy?" Unless the people of the State support their own industries, I do not know what can be done for them.

Mr. Thomson: I am glad to know you are giving the matter that much consideration.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I am afraid the hon. member would not bother to give them a minute's consideration. The same thing applies to our girls. There are not enough secondary industries here to give employ-

ment to all the girls who want to take up trades. It is the duty of the Government, as well as of the people, to see that something is done to remedy the position. We must see that work is given to the State Implement Works so that they, too, may develop and prosper. At present much of our wealth is going out of the State. The Agricultural Bank Act should be amended as it was in 1909 to provide that people who obtain advances from it for the purchase of machinery should be forced to spend the money within the State. This money need not necessarily be spent at the State Implement works. If the machinery is made within this State it will provide work for our people and keep the money in Western Australia. Perhaps members on the cross benches might induce their manufacturing friends from abroad or the other States to come here, and if they are content to abide by the laws of the State, to open up works and manufacture their own implements here.

Mr. Thomson: They will not come here under your conditions.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Do they want special conditions of their own? The State Implement Works would have to compete against them under the same conditions. We could not have a law for the State Implement Works and another for private enterprise. Cannot Hugh McKay stand up to the competition of the State establishment?

Mr. Lindsay: He can compete with the State works after paying freight on his machinery from Victoria.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Many of our local people are unpatriotic enough to send their money out of the State when it should be kept here. Why does not McKay come here and compete for the trade within the State? Money should not be advanced to settlers for the purchase of machinery unless it is spent within the State. If that were laid down McKay would soon overcome the difficulty he alleges to exist, and set about starting a factory here.

Mr. Mann: He could not afford to lose £4,000 a year.

Mr. SLEEMAN: He cannot afford to open up works here whilst he can stay in Victoria and, by means of mass production, supply the whole of Australia with his implements. The people of this State, however, can afford to be loyal enough to patronise their own industries. McKay's factory in Melbourne is of no use to our boys when so much of our money is being sent

to those works. The Leader of the Country Party knows full well that McKay could start here under the same conditions as anyone else. Unfortunately he wants to make special conditions for his own particular brand of machinery.

Mr. Thomson: He wanted the same conditions here as he is getting in Victoria.

Mr. SLEEMAN: He was not prepared to establish works under the awards existing in this State.

Mr. Lindsay: Yes, he was.

Mr. SLEEMAN: He was prepared to come here if given special facilities to compete against the State Implement Works. He was not prepared to abide by the laws of the country.

Hon. G. Taylor: He wanted the same conditions that exist at Sunshine.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Not many years ago the member for Mt. Margaret would have been fully in accord with me. Since he has crossed the floor of the House he has changed his views a little.

Hon. G. Taylor: I have had experience since then.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The hon. member has not improved. He will do anything now—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. SLEEMAN: You, Mr. Chairman, will have to stop the hon. member from interjecting.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot anticipate the hon. member's interjections.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I am glad the Leader of the Opposition has returned to the Chamber to give me a hand. He is a big enough Western Australian to patronise the industries of his own State. Although many of his supporters will not agree with him, I believe he would do all he could to foster local industries. To-night the member for Swan said that if he had his way he would have sold the State Implement Works. His Leader, however, was a big enough Western Australian to stand in his way, and he would not allow the works to be sold.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Mr. Angwin sold one of the trading concerns, and sold it too soon.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The Leader of the Opposition did not sell the Implement Works, I am pleased to say.

Mr. Lindsay: That is the one mistake he made.

Mr. SLEEMAN: And the member for Swan did not get his way. Despite the position in which the works now are, they

could be built up into a sound proposition. It is possible that improvements might be effected in one or two respects. There has been a suggestion that the percentage of bosses is too large compared with the number of workmen. If that is so, the position should be altered. Unquestionably the works should be paying, and anyone standing in the way of their becoming profitable should be removed. The tradesmen employed there are second to none. In the matter of the dredge recently constructed the State Implement Works competed against the world, and turned out a first-class article up to time. If they can compete in the matter of dredges and also in the matter of road graders, they can compete in many other things. The member for Toodyay (Mr. Lindsay) had complaints to make about the road graders, but the State Implement Works are absolutely exporting those machines.

Hon. G. Taylor: How many have they exported?

