

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 31st October, 1929.

	PAGE
Assent to Bills	1278
Government Business, precedence	1278
Bills: Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, 32.	1278
Electoral Provinces, 32.	1278
Licensing Act Amendment, report	1279
Alsatian Dog, 22., referred to Select Committee	1279
Agricultural Products, returned	1287
Dried Fruits Act Continuance, returned	1287
High School Act Amendment, returned	1287
Land Tax and Income Tax, Com.	1287
Annual Estimates: Votes and items discussed	1290
Sale of Government Property Trust Account	1290
Appropriation Suspense Trust Account	1291
Chief Secretary's Department	1291
Aborigines	1300
Fisheries	1302
Registry and Friendly Societies, Gaols	1304
Harbour and Light and Jetties, Lunacy and Inebriates	1306
Observatory	1306
State Labour Bureau	1306
Education Department	1306

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

ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Lieut-Governor received and read notifying assent to the undermentioned Bills—

- 1, Water Boards Act Amendment.
- 2, Pearling Act Amendment.
- 3, Transfer of Land Act Amendment (No. 1).

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS PRECEDENCE.

THE PREMIER (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [4.35]: I move—

That for the remainder of the session Government business shall take precedence of all Notices and Orders of the Day on Wednesdays as well as on other sitting days.

I wish to give the usual assurance that ample opportunity will be given to members, who have private business on the Notice Paper, or who may bring business forward before the close of the session, to discuss it before we go into recess. There will be no attempt to burke discussion, or to hinder any private member from bringing forward and having considered any matter in which he is interested.

HON SIR JAMES MITCHELL (Northam) [4.36]: I have no objection to offer to the motion. There is very little business on the Notice Paper, and it would be quite

possible to clean it up during the next three weeks. I do not know how much more legislation the Government intend bringing down.

Hon. G. Taylor: You do not call these Orders of the Day, Bills?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Even small Bills sometimes require a good deal of discussion, and they ought to receive the attention of the House. I accept the assurance of the Premier that ample opportunity will be given to private members to discuss any business they may bring forward.

HON. G. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret) [4.37]: The Premier has given an assurance that private members will not in any way be handicapped by the passage of this motion. I am not doubting the Premier's statement, but in view of the attitude regarding a certain Bill, I fear that ample time may not be given in which to debate it. It may be crowded out. I refer to the Bill in the hands of the member for Toodyay (Mr. Lindsay). That is a most important measure.

The Premier: My remarks apply to everything on the Notice Paper.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I am satisfied the Premier will carry out his assurance, but I fear the Bill will be crowded out if we are not very careful.

MR. LINDSAY (Toodyay) [4.38]: It is not usual to offer any opposition to this motion. Of course the matter will be in the hands of the Premier. He has assured us that private members' business on the Notice Paper will be dealt with. I hope that will apply to the Bill in which I am particularly interested. On that understanding, I will support the motion.

Question put and passed.

BILL—AGRICUTURAL BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—ELECTORAL PROVINCES.

Third Reading.

Order of the day read for the third reading of the Bill,

Question put.

MR. SPEAKER: As the passing of the third reading of the Bill required an absolute majority, I order the division bells to be rung.

Bells rung, and a division taken with the following result:

Ayes	26
Noes	12
Majority for	14

AYES.

Mr. Cheson	Mr. Lutey
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Collier	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Millington
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Cowan	Mr. Pantou
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Rowe
Miss Holman	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Troy
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Lambers	Mr. Withers
Mr. Lamond	Mr. Wilson

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Mann	Mr. C. F. Wansbrough
Sir James Mitchell	Mr. North

(Teller.)

MR. SPEAKER: I declare that the question is resolved in the affirmative by an absolute majority.

Bill read a third time.

BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—ALSATIAN DOG.

Second Reading.—Referred to Select Committee.

Order of the Day read for the resumption of the debate from the previous day.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Will you wait a minute or two, Mr. Speaker? The member for Toodyay who wishes to reply has had to leave the Chamber for a moment.

[The member for Toodyay (Mr. Lindsay) returned to the Chamber.]

MR. SAMPSON: If the member for Toodyay is not quite ready, I shall speak for a few minutes.

The Premier: That is not in conformity with an arrangement entered into, which was that there was to be no discussion and that the member for Toodyay would reply to the debate.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The member for Toodyay has sent for his papers, and the member for Swan will speak until he is prepared to go on.

The Premier: Then that is quite all right; I did not understand.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [4.53]: The people of the State generally will be grateful to the member for Toodyay (Mr. Lindsay) for having introduced the Bill that is now before the House. The Alsatian wolfhound is a dog, the lack of virtue in which has been discussed frequently. Although I cannot claim any intimate knowledge of the subject, I have noted on many occasions references in the newspapers published in various parts of the world showing that the value of the Alsatian has been gravely questioned. The dangers associated with that breed of dog are so widely known that, from that standpoint alone, hon. members would be wise if they gave the Bill their support. It has been urged that the Alsatian is a valuable dog from the point of view of shepherding. On the other hand, our experience of the kelpie is such as to render the use of the Alsatian quite unnecessary. In those circumstances, there is not justification for special consideration for the latter breed. We will act in the best interests of those engaged in the production and care of stock if we agree to the Bill, in connection with which the member for Toodyay has furnished so much information, including references from so many foreign countries. The incidents disclosed have been, in the majority of instances, such as to prove that the Alsatian is a grave menace to safety. It has been claimed for it that it is a good watchdog and protector, and that, from the standpoint of the owner, its usefulness has been proved. Even on those grounds there is grave doubt disclosed in the instances quoted by the hon. member. It has been shown that on many occasions the owner of a dog has been the victim of injury through the bite of the Alsatian. I shall support the second reading of the Bill.

MR. LINDSAY (Toodyay—in reply) [4.55]: By way of interjection, the Premier indicated that an arrangement had been

arrived at regarding the debate on the Bill. I agree with his statement, but subsequently I spoke to the Government Whip, the member for Collie (Mr. Wilson), and suggested that the arrangement should be altered. In the circumstances, I was surprised when the Order of the Day was read. Nevertheless I shall proceed with my reply to the debate. The Minister for Works discussed the Bill on statements that had been supplied to him, and he did not speak in his usual style. He seemed to be quite at a loss in using the material with which he has been furnished.

Mr. Sampson: He was endeavouring to persuade himself.

Mr. LINDSAY: Since I have been a member of this Chamber, it has always been my policy to quote the name of any authority whose views I read. That was not done by the Minister for Works last night. In the course of his remarks, he said there were 25,000 Alsatian dogs in Great Britain and that they were increasing at the rate of between 700 and 800 a month, or 9,600 in the year. Some people ask why there should be any hurry in submitting legislation such as I have proposed. The figures quoted furnish one reason why the Bill should be agreed to as soon as possible. It is necessary for that course to be adopted so as to prevent the Alsatian dogs multiplying and spreading throughout the country districts. The Minister also referred to Colonel Richardson, whom he ridiculed as an authority. I am perfectly aware that that was not the Minister's idea; his remarks were based on statements supplied to him at a deputation by the secretary of the Alsatian Dog Club. I have endeavoured to procure all the information available on this subject, and I have searched the Parliamentary Library and the Perth Public Library. There are no books dealing with Alsatian dogs in the Public Library, I telephoned to every newspaper office and every bookseller in Perth in an endeavour to secure a copy of Horowitz's book on dogs. I find that I will have to send to the Eastern States for a copy if I wish to obtain one. I have been told that Mr. Snowden has a copy of the book. During the course of my second reading speech, I read passages from the catalogue issued by Mr. Snowden, in which he quoted certain statements in order to boost his own dogs. Those statements were taken from Mr. Horowitz's book on dogs. References were made to Colonel

Richardson's publications on dogs, and I had to send to Merredin in order to procure a copy of one of his books to show that he was not a breeder of Airedales. I will tell the House who Colonel Richardson is. The title of the book I am holding up is, "Watch-Dogs, Their Training and Management" and is by Lieut.-Col. E. H. Richardson, who is described as the late Commandant of the British War Dog School in the Great War, and author of "War, Police and Watch-dogs," and "British War Dogs." Surely such a man will be accepted as an authority. This man was appointed by the British Government to take charge of the British War Dog School during the war. He trained dogs for service in Germany and Russia. He trained collies and sent 20 of them to Russia during the war period. He is recognised as the best trainer of dogs in the world. Surely, when the advocates of the Alsatian endeavour to ridicule a man like Colonel Richardson and try to create the impression that he has no knowledge of the subject, we can only conclude that they will adopt any means to gain their ends. When I moved the second reading of the Bill, I quoted from Colonel Richardson's book and read extracts from Chapter 16 which is headed, "British versus German Police Dogs." He traces the history of the wolf. Hon. members heard what I read, and will any one of them say that such a man is not entitled to express an opinion regarding the Alsatian. As for Mr. Horowitz, whom Mr. Snowden himself quoted in the catalogue issued by the Kennel Club, I also quoted from Mr. Horowitz's book in which he dealt with the wolf and showed clearly that the Alsatis are descended from wolves. I have never said in the House anything I have not proved. I cannot say that for those opposing the Bill. The Minister for Works made a very peculiar statement. He started off by denying that these dogs were descended from wolves. Then he declared they were lupines and could not, in any circumstances, breed. Yet in almost the next sentence he declared that scientists contended that all dogs came from the wolf. If all dogs come from the wolf—they are lupines, while dogs are canines—how can the wolf be lupine while the dog is canine? The Minister, in making that statement, showed clearly that he had not been very successfully briefed. Since moving the second reading, I have been trying to col-

lect further information, particularly in reply to Mr. Snowden's circular. It is issued to every member of Parliament, and in purporting to quote from "Hansard" it deliberately misquotes me, and practically calls me a liar. I am beginning to think the author of this pamphlet is not at all a moderate, but has gone a long way towards settling his own case. This is what he says—

Combating Mr. Lindsay's comments during the second reading: In "Hansard," No. 11, Mr. Lindsay argues at considerable length in an effort to justify his Bill. He says, "Members will notice that this is a drastic measure." The Bill is certainly the most drastic of its kind ever presented to the House, and so far from being based on proven facts its foundation, upon close examination, is reduced mostly to hearsay, lies, "ifs," probabilities and possibilities.

That is rather a strong comment on what is reported in "Hansard." But has he attempted to prove his statement? I am prepared to say the same thing about him as he said about me, namely, that he has deliberately misquoted me. When moving the second reading, I dealt with a verbal report by a certain Minister for Agriculture, and I gave certain names. This is what Mr. Snowden says—

Quoting Mr. Cowan of South Australia, Mr. Lindsay says, "He is a cattle breeder, and has had a great deal of experience with dingoes." Maybe, but he has had no experience whatever with Alsations and, like many others, is quite prepared to sit back and calmly accept lies and half-truths as facts.

I said no such thing. That Mr. Cowan is a South Australian, I agree. But the man I was quoting was the Minister for Agriculture in Queensland, not Mr. Cowan at all. Yet Mr. Snowden, purporting to quote from "Hansard," most deliberately misquotes me in that statement. I repeat that it was not Mr. Cowan I was quoting, but the Minister for Agriculture in Queensland. Mr. Snowden continues—

Mr. Lindsay quotes the case of the daughter of the New South Wales Minister for Agriculture, who was said to have been attacked by an Alsation.

I did nothing of the kind. I quoted the chairman of the conference, who is the Minister for Agriculture in Victoria.

Mr. Richardson: The author of that pamphlet should wear spectacles.

Mr. LINDSAY: I should think so. He goes on to say—

Mr. Lindsay says, "I do not know what they are doing about Alsations in South Australia or Victoria." No, nor in New South Wales either. In the latter State Sir Joynton Smith, Judge Montgomery, and Mr. Hamilton, K.O., having formed themselves into a League for the Defence of Alsations are presenting the Government with a very strong petition from the people of Australia and asking the Government to conduct a most exhaustive investigation before blindly passing any legislation.

I have read to the House a letter from the secretary of the Graziers' Association of New South Wales, informing me that they are going to amend the Pastoralists' Protection Act in New South Wales to deal with the situation this session. Then we have this choice one by Mr. Snowden—

Mr. Lindsay refers to a Lieut.-Colonel Robertson whom he quotes as an authority (page 1004 "Hansard" No. 11). Presumably he means Lieut.-Colonel Richardson, (for there is no such person by the name of Robertson).

I did not mention Mr. Robertson's name. I quoted extracts from this book by Colonel Richardson. Mr. Snowden goes on trying to ridicule me, and to ridicule also Colonel Richardson. He says—

We have already combated Colonel Richardson's statement and proved that he is purely and simply a dealer in Airedales. His address, if Mr. Lindsay does not know it, is Carnoustie, Scotland. As a breeder of Airedales, which is his everyday business, his bias is easy to understand.

