

of the population. Sir Edward Wittenoom stressed the point that the youth of Australia are educated above their opportunities. To me that seems an old idea dressed in modern phraseology. I seem to remember in years gone by a somewhat similar phrase to the effect that boys and girls were being educated above their station. Sir Edward's words have a more modern sound, but when I listened to them I could hear the voice of the parson of my boyhood teaching me my duty my duty towards my neighbour, to comport myself humbly and reverently towards all my betters, and to do my duty in that state of life; to which it should please God to call me. Who can say what opportunity is going to unfold itself to the young life? Did Wolsey the butcher ever dream of his son becoming the King's first Minister and the most important man in England? Did Lloyd George's uncle, a village cobbler, when giving the boy a home, imagine that he was rearing a man who would one day save England? I maintain that every boy and every girl has an inherent right to equal opportunities along the road to knowledge. I am aware of the necessity at the present time for rigid economy; but on all sides I see a most wasteful expenditure on luxuries. Let us apply our knife to this before we cut down the fruitful tree of knowledge. Let us prune our luxuries before we starve our souls. One word with reference to the few remarks that fell from Mr. Dodd. The hon. member lamented the fact that our system of education often trains boys for a life in which there is no opening in this State, so that the boy thus trained has to seek opportunities of advancement elsewhere. That, I am afraid, is unavoidable. It must always be remembered that if we lose a few in that way, we are continually deriving advantage from people who have obtained an education in some other part of the world, and who come to this State. There is no system, so far as I can see, which will prevent a few boys who have been educated here, and who do not readily find an opening here, from going elsewhere. But I maintain that we have a greater advantage from the immigration that comes to this State, as compared with the loss of those few. Mr. Moore made reference to the lack of teaching in drawing and applied geometry. So far as ordinary drawing goes, we found that very wise provision was made for that in the schools. I was impressed and pleased with what was done. I think it highly desirable that children should be taught to draw in the way they are in the schools. In my opinion drawing is of great use in after life, no matter what career one takes up. As regards applied geometry, however, I am afraid we found that those who were taking advantage of the technical schools would not trouble to apply themselves to learn those higher branches of their work which a study of applied geometry would have facilitated. But I maintain that on the whole the educational system of this

State is a good one. Moreover, I was very pleased with what I saw of the personnel of the teachers. I believe that if members of this House, instead of criticising the Education Department, would exercise their privilege of going amongst the schools and seeing what is being done there, they would be astonished. In that case, too, we would not hear so many baseless criticisms of our Department of Education.

On motion by Hon. J. W. Hickey, debate adjourned.

The House adjourned at 5.22 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 7th December, 1921.

	Page
Questions: Gambling amongst Juveniles—1. At Carnival Square; 2. Attitude of Education Department	2185
Liquor, Freight Increases	2186
Ravensthorpe Smelters, Appeal Case	2186
Country Carriers' Charges	2186
Tramway Work	2186
Water Supply, Swan View	2186
Scaffolding Bill	2187
Firewood, Bruce Rock	2187
Eggs for Government Institutions	2187
Russian Famine	2187
Assent to Bills	2187
Select Committee: War Gratuity Bonds, Extension of Time	2187
Bills: Architects, 3s.	2187
Land and Income Tax Assessment Amendment, 3s.	2187
Closer Settlement, 2s.	2188
Workers' Homes Act Amendment, 2s.	2191
Bank Holidays Amendment, 2s., Com., etc.	2198
North Fremantle Rates Validation, 2s., Com., etc.	2198
Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders, 2s., Com., etc.	2198
Gold Buyers, Council's requested Amendment	2198
Stamp, Council's requested Amendments	2201
Inspection of Machinery, Council's Amendments	2201
Nurses' Registration, Com.	2202
Constitution Act Amendment, Council's Message	2206
Annual Estimates, report etc.	2187
Annual Estimates (State Trading Concerns)	2206

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

QUESTIONS (2)—JUVENILE GAMBLING.

Carnival Square, Charitable Appeal's.

Mrs. COWAN asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Is he aware that gambling is said to be freely indulged in by young people and children per medium of spinning jen-

nies, etc., in the various charitable appeals held from time to time in Carnival Square? 2, Can he not do anything to prevent this state of things from occurring?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied 1, No. 2, If I find that children gamble in the way suggested, I will certainly take steps to prevent a continuance of it.

Attitude of the Education Department.

Mrs. COWAN asked the Premier: 1, Is it a fact that the Education Department permitted metropolitan State schools to extend their patronage and take part in gambling per medium of spinning jennies, etc., at the various charitable appeals held from time to time in Carnival Square? 2, If so, is it the intention of the Government to see that the laws against gambling are properly enforced, and to instruct the Commissioner of Police to take action against those offending?

The PREMIER replied: 1, No. 2, Answered by No. 1.

QUESTION—LIQUOR, FREIGHT INCREASES.

Mr. CORBOY asked the Premier: 1, Is he aware that the railway freight on ale and stout manufactured in Western Australia has been increased by from 20 per cent. to 25 per cent. under the new rate list, which came into force on the 1st December, 1921? For instance, has the freight on a consignment of six tons for a distance of two hundred miles been increased from a total of £21 0s. 6d. to a total of £25 2s. 6d.? 2, Has the freight on a consignment of two tons for the same distance been similarly increased from a total of £8 7s. 6d. to a total of £10 16s.? 3, Do the Government approve of this heavy extra charge on the consumer in addition to the large imposts provided under the new Licensing Bill?

The PREMIER replied: 1, The normal classification for rates purposes of ale, beer and porter manufactured in the Commonwealth is second-class. Such rate has not been altered. Formerly concessions in the carriage of ale, etc., were allowed as under:—2 ton lots, first-class; 6 ton lots, "C" class, plus thirty-three and one-third per cent. These concessions have been varied, and the only reduction now provided for is for ale, etc., in 4 ton lots to be carried at first-class. The charges (including handling and sheetage) on 6 tons of ale for a distance of 200 miles have increased from £21 3s. 2d. to £25 2s. 6d. 2, Yes. 3, Yes.

QUESTION—RAVENSTHORPE SMELTERS, APPEAL CASE.

Mr. CORBOY asked the Premier: In connection with the appeal against Mr. Justice Burnside's decision in the case of Bernales

and McNeil v. the Crown, has security for costs been lodged yet, and, if so, on what date was it lodged?

The PREMIER replied: Security for costs of the appeal to the High Court in the matter of McNeil and another v. the Crown was duly given on the 25th November, 1921.

QUESTION—COUNTRY CARRIERS, CHARGES.

Mr. STUBBS (for Mr. A. Thomson) asked the Minister for Works: 1, Has his attention been drawn to the very heavy charge on carriers in the country districts carrying stone, bricks, lime, timber in bulk, earth, gravel, mineral, or other materials or liquid matter, the weight of the load being not less than 10 cwt. per wheel, by the recent addition in fees levied under Regulation No. 149 under "The Traffic Act, 1919," where the charge has been increased from ten shillings to £6 for two-wheel vehicles and from £1 to 12 for four-wheel vehicles? 2, In view of the fact that it is the Government's policy to carry over the railways the materials mentioned at specially reduced rates, will he have the regulations amended to come into line with this policy?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1 and 2, I am giving the matter attention; such fees are only intended to apply in special cases.

QUESTION—TRAMWAY WORK.

Mr. DAVIES asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Has his attention been called to an advertisement which appeared in the "West Australian" last week under the heading "Western Australian Government Railways and Tramways, Machine Shop Contract, New Tramway Workshops, East Perth"? 2, Is it the intention to discontinue the practice which has been in operation since taking over the control of the tramways of doing their work at the Midland Junction workshops?

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Railways) replied: 1, Yes. 2, It is not proposed to alter the present practice.

QUESTION—WATER SUPPLY, SWAN VIEW.

Mr. DAVIES asked the Minister for Works: 1, Is he aware that the residents of Swan View district are complaining of the scarcity of water, and the fact that they have to draw their supplies from Bellevue? 2, If so, will he take action to remedy this immediately?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, Yes. 2, Such action as the present system will permit will be taken to improve the supply. Financial considerations do not warrant the

expenditure needed to fill the requirements of those concerned, and they have already been so informed by letter.

QUESTION—SCAFFOLDING BILL.

Mr. DAVIES asked the Minister for Works: With regard to the deputation which waited upon him recently and asked that a Scaffolding Bill be introduced, what steps have been taken to carry out the deputation's request?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: Inquiries have been set on foot as to action elsewhere, and it is expected that the matter can be dealt with next session.

QUESTION—FIREWOOD, BRUCE ROCK.

Mr. LATHAM asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Where is the firewood obtained which is used at Bruce Rock for the purpose of pumping water to the railway station? 2, What is the mileage carted and cost of same? 3, Is he aware there is firewood on the water reserve adjoining the dam site? 4, Why is not a supply obtained locally?

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Railways) replied: 1, Lion Mill. 2, 147 miles. The ordinary freight rate for this distance is 10s. 3d. per ton. 3, No. 4, Tenders were advertised through the Press, and notices were posted at the local railway station; also tender forms were sent to all likely tenderers, but no local tender was received.

QUESTION—EGGS FOR GOVERNMENT INSTITUTIONS.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN asked the Premier: 1, Is it a fact that recently the Tender Board asked for quotes for 7,000 dozen eggs or a lesser quantity for Government institutions? 2, Is it correct that quotes were received from private suppliers at 1s. 4d. a dozen? 3, Is it further correct that the whole order was given to the Westralian Farmers at 1s. 8d. a dozen?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, No. 3, No.

QUESTION—RUSSIAN FAMINE.

Mr. TROY asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Has he read the newspaper reports of the famine-stricken condition of the people of Central Europe and of Russia? 2, In view of the fact that Western Australia has enjoyed bountiful seasons over a number of years, and to enhance the good name and reputation of the State, will the Minister inaugurate an appeal to the farmers asking for contributions of grain and flour from this season's harvest, and arrange for its transport to the people mentioned?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, Yes. 2, This is unnecessary. A public appeal to assist has already been launched along the lines indicated. I have approved of the Director of Agriculture assisting the committee dealing with this project and of his receiving certificates for wheat donated for this purpose, in order to facilitate its transport, and exchange, if necessary, the varieties received for others more suitable for the dual purpose of seed and local consumption.

ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills:—

1. Local Courts Act Amendment.
2. Mining Act Amendment.
3. Permanent Reserve (Point Walter).

SELECT COMMITTEE—WAR GRATUITY BONDS.

Extension of Time.

On motion by Mr. McCallum, time for bringing up the report extended till the 14th December.

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

1. Architects.
2. Land and Income Tax Assessment Amendment.

Transmitted to the Council.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1921-22.

Report Stage.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam): I move—

That the report of the Committee of Supply be adopted.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We are adopting a new procedure this year, compared with that followed ever since the passing of the Act in 1916, dealing with the State trading concerns. We have always dealt with the Estimates regarding State trading concerns before adopting the report of the Committee of Supply. I do not know that it makes any difference, because the State trading concerns stand by themselves. I would like a guarantee from the Premier that we will have an opportunity of dealing with them.

Mr. SPEAKER: The procedure this session is similar to that followed last session.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The trading concerns Estimates have always followed upon the general Estimates.

Mr. SPEAKER: They will be dealt with in the ordinary way under the State Trading Concerns Act.

The PREMIER: I will promise the member for North-East Fremantle that the House will have the fullest opportunity of discussing the trading concerns Estimates.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is all I want.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before putting the question, I would like to make the position more clear. The trading concerns Estimates will be considered in Committee, and not in Committee of Supply as is the case with the general Estimates. The trading concerns Estimates are dealt with in that way in accordance with the State Trading Concerns Act.

Question put and passed; report of the Committee of Supply adopted.

Committee of Ways and Means.

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

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam): I move—

That towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty, a sum not exceeding £4,945,719 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Western Australia, and a sum not exceeding £130,067 from the Sale of Government Property Trust Account.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported.

BILL—CLOSER SETTLEMENT.

Second Reading.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [4.47] in moving the second reading said: Members have discussed the question of the utilisation of lands adjacent to the railways time after time, but particularly during the present session on the debates on the Address-in-reply and on the Estimates. It is a fact which members should realise that our railways run through a great deal of country which is not very highly improved, but we have to remember that although this State has been settled for something over 90 years, it is only during the past few years that people have made any great improvements to their holdings. In the old days settlers were content to run stock, because there was a very limited market for agricultural products. The railways are losing very heavily. I pointed out last night just what the loss was. Last year it amounted to £600,000 including sinking fund, and this year it is expected to amount to £100,000 less than that. It is not possible for the railways to pay unless every ounce of traffic is to be had. It is true that so far as the wheat belt is concerned, the development has been very rapid indeed. I repeat that we need increased production, and, as a means of getting it, I am submitting this proposal to the House. The Bill is designed to bring about closer settlement on land adjacent to existing Government railways. Such land must be utilised. The area alienated from the Crown held as freehold is 9,197,088 acres and the land held under conditional purchase leases totals 15,034,959 acres. I should like to make it quite clear

that conditional purchase land is held under special improvement conditions. We have a contract with every holder of a conditional purchase lease, and his position is entirely different from that of a man who has freehold land. We have no control over the land which is held as freehold, but we have entered into contracts with conditional purchase holders that certain improvements must be effected. The total improvements made to date consist of 4,681,660 acres cleared and 2,901,612 acres partly cleared, a total of 7,583,272 acres cleared and partly cleared. In addition there are millions of acres of land fenced and used for stock, which areas are quite distinct from other land used solely for stock. The House must not imagine that this is the total area which has been improved, but much land of course is fit only for running stock.

Mr. Harrison: Does the 2,901,000 acres of partly improved land mean that its holders are the men you intend to deal with under this Bill?

The PREMIER: The hon. member knows that this land will probably be portions of holdings improved by ringbarking and in course of preparation for the plough.

Mr. Harrison: Does it include conditional purchase land?

The PREMIER: Largely, but not altogether. The Bill provides for closer settlement adjacent to Government railways. It applies to freehold land only situated within 12 miles of State railways. I mention State railways in this Bill because I think it ought to be made clear that, so far as we have money available for the resumption of land, it should be devoted to the acquiring of land adjacent to our State railways. One of the objects of the Bill is really to bring this land into cultivation, in order that the railways may be used to a greater extent than they are at present. I wish to make it perfectly clear that this power of resumption does not apply to land held under conditional purchase conditions. Such land is held under a contract, the terms of which cannot be varied. In order that we may the better deal with this question of resumption, I think it necessary to have a board to recommend what land should be acquired.

Mr. Underwood: I do not think we have enough boards.

The PREMIER: I do not know who is to recommend the acquiring of land unless it is some such body. We have a board to-day under the Agricultural Lands Purchase Act.

Mr. Underwood: There are quite a number of people in this State who are not yet on a board.

The PREMIER: The hon. member will have an opportunity to object to this system and he may then suggest some other. I do not know of any other system which

can be adopted. I propose that the board shall consist of one official of the Agricultural Bank. I suggest an official of the Agricultural Bank, because the land to be acquired will probably have been improved by advances made by the bank, and we want to be perfectly certain that we acquire only such land as is suitable for cultivation and against which the bank will make advances. Then too, there will be an official of the Lands Department on the board. I think members will agree with this, because that department will be responsible for the sale of the land and should therefore have some say in the acquiring of the land. There will also be one outside member of the board. The cost will be very small, as the board will consist largely of members of existing staffs of departments, and it is not likely that they will need to give a great deal of time to this work, because they will work largely on the reports made by competent inspectors who now inspect for the Agricultural Bank.

Mr. Pickering: Who is to be the third member of the board?

The PREMIER: If we are to deal with land in the Geraldton district, we should obtain a man with special knowledge of that district. If we are to deal with land in the South-Western portion of the State, the third member of the board should have a special knowledge of that land.

Mr. Pickering: A man with local knowledge?

The PREMIER: Yes, so far as possible. I think it would be better for the board to change its third member from time to time as circumstances may necessitate. The board will determine whether land is unutilised and unproductive or is only partly utilised, and whether it is suitable for closer settlement. In most Acts of this kind it is usual to lay down hard and fast rules, but if this measure is to be effective we ought to empower someone—and this board seems to be the right authority—to say that land is not being worked. The board could make it clear that certain land had been idle for years, untouched and unused. It might be uncleared land; that would be a simple matter. But it will be more difficult to deal with land partly improved and it is this land that we expect to acquire. If we said that land improved to the extent of £1 per acre would be land outside the operation of the Act, there would not be very much land to acquire. The board however will determine this. The board will have discretion, which I hope they will exercise wisely and in such a manner as to bring under cultivation much of the land which now is not used. Land determined by the board as unutilised will be brought under the operation of the Act. I want members to clearly understand that when the board determine that a certain block of land should be acquired for closer settlement—it may be 1,000 or 10,000 acres—then that block will be brought under the operations of the Act. All the parties interested in the land will be

heard by the board. The owner is not the only party interested in land; often mortgagees and people who have advanced money against the land are interested. These people should be heard, and their contentions should be considered. If at any time subsequently it is found that the land is being utilised and ought not to be acquired, there is power to discharge the land from the operations of the Act.