Mr. SLEEMAN: More than one, at any rate. I hope the member for Toodyay will be pleased at the information that the State Implement Works have made a success of the manufacture of road graders and are exporting them beyond the borders of Western Australia. I trust that the works will be brought right up to date and will employ at least 1,000 men, instead of a couple of hundred as at present.

Mr. SAMPSON: It is futile to boost a concern while not allowing it to be conducted in a way that will enable it to compete. I know the manager of the State Implement Works, and I believe him to be a thoroughly capable man; but if there is anything that will discourage such a man, it is a speech like that of the member for Fremantle (Mr. Sleeman) attacking the results from the work done. No doubt Mr. Shaw is doing his utmost, but year after year the works show a loss. If the members of this Committee would adopt the spirit of the report read by Mr. Angelo, for which we are much indebted to the hon. member, we might expect good results; but it is hopeless to endeavour to secure trade as the result of kindly consideration for local industry. Everyone will purchase the local article if all things are equal; but it is hopeless to expect, as the member for Fremantle will discover in time—

Mr. Sleeman: That is why you wear a suit of Western Australian tweed.

Mr. SAMPSON: Apparently the member for Fremantle thinks it is the duty of the State to go on losing money on the works and to applaud the proposition. That is a wrong way to treat the organisation. Let us give the State Implement Works a chance to make good.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I suggest that the manager be given as many votes as the men, and then the member for the district would have nothing to say against the manager.

Mr. SAMPSON: The view of the member for Fremantle is entirely fallacious.

Mr. Sleeman: I ask for that remark to be withdrawn. The member for Swan said that I spoke detrimentally of the manager. I did not do so. I have said that he is a good man.

The CHAIRMAN: It seems to be rather a stupendous accusation that the hon. member made; and I ask him to withdraw it, as the member for Fremantle has taken exception to it.

Mr. SAMPSON: I have endeavoured—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Swan will resume his seat. Will the hon. member withdraw the remark to which exception is taken?

Mr. SAMPSON: May I ask what is the remark?

Mr. Teesdale: You used the word "fallacious."

Mr. SAMPSON: Do I understand the member for Fremantle takes exception to the statement that his view was entirely fallacious?

Mr. Sleeman: No. The statement to which I object will appear in "Hansard," and I want it withdrawn now.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the member for Northam (Hon. Sir James Mitchell) desire to rise on a point of explanation?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Yes, Sir. I said simply that if the manager of the works had as many votes as the men had, the manager would not be criticised.

Mr. Sleeman: I never criticised him.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Then you are safe.

Mr. SAMPSON: The member for Fremantle referred to—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I think I have given the hon. member sufficient latitude.

Mr. SAMPSON: I want to see our manufactures built up; and I believe that if we do what has been indicated by the member

for Gascoyne, we shall have gone a long way towards the desired end.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: We have heard a good deal from the member for Fremantle (Mr. Sleeman) on the State Implement and Engineering Works. He accuses me of having at one time supported those works. I admit the soft impeachment, but the Auditor General's report says that the State has lost £169,948 18s. 9d. on them since they began to operate. The hon. member also says McKay ought to come here and compete against them. Neither McKay nor any other private individual or company could operate here for such a length of time and lose so much money as our State Implement Works, and keep out of the bankruptcy court. It is all very fine and large for the hon. member to declare that the State Implement Works deliver the goods.

Mr. Sleeman: Do not they?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The hon. member says they do, but the argument advanced by him is fallacious.

Mr. Sleeman: You do not knock it over, though.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The hon. member's argument is that the farmer, being prejudiced against the State Implement Works is the reason why those works are not more profitable. The implements produced, the hon. member says, are good, but the farmers are prejudiced. Take the farmers in the wheat belt more especially. A large percentage of them got their experience on the goldfields, and received their political training in the trades hall. They are now farmers, and are taking an active part in the farmers' associations. I do not think those men would be prejudiced against anything made in Western Australia. They have realised they do not get the best value from the State Implement Works, and hence they do not deal with those works. A certain amount of prejudice may be involved, but I do not think the hon. member's suggestion on that point holds good. Farmers, I fancy, are just like other people: they deal where they get the best value. There is something wrong with the State Implement Works, otherwise they would be showing better results. Undoubtedly the State is losing money on them year after year; and all the boasting in this Chamber about wonderfully capable workmen and the good manager, with everything up to the handle, does not enable us to compete with other manufacturers. What can we do? It has been

suggested that the men should be given greater incentive to do more work.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The men do good work.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Yes. The whole world is getting away from day labour. In the English-speaking countries and in numerous foreign countries payment is being made according to results. The best value is obtained only when payment is based on results. Pay-on-results and mass-production are the things that have put the United States ahead.