He would ridicule Colonel Richardson, but I ask could anybody in his senses hold that Colonel Richardson is not an authority? Then Mr. Snowden goes on to say that I quoted the "Californian Woolgrower" as stating that the Commonwealth of Australia had just passed a law forbidding the importation of the German shepherd dog. Next he goes on to relate the story the Minister for Works told last night, contending that they are lupines. Yet Colonel Richardson, in his book, shows that even at the present day the cross is being made in the zoos in Germany.

Mr. Richardson: What is a lupine?

Mr. LINDSAY: Here is another of these statements—and I intend to challenge a number of them that Mr. Snowden has made in his pamphlet. I have been in touch with some of the gentlemen alluded to. If I can prove that Mr. Snowden's statements

are incorrect and false, surely members will agree that my case is right and Mr. Snowden's wrong. Mr. Snowden says—

No statement is made hereunder which cannot be amply proved to your entire satisfaction, despite the voluminous but grossly unjust criticisms that have been levelled at this world-famous sheep dog, interspersed by untold lies which, though perhaps not deliberate, are yet nothing more than cruel untruths bred of sheer ignorance.

This man in his pamphlet quotes Captain Von Stephanitz as being recognised as "the greatest dog authority in the world." I am not prepared to say that he is not. The very quotation I made from Lieut.-Colonel Richardson's book alluded to Captain Von Stephanitz as having been instrumental in forming the first Alsatian or German Shepherd Dog Club in Germany. Does not that prove that Colonel Richardson has been quite exhaustive in his investigation? He has quoted two authorities, Herr Meyer and Captain Von Stephanitz as being the two men who started the Alsatian Club in Germany. Now we come to the last and worst part of it all. In Mr. Snowden's pamphlet we find this—

Mr. McCabe, Kellerherrin, says, "I am extremely pleased with my Alsatian's work with sheep and I consider him the best sheep dog I have ever had."

The night before last I rang up Mr. McCabe and asked him if he had an Alsatian. He said he had. I asked him was it pure bred, and he said, "Yes, with a pedigree as long as you arm." He then informed me that he had castrated the animal. I asked him why, and he said because he did not think it was the class of dog to have breeding with other dogs in an agricultural district. I read out that statement from the pamphlet to him, and he declared that never at any time had he said such a thing. He added that he could not send his dog out amongst sheep as he would another dog, because the animal worked too closely and too roughly. The dog was all right for yarding sheep, he said, provided that he, Mr. McCabe, took a stick with which to control him. That is the reply to that statement in the pamphlet.

Hon. G. Taylor: That is deadly.

Mr. LINDSAY: I have here another statement.

The Minister for Mines: I do not know where you get all these statements. I have not even had a copy of the pamphlet.

Mr. LINDSAY: Well every other member has had one. Here is another statement from Mr. Snowden's pamphlet—

R. H. Wallace, Tootra Station, Moora, says, "My Alsatian is quite a pal with a couple of pet lambs, and they drink together out of the same dish. The Alsatian is fully grown."

Mr. Ferguson, the member for Moore, sent a telegram to Mr. Wallace, asking if this were true and this is the reply from Mr. Wallace—

Alsatian as a paddock worker for Australian conditions useless. Mine failed at this, but very good worker in sheep yard. In my opinion there are very few men in Australia to-day capable of breaking in an Alsatian for sheep work, even if they were workers.

That is Mr. Wallace's reply. I have not had time to get replies to all these statements, but does it not prove that Mr. Snowden is not telling the truth when I can show that in two instances? Certainly he is not telling the truth. But why should I have to go through the lot? I have here another telegram, from Mr. Arkell, of Mil-ling, as follows—

Endeavoured eight months train Alsatian work sheep. Result absolute failure. Reason, destroy treacherous savage nature towards my own children.

Yet Mr. Snowden tells us that they are sheep workers. I have given two illustrations, those of Mr. McCabe and Mr. Wallace, who say the Alsations can be used for yarding sheep. But I can go and pick up any kangaroo dog and use him for yarding sheep! And Mr. McCabe of Kellerherrin declares that even when using that Alsatian for yarding sheep he has to take a stick to control the animal. Mr. McCabe also tells me that the dog goes with him in a motor truck, and that when the animal is left in charge of the truck no person dares go near it, for fear of being torn to pieces. I may also tell the House that Mr. Wallace's dog, as well as Mr. McCabe's dog, has been sterilised. Why have these owners in country districts done that? Mr. McCabe said it was because the Alsatian was not a dog he would leave to breed with other dogs in an agricultural district. That is why. Yet the interested men opposing the Bill dare to quote Mr. McCabe as being wholly in favour of Alsations. I cannot understand the attitude of some members towards this measure. I have here a letter from the Road Boards Association, to which much

more consideration should have been given than is deserved by the secretary of the Alsatian Club—

25th October, 1929. I acknowledge the receipt of copy of "Hansard" relative to your introduction of the Alsatian Dog Bill, and I thank you for same. I express the gratitude of the executive committee to you for so exhaustively opening up the subject and submitting facts of an undeniable character in support of the Bill. I trust the Bill will be enacted in the form you have introduced it. Appreciating your efforts in the matter. E. H. Rosman, Secretary, Road Board Association of Western Australia.

The Minister referred to the Canine Association, which body he endeavoured to ridicule. He made a statement that it was now defunct. I have devoted two or three hours to attempting to find the secretary, but have not succeeded. Anyhow, I know that that organisation appointed a committee whose members possessed 25 to 35 years' colonial and international experience. They are dog-lovers, men whose aim is to improve the breed of dogs. I do not believe that their relation with the Royal Agricultural Society was as was represented by the Minister for Works. I intend to refer to the Toodyay case, with which the Minister for Works dealt in his speech. He said it had been proved conclusively that the dog there concerned was a retriever. He said the files showed that it was a retriever. I am a member of the advisory board, which is an honorary position, and which accounts for my introducing the Bill, and I know all about the Toodyay affair and certainly considerably more than the Minister knows. I know nearly as much about it as does Mr. Snowden, the honorary secretary of the Alsatian Club. Mr. Snowden, in his circular, says that several reputable gentlemen went to Toodyay. Who were the several gentlemen? There were two, one of them Mr. Snowden himself and the other a reporter representing "Truth." They were the several reputable gentlemen.

The Minister for Works: I dealt with the letter on the file.

Mr. LINDSAY: I maintain that if an investigation was necessary it should not have been made by Mr. Snowden.

The Minister for Works: Without the file I cannot tell you who made the investigation.

Mr. LINDSAY: Mr. Snowden said that several gentlemen went to Toodyay and proved conclusively that the dog concerned

was not an Alsatian, and that even the owner of the dog agreed. Mr. Lukin had 51 sheep killed by the dog, and he still says the dog was a crossbred Alsatian. So far from its having been a retriever—well, I shall give its pedigree. I have no proof that it was an Alsatian, but when Mr. Snowden said that several reputable gentlemen went to Toodyay to investigate, why did he not say who they were? I do not say that Mr. Snowden is not a reputable gentleman, but he did infer that several gentleman had made the investigation. Mr. Snowden himself was one and I believe the other was his brother. The report stated:—

No so long ago the "Daily News," Perth, had half a column report on alleged "Sheep killing by an Alsatian" at Toodyay. A day or so later, however, when several reputable gentlemen left Perth for Toodyay and conducted a thorough investigation, it was definitely proved that the dog concerned was not an Alsatian. The report, copies of which can be duly handed to every member of the House, was duly sent on to the Secretary to the Prime Minister's Department, Canberra, who noted the contents. Letter on exhibit, together with signed statements by those concerned.

I maintain that Mr. Snowden was biased at the outset and should not have been allowed to make the investigation.

Hon. G. Taylor: Was he sent up by the Alsatian Club?

Mr. LINDSAY: No.

Hon. G. Taylor: Who sent him up?

Mr. LINDSAY: An officer of the department should have been sent. The Minister for Works inferred that Mr. Snowden said the dog was a retriever.

The Minister for Works: I think it was a pure bred mongrel.

Mr. LINDSAY: The Minister said it was a retriever. I cannot accept this man as an expert on dogs when he designates as a retriever the progeny of a kangaroo bitch and a cross between a staghound and a greyhound. I have the names of the parties who were interested in the dog. The owner was Mr. Delaney, of Toodyay; the sheep were owned by Mr. Lukin. Thirty-one sheep were killed at the time and 20 died on the following day. Mr. Lukin followed the dog and shot it. He said it was an Alsatian cross. Even now I am not satisfied that there was not some Alsatian blood in the dog, but I did not mention that case when I spoke because I could not prove that the dog had Alsatian blood. However, the Minister for Works and Mr. Snowden have

brought up that matter, the information having been given to the Minister by Mr. Snowden. Mr. A. W. Thompson, of Wagin, bred the mother of the dog and Mr. Burnett, of Moora, bred the father. Yet we are told by the Minister that the dog was a retriever.

The Minister for Works: I used the information that was on the file.

Mr. LINDSAY: And what was on the file, I assume, was put there by Mr. Snowden.

The Minister for Works: It was put there by the Premier.

Mr. LINDSAY: But the Premier did not go to Toodyay; it was Mr. Snowden that went there.

The Minister for Works: Everybody is wrong but you.

Mr. LINDSAY: If Mr. Snowden said the dog was a retriever, I think I have proved conclusively that he was wrong.

The Minister for Works: I did not state that he said it was a retriever.

Mr. LINDSAY: I have quoted many authorities; I have dealt with the matter exhaustively and I think I have proved my case. I did not intend to speak to-night because I thought it had been arranged that the debate should not be continued, but I have at least had an opportunity to reply to some of the statements made. In this matter I have the backing of the whole of the organisations connected with agricultural and pastoral production in Australia. Every organisation of the kind in Western Australia has requested me to introduce this Bill and is supporting me. It is an urgent matter and I desire to have the Bill passed into law. I do not think that a select committee would be able to obtain one iota of additional evidence, or that it would accomplish any good. It would only be able to peruse the evidence that I have presented to the House. It could take the stuff that Mr. Snowden has put up, but he is the honorary secretary of the Alsatian Club and is directly interested. Mr. Snowden has issued a challenge to the following effect:—

I hereby challenge Mr. Lindsay that if he can prove his assertions, as stated in the House, that the Alsatian is a wolf, I will donate £25 to any charity he cares to name, the conditions being that he appoint a committee to write to any six of the best dog authorities in the world and take the majority of opinion. A cheque for this amount will be put up by me personally, not any club, to be held by any reputable person or body he may choose. Could anything be more fair, I ask you?

I have endeavoured to find all the authorities in the world. There are only two books in the English language that I have been able to find, those of Lt.-Colonel Richardson and Mr. Horowitz. Mr. Snowden himself has the book of Mr. Horowitz, and I challenge him for a sum of £25 to produce the book and show that the statement I quoted from the book is not contained in it. That should be sufficient to prove whether or not the Alsatian is descended from the wolf. I cannot agree to any proposal to refer the Bill to a select committee. I intend to stand or fall by the Bill. If the House appoints a select committee, I shall be willing to take part on it, but it is time the House was given an opportunity to show whether it favours this measure.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

To refer to Select Committee.

MR. CLYDESDALE (Canning) [5.25]: I move—

That the Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

MR. LINDSAY (Toodyay) [5.26]: I have given my reasons why the Bill should not be referred to a select committee, and therefore I intend to oppose the motion. I do not think it possible for a select committee to collect any evidence that is not available to us to-day. I have presented the matter exhaustively to the House and have quoted authorities, and I am desirous that the Bill should become law. Therefore I ask members who favour the Bill to vote against the appointment of a select committee. I intend to divide the House on the motion.

THE PREMIER (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [5.27]: I am astonished at the statement of the hon. member. By an agreement with him last evening I decided to postpone 16 Orders of the Day to afford an opportunity to discuss the matter. It was a clear and distinct understanding with the hon. member that he would agree to the Bill being referred to a select committee. In the many years I have been in this House, I have never known a member to make an arrangement with the Leader of the House and then go back upon it in this manner. It is a most contemptible thing to do. The hon. member misled me. I should never

have postponed the business of the House to permit discussion as I have done had it not been for the distinct understanding and agreement I had with the hon. member that the Bill should be referred to a select committee. Now he stands up in his place and asks members to vote against the select committee and says he will divide the House on the question. I will never again take the hon. member's word in this House or out of it. If the motion be defeated, I shall regard myself as absolved from the promise I gave this afternoon to provide an opportunity for the discussion of the Bill, as well as of private members' business.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You cannot do that.

Hon. G. Taylor: No.

The PREMIER: I shall consider myself absolved from the promise, because the hon. member has broken his word and departed from the understanding and arrangement made with me. I can promise him that everything I can do to block the passage of the Bill through the House will be done, in view of the attitude he has taken.

Mr. Teesdale: But you cannot break your word.

The PREMIER: I have never heard of such a thing in all my life.

HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL (Northam) [5.29]: The Premier cannot go back on the word he gave to the House to-day, and I know he will not do so. It seems to me we have reached the stage when we must regard the Alsatian as a serious menace to the stock of the country. We have 600 of these dogs against 8,000,000 sheep, but we want to do justice to all concerned and ascertain the precise truth about the dog. I am satisfied that a select committee could ascertain the facts, and if necessary the House could sit a little longer in order to deal with the question. So far as I can judge, there will be no time to deal with the matter before the adjournment; therefore, the appointment of a select committee will not answer the purpose. What could be done, if the hon. member would agree to it, would be to appoint a Commission to inquire and meanwhile pass some legislation that would prohibit the sale or gift of any Alsatian until the matter has been finally determined. So far I have taken no part in the discussion, but from what I can judge from the excellent handling of the subject

by the member for Toodyay and the reply by the Minister for Works, who, of course, is possessed of knowledge imparted to him by people who handle the dog—

The Minister for Works: I made that clear.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Quite so, but the Minister's argument is not quite so convincing as it would have been had he possessed actual experience of the dog. The whole question is too serious to be dealt with lightly. We realise that we have sufficient pests in the country already, and that if we want sheep dogs we have enough breeds in the country to give us all the sheep dogs we require—dogs that are perfectly safe. We all favour safety when it comes to voting on the question. The session ought not to be brought to a close until the select committee has finished its work. Until the matter is finally dealt with, we should take steps to prevent the sale of these dogs and any increase in their number. I know nothing about them, but I have heard the discussion in the House and heard what has been read from the authorities who have been quoted. I am in doubt about the usefulness of this animal, and my vote will have to be given against the dogs. I suppose that is the position of most members and we shall play for safety. Can we arrange for the inquiry, and can we have it made in time to save the situation? It is not a situation that permits of delay. I am sorry there has been a misunderstanding between the Premier and the member for Toodyay.

The Premier: There is no misunderstanding on my part.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I am certain the Premier believes he is right. That is proved by the fact that he postponed the consideration of 16 items on the Notice Paper to reach this one.

The Premier: Why, otherwise, should I postpone all those items in order to have this one brought forward?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Will the Premier not agree that we must deal with the situation before we adjourn? If we appoint a select committee it will have to get down to work very quickly.

The Premier: That is why I had the matter brought up to-day. I want the select committee to have as much time as possible to deal with it, and the House to have as much time as possible to deal with the re-

port of the select committee. That is why I brought this Order of the Day up to where it is.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Then the Premier thinks that ample opportunity will be given to deal with the situation. Perhaps the member for Toodyay (Mr. Lindsay) will accept that assurance. There has been a misunderstanding, and I am sorry it has occurred. I think we can now deal with the matter, and allow the select committee to be appointed. This question must be settled before we adjourn.

Personal Explanation.

Mr. Lindsay and the Premier.

MR. LINDSAY (Toodyay) [5.33]: I wish to make a personal explanation. The Premier is correct in his statement. We did come to an agreement last night. To-day, however, when discussing the matter with members I decided that as other members desired to speak on this question I could not adhere to the arrangement that had been made. I spoke to the member for Collie (Mr. Wilson) the Government Whip, and asked him to convey this information to the Premier. It will have been noticed that I was not in my place when this Order of the Day was brought up, and that I had no papers with me even when I did enter the Chamber. The Premier is quite right. It appears now that the Premier was not informed of the altered arrangement. I should not have set up any opposition to the appointment of a select committee, but I thought the member for Collie would have conveyed my message to the Premier. I now see there has been a misunderstanding. I agree that every word the Premier has said is right. My desire was to have the Bill postponed. I was going to fight the appointment of a select committee. I acknowledge that I am in the wrong, and I withdraw my opposition to the appointment of a select committee.

MR. WILSON (Collie) [5.34]: The member for Toodyay (Mr. Lindsay) at the very moment when the House was about to meet requested me to inform the Premier that he did not intend to carry out his promise with regard to what he said last night. That is all I know about the matter. I had to get my 26 members together here to vote in connection with another Bill, and I had enough on my hands to do that.

Debate resumed

MR. ANGELO (Gascoyne) [5.35]: I am glad the storm has passed away. This is a most important matter. I represent a pastoral community to whom this menace may prove very serious if it is allowed to continue. I am pleased that the member for Canning (Mr. Clydesdale) at the instance of the Premier has moved for the appointment of a select committee. I am also grateful to the Premier for his assurance that the work of the select committee will be completed and if possible the necessary legislation passed this session. I shall vote for the appointment of the select committee.

HON. G. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret) [5.36]: We have had a great deal of experience of the reports of select committees of this House, but I fail to see what chance this one will have of meeting with any success in its investigations. I do not know whom the member for Canning has in mind to call as witnesses. I venture to say that Mr. Snowden will be one of them. He has put up the case from his point of view. He is the secretary of the Western Australian Alsatian Club. He has put forward all he knows in favour of the dog, of which he is a breeder. He is the man who supplied the Minister for Works with the case he put up last night. The member for Toodyay has quoted other authorities from bound volumes. Unfortunately we cannot get at the writers of those volumes. The select committee can only question the accuracy of the volumes. What are members of that body going to do? They will question Mr. Snowden, and doubtless someone else who went up with Mr. Snowden to Toodyay to determine whether such and such a dog was an Alsatian or not. The member for Toodyay will produce his volumes, and probably will endeavour to get the book now in the possession of Mr. Snowden. If Mr. Snowden will not lend the book to the select committee, the committee may go to Victoria where the book can be seen. That may be in the mind of the hon. member who moved for the appointment of this select committee. He may intend to take evidence in Victoria where the book is.

Mr. Clydesdale: Before the Melbourne Cup is run.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: He will not have time to do that. I think the select committee will

do nothing but examine witnesses we already know about.

The Minister for Railways: We have had two people calling each other liars. That is all.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Yes. Mr. Snowden has put up his case. It is the best he could put up for the business he is running. If the Government sent him up to Toodyay to decide whether the dog in question was an Alsatian or not it is a scandal.

The Premier: The Government did not send anybody to Toodyay.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: That is the rumour.

The Premier: Who spread the rumour?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: It is on the file.

The Premier: The file does not say the Government sent him up.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: It is reported they did.

The Premier: It has not been so reported.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The Premier has not listened to what was said.

The Premier: I did listen. I know.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Does the Premier know who sent him up?

The Premier: No. He went himself. Who would send him?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Self interest drove him up there to protect the class of dogs he is breeding?

The Premier: Of course.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The Premier accepts that statement as authoritative?

The Premier: Who said I was accepting anything?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The Minister for Works accepted it.

The Minister for Works: I did nothing of the kind.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: But he quoted the whole of the statement. It was the burden of his speech. He quoted from the documents which have been sent to all those who were thought to be opposed to the dog, and in favour of sheep raising in this country. The people who are protecting our flocks of sheep received these documents, and those who are protecting the dogs have no interest in them.

The Premier: Who is protecting the dogs? It is only a dog who said that.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: That is all very well.

Question put and passed.

Select Committee Appointed.

Ballot taken, and a committee appointed consisting of Mr. Coverley, Mr. Lindsay, Mr. Sleeman, Mr. Teesdale and the mover, with power to call for persons and papers, and to sit on days over which the House stands adjourned, to report on the 7th November.

BILLS (3)—RETURNED

1, Agricultural Products.

2, Dried Fruits Act Continuance.

With amendments.

3, High School Act Amendment.

Without amendment.

BILL—LAND TAX AND INCOME TAX.

In Committee.

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

Clause 1—agreed to.

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

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of Subclause (1), "two-pence" be struck out with the view of inserting "one penny" in lieu.

I stated my reasons on the second reading. Under the Financial Agreement we are obtaining many advantages, one of them being the payment by the Federal Government of our sinking fund for 56 years. Last year that payment amounted to £95,000, or just about half the amount collected by way of land tax. The Western Australian people must pay to the Federal Government, in some shape or form, that amount: the Federal Government do not pay on our account anything that is not first collected by them from our people. If the State of Western Australia is relieved of a payment, the Western Australian people should be similarly relieved. The payment of sinking fund will not continue for the full 56 years; but for a number of years that payment by the Federal Government will represent a substantial relief.

Mr. LATHAM: I hope the Premier will accept the amendment. Last evening the Country Party had a lecture from the hon. gentleman on the subject of alleged misrep-

resentations made by them in country districts.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member had better say those things on a personal explanation. I do not want the Premier replying on the same plane.

Mr. LATHAM: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Chairman. I may take an opportunity later to deal with the latitude allowed to members in this Chamber. In view of the case made out by the Leader of the Opposition, the country people should have their taxation reduced.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The Government argue that they have not increased the rate of taxation, and that this Bill does not increase it either: but taxation on city and suburban lands is heavier now than it was five or six years ago. Then I was paying 2s. 6d. tax in respect of the land on which my house stands; I am now paying 7s. 6d.

The Premier: My tax went up from half-a-crown to 10s.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: If the Premier thinks the tax too high, he will accept the amendment. However, I suppose that as Treasurer he needs the money. When he was Leader of the Opposition, the hon. gentleman argued that there should be more economy and less taxation. In view of the revenue being received, he should be able to extend some little consideration to the man on the land.

Mr. SAMPSON: I hope the amendment will be carried. The Treasurer has got used now to the idea of the land tax being doubled, and even regards the doubling as something virtuous. However, when proposing to double the tax he expressed regret for the necessity. In addition to doubling the tax, he has caused the deletion of exemptions.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are not now discussing exemptions.

The Premier: That comes under the Assessment Act.

Mr. SAMPSON: The attitude of the Treasurer in respect of taxation presents a remarkable study in psychology. Whereas at first he looked with what appeared to be sincere horror on the incidence of taxation, when he became Treasurer he doubled the land tax, and to-day it would appear that he has taken the principle to his breast as one of his best and most cherished ideals.

The Premier: As a matter of fact, I did not look upon taxation with horror. I supported the Leader of the Opposition when

he introduced taxation proposals in his capacity as Premier.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Your memory is bad!

Mr. SAMPSON: At any rate, it is an interesting psychological study.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I would remind the hon. member that there is no question of psychology under consideration, but an amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Premier can now see virtue in retaining this excessive tax, which has been more than doubled because of the incessant increase in respect of land valuation. Favourable consideration should be given to the amendment proposed by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. BROWN: I support the amendment. It is because of the new assessments that the land tax appears to be so high. Land that was formerly valued at 10s. is now 25s. an acre. I know of land upwards of seven miles away from a railway that is valued at £2 5s. and £2 10s. an acre. That means that the owner of such freehold land will have to face that increased burden for ever, in addition to other taxation. The road boards accept the Taxation Department's valuations, so that the farmer is similarly affected under that heading.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I think the road boards are foolish if they do that.

Mr. BROWN: We know that local governing authorities like to get as much revenue as they can. It is well known that men who have, in fact, no income at all are still required to pay the excessive land tax. That is unfair, because the people are not in a position to pay it. That has been due to the increased land values. The Premier made a great mistake when he decided to increase land tax and reduce the income tax. The man who has an income is in the best position to pay. If the Government agreed to the amendment, it would give general satisfaction. There are many appeals against the assessments made by the Taxation Department, and in some instances the people concerned have had to approach the banks for financial assistance to enable them to pay the tax in order that they may appeal against their assessments.

The PREMIER: I can assure hon. members it is no pleasure to me to impose taxation. I join with them in a desire for a reduction, but, as Treasurer, I am driven by the exigencies of the financial position, not

by my wishes. Unfortunately, the position to-day is such that the Government cannot propose a reduction in taxation, unless we are willing to have a balance on the wrong side of the ledger. I do not believe anyone desires that, but that is the position. I cannot undertake to get through unless I am able to collect the full amount of taxation that was received last year. The member for Pingelly complained about the increases in land valuations, but the land owners, both in the city and in the country, should be pleased and should not complain on that score. For years past they have had the advantage of paying taxation on valuations much below the real worth of their properties. It is true that in some instances the increases may represent 100 per cent. or 200 per cent., but all that it amounts to is that while they were paying on a valuation of 10s. per acre, the land owners were escaping taxation because the value of their land was really 30s. per acre. That means that the value of their land increased many years before the valuations were increased by the Taxation Department. During the interim the land owners benefited considerably. They have paid a smaller tax than should have been paid, and therefore they should not now complain because of the increased valuations. I have not heard any suggestion that the valuations are unfair!

Mr. Brown: Why, there are dozens of appeals from my small district!

The PREMIER: But that does not prove that the valuers were wrong! People will always appeal against anything, especially any proposed increase in taxation, quite apart from the merits of the issue.

Mr. Sampson: Most of the complaints are in respect of the rate.