Mr. Pickering: Will there be any appeal from the board's decision?

The PREMIER: No provision is made for appeal from the board's decision so far as the use of land is concerned, but there is provision for appeal in regard to the price of the land. The board will have the right to say whether the land is being utilised and whether it is fit for closer settlement. We do not wish to get anywhere near to confiscation. What we want to insist upon is that land be improved and utilised. I repeat that the board will notify the owner that it is desired to acquire his land for subdivision and settlement. A price will be fixed. If the owner does not care to sell at that price, then he can either subdivide the land for sale himself or pay three times the land tax. In the case of the owner who decides that he will subdivide his land, the board will have to be satisfied that the land is subdivided in areas suitable for sale, and that the terms are reasonable and the prices are right. In the case of land where an owner decides he will pay three times the ordinary land tax, he will be required, of course, to improve his holding to get relief, and when he does improve it he can apply to the board to be relieved of the payment of the extra tax.

Mr. Johnston: Would that payment be on the unimproved basis?

The PREMIER: Certainly.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They do not pay land tax now.

The PREMIER: Of course they do, on unimproved land. We do not propose to take land that is utilised.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They have a number of blocks now, and while some are utilised, others are not.

The PREMIER: This will apply to the blocks of land which, should the board say they wish to acquire, will have to pay three times the ordinary land tax.

Mr. Harrison: Irrespective of what the income may be?

The PREMIER: This has no connection with ordinary taxation.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: If you made it twelve times it would be all right.

The PREMIER: It will be the 3½d. in most cases. We do not wish to take land that is utilised.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: There is a £250 exemption to start with.

The PREMIER: We make it quite clear under the Bill that there will be no exemption. It will be three times the ordinary rates of land tax over the area that the board wish

to acquire. If an owner fails to advise the board within three months that he wishes to exercise his right of subdivision and sale, or payment of treble tax the land will be gazetted as resumed for closer settlement. The resumptions will be limited by the funds appropriated by Parliament. I think it ought to be satisfactory to the owner that he has three options, and that he may exercise one or the other of them. The land will be improved under this system and an owner will not be deprived of his land if he wishes to retain it and is willing to improve it. The compensation, of course, must be based on the fair value of the land, and the value may be determined by agreement or by arbitration. It is provided under the Public Works Act that if there are several persons interested in a property, the compensation or purchase money will be distributed by the court amongst the various parties. The land resumed will be disposed of under the Agricultural Lands Purchase Act. There are in both Houses of Parliament members who own land. I suppose more than half the number of members here and in another place own land. They cannot sell it to the Government under the Lands Purchase Act, but they will not escape if the members of the board decide that this land is required for subdivision. I want hon. members to realise that this clause is being introduced into the Bill, and that if members' land is wanted it can be acquired by the Crown without members having to forfeit their seats.

Mr. Pickering: Will it be possible for anyone to bring under the notice of the board that certain lands are available for purchase?

The PREMIER: Yes. If in any district it is desired to dispose of land, that fact can be brought under the notice of the board. The Bill is to operate until December, 1923, a period of two years, and if it is then desired, its operation can be extended in the same way as is done with regard to other Acts of Parliament.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Why that clause?

The PREMIER: Because I think that an Act, giving power such as this one will, should not remain on the statute-book longer than is necessary.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It will take you all that time to start work.

The PREMIER: Not at all. It will be possible to extend the operations of the Act.

Mr. Underwood: Why extend it? It can always be repealed.

The PREMIER: We have heard a good deal about the land acquired in Queensland, Victoria, and New Zealand. The Queensland Act could not be made to apply to Western Australia. In that State compulsory acquisition applies only where the value of land exceeds £20,000 without improvements. There the Minister gives notice to acquire by publication in the "Gazette."

The owner may retain for residence or business purposes in one block land of the value of £10,000 without improvements, or £15,000 where the estate is valued at over £50,000, or £20,000 where the estate is valued at over £100,000. Compensation in Queensland is determined by the land appeal court, consisting of a judge and two members of the land court, and it is based on the value of the land and improvements, and the business loss in consequence of the acquisition. In Victoria land is acquired by agreement and compulsorily. If the owner does not accept the offer of the Crown, a resolution of both Houses of Parliament may direct the compulsory acquisition of the whole or part of the property. There the owner may retain land to the value of £6,000, or up to £10,000 if the judge allows it. The compensation in Victoria is determined by agreement or before a judge with or without a jury, or assessors, and it is based on the value of the land and improvements, damage by severance, and enhancement or depreciation of other adjoining land. In New Zealand land is also acquired by agreement or compulsorily. It may be taken compulsorily if the owner refuses to sell subject to limitations. Firstly the area must exceed the prescribed maximum. Secondly the owner may retain the prescribed maximum. These maxima are 1,000 acres of first class land, 2,000 acres of second class land, and 5,000 acres of third class land. Thirdly the owner may require the whole estate to be taken if part only is required. We have the same provision. With regard to compensation, if the amount be over £1,000 the claim is heard by a judge. Compensation is based on the value of the land and improvements and the loss to business. It is assessed separately for unimproved value and improvements. The unimproved value is the assessed value under the Valuation of Land Act, and to this unimproved value is added 10 per cent. up to £50,000, and for over £50,000 10 per cent. on the £50,000 and 5 per cent. on the balance. To the total compensation is added two per cent. for deprivation. I do not know that I need discuss the methods by which the valuations are arrived at in New Zealand. A district valuation roll is kept there for taxation purposes showing the nature and value of improvements, the unimproved value, and the capital value. The valuations are used by the local authorities and the Taxation Department. The Bill before hon. members is I think a fair one. It is not for us to resume land if land has become freehold, except when it is out of use. Our needs are so great that we must follow this course, and we shall be perfectly justified in asking the owners to give it up in order that others may make use of it. We propose to pay a fair value, which, of course, is only right. The land afterwards will be sold in small blocks to men who will have to be financed by the Government. We must therefore see that they get the very best of the land.

Mr. Munsie: How will you arrive at the purchase price, the amount you will pay to the owner?

The PREMIER: The board will do that. How do they do it now?

Mr. Munsie: Would it not be a fair proposition to value it according to the value they put on it for taxation purposes?

The PREMIER: That may be so, but it must be remembered that land is valued for taxation purposes at a price at which the land may be sold under reasonable conditions. For taxation purposes the value of land is the value fixed by the Taxation Department's officers. That may represent a high price to pay, or it may represent a low price. If hon. members think that the valuation on the basis of the unimproved value should be fixed by the taxpayer's return, then of course that method can be given consideration. But then we shall have to fix the value of the improvements, because under the Taxation Act a man is required to improve his land only to the extent of £1 per acre. Anything he does afterwards, such as building a house even, or sinking a well, he does not add to his taxation return. I think it will be found that the method suggested is perfectly fair, and that land will be got at a reasonable price under it. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Harrison debate adjourned.

BILL—WORKERS' HOMES ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell Northam) [5.16] in moving the second reading said: This is a very small measure, and it provides for two things. One is that the Government may finance the erection of buildings on endowment land held by the University, or on municipal endowment lands, so long as the area on which the house is to be erected is held under lease by the applicant for a loan. The lease would have to be for a term of 99 years. A good deal of our University endowment land is quite close to the city, and ought to be utilised in this way. If a worker or other person desires to have a home erected on any portion of the University endowment land, I ask that the board be empowered to erect a home for him accordingly.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You will want some very strong regulations as to this, though.

The PREMIER: Only as to the term of the lease.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: And as to payment of the lease rent by the person for whom the house is built.

The PREMIER: We are already erecting houses upon land leased from the Crown.

Mr. Munsie: But in this case if payments of lease rent are not met, the University will have the land.

The PREMIER: The Government will have the house and the land for 99 years. I consider it desirable that endowment lands should be available for the erection of homes.

Mr. Munsie: I quite agree with you there.

The PREMIER: Quite near to the railway station at Claremont is a beautiful site belonging to the University. Unless the University sell it, it will probably remain vacant for many years.

Mr. Munsie: There is another lot at West Subiaco, one of the best building sites in the Perth area.

The PREMIER: The Bill proposes that power be given to the Workers' Homes Board to advance against this form of security. Power is also given to vary the interest rate from five per cent., which is fixed under the principal Act. Money cannot be had nowadays for five per cent.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That refers only to new-money being lent?

The PREMIER: Yes, new loans; not retrospectively, of course.

Mr. Munsie: But under the clause as it stands there will be power to the Government to charge any rate of interest they please on loans already made.

The PREMIER: Oh no! Those loans have their rates of interest fixed under mortgage instruments. However, the Government have latterly been lending money for the erection of workers' homes at a lesser percentage than other money is costing the Government now. Then there is also power—and this is really what I want the Bill for—to erect houses for sale to workers in country centres. I have already discussed this matter with some hon. members. At present there is no chance of a worker with a family going into a new district such as Bruce Rock, or Kununoppin, or Korrolocking, or Corrigin, with his family, simply because he has no chance of getting a house. We propose to build homes at a moderate cost, not elaborate homes.

Mr. Munsie: What do you call cheap homes?

The PREMIER: Homes costing somewhere about £200. If the House agrees to this amendment, I propose to erect homes at a place like Kununoppin, homes on blocks of convenient size for sale to the workers who go into the district with wives and families. Everybody knows that in the wheat areas and in the South-West there is work for men practically all the year round. These homes, if erected, would enable workers with their wives and families to be on the spot all the year round for any work that is required. I do not propose to spend very much money on the homes, because I doubt whether a worker ought to be asked to pay interest on a large sum of money. In Perth there are occupants of workers' homes who are paying up to £15 per room per annum in interest and rates and taxes. In the country we shall be able to build homes of jarrah for about £250. The measure will apply to the whole of the State.

Mr. Underwood: Would it apply to the North-West?

The PREMIER: I think it should apply to some of the North-Western ports, at any rate.

Mr. Underwood: The measure will apply to the whole State if the Government will so apply it. They have not yet applied the principal Act to the whole State.

The PREMIER: In older centres workers can get houses, but they cannot get them at new centres in the country. That is a different proposition altogether. In established centres a man can borrow from the Workers' Homes Board and get a contractor to put up the building; but in the outer centres it is very difficult indeed to become possessed of a home in that way. The intention under this Bill is that simple, cheap houses shall be constructed of jarrah, to be finished by the occupants themselves. I want men with families to settle down in each of these new centres, so that they may be available for work that is to be done all the year round, without having to live away from their wives and children. The idea is to provide country workers with homes which will house them far more cheaply than they can be housed in the city, or even in the minor towns of the State. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [5.26]: It is true that the Bill is small as has been stated by the Premier; but nevertheless the measure contains one or two provisions of great importance. It launches out into advances on leasehold property. That may be all right if the Government take care that their security is sound.

The Premier: This refers to endowment lands, you know; not privately owned lands.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: But the endowment lands are held by other persons or bodies. Endowment land may be owned either by a municipality or by the University. I believe there are only two municipal corporations in the State that have endowment lands. Possibly it is the intention of the Government to assist the Perth City Council, who have large ideas in this connection, to erect a new garden city near Ocean Beach. If so, the City Council will be able to get a start with the garden city sooner than otherwise will be the case. The Premier says the increased rate of interest will apply only to new loans. There is one clause which requires very careful watching, especially after the discussion we had here last night. Last night it turned out that a section had an entirely different effect from that intended by Parliament. Here it is proposed to give power to the Government to erect workers' dwelling-houses and dispose of them to workers.

The Premier: I realise the danger of that clause.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We saw last night how a section of the Government Railways Act gave the Commissioner of Railways power

to override the intentions of Parliament. In all probability, a few years hence the clause to which I now refer will be considered as giving the Minister power to take action somewhat similar to that of the Commissioner of Railways. Part III. of the principal Act gives the Minister power to erect houses on leasehold, such houses to be paid for over a certain term of years. The freehold cannot be granted under that Act.

The Premier: Why not?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Because the Act prohibits it. Here we have an indirect method of giving the Government power to erect and dispose of dwelling-houses, which may affect Part IV.

The Premier: That is not intended, of course.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I know it is not intended, but it is a point which strikes me in connection with the Bill. In a few years the intention of Parliament will be entirely lost sight of, and regard will be paid only to what the measure actually says. To-day the Government have no power under the Workers' Homes Act to erect or dispose of dwelling-houses. Under Part IV. of that Act they can advance money to a person to build a home for himself, the Government taking over the home and selling it to somebody else if the person fails to meet his obligations. But under Part III. of the Act the whole of the work of erection has been carried out by the Government.

Mr. Teesdale: But such homes can only be sold to workers.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Under Part III. an applicant can spend as much as he likes on his home, in addition to what he borrows from the Government. I am pointing to the position which might arise in future years. Part III. deals with the erection and leasing of homes by the Government, Part IV. with loans granted to private persons to erect their own homes. Now the Premier proposes to introduce into Part IV. the right of the Government to erect and dispose of buildings. I remind the Premier of what we discovered last night in the Railway Act, Section 64 of which contains a few words which the Commissioner was able to stretch for the purpose of carrying out his intention. In a few years' time some Minister may come along and say to the Crown Solicitor "Have I power to dispose of the buildings which I erected under Part III.?" And the Crown Solicitor will turn to Part IV. and say, "Yes, you may dispose of them." In the first place, I am opposed to doing away with the leasehold system.

The Premier: I think they ought to have the freehold.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I know that, notwithstanding which I am opposed to doing away with the leasehold. There are many persons in possession of splendid buildings at a low rental, money having been cheap when their homes were erected.

The Premier: And, of course, the land was very cheap.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not know that. They are paying quite sufficient for the land. However, they are in possession of dwellings which they would not have secured if they had been compelled to comply with Part IV., and some of those persons are so selfish that, so long as they have homes themselves, they would block everybody else from obtaining a similar privilege. They want to knock out Part III. of the Act simply because they already have their own homes under perpetual leasehold. Again, under Part III. they had to pay a deposit of only £5, whereas under Part IV. a reasonable security has to be provided, in some cases up to £500.

Mr. PICKERING: I think it is up to 20 per cent. of the value of the building.

The Premier: There is no fixed rule.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No, it all depends on the board. The Premier's intention is all right, but I hope he will allow us to assist him by amending the Bill in Committee. The Bill should contain a provision enabling the Premier to erect homes for widows and others in country districts, homes situated on, say, five acre blocks, where the occupants can have a little garden, and will be entitled to pay a lower rental in accordance with the class of house provided. The Workers' Homes Board will not deal with that proposition at all. I hope we shall be able to amend the Bill in Committee.

Mr. PICKERING (Sussex) [5.35]: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and negatived.

Mr. PICKERING: I regret that the Premier opposed the adjournment, because although this is only a small measure, it is a very important one, and we should have an opportunity for fully considering it. The Bill introduces great changes, as will be seen in Clauses 2 and 4. The University has certain land—

The Premier: They are not permitted to sell it, and they cannot lease it.

Mr. PICKERING: Then again there is the question of the cost of buildings, and there is the new principle of allowing the Government to build houses with the object of selling them. I have not seen the buildings being erected on the Peel estate, but I should imagine that for £250 only a very primitive class of house can be provided.

The Premier: They are very good jarrah houses.

Mr. PICKERING: The question is what will be the value of that security. Of course, if the houses are to be sold, it does not matter very much to the Government, so long as they can get rid of them.

The Premier: Yes, they are to be sold.

Mr. PICKERING: The capital cost of those wooden buildings will depreciate considerably. It is a good policy to extend the building of workers' homes to country districts. In many country towns, more especi-

ally in the wheat areas, it is almost impossible for casual farm employees to secure homes in which to rear their families. So, although there may be continuous work, sufficient to keep those employees going permanently, yet, in consequence of the difficulty in obtaining homes, the labour is not available. The extension of the workers' homes principle to country districts will do much to solve that problem. I should have liked a little more time in which to consider the Bill before going into Committee. If members can assist the Premier to get the Bill into better shape, I am quite sure they will readily do so.

Mr. ANGELO (Gascayne) [5.40]: I regret some provision has not been made for increasing the value of the houses which can be built by the Government, or the amount of the advances to be made to private individuals for the same purpose. At the present time that amount is limited to £550. When, in 1911, the Act was passed, very satisfactory houses could be built for that sum, but I am told by the manager of the Workers' Homes Board that to-day it is barely possible to build a reasonable home for a worker for £550.

The Premier: The worker cannot repay any more.

Mr. ANGELO: Workers up North could.

Mr. Teesdale: It means 26s. a week rent, under the Workers' Homes Act.

Mr. ANGELO: Building in the North is of necessity costly. A house of the value of £550 down here would cost, say, £650, perhaps £700, up North in consequence of the increased wages and the heavy freights to be paid on the material. That being so, it is almost impossible to introduce the workers' homes scheme in the North. A little time ago we had a letter signed by 22 permanent residents of Carnarvon asking for workers' homes. Through the courtesy of the Premier I was able to approach the manager of the scheme, and together we have been trying to get out plans of a house which could be built up North for £550. We find that the sum is just about £100 short of what is required. Wooden houses are not suitable up there. The white ants get through the softer woods and, owing to the heavy damp sea air, the iron in the roofs goes very rapidly. In some cases guttering around a house requires to be renewed every 12 months. For another £100 added to the £550 a decent brick house with tiles—which could be made on the spot—could be built. It is just that extra £100 which prevents the workers up North taking advantage of the workers' homes scheme.

