

# Legislative Council,

Thursday, 13th December, 1923.

Solicitor General. That officer is absolutely confident that the amendment will accomplish what the House has in view.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time, and returned to the Assembly with an amendment.

## BILL—LAKE GRACE-NEWDEGATE RAILWAY.

### Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous sitting

Hon. G. W. MILES (North) [2.36]: I support the Bill. The settlers concerned were I understand, promised the railway. The district itself I believe to be one of the best tracts of wheat land in the State. Another reason why I welcome the Bill is that the line gets us out of the South-West Province into the South Province. I hope the line will eventually connect with Ravensthorpe. The arguments of the Minister and Mr. Stewart will, I think, convince the House of the necessity for the Bill. By the construction of the proposed line the Newdegate people will be brought 30 miles nearer to their natural port than by the other route.

Hon. A. BURVILL (South-East) [2.37]: This Bill is of great interest to the province I represent. I desire to remove what I consider to be a wrong impression. For Newdegate the nearest port of shipment—apart from Hopetoun, where considerable expenditure would be needed to make a harbour—is Albany. From Newdegate to Albany would be 187 miles. The next nearest port is Bunbury 227 miles. Then comes Fremantle. I am bound to support this railway, although the proposal has features with which I do not agree. Everyone knows that the Railway Department favours loop lines as against spur lines. The trouble, however, is to find the money for loop lines. A loop line from Newdegate to Albany, and thence back to Kondinin, would serve all these settlers. The northern portion of the loop line would serve Jilakin, Kalgarin and Kondinin, and would eventually go across to Brookton and Armadale. The southern portion of the loop would go past the Newdegate country and link up with the Pingrup extension, go to Ongerup and eventually extend to Albany. Both lines would be connected up with the main railway system. That is the proper course to take in my opinion. I quite agree with the Railway Advisory Board's report on the two lines. From the point of view of the present settlers, if there is no money to build a loop line, we might build a spur line on to Wagin. The length of the line to be constructed is 36 miles. To carry the line northwards so as to serve the Kalgarin and Kondinin country would require 63 miles. The Newdegate settlers, under these conditions, will have far more freight to pay in order to reach the nearest port, than they would have to pay via Wagin. If a loop line were built—

	PAGE
Select Committees: Jandakot Road Board, extension of time	2026
Peel and Bateman Estates, extension of time	2026
Bills: Land Act Amendment, 3A.	2026
Lake Grace Newdegate Railway, 2A., Com., etc.	2026
Brookton-Dale River Railway, 2A., etc.	2031
Road Closure (No. 2), 2A., etc.	2033
Yarramony-Eastward Railway, 2A., etc.	2038
Stamp Act Amendment, Assembly's message	2036
Land Tax and Income Tax, Assembly's message	2036
Vermin Act Amendment, 2A., etc.	2038
Appropriation, 2A., etc.	2043
Land Act Amendment, Assembly's message	2053
Land Tax and Income Tax, request for conference	2053
Vermin Act Amendment, Assembly's message	2053
Land Tax and Income Tax, conference manager's report	2054
W.A. Trustees, Executor, & Agency Co., Ltd., Act Amendment (Private), Assembly's Amendments	2054
Appropriation, 2A., Com., report	2054
Land Tax and Income Tax, Assembly's further message, 3A.	2063
Vermin Act Amendment, Assembly's further message	2068
Public Service Appeal Board Act Amendment, 2A., etc.	2068
Women's Legal Status, 2A., etc.	2069
Lunacy Act Amendment, Assembly's further message	2070
Jury Act Amendment, 2A., debate adjourned	2071
Appropriation, 3A.	2072
Close of Session, complimentary remarks	2072

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

## SELECT COMMITTEE—JANDAKOT ROAD BOARD.

### Extension of Time.

On motion by Hon. G. Potter, the time for bringing up the report was extended for one week.

## SELECT COMMITTEE—PEEL AND BATEMAN ESTATES.

### Extension of Time.

On motion by Hon. J. J. Holmes, the time for bringing up the report was extended for one week.

## BILL—LAND ACT AMENDMENT.

### Third Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. Ewing—South-West) [2.34]: I move—

*That the Bill be now read a third time.*

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [2.35]: A question has been raised whether the amendment agreed to by the House last night tightens up the Bill sufficiently. I have been once more to the Crown Law Department, and have again gone into the matter fully with the

and there is good land almost the whole way—the nearest port would be Albany, and the Newdegate settlers would save 40 miles of railway freight. Mr. Stewart spoke elaborately on the capabilities of the country, and its extraordinarily good prospects, and also on the undoubted success of the settlers now there. If the line were to go to Albany instead of Wagin, I have no doubt Mr. Stewart would have supported that proposal, even though the line would not pass through the part of the province with which he is most closely connected. From the aspect of economical working, we should have a loop line. Moreover, the loop line should be built first. The connection between Lake Grace and Newdegate should be, not the first step, but the last. Before that connection is made, the line should be linked up with Hopetoun. The trouble, however, is that for some years to come the Government will not have the funds necessary to carry out the scheme that must be carried out if the whole district is to be served. Thus, by voting against the Bill I might help to create a delay of several years. The building of the short spur line here proposed will not interfere in any way with the complete scheme eventually required in order that every district may have access to its nearest port. I should like an assurance from the Minister that this Bill will contain the same clause as the Bill for the line from Denmark to the Frankland River, a clause providing for construction by contract and not by day labour.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) (2.45): I oppose the Bill for several reasons. We are battling day and night to complete the business of this session. I do not think it will be claimed for one moment that there is any urgency regarding the construction of this railway. The Premier has stated publicly that 100 miles of railway construction per annum is as much as Western Australia can embark upon at the present time. I have looked up the list of authorised railways that have not yet been constructed, and I find that some 200 miles of lines remain to be built. On the Premier's own showing, that constitutes a railway construction programme covering a period of two years. There is an honourable understanding that railways are to be built in the order of their authorisation. That being so, once the construction of a line is authorised it holds up any other railway that may be authorised subsequently, pending its completion. The Margaret River railway is now in course of construction. We know that deviations have been made from the route as originally agreed upon. It is on record—I do not think it is disputed—that between the time the line was authorised and the date when the construction was commenced, an agricultural hall was built on a site, which was to be in the vicinity of the railway station. I understand that that large hall has had to be pulled down and shifted because the railway did not go through that locality at all. Then again we had a special session to deal with the Jarna-

dup-Denmark railway, which was to connect those two centres, a distance of 120 miles as the crow flies. The trouble I was confronted with then is that which faces me now. On that occasion I was successful in having the central portion of the line cut out. It was not that I did not think the complete line would have to be built in due course, but as we had ports at Bunbury and Albany it was patent that we could commence the railway from either end without committing the country to the expense of the whole line. For that reason we agreed to 30 miles of railway being constructed from each terminal point. We were then told that it was a matter of urgency, and cables from England were produced showing that people at Home were anxious to send out migrants. We were informed that it was necessary that the Government should have the authority to construct the railway. The cost of the complete line would have been, approximately, £500,000, whereas the cost of the sections that Parliament authorised will represent about £250,000.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: The whole line will cost nearer a million.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If that be so, it merely adds strength to my argument. What is the position? Although it was a matter of extreme urgency 12 months ago, not one sod has been turned yet. A start has not been made with the line. When we turn to the loan schedule we find that out of a total of £3,750,000, only £50,000 has been provided for this railway, £25,000 being for the line from the Jarnadup end, and £25,000 for the line from Denmark. That is all that is to be spent within the next 12 months. On that basis it will take nine years to complete the railway.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: That is an argument in favour of the Government making an early start.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: That may be one way of looking at it. As to the railway to Newdegate, it has been made clear to me from several quarters that a promise was originally made to construct the line via Kalgarin, East Jilakin, and thence to Newdegate. The line would thus serve the three townships. In addition to that definite promise, there is the report from the Railway Advisory Board. In view of the conflicting reports we have heard regarding the promises made and the fact that two of the towns I mention are to be cut out under the proposal before us, the Bill could well be left over till next session, particularly seeing that there is already a two years' railway programme before the Government. With that position before us, I fail to see how this matter can be regarded as urgent.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Perhaps the line is of political urgency.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: We have to deal with another railway Bill, and perhaps that line is also a matter of political urgency. If that sort of thing is creeping into politics, and railways are authorised on the eve of elections—I do not say that that is the position—the sooner the House takes the bit between its teeth and says it will have no more

of such political railways, the better it will be. This matter could be left over until the new Parliament is elected. I am at a loss to understand the attitude of Mr. Miles, who has rightly advocated the necessity for expenditure of public funds in the North. A perusal of the Estimates shows that, although the North constitutes quite half the State, only £70,000 is provided for the completion of a jetty that should have been built 25 years ago. It would have been built by Sir John Forrest in those days had it not been that there were two factions, one desiring the jetty to be constructed at the one spot, and the other urging its construction elsewhere. Sir John did not desire to make an enemy of either faction and so the work was not done. That small amount is all the North gets out of these Estimates! So long as we have representatives from the North and members in another Chamber who are willing to spend money in the South, so long will the North be left high and dry.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: You have the Wyndham Meat Works in the North.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Yes, and we get them in the neck. Anyone living in the North knows what is the position regarding those works.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [2.55]: Mr. Holmes has furnished cogent reasons why the Government should not rush the Bill through this session. In answer to an interjection by one hon. member, the Leader of the House stated that the railway would be completed as soon as necessary.

The Minister for Education: As soon as possible.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: No doubt the Minister thought he said that, but on two occasions he repeated that the line would be built as soon as necessary.

Hon. J. Cornell: The railway is necessary now.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: There is another place to which a railway ought to have been constructed. The time has long since passed when the line should have been built to serve the settlers towards Kalgarin and East Jilakin. If the line from Lake Grace to Newdegate is to be completed as soon as necessary, clearly ordinary justice should dictate that the settlers at Kalgarin and East Jilakin should also have their line. Mr. Stewart said that the settlers at the two last-mentioned centres had taken up their holdings without any promise of a railway by the Government. I am sure the settlers would not have taken up their holdings if some such promise had not been made to them.

Hon. H. Stewart: It is easy to ascertain from the Lands Department the conditions under which the land was taken up. The statement made regarding the promise was contradicted by the Premier.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The hon. member must be under a misapprehension. Ordinary common sense would suggest that people would not go into remote areas like Kalgarin, nearly 40 miles from Kondinin, without some

assurance from Government representative that the line would be constructed. The settlers have established their holdings in the district and are producing large quantities of wheat. If they had known they were to be left in that remote and isolated part without railway facilities, would they have developed their holdings and produced such large quantities of wheat? It will cost nearly £5,000 to cart to Kondinin the wheat grown in the Kalgarin district.

Hon. H. Stewart: Is that a reason for throwing out a Bill for a railway to serve a bigger area?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: No, but I propose to show that both areas can be served by a common railway.

Hon. H. Stewart: At double the expenditure.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It will not double the expenditure. The line from Lake Grace to Newdegate is 35 miles long. A line from Kondinin to Newdegate via Kalgarin on its route to serve East Jilakin will be 63 miles. If the proposed line be built, another spur line, if not two, will be required to serve the settlers at East Jilakin and at Kalgarin. Add the extra mileage of those two spurs to the spur line proposed in the Bill, and we get a longer mileage than that proposed by the advisory board in lieu of the line from Lake Grace to Newdegate. Apart from that, it would be cheaper to have a line from Kondinin to Newdegate, and serving East Jilakin and Kalgarin, both requiring railway facilities. Newdegate is not yet in the productive stage, whereas the other districts are. The people at East Jilakin and Kalgarin have been wanting a railway for years. At present they are carting over distances of from 20 to 40 miles.

Hon. H. Stewart: Where does the hon. member get his information??

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: From the residents in the district. There is no need to go to the Government for authority to construct this line at the present time. It would be better to defer the Bill until next session. If this were a proposal to construct a line from Kondinin to Newdegate via East Jilakin and Kalgarin, I would support it; but to authorise a line not immediately required, when the alternative railway is urgently needed, would be altogether unwise. I will oppose the second reading.

Hon. E. ROSE (South-West) [3.5]: I will support the second reading. The proposed line will be shorter and more serviceable to the Newdegate people than would be a line from Kondinin, via East Jilakin. Moreover much more wheat will be produced along the proposed railway than is likely to be grown along the alternative line. If the Government are to construct railways to follow up settlement, irrespective of whether or not a railway has been promised, we shall be put to no end of unnecessary railway construction. The Newdegate people prefer that the line should go from Lake Grace, the shorter and better route. As for the Bill being an electioneering expedient, I do not think that

contention should have been raised at all, for the railway will affect but one member, and his seat is pretty safe. The Government are perfectly justified in bringing forward the Bill, and I hope it will be carried.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS (North-East) [3.8]: I have not hitherto opposed the construction of an agricultural railway, but in view of the promise of a railway given by the Premier to the settlers in the vicinity of Kondinin, I should like to hear from the Minister why that promise was not fulfilled. On the 18th January, 1923, the Premier was asked in another place whether it was the intention of the Government during the then session to introduce a Bill for the construction of a railway from Kondinin to Newdegate via East Jilakin in accordance with the recommendation of the Railway Advisory Board dated the 13th November, 1922. To that question the Premier replied that a Bill would be introduced next session. "Next session" meant, of course, this session. That Bill has not been introduced, but we have before us a Bill for a railway that will not help the settlers of East Jilakin. On inquiry I find that the Agricultural Bank has advanced £80,000 to the settlers of East Jilakin who, this season, have cropped 5,000 acres, whereas in the district the proposed railway will serve, the settlers have cropped only 2,000 acres of wheat. I was astonished to learn, too, that the proposed railway had not been surveyed.

The Minister for Education: A preliminary survey has been made, but not the permanent survey. That is being made now.

Hon. E. Rose: You have not had any money voted for it.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: It is a well recognised principle that when a railway is to be constructed the survey is first made.

The Minister for Education: Only a preliminary survey.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I was interested in Mr. Holmes' remarks as to railways authorised. On the 4th of this month, in answer to a question asked by Mr. Kirwan as to what railways had been authorised, and the mileage laid and to be laid, we were told that seven lines covering 289 miles had been authorised but not completed. Some 109 miles had been constructed, leaving 180 miles yet to be built. On three of the authorised railways, namely, the Piawaning Northward, the Dwarda-Narrogin and the Albany-Denmark extension, not a tap has been done. Mr. Holmes said that roughly sufficient railway mileage had been authorised to keep the construction going for the next two years. We see that on the Notice Paper there are railway proposals aggregating roughly another hundred miles. Apart from that, if the railways are to be constructed in their order of authorisation, it will be some years before the one before us can be started; for nothing has yet been done in respect of the Albany-Denmark extension, although 16½ miles have been constructed at the Bridgetown end. As we

know, there is a long gap between the two ends of that big railway, and that gap must be bridged before the service can be effective. In view of the promise given by the Premier and the work done by the settlers in the East Jilakin district, unless strong reasons are given by the Minister in his reply, I shall vote against the second reading.

Hon. J. CORNELL (South) [3.16]: If docility in voting for the authorisation of railways is any attribute, I can claim to be a paragon of perfection. Last year I opposed the Mount Marshall railway extension by way of entering a protest against the tardy construction of the Esperance line, but with that exception I have supported every agricultural railway Bill since I have been in the House. Western Australia lends itself to cheap railway construction. Railways should precede and not follow settlement. If this policy had been followed in the past, the man on the land would have been spared many trials and tribulations. Extraordinary reasons have been advanced as to why this line should not be authorised. One is that a promise was made by the Premier to introduce a Bill for a railway from Kondinin to Newdegate.

Hon. E. H. Harris: As the advisory board reported.