The PREMIER: I do not know that that is so, because the valuation of land has gone up more than the rate. The report of the Commissioner of Taxation for the year ended 30th June, 1929, shows that there has been an increase in the valuation of country land of £6,667,276. It has increased from £8,982,719 to £15,649,995. In respect of city and suburban land, there has been an increase in valuation of £6,347,285. Those increases bring in added revenue.

Mr. Sampson: Then you are supporting the Leader of the Opposition

The PREMIER: No. Although we secure that increased revenue, there comes, year by year, increased expenditure for the work of government in all directions. It may be

pointed out that we now receive double the amount we secured five or six years ago.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: More like five times the amount!

The PREMIER: No, the hon. member has mistaken the figures; I have them here. For the year 1923-24, the last year he was Treasurer, he received £71,000, whereas last year the amount received was £196,000. That is about 2½ times as much.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: And you will receive £210,000 this year, which is about three times the amount.

The PREMIER: Yes, but the State's responsibilities and expenditure have increased, too. I am sorry that the position of the finances does not enable the Government to agree to any reduction in the taxation.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I am disappointed at the attitude the Premier has taken up in regard to this, for I thought he would have agreed to the amendment. We all understand the position quite clearly. We have doubled the land tax, imposed the vermin tax, and the valuations of land have been increased. So, of course, the actual tax has been considerably increased, and the time is ripe for a reduction. Naturally, since land was sold a few years ago at a policy price that did not by any means represent its value, the value of the land had to increase as we progressed. So it followed that the land had to be revalued. The Premier has told the people from time to time that it was I who was responsible for the revaluation. As a matter of fact, in the Taxation Department revaluing is going on all the time.

The Premier: That is only fair.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, but it is not fair for the Premier to tell the people that I have been responsible for the increased valuations, and consequently the increased taxation.

The Premier: Did I say that?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Well, you have led the people to believe that. Rightly, the Premier said to-night that if the returns from the land become greater, the value of the land is enhanced, and so the rating values must be increased. All will admit that we must get value for what we spend or part with. Money has become

tighter, perhaps because we are not going to get so much for our produce in the coming year as we have been getting in the past. Perhaps it is good to anticipate trouble, but certainly it would be better still if we were to endeavour to curtail our imports, at all events until the outlook improves. I urge the Premier to let us have that £99,000. A little later on I will talk about the £360,000, but for the moment we want him to take off that £99,000.

Amendment (that "twopence" be struck out) put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	15
Noes	14

Majority for .. 1

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Barzard	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Brown	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Davy	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Latham	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. C. P. Wansbrough
Mr. Mann	Mr. North
Sir James Mitchell	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Chesson	Mr. Lamond
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Munie
Mr. Collier	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Troy
Mr. Cowan	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Withers
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Willson
	(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYE.	No.
Mr. George	Mr. Lutey
Mr. Stubbs	Miss Holman
Mr. J. H. Smith	Mr. Coverley
Mr. Doney	Mr. Johnson
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Rowe
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Panton
Mr. Thomson	Mr. Kenneally

Amendment thus passed.

Progress reported.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1929-30.

In Committee of Supply.

Resumed from the 29th October; Mr. Lambert in the Chair. The Premier in charge of the votes.

Vote—Sale of Government Property Trust Account, £154,935:

HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL (Northam) [7.43]: I asked the Premier the other day if there were any trust fund in this account, and he gave me to understand there was none. So that part of it is quite all right. We had £711,000 in this account last year, and we used £184,000. This year we propose to use £154,000 of this amount, leaving in the account £373,000. Under the Financial Agreement this method of dealing with the sales of Government property was abandoned, and now returns from the sales can be paid into revenue. I think some of them are paid into a trust account in another form. But that is the position: we are no longer required to add to this fund.

The Premier: There will be no more payments into it.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: All the same, I think this is the proper way to deal with sales of Government property. However, if the Committee decide otherwise, in future it will no longer be done. The Premier is using this fund freely for work that ought to be charged to revenue. There were many items last year and there are many this year that are straight out revenue items. The Premier used £174,000 last year and proposes to use £150,000 this year. I suppose we can say that the Premier was £184,000 wrong last year and only £150,000 wrong this year, but there is no question that it is wrong. I do not know what will happen when this fund peters out. It ought to be used carefully and, if the money be derived from sales on account of loan expenditure, it should be credited to loan. So far from doing that, however, we are reconditioning jetties and doing all sorts of things that ought not to be done with the money. I noticed in connection with the discussion of the Main Roads Act Amendment Bill in another place last evening the Minister stated that the amount to be collected from the local authorities for 1927-28 and 1928-29 would be collected during the next 30 years in addition to the percentage of license fees that would be deducted under the new scheme. We are to abandon the system of allocations that has been operating and substitute a new scheme based on a percentage of the license fees collected.

The Premier: We are asked to strike out the three years' arrears.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Government have struck out the 1926-27

allocations, but if they struck out those for 1927-28 and 1928-29—

The Premier: I could have charged the local authorities for 1926-27.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It was a very small amount.

The Premier: So small that they would not pay it.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I hope they will not pay it. For each of the two years up to the passing of the new legislation, £39,000 will be paid. It is quite right that the local authorities should pay that sum. Then we come to another arrangement in 1929. The Minister in another place produced something of a bombshell when he said that for the next 30 years the £39,000 would be collected. It was an accumulating amount. £11,000 one year, £27,000 another year, and so on.

The Premier: It was increasing every year as new roads were declared main roads.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes. The Minister in another place said there was a million of money at stake. The sum is £1,150,000 for the 30 years, but the point I wish to make is that the local authorities and this House having agreed to substitute the percentage of license fees, the old arrangement should cease. If the Government intend to add £39,000 a year for 30 years to the amount to be deducted from license fees, they are doing wrong and this House would never have agreed to it. The member for Toodyay asked the Minister about the matter by way of question this afternoon and the Minister asked that the question be postponed until the next sitting. I do not know why the Minister desired postponement, because it is a simple matter to say whether we were under a misapprehension when we passed that measure or whether the £39,000 a year should be added to the amount of the license fees to be deducted. I have no wish to hold up the Estimates and there is not much object in doing so, but unless we can get some satisfactory reply, I propose to move that we reduce the item, "Recoup to Main Roads Board," by £500. It is a serious matter to local authorities, as the Premier will readily understand, if in passing the measure we have made a mistake. Can the Premier tell us it is not the wish of the Government that the measure should be interpreted as it is being interpreted in another place? If so, he can have it amended.

The Premier: I cannot tell you.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It seems to me to be such a simple matter. First we appointed a select committee and then we dealt with a Bill in this House and substituted the new system of deductions from license fees, thinking that we were wiping out the past arrangement. I am sure that the Premier thought so himself; everybody did. Otherwise the Bill would not have been passed. Taking up this morning's paper, it was very disquieting to read the remarks of the Chief Secretary. Goodness knows where taxation will stop if we go on at this rate! Has the Premier any information to give us?

The Premier: I am sorry I cannot give you any information. The Minister for Works who would be able to give the information is not here.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Was not the member for Toodyay chairman of the select committee?

The Premier: He was a member of the select committee.

Mr. Clydesdale: The Minister for Works was chairman.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is a serious matter. If another place passes the Bill and the effect of it is what it is said to be, money will be taken out of the pockets of the local authorities in a manner to which we have never consented. I do not know whether any member who served on the select committee can give us information. When we meet on Tuesday next, I hope we shall be informed of the position.

Hon. G. Taylor: Is there any other member who can give us information?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I suppose we shall be able to get the information on Tuesday next, but this is our opportunity to reduce the item.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the Leader of the Opposition desire to move for a reduction of the item.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: No.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Appropriation Suspense Trust Account, £700,000—agreed to.

Department of Chief Secretary (Hon. J. M. Drew. Minister—Hon. H. Millington in charge of the votes).

Vote—Chief Secretary, £16,429:

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [7.58]: Last year I gave some information with regard to the jute mills in operation in the San Quentin prison, California, and suggested in view of the large quantity of bags used in this State that the question of installing similar machinery in the Fremantle Prison should be considered. There is no industry of the kind in this State and the setting up of such mills would have no ill effect on labour here, but would permit of labour not being used at present to be utilised for the benefit of the State. I have always considered it a sad reflection on the wisdom of many civilised peoples that while men are held in prison suffering punishment for their misdeeds, they are held at the cost of the people who observe the law and carry out their duty to themselves and their fellow citizens. Realising the great difficulty of finding work for prisoners, the suggestion of installing jute mills and ginning machines might be considered. Some years ago I visited the prison in Queensland and there the difficulty of finding sufficient work for the prisoners was pronounced. The Californian gaol authorities have to a large extent solved the problem without any disability to the free population. I hope the suggestion will receive consideration. I doubt whether anyone would advocate holding prisoners in idleness while people who are discharging their obligations to society are working the harder in order to keep them. Let the prisoners' efforts be utilised towards paying at least a proportion of the expense to which they are putting the country. By this means money which goes out to foreign countries for jute goods could be saved to the State, and the expense of maintaining these prisoners would be proportionately reduced. I am sure if the Minister for Agriculture would advance his views I should find an advocate of my suggestion. If the Minister for Lands, who has been in touch with agriculture, would express his opinion I think he would say that the proposition had within it the germ of practicability. The project could be developed on practical lines, the prisoners could be given the opportunity to work, and the State would retain the money which at present goes to foreign countries. I do not want members to think I am desirous of exploiting the prisoners. Let the prisoners be paid a reasonable amount and this could

be utilised in helping to maintain their wives and families.

Mr Teesdale: And give them a few bob when they come out.

MR. SAMPSON: From the moment a man is put into prison, the State begins to keep his wife and family. If prisoners were given useful work to do, especially work that would not affect the livelihood of free men, the situation would be considerably relieved. My request is a reasonable one, and might be received with some little consideration. I have always been in favour of the proper treatment of prisoners and of reforms on right lines being made. This suggestion is in that direction. I hope the Minister for Agriculture will say a few words about it.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot allow the hon. member to indulge in tedious repetition merely because the Minister will not reply to him.

MR. SAMPSON: Last year I asked that the matter be inquired into. One member stated that this might lead to another State enterprise. I look upon this not as a State enterprise but as a useful means of utilising labour which at present is wasted. A reasonable request such as this should meet with a reasonable reply.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. H. Millington—Leederville) [8.5]: The hon. member is very persistent. I do not think this matter has been seriously considered. What has been considered is the establishment of the Pardelup prison farm, a very practicable proposition. I am not aware that the hon. member knows anything about the jute industry, or whether he knows it is practicable to establish it here. If so, he had an opportunity to experiment, had he so desired, when he was in office. Practically the only thing he did in the direction of prison work was to enter into competition with outside printing establishments by starting a printery in the Fremantle Gaol. The Pardelup farm represents a really fine reform movement. It has proved very successful from every point of view and the farm is being developed on practical lines. I cannot even promise that the jute proposition will be seriously considered. If I could, I would. I understand the Chief Secretary has not moved in the matter.

Mr. Sampson: I resent the suggestion—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot speak again on the vote itself.

MR. ANGELO (Gascoyne) [8.7]: I hope the Government will seriously consider the advisability of striking out the royalty that now has to be paid on kangaroo skins. Some members may look upon this as a small matter. All those who have been through the pastoral districts recognise that it is anything but a light matter. I recently travelled 3,000 or 4,000 miles through the Murchison and Gascoyne districts and found that kangaroos were increasing there in alarming proportions. In certain parts of those districts these pests were twice as numerous as were the sheep. In one day we were never out of sight of kangaroos. That will give members an idea of the harm they are doing to the sheep raising industry.

The Premier: Was it the same kangaroo you were following all day?

Mr. ANGELO: In the course of 200 yards of motoring at night I passed 64 kangaroos. It was impossible for the same kangaroo to be flicking past the lamps all the time. These pests eat the best food that is produced on the runs. They eat all the grass and leave only the rougher stuff for the sheep. The road boards in my electorate have all asked that the royalty should be removed. I understand that the Government will not remove it, although they have done so in the Pilbara district. I cannot see the reason for this differentiation of treatment between adjoining areas. When I asked for an explanation I was informed that because of the number of kangaroos in the Gascoyne district the Government were deriving a considerable amount of revenue from the royalties, but as there were so few in the Pilbara district, the royalty was removed. That argument is in favour of applying the same principle to the Gascoyne district. Because of this royalty and other causes kangaroos are increasing to a very great extent. The royalty does not amount to more than £2,000 or £3,000 a year, but meanwhile hundreds of thousands of pounds worth of damage is being done to the pastoral industry. If these pests could be got rid of pastoralists would be able to carry many more sheep. This would assist production and mean an increase in the wool cheques. The pastoralists are doing all they can to

overcome the difficulty. I have recommended persons out of work to go up there and shoot kangaroos, but they declined to do so on account of the royalty that has to be paid. They maintained that if the royalty were taken off, the amount saved would pay for their cartridges.