Mr. Underwood: It has never been put into practice in the North.

Mr. ANGELO: The scheme extends to the North-West, but the sum of money is too small for use up there. There are no workers' homes in the North-West. There is only one man in Carnarvon who has been assisted to the extent of a loan of £200. With that exception the workers in the North have never

been benefited by the scheme. It is said it is impossible for the worker to pay the instalments of interest on a worker's home. A special increase is given to workers in the North as against the wages given to workers down here, and an increase of, say, £100 on the £350 would only mean an increase of something like 15 per cent. to the worker, which is more than covered by the extra wages he receives in the North. If a worker in the metropolitan area can afford to take on a house costing £350, the worker in the North can afford to take on a house costing £700. The Government say they do not want to centralise too many people in the cities, and that their desire is to get the people out into the country. I urge the Premier to amend the Bill to enable the worker further North to obtain a decent dwelling, which he cannot get unless the maximum of £350 is raised by at least £100. Three of the people who signed the letter I have referred to have had to leave Carnarvon and come to Perth. They had permanent billets there, but it was impossible for them to obtain homes in which to place their families. Rather than be separated from their people they had to give up their billets and come to Perth.

Mr. DAVIES: Is there congestion there?

Mr. ANGELO: It is impossible for a new comer to get a house to live in. I know of two families who live in a two-roomed cottage. There are not many moneyed men in the town, and the pastoralists are too busy with their own affairs to put up houses in Carnarvon for renting purposes. I would prefer to see a worker who is satisfied with the locality in which he lives, and who wishes to make a home for his family, afforded an opportunity of building a home for himself. The workers earn good wages up there, and are ready and willing to pay the instalments required. At present it is impossible to build a suitable house for £350. If the Premier would increase the advance by, say, £150, I think the difficulty would be overcome. I hope he will think a little more of the workers in the North, and so amend the Bill as to carry out the suggestions I have made.

Mr. DAVIES (Guildford) [5.17]: I intend to accord this measure my full support. The Bill is long overdue. I am sorry it is not the intention of the Premier to apply the Act to the metropolitan and suburban area. It is a new departure for the Government to erect homes in advance of application. The Premier has been somewhat bold in bringing forward a measure like this, and running the risk of being charged with starting out in a new State enterprise. The Government apparently now intend to erect homes under the Workers' Homes Act, under an entirely new principle. Within a short time I think there will be so many applications for homes within the metropolitan area that the Government will be forced by that pressure to apply the Act to that area.

Mr. Angelo: There are already too many people here.

Mr. DAVIES: That may be so, but they must be housed.

Mr. Angelo: Send them to the country, where they are wanted.

Mr. DAVIES: I hardly think the deplorable conditions under which many of our workers are living to-day in the metropolitan area, owing to the fact that they are insufficiently housed, is fully appreciated by many people.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: All the money that is advanced to them they must repay.

Mr. DAVIES: I listened with interest to the speech of the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin), but could not follow him in his reference to Part IV. of the Act. He said that Clause 4 of the Bill could be interpreted to mean that the Government should dispose of what is known now as the leasehold homes. Clause 4 gives the Government power to amend Section 24 of the principal Act.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I said it might apply as it did in connection with the Railways Act.

Mr. DAVIES: That deals with advances for workers' homes and not with the question of leasehold.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The Government erect the homes under Part III.

Mr. DAVIES: But this deals with Part IV. of the Act and not with Part III. We need have no fear on that score.

Mr. Munsie: There is a good deal of fear.

Mr. DAVIES: I see no reason for it. Sometimes things are read into an Act which it was not the intention of Parliament should be read into it. I hope the Government will extend the principle of erecting workers' homes in advance of application to the metropolitan-suburban area. It would be the dawn of a new era in Western Australia notwithstanding that the Government may be charged with socialistic tendencies, and I think it would be a step in the right direction. The Bill is one mainly for Committee, and I think it will be welcomed by the people of this State. I support the second reading.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (Pillara) [5.53]: I regret that the House would not agree to adjourn the debate on this Bill. Hon. members cannot follow a debate and read a Bill at the same time. I defy any member, after listening to the Premier as we have done this afternoon, to take up a Bill, connect it with the Act it relates to, and read them both intelligently. It is the intelligent reading of Acts that we require. Since the House has decided not to adjourn the debate, I have very little to say. The point raised by the member for North-East Fremantle in regard to the leasehold principle I do not think matters very much. I have always been a supporter of that principle, but, when we have sold almost all we have got, it is hardly worth while having two or three acres of leasehold amongst so many millions of acres of freehold. Although the Bill does not pro-

hibit it, the administration of the Act absolutely precludes the North from any benefits to be derived from the operations of the Act. Not only has the Workers' Homes Board precluded workers of the North from coming under the Act, but the Federal Government, under the War Service Homes Act, have also declared that there is no part of Australia north of Geraldton where there is sufficient security to warrant the erection of soldiers' homes. We hear a lot of talk and some limelight lectures, and we have appointed a Minister and a Commissioner for the North-West, and we have two or three thousand pounds on the Estimates for technical assistance and for secretaries, and yet we are told by the departments there is no place north of Geraldton that holds sufficient security to warrant the erection of a £500 house, either for a worker or a soldier. There is a lot of falseness and a lot of spectacular rubbish in regard to a good many people who talk about the North. If they want to help the North here is an opportunity for giving the workers and returned soldiers of the North as much advantage as they are given in the South. We ask no more. Seeing that we pay our taxes, we are entitled to as much. I would urge the Minister controlling this department to insist upon treating the whole of the State evenly, and, if we are spending money on workers' homes or other necessities, to see that the North has its turn as well as the South.

Mr. MUNSIE (Hannans) [5.55]: I support the principle contained in the Bill, and agree with the member for Pillbara (Mr. Underwood) that it is very difficult to listen to the introduction of a Bill, compare it with the principal Act, and at the same time grasp the contents of the Bill. Although it is only a small Bill, the task is a difficult one. Since the Premier resumed his seat I have gone carefully through the Bill and compared it with the Principal Act. There are practically three principles contained in this measure. The first is the granting of permission to the Workers' Homes Board to advance money for the purpose of building homes on endowment land, University and other endowment lands. I agree with the principle, provided the Government or the board see that they get sufficient security to safeguard the State for the money spent in the erection of homes on such lands. I believe the board will do that. None of us like to see some of our University endowment lands in the metropolitan area, situated in splendid positions for homes, remain in their natural state without any improvements being made upon them. I take it the Premier would not have made the statement he did unless he knew that the University were prepared to utilise portion of their endowment lands on condition that they received advances from the Workers' Homes Board for the erection of homes thereon.

The Premier: They have said they would.

Mr. MUNSIE: Near Claremont and the West Subiaco stations there are two of the

picked sites for homes in the metropolitan area, both of which are University endowment lands. If an arrangement could be made by which quarter-acre blocks on these endowment lands could be leased for the purpose of erecting workers' homes thereon it would be a good idea. I trust the Government will go on with the erection of homes in the metropolitan area, and do away with some of the congestion that has grown up. With regard to the question of giving the Workers' Homes Board power to increase the rate of interest, I admit that the Bill only empowers the board to charge such interest as will be sufficient to cover the interest which the Government have to pay on the money that is advanced. That is all right. The clause in question will, however, require some explanation in Committee. I read the clause to mean that it simply gives the Workers' Homes Board power to increase the rate of interest to any extent they like. The Premier made the statement when moving the second reading of the Bill that the Government had advanced money in connection with the workers' homes scheme at less than it cost them.

The Premier: No, at less than it is costing now.

Mr. MUNSIE: What may happen under the Bill is that if we agree to this particular provision, the Workers' Homes Board will have the opportunity of increasing the rate of interest charged to people who have their homes already.

The Premier: Not at all.

Mr. MUNSIE: We will go into that matter at greater length in Committee. Reading the words it is proposed to incorporate in the existing legislation, with the parent Act as it stands at present, it is questionable whether or not the Board will have power to increase the interest chargeable to both future and past transactions.

Mr. Davies: The interest charges on past transactions could not be increased.

Mr. MUNSIE: If the amendment is agreed to, that opportunity will be present in the amended Act.

Mr. Davies: But that would amount to a breach of contract!

The Premier: Of course, it would. That is not intended at all.

Mr. MUNSIE: The next matter refers to the building of workers' homes in the country. The Bill gives the Government power to erect homes in the country on areas up to five acres, and to sell the homes. That is all right; but, I do not consider that provision will be of great advantage to the country districts or to the workers there. I think the workers who go into the agricultural areas in order to secure employment are hardly likely to be in a position to pay £250 for their homes unless the same consideration is extended to them as to the purchasers of workers' homes in the city.

The Premier: They will be on the workers' homes terms.

Mr. MUNSIE: If the workers in the country are to get their homes on the same terms as the workers in the city, why should not the Premier introduce an amendment to Part III. of the Act and so keep the property on leasehold and have the security?

The Premier: Because I believe in the freehold principle.

Mr. MUNSIE: If the Premier gives the purchaser of the property the freehold, the owner of the property has the upper hand regarding the occupancy of the building. The man in possession has nine points of the law in such cases. The member for Guildford (Mr. Davies) said he could not see anything in the objection raised by the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin). I consider there was a good deal in the argument advanced by the latter member. There was a considerable amount of argument last night on the provision inserted in the Railways Act which empowered the Commissioner of Railways to do certain things. If the provision I refer to is included in the Workers' Homes Act, there is not the slightest doubt that within the next 12 or 18 months, it will be interpreted as giving the board power to sell properties at present held on leasehold.

Mr. Davies: I do not think so.

Mr. MUNSIE: I consider that will be the position if the amending clause be agreed to. I consider that what the Premier wants is to amend Section 24—

Mr. Davies: Which does not apply to leasehold at all.

Mr. MUNSIE: But which gives the Government power to build and sell. The Government know that at the present time they cannot dispose of leasehold properties, for there is nothing in the Act to enable them to do so. I want to be very sure that the suggested amendment cannot be interpreted as giving the Government power to dispose of present leasehold properties. I believe that the majority of the present Cabinet—I will not say a majority of those sitting behind the Government, although I think I would be right there too—are favourable, if they have the opportunity afforded them, to converting the present leasehold properties into freehold. If they did that, I am convinced that nine out of ten persons who at present occupy leasehold properties would not own their homes within 12 months.

Mr. Teesdale: What would happen?

Mr. MUNSIE: The same as happened in every other State where this has been done. We had a small patch of about five acres in Victoria, close to Melbourne. It was cut up and workers' homes were erected and provided to the workers under leasehold conditions. After four or five years, the workers occupying those homes were in a good position. I think I am right in saying that 90 per cent. of those workers, unless they won Tattersall's sweep, would never have been in the position of owning their own home, had it not been for the provisions of that leasehold system. After the scheme had been in

operation for some time, the workers clamoured to get the freehold of their property. Most of the people around them owned the freehold of their properties, and the workers asked for the same rights as the other people had. The Government gave way and the workers secured their freehold. At the end of less than five years, only three out of the workers concerned owned their homes, and the balance were paying rent to landlords.

Mr. Teesdale: How many workers were there altogether?

Mr. MUNSIE: I am not sure of the number, but there were as many as could be provided for on the 5-acre block. There is a small patch at Leederville where workers' homes were erected, and where the people asked for the right to convert their leaseholds into freeholds. I admit that the request came from the people owning their homes there. If that right were extended to them, in the course of three years or so, those workers would be paying rent.

Mr. Teesdale: You have not much respect for them.

Mr. MUNSIE: It is not a question of respect for the workers. If a man can make £100 profit on a deal, he will make it, forgetting that in 12 months' time he will be as badly off as before. It is human nature, or perhaps the selfishness that is bred in us, but it is not right. We should protect people against themselves, and I believe that in legislation like that under consideration, we must do it. We must be careful in agreeing to any such amendment, that we are not giving a right to the Government which they may interpret as empowering them to sell leasehold properties.

Mr. McCALLUM (South Fremantle) [G.3]: With the tightening up of the clause referred to by the member for Hannans (Mr. Munsie), the Bill under consideration will do a lot of good. Particularly will that be so in connection with the properties controlled by the University of Western Australia. It will not only assist in the provision of homes for the workers, but it will assist the University regarding its financial position. I hope the passing of the Bill will permit the withdrawal of the Statute which has been placed upon the Table of the House and which deals with fees at the University. The University authorities have been engaged in surveying and cutting into blocks, their various endowment properties between Perth and Fremantle, as well as in connection with those close to Fremantle itself. Offers have been made for the leasing of that land at a nominal rental. No one was inclined, apparently, to erect workers' homes on those blocks because of the prejudice which financial institutions have against the leasehold principle. I take it that what will happen will be that the people will go to the University and secure a lease of one or other of the blocks and, having done so,

will go to the Workers' Homes Board to borrow the necessary money to erect their homes. At present, financial institutions will not advance money on leasehold property. The passing of the Bill will relieve the financial pressure on the University and upon the workers themselves, and enable homes to be erected for them on some of the picked sites around the metropolitan area. I hope that the Premier will agree to the insertion of a clause which will mean that money will not be advanced on allotments of less than a quarter of an acre. If that were done, it would save the possibility of congestion. At present we are faced with the possibility of the creation of slums in our midst and, in fact, Perth is worse off in that respect than many of the older cities in Australia. There are very few places in those cities where the blocks are of less than 50ft. frontage, whereas in Subiaco, Leederville and North Perth there are plenty having a frontage of 33ft. or even less. If that were done, it would be a distinct advantage.

The Premier: I will accept that.

Mrs. Cowan: Hear, hear!

Mr. McCALLUM: That will prevent the possibility of congestion in our residential areas. I have inspected the houses which have been erected on the Peel estate and which the Premier says he expects to provide for the workers in the country districts. The houses are very comfortable and quite suitable for country residents. They have three good rooms with a wide verandah at the back. Most of them are closed in and are used for kitchens. They also have wide front verandahs and the larger part of the two front rooms is lined. I was informed by Mr. Anketell, who has inspected them, that the average cost is from £180 to £190 each. There is no chance of workers in the metropolitan area getting homes at anything like that price and value, because wooden buildings may not be erected in many portions of the metropolitan area.

Mr. Pickering: What kind of stoves are provided?

Mr. McCALLUM: They have the ordinary Metters stove, with the usual iron casing. They do not have brick chimneys. In any case, they are nice, comfortable, snug little homes. By providing such homes in the country, it will encourage the casual worker to go away from the congested centres of population and make his home there, where such a man, under present conditions, cannot afford to go to the country to secure work because he cannot take his family there as well. With the provision of such a home, that worker will be encouraged to take up a block and work on the land in order to supplement his income and to fill in his time between jobs. Such a worker would be able to take up contracts and work for the farmers.

Mr. Davies: He would have to purchase his block.

Mr. McCALLUM: Just so, but the purchase would be on the time-payment system as operating in connection with the workers' homes scheme now. By this means, too, the worker will have a better chance of getting a home than he would have if he remained in the city. Thus, the Premier will be not only assisting the workers, but he will assist the farmers to secure the casual labour they require. Regarding the suggestion that the amount should be increased to £550, the most effective way of solving the problem is not so much to increase the amount of the advance as to try to devise some better means of construction. With £550 provided for a house, the interest, insurance, rates and taxes have to be taken into consideration as well, and it is quite as much as any ordinary worker can shoulder.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. McCALLUM: There is only one point further I wish to make and that is with regard to the matter mentioned by the member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo) that the present amount of £550 should be increased. I agree that wages men in his district, receiving higher rates than workers in Perth, would be able to meet the additional amount. I only want to remind him that the existing law describes a worker as a man receiving not more than £300 a year.

Mr. Angelo: I think it is £400.

The Premier: Yes, the Act has been amended.