Hon. J. CORNELL: It has also been urged that the Premier promised a line from Lake Grace to Newdegate. A Bill has been introduced for the fulfilment of one promise, but not the other.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Did he make the other promise in the House or in the street?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I have been promised many things. I am promised something next May, but I hope it does not come off. When a promise is given by a reputable authority, it does not matter where it is made. Are we going to vote this Bill out because a measure has not been introduced to authorise a line from Kondinin to Newdegate? To do so would be so extremely illogical. I do not think the settlers on the Kondinin-Newdegate route, irate though they may be at the non-fulfilment of their promise, would ask that another group of farmers should be denied railway facilities. I do not wish to enter upon the merits of the different routes, but a line from Kondinin to Newdegate is necessary and should be constructed as early as possible. The settlers that went out there were warned by the Agricultural Bank that they did so at their own risk.

Hon. H. Stewart: You know something about that.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The fact remains they went out and demonstrated the possibilities and permanency of the district. When men are willing to go out and do things as these settlers have done, we should recognise their claims for consideration. We should not jettison the other people and deny them a railway, simply because the second promise has not yet been fulfilled. A glance at the map will show that, if the Kondinin-Newdegate line

were constructed, it would be necessary to have a line from Newdegate to Lake Grace, not only to give producers access to the nearest port but to give the State a reasonable and workable railway system.

Hon. A. Burvill: The nearest port is Albany.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Hopetoun is almost as near. I have sufficient faith in the possibilities of that corner of the State to believe that in the near future the country between Newdegate and Ravensthorpe will justify a railway. If a railway is not built in the near future, the only thing left for the Government to do will be to close down the Hopetoun-Ravensthorpe line. This line has a dead-end that strangles industry, despite the efforts of the residents to foster it. I hope the Bill will be passed, and I hope that whatever Government be in office next year, it will give recognition to the claims of the Kondinin-Newdegate settlers. Once it is demonstrated by settlers that a district is good, a line should be constructed as speedily as possible. When people have to cart their produce so many miles, it is a heart-breaking job and an economic loss to them and to the State. The sooner our dilly-dallying methods are rectified, the better it will be for all concerned. Provide the facilities and the producers have a chance to make good.

Hon. J. A. GREIG (South-East) [3.25]: I protest against such a controversial measure being introduced so late in the session.

Hon. J. Cornell: It has ever been so. Railway Bills are always brought down late.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: It is a fault of Governments that they bring in Bills during the last session of Parliament, and endeavour to push them through without giving the House much information concerning the land to be served. The policy of sending out the Railway Advisory Board to report on short lengths of railway to serve particular areas or settlements has been wrong. Mr. Cornell advocated the construction of railways in advance of settlement. I agree with him. We in Western Australia, however, are always hard up for money. We cannot always find sufficient to build railways where settlement has taken place. Therefore, the least we should do is to classify all the agricultural lands in the south-west division held by the Crown, and instruct the advisory board to make a comprehensive report on a system of railways to serve the country. Had this been done years ago, many of the routes selected would never have been adopted. Of course it is easy to be wise after the event. A few years ago we did not realise the possibilities of the State, or the extent of the wheat growing areas it contains. Many of the leading men in Western Australia to-day do not thoroughly appreciate the position. They do not realise that we have millions of acres of agricultural land unsurveyed and almost unexplored.

Hon. J. Cornell: Over three millions in the Esperance district alone.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: In the Esperance district we do not know what area will be profitable for wheat growing, but thousands of acres that may not be profitable for wheat growing will be profitable for mixed farming, and therefore must have railway facilities. The Bill deals with a short line from Lake Grace to Newdegate. That is contrary to the recommendation of the advisory board. Some members have said they will stick hard and fast to the recommendation of the board. I agree with that policy. Earlier in the session I opposed the report of the advisory board on one route because it was 13 years old. The report on the Lake Grace-Newdegate railway is up to date and recommends a line from Kondinin to Newdegate, which would serve three settlements, while the Lake Grace-Newdegate line would serve only one settlement.

Hon. J. Cornell: Both lines are necessary.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: In fact three lines will be necessary. It is necessary to have a line running east from about Kulin or Dudinin to serve the Jilakin area. Another line is required east from Kondinin to serve the Kalgarin area. Settlers there last year cropped 5,000 acres, though prior to that not a grain of wheat had been sown there. This year they have an average of about 15 bushels, which means about 25,000 bags of wheat produced in that district. At Newdegate 1,200 acres are under crop, but this will be required there for seed next year. A line for the Kalgarin settlers is necessary at present, but a line to the Newdegate settlers is not necessary at present, though it will probably be required next year. I am in somewhat of a quandary to know what to do for the best. If I oppose the Newdegate railway, that will not give a railway to the Kalgarin people. We must consider the Bill before us and I have therefore decided to support it. I hope that next session the Government will bring in a measure for a railway from Kondinin eastward to serve the people at Kalgarin. The settlers went out there without having been promised a railway, but they knew the land was good. The Government said definitely to them, "If you go outside the 12½ mile limit, you go at your own risk; we will not finance you or assist you." These men, many of them returned soldiers, knew the country was good and took a risk. Some of them are out 45 miles east of Kondinin. Thirty miles out I have seen a 600-acre crop, and in my judgment the settler was quite justified in going out that far. No Government can keep that country without a railway for any length of time. The Government should build railways faster than they are doing. I hope they will construct these railways by contract. The line from Lake Grace to Newdegate runs through about 20 miles of level country. One man said to me, "The sand plain between Lake Grace and Newdegate will do me. If I were a young man and could grow oats, such as were grown last year, I would be quite satisfied to go there with a tractor, feeling

sure I could make a fortune on that country.' I hope all this land will be taken up in the near future. There are no engineering difficulties in the way of constructing this line, but it ought to be built by contract. We should be able to get the line constructed to-day for half the cost the Government are incurring in building lines elsewhere under the day-labour system.

Hon. E. H. Gray: The experience of the past has not proved that.

Hon. J. H. GREIG: It has. It has proved that other jobs can be done cheaper under the contract system.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That is not the experience of the State.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. Ewing—South-West—in reply) [3.37]: The policy of the Government is to invite tenders for the construction of these railways, and no doubt that will be followed in this instance. Many members have expressed the opinion that a line should be constructed from Kondinin to Kalgarin on to Newdegate, instead of this one. I understood Mr. Harris to say that the Premier had stated he would introduce a Bill this session for the construction of the longer line. He did make a promise as to the Lake Grace-Newdegate line. He has fulfilled one promise.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: And broken the other.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: And has an earnest desire to fulfil the other. It is certainly wise to authorise those lines which can be constructed at an early date. The railway under review is very necessary and will be about 35 miles in length. It will be constructed as a spur line due east from Kondinin.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee, etc.*

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

Read a third time and passed.

### BILL—BROOKTON-DALE RIVER RAILWAY.

#### *Second Reading.*

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. Ewing—South-West) [3.37] in moving the second reading said: We have discussed the principle of introducing Railway Bills, in the opinion of some members rather late in the session, and I hope this Bill will, therefore, not be delayed in its passage through the Chamber. One member said insufficient information had been made available to the House. All the information that could be supplied on these questions has been supplied, and has been available for some time. The reports of the advisory board, the

plans showing the contours of the railway lines and the deviations, and everything that could convey the requisite information to members has been presented to this House. The Brookton-Dale River line is a section of the proposed Brookton-Armadale line, that was surveyed some years ago. This particular line will be 26 miles in length. It has been recommended by the Railway Advisory Board as a straight out proposition. There is no question of going from one point or another. The estimated cost is £106,000 if 60-lb. rails are used. It is not the intention of the Government, however, to use 60-lb. rails for this line. In the line as previously surveyed the ruling grade was one in eighty, as shown in red on the plan. The route has now been located a few miles to the south, and the grade will be not so good, namely one in sixty. The reason for going south is to give facilities to people who are settled in a better class of country. The deviation is, therefore, fully justified. The line has not been surveyed. To this fact members seem to take exception, but it is not a point they need take. In most instances the lines are not surveyed before the authorising Bill is introduced. A contour survey is made as well as a preliminary survey, which shows as nearly as possible what the location of the line will be. In some cases the deviation is a big one, in other cases it is small. Everything depends on the contour of the country, and the possibility of the deviation required being great or small. In this case the deviation is a wide one. It is nearly five miles to the north and two miles to the south. A permanent survey is now being carried out and will be completed at an early date. I regret the grade of the line will not be as good as it was when it was first surveyed, but the railway will pass through better country. Approximately the area of first-class land suitable for wheat and oats growing, inside the 12½ mile radius of the Great Southern railway is 31,700 acres, and outside that radius 40,450. The approximate area of grazing land inside the 12½-mile radius is 20,216, and outside 41,727 acres, making a total area of first-class and grazing land of 134,083 acres. The number of acres cleared is 47,738. In 1922-23, 2,200 tons of hay were taken off the area in proximity to the route of the line, 21,280 bags of wheat, 20,822 bags of oats, and 42,470 sheep were shorn during last season. The proposition is a satisfactory one. Eventually the line will go through to Armadale, and this should meet with the wishes of many members. Members appear to be kindly disposed towards these new railway lines. They realise that people in the country must have railway communication to enable them to develop their properties and transport their produce to market. That is the policy of the Government. The Premier desires to increase the production of wheat within a short time to 30 million bushels. It is also desired that all the produce should be taken to its geographical port. Mr. Burvill talks about Albany being closer to Lake Grace than Bunbury. If that is so, in the years

to come, when railway communication right through is completed, all the produce from Newdegate will eventually go to Albany. It will certainly go where the lowest freight is offering. The policy of the Government is to give both old and new settlers every possible chance of succeeding. The building of railways is one means of serving the settlers and developing the lands of Western Australia, thus making the country prosperous.

Hon. J. A. GREIG (South-East) [3.46]: I support the Bill because the line has been promised to some of the settlers for nearly 20 years, to my own knowledge. There are settlers on the route of the proposed line who have been there for 60 years. They live within 50 miles of Perth, and they cart their produce back 30 miles to Brookton or Beverley, and then have to send it over 100 miles to Perth. This being the first section of an eventual trunk line from Brookton to Armadale, I have no hesitation in supporting its construction. I feel very disappointed, however, that the line will be on a one in sixty grade, whereas the old blue line shows a grade of one in eighty from Brookton to Armadale. I hope the Minister will use his best efforts to induce the Government to put in cuttings which will give a better grade. Looking at the preliminary survey on the map, and observing the numerous bends of the line, one feels disgusted. A much straighter line than that can certainly be obtained by a proper survey. It is in the interests of the safe and economical working of our railway system that the State should spend a little more money on construction of lines, thus obtaining decent grades which will enable a good load to be pulled, rather than the small loads to which a one in sixty grade limits the department.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [3.51]: I oppose the authorisation of this railway, for the reasons I indicated when speaking on the previous Bill. I shall not repeat what I said a few minutes ago. Moreover, it has always been understood that this railway would be a part of the Transcontinental line coming to Armadale and along the south side of the river.

The Minister for Education: That is so.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: From the best of authority I understand this line can never be part of that Transcontinental line. This is a branch line going out south and coming back to couple up with the blue line shown on the map as part of the Transcontinental survey from that point to Armadale. Certainly the Transcontinental line will never come along the red route. Another railway will be needed to connect with the blue line where the red line is now shown. In fact, this proposed line is really only a spur line, with a grade of one in sixty, whereas if the route of the blue line were adopted the grade would be one in eighty, and the line would ultimately become part and parcel of the Transcontinental railway. We seem to be bent on urgent business this afternoon,

and that business is the authorising of railway after railway. On the Notice Paper I see a Bill for the construction of a line to Yarramony, a place of which I never heard before. That proposal involves 75 miles of construction. This afternoon we are committing the country to heaven knows what expenditure in the way of railway construction. According to the Premier's figures we have two years' railway construction already authorised, and I am certain that this afternoon we are being asked to authorise another two or three years' construction. So we are tying up the next Parliament for practically the whole of its life. The next Parliament will have no opportunity to authorise any railways, because, on the Premier's own showing, we are now committing the country to a five-years programme of construction. I would have divided the House on the Lake Grace-Newdegate Railway Bill but that I happened to be outside the Chamber. If I get any support, I shall divide the House on this measure.

Hon. W. CARROLL (East) [3.54]: I support the Bill. It is absolutely necessary that the line should be constructed. Many of the people concerned have been living in the district for 50 or 60 years, and ever since responsible government they have been hoping for a railway. It has been promised to them over and over again. I express no opinion regarding the extraordinary red line on the map. I believe that if the line were built on the original survey, it would be the best ultimately. I must admit, however, that from my knowledge of the country there is more settlement further south, where the new line goes, than along the old route. However, the Bill provides for a deviation of five miles from the flying survey. With that proviso the people of the district are, according to the information I have, quite satisfied with the Bill.

Hon. G. W. MILES (North) [3.55]: There is a good deal in what Mr. Holmes said about this line. Personally, I think the railway should be constructed on the blue route, which offers a one in eighty grade. I understand it is the policy of the Commonwealth Government to standardise the Transcontinental railway. Taking the blue route, we shall get a decent grade, instead of the one in sixty grade which the red route involves. Our mountain grade is one of the curses of our railway policy. Here we have an opportunity of obtaining a one in eighty grade, and we are not going to take advantage of it. If unification of railways is to come off, it will come off within the next few years. We should hesitate to authorise the construction of this line. A point which I missed in speaking on the Lake Grace-Newdegate Bill is, that I want the Minister's assurance that these lines will be constructed by contract and not by day labour.

The Minister for Education: I said that tenders would be called.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I am glad to hear it. I hope that the Government will call tenders for all the lines they are constructing, as was promised during last session. I do not know exactly how to vote on this Bill, but I consider we should hesitate to authorise a line on a one in sixty grade.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. Ewing—South-West—in reply) [3.57]: The Government recognise the fact that the safe and efficient working of the railway system depends upon grades and curves and the weight of rails. I shall bring before the Premier and the Minister for Works what has been said here this afternoon, with a view to obtaining a ruling grade of one in eighty, if possible.

Hon. J. A. Greig: I am sure it can be got. The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The hon. member knows the country, and I do not. So far as I can, I shall insist upon the grade being one in eighty.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	17
Noes	..	..	..	5
Majority for	..	..	..	12

#### AYES.

Hon. H. Boan	Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. W. Carroll	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. J. A. Greig
Hon. J. W. Hickey	(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. W. Kirwan	Hon. R. J. Lynn
Hon. A. Lovekin	(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee, etc.*

Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 8—agreed to.

Schedule—agreed to.

Title:

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Would I be in order in moving to add to the Title the words "in the year 1930." It would then read: "A Bill for an Act to authorise the construction of a railway from Brookton to Dale River in the year 1930." I am certain that the railway will not be built during the next six or seven years.

The CHAIRMAN: The Title is not the place where an amendment of that description can be moved. The amendment, therefore, is out of order.

Title put and passed.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Read a third time and passed.

#### BILL—ROAD CLOSURE No. 2.

##### *Second Reading*

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. Ewing—South-West) [4.6] in moving the second reading said: Some of the residents of Collie wish to establish a croquet lawn at the corner of Wittenoom and Patterson streets. The proposed croquet lawn adjoins the bowling green and the tennis courts. The land on which it is proposed to establish the croquet lawn is, however, reserved for a trades hall site. The Collie branch of the Australian Labour Federation is prepared to relinquish the site, provided a piece of land on the opposite side of Patterson-street, with frontages to Throssell, Patterson, and Wittenoom-streets, is made available in return. The site suggested for the trades hall is not adequate for the purpose, and the proposal is to increase it by reducing the width of Patterson-street from 150 links to one chain. The 50 links taken from Patterson-street will be added to the trades hall site. The Collie Municipal Council has no objection to the exchange, and the Surveyor General, after personally inspecting the site, has reported favourably upon the transfer proposed. I move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee, etc.*

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

Read a third time and passed.