Mr. Teesdale: Oh, do not quote America.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I know that is offensive to the member for Roebourne (Mr. Teesdale). At the same time, Canada pays high wages and is successful, and can put its goods on the market to great advantage. I know it is difficult for the Minister, no matter how anxious he may be, with all the ramifications of the State trading concerns, to effect much in the way of improvements. Undoubtedly the manager of the State Implement Works is a most capable man. I have never heard a breath against him, either personally or professionally. In both respects he ranks high. I believe that the men working under him are giving satisfaction too. Nevertheless, there is something wrong somewhere. The hon. member who champions the works has not put it up to this Chamber. There is something more than prejudice.

Mr. Sleeman: Tell us what it is.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Hon. members on the cross-benches have repeatedly said that the implement works do not deliver the goods. I am not a farmer, and have not used any of the implements. Still, it is strange that Eastern manufacturers can send implements here and defeat us on the spot. If the State trading concerns were privately conducted on such lines, they would not run for a second year, let alone 21 years. There is the position. We cannot go on losing year after year. The amount of £160,000 odd represents a huge loss. No private company would bear such a loss. Unquestionably there is a screw loose somewhere. Surely we ought to have found that out in a less period.

Mr. LINDSAY: It is rather remarkable that whenever the Estimates come along, members on this side of the Chamber are subjected to unprovoked attacks by the member for Fremantle (Mr. Sleeman). That has occurred every year since I have been a member. I would not have spoken had it

not been for the member for Fremantle mentioning my name. I have spoken here repeatedly on the State Implement Works, and in every instance it has been by way of reply to an attack on me by the member for Fremantle. This side of the Chamber has been told that members sitting here and also all the farmers in Western Australia are prejudiced against the State Implement Works. I consider it a reflection on the farmer as a business man to say that he has a prejudice in a matter affecting his business. The farmer buys the machine that suits him, the machine out of which he gets the best value. When the member for Fremantle deals with this question, let him attack the evil at its source. It is not the fault of the farmers that they do not buy the machines made by the State Implement Works. True, there is a high protective tariff; but, what is more, McKay in this State sells more machines than all the other firms in the world; and this notwithstanding the fact that Western Australian farmers have to pay $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. more for the machines than is paid by Victorians. One would think that the added protection McKay enjoys in Melbourne, and the extra charge of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. representing freight and transhipment on Victorian machines landed here, would enable the State Implement Works to compete successfully and make profits. Although I have been attacked by the member for Fremantle, I can say positively that I have spent more money on State implements than anyone else in this House. I have several of the machines and I have not been prejudiced. I have used them, and have scrapped a lot of them in the process. The difficulty we find is that the State machines are not kept up to date. The management do not experiment and make improvements as other manufacturers do. I shall repeat an illustration that I mentioned last year to show what happens. Some time ago the Works sent a harvester to Wyalatchem and it remained at the siding for a week or two. I discussed the position with the agent who decided to find out what the machine was there for. Eventually a fitter came up. The machine was taken off the truck; a local farmer provided horses and the agent arranged a field day in order to allow the farmers to see the machine in operation.

Mr. Sleeman: It was a reaper thrasher last time you referred to it; now it is a harvester. What was it?