Mr. McCALLUM: A man on £8 a week would find it pretty difficult to meet the charges that the extra £150 expended on a dwelling would mean to him. The real solution of the difficulty is to endeavour to get cheaper construction. I hope the Premier will instruct the officer in charge to ascertain what is being done in other parts of the world and whether they have succeeded in devising cheaper means of construction. Until we discover cheaper means, I do not see how we can afford much relief to the average wage earner here. With the tightening up of the two provisions I have mentioned I hope the Bill will receive the support of the House.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam—in reply) * [7.32]: The existing advances will not be interfered with in the slightest degree. We cannot increase the interest on them, but of course we might use the money which was borrowed at a low rate of interest years ago. To-day we are paying more for our money than we are getting for the new money which is going out. Of course, we are building more houses now than was the case six months or a year ago. I will look into the question of the application of this measure to existing leasehold blocks and will make sure that it does not apply. I think we ought by some means to allow men to have the same title, but it

should be done by fair means. I believe in freehold—I do not wish to be misunderstood on this point—and I would give freehold if I could. I am glad the House supports the idea of the University authorities being able to use their lands in this way. It is only right to let the House know that the University authorities desire to do so.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—BANK HOLIDAYS AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. F. T. Broun—Beverley) [7.37] in moving the second reading said: This is a short measure to substitute Labour Day for Proclamation Day. Members know that Labour Day is now celebrated throughout the States on one day instead of on different days as previously, and it has been considered advisable to have Labour Day proclaimed a public holiday in lieu of Proclamation Day. This Bill will amend the Bank Holidays Act and the Public Service Act in order that the substitution might be made. I move —

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

BILL—NORTH FREMANTLE RATES VALIDATION.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. J. George—Murray-Wellington) [7.40] in moving the second reading said: This Bill is rendered necessary to validate certain action taken by the council of the municipality of North Fremantle which has been explained to me in this way: Following on an investigation made in consequence of trouble with the Town Clerk, a special audit was undertaken and it was found that the rate books were all in order with the exception that one little thing laid down in the Act had not been complied with. It is the province of the mayor to sign the various sheets of the rate books and initial any alterations which might have been made. This omission has occurred in other municipalities. It was considered that if the mayor signed the last sheet of the rate book that was sufficient, but the Act makes it imperative that each sheet be signed, and that all alterations be initialled. This omission was pointed out by an officer of the Works Department and, on the advice of the Crown

Law authorities, this Bill has been introduced. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [7.42]: For the information of members I might state that the omission was due to the illness of the mayor who subsequently died. All the rates with the exception of £15 have been paid.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Angelo in the Chair; the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Validation of rates:

Mr. JOHNSTON: I understood the member for North-East Fremantle to say that all the rates with the exception of £15 had been paid. If that is so, I would like to ask the hon. member whether this Bill is being put through merely to cover up the £15.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: A special audit was made, and the Public Works Department thought it advisable to pass legislation to put things in order. I have explained that the reason why the rate-book was not signed was that the mayor was taken ill. I understand that there are several other municipalities in a similar position. Will the Minister agree to introduce legislation to meet those cases?

The Minister for Works: If necessary, certainly.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

BILL—RECIPROCAL ENFORCEMENT OF MAINTENANCE ORDERS.

Second Reading.

Order of the day read for the resumption of the debate from 2nd December.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

BILL—GOLD BUYERS.

Council's requested amendment.

Amendment requested by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 4—Strike out the words “from time to time by proclamation declare any part of the State to be or cease to be exempt from the operation of this Act,” and insert the words “by Order in Council exempt any defined portion of the State from the operation of all or any of the provisions of this Act, but any such order may in like manner be varied or revoked.”

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The object of the amendment is that instead of exempting part of a district from the whole of the Act, it will give power to exempt a district from a part of the Act. I think the amendment is a good one, and I therefore move—

That the amendment be made.

Question put and passed, the Council's amendment made.

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

BILL—STAMP.

Council's requested amendments.

Schedule of 13 amendments requested by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

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

No. 1. Clause 6.—Strike out Subclause (2) and insert the following:—“The appointment of a Commissioner of Stamps notified in the “Gazette” of the 20th day of May, 1921, and the 15th day of October, 1921, respectively, are hereby ratified, and the persons so appointed shall (subject to the revocation of the former appointment published in the “Gazette” of the 15th day of October, 1921) be deemed to have had, as from the date of their respective appointments, the powers of the Commissioner of Taxation for the purpose of any Act hereby repealed, and the latter appointment shall after the commencement of this Act have effect as if made under this section.”

The PREMIER: The amendment merely provides for the ratification of the appointment of Mr. Randall in the place of Mr. Owen as Commissioner. I move—

That the amendment be made.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: This appears to me to be a queer clause to put into a Bill. Would it not have been better to merely ratify the appointment made on the 15th October, 1921, without also ratifying an appointment which was cancelled some time ago? Why all this verbiage?

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 2—Clause 7, after the word “inspection” in line 2, insert “within a reasonable time after demand has been made”:

The PREMIER: There is no objection to this amendment. I move—

That the amendment be made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 3—Clause 50, after the word “any,” in line 2, insert “negotiable”:

The PREMIER: In this case also I move—

That the amendment be made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 4—Clause 51, Subclause 1, strike out the words “except as hereinafter provided”:

The PREMIER: I move—

That the amendment be not made.

In view of amendment No. 6, the present amendment and No. 5 are unnecessary. This amendment, No. 4, provides for the use of adhesive stamps in cases where promissory notes with embossed stamps, which are generally used, happen to be unobtainable. The matter is covered by amendment No. 6.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not made.

No. 5—Clause 51, Subclause 1, after the word “impressed” insert “or adhesive”:

The PREMIER: For the reason just stated, I move—

That the amendment be not made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not made.

No. 6—Clause 57, after the word “accident,” in line 6, insert “or any reasonable cause”:

The PREMIER: This amendment provides that reasonable time shall be given for the stamping of promissory notes drawn on plain paper, or for any other cause not immediately stamped. I move—

That the amendment be made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 7—Clause 71, after the word “trustee,” in line 7, insert “or any conveyance or transfer under which no beneficial interest passes in the property conveyed or transferred or made to a beneficiary by a trustee or other person in a fiduciary capacity under any trust whether expressed or implied”:

The PREMIER: I do not quite know how a transfer or conveyance can be of any use at all if no beneficial interest is conveyed. However, what the amendment proposes is to extend the provision to a conveyance. I move—

That the amendment be made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 8—Clause 72, Subclause 1, strike out “or,” in line 3, and insert “situated within Western Australia or any real or personal”:

The PREMIER: This amendment merely makes the clause clearer. The clause read queerly as it left this Chamber. The Stamp Commissioner had ruled that a contract of sale was to bear the same stamp duty as if a transfer and a title deed had been submitted for registration. That was not, however, intended; and the Solicitor General ruled that only a stamp of 2s. 6d. was necessary on a contract of sale. If payments were not completed under a contract of sale, the contract was set aside, and then the amount of stamp duty appearing on the contract of sale had to be refunded. I move—

That the amendment be made.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Premier might tell the Committee where the words have to be inserted.

The Premier: That is shown in the Council's message.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No. Which word “or” was struck out? There are two words “or” in line 3.

The Premier: It is the second one that is to be struck out.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Then the clause will read queerly—

Any contract or agreement under hand and seal, or under seal only, or under hand only, for the sale of any equitable estate or interest in any property whatsoever, or for the sale of any estate or interest in any property (except land, tenements, or hereditaments) situated within Western Australia, or any real or personal property locally situated out of Western Australia—

and so on. Can the Premier tell the Committee what will be the effect of the words “lands, tenements, or hereditaments, situated within Western Australia or any real or personal property locally situated out of Western Australia”?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The wording of the clause seems bad after all. It would be better expressed if for “locally situated” were substituted the word “located.” The word “local” conveys something in the immediate vicinity of where the speaker himself is.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 9—Clause 93, after the word “chargeable,” in line 1, insert “on a transfer or assignment of a policy of fire insurance nor”:

The PREMIER: I think the amendment is fair, as applying to the assignment of a policy in connection with the mortgage of a property. I move—

That the amendment be made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 10—Clause 96, add a proviso as follows:—“Provided that whenever any person in receipt of salary or wages is called upon to sign a pay roll or salary or wages book in respect to such salary or wages it shall be sufficient compliance with this section if the person paying such salary or wages affixes and cancels one or more stamps of equivalent value to the duty chargeable if such stamps had been separately and individually affixed or cancelled: Provided, further, that notwithstanding any thing in section fourteen of this Act contained, it shall not be deemed an offence on the part of the payor of any salary or wages to supply and charge for any stamp or stamps, or to accept any contribution towards any stamp or stamps used for purposes mentioned in the first proviso to this section”:

The PREMIER: I do not think the Committee will have any objection to this requested amendment.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I wish to protect the revenue. The Premier should not forget that we inserted the words “reasonable cause” just now.

The PREMIER: We were perfectly safe in doing so. Here it is proposed to enable the employer to cover many single stamps by one large stamp. It is easier to stamp a pay sheet once than to have, say, 50 different receipts. The Council's amendment represents a convenience to employee and employer alike. I move—

That the amendment be made.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Probably the revenue which the Treasury obtains from taxation of wages is fairly large. That revenue is now received week by week as wages are paid. That is so because the person who is paid wages has to see that the stamp is affixed and cancelled.

Mr. A. Thomson: That would be the same under this amendment.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Nothing of the kind. The inspector does not go round, and will not go round, every week to see that the wages sheet is stamped.

Mr. A. Thomson: But when he does call, he sees the wages sheet.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: He might not inspect oftener than once in six months. Then, if the wages sheet were found to be unstamped, the necessary reasonable excuse would be forthcoming. Under this amendment, a proportion of the tax on wages would come in once every six or nine months, instead of, as now, coming in steadily week by week.

The Premier: But the wages sheet will have to be stamped at once.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Premier knows how these things are stamped. The hon. gentleman has not been Treasurer several years without learning about the stamping of documents, and about applications for the remission of fines.

The Premier: I have never had one such application.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Then the Premier has been very lucky. Or possibly the officers, knowing the Premier's generosity, in view of the overflowing Treasury, have remitted fines without first referring to the Treasurer. The Premier: Most people stamp their documents.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Oh, do they?

The Premier: Yes.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have seen dozens of applications to be relieved of penalties for not affixing stamps. However, if the Premier is willing to wait for his money, I will not offer any objection; but I say it is better that the man who is paid the money should see to it that the stamps are affixed.

Mr. ANGELO: Recently I saw a large number of men paid. Considerable time was lost and inconvenience caused in the procuring of separate stamps. Had the suggested amendment been in force, the employer could have had one stamp to cover the whole of the stamp duty. That stamp could have been affixed to the pay sheet where the men could see it, and much time would have been saved.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: How much longer would it take to put a penny stamp opposite each name than to have every man calculating the number of names on the pay sheet and assuring himself that they agreed with the value of the single stamp affixed? There would be no saving of time.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 11. Clause 97.—After the word "fine" in Subclauses (1) and (2) insert "not exceeding the sum."

The PREMIER: This amendment merely provides that the penalty shall not be more than the prescribed amount. I move—

That the amendment be made.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Since a fine of £5 is prescribed, the fine cannot exceed £5.

The Premier: It might be held to be within the discretion of the Commissioner.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Well, we know the Commissioner is a law unto himself, but it is nearly time we brought him within the Act. The amendment is quite unnecessary.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 12. Clause 98, Subclause (3).—Add the following words:—"nor to any moneys deposited with or paid by one employee of a person or firm to another employee of such person or firm and to be used on behalf of such person or firm in his business or any branch thereof."

The PREMIER: I do not know why this amendment is asked for. Of course, no stamped receipt would be necessary. The amendment merely makes clear what is already obvious. However, I move—

That the amendment be made.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I hope the Committee will refuse to make the amendment. It is a perfectly ridiculous one.

Mr. Teesdale: The whole thing is absurd.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Suppose I am driving a delivery cart for a man and handling his money. On my return I transfer that money to the manager. It is ridiculous to suggest that any stamped receipt would be required. It is the most absurd amendment I have seen.

The PREMIER: I have already said I do not think it necessary. It is inconceivable that money passing in this way would involve a stamped receipt.

Mr. TEESDALE: I will oppose the amendment. The Premier himself admits that it is not necessary. We have quite sufficient necessary laws without making laws that are unnecessary.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: There is a slight justification for the amendment. In a Stamp Bill we require to be most explicit, because the Commissioner is apt to make mistakes, and the taxpayer has to pay for them. That is the only possible reason for the amendment. I will oppose it.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment not made.

No. 13. Second Schedule (Agreement).—Strike out the second line in exemption No. 3, and insert "supply or sale of any goods, wares, or merchandise, or any order calling for the rendering of any particular service including the supply of electric."

The PREMIER: I am not sure what this amendment is intended to do. It does not seem to be necessary.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They have exempted large gas meters and stoves.

The PREMIER: The Bill already exempts all those. I move—

That the Council's amendment be not made.

Mr. MONEY: The amendment includes other services in addition to the supply of electric light. I do not see an exemption for agreements made for the supply of water. Apparently an agreement between a local authority and an individual person is not exempt.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Yes, under No. 5.

Mr. MONEY: That is as between the local authority and His Majesty, or the Government. It is not a service as between the local authority and an individual person.

The Premier: That would be provided for in the by-laws.

Mr. MONEY: By-laws cannot override a Stamp Act. I daresay there are many other services which should be included.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not made.

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

BILL—INSPECTION OF MACHINERY.

Council's Amendments.

Schedule of 29 amendments made by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair, the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

No. 1. Clause 1—Add the words "Provided that such proclamation shall not issue before the 1st July, 1922."

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: This amendment means that the Act cannot be put into operation until the end of June next, and that there will be considerable loss of revenue to the State. This amendment is contrary to the usual practice and I cannot understand why the Council made it. I believe it was thought that without the amendment some hardship would be created through people having to pay fees for the whole year who had already paid fees for part of the year. This would not be the case. I move—

That the amendment be not made.

Mr. A. THOMSON: I hope the amendment will be accepted.

The Colonial Secretary: You do not want them to pay.

Mr. A. THOMSON: A lot of the machinery provided under the provisions of the Bill has never been taxed before. It will take fully 12 months for the inspectors to go round the farmers, and they will be paying for something for which they have had no services. If it is the intention to appoint more inspectors to harass the people in the country I doubt if there will be any increase in revenue at all.

Mr. DAVIES: I hope the Committee will reject the amendment. We must consider the necessity for the Bill, and for the protection of people in the country districts who may require such protection.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Bill provides that it shall come into operation on a date to be fixed by proclamation. By the amendment the Council have shown they have no confidence in the Government. The question is whether the Council shall control the Government, or whether this House shall say when the Bill shall come into force. Bad as the Government are I am willing to give them power to fix the date by proclamation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The Bill not only imposes taxation but imposes upon machinery owners certain conditions. The immediate proclamation of the Act would work considerable harm on these machinery owners. On the understanding that it is not proposed to bring it into operation immediately I will support the motion of the Colonial Secretary.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: We shall have to continue to operate under the old Act for some time.

The CHAIRMAN: I would call the attention of the Committee to the form in which these amendments have come to us. In my opinion they are not properly before the Committee.

Mr. A. Thomson: In what way?

The CHAIRMAN: The Bill emanated from this Chamber. In my opinion it is one

which, when it left here, imposed taxation. The Legislative Council have sent it back to us in the following form—

"Schedule of amendments made by the Legislative Council in the Inspection of Machinery Bill."

I am of the opinion that the amendments are not properly before the Committee. The Council had no right to make amendments.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Bill was introduced in this Chamber and sent to the Upper House. Without any desire to disagree with your ruling, I take it that the Upper House had a right to make amendments to it.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister can do what he likes, but I rule that the amendments are not properly before this Chamber. I understand he desires to report progress, so I will withdraw my ruling for the time being in order to allow the Minister to consider his position.

Progress reported.

BILL—NURSES' REGISTRATION.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 18th October; Mr. Stubbs in the Chair, the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 5—Who may be registered as nurses:

The CHAIRMAN: The member for North-East Fremantle had moved the following amendment—

Subclause 2, line 4—Strike out the words "recognised by the board."

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: This is an amendment we were discussing when we reported progress.

The Colonial Secretary: Will you withdraw it?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I should think not. The subclause means that if a young girl had put in three years training at the Northam hospital ten years ago or so, and holds a certificate to the effect that she is a properly trained nurse, and that girl is today earning her livelihood as a trained nurse, she will be debarred from continuing practice, if the Northam Hospital is not recognised by the board as a proper hospital for the training of nurses.

Mr. Harrison: But will this have a retrospective effect?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes, the clause deals with the nurses who already hold certificates at the time of the commencement of the Act. It may be that a large number of nurses will be affected by the passing of this clause. We have been told that probably only three or four hospitals in Western Australia will be recognised by the board as suitable for the training of nurses. Should such be the case, is it fair that women who are already earning their livelihood, should be debarred from practising in

future because of the passage of such legislation?

The Colonial Secretary: You are entirely wrong. They will not be debarred under the clause.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If that is not so, I do not understand the position. The clause refers to persons holding certificates at the present time.

The Colonial Secretary: That is correct.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Then the Minister already admits that at least half of what I have said is correct. If a nurse can demonstrate her qualifications by her ability to pass an examination, that should be sufficient for any board. Why should we legislate to compel a nurse to be trained in a hospital recognised by the board, and perhaps affect the livelihood of so many nurses as I have indicated? The Colonial Secretary realised he would be defeated when the Bill was last before the Committee and he reported progress. The Colonial Secretary himself admitted that in all probability the only hospitals which would be recognised by the board as suitable for the training of nurses would be the Perth Public Hospital, the Fremantle Public Hospital, the Kalgoorlie Public Hospital, and the Wooroloo Sanatorium, with probably the Children's Hospital as well. These are the hospitals that probably will be recognised by the board in the future.

The Colonial Secretary: Not necessarily so.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We have to surmise that position and draw our own deductions from the remarks by the Minister himself. He probably has received information from his officials to enable him to say that those will probably be the hospitals to be selected. Owing to the scattered nature of our population, we should avail ourselves of every hospital in Western Australia for the training of nurses. Some time ago, the Medical Department could not get sufficient nurses to staff our hospitals and the State had to pay the fares of nurses to come to Western Australia from the Old Country. The passing of the clause will tend to again curtail the number available for the hospitals throughout the State.