#### BILL—YARRAMONY EASTWARD RAILWAY.

##### *Second Reading.*

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. Ewing—South-West) [4.10] in moving the second reading said: This is the last railway Bill that will be placed before hon. members this session. It is not the least important of those which have been submitted to Parliament.

Hon. J. Nicholson: What is the length of the line?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The length is about 85 miles, with a ruling grade of 1 in 80, and the sharpest curve has a radius of 20 chains. It is proposed to use 45lb. rails, substituting later 60lb. rails. If the Government carry out their policy of constructing railways with 60lb. rails, a certain number of 45lb. rails will be available and we can economise in the construction of this line for the time being by using them. The



line was recommended by the Advisory Board as far north as North Baandee. The board did not report upon the country beyond that point.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: How far is North Baandee along the line?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I cannot say, but I should imagine it was about half way.

Hon. W. Carroll: It is nearer three parts of the way.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: In that case the Advisory Board have reported upon the major portion of the line. The House is not asked to agree to the construction of the line through to its proper terminus, because there has been a controversy as to where the line should junction. There is a divergence of opinion as to whether it should join up with the existing system at Merredin or at Newearnie. No decision has been arrived at on that point, but it is proposed, on the recommendation of the Engineer-in-Chief, to stop at the 85-mile post. The question will then be investigated and a decision arrived at as to the best point for the junction. Next session hon. members will be given the opportunity to consider that matter. The line is situated about midway between the Eastern Goldfields railway and the Dowerin loop line, and is from 12 to 15 miles from those lines. The railway will serve well settled land, and on this point the Railway Advisory Board reported—

Within lines drawn ten miles from and parallel to existing railways, a stretch of country is contained about 67 miles long, with an average width of nine miles. Its area is approximately 448,500 acres, of which 289,900 acres is alienated or in process of alienation, and 158,600 acres is still Crown land.

I have not any information to indicate whether that is all good country, but the fact that we have so much Crown land available should be sufficient justification for the line. The report continues:—

From returns received, it is estimated that within the area to be served there are about 226 settlers, who have 126,529 acres of forest land cleared, 96,584 acres of forest land uncleared, or a total of 223,113 acres, cleared and uncleared. This appears to be a liberal estimate.

I should say it was a conservative estimate.

Hon. J. Nicholson: What is the cost per mile?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The estimated cost of the line is £316,000, and the length of the line is 85 miles. The board's report shows that the production for 1919-20 was, wheat 185,588 bags, oats 6,914 bags, or a total of 192,503 bags, approximately 16,000 tons. With railway facilities this tonnage may be reasonably expected to increase to 20,000 or 22,000 tons. The main centres to be served are Ucarty, Hindmarsh, Yorkrakine, and Kodj Kodjin. The best of land surrounds these centres, which, however, are separated one from another by lower grade

country at present not used to any great extent. The same thing obtains along the Lake Grace-Newdegate line, as I know from my own observation. The settlers in the centres mentioned have to cart from 12 to 18 miles to existing railways, and that over roads very heavy and sandy.

Hon. J. Nicholson: The same may be said of the Kalgarin district.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The hon. member may be satisfied that in the near future the Government will take into consideration the serving of that district by a spur line. The estimated cost of this Yarramony railway is £316,000 if 45lb. rails be used, or £369,000 if 60lb. rails be used. Of course the heavier rails give greater efficiency in working, and I hope that before the line is completed the Government may be able to lay down 60lb. rails instead of 45lb. rails. If so, it will help both the settler and the Railway Department. Just as it is good to have easy grades and wide curves, so is it good to have heavy rails. It is the policy of the Government to lay down 60lb. rails, but in this instance they propose to depart from that principle. Possibly they will reconsider the question and lay down the line with 60lb. rails. I hope it may be so. I move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Hon. W. CARROLL (East) [4.20]: I support the second reading. For many years past the settlers in this district have been promised a railway. There is no better wheat growing area in the State. The Minister said the settlers were carting wheat from 12 to 18 miles. Of my own knowledge I can say that many of them are carting from 20 to 22 miles. I know of one who has let a contract for the carting of 5,000 bags of wheat, for which he will have to pay 2s. per bag. That sort of thing has been going on for a number of years. One has to live under the conditions existing in that district to realise the extent to which development has been retarded for want of a railway. Carting over long distances represents a loss, not only to the settler but to the State, because the time spent on the road could be more profitably occupied in developing the holdings. No doubt when the railway is built the quantity of wheat produced in the district will be very largely increased. The Bill, as first introduced in the Assembly, provided that the line should run from Yarramony to Newearnie. It has now been decided that the line shall run from Yarramony 85 miles eastward, ending at a point 13 or 14 miles from Merredin. So all the people of the district will be served, and the only disadvantage will be, from a railway point of view, is that the line will have a dead end.

The Minister for Education: Not for long.

Hon. W. CARROLL: I am glad of that assurance. The question, I understand, is interwoven with the wider question of future railway projects. In my view we have never before had a railway Bill better justified than is this one.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE (Metropolitan) [4.24]: This afternoon I voted for the construction of two railways about which I have very little knowledge. I was persuaded to do so because I believe those railways will be helpful to the settlers already in the district and encouraging to intending settlers. But in respect to the railway now before us, I may say I know the country very well. I have travelled along both the existing lines many times, and have frequently crossed from one to the other per motor car. I honestly believe the construction of this line to be fully justified. The Yarramony district, affording in spring time one of the finest sights to be seen in the State, is closely settled and produces very fine crops. The line will just about equally divide the area lying between the existing railways. I have within that area clients who sometimes consign from Korrolocking on the one line and, perhaps, send their next consignment from Tammin, on the other line, presumably according to the condition of the roads, their holdings lying about midway between the two existing lines. In 1911 or 1912, when the State was suffering from a depression, the Premier, then Minister for Lands, placed a lot of ex-public servants in the Yorkkrake district. Those settlers are still there awaiting a railway. So I think we can justifiably authorise this proposed line. The area to be served is splendid wheat growing country and also good cattle country. It gives point to the statements I have frequently made here, that had the Government paid some attention to that country in respect of the settlement of migrants, they would have been able to attain their object more quickly and at a less cost. One man in the Toodyay district, with a holding of 200 acres, cropped last year 120 acres. He owns 25 head of cattle and nine horses. During the year just closed he has produced butter fat and pigs valued at £208; 150 tons of hay valued at £300; 700 bags of oats valued at £300; 35 tons of ensilage valued at £1 per ton; 16 bags of household peas valued at £32, and wheat valued at £16; or a total of £891. All this was done by him, his wife, and his children under 15 years of age. That farm is not yet two years old. It shows what can be done, not only in that particular area, but along the whole length of the proposed line. He has supplied me with the following figures in respect of an acre of ensilage:—ploughing cost 8s., seed 5s., super 4s., cutting 6s., and carting 1s., or a total cost of 24s. per acre, from which he produced 7 tons of ensilage. If one man can do that close to Yarramony, where the country is typical of that through which the line will pass, we can expect decent advancement right along the line. The Crown lands still available could be brought under a scheme of closer settlement and would quickly produce results, the equivalent of which would not be obtained in the South-West for many years.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [4.31]: No one can dispute the wisdom of building railways in keeping with the settle-

ment, progress, and development of our agricultural areas. We wish to see all our areas settled, but the question is whether we are pursuing a wise policy in authorising the construction of 85 miles of railway. We have already authorised two other lines, one of 37 and the other of 26½ miles.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You will not oppose this one after agreeing to the others?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I spoke against one and supported the other on the ground that it was a short line that had been promised many years ago. The Yarramony line will cost £316,000, equal to £3,720 per mile.

The Minister for Education: That is with 45lb. rails. With 60lb. rails it will cost more.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Then we can put down the cost at about £4,000 per mile. There are only 226 settlers at present along the route, and the cost of the railway will be equal to £1,400 per settler.

The Minister for Education: What about the other country that will be taken up?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Are we justified in authorising the construction of 85 miles of line when we do not know that the whole of the country will be taken up? It will be impossible to construct this railway for many years, and I suggest it would be sufficient to authorise the building of the first section of 31 miles. By so doing we shall give the settlers hope that if the land is suitable, extensions will be made in due time. No one can seriously argue that it is necessary to build 85 miles of railway to serve 226 settlers. If 60lb. rails are used the cost will be close on half a million, and we shall thus be committing the State to a very serious obligation. If I were not assured that the district is a good one, I would feel inclined to ask members to reject the Bill. In view of the information given us, however, I think it would be wise to authorise the first section only.

Hon. A. Burvill: What is wrong with railways preceding settlement?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I have no objection to that, but I have a strong objection to misleading settlers into a belief that they are going to get railways in the near future, when we know it will be impossible for the Government to construct them for many years. There may be a prospect of building a short line in a few years. The shorter section will be better for the Government and for the Railway Department, because it will be conducive to closer settlement. If we authorise the full length, people will select land far beyond points to which the line can be carried within reasonable time.

Hon. G. W. MILES (North) [4.38]: Four years ago a Parliamentary party visited this district. I was surprised at the quality of the land and the crops. At North Baandee the Premier and some members of the party went north and another section, including Mr. Duffell and I, went south between the two lines. A deputation waited upon us and we promised to do what we could to assist the settlers to get this railway. Northern

members were particularly impressed with the quantity of feed going to waste. If the Government would go further and provide wire netting to assist the settlers to fence their holdings, they would be doing a good thing for the settlers and for the whole State. I hope the Government will take advantage of the British Government's offer to advance three-fourths of the interest for five years and that netting will be supplied on 20 years terms. This is one of the best districts I have seen in the State.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee.*

Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 8—agreed to.

Schedule:

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Following upon my remarks on the second reading, I move an amendment—

*That all the words after "thirty-one miles" be struck out.*

It would be misleading to authorise 85 miles when there is no possible hope of building the line for many years. The Government might as well ask for authority to build a line to some place 500 miles away.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The next Government will speed up and get on with the work.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: There is no possibility.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I oppose the amendment. My only objection to the line is that it will have a dead end.

The Minister for Education: Not for long.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: It should junction with Merredin or Newearnie. I take it Newearnie is the more suitable place. I was surprised to hear that there are only 226 settlers along the route, but there are many miles of crop unfenced and without habitations in the vicinity. My explanation is that while farming is going on actively in that area, the people reside closer to the lines already constructed. This line should be linked up with Newearnie straight away.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I hope the amendment will not be carried. Undoubtedly a great deal of the magnificent land taken up by early settlers would not be reached by an extension of 30 miles. The whole of the settlers should be served. The land represents the pick of the State, and the authorisation of the whole line will encourage development there. At the time the Railway Advisory Board's report was made, some years ago, there were 226 settlers in the district; but a great deal of settlement has taken place since then. Many soldiers have gone on that country meantime.

Hon. G. POTTER: I hope the Committee will not carry the amendment. Mr. Burvill asked, by way of interjection, why the mover of the amendment should not believe in rail-

way construction preceding settlement. The amendment stultifies the Bill. The present number of settlers afford no indication of what will ensue upon the construction of the line, having regard to the class of country.

Hon. W. CARROLL: I must add my protest against the amendment. If the Chamber is not prepared to authorise the construction of the line as proposed in the Bill the Government will not be justified in expending any money on the proposition. Money spent on 31 miles would, until the complete line had been built, be absolutely thrown away. The best land to be served by the construction of the line will be left unserved if the amendment is carried. In fact, carrying the amendment means killing the Bill. Since the Railway Advisory Board's report was made, settlement has practically doubled.

Amendment put and negatived.

Schedule put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Read a third time, and passed.

#### BILL—STAMP ACT AMENDMENT.

##### *Assembly's Message.*

Message from the Assembly notifying that it had made the amendment requested by the Council now considered.

##### *In Committee, etc.*

Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Read a third time, and passed.

#### BILL—LAND TAX AND INCOME TAX.

##### *Assembly's Message.*

Message from the Assembly notifying that it declined to make the amendments requested by the Council, now considered.

##### *In Committee.*

Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The first amendment requested by the Council but declined by the Assembly was that Subclause (1) of Clause 6 be deleted.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move—

*That the Council's requested amendment be not pressed.*

There is no need for me to say anything at this stage. I hope hon. members will see the wisdom in my motion.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I propose to move as an amendment "That the requested amendment be pressed."

The CHAIRMAN: That would be a direct negative to the motion.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: But if we decide to press the request we shall have to send a message to another Chamber showing that the request was pressed.

The CHAIRMAN: All that is necessary is for the hon. member to vote against the motion.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I do not intend to say anything on the merits of this question just now, because I have reason to believe that the Minister will not strenuously oppose the pressing of the amendment. If we press the amendment I think we shall find that another place will invite us to a conference, which is the end we set out to accomplish. All I want just now is that the Bill shall go back to another place where, I understand, a conference will be asked for.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: This is the time for me to appeal to hon. members to carry my motion. If there is to be a conference later, well and good, but I have no knowledge of it.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: There cannot be a conference if we agree to your motion.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: If a conference be held, it will then be for me to fight for the Government and the interests of the State. A big constitutional question is involved in this, and I ask hon. members to realise the seriousness of the position. I hope my motion will be carried.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I am disposed to support Mr. Lovekin in opposing the motion. If we press our amendment there will be a conference between the two Houses.

The Minister for Education: You cannot be sure of that.

Hon. J. Cornell: I should like to be as sure of winning Tattersall's.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I think we can afford to take the chance. If the conference does nothing else, it will bring together three members of this House and three from another place, and so will help to throw more light on the subject.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I hope the request will be pressed. The House has made a protest, and now we are at the parting of the ways. It has been said the House will be accepting a grave responsibility if it goes farther than it has gone. In that excellent apologist for the Government, the "West Australian," this morning, certain members of this House were taken to task. Some were held up as fountains of common sense, and others as having every sense but common sense. Under the Constitution we can request amendments in Bills imposing taxation, so long as we do not thereby in-

crease the burden on the people. As a matter of fact in this instance we propose to reduce that burden. The Minister has appealed to us not to press our amendment, but I say it ought to be pressed. Not that it matters to me individually whether or not the super tax be imposed, but that there is a principle involved. I will support the pressing of our request, in order that the question may go to a conference. If the conference cannot agree that the super tax be abolished—I utter this warning to our managers, whoever they may be, that if the tax is to be continued—

Hon. G. POTTER: On a point of order: Is the hon. member entitled to utter a warning to managers yet to be appointed? Last session we had a heated discussion as to the divulgence of information relating to a conference. I do not think it right that any member should utter warnings to our managers, for in another place it may be taken as a direct threat.

The CHAIRMAN: It is distinctly out of order for any member to issue a note of warning to any manager.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Well, I will use the word "advice." I say, that if there is to be any compromise, the compromise ought to be in the direction of a gradual elimination of the super tax. Up to this stage I say "no surrender"; and if at any subsequent stage ammunition and provisions run out, then let us do the best we can.

Question put and negatived; the Council's requested amendment pressed.

The CHAIRMAN: The second request made by the Council was for the deletion of Clause 7.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: This is the clause disallowing the payment of taxation in two moieties. It is the desire of another place that it should be paid in one moiety. Seeing how far the financial year has gone, I think we might well refrain from pressing our request. I move—

*That the Council's requested amendment be not pressed.*

Hon. J. CORNELL: The reason given for the introduction of this clause into the Act of last year was the lateness of the session when it was brought down. If that was a valid reason for its inclusion, the remedy for the position is in the hands of the Government. But they have perpetrated the same sin this year, and for the same reason they ask that we should humble ourselves now. The payment of income tax in two instalments is of great benefit to the people, and the payment in one instalment is a benefit to the department.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment pressed.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly transmitted to the Assembly.