Mr. LINDSAY: We call it a reaper thrasher, which is a harvester just the same. I can quite understand that the member for Fremantle has not had sufficient experience to know the difference. The machine was taken into a paddock and the horses were harnessed up. The machine travelled for about two hours followed by the farmers who suggested certain improvements. The machine was taken back to the siding and sent down to Perth. The next time I saw the machine it was at the Royal Show. I discussed it with the man in charge who was the person that had gone to Wyalatchem. He suggested I should have a talk with Mr. Murray. I did so and Mr. Murray said, "If you like, Mr. Lindsay, we will pay your passage to Adelaide so that you may tell the makers there what is required." I replied, "I can afford to pay my own passage money and do not want any of your insults." That is the treatment a man receives when he makes suggestions regarding necessary alterations. As to the hon. member's assertion that Mr. McKay desired to do away with the laws of the land, that was not so. If McKay comes here, the Arbitration Court awards must apply. McKay did not desire to reduce wages or to provide worse conditions, but to do better. He could not pay less than was provided in the Arbitration Court award, but he could have paid more had he been allowed to pay on results. The member for Gasegyno has illustrated the position clearly in his references to Walsh Island. If any better illustration could be afforded, I do not know of it. These continuous attacks on farmers by the member for Fremantle will react against the interests he desires to serve. The farmers are prepared to buy any machine from which they can get value for their money, and they are not foolish enough to allow prejudice to interfere with their business. The member for Fremantle suggested that we should pass a law to force men who receive advances from the Agricultural Bank to buy State machines. What would he say if the same sort of argument were applied to the unions? The farmers he refers to have to pay back the money they borrow from the bank and if they do not, they are put off their farms and others are given the properties. From my experience of the State implements, I can say that if farmers were forced to use them, some of the men on the land would not be as successful as they are to-day.

Mr. Sleeman: That is what we would expect from you!

Mr. LINDSAY: I have hundreds of pounds' worth of machines on my property, and I can speak from experience. I have three State ploughs on my farm. The member for Fremantle has stated that I say outside what I will not say inside the House. The State ploughs do good work, but they contain too much material and they pull too heavily. That is what I have said outside, and that is what I say inside the House. I have used the ploughs for many years. Notwithstanding the attacks made by the member for Fremantle, the whole of the farmers of Western Australia would like to see agricultural implements manufactured in this State. I hope the member for Fremantle will not consider the State Implement Works so much but will have regard more to the number of men who could be employed if the manufacturers of farming implements were allowed to carry on in this State.

Division put and passed.

Division—State Quarries, £39,870:

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The Estimates show an increase of £1,511. The estimated receipts are given as £44,000, while the actual expenditure for the last year was £38,359. The actual contribution for 1928-29 was £2,500 while the estimated contribution to Consolidated Revenue this year is £5,000. I cannot understand why with an increased expenditure of only £1,511, it is estimated that the contribution to Consolidated revenue will increase by £2,500.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURAL WATER SUPPLIES: We have had a successful run with the State quarries. Recently there has been a reduction in orders following upon the reduced Loan expenditure and the consequent inability of the Government to put authorised public works in hand. There has been a falling off in production, with the result that we may not make anything like as much profit as we did last year.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But you show an estimated increased profit!

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURAL WATER SUPPLIES: That will be all right, provided we can get the necessary sales. In addition to that, certain improvements have been effected and paid for out of revenue. A considerable amount of money will be spent.

There is a heavy over-burden in the quarries as we get further into the hill, and that requires additional displacement of earth in order to get at the metal.

Division put and passed.

Division—State Shipping Service, £204,800:

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I notice that questions were asked in another place with reference to the hold-up of the "Kangaroo." Those questions dealt with the loss incurred by the shipping portion of the service. I do not know whether the replies to those questions indicated the total loss. It was stated that the money paid to other shipping companies for transporting the workers from the Wyndham Meat Works and for freight charges ran into over £3,000. I presume that would be charged up against the Wyndham Meat Works. The answers did not indicate if that was the total loss to the State Shipping Service or whether the loss to the State was greater than £3,000.

The Premier: No.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Then that statement in reference to the extra money for the passage of the men—

The Premier: Included everything.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Does it cover all.

The Premier: Yes. That question was specifically asked, and the answer to the question gave everything.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: It has since been stated that £2,270 was paid to the shipping company and was not included, and that £700 was paid for freight that the "Kangaroo" would have carried had she been in commission. That was paid, it is said, to another shipping company, to carry the freight and fetch the men from Wyndham. It was argued that had the men not come down, their wages would have run into more than was paid for their fares. However, I accept the Premier's statement.

Mr. NORTH: I should like to ask the Minister whether the balance sheet of the State Shipping Service will be laid on the Table, as was done last year.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, that is a statutory requirement.

Mr. ANGELO: I have heard a number of adverse comments on the hold-up of the "Kangaroo." People have said that had she not belonged to the State Shipping Service there would have been no hold-up.

I do not agree with that. Similar hold-ups occur frequently amongst Australian shipping. We have had instances of it in the interstate trade, and here also. It was very unfortunate, and it created a great deal of inconvenience and hardship to the people of the North, to say nothing of the huge expenditure that was involved, but it is not peculiar to the State Shipping Service; the same thing may happen to a ship of another line. I have heard it said that the State steamers run aground, whereas others do not. But the State steamers are asked to do what other boats will not do; that is the explanation.