Mr. Mann: Would you not agree that a nurse's training should be finalised in one or other of the metropolitan hospitals?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No, because it may not be possible for some nurses to come to Perth for that training.

Mr. Mann: Would not a girl who has received training at the metropolitan hospital be better equipped than those in the country hospitals?

Mr. Teesdale: Why so?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That was an old argument put up, but I consider that in the small country hospitals a nurse learns her work from A to Z, whereas in the Perth Public Hospital she would not get such a general experience but would specialise more.

Mrs. Cowan: They would get a more general experience at the Perth Public Hospital.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I will not argue with the hon. member, because she is a member of the board of management.

Mr. Mann: It is peculiar that only recently a man had to be sent from Merredin to Perth because they had not the conveniences at the local hospital to treat his broken leg and he died on the way down.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There was a hospital at Northam.

Mr. Mann: He was taken off at Northam, but he was on his way to Perth.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Many people will try to get to Perth, in any case.

Mr. Harrison: It all depends on the medical men and the staff.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is so, but the point is whether we are to prohibit a woman who has been trained at a hospital and has been practising her profession for years, from continuing her practice because of legislation such as that suggested?

Mr. Davies: Do they train nurses in the country hospital to which you refer, or are girls appointed there after they have been trained?

Mr. Mann: They take them after they have been trained.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Not always. Do not make any mistake about that. In any case, I contend that the ability to pass an examination should be sufficient for anyone, and that is all that should be required.

Mr. PICKERING: I support the amendment moved by the member for North-East Fremantle. Owing to the position in Western Australia we should make the registration of nurses as simple as possible. It is not right that because a nurse has not been trained, say, at the Perth Public Hospital, she should not be allowed to continue practising her profession. The main thing is that the nurses are qualified by passing examinations. The Committee would be well advised to accept the amendment.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment. This subclause deals entirely with nurses already registered.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No nurse is registered at the present time.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: They are, under the A.T.N.A. and their certificates will be recognised by the board. The association recognises no nurse unless she has practised for a certain period in a hospital with a minimum of 40 beds.

Mr. A. Thomson: That cuts out the country hospitals.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: All those nurses holding a certificate will be eligible. Those who have not completed their training will be covered by the other subclauses. I do not wish to see unqualified nurses holding certificates. We are out to protect the lives of the people, and we know that medical officers have to rely to a large extent on the nurses. If nurses can become registered simply because they have practised in a tin-pot hospital of five or six beds—

Mr. Pickering: Are you speaking of Beverley hospital?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No, Beverley has more than six beds. Wherever possible, dangerous cases are sent to the big hospitals, and nurses do not get an opportunity to qualify in the small hospitals. The amendment would lead to the examination being made more difficult. It should be left to the discretion of the board to say which hospitals should be recognised. The board would not impose restrictions to debar nurses from becoming qualified. Their desire would be to get qualified nurses.

Mr. HARRISON: In the country hospitals, there are good medical men and good nurses. It has been stated that the A.T.N.A. will fix the conditions. Parliament should be supreme in this matter; not an outside body. It is stated that the number of beds will count in the qualification of a nurse.

Mrs. Cowan: It must.

Mr. HARRISON: I do not see why it should. There are large hospitals in Perth which specialise in certain cases, but the country hospitals cater for all cases, and a country nurse gets wider experience and can become as proficient as a nurse in one of the larger hospitals.

Mr. A. THOMSON: I am surprised that the Minister should oppose the amendment. Judging by his remarks, no good at all can come out of the country. He referred to tin-pot hospitals of five or six beds. That remark was unfair. One would imagine that country hospitals were provided for people who were not sick. The country hospitals have to treat cases just as serious as those treated in the larger centres. To say that a nurse must come to the city to get her training—

The Colonial Secretary: You know it is not so. Why say it?

Mr. A. THOMSON: I can only assume from the Minister's remarks that it is so. It is very difficult for girls to get into Perth hospitals. It is often necessary for them to wait for months. I commend the member for North-East Fremantle for striving to protect the interests of those who wish to follow this calling. The Minister said that if the amendment were passed, the examination would be made more difficult. If this is probable, we should insert a clause to prevent such a course being adopted. The Minister represents a country district and should protect the country hospitals. It should not be within the province of any outside body such as the A.T.N.A. to say which institutions shall be recognised.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am not surprised at the outburst of the Minister because he has not read the clause. He has pointed out that this subclause is intended for nurses holding A.T.N.A. certificates. Can any member see in the subclause anything relating to A.T.N.A. certificates? I am not raising objection to A.T.N.A. certificates. Nurses are supposed to be qualified before they get the certificate. The Minister must be aware that

there are numbers of nurses who get certificates signed by the matron and medical officer of Government hospitals throughout the State when their period of training is over. The A.T.N.A. certificates are not the only ones granted in Western Australia. The Minister said the association would not recognise a nurse unless she was trained in a hospital with 40 beds. How many hospitals are there having not more than 10 beds? The Minister should read the clause. I am not objecting to the qualifications of the nurse, or the knowledge of the nurse. My objection is based on the fact that, no matter what qualifications a nurse holds, if she has not been trained in an institution recognised by the board, she cannot be registered under the Bill. I am not dealing with nurses' qualifications, but with institutions.

The Colonial Secretary: You would have a nurse qualifying after three years in a private hospital.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not care, provided she is qualified, and that is the only question that should be raised regarding her registration. The very principle of the Architects Bill was qualification and not the institution in which the training was carried out. I admit that when the Bill is passed we may have some difficulty because we have an association which may say, "We will not recognise certificates issued under this Act."

Mr. Davies: They dare not.

The Colonial Secretary: The association will have nothing to do with it after this is passed.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There is a possibility of the A.T.N.A. saying that any nurse registered under this measure, and trained in a hospital with less than 40 beds, shall not become a member of that association. To get over that difficulty the Minister says "We must allow the A.T.N.A. to fix the qualifications under this Act."

The Colonial Secretary: I said nothing of the kind.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is what the hon. member meant.

The Colonial Secretary: I said I would leave it entirely to the board.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We know, too, that if a board does anything unreasonable, there is always a possibility of an amending Bill being introduced to remove the board.

Mr. TEESDALE: If the warmth displayed by the Minister in connection with country nurses and hospitals is any criterion to the warmth likely to be displayed by the board, then country nurses will have a bad time. I have had experience in country hospitals, having undergone serious operations in those institutions, and all I can say is that I have had the best of treatment from the doctors, matron and nurses. The Minister is not right in speaking disparagingly of the nurses as he has done. It does not follow that because a nurse may not be wearing crepe de chine or silk that she is not respectable. It is quite possible that country womenfolk know as

much about attending an unfortunate man as a nurse in a bigger town, and it does not follow that because a girl has been in an institution with a few beds that she has not gained as much experience as a cog in the wheel of one of the big hospitals. It happens very often that two or three girls are singled out for important operations.

Mrs. COWAN: They all take their turn.

Mr. TEESDALE: Their turns do not come too often. I consider that those girls are entitled to have every consideration shown them.

Mrs. COWAN: I agree with the Minister about not amending Clause 5, but I do not agree about amending Clauses 2 or 3; because it seems to me that Clause 5 applies to a section of the nurses that it is desired shall be controlled, and which nurses must be trained in a place recognised by the board. If we leave out the words "recognised by the board" in Clauses 2 and 3 they would make it all right for the others.

The CHAIRMAN: We are only dealing with one amendment at a time and that amendment relates to Subclause 1.

Mrs. COWAN: Well, of course, if I may not say any more on that subject, then I shall not. I do not think there is any feeling against nurses trained in country hospitals, but we must recognise that a nurse cannot get the same training in a small country hospital that she can get in a big hospital which has a number of different wards, and where they devote a long period of time to training in each particular section. If we make further amendments, we can make the position perfectly just and right for all sections.

The Minister for Works: The best engineers the world has ever seen were trained in small shops.

Mrs. COWAN: Engineers and nurses are hardly on the same footing. If the Minister for Works thinks so, I can only say it is a great pity he was not born a woman. I too desire to give nurses in private hospitals a chance, and I want to see that we provide for those women who have had no training at all. It seems to me, however, that under the Bill they are provided for, and that they can register if they can pass an examination.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The best engineers the world has ever seen were trained in small shops where they were well looked after by good men. Therefore I will not subscribe to the statement that because a nurse may have been trained in a small hospital, she may not be able to carry out her work as well as a nurse trained in a bigger institution. I know that at timber mills, on railway contracts and on public works generally where many men are employed—

Mrs. Cowan: Would you call nursing a public work in that sense?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, and a public work that should be respected too. I am grateful to the nurses I have met in different parts of Australia and I have met

those who without having been trained in a hospital knew exactly what to do in an emergency. In small engineering shops men who are being trained have to do all kinds of work and they do that work thoroughly because they know the boss's eye is on them. In big engineering shops they are put on to special work. We should be very careful we do not throw obstacles in the way of those who have to get their training in small country hospitals.

Mr. MONEY: I am not quite sure whether the Minister or members have read this clause carefully. The first subclause sets out "... As a nurse in a hospital or ..." something else. That something else is an establishment recognised by the board. Everything depends on how this is read. "Or something else" means some alternative.

The Colonial Secretary: So long as it is recognised by the board.

Mr. MONEY: The alternative is a training establishment recognised by the board.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You cannot read it that way.

Mr. MONEY: If the word "and" were there, it would mean both. The word "or" is used, and that means either. Clearly, an alternative is given to "hospital," and that alternative is some institution recognised by the board, not necessarily a hospital at all. I read the clause as I find it.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You find no stop there.

Mr. MONEY: I find the alternative "or." Pass the clause as it is, and I guarantee that in any court in Western Australia I will get it for both.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Never!

Mr. DAVIES: One does not like differing with a professional man, but I hold the clause can be read in a different way from that put forward by the member for Bunbury. The retention of the words "recognised by the board" is hardly so important as the Minister would have us believe. By what right shall a board not yet in existence declare, say next June, to girls who have finished their training to-day, and are recognised to-day, that they must prove to the satisfaction of the board that they have received certain instruction? That is indeed retrospective legislation.

Mr. MONEY: I wish to move a further amendment, namely, to insert between the words "or" and "training," in line 4, the words "in a."

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot accept that amendment except with the consent of the mover of the amendment before the Chair.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not agree to that, because I maintain that a nurse should pass an examination, no matter where she was trained.

Mr. MONEY: Apparently the whole standing of the board is at stake, in the

opinion of the Committee. If that is so, the Committee has no right to confer any powers whatever upon the board. If the board are not competent to declare what shall be a recognised training establishment, we had better have no board, and let the legal position of nurses remain what it is. From this tendency of Parliament to interfere in matters that hon. members are not qualified to deal with, many of our present troubles have sprung. If we constitute a board at all, we should leave this matter to the board.

Mr. McCALLUM: It seems to me that the member for Bunbury entirely misunderstands the amendment, which does not involve any question of confidence in the board, but a question as to limiting the scope within which nurses can become registered. Say we have 100 nurses upwards of 21 years of age trained all over the State; then the board, upon being appointed, could say to them, "We will set you an examination to pass, but we will admit to that examination only those of you who have had your training in hospitals of which we approve."

Mr. Mann: Do not you approve of that?

Mr. McCALLUM: No. Why not widen the scope, instead of limiting it? Let there be the widest possible opportunity for registration of nurses having the necessary qualifications.

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

Ayes	27
Noes	10

Majority for .. 17

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Angwin	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Boyland	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Carter	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Corboy	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Davies	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Gibson	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Heron	Mr. A. Thomson
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Troy
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Latham	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Lutey	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. C. C. Maley	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Broun	Sir James Mitchell
Mrs. Cowan	Mr. Money
Mr. George	Mr. Piesse
Mr. H. K. Maley	Mr. J. Thomson
Mr. Mann	Mr. Mullany
	(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed.

Progress reported.

BILL—CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Message.

Message received from the Council notifying that it insisted on its amendment to the Bill.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, STATE TRADING CONCERNS.

In Committee.

Mr. Angelo in the Chair; the Minister for Works (Hon. W. J. George) in charge of the divisions.

Division—State Brickworks, £18,321:

Mr. DAVIES: Is the Minister not going to give the Committee an explanation in regard to these various divisions?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If the Committee desires it I will make a statement, but I must say that never since the establishment of the trading concerns has there been a session in which so much information regarding those concerns has been placed on the Table.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Let the points be dealt with as they arise.

Mr. DAVIES: Well, I want to know something about the brickworks. The increase is set down at £1,131, notwithstanding which the works appear to show a dead loss.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: There is no loss shown here.

Mr. Munsie: The works show a profit.

Mr. DAVIES: I hope it is so.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The footnote refers to the estimated receipts. Hon. members will make a mistake if they take it as showing the financial position. The financial position is shown on the balance sheet. The estimated receipts is what is expected to be returned from the bricks made. The reason why not more is shown is that there is a slight slump in the trade and in consequence we may have to stock a quantity of bricks at our siding. It is not anticipated that the balance sheet to the 30th June, 1922, will do other than show an honest profit. However, we do not expect to receive from sales more than £16,000. That is not to say we will make a loss.

Mr. MUNSIE: It is up to the Government to make some statement regarding trading concerns. I do not want the Minister to go through the petty details, but I want a statement from a member of the Government as to the policy regarding the State trading concerns. It is put up by the Chamber of Commerce, the Chamber of Manufacturers, the Employers' Federation and employers generally that the State Trading Concerns have been responsible for the deficit, and all those people are urging on the Government the necessity for selling the State Trading Concerns. Ministers get up in their places and say they are quite favourably disposed to the selling of those concerns. Now is the time for the Government to make an

announcement of their policy in regard to the trading concerns. If, during the financial year, the trading concerns make a loss, there will be no one to blame but the Government, since the Government do not appear to be ready to announce their policy to-night. I am informed that the managers of some of the trading concerns are afraid to enter into contracts for work, because they do not know what attitude the Government will adopt in regard to the possible sale of the trading concerns.

The Minister for Works: There is nothing of that sort in the four concerns I handle.

Mr. MUNSIE: I am told it is so in respect of the State steamers. If that be true, then the same mistrust is likely to be found in the management of other trading concerns. As representatives of the public, we should know what the Government are going to do about the State Trading Concerns, and I hope the Minister will make a definite announcement of policy.

Mr. TROY: I, too, should like to have from the Minister a comprehensive statement regarding the trading concerns administered by him. There is running through the Press a propaganda in which the most reckless statements are made regarding trading concerns.

Mr. Munsie: Chiefly by those who are desirous of getting hold of them.

Mr. TROY: I saw the other day a pamphlet containing an extract from a leading article in the "Bulletin" in which it was stated that 14 or 15 million pounds was sunk by the Labour Government of Western Australia in trading concerns. I have a suspicion that the writer of the article knows the real facts very well, that he was for some time not altogether disassociated from the "Sunday Times," and that while connected with that paper he was responsible for many similar statements. I have read in the "Bulletin" another article which apparently came from the same pen. That article contains statements regarding the reckless expenditure of the Labour Government on railways. I remember reading in the "Sunday Times" an article, apparently by the same writer, in which he condemned the Labour Government because they did not build a railway to Mt. Marshall. It might be regarded as bad taste if I were to say that the writer to whom I refer had a farm at Mt. Marshall. Now, in the "Bulletin" he draws attention to the reckless expenditure of the Labour Government of this State in the building of railways. I am not very often wrong when I pick a writer's style. That writer has a style peculiarly his own. I feel I can lay my finger upon the man who is responsible for these reckless statements. This extract from the "Bulletin" has been sent to members, and the people who have sent it have not had the courage to place their signatures under it. The same thing has been forwarded to all the newspapers in the country. A number of country journals have reprinted it. That is evidence of the propaganda referred to by

the member for Hannans (Mr. Munsie) as being in progress in Western Australia.

Mr. Munsie: A propaganda of lies.

The Minister for Works: That article has been distributed all through Western Australia.

Mr. TROY: The Minister controlling these concerns should give the House some information in regard to them and state his policy for the future. It is necessary that it should be stated now so that the people may know how they stand. We want to know whether they are showing a loss or a profit. We want to know whether the administration of these concerns is sympathetic or otherwise.

The Minister for Works: Is the hon. member speaking on the general discussion or is he taking each concern by itself? I do not want to be considered to be burking discussion. I have said a great deal about the State trading concerns this session, but if the Committee desires me to deal with each one of them I shall be prepared to do so.

Mr. TROY: If hon. members desire to discuss the various State trading concerns under their several heads, I shall be quite agreeable. The Minister has made no definite statement, such as can be made upon the Estimates. He has given us no policy in regard to them. To his credit he has said he is not in favour of them, but that so long as he administers these departments, he will do so to the best interests of the State.

Mr. A. Thomson: He would not be worthy of his job if he did not do that.

Mr. TROY: He has resisted the pressure of interested persons, whose only interest in the concerns is that they may be of benefit to their own pockets.

The Minister for Works: I said that in the Press.