## BILL—VERMIN ACT AMENDMENT.

*Second Reading.*

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. Ewing—South-West) [5.18] in moving the second reading said: This Bill is the result of numerous requests put forward by settlers and vermin boards at various conferences. The dingo is a serious menace to stock. It is desired that there should be a uniform bonus throughout the State, so that the pest may be effectively coped with. It is gratifying to find when travelling through the wheat areas and eastern districts that the rabbits are not as plentiful as they were. In that direction the position has improved. The dingoes, however, have become more numerous, and the pastoral industry is being considerably hampered by them. It is desired, therefore, to make the Act more effective so that the position may be better handled. The State is divided into two parts, each being under a separate Act. The 1918 Act covers the South-West division, and the 1909 Act deals with every portion of the State outside that division. The difficulties of administration have been increased by the present legislation, and this Bill is brought in so that economies may be effected. Road boards in the South-West are compelled to constitute themselves as vermin boards, but that is not so with road boards outside that division. The dividing line between the two parts of the State is the rabbit-proof fence. The administration of the Act outside the South-West is not satisfactory. This is the case in such districts as Esperance, where there have been great developments in agriculture recently. A large area of land in that locality, which was not thought to be cereal producing, is now coming under cultivation. This district is covered by the 1909 Act, which contains no provision for rating on the unimproved capital value. The reward for dingoes under the 1909 Act was 5s. a scalp—this is the area administered by road boards—and under the 1918 Act, 10s. In Yalgoo, Cue, Day Dawn, and Nannine some dogs are paid for at 5s. a head and some at 10s., for some portions of those districts come under both Acts. There is, therefore, confusion. In 1922-23, 6,692 dogs were caught. The bonuses paid by the Government amounted to £2,560. The vermin boards paid £5,286 over the same period. The Bill proposes to apply the 1918 Act to the whole State, and make special provision for that portion of the State outside the South-West. A good deal has been said in another place about this Bill. I have had no opportunity of reading the discussions there, or of seeing the Minister for Agriculture to-day. I have endeavoured, however, to arrive at the attitude he adopted in another place.

Hon. J. Duffell: He could have supplied you with notes on the matter.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I have compiled my own notes.

Hon. J. Duffell: That is not fair to you.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It is quite fair. To the Bill has been added a new clause, 7, which does away with the road boards under the 1909 Act. The Minister for Agriculture will supersede existing boards, except in the South-West Division of the State. It gives him a position of sole responsibility, and he becomes merged, so to speak, in each of these boards. He has a big part to play.

Hon. A. Burvill: I notice that the South-West is exempt.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I do not know that there is any exemption.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The South is not prepared to tax itself, but the North is.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Clause 7 provides for the abolition of all boards outside the South-West division. It vests in the Minister for Agriculture all the powers of the boards in each district. The boards are being abolished at the request of the North-West pastoralists, who are the people principally concerned. Under Sub-clause 4 the annual rate, as may be prescribed by Parliament, shall be payable in every year to the Minister for Agriculture by the owner of every pastoral holding in each district. The amount so raised will be devoted entirely to the destruction of dingoes and foxes. It is considered that these are the chief menace to that portion of the State at the present time. The pastoralists are going to help considerably in this direction. They are wise in doing this, and in protecting their properties. These holdings are very valuable in view of the wonderful price of wool, and the prosperity these parts of the State are now enjoying. The Minister for Agriculture is prepared to provide for the appointment of an advisory board. That should be satisfactory to members from the North. The board will give advice to the Government as to how the money raised under this provision shall be used. The Government will pay a subsidy in proportion to the amount raised by the pastoralists in each district for the destruction of foxes and dingoes. I believe there is some difficulty in another place concerning this being a money Bill and that the fees to be charged will be embodied in another Bill.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Will that Bill be brought down before we adjourn?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I do not know what will be done otherwise.

Hon. J. Duffell: Can it not be done by regulation?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I will ascertain the position from the Minister for Agriculture. The arrangement made with the pastoralists is satisfactory and should be in the interests of the State. The Government will assist them as far as possible in exterminating these pests.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Is the subsidy to be on a pound for pound basis?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I will come to that. No rate will be levied under Section 59 of the Act other than for the purpose of defraying the cost of erect-

ing, maintaining, and removing fences. I understand there is a fence in the Gascoyne district which cost something like £60,000. The information I have is that the money that has been raised has not been used for any other purpose than to pay interest and sinking fund on the money invested. No repairs are being effected. I believe Mr. Holmes intends to move an amendment. I hope he will not move an amendment that will prevent the Minister from effecting such improvements to the fence as may be necessary. From what I understand of Mr. Holmes' intention, he does propose to prevent the Minister from expending any money upon the maintenance of this fence. It is proposed to embody in the Bill a new clause empowering boards to charge interest on overdue rates. This is in accordance with the express wish of vermin boards. Much expense attaches to the collection of overdue rates, because of the extra clerical work and postage involved in the task. The boards desire something to be done so as to secure the more rapid payment of the rates. If a penalty is provided in the Bill it should have that effect. Another amendment provides that inspectors will be compelled to submit reports on holdings visited. In the past the reports when received have not been satisfactory. Some have been of no value at all. The object is to bring about uniformity in procedure by all the inspectors. Some of the boards do not call for reports at all. It is hoped that this provision will overcome that difficulty. It is proposed to provide, by way of regulation, a uniform bonus of 20s. throughout the South-West and 10s. throughout the rest of the State. At the present time there is no uniformity about it and some of the vermin boards pay as much as £5 by way of bonus. The Bill will do away with that difficulty and provide bonuses on a uniform basis. On account of the larger payments in some districts a certain amount of trafficking has been going on and dogs killed in one vermin board area have been taken where it was possible to collect a bigger bonus.

Member: That is business acumen.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Perhaps so, but it is intended to exercise a greater control so as to prevent that sort of thing continuing. The Government bonus throughout the State will be 10s. These bonuses will represent double the amount being paid at present in areas outside the South-West division. There are other pests that effect the position of pastoralists and agriculturists in other parts of the State. Many members, doubtless, have received complaints regarding euros which are a menace in some parts of the North-West. The Government regret that for the moment it is not possible to legislate for the extermination of that pest.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Why cannot that be done?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It has been considered, but the Minister for Agriculture has not been able to embody pro-

visions in the Bill to deal with euros. It is necessary, of course, to deal with euros, for in some parts they are worse than dingoes and foxes.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Will not the rabbits increase if you exterminate the euros and foxes?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: But the euro is a kangaroo and will not eat rabbits!

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The Minister for Agriculture explained in another place that euros and kangaroos come within the scope of the Game Act and something might be done to help the pastoralists under that Act.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Wipe out the royalty and bring them under the Vermin Act!

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I am prepared to accept any satisfactory amendment that the hon. member may move. Among the other pests that might be mentioned are white cockatoos in the South-West, where they have ruined some of the orchards and where their depredations are noticeable throughout the apple season, the emus in the North Midlands, where they are extremely troublesome during the harvest time, and the euros in the northern districts. All these are serious pests, but at the present time the legislation does not cover them because, as the Minister for Agriculture has pointed out, it is not possible for the Government to do all this work. Perhaps the Government may be able to reconsider the position in the future. I hope some suggestions will be forthcoming during the debate, particularly regarding the euros, and perhaps some amendment may be forthcoming to improve the position in the North-West. The Government desire to protect the pastoralists in the North as well as the agriculturists in the South-West. The Government also realise that the pastoralists are anxious to help themselves. I believe the Bill will be a useful measure and I trust that representatives of the South, East, and North Provinces will have suggestions to make that will materially improve the Bill. I move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [5.36]: The Minister has rightly said that the pastoralists are up against a serious problem in the North-West regarding dingoes, euros, emus, and, possibly, foxes. The pastoralists, realising this, have been negotiating with the Government for some months past in order to arrive at a basis satisfactory to them and to the Government for the destruction of these pests. What the pastoralists wanted and what they are getting in the Bill are two different propositions. The pastoralists suggested they were prepared to tax themselves to the extent of 1d. in the pound on the unimproved capital value of pastoral holdings in the northern portions of the State and asked in return that the Government should pay a subsidy, on a £ for £ basis, of 10s. for

a dingo, the pastoralists to put up another 10s., making a total of £1 per dog.

The Minister for Education: That has been done.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The reason for asking Government assistance under that heading is that many of these dogs are bred on Crown lands and not on land occupied by pastoralists. In the interests of the whole State, including the South-West Division which does not come under these provisions, it is necessary to destroy these pests. The pastoralists asked for a representative advisory board to be elected or nominated by the taxpayers. They regarded that as a reasonable request, but the Government would not agree to it. They want a board nominated by themselves, and that board will be empowered to spend the pastoralists' money. We have not a great voting strength in the North and consequently we have to take what is given to us and be thankful. It is suggested that the pastoralists will be at the mercy of the Government. I have figured that out for myself and I do not think the Government would attempt to penalise them, because if they did so they would also penalise the Treasury. At the rate proposed, I believe £25,000 would be the result. If the Government had to subsidise on a pound for pound basis they would have to find another £25,000 in order to assist in exterminating this pest. It is in the hands of the Treasurer to fix the amount of the tax and I think he will not fix more than £5,000 to be provided by the pastoralists and a similar amount to be provided by the State. Perhaps a farthing will be the first levy imposed by the Government, and if that is not found sufficient to destroy these pests, then a higher rate will probably be imposed. The Bill will apply only to the pastoral areas in the North, and not to the South-West Division. The Government propose to pay a bonus of 10s. throughout the State and the pastoralists are to be asked to provide a further 10s. The trouble may be, however, that the pastoralists will not pay for their own dogs only but for dogs killed in the South-West division because, with only a dividing fence between the two areas, it is possible for a man to kill dogs in the South-West division and take them across the fence, where he will be able to collect £1 instead of 10s. for the scalp. That practice has been in vogue throughout the State and the Bill is introduced to get over the present system of payments for scalps, which range from 5s. to £2.

The Minister for Education: Some boards have paid up to £5.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Under the existing system the board paying the highest rate for dogs gets the most dogs killed in its district and has to provide the greatest amount of money. We know that all the dogs are not killed in that district, but advantage is taken of this position. As it is, the pastoralists now carry not only the responsibility of dogs killed in their own district but are liable to pay for dogs killed in the South-West. I do not know whether

the members of the Country Party, if there is such a party now, know of the position.

Hon. W. Carroll: The average amount paid by boards in the South-West is from £2 to £3.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: In the stations I am interested in we provide a man, who gets station wages, with a complete outfit, provisions, and equipment, together with a payment of £6 for each dog. When the man had cleaned up our stations, he went outside on to someone else's property, killed the dogs there and came back to us for payment.

Hon. H. Stewart: It paid you to do so.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: In the North we are not in the same position as in the spoon-fed South-West.

Hon. H. Stewart: Or the metropolitan area.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: There is one amendment that the Solicitor General has drawn up for me. A section of the pastoralists in the Gascoyne many years ago conceived what they thought was a brilliant idea when the first invasion of rabbits was reported, to construct a fence from Exmouth Gulf to the Bight and by that means protect their holdings within the fenced off area. In this way they were to keep out the rabbits. They borrowed something like £60,000 from the Government. When the Bill was before the House, no maximum rate was fixed. They were thus left to the mercy of anyone and everyone. The Legislative Council in its wisdom fixed the maximum rate at 2s. per hundred acres. Somebody suggested there should be a maximum. The rental in those days was 10s. per thousand and the maximum imposed by this House made the vermin tax twice the amount of the rental. It became necessary to have a board to administer the Act in that particular area and the pastoralists, or some of them, were 150 or 200 miles from a port. There were no motor cars in those days and if I may use the term not offensively, I will say that the administration of the Act drifted into the hands of publicans and sinners. The erection of the fence cost an enormous sum of money. Fortunately for the pastoralists there was subsequently found a defect in the Act, and whilst the Board were given the rate of 2s. per thousand, no provision was made as to whom or where the money should be paid. It became necessary to come back to Parliament to adjust that, and it was shown that a maximum of 1s. per 100, or 10s. per 1,000, would be sufficient to meet interest and sinking fund over the period for which the loan was granted, and it was then agreed to make good the defects in the Act to legalise the collection of the rate, not only the existing rate but the arrears, and to fix the maximum at 1s. per 100. Fortunately there was no invasion of rabbits. It was found that the country through which the fence had been built contained watercourses and that after rains there were floods and the fence in places was washed away. The pastoralists came to the conclusion that their moral obligation was to pay interest and sink

ing fund. The fence was theirs and they decided to abandon it, but to pay interest and sinking fund in accordance with the Act, so that in due course their liability to the Crown might be liquidated. That was quite a decent thing to do. As a matter of fact the pastoralists have always acted decently. They are scattered all over the country and they cannot administer the Act. It was agreed that the Minister should administer the Act, collect the rates, pay them into a fund and liquidate the liability. That would have been all right if the Minister had done what the Act compelled him to do, that is, to allocate the money for one particular purpose, the payment of principal and interest. But the Government, as is usual, appointed a chief inspector and an army of men to repair the fence, a fence that the squatters said they would abandon, and there was spent on it no less a sum than £17,000 in trying to do to the fence what the pastoralists said they did not want. Moreover, instead of paying that £17,000 out of revenue, as they should have done, the Government confiscated £17,000 of the rate money that the pastoralists had paid for the reduction of the principal and the payment of interest. The pastoralists are going to the court to get an order for the proper adjustment of the accounts. For that reason, the amendment I propose to submit becomes necessary, because the clause, as it is drawn, gives the Minister power to take portion of that money, paid for a specific purpose, in order to maintain and repair the fence. It is not a fair thing to seize the opportunity to amend the Act so as to prevent the pastoralists doing what they intend to do, namely liquidate their liability. Instead of their capital account coming down £17,000, and the interest being reduced proportionately, the capital account still stands and the interest will still be debited against these people on the increased amount instead of the lesser amount after deducting the £17,000, as should have been done. Subclause 5 of Clause 7 gives the Minister power to erect, maintain, and renew fences. The Great Barrier fence was built to protect, not the pastoral, but the agricultural areas. I do not suppose the Government would come down on the pastoralists and ask them to maintain, renew, or pay interest on that fence, but there is no doubt that if the amendment I suggest is not made, the Government will come down on the unfortunate Gascoyne people and compel them to maintain and repair the fence and so keep the people there in debt for ever. The pastoralists have paid for the fence and they want to abandon it. They are prepared to pay 10s. per thousand and ultimately liquidate their liability. In order to protect these people, I have had an amendment framed by the Solicitor General. I propose to add it to Subclause 5 and it will read—

And as regards the existing fence in the Gascoyne district, such rates shall not be applied otherwise than to the payment of

interest on, and sinking fund for, the redemption of the loan already raised.

I am asking the House to let these people do what they are entitled to do, that is, to abandon their fence and pay 10s. per thousand and acres per annum until the liability is liquidated. The pastoralists in this particular area have also to pay a rate for the extermination of dogs. I wish to make it clear that these people will still pay their 10s. a thousand and in addition will pay their quota of the £5,000, £10,000, £15,000 or £25,000, as the case may be. I am sure my case will appeal to members. The Solicitor General argued that the fence is the Government's security and must be maintained. That did not appeal to me, but he did not pursue it any further. The fence is not the security. The pastoral leases within the area are the security. If all the pastoralists walked out and abandoned their leases the Government would have no claim on anybody. It is only whilst the pastoralist is in possession of the lease that the Government are entitled to enforce the rate. If I borrow £10,000 on a property in Perth, the man from whom I borrow will insist on my insuring the property because that is his security. In this case the fence is not the security; it is the pastoral leases that is the security while it is in the occupation of the lessees who have to pay the rate of 10s. per thousand per annum.