Mr. Mann: Do the other boats consider it impossible?

Mr. ANGELO: Well, they will not go into Shark Bay. It is was unfortunate that the "Koolinda" went aground in Shark Bay, but I am confident it was due to the wrong placing of the buoys. Two of the Singapore boats went aground almost at the same place. I was on the "Gorgon" when she went aground, so it is not peculiar to the State Shipping Service. We in the North-West fully appreciate the value of the State Shipping Service. Without it I do not know to what point our freights and fares would have been raised. If a company has a monopoly, it is only natural that it will charge all it possibly can, and will not consider the people.

Hon. G. Taylor: You do not think these companies have any bowels of compassion.

Mr. ANGELO: I do not think so. Time after time they have approached the manager of the State Shipping Service in an endeavour to get him to raise his fares and freights. It was declared that if the State steamers were taken off the coast, another Australian company would put its boats on to that run. I had a talk with the general manager of one of those companies, and he asked me why I supported the State Shipping Service. I told him that if he would undertake to put on two or three steamers and agree not to raise fares and freights for the next ten years, I might review my attitude.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are not discussing the hon. member's negotiations with private steamship companies.

Mr. ANGELO: No, but it shows we have no hope of getting any other company's boats on that coast, and therefore it is very necessary that we should retain the State Shipping Service.

Hon. G. Taylor: Nobody is trying to do away with it.

Mr. ANGELO: Yes, there have been significant comments in another place. In my opinion the State steamers are just as necessary as are the State railways. But here is an anomaly that might possibly be removed: "The 'Koolinda' will leave Fremantle at the end of this month and so, too, will a Singapore boat, both within a day of each other, after which there will be no boat until the New Year. It is hardly fair to the people of the North, and I think the Minister should put a little pressure on the Singapore boats with a view to seeing if it be not possible to arrange a more satisfactory time-table. The "Koolinda" can run to the North only once in every four weeks, and the Singapore boat leaves Fremantle within a day of the "Koolinda," after which we have no boat for a month. Mr. Glyde has approached the Singapore company and explained that he would be prepared to work in with them. It is ridiculous to think there should be two boats leaving for the North within a day of each other. It is hard on the people up North, who have been looking forward to laying in their Christmas supplies but will not be able to get them. Because of having to enter the tidal ports, the boats can leave Fremantle only every fortnight. But surely arrangements could be made for the State boat to leave on the 1st of the month and for the Singapore boat to leave on the 15th, and so on. Also an interchange of tickets between the State steamers and the Singapore boats might well be arranged. It seems designed to ensure that the "Koolinda" shall not get too much trade. Fortunately, she is now almost full of cargo and passengers each trip. If the Minister controlling the service had a talk with the gentleman controlling the Singapore service and said, "The Government of Western Australia being interested in the welfare of the people of the North-West consider that this arrangement should be made," he would probably agree to it. An arrangement should be made for a common fare for passengers and an interchange of tickets. Later on I hope the Government will seriously consider the question of obtaining another boat, but it is useless to ask for it while money is so tight. I think more good could be done with the boats we have if arrangements were made to work in harmony with the Singapore boats. As one who travels a good deal on

the State boats, I should like to say how well they are run. When we had antiquated boats, the service was not to be compared with that of the Singapore boats. Of course, if we put a jockey on a earhorse, we could not expect him to win a Melbourne Cup. Now that we have suitable boats, they are running the service well. If any member desired a more comfortable or happier trip than he could get on the "Koolinda," he would be hard to please.

Division put and passed.

Division, State Saw Mills, £662,279—agreed to.

Division, Wyndham Freezing, Canning and Meat Works, £321,000:

Hon. G. TAYLOR: According to the report of the Auditor-General, the loss on the Wyndham Meat Works has been £869,381. Is that the loss from the inception of the works?

The Premier: Yes, and part of it is interest.

Division put and passed.

Resolutions reported and the report adopted.

BILL—AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS.

Council's Amendments.

Schedule of six amendments made by the Council now considered:

In Committee.