Mr. Marshall: That is a fact.

Mr. ANGELO: Why are the two districts treated on different lines? Of course, more royalty is derived from the Gascoyne district than was derived from the Pilbara district.

Mr. Marshall: Who said that?

Mr. ANGELO: One of the officers. I think the argument is all the other way. The pastoralists are assisting men to reduce the number of kangaroos and are supplying many of them with tucker. For the shooter the business is not attractive because skins are not as saleable as they used to be, the market being very depressed. I hope the Government will reconsider the question.

The Premier: What is the royalty?

Mr. ANGELO: It is 2d. a skin.

Mr. Marshall: And you collect about £3,000.

Mr. ANGELO: I assure the Government that the benefit Western Australia would receive if the royalty were abolished would exceed many times the actual revenue derived from that source.

MR. CHESSON (Cue) [8.12]: I support the remarks of the member for Gascoyne. The request for the removal of the royalty has been put up by every road board throughout the Murchison and the North. The shearers also have advanced the same claim. Kangaroos have been increasing in number for a long while, but the price of skins is low and on account of the royalty men are reluctant to embark upon the business of killing them. Kangaroos always eat out the best of the feed. After showers of rain they will congregate where the rain has fallen, and then shift round, destroying the best feed wherever they go. Kangaroo shooters throughout the Murchison have also requested that the royalty should be removed, and they have the support of all the road boards and of the pastoralists. Only a small revenue is derived by the Government from this source. The request might well be granted.

MR. MANN (Perth) [8.13]: When I was speaking on the Police Estimates I drew attention to the number of persons of unsound mind who were being detained for an unnecessarily long term in the Roe-street lock-up. The Minister undertook to make inquiries and to give me a reply on these Estimates. I understood the Minister for Health to say that the maintenance cost of the Point Heathcote Home was £40,000 a year.

The Minister for Health: I did not say that.

The Premier: Perhaps he said there was accommodation for 40 patients.

Mr. MANN: It was said that the establishment cost £120,000 and the maintenance £40,000 a year.

The Premier: I do not think that was said.

Mr. MANN: If the cost of maintenance is £40,000 a year and there is accommodation only for 40 patients, there must be something wrong.

The Premier: You must be mistaken. No one could have said anything like that.

Mr. MANN: I think the cost was stated to be £120,000.

The Premier: Not half that.

Hon. G. Taylor: I think I stated that the cost was rumoured to be £120,000.

Mr. MANN: I hope the Minister can inform the Committee that provision will be made at Point Heathcote to accept these people more speedily, so that they may be removed from Roe-street after shorter periods.

MR. TEESDALE (Roeburne) [8.17]: I support the remarks that have been made about the seriousness of the kangaroo evil. I do not remember the pest having been so numerous before as it has been during the last three years. The matter is most serious for stations short of feed. This year, at all events, pastoralists have something to growl about. The price of their product is down almost to cost of production. The Government should surrender the small amount of royalty derived from kangaroo skins, which is infinitesimal in comparison with the damage done by the pest. The price of ammunition is now high. At one time 40-bore could be bought at 12s. 6d. per hundred; but to-day it costs twopence to shoot a kangaroo. The price of skins hardly suffices to cover the cost of ammunition, tucker, royalty and other expenses. Kan-

garoo are doing hundreds of thousands of pounds of injury to the pastoral industry every year.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison) [8.19]: I support what has been said about the kangaroo pest. Many members believe that if kangaroos were pursued ferociously, the figure on Australia's Coat of Arms would become extinct; but those hon. members do not understand the position. There was a time when a kangaroo could hardly be found further north than Mullewa, which is about 30 miles more than half way to Meekatharra but owing to the improvement of pastoral leaseholds kangaroos have multiplied rapidly in my electorate. Before the days of pastoral leases, the kangaroo suffered and died in dry seasons; now, wells having been put down for stock, the kangaroos have water supplied to them in troughs. Kangaroos, euros and other species of the breed can travel great distances in short periods; and after satisfying their thirst they move three or four times as far as stock can go in the same period. On the Murchison more kangaroos than sheep are to be found now. The pest follows the thunderstorms; and before sheep can get near the grass, kangaroos pinch it off as it comes to the surface. Unfortunately the red kangaroo, which gives a great deal of trouble, is somewhat cherished by kangaroo shooters, his skin being large and comparatively valuable. Euros and smaller species are equally destructive; but they are not as valuable as the red kangaroo from the kangaroo-shooter's point of view. The shooter might find it advisable to clean up euros and other smaller species, but he could not do that except for the red kangaroo. The Government seem desirous of hiding the position in regard to royalty. In reply to a question I was informed that the royalty is charged at per skin, red 2d., grey from 2d. to 9d. A royalty of 9d. may mean the absorption of the whole profit on the shooting of a red kangaroo. A squatter is generally understood to be a wealthy person well able to pay for the destruction of vermin on his property; but in my electorate there are squatters who cannot possibly bear the expense. The man who develops a pastoral area is by no means necessarily wealthy. Many pastoralists in my electorate are working on one draft. Owing to the abundance of means for its existence, the pest is becoming extremely numerous. Pastoralists in

cur heavy expense for the destruction of vermin such as eaglehawks and dingoes. Kangaroo shooting as a means of livelihood would not be adopted by many men, since it involves shooting and working day and night. A 2-lb. skin brings up to 5s., whereas other skins bring only 2s.; and therefore a deduction of 9d., as in the case of a grey kangaroo's skin, means that the work is profitless. After the shooting of the kangaroo, there is skinning, pegging out, and painting to be done. The royalty should be abolished forthwith.

MR. LAMOND (Pilbara) [8.25]: It is perfectly true that kangaroos are becoming a serious menace to the pastoral industry of the North-West. On northern stations it is now useless to spell a paddock, because as soon as the stock are removed and feed begins to rise, the paddock is invaded and eaten out by kangaroos. During the last two good seasons kangaroos have increased to an alarming extent. For some considerable time kangarooers have not shot for skins, chiefly because of the royalty. In my electorate they have told me repeatedly that unless the royalty is abolished, they will not follow the avocation. Most of the stations have been paying bonuses of 6d. to 1s. per skin. Is it fair that they should be called upon to do that, seeing that they are already paying vermin tax? A portion of the surplus funds available for vermin destruction should be applied to dealing with the kangaroo evil. The abolition of the royalty would largely relieve the position, as it would be an inducement to kangaroo shooters to resume their old occupation. I hope the Government will consider seriously the abolition of the royalty, particularly when it is remembered that, although the revenue may be decreased by upwards of £3,000 per year, the Government will benefit to a much greater extent indirectly because of the increased number of sheep that the stations will carry, owing to the paddocks being spelled at intervals.

MR. DAVY (West Perth) [8.30]: I am prompted by the remarks of the member for Swan to say a few words on the Vote. I do not know that the establishment of a jute factory is a good or bad proposal, but it does not seem to me that we give those who are placed in gaol a sufficiently profitable occupation. I imagine that, although

the treadmill was abolished a long time ago, the occupations provided for prisoners are of a somewhat similar nature. I think that people whose liberty we have taken from them, ought to be compelled to earn their daily bread, and we should find the most suitable means of making them do so consistent with the maintenance of the best bodily and mental health of the prisoners. It has always seemed to me that we are on a hopelessly wrong tack in our treatment of the criminal portion of our population. It depresses me when I go into the Perth Police Court and note the fact that it is a rarity for a man to be found guilty of almost any charge who has not a record of convictions against him. The conclusion I have come to is that if we could collect upwards of 500 people in Western Australia, and deport them to an island where they would be isolated, a large proportion of the police force would be out of work, except for those who are engaged in chasing delinquent motorists.

Mr. Sleeman: Are not most of the prisoners at Fremantle first offenders?

Mr. DAVY: No; there are extraordinarily few there who are first offenders. If the member for Fremantle were to attend the police courts regularly he would be amazed at the number of convicted persons, with records against them. Frequently, a young man may be seen in the dock charged, say, with obtaining money by means of false pretences in endeavouring to cash a valueless cheque. The man may look highly respectable—

The Premier: Like a member of Parliament.

Mr. DAVY: Perhaps better than that. He may have made a slip, and you feel sorry for him the moment you see him. In due course the young man may plead guilty or he may be convicted. There comes the question from the magistrate, "Any record, sergeant?" Then the little pink slip is handed up. It contains a photograph of the man in the corner and an amazing number of convictions against him. That type of person, apart from the motorists—poor creatures!—is occupying the greater portion of the time of the police force. If we could get together persons of that type, who represent a tiny proportion of the population of the State, we could possibly sack a couple of magistrates immediately and engage them upon more useful work and, at the same

time, substantially reduce the strength of the police force. These habitual offenders are not really wicked people. They are misfits, who cannot settle down in the ordinary battle of life. If a little outside control were exercised over them, they could do useful work for the community. Some of these very people were jolly good soldiers, when a little control was exercised over them. They did their daily job well, and displayed splendid qualities of self-sacrifice and courage. Without such outside help, these people drift miserably from one wretched offence to another, passing in and out of gaol, and continuing in that fashion year after year. We have not made a proper attempt to tackle the problem regarding that section of the community. I do not think it is good to put them in the Fremantle Gaol. To do that is merely to push them down still further, and run the risk of preventing them from improving. I do not suggest that they should be placed on a farm such as the Pardelup prison farm, but on some such farm where some control would be exercised over them and they would be able to earn their own living. They would be treated more like soldiers on active service than as criminals in gaol. As their conduct improved and they showed that they could profit from freedom on leave at intervals, those intervals could be extended from time to time. I cannot support, or oppose, the suggestion of the member for Swan regarding the establishment of a jute factory or any other type of factory.

Mr. Mann: In Melbourne they run a rabbit-netting factory, the only one in Victoria.

Mr. DAVY: I have no doubt something along those lines could be done to provide prisoners with a useful occupation. I can see no reason in the world why a man who has to be confined because of an offence against society, should not have his labour employed in useful production. I support the member for Swan in urging the Minister to consider whether it is not highly advisable that the people confined in the gaol at Fremantle should be employed in the most useful and healthy occupations possible, and that anything in the nature of treadmill-labour should be abolished from our penal system.

HON. G. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret) [8.40]: Members representing pastoral areas have spoken regarding the kangaroo menace,

and it has been stated that the revenue from the royalty imposed represents between £3,000 and £4,000. I feel inclined to test the feeling of the Committee by moving to reduce the Vote. The Premier would be well advised to give consideration to the reduction of the royalty by one-half, if he cannot agree to dispense with it altogether.

Mr. Angelo: But it would not be worth collecting! It should be knocked right out.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Any assistance the Government can render the pastoralists will be appreciated, particularly in view of the trying times they have passed through, and the reduction in the price of wool.

MR. NORTH (Claremont) [8.41]: I do not desire to refer to either enros or prisons. The debate so far seems to have been a syncopation, first one member dealing with the former subject and the next dealing with the latter topic. I wish to refer to the speed boat nuisance. Has the Minister been able to take certain steps, as promised during the session? Many people who live on the river frontages in my electorate are waiting anxiously for something to be done. I believe some action has been taken, but I would like the Minister to inform us what has been done. If action has been taken, it will relieve the minds of many people who are annoyed on Saturdays and Sundays by the noise of the speed boats.

HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL (Northam) [8.43]: I am sorry to trouble the Minister but I think we should have some information regarding the matters that have been referred to, particularly regarding the royalty on kangaroo skins. In some parts of the North-West, the pastoralists desire kangaroos to be declared vermin and if that is done, I suppose they will seek some return from the vermin tax.

Mr. Marshall: They have wanted that for years.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not think the millions of kangaroos in the North could be destroyed at the expense of the land owners of Western Australia. If it is expected that that can be done from the vermin fund, the rates for which are already a fairly heavy burden upon the people concerned, the fund will quickly be exhausted. We cannot take money from that fund for the destruction of kangaroos, but we might

relieve the pastoralists of the royalty charge. As an indication of our feelings, I move—

That the vote be reduced by £100.

The Premier: That will mean that we will be less able to forego the royalty.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE
(Hon. H. Millington — Leederville — on amendment) [8.45]: I have already replied.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I am giving you a chance to reply again.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member will not give anybody a chance. It is not for him to say whether a member has or has not the right to speak again.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I have given him a chance by moving to reduce the vote by £100.

The CHAIRMAN: Very well. I misunderstood you.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I do not propose to say much more regarding the prison. The Government have done more than any previous Government in that respect, and their policy has been successfully carried out. I am aware that more could be done in that direction, but I am aware also that these schemes cost money.