The Minister for Education: It is a most extraordinary position.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Minister for Agriculture must admit that the pastoralists are paying the maximum amount of rates.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS (North-East) [6.0]: I welcome the introduction of the Bill. The whole of the pastoralists are not confined to the North province; there is a number in the North-East province which I hope will grow. During the visit of the Premier recently the pastoralists and representatives of the road boards of Lawlers, Wiluna, Mt. Margaret, and Leonora waited on the Premier and requested that legislation be introduced on the lines of this measure. They desired the Government to assist them by supplying dog-proof fencing, but owing to the huge area that would have to be fenced, they found that this proposal was more or less impracticable. They suggested that the Government should give a higher rate for dingo scalps, and this has been conceded under the Bill. The country there until recently was used almost exclusively for cattle raising. Lately it has been proved that it will profitably carry sheep, and there are prospects that in years to come it will be an important sheep-growing area.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: But you must have netting.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Yes, that means an expenditure of £75 to £80 a mile.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The Government are going to provide some cheap netting for you.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Those pastoralists would welcome it. The pastoralists there may



not be working on such a big scale as are those in the North-West, but they are equally interested in vermin legislation. The Bill will assist them to fight the dingoes which, from 20 miles east of Laverton, are particularly bad right through to the South Australian border.

Hon. G. W. MILES (North) [6.2]: Mr. Holmes has fully discussed the Bill as it affects the dingo in the North-West, but he omitted to mention the euro, though the Minister referred to it. Is it not possible to amend this Bill so that euros in the northern and outer portions of the State may be declared vermin? At present they come under the Game Act and a royalty is charged on them. The pastoralists in the North-West have gone to a good deal of trouble to exterminate the dingoes, but proportionately to their diminution euros have increased, and in some instances there are more euros than sheep in the paddocks.

Hon. J. A. Greig: Are not they of value?

Hon. G. W. MILES: Of very little value. It does not pay to shoot them and when they are shot the Government impose a royalty—this on an absolute pest! Considering the value of the wool industry to the State, something should be done quickly to cope with this pest.

Hon. H. Stewart: Get the Government to put a regulation through.

Hon. G. W. MILES: North-West members have urged the Government to take action and it is time they did something. That is how the North is treated. Some of us saw the Colonial Secretary, but he told us it was useless to go to him. It is time Ministers realised their responsibility and did something.

Hon. H. Stewart: You want to go to the Premier.

Hon. G. W. MILES: If euros in the northern portions of the State can be declared vermin under the Bill, we shall not mind if they are kept under the Game Act in the southern parts of the State. I support the Bill, and hope the House will agree to Mr. Holmes' amendment. The pastoralists are prepared to pay the tax to cover the interest and sinking fund on the fence in the Gascoyne district, and I do not see why it is necessary to compel them to keep the fence in repair when they contend it is of no use to them.

Hon. J. Duffell: The Government will not allow them to remove it.

Hon. G. W. MILES: If the Government allowed them to remove it it would be better, because it would assist to reduce their liability. The fence extends from Exmouth Gulf to the inner fence.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee.*

Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 6—agreed to.

Clause 7—The Minister to supersede boards except in the south-west division of the State:

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I move an amendment—

*That the following be added to Subclause 5:—"and as regards the existing fence in the Gascoyne district, such rates shall not be applied otherwise than to the payment of interest on and sinking fund for the redemption of the loan already raised."*

The amendment proposes that the money raised, not under this legislation but under the 10s. per 1,000 acres provision, shall be applied to interest and sinking fund.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I have the greatest sympathy with the Gascoyne people. They seem to be in the position of having to pay interest on a large amount of money in respect of a fence that is valueless. I do not know whether the Government regard the fence as security. The Solicitor General reports—

I do not think this amendment should be received taking absolute power away from the Minister to do what is necessary in the way of repairs.

If the amendment be carried the Minister would not be able to do anything in the way of repairs.

Hon. G. W. Miles: We do not want him to.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I do not think the amendment is necessary, but if it be accepted, the Solicitor General suggests the addition of the following words:—"and any repairs found absolutely necessary by the Minister." I suppose Mr. Holmes would not accept that.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: No.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That would make the position as before.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Why should the Minister for Agriculture be able to examine a fence for which the people are paying and say it shall be repaired when, in the opinion of the people, the fence is no good. It is washed down by every storm and broken through by every kangaroo, euro and emu. Their only hope is to abandon the fence. I oppose the amendment.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: In the south-west division the people that have fenced their areas against vermin are excluded from taxation under the Vermin Act. I understand the squatters in the Gascoyne area arranged with the Government to fence in this area. Will the amendment exempt them from rating under the Act?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: They will pay the 10s. per thousand and will pay under this clause too.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move an amendment—

*That the following words be added, "And any repairs found absolutely necessary by the Minister."*

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. G. W. MILES: Referring to what I have said as to bringing euros under this measure, I now find that the Government can include them by proclamation. There will be no need for me to move an amendment in that connection if the Minister will give an assurance that he will use his best endeavours to get euros included where that course is necessary. I understand also that the Government will waive the royalty on euro skins.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The Minister for Agriculture has informed me that the Government have waived the royalty. There is power to do by regulation what Mr. Miles desires with regard to euros, and I shall make it my business to have it done as speedily as possible.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment, and the report adopted.

Read a third time, and returned to the Assembly with an amendment.

## BILL—APPROPRIATION.

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 11th December.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY (Central) [7.39]: At an early stage of this session I offered my congratulations to the Leader of the House upon his accession to Cabinet rank. Those congratulations were tendered in all sincerity. At that stage I also expressed my hope that the Minister for Education, as the Council's only representative in the Cabinet, would assert his personality in connection with Government arrangements. I am deeply sorry to say that my hopes and prognostications in that respect have not been realised to the extent I would like. I thought the Minister for Education would endeavour to put an end to the system of one-man government. But the Premier now dominates the Government exactly as he did prior to the opening of this session. Some of us hoped that Mr. Ewing, on attaining Ministerial office, would assert his individuality and protest against the drift which then obtained—unfortunately it obtains today. In connection with the Appropriation Bill I was greatly struck by the note of criticism sounded by Mr. Holmes, Mr. Baxter, and others who by no stretch of imagination can be deemed enthusiastic supporters of the Labour policy. The criticisms passed by these gentlemen upon the Government are backed up by strong arguments. When introducing the Appropriation Bill the Minister fortified himself with an accumulation or confusion of figures. Possibly he may have understood those figures, and hon. members may or may not have appreciated their bearing. The Minister may or may not have proved his case. Mr. Holmes, taking up the Minister's challenge, replied

with another accumulation of figures. After dissecting those figures I am of opinion that Mr. Holmes put up a good case, and one which requires a deal of answering. It remains for us to say how much longer we will sit down and accept the existing state of affairs. It is for this House to decide whether the Government are in the right or whether Mr. Holmes and those who supported him are in the right. Finance is government, and government is finance. We have to decide how the sum of nearly £10,000,000 sterling covered by the Appropriation Bill is to be apportioned. Before casting our votes on a Bill involving such gigantic expenditure, we must form an opinion on the manner in which the administration of public affairs has been carried on. As proved by Mr. Holmes and others, that administration has been entirely wrong for a long time. We now have to analyse our position. If there is justification for the criticisms, or I may say accusations, levelled at the Government by Mr. Holmes in particular, it is time for the Minister for Education, as representative of the Government in this Chamber, to sit up and take notice. I have long been connected with the public life of this State, and particularly as a member of this Council for eight years; and certainly I have never read or heard such an indictment levelled at a Government as that levelled by Mr. Holmes at the Mitchell Ministry in connection with the Appropriation Bill.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I merely quoted their figures.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: Quite so. I make no complaint on that score. Somebody should ascertain whether Mr. Holmes is right or is wrong. If he is right, somebody else must be wrong. Unfortunately I was not here when Mr. Holmes moved for a select committee to inquire into the administration of the Peel and Bateman estates. I certainly would have supported him in his request for a select committee. A few years ago the Labour Government piled up a deficit of about a million and a half. Then a Government consisting of men of business acumen and commercial instincts took charge of affairs with a view to squaring the finances. The result was that the deficit accumulated still more rapidly until it reached nearly six millions. No public man is justified in crying stinking fish. We ought to put our best goods in the window. Still we must occasionally have a review of the position. The other night it was ironically declared that we were getting a fine advertisement from the remarks of Mr. Holmes. I say it is better for the State that the facts should be put before the people than that we should be at pains to present an unduly attractive picture. The Minister for Education says that everything in the State is lovely and that the deficit is justified by virtue of the fact that we are getting increased population. But all thinking people know exactly the value of the apparent increase in our population. It has been said that as fast as people come

here from the Old Land they go on to the Eastern States. I will not say that, but I do declare that for every hundred people coming into the State, 75 are leaving. I do not think the Minister can successfully combat that statement. Western Australia is being used as a recruiting ground for the Eastern States. Moreover, in quality, the men and women coming to the State do not represent 25 per cent. of those we are losing; for we are losing some of our best citizens, men who have battled hard here for years and raised families. They are disgusted with the existing conditions, and, having saved a little money, are getting out of the State. What I am saying I know to be correct. Yet the Minister declares that everything in the State is satisfactory. In my view we should not allow the existing state of affairs to continue. Each member of the House has to take his share of responsibility for the actions of the Government. I enter my protest against the Government's immigration policy. Mr. Baxter and Mr. Miles the other night by interjection said the Government's immigration policy had the blessing of the Labour Party and that Mr. Augwin, the deputy leader of the party, was strong in support of it. The Labour Party stands for a healthy, progressive system of immigration; for they realise that Australia is the best country in the world and they want it populated by a white race. But the party says that provision has to be made at this end for those who are being brought out to the State. To-day we are bringing out men and women under false pretences. We have paid officials going around the back country trying to induce our farmers to employ the new comers. In due course the migrants are shanghaied up country at 25s. a week. They do not suit the boss, or the boss does not suit them, and in about 24 hours they are on their way back to the city. The Labour Party stands for any good, healthy system of migration, but it must be on sound lines, not on the lines of Sir James Mitchell's system. The Minister for Education as usual enthusiastically supported the Premier, punctuating his remarks with "The Premier wishes this, and the Premier wishes that."

The Minister for Education: That was not so.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: I listened to what the Minister said.

The Minister for Education: You did not hear me say that.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: But I did. I was disappointed to find that the Minister had dug himself in as the chief apologist for the Government.

The Minister for Education: Do you say I ought not to be loyal?

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: I have never questioned the Minister's loyalty. He is entirely loyal to the Government on the floor of the House. But there is such a thing as loyalty, and such a thing as loyalty carried to excess. A Minister loyal in the true sense ought to say to the Premier, "I am fifty-fifty with you; I have to justify your Cabinet in the

Legislative Council, and so I require an argument to put up." Instead of that, the Minister comes here with nothing but apologies for the Government.

The Minister for Education: I did not apologise for them. I simply stated facts.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: Other members may have construed the Minister's remarks in a different way. As I have said, in the early stage of the session, I was hopeful that the Minister would assert himself. However, let that pass. It was thrown across the Chamber when Mr. Moore was speaking that the Labour Party supported the immigration policy, and were on the Premier's side in that matter. To this I agree to some extent. There is one thing we would have insisted upon and that was the making of complete arrangements for marketing. The Government establishes group settlements, but, ostrich-like, their heads are in the sand and they know no what will happen afterwards. The whole question depends upon the marketing of the produce, and this will be the biggest factor in the position. The Minister has not told us what the attitude of the Government is as to the marketing of the produce of these group settlers, or of that of any other settler.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Do you expect the Government to do that?

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: The party that keeps the Government in power expects them to do everything.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Your party is keeping them in power.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: The Government should not do everything, but as they established these group settlements it is their responsibility to see that markets are opened up for the settlers. As things are, a great deal of the produce that is grown by the settlers may prove to be unmarketable. It may be said that wool will always command a price, but the time may come when that may not be so, and hon. members representing that interest will be looking to the Government.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Never.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: The squatters and farmers, in common with other people, will be looking to the Government.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The squatters are looking after themselves.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: No one better. They have done so for a long time, but that was not always the case. The Minister should state the attitude of the Government as to the marketing of produce. Mr. Holmes levelled severe criticism at the Government. I could have understood it coming from the Leader of the Opposition, but not from Mr. Holmes. I have visited the Peel estate, and from what I saw, with all its disabilities, sandhills and bush, I think there is a good chance of the estate making good. I do not refer to individuals there because they do not count, but the proposition appears to me to be a good one. It is certainly over-capitalised, and the wrong class of settler has

been placed upon it. This surprised me very much. The land seemed to be good, the work being done upon the estate was efficient, and the settlement as a proposition seemed to be all right. If, however, the Government are not getting a *quid pro quo* for what they are doing we shall have an over-capitalised estate. I did not know until Mr. Holmes said it that the better part of this estate, which was being cultivated when I saw it, had been swept away by floods, and that men were being paid a big price to clear it.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I said the other end was a washaway, and that this end of the group settlement was the part under the Agricultural Bank.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: Someone must be responsible for this. I know both Mr. Anketell, and the foreman of works, Mr. Devine, and I believe they are men who know their jobs. If they do not know it they should not be allowed to remain.

Hon. A. Burvill: What about the abnormal rains we had?

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: That will be brought out at the inquiry. Either these officers are right, or they are wrong. If Mr. Holmes' statement is correct, there must be a reason for the position. I have been hopeful that with such land as there is on this estate, we have a chance of making a success of it, but, if what Mr. Holmes says is correct, the report of the select committee or Royal Commission will prove interesting. Mr. Mills, Mr. Moore, and others resented the remarks of the Minister that there was land for all. I have seen as much of this State as any member of Parliament, and I know it north, south, east and west. When men are inquiring for land I endeavour to get it for them, but one cannot get land for any man.

The Minister for Education: Do you say that of this big State?

Hon. J. Nicholson: It depends on the kind of land.

Hon. J. Cornell: You can get it if you die and go to Karrakatta.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: There are Country Party representatives in this Chamber who know what I mean when I say that a man cannot get land. I do not refer to land beyond the Leopold Ranges.

The Minister for Education: Where do you want it?

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: Within a reasonable distance of the railway.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Alongside a town hall.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: That interjection is worthy of the hon. member. I remember that Mr. Hamersley did not come out too well in the report made by the lands surveyor, Mr. Lefroy.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Did he get the cane?

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: Mr. Hamersley holds a lot of country in the Toodyay district, but it is all tied up. If the Government wanted it for returned soldiers they would have the cold hard word put upon them by Mr. Hamersley.

Hon. G. W. Miles: He would sell to-morrow.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: At a price.

Hon. J. Cornell: Do you not wish you had half his complaint?

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: He should not be given a chance of dictating terms. He and others should be compelled, in the interests of closer settlement, to go to arbitration, where the miners had to go.

Hon. G. W. Miles: They would not abide by its decisions.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: I am afraid our friends would very quickly declare a lock-out. During the course of the Minister's speech I interjected with reference to a thousand men on the goldfields who were looking for land. I asserted that those people had already communicated with the Queensland Government and informed them that they were prepared to leave Western Australia if land could be provided for them in Queensland. The Minister contradicted me, and said that land was available. Sometimes we exaggerate and I may cut down the figure by one-half. On that basis, 500 men, with their families, are prepared to go to Queensland. They are good citizens and anxious to get holdings for themselves. The Minister says the Government can provide land for them here.

The Minister for Education: We must do so.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: Then why do not the Government provide the land?

The Minister for Education: Give us a concrete case! Put it in writing and let us see what there is in it.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: I can give the Government many concrete cases. In the Geraldton district there are a number of young, able-bodied farmers who wish to get land in their own district or elsewhere. There are other men in the Murchison district anxious to get land in any part of the State, but they cannot get it.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Do you mean to say there is no land available?

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: No.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You mean that you could find the land if the Labour Party were in power? You say the land is here?