Mr. Lambert in the Chair; the Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

No. 1. Clause 4, Subclause (1).—Delete the words "For the purposes of this Act" in line twenty-nine, and insert in lieu thereof the following words:—"Whenever and wherever an inspector has reasonable grounds for believing that agricultural products are exposed or offered for sale, or are in process of transport for the purposes of sale."

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. Mann: You would not accept a similar amendment in this Chamber.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I cannot see that the amendment will make any difference.

Mr. Sampson: It will make the clause a little more cumbersome.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 2. Clause 4, Subclause (2).—Delete the word "and" where it appears a second time in line forty, and insert the words "but such inspector shall take all reasonable precautions to protect such packages or products or lots from injury, damage, theft, or loss to the owner."

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: That is a reasonable provision. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Minister is very ready to accept the Council's amendments. This one implies that an inspector would act carelessly or thoughtlessly.

The Premier: What is wrong with inserting a provision that he shall be careful?

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 3. Clause 4.—Insert a new subclause to stand as Subclause (4), as follows:—"In the event of an inspector taking possession of and detaining any package in the absence of the owner, he shall do so in the presence of a reputable witness, and shall affix to the package a statement giving his name and the date of his inspection, and shall, as soon as practicable, notify the owner that he has taken possession of and detained such package."

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Provision to this effect could have been made by regulation.

Hon. G. Taylor: You would not let us insert it here.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It is provision that would have been made in any event.

Mr. Mann: But when it was suggested here you would not accept it.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. SAMPSON: It seems to me that the words "if practicable" should be inserted.

Hon. G. Taylor: Who will decide whether it is practicable?

The Premier: Who is going to force people to do things that are not practicable?

How could things that are not practicable be done?

Mr. SAMPSON: Anyhow, I move--

That the amendment be amended by inserting after "shall," where it first occurs, the words "if practicable."

Mr. DAVY: I hope the hon. member's amendment will not be agreed to. We might as well wipe out the Council's amendment as insert these words. Who will judge as to the practicability?

The Premier: Of course it is absurd.

Mr. DAVY: The Council's amendment would be rendered futile by the insertion of these words.

Mr. Sampson: I can't see how the land lies. I will withdraw the amendment.

Amendment on the Council's amendment by leave withdrawn.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 4. Clause 4.—Insert a new subclause to stand as Subclause (5), as follows:—"An inspector acting under the provisions of this section shall, if and when called upon, produce satisfactory evidence of his appointment as such."

No. 5. Clause 7, paragraph (b).—Insert after "products" in line twenty-two the words "for sale."

On motions by the Minister for Agriculture, the foregoing amendments were agreed to.

No. 6.—Insert a new clause to stand as Clause 5, as follows:—"Nothing in this Act shall apply to any products, package of products or lot consigned or forwarded to a consignee for the purpose of manufacture or processing or packing, and distinctly and conspicuously marked or branded as such."

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move—

That the Council's amendment be agreed to. This will exempt from the topping provisions packages that are distinctly marked and are sent for processing or packing, and are not for sale.

Question put and passed: the Council's amendment agreed to.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

House adjourned at 10.36 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 7th November, 1929.

	PAGE
Question: Hospitals Bill	1407
Jetties, Albany	1407
Public Service, Superannuation	1407
Leave of absence	1408
Bills: Appropriation, 1R.	1409
Agricultural Products, Assembly's message	1410
Industries Assistance, 3R.	1410
Land Agents, 3R.	1410
Cremation, 2R., Com.	1410
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, 2R.	1418

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

QUESTION—HOSPITALS BILL.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Do the Government intend to re-introduce the Hospitals Bill this session? 2, If not, what provision is to be made to relieve the needs of our public hospitals?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, No. 2, Owing to the rejection by the Legislative Council of the State Lotteries Bill, 1924, and the non-acceptance of the Hospital Fund Bill, 1928, the Government have been prevented from making adequate provision to relieve the needs of our public hospitals.

QUESTION—JETTIES, ALBANY.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL (for Hon. W. T. Glasheen) asked the Chief Secretary: Are the Government aware of the dilapidated, shaky condition of the Albany jetties, and, if so, will steps be immediately taken to effect repairs?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: It is not considered that the Albany jetties are in a dilapidated and shaky condition. They are being efficiently maintained for general railway purposes.

QUESTION—PUBLIC SERVICE SUPERANNUATION.

Hon. H. SEDDON asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Have any proposals been made to the Government to provide a superannuation scheme for the Public Service? 2, If so