Mr. Sampson: This one is self-supporting.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: All these schemes cost money in capital outlay. In spite of that, I admit this one is worth while. Another matter upon which I agreed to give some information is the reception home at Point Heathcote. I have here a statement issued by the Chief Secretary respecting the institution. It has been suggested that a number of patients were being kept too long at the Roc-street lock-up prior to being sent on to Heathcote, or alternatively to the Asylum for the Insane. Under the heading, "Mental Patients," the statement reads as follows:—

The impression seems to be that either all the cases, or many of the cases which go to Heathcote go per medium of the police cells. That is not so. Only police cases emanate from the cells. Men or women found wandering about, apparently insane are, under the Lunacy Act, taken into custody and put into the police cells pending a medical examination. Before they can be sent to Heathcote two medical certificates must be obtained. Often a man or woman is found acting in a disorderly manner, and is arrested. Subsequently the police suspect mental trouble, and delay for a day or so proceeding against the person in the police court. Meanwhile a medical examination takes place, and if mental trouble is indicated, the

two necessary certificates are obtained. There are instances in which persons locked up for various offences develop delirium tremens after two or three days' detention, and it may be found necessary to have them sent to Heathcote. Heathcote is a place for the treatment of mental or nervous persons. Then again, cases come from the country in charge of police. They may arrive late at night, and it may not be practicable to get certificates till next day. In the country the police cells are the only possible places in which mental persons, taken in charge by the police, can be detained. They cannot be safely kept in the ordinary hospitals. We cannot find money to instal mental homes in every town in Western Australia. Only a very small percentage of Heathcote cases see the police cells. Those cases are limited to persons found wandering at large, and under no control, and to persons who develop mental disorders while in the hands of the police.

It may be of interest to members to know that accommodation is provided at Heathcote for 36 males and 36 females. Up to the 30th September the total number of patients sent to Heathcote was 115 males and 97 females. Of this number 42 males and 24 females were discharged; 27 males and 17 females were transferred to Claremont; 7 males and 4 females died; and 5 males and 4 females were released on trial. At present there are in residence at Heathcote 42 males and 42 females. Of the number admitted, 59.9 per cent. are received as voluntary boarders. Some of those have passed through the hands of the police. The plans of Heathcote allow of additional accommodation for 36 males and 36 females, but owing to the financial stress the Government are not prepared at present to proceed with any further building operations. The accommodation at the Perth Hospital for mental patients prior to the opening of Heathcote was for 16 males and 8 females. The period of six months stated in the Mental Treatment Act is not too long. A number of patients are discharged or certified in a shorter period than six months. Certain recoverable cases, such as melancholia cases and puerperal cases may require a longer period than six months before they are discharged. It is not desirable that the period of six months be reduced. If the Mental Deficiency Bill, now before Parliament, is passed, it will tend to relieve Heathcote, as amongst the admissions there is a number of mental deficient. I think the member for York immediately came to the conclusion that a lot of women were detained at the police station for several

days. What actually happened was that only one woman was detained at the lock-up, and she for one day. So the hon. member's mind may be relieved on that point. I have discussed this with the Commissioner of Police and also with the Chief Secretary. It is true the Heathcote Reception Home is congested. It is presumed that when it became known that the hospital would be opened a number of prospective patients—

The Premier: Postponed their insanity.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Well they believed that the accommodation there would be much superior to anything then available. It must be remembered that there are plenty who volunteer to go into such an institution. Another point is that before patients can be admitted they require to have two medical certificates. Very often those coming from the country to Perth have only one, and so cannot be admitted to the home. Consequently they are taken charge of at the police quarters until the second certificate can be obtained. Also there are cases found wandering about the streets. They are taken charge of by the police, not necessarily for the purpose of being passed on to Heathcote or to Claremont, but simply to be looked after. It does not necessarily follow that all those who eventually go to the reception home or to the asylum are taken up by the police with that end in view. Very often they are found wandering about—they may be alcoholic cases—and are taken up in their own interests. It is the only thing that can be done. It may be decided that they are cases for medical examination. After being medically examined, some of those cases are sent to Heathcote, while no fewer than seven have been transferred direct to Claremont from the police quarters. Some are very bad cases, whilst others are suitable for Heathcote.

Mr. Mann: There is no reason why they should not go to Heathcote.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: There is plenty of room at Claremont, but only limited accommodation at Heathcote, and there are times when it is difficult to gain admittance. As for ministerial control, it must be remembered that Heathcote is under the control of a medical expert. Although we might think some of those at Heathcote should be either discharged or sent on to Claremont, the fact is that the time they stay at Heathcote is determined by the medical officer in charge. So even if we desire

to shift some of those patients with a view to making room for others coming in, it is to a large extent a matter for the medical officer in control of the institution. But there has not been any great delay in dealing with these cases. A list supplied me shows that the time spent in the lock-up works out at 2.73 days per patient. When we remember that some of them are there merely to be taken care of, and that it might require three or four days to determine their mental condition, it will be seen that there has been no great delay. In fact, the best possible treatment has been accorded to those people. It is true that Heathcote is congested, and I cannot see how we are to get over that difficulty. The position is certainly better than when we were dependent on the observation wards at the Perth Hospital, where the accommodation provided was for 16 males and 8 females. The other point is the question of royalty on kangaroo skins. I am disposed to agree with all that has been said as to the kangaroo being a pest in the North-West; and not only the kangaroo but, I think, the euro also. When I was in the Pilbarra district I saw for myself that the euros were nearly as numerous as the sheep.

Mr. Marshall: More so.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: There is the added difficulty that in the North-West the pastoralists, where possible, are trying to conserve their paddocks rather than to overstock them. Even when the pastoralists do this, although they may limit the number of sheep, they cannot limit the number of euros and kangaroos. As the member for Roebourne has pointed out, that is one of the greatest problems the pastoralists have to face. So I agree with what has been said as to the kangaroo and euro being a menace, but whether the difficulty can be overcome by the royalty on skins, I am not prepared to say. That might be a sufficient inducement, but the impression I gained from the pastoralists was that a bonus of at least 6d. per head should be provided from somewhere, and some of them appeared to think it should come from the Government. It was suggested that it should be taken from the central vermin fund. The difficulty about that is that the Act giving authority for the tax composing that fund was introduced at the request of the pastoralists and the farmers, who have since contributed the fund. My view is

that if it were proposed to proclaim kangaroos vermin, there would be difficulty in getting those who contribute the fund to agree, because that fund is for the purpose of eradicating vermin prevalent throughout the State. So when it came to a special request from the Northampton district that emus be declared vermin and that a bonus on their destruction should be provided from that fund, the other districts would object.

Mr. Teesdale: And so would the North. The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Also the pastoralists would object. So, although undoubtedly kangaroos are a pest in some districts in the North, it is not so uniformly throughout the State. Consequently while one part of the State would agree, the pastoralists contributing to the fund for the destruction of dingoes, foxes and eagle hawks would object to the fund being used for the destruction of kangaroos and emus. It is their money: all we do is to administer it.

Mr. Angelo: They will not agree to a bonus while you are pulling the other way with a royalty.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I am explaining that the requests for the payment of a bonus from the funds could not be considered, except by the common consent of the contributors to the fund. The question of abolishing the royalty will be referred to the Chief Secretary. The matter has been discussed and recommendations have been made by members representing the districts where the kangaroos and emus are a pest, but the abolition of the royalty will not overcome the difficulty.

Mr. Marshall: You misunderstand the position.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I do not misunderstand it. The abolition of the royalty would not overcome the menace.

Mr. Marshall: You are entirely wrong.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: To abolish the royalty might assist the position, but it would not overcome the difficulty.

Mr. Marshall: Well, assist the position.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It would not affect it very much.

Mr. Marshall: It does not matter to you farmers down south, but it does matter to the people up there.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I spoke to the men who were suffering and I appreciate their position. The biggest

difficulty in the Pilbara district was the euro, but there is another pest, the goats that have gone wild and are eating the feed. The pastoralists in those districts have had a pretty bad time, and now when they have a good season and the prospect of another one, the pests come to worry them. It seems that just as the North-West becomes prosperous, the pests arrive and knock out the profit. For some time it has been realised that there was need to regulate the river craft. Information has been collected, and a Bill has been drafted. I cannot promise that the Bill will be introduced this session. I had a brief experience of the department and I know the trouble that occurs. I also appreciate the speed boat nuisance.

Mr. Teesdale: The curse of the country.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It seems to me speed boats are an invention for no purpose other than to upset legitimate river traffic, and something should be done to control the speed hog of the river.

Mr. SAMPSON: I understand that I can speak on the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister having replied, the general discussion, I understand, is closed.

Mr. Marshall: On a point of order, when an amendment is moved to any motion, is not a member in order in speaking to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. SAMPSON: Must I confine my remarks to the question of euros and royalty?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. SAMPSON: Then I shall reserve my remarks.

MR. ANGELO (Gascoyne—on amendment) [9.6]: I regret the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. The Premier has heard the discussion and knows the considered opinion of every member representing the pastoral industry.

Mr. Sampson: The Minister was disinclined to speak.

The Premier: The Minister did not have a chance to speak until other members had spoken.

The Minister for Agriculture: I am not here to be subjected to a cross-examination.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Gascoyne will proceed.

MR. ANGELO: It is bad business for the State to retain the royalty. We are losing considerably more through the kangaroo pest

than we are getting from the royalty, but I am quite satisfied to leave the matter to the good judgment of the Premier.

Amendment put and negatived.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Aborigines, £24,000:

MR. LATHAM (York) [9.9]: I should like the Government to give some consideration to the aborigines in the agricultural areas. At Quairading I understand there are 200 to 250 aborigines and half-castes, and during the winter months the old people suffer extremely from the cold. Out of this vote it is usual to provide a blanket for each aboriginal in the North, where the climate is much warmer. Could the same consideration be given to the natives around Quairading? It has been suggested that these people should be sent to a mission at Kataning. I cannot support that proposal. Immediately they go to a mission station, the State has to maintain them. Another point is the treatment of the aboriginal women at Quairading. The committee of the local hospital object to housing the women during maternity, and the womenfolk have complained bitterly of the gins having to go into the scrub. The doctor's wife used to take the women into her own house and nurse them, but she is now deceased.

Hon. G. Taylor: Had the nursing of the lubras anything to do with her death?

MR. LATHAM: No. The gins during confinement are treated anyhow. There is a Government hospital at York, but that is a considerable distance away, and anyone who understands the aborigines knows that they are averse to moving far from their usual camping grounds. The Government might arrange for shelter adjacent to the hospital to provide for midwifery and other urgent cases.

MR. MARSHALL: They could go to the Moore River settlement.

MR. LATHAM: I do not want them to go there. We should give them a little help when they require it, and not start to spoon-feed them or put them into glass houses.

MR. MARSHALL: Why not get the maternity bonus applied to them?

MR. LATHAM: That is purely a Federal matter over which we have no control. I hope the Minister will take the matter up with the Chief Secretary, and see if some relief can be afforded those people.

MR. ANGELO (Gascoyne) [9.11]: Last year I referred to the number of natives who congregate at some of the stations on one section of the trans. railway. Later I received from the Honorary Minister a letter stating that he had read my remarks and that something would be done to endeavour to collect the natives and remove them from the public gaze.

MR. MANN: They are on the South Australian side.

MR. ANGELO: Some are on our side, at Karoni and Zanthus. Recently I travelled over with a number of tourists from all parts of the world, and I should have liked the Chief Secretary to hear the uncomplimentary remarks made about Australia and Western Australia and their treatment of the natives.

The Premier: Tourists from where?

MR. ANGELO: England, Scotland, America and other parts.

The Premier: Some countries have not too much room to talk about their treatment of the native people.

MR. ANGELO: The presence of the natives is not a credit to the State, or good advertisement for the State; neither is it beneficial to the natives themselves. If they could be collected and put into a home they would be better off and would not be an eyesore to the travelling public.

MR. TEESDALE (Roebourne) [9.13]: I was surprised to hear the statement of the member for York. I question whether there are 250 natives at Quairading.

MR. LATHAM: You have my word for it.

MR. TEESDALE: I am not contradicting the hon. member.

MR. LATHAM: But you are imputing to me I was not speaking the truth.

MR. TEESDALE: My opinion is that the natives of Western Australia are looked after better than are the natives of any other part of the world, and I claim to know something about the matter. I am quite confident that if the condition of the natives camped at Quairading had been reported to the department, the officials would have investigated it and the state of affairs described by the member for York would not have continued. I cannot imagine that maternity cases would be treated in that way. If the womenfolk of Quairading are responsible for it, I am glad that I am not the member. In the North the Government pr

vide maternity sheds and the women are properly cared for.

Mr. Latham: That is what I am asking for the Quairading natives.

Mr. TEESDALE: It would certainly be remarkable if we in the North had anything better than prevails elsewhere. That would be too wonderful. If the member for York would report this matter to the authorities, I am sure it would be looked into, and any injustice be remedied immediately.

Mr. Latham: I should like to reply to the hon. member's remarks.

The Premier: You cannot speak again on the general discussion.

Mr. Latham: I do not want a wrong impression to get abroad.