Mr. TROY: The Minister ought to give the Committee a resumé of their operations, and if he is determined to resist the influences of these interested persons, I for one will stand by him.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am prepared to state my views in regard to the State trading concerns. Generally speaking, I am opposed to State trading concerns, and always have been, but they have been entrusted to me—four of them—

Hon. W. C. Angwin: And you have done well.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: And I have done my best with regard to them. If I could sell them to-morrow for a fair price to the State, and I had power to do so, I would dispose of them. I am not prepared, however, to allow any boycotting or misrepresentation to influence me in disposing of them. I am not going to allow any of the tactics which have taken place to affect my judgment. Some of the tactics which have been resorted to lately are a disgrace to all concerned. The only trouble I have is that I cannot track down the criminal and prosecute him. I have in my pocket a letter which

I will read to the Committee. The manager of the State Implement Works reported to me on the 28th November as follows—

Herewith please find a communication received by Mr. B. Burlinson of these works together with 10s. note to pay his initial expenses. I do not think there is any need for me to pass many remarks upon this matter. It goes to show the lengths to which some of our antagonists are prepared to go in their propaganda against the works. It also goes to show how very careful one wants to be in placing any credence upon the yarns and short stories which are at present in circulation. There is one thing very certain—the writer or the late employee of the works referred to made a big mistake in picking Burlinson for the purpose. Although he is a very intelligent man he is one who is honourable in every sense of the word.

That is a very unfortunate way of expressing the thing.

As regards disposal of the half sovereign he agrees with me that you should forward this, if you approve, to the Waifs' Home, Parkerville.

An envelope is mentioned as bearing the postmark dated the 19th November and there is a minute stating that Mr. Shaw will find the envelope and send it up. Unfortunately, the envelope cannot be found and this has prevented me from pursuing the subject with the police. I have here the note for 10s. referred to in the letter from the manager. Here is a copy of a letter dated Perth and addressed to Mr. Burlinson at the State Implement works as follows—

To Mr. B. Burlinson, care State Implement Works. Dear Sir, I have been recommended to approach you as an able and likely person to assist in writing a few short articles on the State Implement Works. My principals will recompense you very liberally for any private information (especially of a deteriorating nature) and your identity will be profoundly secret. If you agree to this I will meet you in company of a late employee of the works who will introduce me to you. I enclose you 10s. for expenses. If this does not meet with your approbation kindly destroy this note. We will meet you at the lounge, Savoy Hotel, Saturday, 7 p.m. Yours in anticipation.

Mr. Munsie: Those are the tactics we have to put up with.

Capt. Carter: Is the note a good one?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, as good as the hon. member. I do not know whether this is a kite someone has been flying. It may be that someone sent this letter to test the position. I regret that Mr. Burlinson could not attend the meeting so that we might pursue the matter.

Mrs. Cowan: Are you going to meet the gentleman next time?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If I could meet him I would be happy for five

minutes, but I do not know if he would be. Hon. members have seen the communications in the Press. The system of boycotting has been going on in regard to the implement works for the last couple of months. Statements have been made that the implement works must not be supported. There is no question about that, because Mr. Shaw has quoted me several instances. I stopped a good deal of it. The practice has grown up of asking Mr. Shaw to examine machinery. As a rule someone else has got the job by the time he got there, and this has meant loss of Mr. Shaw's time. I have now instructed him not to go anywhere unless he is guaranteed the job beforehand, or is paid his fee as a consulting engineer. The other manufacturers have not much to complain of. Some months ago the engineers in Western Australia were badly in need of pig iron. They could not get it at any price. They asked me, as I had a stock of pig iron, whether, in order to keep their men going, I would help them out. I did so, and let them have pig iron practically at cost to assist them in keeping their works going. Within the last six weeks a letter was received from Messrs. Metters Ltd. at Subiaco stating that they had been offered 250 tons of material at £7 a ton, and that all the engineers in Western Australia could not make up an order for more than 100 tons. They asked if the State Implement Works would oblige by taking over the 150 tons so that they might get their 100 tons at a low price. We declined to do this. There is no difference of opinion amongst Ministers that I am aware of. We do not consider the Government should enter into propositions such as the different works have entered into in opposition to private enterprise. We have a right to our opinions and those are our opinions. It is the intention of the Government within the next few days to introduce to the House a Bill to give the Government power to sell these trading concerns without having to bring the matter before Parliament.

Hon. W. G. Angwin: When do you expect to close the session?

Mr. O'Loughlen: On the 17th March.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I have been perfectly frank with hon. members. I will give them this assurance that I shall not act against anything I have said in the House with regard to these trading concerns. I am ready to sell them but am not prepared to scrap them. Members can rely upon me not to let anyone get at scrap prices the implement works, the brickworks, the quarries, or the sawmills. I have given five years of my life to these works and the best of the life-long experience I have had, and have been enabled, with the help of my officers, to put them in good condition. If people want them they will have to pay for them, just as they would have to pay for any other good business. Hon. members cannot say that I have not plainly

and simply told them what the intentions of the Government are.

Mr. O'Loughlen: If they had wanted to get the Bill through, do you not think they would have introduced it three months ago?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I cannot reply to that interjection.

Mr. O'Loughlen: You have no more hope of getting it through this session than you have of flying to heaven.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We will see to that.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Life without hope is not worth much. We never know whether hope is good or bad until we try it. Hon. members will have ample opportunity of expressing their opinions on the subject.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They have bluffed the Government with their scandalous statements.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: At present I am more concerned about these Estimates. I should not have said what I did if the member for Mount Magnet had not drawn it from me.

Mr. O'Loughlen: You think it is a good thing to sell profitable concerns like the sawmills?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: These people tell you what they want and you bring in a Bill.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Just bluff!

Mr. Munsie: The Westralian Farmers Ltd. wanted to buy it without cash.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: They did not get it.

Mr. Munsie: I know that. All the more power to you for refusing them!

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Does not the hon. member think that the spirit that actuated me then, will actuate me again?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Yes, but you may not be there always.

Mr. Munsie: I say all the more power to the Minister for refusing such a scandalous offer. They were not game to make it in public.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not know about that. However, the estimated receipts of the brickworks for the coming year are £16,000. I believe they will be more, because for the past five months our trade has been going ahead. While we have not had to stack the number of bricks we had anticipated, that has been brought about by reason of the sales we have made. The different institutions of the State assist in the disposal of the bricks. We are doing a big trade at Carlisle where people are able to get their requirements for bricks supplied easily. This year we are asking for a vote of £18,321 as against an expenditure last year of £19,452. The reason for this is that last year we had to include £1,000 in connection with the siding and approach from the station to the brickyards. We do not expect to get in so large a sum this year from the sale of bricks, because we were very much pressed during the past 12 months. We are confident we shall

do a good trade and the works should show a good increase in the next balance sheet. For the year 1920-21, the profit on the State brickworks was £2,182; thus reducing the accrued loss of £4,000. That accrued loss had been nearly £7,000, but the working of the yards reduced it to £4,000 and then, with the results of 1920-21, reduced that accrued loss to £1,818. I am pleased to tell hon. members that there is now no accrued loss on the works.

Mr. Munsie: And the works have been a good policeman in the interests of the public as against the brickmakers.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We used to have some trouble at the brickworks with the men, but we have very little trouble with them to-day. At the bottom of this change is, I think, the fact that the management has recognised that if men are to be comfortable and satisfied at their work, they should be decently housed. We have built several really decent cottages—I think there are seven of them—for the married couples and some decent huts for the bachelors. Since they have been occupied, the feeling at the brickworks has been very much more satisfactory to all parties concerned and the reason is, I think, not far to seek. Following out that principle, I have also adopted a similar plan at the State quarries and the same results are shown there. I think members will agree that if a man is to do good work, and be contented, he must be decently housed. We charge nominal rents for the huts and from 5s. to 7s. a week is charged for the married couples' quarters. We charge 2s. 6d. a week for the single men's huts, which are about 12ft. by 10ft., and if two men share the one hut, the rent is reduced to 1s. 3d. per man, which I do not think can be regarded as exorbitant. If any reward were looked for regarding these charges, I think it is to be found in the fact that the relations between the men and the management are happy indeed. There were some arrears in the Treasury until last year, but trade has been so good and the money has come in so well that we paid off those arrears and started with a clean sheet. The manufacturing costs for the year have worked out at £2 13s. 10½d. per thousand as against £2 4s. 6d. for the previous year, showing a difference of 9s. 4½d. per thousand. This result has been brought about through increases in the wages and in the cost of material, and also because of the fact that we have had a reduced number of bricks set. We have not been able to set as many bricks as we should have liked. That naturally brought up the cost of manufacture. The average selling price for the period was £3 3s. 3¼d. per thousand. Although the cost of production has gone up, we have been able to pass it on and get a decent price from the people outside. The manager of the brickworks so arranged matters that we would not allow the price of bricks to go sky high, because it was recognised that there was need for a check, and that it was more important to keep the price

of bricks down than to make big profits on the bricks sold. The interest charged against the concern for the 12 months was £1,493, sinking fund £70, departmental charges £209, and depreciation £1,270. Out of the cash receipts, £1,657, being temporary loans received during the lean years, was repaid to the Treasury. The total depreciation charged since the inception of the works is £5,880 14s. 1d., of which £4,062 3s. 7d. has been met out of profits, leaving a balance of £1,818 10s. 6d. So far as the industrial aspect is concerned, we are indebted to the secretary and the officials of the brickmakers' union for the way they have acted during the year. If there has been any trouble the secretary has come along and assisted in smoothing things down. I want to express the recognition, and I think I can say the gratitude of the management, to the union official in that regard. Hon. members will have seen the balance sheet which has been laid upon the Table, and the only other thing I want to refer to, concerns a matter that appeared in the Press some months ago. I think the matter was also mentioned in the House by the member for Katanning (Mr. A. Thomson). Reference was made to a charge of £7 per thousand regarding fancy bricks which were supplied to a certain contractor in Perth. I explained the position to the House at the time it was mentioned here. These bricks had to be specially selected and specially dealt with in the hand press and they had to receive special attention throughout. We would have very much preferred not to have made this line of bricks even if we had got £20 per thousand. The Committee should understand that the profits on brickworks and similar concerns have to come out of the quantity, and anything that has the effect of interfering with the routine operations, inevitably interferes with the profits.

Mr. Mann: Was not the price of bricks fixed by the Prices Regulation Commission?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not know. I never bothered about them.

Mr. Troy: They controlled nothing.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am certain they could not control the hon. member. The Prices Regulation Commission may have done good work, but as to the fixing of the price of bricks and keeping that price down, the manager of the brickworks and I did that in my office. If we flouted the Prices Regulation Commission we would have been brought up by our opponents in the trade. There was no trouble, however, and I think we did well.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Minister for Works has put a very clear and precise statement regarding the brickworks before the Committee. During the lean years a loss was incurred, but owing to the successful operations at the brickworks, those losses have been wiped out entirely. It shows clearly that, regarding this trading concern, there is no charge against the Consolidated Revenue of the State, and people will not be able to

say that it has contributed to the heavy deficit confronting the State at the present time. I am glad the Minister put his statement so concisely regarding the operations at the brickworks. In connection with the closing of the session, reference has been made to the fact that the Leader of the Opposition has assisted the Government in their difficulties. We have been accused, however, by a section of the Press of sacrificing our rights as His Majesty's Opposition. We have been told we have not carried out our duties and have not attacked the Government as in the past. We have realised that owing to the special circumstances obtaining nowadays, the Government need assistance. Now we find from the statement made by the Minister to-night that the Government, in the closing hours of the session, are bowing the knee to those scoundrels who wish to bribe workers in the Government employ for the purpose of making false statements against the works where they are employed. If other hon. members sitting on this side of the House are of the same mind as I am, we are going to be in real opposition during the remaining portion of the session. Do not make any mistake about that! If the Government intend to give way regarding the trading concerns to the wishes of a few men who gather together to cry stinking fish, instead of keeping them intact in order to act as policemen in the interests of the public, then it is time for the Opposition to take a stand and show that they can at least fight for what they consider is in the best interests of the State. We know very well that the Minister for Works is doing his best to make the trading concerns a success. It is not because the concerns are losing, that these people are worried. It is because they are a success that they are worried. If the trading concerns continued to lose, these people would be silent. When the works are paying is when people start squealing, because they realise that the State has demonstrated that we can manufacture articles at prices which the public can afford to pay. When the brickworks were started, bricks were bringing £3 per thousand.

The Minister for Works: The average price to-day is £3 3s. 3d.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Government were then paying £3. Since then prices generally have gone up 80 or 100 per cent. Yet the Government to-day are paying only about the same price as they were paying then.

Mr. Mann: They are charging the same price.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No, paying the same price.

Mr. Munsie: But for the brickworks, it would have cost the State, on public buildings alone, £100,000 more than it has done.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The State has made an enormous profit indirectly through the establishment of the works; and even on the financial side the works do not owe the State a penny. Those who are endeavouring to condemn the brickworks will not support me in this. They will scarcely be courageous

enough to call me a liar, but they will go as near to it as they dare, and will endeavour to get other hon. members to support them. Those members have not the pluck to tell the truth. They accompany deputations to the Premier, and hear the deputationists tell downright lies, but have not the courage to denounce them. Is it any wonder those people declare that the brickworks are selling below cost and that the public have to make up the loss in taxation?

Mr. MacCallum Smith: Well, we have proof of it, printed here.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That does not matter. The Minister has made a statement which the hon. member was not here to listen to. I said just now that I should not be believed by certain hon. members, and here is confirmation of that immediately the hon. member comes into the Chamber. If the brickworks made £1,000 profit and the Minister said it actually represented £1,000 loss, he would be believed, but they will not believe him when he tells the truth. Why? Because a body of Bolsheviks have come together in an attempt to condemn the trading concerns, not in the interests of the State but in their own personal interests.

Mr. Troy: And in the interests of advertising.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I will have something to say about that on another division. The word has gone round that all is well in the Chamber, and that now is the time for the Bill. All will not be well in the Chamber if that Bill be introduced.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: That is a threat.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Let me tell the Premier that we on this side require to see that Bill before any other Bill passes this Chamber.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: Another threat.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We are not going to be had at the last minute.

Mr. Davies: We cannot be had without the consent of hon. members.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Premier has already given notice to move for the suspension of the Standing Orders to allow of Bills passing all their stages at one sitting. The word has gone out that all is well, and that the majority of members will be against us.

Mr. Troy: The Country Party has had a conference.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes, and the Western Farmers Ltd. The Minister took away a commission from them because they acted dishonestly.

Mr. Pickering: Acted dishonestly? I cannot let that pass.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is what I said. I am sorry the Government intend to introduce this session a Bill giving them power to sell the State Trading Concerns without reference to Parliament. I saw something about it in the Press the other day, something to the effect that it was only three weeks to Christmas and the Bill had not yet been introduced. I am not quite sure, but I think I can talk for three weeks.

Mr. Munsie: I will assist you to the extent of 24 hours, against a Bill to sell the trading concerns.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Minister has announced the policy of the Government. It is as well to let him know the policy of the Opposition. From this out it will be opposition. If the Government drop the Bill we will assist them; if they attempt to pass the Bill we will oppose them. And, as I say, we must see that Bill before we allow another Bill of any sort to pass. We have kept the Government in office during the past session. All opposition on important measures has come from their own side of the House. We have assisted them to carry on the affairs of the State as peaceably as possible; and then, at the tail end of the session, when notice of motion to suspend the Standing Orders has been given, the Government come here and say to us, "You have helped us during the session; you have put up no factious opposition; you have endeavoured to assist us to carry on the affairs of the country; the session is coming to a close, and now we are going to give you a smack in the jaw." The Government confess that they are going to bow the knee to those who are offering money to bribe their servants to fight against them. The Government say to us, "Although you have assisted us, we are going to sacrifice you in the interests of those damned scoundrels." That is the position as it must appeal to any honest person in the State. I am very sorry that the Government have adopted this line of action, as it will create dissension at the end of one of the most harmonious sessions I have ever experienced. Still, we have to fight for our rights. I do not intend to block the Minister's Estimates. I believe he is doing his best with these concerns. He has shown that the brickworks can be made successful, and they can turn out a good article. Consequently, I do not intend to block his Estimates, but we can take action with regard to other business which has to be brought forward.

Mr. DAVIES: I was pleased to get an assurance from the Minister that there has not been a loss on the State Brickworks. What conclusion could members have come to on the statement presented other than that there had been a loss on the works?

Mr. Munsie: I did not come to that conclusion. The Estimates state "actual contribution for 1920-21, £1,658; estimated contribution to Consolidated Revenue this year, £675."

Mr. DAVIES: Anyhow we have been assured that the brickworks are paying. I am concerned that the statement of accounts made public does not take the form in which it has been put before us. One of the reasons for the success of the works is that we have a contented service. Recently decent brick cottages have been provided for the married employees and comfortable huts for the single men, and it is a big factor in the success of the works that these men are there to stay so long as there is a job for them. Now,

a school is being built in the district. I thank the Minister for the great personal interest he has taken in the welfare of these men.

Division put and passed.