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: The Minister says land is available to-day. I say it is not. If he shows me where the land is to be secured, I will guarantee to produce to-morrow morning 20 men, with a few pounds as capital, who are prepared to go before any committee of investigation and take up the land. There may be land for immigrants, but there is no land for good Western Australians!

The Minister for Education: That is not the policy of the Government.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: Where is the land for our people?

The PRESIDENT: These conversational arguments are quite out of order.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: There are huge estates, more particularly in the North, that can be resumed. There is a large area in the Victoria district, between Mullewa and Minnewa, and if a board comprising shrewd

business men were appointed, that land could be acquired on advantageous terms. I do not stand for confiscation but for a sound scheme of closer settlement, and it is essential that something should be done to further such a policy. Reference has been made to the Government scheme to generate power at Collie. I trust the Minister will give an adequate explanation of what the scheme means. If it is that the State is to be tied for all time to that scheme, we must remember that the coal mining industry here is only in its infancy. We have no guarantee that large coal fields will not be developed at Irwin and Eradu and in the North-West.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Power could not be transmitted from Collie to a radius of more than 200 or 300 miles.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: I want some assurance on the point.

Hon. G. W. Miles: They could not transmit current economically over a greater distance.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: We should have some assurance that the whole State is not to be tied up to Collie for all time, for I have heard grave doubts about this proposition. The Minister referred to the mining industry and said that the Government were doing everything possible to assist that industry. Last year Western Australia contributed over 60 per cent. of the gold yield of the Commonwealth. Mining has done much for Western Australia and it should at least get a little help from whatever Government may be in power. Every other industry has received assistance but the mining industry is still at the same old stage.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The Premier has just promised to place another £100,000 aside to assist the industry.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: The total mining vote is £100,000, and as for the Premier's attitude, the assistance referred to is made up of a reduction of 9s. a week in the wages of the miners and the balance represents a reduction in the price of water supplied to the big mines. Never in the history of the State has the mining industry received a worse deal than it has had this year! I have been associated with mining for many years and I have spent almost every "bob" that I had in the business and got little or nothing out of it. I speak with authority when I say that the industry has not had a fair deal. I may be pardoned for referring to recent events on the Golden Mile. We find there at the present time the men employed in the industry reduced to a position of serfdom by the Arbitration Court. Almost simultaneously the Government go to the assistance of the mining companies to the extent of relieving them of payment for water supply, the benefit in this respect derived by the companies being about £40,000. This amount, together with the reductions affected by the Arbitration Court in the wages of the men employed on the Golden Mile, has resulted in a benefit to the companies of something like £100,000.

Mr. Miles: A judge appointed by your own party gave the award.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: Though I am not an alarmist, I sound a note of warning. I do not talk very much in this House, but I can say as one who has been in the hurly-burly of things that we are on the edge of a volcano so far as the industrial world is concerned. I say this as one who knows something about the position. The award that has lately been given has created a feeling of hatred similar to that which has existed at Broken Hill for many years past. Efforts have been made to bring the Chamber of Mines and the employees together, even though the Chamber has turned down every proposal submitted to it. In spite of that I am still hopeful that the organisations throughout the State are prepared to assist the miners and to take a certain line of action. I wish to give the Chamber of Mines another chance to realise the unfairness of the award recently given. The position that exists can be relieved by the Chamber of Mines, and at least that body should have the courtesy and decency to meet the executive of the Miners' Union. They have not done so yet. I am hopeful that they will, and for that reason I shall refrain from saying anything further regarding the existing condition of things at Kalgoorlie. The companies operating on the Golden Mile have paid millions in dividends, and now they tell us that they cannot carry on unless there is a reduction in the working costs. The Government thereupon go to their assistance by reducing the charges for water. This action involves the State in an amount of £40,000. That sum, together with what the Arbitration Court award means to the companies, is sufficient to enable the companies almost to pay a dividend. This House would be justified in hanging up the proceedings until such time as the conditions of the employees on the Golden Mile were improved. I am as interested in the development of mining as any member of this House.

The PRESIDENT: I do not wish to interrupt the hon. member, but I suggest to him that he should keep a little more to the subject before the House. He has already spoken for a little over an hour.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: I thank you, Mr. President, for your suggestion. There is one matter, however, I do wish to touch upon and it is the latest proposal on the part of the Government to grant concessions to an individual named Stevenson to operate all abandoned leases in the State.

Hon. G. W. Miles: But that is only a proposition up to now.

The PRESIDENT: I hardly think that comes within the scope of the Appropriation Bill.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: I think it does. The mining industry was referred to by the Minister in terms that would give the public to understand that the department were doing everything possible to develop it. The proposal which was recently announced was to give Stevenson the right to operate in thirty

divisions in the State covering an area of 63 miles by 63 miles each for a period of five years.

The Minister for Education: It was only a suggestion.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: I was present at a meeting the other day at which the whole matter was gone into, and having seen certain things happen in connection with Government departments I am half afraid that during the recess the concession may be granted to this individual.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: You have nothing to fear.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: We have seen subjects of even greater magnitude than this happen during recess. Under such a proposal 500 men could hold the whole of the State, and particularly would the scheme apply to Kalgoorlie. I know something about this business, and perhaps even more than you, Sir, and the Leader of the House. If the concession should by any chance be granted it would be the greatest tragedy experienced in the history of mining in Western Australia. Who is this individual? I know, or have heard of practically all the mining people of any consequence in this State, but I never heard of Stevenson. I went to the meeting to hear first hand what his proposition was. He said that the idea was that the State should give him the right to operate in 33 divisions comprising the area that I have already quoted. That practically means operating the whole of the auriferous areas in the State, excepting the North-West. I do not know why the North-West was excluded.

Hon. G. W. MILES: The Government would never agree to that.

The Minister for Education interjected.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: I am taking the full responsibility for my utterances. I do not make statements unless I have proof.

The PRESIDENT: The Minister can reply to you.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: I hope he will be able to do so. I was shocked to find that officers of the Mines Department should have fallen to this proposal. I do not know who is behind Stevenson, but I am forced to the conclusion that the officers of the department are acting under direct instructions. Unless those instructions were given by the Minister, I do not know where they came from. The Minister is going out of office at the end of the year, and I want to see the Government take no chances. We should not permit our goldfields to be locked up, but they will be locked up under this proposal. Members representing the eastern goldfields can speak for themselves. In the Murchison we have men that have opened up the country, have made fortunes and have put their all back into the industry. To-day they are operating on miners' rights. This proposal will tie up 400 or 500 men and prevent them from working up there any longer. Why should any Government entertain such a proposal? Mr. Miles says the Government will not agree to it; so does the

Minister, but why do they entertain it? Why did not the Government give Stevenson the order of the boot and poke him out of the door as soon as he suggested such an impudent scheme? It seems as though the Government are prepared to go on with the proposal and tie up our auriferous areas for five years. The Minister says the Government are doing a lot for the mining industry, but when we know they are entertaining a proposal of this kind, we should protest. Every representative of a mining constituency should raise his voice in protest against the proposal. I shall always raise my voice against any such scheme irrespective of whom I offend or please. The mining industry has done much for the prosperity of Western Australia and should not be allowed to languish, because someone has put a tale in the ear of the Government with the object of holding up the best portion of the State to the detriment of the men that have blazed the trail.

Hon. G. W. MILES (North) [8.50]: I concur in some of Mr. Hickey's remarks, particularly those regarding Mr. Holmes' speech. That speech should have been made by the Leader of the Opposition in another place. I regret we have no active opposition there. Whatever Government is in power, it is necessary that the other side of the case should be presented to the public. Mr. Hickey has spoken of the Government neglecting the mining industry. A conference of goldfields members was called last week and a deputation was arranged to meet the Premier this morning. In addition to the £100,000 provided on the Estimates, of which £44,000 is allocated for goldfields water supplies, the Premier has promised to make available £100,000 a year for any sound mining propositions put before him. It is proposed to form mining boards in the various mining centres. I mention this in fairness to the Government. I think they are prepared to assist the industry, and are beginning to realise that more should be done than has been done in the past. I was glad to hear the Minister say that public works are being carried out by contract and not by day labour or that the Government intend to call tenders for their works. From what I can hear, I do not think all the public works are being carried out by contract, and I hope the Minister will look into this question and see that this portion of the Government policy is given effect to in future. There has been a discussion in another place on State trading concerns. I do not wish to labour that subject. Members know my feelings towards those concerns. State trading is no function of government. When the Government go to the electors next March, if they are returned, I hope it will be with a mandate from the people either to get rid of the trading concerns or carry them on in a proper way. If the concerns are to be continued, they should be placed under a board, just as the Commonwealth have done with their ships. If the

Government intend to continue the shipping service to the North-West, they should dispose of the present boats and get up-to-date ones. It is of no use tinkering with the matter. We cannot go on fooling with trading concerns. I hope the Government will be returned with sufficient members to get rid of them. Our six Ministers have quite enough to do to attend to the affairs of State without trying to manage trading concerns, of which they know nothing. The functions of the Government are to control railways, roads, harbours, water supplies, police and education, and if they attend to those matters properly, it is all they are asked to do.

Hon. E. H. Gray: The Government do not want to get rid of them.

Hon. G. W. MILES: If a Labour Government be returned, we shall know that the trading concerns are to be carried on, but they should then be carried on properly. Boards should be appointed to control them and political influence should be done away with. Reference has been made to the metropolitan tramway extensions. I consider the Government are building some tramways to compete with their own railways. The condition of the city roads along the tram tracks is an absolute disgrace to the Government. If the trams were owned by a private company, the roads would be kept in order. Sooner or later someone will meet with an accident through the bad condition of the roads. The Government are supposed to keep the roads in order for a distance of 18 inches outside the lines. In all the streets carrying tram tracks and particularly at the Barrack-street corners, the state of the roads is disgraceful. The Government should be ashamed for any visitor to see them. I am glad the Government have provided money for the metropolitan water supply. I want to see the sewerage system of the city diverted from the river. It was a mistake from the start to put it there, and if it would cost a quarter of a million of money to divert it to sewage farms, the money should be made available as soon as possible. I am sorry a larger amount is not provided for water supplies in agricultural districts. In the wheat areas it is necessary to provide key dams. The Government should provide dog-proof fencing in the wheat belt so that farmers may run sheep as well as grow wheat. Then when the price of wheat comes down, the farmers will be able to carry on and meet their liabilities to the Government. Western Australia is one of the best wool-producing countries in the world, and the whole world sends to us to buy our wool. It is not so with wheat or any other product. The pastoral areas on the North-East goldfields and further north are being developed, and the Government should take advantage of the offer of the British Government to guarantee three-fourths of the interest for five years on material purchased in the Old Country. There should be no delay about this; the Government should take advantage of it immediately, get the

material here and supply it to the farmers and pastoralists on 20-year terms. Then they would be doing something to develop the industry. We have the whole world for our market; there would be no question of having to seek markets for the produce thus raised. The Government should also consider the question of railway freights. A business man running the railways, when he found motor traffic competing, would reduce his freights and fares. The railways are not run entirely as a business proposition. They are intended to develop the country, as a result of which the Government benefit. Between Perth and Fremantle most of the passenger traffic is being done by motors on the roads. Freight also is being carried by motors and by water. It is time the Government considered the question of reducing railway freights and fares. In the back country freights are exceedingly high and are hindering development. During the last two or three years I have on several occasions pointed out that the farther distant a centre is, the higher is the freight per ton per mile. A man starting a pastoral property out from Meekatharra or Leonora has to meet freights representing 34 per cent. of the working costs of his proposition. It is of no use saying the State cannot meet its obligations, but it can never expect to do so if the Government permit the rates to be raised so greatly as to kill freights on their railways. Motor lorries are competing with the railways as far as York and Northam. I do not know whether the Government, having appointed a Commissioner of Railways, can take action directly; but I should say they have sufficient influence with the Commissioner to make him adopt their policy. The only way the railways can compete with motor lorries is by reducing freights and fares, not by running one train per hour to Fremantle. The sooner the railways are electrified, the better it will be for the country.

The Minister for Education: Quite right.

Hon. G. W. MILES: Recently there has been some criticism passed by Mr. Cornell on Mr. J. Thomson, member for Claremont in another place. Mr. Holmes has referred disparagingly of the late Agent General, Sir James Connolly. As regards Mr. J. Thomson, I can testify that he did good service in the Old Country by interesting the British Labour Party in our immigration scheme, to which end he arranged meetings at his own expense. With regard to Sir James Connolly, no one has a greater respect than I have for our late leader, Mr. Colebatch, but I say he will have a hard task to follow in Sir James Connolly's footsteps as Agent General. Sir James Connolly has done magnificent work for this State in London. An Agent General can confine himself to the official and social sides of his office; but a man with energy and initiative can make work for himself as Agent General by keeping this State and Australia well before the people at Home. And that is what Sir James Connolly did. As regards the agreement for the sale of the

products of the Wyndham Meat Works, although it has since been found that the agents are connected with the American Meat Trust, and although Sir James Connolly no doubt introduced the agents to the Premier, still it was the Premier who made the appointment. At that time no doubt Sir James Connolly thought he would be Agent General for another three years, and had no idea of accepting another position. To show the esteem in which Sir James Connolly is held at Home, I may relate a conversation I had with one important business man. He asked me what Sir James Connolly would be doing after he had retired from the Agent Generalship. I said, "He is remaining in London so far as I know." The business man said to me, "I want someone to run my Hull business in connection with Australian produce. Would Sir James Connolly take it, and what kind of salary is he getting?" I said that his salary, with motor car and house and other allowances, would be worth £2,000 or £3,000 a year. The business man said, "I can afford to pay him that." I replied, "I don't think you could get him to live in Hull, but you might get him on your board in London." I feel bound to express my appreciation of the work done by Sir James Connolly as Agent General. In connection with an exhibit of cotton grown in the North, which was recently sent Home from Fremantle, the Minister was reported in the Press to have paid me a left-handed compliment. It was printed that he had referred to some of my work in the North as "a visionary scheme." I do not think the Minister used any such language, but I think he should have corrected the mistake before this.

The Minister for Education: I never used such a word.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I know that.

The Minister for Education: I will make the correction with pleasure.