HON. G. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret) [9.17]: I should like to know what is the outcome of the deputation that waited upon the Honorary Minister (Mr. Kitson) asking for the removal of the Mt. Morgan Mission Station to Salvation Point. The squatters who waited upon the Honorary Minister complained for hours about the nuisance caused by native dogs, running about the mission, and the Minister promised to give the matter consideration. I understand the Pastoralists' Association and the squatters' have been making overtures for the removal of the buildings to Salvation Point. I should like to know if they have made any financial offer to assist in this direction. There is no doubt the aborigines are being well treated and looked after there, but they keep a great many dogs, and when they roam about the country the dogs are allowed to kill the sheep. The only way to keep the dogs in hand is to move the mission station to Salvation Point, and fence in the station so that the dogs cannot get out. Apparently aborigines cannot live without their dogs.

Mr. Marshall: The dogs are always found where the tribes are.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The dogs are uncontrollable and hungry. When they see a sheep they go for it. Other dogs would do the same thing under similar conditions. I do not take much notice of the remarks of the visitors referred to by the member for Gaseovne. They know nothing about aborigines or their treatment, and probably have very seldom seen any.

Mr. Teesdale: They expect to see them in tunnel suits.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I have seen aborigines in most of the States as far North as the Gulf of Carpentaria and the Catherine River, and I have no hesitation in saying that nowhere are they treated so well as they are here. One of the troubles with our aborigines on the Eastern Goldfields is that there is no hunting available for them. They are almost starved and have to depend upon Government sustenance. Most of their hunting grounds are taken up for pastoral purposes, except right out near the Warburton Ranges. The number of aborigines is ever decreasing in the outback country as they work in towards the more civilised parts. Our natives are not at all badly treated, but they have difficulty in getting food. They certainly steal rations whenever they can, but are seldom anxious to take a rifle. Western Australia has nothing to be ashamed of in the treatment it metes out to its native races.

Mr. LATHAM: On a point of order. Under Standing Order 372 cannot a member speak more than once in Committee?

The CHAIRMAN: Not on the general discussion upon a vote. Notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 372 no member, except the Minister, who shall have the right of reply, shall speak more than once.

Mr. LATHAM: May not I speak on the first Item?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Item—Details of gross estimate, £1,982:

Mr. LATHAM: Then I will say what I have to say on the Item giving the details of gross estimate. I assure the member for Roebourne that to my knowledge there are 200 aborigines at Quairading. The matter was taken up with the department, and the reply I received was that they had insufficient funds for the purpose.

Mr. Teesdale: You ought to have told us that.

Mr. LATHAM: I have just done so. I was also informed that there was a mission station at Katanning and a Government hospital at York to which the natives could go. York is 47 miles away, and very frequently the women arrive there just at the time when they should receive attention. I hope the Minister will take up the matter. I am not here to put up jokes.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The question raised by the member for York will certainly receive attention. Throughout the Great Southern district the problem is

mainly one of half-castes, who, by the way, cannot be dealt with under the Child Welfare Act; the Government lack statutory power to deal with them. In reply to the member for Mt. Margaret, I know that representations were made in favour of the removal of the Mt. Morgan native station; but the Minister has been unable to arrange the removal. On stations still held by the old owners, the natives are looked after; but the new station owners do not want natives, and drive them off. This applies especially to stations purchased by people from the Eastern States. Thus the Government have great difficulty in providing for the natives. At Giallong provision is being made for a native reserve. I do not know whether the Minister has considered the shifting of the Mt. Morgan station to Salvation Point. He is at his wit's end to provide for natives driven off stations. The problem is increasing, although the total number of natives is decreasing. The half-caste problem is greater than the aborigine problem. I cannot hold out any hope of the removal of the Mt. Morgan station in the near future.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The information received by the Minister as to natives driven off stations may be well founded. Within the last few years there was no difficulty, even in the absence of the mission station, as the Lancefield mines employed hundreds of men, who supplied the natives with rations. Not one of those mines is working now, and as a consequence the natives have been and are depending largely on the Government. Natives are looking to the mission station for sustenance and shelter. That is all the more reason why drastic steps should be taken to cope with the difficulty. Sheep cannot be raised to be killed by dogs.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—*Fisheries*, £5,482:

Item, Chief Inspector £600:

Mr. ANGELO: From a return furnished by the Government Statistician I see that during the 12 months ended on the 30th June last Western Australia imported fish to the value of £149,826 from overseas and £50,042 of Australian origin. There is something radically wrong when this State has to import fish of any kind. I know that the Honorary Minister and the Chief Inspector of Fisheries are both keen on assisting the Western Australian people to get cheap fish, so that this article of diet

may cease to be a luxury. It is not a function of Government to open fish shops, but it is a function of Government to furnish the fishing industry with the necessary transport facilities, as is done in the case of other industries. Such transport would not, I believe, cost the Government anything, as the quantity of fish carried would meet the cost. Fishing authorities, including Norwegians, who are recognised to be the best fishers in the world, state that in Shark Bay there are nearly 400 miles of fishing beach in the shape of promontories and peninsulas where fish breed and multiply. Millions of tons of fish go to waste every year simply because in the absence of transport facilities they are not caught. Thirty or forty boats are now fishing out of Geraldton. They have to sail to Shark Bay, a distance of about 300 miles, which may take them several days. They can load up with fish in a couple of days; and then it takes them, especially in summer, a fortnight to get back to Geraldton, making a total of nearly three weeks for the entire expedition. If suitable transport were provided, these boats could catch their cargo of fish in two or three days. In addition to the fishing boats operating near Geraldton there are 20 or 30 boats owned by pearlers. Pearling being at a low ebb, these people are finding it difficult to make ends meet. They would be glad to join in such an industry as I have suggested. Adequate transport would mean employment for many more men, and would cut out the enormous quantities of fish Western Australia now imports. I would suggest a boat about the size of the "Kybra," but fitted with cold storage for 100 tons. The boat should be able to carry ordinary cargo and a certain number of passengers. If she were a foot less draught than the "Kybra," she would be able to enter Shark Bay, and thus considerably reduce the distance which the boats doing the actual fishing would have to travel. She should be under the control of the State Shipping Service. The Fisheries Department or the fishermen should have first call on the space. In that case the steamer would take all the Shark Bay and Geraldton cargo amounting to several hundreds of tons which the "Koolinda" now takes. She could take passengers to Geraldton and Carnarvon and then go on, enabling her to call to Wyndham and Darwin every month in

stead of every second month as at present. By that means the additional boat would also pay her way. Recently the "Kybra" brought down 2,200 sheep from Carnarvon and lost only one on the trip, showing what a serviceable little boat she is. Such a boat could bring down 1,000 bales of wool.

The Premier: And a million fish.

Mr. ANGELO: That would be acceptable to the people of Perth.

The Premier: It would not be much use unless you could arrange for the distribution, which is in the hands of the foreigners who are keeping prices up.

Mr. ANGELO: I cannot agree altogether with that statement.

The Premier: Is there one fish shop that is not controlled by a foreigner?

Mr. ANGELO: Yes.

The Premier: There cannot be many.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is not what the member for Roebourne said last year.

Mr. ANGELO: Quite so, but I did not agree with that hon. member. I have been into some of the fish shops and the proprietors complain that they cannot get sufficient fish. They have trouble with the Italians, who catch the fish. It is the Greeks who sell the fish; they do not catch them. Two years ago the people of Shark Bay provided cold storage with a capacity for ten tons of fish. It was found that the space could be filled within two days, after which it was quickly discovered that they could not get the fish away. The "Koolinda" was able to pick up consignments every month, but what was the use of a ship calling once a month to pick up a consignment that could be caught in two days? Since then, the "Kangaroo" has been hung up on account of a strike and the "Koolinda" went aground. The "Kybra" called in and took five tons, half of the quantity in cold storage. What we want is a boat a bit smaller than the "Kybra," with a capacity for 100 tons of fish in cold storage, and with an ice plant on board from which she could supply the fishing boats with ice to enable the fish to be held. I believe that if such a boat were run in conjunction with the State Shipping Service, it would relieve the "Koolinda" and obviate the necessity for the latter to call at Geraldton, Shark Bay and Carnarvon for cargo. Hon. members would be surprised if they learnt the profit made by the "Kybra"

on her voyage from Fremantle to Carnarvon and return. I shall not go into that matter, because I may have an opportunity to deal with it in another way. If a boat such as I suggest, were put on the run from Fremantle to Carnarvon, there would always be cargo and passengers available for her. The boat could be about half the size of the "Kybra."

Mr. A. Wansborough: I hope you will not suggest that the "Kybra" should be taken off our run.

Mr. ANGELO: No. A vessel of the type I suggest could also assist in another direction. Dozens of people at Carnarvon are growing tomatoes and a wonderful market is provided for them in Adelaide, Melbourne and Perth. Only recently I saw 20 tons of tomatoes that had gone bad because no boat was available to lift them from Carnarvon.

The Minister for Lands: What have tomatoes got to do with the Fisheries Department?

The Premier: This is a general discussion on an item.

Mr. ANGELO: I am glad the Premier did not wake up before, and I hope the Government will give consideration to the points I have raised.

Item—Upkeep of boats, £430:

Mr. SLEEMAN: I presume the item refers mostly to the upkeep of the fisheries launch. The boat is obsolete and steps should be taken to provide the officer who is carrying out such valuable work with a better boat. It is expensive to run and not suitable for the work. If there is a wreck at Jurien Bay, or something requiring attention at Bunbury, it is this boat that is asked to do the trip. She has to go out in all sorts of weather, and it is not right to ask a man to do that in such a boat. She is quite suitable for running about the river or the harbour, but she is not suitable for work in rough weather. The man in charge has to be on duty for upwards of 20 hours per day or more, being at the wheel himself during most of the time. I understand that there is a move to procure a launch to be used by the Harbour and Lights Department, the Fisheries Department, and the Police Department.

Vote put and passed.

[*Mr. Angelo took the Chair.*]

Vote—Registry and Friendly Societies, £11,719—agreed to.

Vote—Gaols, £31,354:

Item, Superintendent Fremantle Prison, £552:

Mr. SAMPSON: I regret the attitude adopted by the Minister regarding my proposal for the establishment of jute works for the employment of prisoners.

The Premier: This is not a general discussion. I am going to insist upon the hon. member sticking to the item and not indulging in a general discussion on every item.

Mr. SAMPSON: I regret that the Minister adopted that attitude.

The Premier: That has nothing to do with the item.

Mr. SAMPSON: I am dealing with the Superintendent of the Fremantle Prison, and I presume he has to do, as the headings indicate, with the Fremantle Prison, the Pardelup Prison Farm, and other district gaols.

The Premier: But you cannot discuss an institution that is not yet established; you can discuss only the question of salary.

Mr. SAMPSON: I wish to refer to the remarks of the Minister, who said that when I was in charge I should have done this work myself.

The Premier: I rise to a point of order. I submit that the hon. member cannot discuss questions of policy on such an item. If that were allowed, we could have a general discussion on every item.

The CHAIRMAN: I must ask the hon. member to speak to the item.

Mr. SAMPSON: I will be in order in replying to the statement made by the Minister.

The Premier: No.

The Minister for Lands: Why don't you obey the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot reply to anything the Minister said during the general debate, regarding a question of policy.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Minister referred to my attitude regarding the Pardelup Prison Farm and implied that I was not sympathetic.

The CHAIRMAN: There is nothing about sympathy in connection with the item.

Mr. SAMPSON: Surely I can discuss the Minister's remarks on this item!

The CHAIRMAN: No.

Mr. SAMPSON: I wish to say a few words only. When I was speaking on the 31st October, 1928—

The Premier: On point of order, I insist upon the Standing Orders being obeyed.

The CHAIRMAN: That is all right, Mr. Premier. I will see that the member for Swan obeys the Standing Orders.

Mr. SAMPSON: It is difficult to know how to proceed. The Superintendent of the Fremantle Prison is directly associated with the Pardelup Prison Farm.

The CHAIRMAN: I rule the hon. member out of order, and if he is not satisfied he can appeal to a higher authority.

Item, Sundry services, Fruit packing, £55:

Mr. LATHAM: Do I take it that we pay for labour for the packing of fruit at the Pardelup Farm?

The Minister for Water Supplies: They have to buy cases.

Mr. LATHAM: I want the Minister to explain the item. Surely he knows something about it. I represent some people who have to pay their contribution towards the cost of government and I demand some recognition of my position in the House. I want an answer; I want this information from the Minister. If he has not got it, I am prepared to accept his statement and get the information later on.

Mr. SAMPSON: It is a remarkable figure to place in this schedule of amounts.

Mr. Sleeman: Do you think they can send a prisoner out to pick fruit and pack it properly?

Mr. SAMPSON: If that is the correct explanation, it is very interesting, but the hon. member cannot know it. It is a remarkable item.