Division—State Ferries, £9,238:

Mr. PICKERING: Recently the South Perth fares have been considerably increased. Seeing that the ferries are a paying concern, I would like to hear what the Minister has to say on this matter. The increase has fallen very heavily upon many wage earners who reside at South Perth.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Last year the working expenses of the ferries totalled £7,591, and the estimate for the present year is £8,137. Management expenses, departmental services, reserve for doubtful debts, interest, sinking fund and depreciation will bring the total this year to £9,238 as against £8,742 last year. The estimated revenue for the present year is £10,050 compared with £9,693. The estimated net profit for the year is £812 against £950 last year. The increase in fares has been rendered necessary by increased wages to the staff, and the higher cost of running the service. In the past women folk have been able to travel at a remarkably low rate. I do not know why such a substantial concession was ever made. Recently there has been an adjustment of rates. A lady's quarterly ticket will now cost 27s. 9d., the same as a man's ticket, as against the concession rate of 14s. previously charged. Complaints have been made regarding the increase. It has been pointed out that it will be a hardship on certain wage earners who have dependants to support. I shall consider the question in this connection only. The people who are able to pay will have to pay. No such concession is allowed to women travelling on the railways or tramways, and I do not see why it should be allowed on the ferries. The South Perth fares will now be on something like the same basis as those charged by the private company running to Como. The increase in fares will not produce a great amount of additional revenue, but should bring the profits up to those of last year. During the year £613 has been spent on the "Duchess" and she will now be good for another five years' service.

Mr. Troy: What has happened to the "Perth"?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: She is used only for excursion trips. She is costly to run, and on that account is only used for the South Perth service when the "Duchess" is not running. I have been trying to dispose of the "Perth." I thought I could get rid of her in the Eastern States. She was put into the hands of brokers, but she is considered unsuitable for service there.

Mr. Troy: Isn't she better than the "Duchess"?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: She costs half as much again to run and is not suitable. Further, she is not suitable for work outside the river. A paddle boat a little larger than the "Duchess" is what we require for this service.

Mr. TROY: I was surprised at the impertinent remarks of the member for Sussex. He is opposed to State trading concerns, and is constantly drawing the attention of the community to their being a losing proposition, and yet he now demands that the Colonial Secretary should carry passengers at a loss on the South Perth ferries. The hon. member should refrain from rushing in where angels fear to tread. He is the champion of private enterprise in respect to public facilities, and he now requests that the State shall afford facilities to his friends in South Perth at a loss. Why should women travel from South Perth to the city at a cheaper rate than men? They are not allowed to do it on the trams. It is impertinent on the part of the hon. member to ask it.

Division put and passed.

Division—State hotels, £53,756:

Mr. MUNSIE: I should like to have a definite statement from the Minister as to the intentions of the Government regarding State hotels. The information that has been placed before us, regarding this branch of the trading concerns, is satisfactory, and I should not have required this information except for a certain Bill which provides for the cutting out of State hotels. If Parliament decides that hotels shall not be provided for in that legislation, every one of them will have to be closed. The Government have introduced a Bill providing for their abolition.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They have not got the Bill through yet.

Mr. MUNSIE: The actual contribution of State hotels to Consolidated Revenue was £7,309 in 1920, and the estimated contribution for this year is £9,000.

The Minister for Works: That is the amount they could spare.

The Colonial Secretary: It is increasing each year.

Mr. MUNSIE: What is it intended to do with State hotels?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Bill mentioned by the hon. member will not cover State hotels.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You will not finish this side of Christmas.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: A vote was taken recently which showed that the public were in favour of State control. So far as the Bill is concerned, it is not the intention of the Government to dispose of State hotels.

Mr. Munsie: Do you say the Government have no intention of disposing of them?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No.

Mr. Munsie: That is one trading concern we can be sure of keeping.

Division put and passed.

Division—State Implement and Engineering Works, £160,384:

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am sorry that some members who have interjected are not here to listen to my statements regarding these implement works. The actual contribution to Consolidated Revenue for 1920-21 was nothing, and from this it may be thought that they have lost the State a lot of money. Each of these concerns has two accounts—one is fixed capital for plant, etc., and the other is trading capital. Through the Treasury we secure bank overdrafts in the same way as overdrafts are obtained in any other business. If our returns come in showing that we have some cash to spare, and we have a profit on our balance sheet, we hand that spare cash over to the Treasury. The State Implement Works are trading on an overdraft of £90,000. This morning our debt was £87,000, and we have a margin of about £3,000 to operate on. If our returns came in as one would like, I might be able to spare a greater contribution to the Treasury without going against the principles of sound finance. I have over £35,000 worth of promissory notes in the safe. We do not discount these, or get an overdraft on them. We keep them. If the money on account of the promissory notes came in and I did not require it for trading, it would be handed to the Treasury instead of being kept in the bank. That would be our contribution to Consolidated Revenue. Members are wrong in thinking that these particulars indicate the actual position of the concern. The real indication as to that position is gathered from the properly audited balance sheets that are laid on the Table of the House. The criticisms of the Auditor General upon these balance sheets have, I am glad to say, only been on mere matters of routine, and he does not complain that they do not show a true and correct position of the accounts of the concern.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We do not take much notice of what he says.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If hon. members will turn to the balance sheet they will find a position that one can fairly be proud of. The sales for last year amounted to £160,000, which represents a very large volume of business. We employed 300 men drawing good wages, and we turned out a considerable amount of stuff. If the returns so far as profit is concerned are to be the test, I must tell members as a business man of long experience that, on the capital we have invested in these works, they would not be considered satisfactory. We have met our interest bill and have allowed for depreciation, sinking fund, etc., but the net result of the last 10 years' trading shows a debit to profit and loss account of £3,521. That is accounted for partly by the fact that

we had to meet retrospective pay and certain increases in wages last year, and also had to provide some commission to the co-operative companies in the agricultural areas which had done business for us, under the control of the Westralian Farmers Ltd. I could not get out of paying that commission.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The Westralian Farmers got commission for work they did not do.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Westralian Farmers tried to get it, but they never got it. The co-operative companies in the country have really been the means of securing us trade, after we had told the Westralian Farmers that we would not have any more to do with them. Perhaps I could have got out of paying the commission, but as a business man I reckoned that I had to keep on doing business with the co-operative companies, and that as they felt they had done this work, I would do well to pay them the commission, especially as the sales manager advised me that he considered the co-operative companies had rendered the works material assistance. We had to make an arrangement with them under which they would continue to act as our agents. The payment of that commission might be called a sweetener. In the end we paid about 50 of these societies a total commission of £1,500. They have acted as agents for us since, dealing direct with us; and the result has been entirely satisfactory. We have no complaint whatever regarding this arrangement from the Westralian Farmers at the present time.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The trouble is the officers of that company are now putting the knife in.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: They have tried to put it into me, but I do not think they have got, or will get, it in very far. I am a determined man, and I have my convictions as regards these State Trading Concerns. I tell the Committee, and I mean it, that so far as I am concerned, and I know this holds good of the Premier, and I believe it holds good of every other Minister, that despite all the misrepresentations to which the Government generally and myself in particular are subjected in this connection, not one of the State Trading Concerns will be allowed to go unless a proper price is paid for it. We would be fools to let a concern go at a scrap price. Whatever else members of the Ministry may be, they are not fools. One reason militating against the complete success of the State Implement Works has been that the stocks of material there have been much heavier than the volume of trade warranted. But the implement works, like other manufacturers and traders, have been the victims of their suppliers; orders for material given some considerable time ago, in some cases two or three years ago, have been coming to hand during the last seven or eight months. The sales manager says—

The response from the country for our wares is still liberal, and, given a good article, local production will beat the imported article every time; but the business has to

be sought and fought for; it will not come to you in payable quantities.

I want the Committee to realise that the officers working on this thing are, to my personal knowledge, putting their hearts and their backs into it, doing their best under very arduous conditions. Let me say that the amount of interest paid to the Treasury by the works during the last financial year amounted to £12,689 5s. 7d., while there was a contribution of £228 12s. 5d. to sinking fund, and depreciation was provided for to the extent of £1,967 13s. 4d. Since the capital was amended as at the 1st July, 1917, the total depreciation charged from that date amounts to £8,863 4s. 10d., of which £1,504 3s. 2d. has been invested by the Treasury. The total sinking fund charged, for the redemption of Loan Funds, from the inception is £930 4s., all invested. Then there is another factor militating against the success of the works. Times out of number I have said in this Chamber that the State Implement Works have a lot of machines which, if the business were my own and I had the necessary capital to deal with it, I would have scrapped long ago, or else looked for a mug to buy them from me. If the capital were available, I should like to see the shop converted into a good shop with modern machines. However, with the machines that are there some very good work has been done; it is only justice to the manager and his staff to say that much.

Mr. TROY: Where did the scrap machinery come from?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It was purchased on the other side, so far as I am able to learn.

Mr. TROY: Purchased by Davies?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I believe that is so. Some of the machines at the State Implement Works were obsolete when I served my apprenticeship, and that was not yesterday. In the "Black Swan" foundry I had better machinery than there is in the State Implement Works to-day.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: A lot of the machinery at the State Implement Works came from the old harbour works.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Irrespective of the source of that machinery, I would, if I could, scrap a lot of it, because it is not up to date. Let me say once more that the ploughs made by the State Implement Works are recognised to be the best in the State. We are making them in large numbers; indeed, we made 214 ploughs of various sorts last year, in addition to 30 road ploughs. We also made over 200 windmills last year. In connection with these there have been some little difficulties, which however are now overcome. One thing I am better pleased with than anyone, and that is that some three or four years ago I instructed the manager to make several of those road-forming machines, because as Minister for Works I wanted to see the machinery for making roads kept up to the highest standard. So far we have sold about 30 of the machines, and they are giving satisfaction. I am convinced that

any road board dealing with the State Implement Works for such a machine will be well satisfied.

Mr. McCallum: Is that road making machine the manager's own patent?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is a copy of an American machine, with a few improvements. In the South-West it has been proved that with this machine a road, after the work of clearing has been done, can be formed to a width of 22 feet, with water table on each side, for 4s. 6d. per chain, as against a cost of 26s. to 28s. per chain by the old methods.

Mr. McCallum: I had good evidence of the work of the machine when I was in the South-West, and I was anxious to know whether the machine was the manager's own invention.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not know what more I can tell the Committee. The balance sheet speaks for itself. On the engineering side we are suffering somewhat from an organised boycott; but we shall beat that boycott. In Frank Shaw I have got not only an engineer, but a fighter; and if he wants help and will come to me for it, he will get it without any hesitancy whatever. If the two of us, Frank Shaw and myself, cannot manage to hold our own, we had better get out of it. But we can, and those others know we can; and that is why there is so much misrepresentation going on in the Press and out of it. We do not want to do those others any damage; but I say, let them fight fair, and not under the lap. If they want real stoush, they can have that too.

Mr. TROY: I was glad to hear the Minister's references to the State Implement Works and I can bear out the statement he made that some of the implements which have been constructed at the State works are equal to those imported from elsewhere. He referred to ploughs. There is one defect regarding the plough, however, and I want to impress upon the Minister that the material is not of the best. The spare parts, including the shares and mouldboards, wear out very much quicker than the same parts of imported ploughs.

The Minister for Works: That is in the material which we have to buy. We do the best we can.

Mr. TROY: I think the State implement should be given first place, except so far as the material in the parts are concerned, and the sooner an improvement is made in that connection the better. That is the only complaint we have. Regarding the commission given to the co-operative companies for selling machinery, I interjected that sometimes the companies got commission for sales they had not made. I suppose that happens in the ordinary routine of business, but I know in my own case, I bought some machinery direct and one of these companies drew commission.

The Minister for Works: That would be so.

Mr. TROY: That should not be so.

The Minister for Works: That is in accordance with the agreement.

Mr. TROY: That would be perfectly reasonable if the co-operative companies confined their selling to State implements, but they do not. They sell machinery for other firms as well.

Mr. McCallum: And boom them, too.

Mr. TROY: I cannot say that from my own experience, but I do know they are not as keen upon selling the State implements as upon selling others.

Mr. Lutey: They are disloyal.

Mr. TROY: I have no doubt that they get some secret commission as they offered the bribe to the employees of the State works, an incident to which the Minister referred this evening.

The Minister for Works: We got £85,000 from the sale of agricultural implements last year.

Mr. TROY: The Government have their own representatives travelling round the State looking for business, and they get the business, too.

Mr. Hickmott: It is not the fault of the co-operative companies that the sales are not greater but it is the fault of the clients who will not take them.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It is easy to get over that, seeing that the Government have the money which the clients require to pay for machinery.

Mr. TROY: I have a State harvester and my neighbours have them, too, and we are absolutely satisfied with them. I have heard people say there are better harvesters, but, after all, it is largely a question of personal preference.

Mr. Harrison: That is correct.

Mr. TROY: If the State implements had a fair deal and the agents were as loyal to the country as they should be, there would be more State implements sold. As it is, the agents in the country are pushing other firms' articles in preference to the State machinery. I do not contend that all the work done by the State Implement Works is of the best because some of it has been slipshod. I had an experience which should never have occurred. I sent down some material to be fixed up and I had to return it to the works. These little things should be seen to because, when a farmer's harvester is lying idle, and he is paying wages to his men and losing money all round, it makes him feel sour.

The Minister for Works: It is not always the fault of the works.

Mr. TROY: In this instance it was the fault of the State Implement Works. I sent down a threshing spindle which had to be welded. When it was returned, it was not filed down and consequently could not be fitted on to the threshing machine. Such neglect is inexcusable. There should not be any such cases possible. I lodged a complaint about the matter.

The Minister for Works: Did the works not remedy it?

Mr. TROY: Yes, but the trouble was that my harvester was held up for a fortnight.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That sort of thing happens everywhere.

Mr. TROY: But it should not happen.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The fact remains that it does.

Mr. TROY: There is no excuse for such things happening.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I agree with you.

Mr. TROY: That is the sort of thing that makes people complain about the State Implement Works.

The Minister for Works: Of course, the spindle should have been tested to see that it would fit.

Mr. TROY: That is quite correct. We are told that we shall have a Bill brought before us to give the Government power to sell the State trading concerns. Remarks which I may desire to make on that question may well be left until the Bill comes down, but, in the meantime, I am surprised that members of the Country Party should ally themselves with members of the Chamber of Commerce in opposition to this particular State industry. If there was one concern of importance to the farmer more than any other, it is the State Implement Works. A lot may be said regarding State trading concerns and private enterprise. I want to know, if the State Implement Works are shut down, where the farmers, who have purchased thousands of pounds worth of machinery from that concern, will get their spare parts in future? Am I to scrap my harvester and all my other machinery?

The Minister for Works: I do not think that position would arise because that would be adjusted in any arrangements that would be made.

Mr. TROY: How could that position be safeguarded? Farmers have bought machinery from the State Implement Works on the understanding that spare parts would be available. Are we who purchased machinery from the State Implement Works in good faith, to have our interests so jeopardised? In the interests of the State, I supported the State Implement Works. Perhaps I would prefer to buy a Sunshine harvester, but I desired to support the State works and bought there. Must I scrap all my machinery?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The commission agents will not care a hang if you do!

Mr. TROY: I could not replace my machinery for £1,000. Must I scrap that machinery to please the Chamber of Commerce and buy imported articles, because I cannot get spare parts to carry on? Must I pay whatever price they like because there is no manufacturing policeman, in the shape of the implement works, to keep a check on prices? These Chamber of Commerce people, with whom the Country Party mem-

bers are flirting and with whom they meet in conference and have agreements, have no factories in Western Australia to which I can send material. Country Party members are aiding and abetting these conspirators, importers and members of the so-called Chamber of Commerce. Those people are largely aliens, men who are here to-day but gone to-morrow to Melbourne, Sydney, or anywhere else where their firms care to send them. They do not mind destroying industry here.

The Minister for Works: Spare parts, last year, were worth £22,000.

Mr. TROY: Spare parts for my harvester alone cost me £25. The Country Party have had a conference with the Chamber of Commerce and, it is understood, have agreed to the sale of the trading concerns. That has been stated in the Press.

Mr. Harrison: What if it has? We do not take our mandate from the Press.

Mr. TROY: One gentleman associated with the Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Basil Murray, is closely associated with the Country Party.

Mr. Lutey: He is one of the bosses.

Mr. TROY: He is hand in glove with the people out to destroy the State Trading Concerns, which are of great benefit to the farmers. Experience of the Country Party in this House has taught me that they are totally incapable of looking after the interests of the farmers. A body of men who come here to protect the producer as against the middleman, and who end by intriguing with the middleman, can scarcely be said to be looking after the interests of the producer. The State Implement Works has been of very special value to the farmers. To destroy this State policeman would be disastrous to the farmers, for it would hand them over to the middlemen in combination. The loss of the State Trading Concerns would remove all competition in trade. To-day we have two private super-phosphate firms in competition (!) one with the other, yet charging precisely the same prices. The farmer goes to buy bags for the season, and all the merchants demand the same price.

Mr. Money: It would be extraordinary if they did not, since there is a market price for all bags of the same quality.

Mr. TROY: Only the other day a man asked me what I was paying for my bags. When I told him 8s. 6d. he said "Yes, there is an understanding that after a certain day it will be 9s. 6d." It is curious that none of these merchants ever break away. If we go to buy fencing wire, we find everybody readied up with the one price for us.