Hon. G. W. MILES: As regards the North-West, we had a tour through the Kimberleys a few years ago in company with our late leader, Mr. Colebatch. After travelling about 5,000 miles by water, rail and road, we got back from Wyndham to Derby, and there Mr. Colebatch made a speech. I remember his saying on that occasion, "Things seen are mightier than things heard." Mr. Colebatch went on to speak of the development of the North-West. I then said that if the Minister was sincere in his statements—and I believed he was—there would in future be no need for North-West members, as the Minister would carry out the schemes which we had been advocating. Subsequently Mr. Colebatch was appointed Minister for the North-West, and the North-West Department was created. When a Commissioner for the North-West was appointed, North-West members here and in another place suggested that he should reside in the North. We understood that the Commissioner's job would be to frame a policy for the development of the North and advise the Government on that subject. Instead we find that a man has

been appointed Commissioner, and another man as Assistant Commissioner, with a complete staff, but that the Commissioner has no scheme for the development of the North and functions merely as a buffer between the people of the North-West and members for the North-West on the one hand, and the Government on the other. If any proposition for the advancement of the North is put up to the Commissioner, he turns it down at once, saying that there is no money available for it. I say that the Commissioner's duty is to live in the North. As the member for Kimberley, Mr. Durack, in another place said, "The North-West Department, lock, stock and barrel, should be transferred to Broome." If the Government are not going to give the Commissioner the necessary power, the North-West Department should be abolished. If it were competent for me—I believe it is not—to move the deletion from the Estimates of the amount of £24,000 for the North-West Department, I would do so. I do not know whom to blame in this connection. Probably the fault lies with the Government, though I do not wish to put this at all personally. If I quote figures comparing the North with the South, I do not want members to think I am setting one end of the State against the other. I have equal confidence in all portions of the State. But I ask, if the Government are not going to put up a policy for the North, and put it up at once, will they be prepared to assist us of the North to get separation? We are prepared to take over the North Province, and also to take over our share of the public debt on a population basis; or else we are prepared to take over Government assets in the North less depreciation, thus repaying to the Government every penny they have spent on the North. I say emphatically that the North has not received fair treatment from the South. Mr. Holmes has put the case by saying that the North is treated worse by the South than the Commonwealth treats Western Australia. If the North had home rule, the British Government would assist to develop and people that country. Now I wish to mention one or two matters concerning which I have already spoken to Ministers. The Ministers have told me that they are prepared to look into them, but I regard it as my duty to put those things on record. Mr. Holmes has referred to the difference between wharfage rates in the South and wharfage rates in the North. The man who grows a beast in the South is charged for wharfage 4d. plus 20 per cent. In the tropical North—where labour is dear, and where every employee has to be paid a tropical allowance of 5s. per day, though board is only 30s. per week, where in fact all employees receive tropical allowances—the wharfage on a beast is 1s. 6d. plus 20 per cent. That compares with 4d. plus 20 per cent. in the South. Coal, flour, and wheat are taken over southern wharves free, as primary products. If pearl shell were fished in southern waters, it would be considered a primary product. The pearler of the North



has had a bad time, but for pearl shell he pays a wharfage rate of 4s. per ton plus 20 per cent. The Minister told us here recently that that wharfage charge had been reduced by 1s. per ton. For a ton of chaff landed on Broome jetty, from which the township is two miles distant, wharfage and haulage amount to 18s. To land a wagon on the Port Hedland jetty costs £5. The Port Hedland-Marble Bar railway, as I have stated times without number, has demonstrated that one can carry stock another 100 or 200 miles further back. I wish to read a short extract from what the Commissioner of Railways stated after visiting the North—

This having been my first visit to the North-West, of which, on this occasion, I saw only a very small part indeed, I would ask to be pardoned for mentioning the very favourable impression strongly created in my mind as to its wonderful possibilities in all kinds of natural wealth, and the wonderful opportunities which it offers to healthy young men who are not afraid of work. The population, is it true, is so small as to be almost negligible, but the people are of that kind to whom difficulties exist only to be overcome. Looking at the railway problem there from the broad point of view (and not from that purely selfish railway point of view which the holder of my position is usually bound to adopt), I cannot regard the loss on the working of these 115 miles, from Port Hedland to Marble Bar, as being of detriment to the State, however annoying it may be as part of the railway finance as a whole. Prior to the construction of this railway, I understand, land was taken up for pastoral purposes, and mineral shows were worked, within about 100 miles of Port Hedland, that being the limit of cartage. With the construction of the railway, it has become possible to utilise the area within a radius of 100 miles from Marble Bar—114 miles away from Port Hedland—thus giving a very large additional area of rich country to the State, which formerly was beyond the reach of profitable exploitation.

Prior to the Commissioner of Railways visiting the North, Mr. Stead was sent there as a Royal Commission of inquiry into the working of the Port Hedland-Marble Bar railway. From what I can gather, he practically threatened the residents that he would recommend the pulling up of the railway if they did not agree to higher freights. I only discovered this on my last trip North. I wired to the Minister regarding the matter, and the Minister replied that the rates had not been increased until the road boards there had agreed. It is a wrong policy. The Government should treat the North the same as they treat the South. On that northern railway the freight on mining machinery has been raised from 63s. to 76s. per ton for the run of 114 miles. That is how the Government assist the mining industry up there. When the line was built we had an average rate of 6d. per

ton per mile. That has been increased to 8d. Then consider this: to assist the fruit grower in the Bridgetown district, the Government have arranged a freight of 5s. per case over the 200 miles of railway to Perth, 1,000 miles of sea carriage to Port Hedland, and 114 miles of railage to Marble Bar. That is the way the producer of the South is treated—and should be treated. But consider the producers in the North: they can grow vegetables up there. I have sent down tomatoes weighing over 2lbs. each. When I was last on the Port Hedland-Marble Bar railway the freight on a bag of vegetables sent 48 miles to Lalla Rookh was 8s. 6d.! For a parcel of 10lbs. of cabbage 3s. 6d. is the minimum freight. Most men at Marble Bar have private gardens and send vegetables to their friends at Hedland, but I have known Hedland people write back saying, "Please do not send us any more, for we cannot afford to pay the railway freight." I have an assurance from the Premier and from the Minister for Education that these things will be looked into. But they should never have been created. Again, the freight on a stud bull carried 64 miles on the northern railway was £3 14s. 8d. The squatter up North has to pay 1s. per ton per mile on his wool, whereas the wool grower in the Premier's district is charged only 43s. 7d. per ton from Northam to Fremantle, a distance of 66 miles. And the poor tin miner up North, battling in a temperature of 112 in the shade, has to pay 4d. per ton per mile, as against 39s. 3d. paid from Bridgetown to Fremantle, a distance of 155 miles. The charge up North is 38s. for 114 miles. These anomalies have to be adjusted. We do not want to wait for another Government to come in and adjust them. My motto is "If anything is wrong, right it now." I congratulate the Premier on the Beadon Point jetty, a reinforced concrete structure. It will be the means of saving considerable sums of money to the State. I wired to the Premier from the North saying that the jetty would stand as a monument to him for the next century, and asking him not to spoil it by putting any timber into it. I understand they have now decided to make the piles of reinforced concrete. However they are committing one error, for the berthing part of the jetty is to be decked with jarrah. It should be done in concrete. It will be necessary to have jarrah spring piles to keep the ships from bumping the concrete. I hope the Government will see to it that the whole of the actual structure is completed with reinforced concrete. The work may cost a little more, but the saving in maintenance will more than counter-balance the extra cost. I suggest that in future repairs to other jetties up there reinforced concrete piles should be used. We often hear of the possibilities of the North. I want to mention Millstream, on the Fortescue River. The Government should at once send an engineer there to take the levels and see whether the water cannot be conveyed over Mt. Herbert, where there is a fall of 700ft. in three miles. If that could be done, electricity could be gen-

erated and we could have scouring works in that district, the water being subsequently used for irrigation purposes. Lower down on the river there is a pool two miles long and 200 yards wide with a depth of 68ft. In it are natural springs, for it has never been known to drop a foot. It is estimated that 25,000,000 gallons of water flow out of that pool daily. Still further down there are two other pools with springs in them and five streams running out, each from four to six feet wide, with a depth of from 18 inches to 2ft. It is estimated that 15,000,000 gallons of water are there running to waste daily all the year round. None of those pools has ever been known to go down a foot, not in the hottest summer. Nature did not put that water there to run to waste. It is a State asset and should be used. If the Commissioner for the North-West had been doing his duty he would have had this attended to in his first year. But he has never lived in the North in summer time, and so does not understand the requirements. It that man is to remain in the department he should be put up there and told to frame a policy for the North or, alternatively, get out. In fact, the whole of the department requires to be wiped out. It would save expense.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I do not think it is the Commissioner's fault.

Hon. G. W. MILES: He does not seem to have any authority. If a scheme be put up to him he says, "I cannot do anything. I have no money." The Government have never made any money available for the North.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You would want all the railways of the South up there.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I am not one-eyed. I say the North and the South alike must be developed. The North must come into its own. If the South, which has held on to the North for the last 50 or 100 years, is not prepared to give us fair treatment, let us get out on our own. We will repay every penny the South has expended on the North, and will develop a profitable policy for the North. It is true the Government have decided to settle 100 men at Wyndham; but that is only tinkering with the system. The railway scheme that the North-West Development League has advocated, has the support of the whole of the people of the Commonwealth. But we are asked, "How can you put a railway there when there are no people there?" I reply, "Were any people settled along the routes of the Canadian railways before those railways were constructed?" Yet what do we find to-day? Away out there in the Canadian prairies are towns with populations bigger than that of Western Australia. Why cannot the same be done on the tablelands of Kimberley, where £5,000 or £6,000 spent will return four times as much as it would if spent down here. That Kimberley country will carry a sheep to the acre, whereas down South 15 or 20 acres are required for the maintenance of one sheep. Moreover, the possibilities to be derived from the conservation of water in the Kimberleys are enor-

mous. But nothing can be done without communication. With a line running down through Meekatharra, sheep could be sent up North when there are hundreds of thousands of pounds worth of feed going to waste up there. At another season of the year, sheep could be sent down from the North to fatten. By having transport to keep stock alive in a drought season sufficient wealth would be saved to pay the interest on the cost of the railway. But before a line can be constructed through pastoral country a betterment tax must be imposed. Every Kimberley leaseholder is prepared to pay such a tax. Away back in 1838, Sir George Grey declared that the Kimberley country was the best watered and most magnificent he had ever seen in the world. In 1879 the late Mr. Alexander Forrest said, "It is remarkable that this magnificent country should have been left undeveloped for so long." Yet there it is to-day with only a handful of people in it, and a few thousand head of cattle. The Kimberley tableland country will grow sheep just as well as will the best of the Murchison district. In the Kimberleys one does not suffer droughts, for the rainfall, ranging from 20 inches to 60 inches, is perfectly regular. And along the coast between Derby and Wyndham we have some of the finest harbours in the world. In a recent article on the iron deposit at Yampi, the writer described the harbour and the scene as being similar to that presented in Sydney before the buildings were erected. There are dozens of harbours equal to that. We have this magnificent land and unlimited water running to waste. There are three rivers running into the Walcott Inlet alone. In Canada every water supply is used for the generation of electricity. On the Nile there is a system of irrigation which extends for 600 miles. All these and other schemes could be carried out in the North. The Premier has proposed to settle 100 men in the North around Wyndham. I see no item on the Estimates to provide for the expenditure.

The Minister for Education: The money will be made available.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I hope the scheme will be gone on with at once. We have the meat works at Wyndham. If we could get a closer settlement scheme inaugurated there we could settle numbers of men. The difference between the South-West and the area around Wyndham is that the land requires very little clearing. It is possible to settle men there for half the cost of settling them in the South-West. They could go in for pig raising, cotton raising, maize and peanuts, and other tropical products. If the pig raisers up there could get £2 a head and could each produce, as they could easily do, 200 pigs a year, they would have an income of £400 a year from that source alone. We have demonstrated what can be done with cotton in the Kimberley area. The possibilities there are enormous. There would be sufficient men in the district then to conduct the Wyndham Meat Works, instead of its being necessary at

considerable cost to send men up every year from Perth. At the works there could be put through a few hundred thousand pigs a year, and this would turn the works into a payable proposition instead of leaving them the white elephant they are now. Before I entered Parliament Mr. Underwood and Mr. Holmes put up a scheme for a water supply at Port Hedland. That was ten years ago. The Government must find a water supply for the district; it is a national question. Port Hedland is the centre for the pearling industry, the harbours and inlets around it are teeming with fish, and at the back are the pastoral and mining industries. It is no good putting a few hundred pounds on the Estimates for boring, because there is no artesian basin there. The Government should send up a competent engineer to frame a scheme. Officers of the service are travelling round the country killing time and acting as buffers between members and Ministers.

The Minister for Education: That kind of thing is not going on.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I do not want to attack anyone personally at this festive season. I understood the Minister to say there are £18,000,000 worth of Treasury bills still out.

The Minister for Education: I did not say that.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I think Mr. Holmes referred to £14,000,000 worth. That system of finance should be altered. I was certainly under the impression we were providing sinking fund for all our debts. I was not aware that we had £14,000,000 worth of floating Treasury bills for which we were providing no sinking fund. That system is bad.

The Minister for Education: After a time they are converted into inscribed stock.

Hon. G. W. MILES: The State has boasted of its having a sinking fund that was not established by the other States. That principle should be adhered to. Reference has been made to the Auditor General's report, and the Minister said, "That appears in every Auditor General's report." He should not adopt that attitude. As Mr. Holmes has said, this report is for the use of Parliament, and should be taken notice of by the Government. There should be no necessity for the Auditor General to continually make reports of this nature. It is not a proper way of running the affairs of State. No private firm would conduct its business as the State departments are conducted. In regard to trust funds, the Auditor General says:—

The return includes, under the head of trust funds, eight accounts with debit balances. There should be no such thing as a trust account with a debit balance.

Cannot the finances of the country be arranged without methods like this being adopted? There is only one end for private individuals who continue in that way, namely, gaol.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Do you not see how they will square that?

Hon. G. W. MILES: They will square it somehow. I am not certain what rate the Government Savings Bank are paying to their depositors. I understand it is about 4 per cent.

The Minister for Education: I think so.

Hon. G. W. MILES: Why not pay our own people a fair rate of interest, and make use of their money without flotation charges being incurred?

The Minister for Education: It has gone elsewhere.

Hon. G. W. MILES: No wonder. We are driving our own money into the Commonwealth or into other investments, because we do not pay a fair rate of interest.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The Treasury are offering 5½ per cent.

Hon. G. W. MILES: Referring to Government stores, the Auditor General says:—

In several instances the stock sheets submitted were unreliable. Fictitious entries were made in the head office accounts for balancing purposes.

Is there no notice taken of these things?

The Minister for Education: Very considerable notice is taken of that.

Hon. G. W. MILES: And yet the Minister interjected that this was the usual thing.

Hon. A. Lovekin: We have the papers about that on the Table now.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I only want to see the affairs of the country run on business lines. Mr. Hickey referred to markets and group settlements. We are importing £2,000,000 worth of products that could be grown in the South-West. If we overtake our local markets, what are we to do? We should go in for pig-raising. In England £68,000,000 worth of pork and bacon are imported annually, and enormous fortunes are made out of these commodities in the United States. We, therefore, have an unlimited market for anything we can produce of this kind in the South-West. The Government are settling these people on the land and providing them with stock, but they should see that the stock is of the right type. It costs as much to feed a mongrel as it does to feed a well-bred animal. Some figures were given to me by a South Australian pastoralist. Last year Western Australia shored about 7,000,000 sheep, resulting in 134,000 bales of wool. South Australia shored 6,000,000 sheep, resulting in 200,000 bales of wool. We are therefore, about 50 per cent. behind that State. We are gradually improving, and have had magnificent results at the recent wool sales. There is still room for great improvement in the pastoral industry. It is only recently that the wool growers of the North adopted the principle of culling their ewes, but we still have a long way to go before we come up to South Australia. The same thing applies to our cows, pigs and cattle generally. In the Argentine breeders pay from £2,000 to £3,000 for a stud bull for beef-raising purposes. In that country steers, two years old, weigh 600lbs., whereas in this State they are four or five years old

before reaching that weight. I hope the Government will see that the people in the South are provided with the best type of stock. I understand the Hopetoun-Ravensthorpe railway is being treated nearly as badly as the Port Hedland-Marble Bar railway in the matter of freights. I am told it costs a man 1s. a bushel to get his wheat round from Ravenssthorpe to Perth. Recently a through freight of £3 a ton, covering wharfage, shipping, freight and railage was arranged. This matter should be looked into. I hope the money for the Bunbury harbour will be wisely spent and a proper harbour system inaugurated. It is no good tinkering with an undertaking of that nature, for the Government might as well throw their money into the sea. If we have not engineers capable of conducting work of this kind, it is time we imported them. We should pay them decent salaries so that we may secure brains and ability that will save the State hundreds of thousands of pounds a year. I hope the Government will proceed with the development at the Geraldton Harbour, and continue the line from Esperance to Norseman. I wish to refer to the dog disc that has recently been handed to members of Parliament to enable them to travel over the railways. It is a disgrace that the Government should not provide a better pass than this. If they are not melting the old passes down, in order to decrease the deficit for December, I hope they will hand them back to us, instead of the abortions of things that we now possess. The Premier's latest migration proposal which the Imperial authorities will finance is a good one. If the scheme is pressed strongly, the Imperial authorities, I feel sure, will be prepared to find the necessary money. By that means we will take the migrants and Britain will finance their settlement here. I am told that the Commonwealth is paying the whole of the passage money for migrants. If that is not so, the Commonwealth should shoulder that burden, because it is in the interests of the Commonwealth that the migrants come here. As soon as the newcomer lands in Fremantle, he commences to benefit the Commonwealth by taxation paid through the Customs. If there is anything in the contention that our population is drifting to other States, the Commonwealth still gets the benefit. It should be the function of the Commonwealth to pay the passage money and of the Imperial Government to finance the scheme. The Premier's proposal means that the introduction of the migrants will reduce our indebtedness per head. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

On motion by Hon. E. H. Gray, debate adjourned till a later stage of the sitting.