The Premier: It is not remarkable. Not any fool can pack fruit.

Mr. SAMPSON: Any prisoner working under supervision ought to be able to do it. It seems an unnecessary expenditure.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The item is for the material used in packing, paper, cases and so forth, for the export of fruit.

Hon. G Taylor: Not for labour?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No.

Mr. Latham: Well, that is quite understandable.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The fruit grown last year realised £270.

Mr. Sampson: That value of fruit would not require £55 worth of containers. Obviously that information is incorrect.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Harbour and Lights and Jetties, £24,705—agreed to.

Vote—Lunacy and Inebriates, £114,993:

Item, Temporary clerical and other assistance, £9,924:

Mr. LATHAM: I want to know whether the Minister has seen in the report of the select committee appointed by this House to inquire into the Mental Deficiency Bill a statement by Dr. Thompson that they keep mental defectives at the Asylum for the Insane to help run the department with a view to reducing the cost. That is what Dr. Thompson said in answer to Question 54—

It is economically sound for institutions under the Lunacy Department to have a certain percentage of useful and employable defectives. If these are to be taken away from the Lunacy Department, it will require, in proportion to the number of patients, a relatively increased number of paid employees.

Surely that is an extraordinary statement for the medical officer to make. It seems they are keeping people there to help run the institution.

Hon. G. Taylor: They must utilise their services.

The Premier: It does not mean they are keeping defectives there after the time when they should be released.

Mr. LATHAM: It struck me that it was so, that they were keeping in the Asylum for the Insane people who ought to be liberated, keeping them merely to reduce the cost of running the institution.

The Premier: No, those defectives would have to be kept there in any case. Whilst there, if they can do some of the work it serves to lighten the duties of the staff.

Mr. LATHAM: The impression I got was that those people were being kept there solely in order that they might do useful work.

The Premier: No, the doctor was referring to people who would have to be kept there in any case.

Item, Contingencies £45,000:

Mr. SAMPSON: There is here an increase of £3,737. Can the Minister explain?

The Premier: We now have Heathcote with a big staff and a bigger number of inmates, and it is necessary to provide them with bedding, crockery, uniforms, fuel, light power, etc.

Hon. G. Taylor: Is provision made there for Heathcote?

The Premier: Of course.

Hon. G. Taylor: Well, it does not seem a very large sum.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Included in the list is the item, Board of Visitors' fees, £775. How are those fees paid, by the sitting or by the year?

The Minister for Agriculture: By the year.

Mr. SLEEMAN: How many members of the board are there, three?

The Premier: About five, I think.

Mr. Sampson: How often are the inspections made?

The Premier: You ought to know that.

The Minister for Agriculture: Pretty frequently.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Observatory, £1,786:

Item, Government Astronomer, £708:

Mr. SAMPSON: We heard a lot about this institution some time ago.

Hon. G. Taylor: We don't want to hear any more of it.

Mr. SAMPSON: Perhaps the Minister will throw a little light on the present situation.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The note supplied to me reads as follows—

Solar photographs were secured on 345 days, and the films on which they were taken were sent regularly to the Solar Physics Observatory, Mount Stromlo, Canberra, where they supplement the work being done there. To take photographs of the sun on 345 days out of 365 is, I think, a record for an observatory, and speaks volumes for the amount of sunlight experienced in Perth. The needs of the general public have never been more sedulously catered for than during recent years.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—State Labour Bureau. £5,134:

Mr. SAMPSON: Has the position been altered regarding the method of allocating Government work since the time when it

was stated that men with dependants were not given first consideration?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Statements have been made about unemployed having to undergo a certain amount of examination and produce union tickets and have their names on the roll; also if they missed a pick-up, they were stood aside. Are those statements accurate?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The statement frequently made that any man who is registered and is absent when there is a pick-up is struck off the sustenance list is true. He has to explain why he was absent and if he can give a satisfactory explanation he is re-instated, but the onus rests on him. The utmost care must be exercised to avoid imposition. We do not propose to make it easy for men to get sustenance, but we are prepared to provide relief for those who really need it. When a man with a family is out of work, the responsibility is on him to find work. We impress that upon him. If there is a pick-up, it is his responsibility to be present and, if he is not present, he must satisfy us that he was looking for work elsewhere and was not absent through carelessness or neglect. The officials keep the men up to scratch. We are paying out an enormous amount for relief and the officials are doing their work efficiently.

Mr. SAMPSON: I believe the officials do their best—

Hon. G. Taylor: They have a difficult job.

Mr. SAMPSON: But I protest against men desiring Government work having to pay tribute to a union before they can get work.

Member: That is not right.

The Premier: On a point of order, I ask what item the hon. member is discussing? He is launching into a general discussion.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot allow a general discussion.

Mr. SAMPSON: I do not intend to indulge in a general discussion.

The CHAIRMAN: But you are constantly doing it.

Vote put and passed.

This concluded the Estimates of the Chief Secretary's Department.

Department of Education (Hon. J. M. Drew, Minister—Hon. H. Millington in charge of the Votes).

Vote—Education, £691,019:

MR. SLEEMAN (Fremantle) [10.15]: Very few complaints are heard against the Education Department, but during the last few months some of the heads seem to have had too much of their own way, particularly in the Technical School branch. At the Fremantle Technical School there have been two classes for dresscutters and some of the regulations seem to be quite unusual. It is stipulated that a dresscutter must have a "C" class certificate in English, but very few dresscutters could pass the examination. Some of the most expert could not pass a fourth or fifth class examination in English. A vacancy occurred in the Fremantle Technical School because the dresscutter, a capable woman, left and started business on her own account. An advertisement was inserted in the newspapers calling for an instructor in dresscutting, etc., at a salary range of £225 to £270. The position was advertised by Mr. J. F. Lynch, Acting Superintendent of Technical Education. On the 24th May Mr. W. J. Jennings, Superintendent of the Fremantle School, wrote to a young lady telling her that she had been recommended for the position commencing on the 10th June at a salary of £225 per annum. Mr. Jennings notified Mr. Lynch that he was forwarding a recommendation in favour of the young lady. On the 4th June Mr. Jennings wrote to the young lady expressing his regret at having to inform her that he had received an intimation from the head office that owing to the falling off of numbers in the dresscutting classes at the Perth Technical School it was now proposed to transfer a dresscutting instructor from the Perth school to fill the position at the Fremantle school.

Hon. G. Taylor: That was giving Fremantle a lift, was it not?

Mr. SLEEMAN: No, there was a system adopted at the Perth school that was not followed at the Fremantle school. On the 5th June, Mr. Lynch wrote to Mr. Jennings as follows:—

Further to our conversation on the 31st ult., with reference to filling the position of instructor in dresscutting at the Fremantle Technical School I have now to confirm the arrangement which I then mentioned to you. It has been decided to transfer Miss — to your school as from July 1. She is a good instructor with considerable experience, and her addition to your staff will be to the advantage of the school. I assume that you have already noti-

fied Miss — that there was a likelihood of this transfer being made, and I shall be glad if you will now definitely notify her and the other applicants that the position has been filled.

The appointee was to have received £250 a year. The heads of the department were quite satisfied that an instructor in dress-cutting was required. In the following month the department wanted to recommend a young lady as assistant in dresscutting at a salary of £168 a year. She was not intended to assist anyone, but was to occupy the position of the dresscutter who was there previously, and was to have a class of her own. Yet we were told that we must have an assistant at £168 a year, instead of an instructor. The local committee were asked whether they would recommend a certain young lady at £168 a year, and Mr. Lynch went to Fremantle with the object of getting the committee to agree to the appointment, notwithstanding that he had previously advertised for an instructor at a salary ranging from £225 to £270 per annum. Later on the Committee could not agree to recommend the appointment of an assistant at the reduced figure, and a discussion ensued between them and the superintendent of technical education. Finally an assistant was advertised for at a salary of £156 a year. Actually, the assistant was not to assist anyone. On a previous occasion an effort was made to put up that sort of thing. The instructor, however, went to the appeal board, and the board ruled that he was not assisting anyone but was in charge of the class. It was wrong for the department to cut down the position from one of instructor to that of assistant, and at the same time to reduce the salary for the position. The person in charge there now is deemed an assistant, although she is fully qualified to be termed the instructor. This amounts to lowering the standard of the school as well as of the salary.

Hon. G. Taylor: That must be an oversight; I do not suppose the Government would do that.

The Premier: The Government have nothing to do with it; the matter is controlled by the superintendent.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The superintendent has done wrong to reduce the status of the position, and to lower the salary of the girl to that of an assistant, after having previously been given the salary of an instructor. I hope something will be done to remedy the position so that the standard of the teachers may be maintained as well as the rate of pay.

If the present occupant of the position, who is called an assistant, is really the instructor, she should receive the pay for such a position.

Hon. G. Taylor: Is there any power to go before the appeal board?

Mr. SLEEMAN: No. There is power to appeal against being classed as an instructor unless she passes some examination outside the scope of that of dresscutting. Only a dresscutter is required for the position, but it is necessary for her to show that she has attained a certain educational standard, although actually that is not required for the position. She may be a very capable dressmaker, but may not be able to pass that educational test.

Hon. G. Taylor: What is the standard required?

Mr. SLEEMAN: She must hold a "C" certificate. There are very few efficient dress cutters in this State who could pass an examination in the subjects required for a "C" certificate.

MR. GRIFFITHS (Avon) [10.22]: I would like to pay a tribute to the work that is being done by the Education Department. In 1914 people in the country districts were constantly complaining about the class of teacher who was being sent to them. That which has been accomplished in the intervening years constitutes a great tribute to the department. The class of teachers now engaged is far superior to anything we had then. We have reason to be proud of the department as well as of the good work that is going on in the country schools. It is important to us that a good class of teacher should be sent out, because the manner in which a child's character is formed when young and the degree of education imparted to it, are big factors in its after life. I remember a remark passed by the president of one of the teachers' conferences. He stated that the teaching profession was one of the most honourable but also the most honorary of all the professions. There is a good deal in that remark. Since 1914 the scale of pay has improved, and the teachers are getting a better deal than they did before. On any occasion when I have taken matters to the Director of Education, either Dr. Andrews or Mr. Wallace Clubb, I have always had fair treatment meted out to me. Only to-day I read a letter from Mr. Clubb with regard to a small country school in a district where it appeared there

would not be sufficient children to maintain the requisite average attendance. On the report of the inspector the establishment of the school was turned down. The Director has now written to me again asking what has been done concerning that school. Apparently, the idea had been set aside, but the Director, believing that possibly circumstances might have arisen to overcome the previous difficulty, wrote to me inquiring if there had been any change in the situation. Usually such things are pigeonholed and forgotten. A striking feature of the report of the Education Department is that the average attendance to-day is 90 per cent. of the average enrolment. Perhaps parents are becoming more alive to the importance of their children being educated, or the department are more vigilant, but the fact remains these figures are extraordinary. Another interesting feature of the report is that in the course of 20 years the prosecutions for non-attendance at school have fallen from one in 86 to one in every 242 children. That is a fine record. I also wish to refer to the excellent work that is being done by the parents and citizens' associations. I have already recorded what was accomplished at Pemberton where magnificent work was done by one of those associations. When it is possible to imbue the children with the requisite enthusiasm and to induce them to work in with the parents and citizens, many fine results are achieved. Ministers themselves have recognised the benefit accruing from these organisations. Those of us who interested ourselves in the movement in the early days find great pleasure in seeing all that has been accomplished, and knowing that the Government are ready to encourage the associations in their efforts. I should like to draw the attention of the Minister to the question of shelter sheds in small country schools. I know the Treasurer insists that all non-essentials shall be cut out, and that only those things that are necessary shall be a charge upon this year's Loan Estimates. We realise that economies must be effected wherever possible, but I do not think the Minister should rigidly insist upon the decision to cut out these shelter sheds. In some parts I have induced the local people to put up their own bush shelters. Parents and citizens' associations have got together working bees and in some cases have overcome the difficulty. I would ap-

peal to the Minister not to be too cheese-paring in this regard. We have had many requests from parents in the country that we should voice our protests against this cheese-paring policy. They realise there is room for economy, and that only in those cases where it can be shown a need exists should the shelter sheds be provided. I desire to bear testimony to the good class of teacher the department now provide for country schools, and to acknowledge the great improvement which has taken place in that direction since my first entering Parliament.

HON. G. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret) [10.31]: I wish to compliment the Government on their selection of the Director of Education. I have known that gentleman for a number of years, and have had a good deal to do with him in arranging for the erection of schools and the appointment of travelling inspectors. The Government have secured an excellent man for a most important position. Not only is he splendidly educated—

The Premier: But he has an Australian outlook.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Yes, and broad ideas on education and other subjects. He is a man who will fill the position with great benefit to the country and much credit to himself.

Vote put and passed.

This concluded the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the year.

Resolution reported.

House adjourned at 10.34 p.m.