Mr. Harrison: You have heard of honourable understandings?

Mr. TROY: How are we to be saved from honourable understandings if we lose the State policeman, which serves to put the profit into the pockets of the producers in-

stead of into the pockets of the Chamber of Commerce?

Mr. Pickering: What about fruit cases supplied from the State sawmills?

Mr. TROY: If it were not for the State sawmills, the price of fruit cases would probably be much higher than it is. Wages and everything else have gone up, and the price of fruit cases has had to advance accordingly.

The Minister for Works: I agree with much of this, but why cannot it be put forward when the Bill comes down?

Mr. TROY: Yes, perhaps it would be as well.

Mr. JOHNSTON: We have had important but conflicting statements from Ministers to-night in regard to the proposed sale of certain trading concerns. I should like to know exactly the intentions of the Government in the matter. We have had a clear statement from the Minister for Works that the Government intend bringing in a Bill which will give them power to dispose of the State Trading Concerns. Then the Colonial Secretary got up and stated definitely that the Government were not going to sell or lease the State hotels, whatever happened. Now we are dealing with the State Implement Works, which in my opinion is the most valuable of the State Trading Concerns. I want to know from the Minister for Works whether that particular trading concern is to be sold, or whether it is in the list of trading concerns not to be sold. I think the Minister might enlighten us as to which of the trading concerns the Government wish to dispose of, and which they intend to retain. It seems to me the Government have somewhat peculiar ideas of the comparative importance of industries, if the State hotels are to be retained while the State Implement Works, which have done so much for the development of the agricultural industry, is to be sold. The State Implement Works should be the last of the trading concerns to go. I do not approve of the policy of letting the implement works go, whilst retaining other concerns such as State hotels, which appear to me to be of far less value to the State.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: When I see a copy of the Bill I shall be able to answer members' questions. I have not the slightest doubt that the sawmills, implement works and brickworks will be included.

Mr. McCallum: And the quarries too?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not know what the Premier may decide. I admit that there are reasons for and against, but would not it be far better to discuss the matter when the Bill is before us? We ought to discuss these Estimates from the point of view whether the figures are reasonable. The member for Williams-Narrogin is evidently interested in State hotels.

Mr. Johnston: My constituents are interested in the State Implement Works.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I cannot tell the hon. member about the State hotels. All I know about them is that I have had in them liquor just as good as I have had in the hon. member's hotel. The only difference was that at the State hotel I had to pay for it, and at the hon. member's I did not. If members have any suggestions to make regarding the conduct of these trading concerns I am prepared to listen to them, but the other questions could be better discussed when the Bill is before the House. In response to very pointed statements made by members, I merely intimated the intention of the Government. I am not afraid to say what we intend to do.

Mr. Johnston: We commend your frankness.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not care twopence for the commendation; let us get on with these Estimates. Never before has information regarding the trading concerns been so fully and fairly presented to members.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We have reached a stage of the session when the matter has become serious. We are not going to wait for the Bill; we are going to block everything until the Bill comes down.

The Minister for Works: But let us get these Estimates through.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I told the Minister we would assist him to get these Estimates through, but we are not going to wait until the Bill is brought down at the end of the session and bludgeoned through. The Government have no right to introduce such a Bill. They are being forced into the position of doing so by a lot of damned scoundrels who want, by bribery, to get from the service information to which they are not entitled.

The Minister for Works: I only wish I could get hold of them.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Minister said the implement and engineering works are not in a paying position. There are a lot of farmers whom the Government have provided with money to purchase implements.

Mr. Harrison: They have to give their orders to the State Implement Works.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No, they have not. The Government established these works to keep a check on prices; they have to find the money to pay for the machines and they should use their own money to meet capital expenses. I believe the great bulk of the farmers would vote for the retention of these works.

[Mr. Stubbs took the Chair.]

The Minister for Works: Only the other week I was accused of shutting up Hoskins and Company's Works.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No one on this side is jeering at the Minister. I have a copy of the minutes of evidence taken by a select committee about 12 years ago on the subject of the manufacturing industries of

Western Australia. I want members to realise the position at that time with regard to implements. This was the evidence of the seller of probably the largest quantity of agricultural machinery in Western Australia at that time:—

Are any of the lines you sell in agricultural implements or general machinery made here?—No; all our lines are made either in Eastern Australia or America, with the exception of a very few English implements.

Implement works were not in existence in Western Australia. The money expended on implements was being sent to other parts of the Commonwealth or to America instead of being circulated in this State. I regret to say that there are a large number of members in this Chamber who prefer to see money sent out of the State rather than spent within the State. They do not care a hang so long as some people outside the House can put a little extra money into their own pockets. The witness was further questioned and replied as follows:—

Eastern Australia would be the principal competitor with Western Australia in any such manufactures?—I think so.

Do you think there would be a desire on the part of the importer from the East to prevent the establishment of such industries here?—I think there would. I do not think they would allow an opposition firm to start here if they could possibly prevent it. It would affect them very much. At the present time Western Australia is, I suppose, about one of the best markets they have outside their own.

Is it a fairly big market?—Yes.

Do you think that manufacturers starting here would have to face dumping?—I think so. Rather than lose their trade here, the Eastern manufacturers would do as much dumping as they possibly could. They would get all their surplus machines down at a very low rate.

Mr. Harrison: I wish they would make a dumping place on my farm.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The hon. member would not care about the interests of the State. The evidence continues:—

You said that you thought manufacturers in the Eastern States would not allow a new manufacturer to spring up here?—They would not if they could possibly help it.

Do you think the Government should take the matter in hand?—They are the only people who could do anything, I think, as regards starting.

How would it assist new manufacturers if the Government were to call tenders for the supplies of large quantities of machinery to be made in Western Australia—take harvesters for instance; you mentioned 200 would be needed this year?—I do not think it would pay any firm to manufacture 200 harvesters.

I read this to show that before the State started manufacturing agricultural implements it was ascertained from the business people of Western Australia as to whether or not it would be possible for private enterprise to start. Private enterprise realised that it would not be possible. In the opinion of one of the largest importing firms in Western Australia the State alone could start successfully in this direction. I regret that the Minister has to suffer from a little of that dumping.

Mr. Harrison: We have not realised any fall in prices.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Prices would have ruled very much higher if it had not been for the State Implement Works.

Mr. Harrison: What about dumping?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: They are dumping here at a low price and the hon. member knows it.

Mr. Harrison: I do not.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Implements are selling here cheaper than in other parts of Australia.

Mr. Harrison: Implements are at a higher price than ever before.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: So is everything else at a higher price.

Mr. Harrison: There is no dumping taking place.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That applies to every article. Wages are higher, coal costs more, and so does iron and timber.

Mr. MacCallum: Even the price of members of Parliament has gone up.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The State Implement Works cannot be blamed for the present position. If they had not been in existence prices would have ruled 20 per cent. higher than they do now.

Mr. Harrison: That is an assertion you cannot prove.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am sorry for the hon. member. He was led into a trap.

Mr. Harrison: You need not be sorry.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: He was led into a trap by the Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Harrison: Nothing of the kind.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Those who endeavoured to squash these works bluffed the primary producers of the State, and the hon. member went down. He was patted on the back.

Mr. Harrison: I did not.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: He could not stand a little praise. He said, "I agree with all you say, and will endeavour to get the State Trading Concerns sold."

Mr. Harrison: Who said that?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The hon. member's speech was published in the paper.

Mr. Harrison: I should like to see it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I will look it up for the hon. member. What the hon. member said at a meeting that was held in Perth he would not say at Kellerberrin.

Mr. Harrison: What I have done in Perth I am prepared to do anywhere.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are discussing the State Trading Concerns.

Mr. Money: How long ago was this evidence taken?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: About 12 years ago, before the State Implement Works were started. I had not intended to mention the name of the gentleman who gave this evidence. I have, however, shown the evidence to some hon. members and might as well say that it was given by Mr. John James, a partner in the firm of Messrs. Wm. Sandover & Company, and he ought to know what he was talking about. He was speaking as he thought, and not for his own personal gain, but in the best interests of the State.

Mr. Harrison: He was quite right too.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I only referred to this to show that the State would have been the poorer but for these works. They employ a large number of men who are engaged in assisting in the development of the State, as well as bearing a part of its indebtedness. The Minister said that £85,000 worth of machinery was sold last year. If the works had not been in existence at least £60,000 of that would have been spent on machinery in the Eastern States. Is it any wonder that the importers have cried out against the Minister because of these State Implement Works?

The Minister for Works: I do not mind that so long as they fight fairly.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: They never have dealt fairly with either the country or the Government. They get what they can out of the country, and abuse the Government afterwards.

Mr. Money: They all have to bear their share of the taxation.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Do they? Most of the agents do not pay a penny. It is all passed on to others who have to meet the bill. It is added on to the price of the goods they sell. I am pleased that the position of the State Implement Works is satisfactory so far as the State is concerned, and I trust it will be a long time before they are closed. It is all very well for members to say they will not be closed if they are sold. There was a butcher's shop in Fremantle which, although only a small one, was paying handsomely though one or two others in the vicinity were not. It was then decided to let the shop, and this was done at a fair rental. Another butcher took it. Within three months the shop was closed. Then it turned out that the real purchasers were Baker Bros., the big butchers of the metropolitan area, who had another shop in the same street, and did not want this shop open. If a firm purchased the implement works, it would be a dummy purchase, made merely with the object of closing the works. If a genuine buyer did take over the implement works, the Eastern States machinery manufacturers would dump machines here so as to ruin that genuine buyer. Let me point out to the present Government that they are not in office for all time. They can sell the implement works if they like; but some other Government, in

power some other day, will establish other State Implement Works. It is only a few business men who are opposed to the State Implement Works, and members like the member for Bunbury, who has not given the question full consideration.

Division put and passed.

Division—State Quarries, £9,721—agreed to.

Division—State Steamship Service, £199,970:

Mr. ANGELO: I hope that when the Government are disposing of State trading concerns, they will not get rid of what is a very necessary developmental utility, one which is required in the North just as railways are required in the Southern part of the State. I refer to the State Shipping Service. As is well known, the three Singapore boats now on the coast are allowed to remain through an act of grace. But at any time, and at very short notice, we may lose these boats. Since the Navigation Act was proclaimed, these three steamers have been able to run merely on sufferance. It may be that the Federal Government will continue the permit, but some day there may be trouble among seamen, and then the boats will be lost.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The trouble is on now. Make no mistake about that.

Mr. ANGELO: For some time I have been warning the Government that that may occur. I am perfectly certain that the Federal Government will not care a tinker's curse about the requirements of our North-West if they think that by continuing the permits they may bring on a seamen's strike affecting the whole of Australia. That is the reason why I consider it so urgently necessary that our State Government should not only continue the service but improve it. At present the service is not being run as it should be. We have heard it said that before the State steamers came along, freights were lower. We know that formerly freights were lower than they are to-day. Before the war freights were fairly reasonable. But let me put this aspect of the matter, that even when freights were low, stock owners and growers in the North could not get space. Monopolies had been established in connection with the steamers running on the coast at that time. Powerful firms like Forrest, Emanuel & Co., year after year secured the whole of the stock space available, which, of course, militated considerably against the development of the pastoral industry in our North-West. Freights have now increased considerably, and especially those for carriage of stock, but the State Shipping Service are not to blame for that, though they are blamed for it. The private shipping company's are charging equally high rates, which have been rendered necessary by increased cost of wages, increased cost generally of running the ships, and particularly the increased cost of coal.

Mr. Lutey: The rates would be much higher if the State steamers were not on the coast.

Mr. ANGELO: I am perfectly certain that if the "Bambra" had not been kept on that coast during the war, the North-West people would have suffered very severely through increased freights. The people of the North-West fully realise that they were specially favoured during the war in the matter of low freights. Those low freights were due, I consider, to the action of our State Government in keeping on that coast a policeman—this expression has been frequently used, but it is a very good one—in the form of the "Bambra," to ensure that freights were not unduly increased.

The Minister for Works: The "Bambra" is losing about £400 per trip through messing about Port Darwin.

Mr. ANGELO: I am coming to that. It is said that the Government cannot run ships, and that therefore we should get rid of the State Shipping Service. But I contend that the reason why the Government cannot run ships on this coast is that they have not the proper ships to run on the coast. I am confident that if the Government had suitable ships, such steamers as the Singapore line have, they could run a decent service and run it at reasonable cost.

Mr. Money: Why have not the Government got the right ships?

Mr. ANGELO: That is a question one may well ask. The Federal Government gave an increased service, in the hope of some trade being worked up with the Northern Territory. I say now, as I have said before during this session, that the State Government would do well to discontinue that service to the Northern Territory.

Mr. Teesdale: The day we do that, the Federal Government will take away the "Bambra."

Mr. ANGELO: That may be the reason why the service is being continued. I wish to emphasise the expression of my firm conviction that the State Shipping Service has so far proved unpayable not because the Government are unable to run the ships but simply because the ships they have are unsuitable.

Mr. Money: Why have we them, then?

Mr. ANGELO: Because, unfortunately, the right ships were not purchased when the service was inaugurated.

Mr. Money: Who purchased the ships?

Mr. Lutey: Perhaps some of the enemies of State trading concerns may have had a hand in it.

Mr. Marshall: And then the war came along.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Yes, and the member for Bunbury know that. He just wants to poke his nose in. Instead of making insinuation, why does he not get up and make statements openly?

Mr. Money: I made no insinuations.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Yes, you did.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Money: I have a perfect right to ask a civil question.

1½ o'clock midnight.

Mr. ANGELO: Let me emphasise the absolute necessity for the Government continuing the service along the North-West coast. At any time we may lose the Singapore boats, and then where shall we be? The whole of the development of the North-West will be stopped, and to re-establish a suitable shipping service will take months and months, possibly years. It is all very well to say that if the Government steamers went off the coast, the private shipping companies would come along. If that statement is well founded, I would like the Government to invite offers from the private shipping companies, so that we may know what they are prepared to do. If the companies are allowed to take over the North-West service, they should be allowed to do so only on conditions which will safeguard the development of the North-West and will prevent the raising of freights and fares to exorbitant figures. At the present time, we have the motor ship "Kangaroo." She seems to be fitted up in an excellent manner for carrying stock and may yet prove to be a good stock boat. She is untried, however, because she is only now on her first trip to Java and Singapore. Provided she can get into the port where stock is to be loaded, she should prove satisfactory. From her appearance and the opinion of marine men I have met in Fremantle, I consider she will be a serviceable boat but unfortunately she is about three knots too slow. We have lost the "Kwinana" which was an excellent stock boat and a very profitable one too. As to the "Bambra," at the present time there is no passenger boat that is being run in such an excellent manner along the Northern coast. She has become the most popular passenger boat on the coast. The present skipper and his officers do their utmost to make the passengers comfortable. They get every ounce that is possible out of the boat for the comfort of the passengers and in order to give the people the best available service. There are difficulties, however, which prove that she is unsuitable for the trade. Sometimes the "Bambra" leaves Fremantle two days before the s.s. "Minderoo." The captain and his officers are just as anxious to do the trip as quickly as possible as are those connected with any other vessel. Every time they go up the coast, they urge the agents at the various ports to expedite loading in and out of the ports. At Perth Hedland I have known the "Bambra" to arrive six hours before the "Minderoo" but she has had to anchor because there was not sufficient water available for her to cross the bar.

The Minister for Works: Am I to be held responsible because there is not sufficient water?

Mr. ANGELO: Of course not; I am merely pointing out the position which does arise

there. Because the "Minderoo" is not of such a draught as the "Bambra," she can berth. If such conditions are to continue, the position will remain unsatisfactory. This shows how those connected with the State Steamship Service, who are doing their utmost to make the service profitable, are hampered. I again urge upon the Government to do all that is possible, if they desire to continue the service, to put on at least one or two decent boats. If the Government provide such boats, those in control of the service will make a success of it. If the Government are determined to get rid of the steamship service, it is their duty to the North-West to see that a proper service is inaugurated under such strict conditions as will prevent the creation of any monopoly or overcharges in fares and freights.

Mr. Teesdale: They cannot do that.

Mr. ANGELO: If they cannot, then it is the duty of the Government to keep the service going and buy one or two good boats for the service.

Division put and passed.

Divisions—State Saw Mills, £568,987; Wyndham Freezing, Canning, and Meat Export Works, £264,630—agreed to.

Resolutions reported and the report adopted.

House adjourned at 10.6 a.m. (Thursday).

Legislative Council.

Thursday, 8th December, 1921.

	Page
Irish Agreement, Congratulations	2220
Select Committee: State Shipping Service, Extension of Time	2223
Question: Townsley, Walliston	2223
Papers: Esplanade Fair Grounds	2223
Bills: Constitution Further Amendment, 2r	2223
Grain, 2r.	2227
Gold Buyers, returned	2232
Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders, returned	2232
Bank Holidays Amendment, returned	2232
Stamp, Assembly's Message	2232
North Fremantle Rates Validation, 1r.	2232
Motion: Education Commission, Report	2232

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

IRISH AGREEMENT, CONGRATULATIONS.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [4.32]: With the