#### BILL—LAND ACT AMENDMENT.

##### *Assembly's Message*

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the Council's amendment.

#### BILL—LAND TAX AND INCOME TAX.

##### *Request for Conference.*

Message received from the Assembly requesting a conference with managers of the Council.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. Ewing—South-West) [9.50]: I move—

*That a message be transmitted to the Assembly agreeing to a conference; that Hon. A. Lovelock, Hon. R. J. Lynn and the mover be appointed managers on behalf of the Council and that the conference meet in the President's room at 10 p.m.*

Question put and passed.

#### BILL—VERMIN ACT AMENDMENT.

##### *Assembly's Message.*

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it disagreed to the amendment made by the Council for the reason set forth in the schedule annexed, now considered

##### *In Committee.*

Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The Council's amendment was to Clause 7 and was as follows:—

*Add at the end of Subclause 5 the following words: "And as regards the existing fence in the Gascoyne district, such rate shall not be applied otherwise than for the payment of interest and sinking fund for the redemption of the loan already raised."*

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move—

*That the amendment be not insisted upon.*

The reason given by the Assembly for disagreeing to the amendment is that the rate is intended for the destruction of vermin only. It has no application whatever to the fence. During the tea adjournment I consulted the Minister for Agriculture, and he assured me there was no necessity for the amendment. The fence has been abandoned and the money will not be used in future for the purpose of maintaining the fence. I do not know that it would be wise to jeopardise the Bill by insisting upon the amendment. If Mr. Holmes can adduce adequate reasons for insisting upon it, he may do so, but it will not be in the interests of the Bill to pursue that course. We cannot always have our way.

Hon. G. W. Miles: If we are right we can.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The Minister for Agriculture assures me that the Gascoyne people are fully protected. I hope hon. members will agree to the motion.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I am not concerned with what the Minister for Agriculture told the Leader of the House, but I am concerned

with what the Solicitor General has stated. He told me that if I wished to protect these people the amendment was what I should have included in the Bill. The amendment was drafted by him. He went further and advised the Minister to have certain words inserted to protect the Government. What does the Minister for Agriculture know about the law on this subject?

The Minister for Education: He consulted the Solicitor General.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I do not know whether we are to have a conference on this question but I think we could make the position clear. The pastoralists are not much concerned as to whether the Bill is passed or not. For my part I am not much concerned about the Bill, but I cannot allow these people to be stranded seeing that they have been honest regarding the transaction from the start. They have recognised their obligations to the Government. I ask the Committee in common justice to agree with me on this point.

Question put and negatived, the Council's amendment insisted upon.

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

*Sitting suspended from 9.55 to 10.55 p.m.*

## BILL—LAND TAX AND INCOME TAX.

### *Conference Managers' Report.*

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. Ewing—South-West) [10.50]: I desire to report that the managers appointed by this Chamber to meet the managers appointed by the Legislative Assembly have conferred and have failed to arrive at an agreement. I move—

*That the report be adopted.*

Question put and passed.

## BILL—THE W.A. TRUSTEE, EXECUTOR AND AGENCY COMPANY, LTD., ACT AMENDMENT (PRIVATE).

### *Assembly's Amendments.*

Amendments made by the Legislative Assembly now considered.

### *In Committee.*

Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; Hon. J. Nicholson in charge of the Bill.

No. 1—Clauses 15, 16, Strike out these clauses:

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I move—

*That the amendments be agreed to.*

Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendments agreed to.

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a Message accordingly transmitted to the Assembly.

## BILL—APPROPRIATION.

### *Second Reading.*

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

Hon. E. H. GRAY (West) [11.0]: When Mr. Hickey was speaking he referred to the proposal to divide the mining areas in the State into sections, and the Leader of the House scouted the idea that it was possible to do such a thing. I have in my possession a statement from a file dated 1st November, 1923. I will read it—

Hon. G. W. Miles: What file is it taken from?

The Minister for Education: Is the file on the Table of the House?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I cannot say. It has been handed to me; I do not know where it came from, but I will read it—

In November last year, information was sought from the department regarding abandoned mining tenements, and it was intimated that Mr. J. D. Stevenson proposed to endeavour to raise capital for the purpose of working some of them if some right could be given him on which he could proceed.

After discussion of the matter with Mr. Stevenson by the State Mining Engineer, and the Under Secretary for Mines, a recommendation was submitted and approved of on the following lines:—

1. On the Minister being satisfied with the resources and constitution of a limited company to be formed by Mr. Stevenson he would approve of the reservation of the ground formerly held under gold-mining leases throughout the State which had produced gold, and which had been abandoned and not held within the past two years as mining tenements, and would grant the company the right, temporarily, to occupy such reservations for prospecting purposes, subject to the following conditions: (a) The goldfields of the State to be divided into squares as shown in red on the lithographs attached hereto and the abandoned gold-mining leases within each such square to be reserved when and as hereunder provided. (b) A nominal rental for the reserves as may be fixed to be paid by the company. (c) The term and occupation of the reserves not to exceed five years. (d) The labour conditions to be as required from time to time by the Minister, but not more than three parties of six men each are to be required to be employed in any one square. (e) The Company to declare from time to time which of the squares it intends to occupy for prospecting purposes and how many parties of men it proposes to employ on each. (f) During the occupancy of any square by the Company it to have the sole right to prospect for gold on all the said abandoned leases therein, but to have no priority in respect to other vacant Crown lands. (g) The period for prospecting any squares limited to one year unless extended by consent of the Minister. (h) Any

square not occupied by the Company working to the satisfaction of the Minister to become thereon open to prospecting by all comers on ordinary terms. (i) Upon the Company notifying the Minister as provided in Clause 2 of its intention to occupy a square, abandoned leases on such square to be reserved in favour of the Company for one year. (j) The Company to have priority of application during the period of reservation for mining tenements over reserved abandoned leases. (k) The Company to conclude the whole of its prospecting within five years. (l) The Company to have no right to sell, assign, or sub-let any part of its concession without consent of the Minister. (m) The abandoned gold-mining leases referred to above are those leases included in a list or lists to be supplied by the Department of Mines. (n) The concession to be liable to cancellation if the conditions are not duly observed.

2. At the present juncture no reservations have been made, for the reason that Mr. Stevenson has not advised the department that he has been successful in forming a company, and this is a condition precedent to further action by the department.

The object in giving encouragement to Mr. Stevenson to proceed was to endeavour to get old abandoned mines again opened up. The point to be considered was that no difficulty should be placed in the way of any prospector who might desire to acquire any of them, and it was thought the most equitable way would be when Mr. Stevenson announced he was ready to occupy a square, reservations should be made of land that had not been held under any form of mining tenement for a period of two years, it being considered safe to assume that if the land had lain idle for that period it would not be required by anyone.

It is unreasonable to assume that in centres such as Kalgoorlie, land which has lain idle for this period is probably considered quite valueless. It should also be noted that if Mr. Stevenson's company desired to occupy the whole of the squares, of which there are 33, his company would, unless the Minister reduced the labour requirements, have to actively engage in mining operations a total of 394 men. If the Company is occupying, say, only one square, it has been made clear to Mr. Stevenson that the abandoned leases in the remaining squares are not reserved to him until such time as he is ready to occupy them, i.e. until his company is definitely prepared to proceed the land is open to all comers.

It might be pointed out that many of the abandoned leases which would come under the scheme have lain idle for very many years, and it is desirable to encourage, so far as possible, the further exploitation of these areas.

I do not pose as a mining expert. Mr. Hickey, however, made certain statements, and I think those particulars show his remarks were fully

justified. I was astounded at the attitude of Mr. Miles to State trading concerns and particularly the shipping service. I cannot understand any man from the North-West advocating the abolition of the shipping service.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Were you here when the Adelaide Steamship Co. were running boats up there?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I am given to understand that people residing there desire the service to be continued, and that they have never had any service comparable with that provided by the State shipping department. I was working on the wharf, and as a believer in trading concerns, I paid a good deal of attention to the shipping service. I had an opportunity to discuss the balance sheets with the departmental experts and people engaged in the shipping business, and was informed that the deficiencies are only paper deficiencies.

Hon. R. J. Lynn: But we have to borrow the money to pay for them.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Let me mention the "Kangaroo" that was placed on the world's trade routes during the war, and made enormous profits. Elder Smith and Co., Dalgely's and other big traders making tremendous profits, paying big dividends, and incurring all sorts of expense to cover up their profits, do not pay everything away in dividends and leave their business helpless. They make their business sound and secure. Under sympathetic administration the profits from the "Kangaroo" would have been devoted to putting the department on business lines and business values, and then no great loss would have been shown. We have to remember the little commissions that the service does for the State, such as going into Yampi Sound to permit of inquiries being made there. I believe Mr. Miles knows something about that.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The service should receive credit for it.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: On one trip when the "Bambra" was running from Sourabaya direct to Fremantle, she was diverted hundreds of miles out of her course to Wyndham to pick up mails for Perth. If a blue funnel boat had been similarly deviated it would have been done only at enormous cost. I doubt whether the shipping service was paid a penny for that deviation. This sort of thing is happening all the time.

Hon. J. W. Hickey: They do not complain about the £25,000 spent on the aerial mail.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I hope to see a Western Australian mercantile fleet built up. Even when some of the inter-State companies operated on the North-West coast they did not victual their boats at Fremantle. All the stores were brought from the Eastern States.

Hon. G. W. Miles: So they are now.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: If the shipping service were developed it would mean a big thing to the working people and business people of Fremantle. One of the big factors that resulted in my election to this House

was that my opponent, who had to his credit an honourable record in this House, objected to the State shipping service. The electors showed emphatically that they did not approve of his views. It is the duty of the Government to improve the service. Mr. Miles' suggestion is a good one. The Government should secure better boats for the coast.

Hon. G. W. Miles: If they are going to carry it on, let them do it properly, but otherwise let them get out of it.

Hon. J. W. Hickey: What is wrong with the "Bambra"?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: She is unsuitable for the North-West coast. The people are solidly in favour of the continuation and improvement of the service. The Commonwealth authorities are advertising for boys for naval service. It would be a fine thing, if after they completed their naval service, they could be transferred to the mercantile marine of Western Australia. It is a goal worth striving for. It is an insult to find on the coast boats manned by black labour when the policy of all parties is to maintain a white Australia. During my short experience in this Chamber Mr. Lovekin has appeared horror-stricken at the idea of Government enterprise or any suggestion to create new departments. The party I represent have a cure for any negligence on the part of departmental officers. We believe in State industry. If the workers were given a share in the management of business, the difficulty would be overcome.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Do away with political influence.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I am absolutely opposed to political influence. Great firms operating in the Old Country have given workers a share in the control of industry, and I know of no instance where it has proved unsuccessful. Twenty-five years ago we were of opinion that if everything was controlled by the State all our troubles would be over. We know now it is not so. We have created big staffs of public officials, and at election time they always vote against the Labour Party.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: A disturbing influence?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Yes. We think the workers should be given a share in the management of industry. The works of Joseph Baker, Sons & Perkins' Ltd., a big engineering firm in London specialising in machinery used in the baking industry, are a haven for Labour agitators. If the union secretary has a good workman who is boycotted for pushing the objects of his union, the secretary can go to this firm with the certainty of getting a job for the man if there is a vacancy. The firm has long been in successful operation without ever a strike or a lockout. In that firm it is impossible for a foreman to sack a man. If the foreman considers that a man has done something detrimental to his work or to the firm, he brings the man before the shop committee, who deal with the case and forward a recommendation to the head office. On the strength of that recommendation the

man is retained or dismissed. Such a procedure seems an innovation in Australia, but it is an old established custom in that English firm. If the State Shipping Service and the State Implement Works were similarly controlled they would be a great success. Undoubtedly the State Implement Works have been of enormous service to the farmers of Western Australia. It would be a calamity to this State if the works were sold or handed over to a company who would close them down in order to bolster up their works in the Eastern States or in America. In view of the fact that numbers of parents in this State are unable to apprentice their sons to trades, it would be especially undesirable to get rid of the State Implement Works. I know a number of the mechanics employed at the implement works, and those men struck me as taking a keen interest in their duties. I trust there will be no attempt to dispose of the works.

Hon. W. Carroll: What is wrong with the State Implement Works now?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The selling charges are out of all proportion to the wages. For the last year the wages amount to £50,367, and the charges of the sales department to £18,417.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Have you details as to how the £16,000 odd is made up?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I have not the details, but the amount includes advertising, commissions on sales, and other charges incurred in disposing of the products of the works. Mr. Moore and Mr. Hickey have referred to the Government's migration policy and the cost involved therein. I was greatly struck with the apparent indifference of the House to the case made out by those hon. members. I am a Pommy, and I am not going to admit that English people are inferior to Australians. For a fortnight I was acting secretary of the Fremantle trades hall, and I got quite a shock when I found the huge amount of work which that institution had to undertake in adjusting the worries and cares and troubles of migrants. An overseas steamer which came into Fremantle yesterday landed a good many passengers. Many a little mother in England will have sent out by that steamer a parcel of clothing, or perhaps a Christmas pudding, according to the English custom. As a result of mismanagement on the part of the Government many lads have not the money to pay the Customs duties on such parcels of clothing and Christmas presents.

Hon. G. Potter: Is duty charged on such small matters?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I myself have paid duty on a Christmas pudding.

Hon. A. Burvill: But is not that a Federal matter?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: There are in this State migrants who have not enough money to pay duty on presents from their friends at Home. Men and women are being brought from Britain to this country though there is not enough work now offering in Western Australia to absorb the labour available. That

is a disgrace to the Government and a disgrace to the State. When we leave this House to-night even the poorest of us will have enough money to enjoy Christmas, but there are hundreds of migrants here who have not the wherewithal to buy a Christmas dinner, who will be on the starvation line on Christmas Day.

Member: How long have they been here?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Some of them three or four months. It is a disgrace that English people should be asked to send their sons out here if, after they land here, the Government care not a "dump" whether they get work or not. I want the Leader of the House to answer me on this point. There is not enough work offering to enable migrants to obtain jobs in the bush. As a consequence they drift from the country into the city. The first question asked at the trades hall is, "Are you in a union?" The reply generally is, "No." Of course the trades hall looks after all the cases.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The Government, under their agreement with the Imperial authorities, undertook to find employment for the migrants.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Yes, but it is not done. They are sent into the bush and after a fortnight or three weeks are set adrift. Any adult man called upon to do unskilled labouring work should receive sufficient pay to keep him in decent comfort, a wage conforming to our Australian standard of living. Large numbers of men receive £1 or 15s., or even less, per week with food. Two migrants who had worked for a fortnight on a clearing job got a shilling to go on tramp with. One young fellow told me recently that he came out with the idea of going on the land and making good. He was sent as yardman to a "pub" at Norseman. Is that the sort of job to give a young migrant? These illustrations show how young men and married people from the Old Country are treated on arrival in a country where they expect to be able to make good. They are simply cast adrift. The Minister for Works, proposing to start the construction of a reservoir, advertised for 200 men at 18s. per day to report on the next Monday morning. When the men arrived, they found there was nothing doing. The Government are guilty of extravagance and waste, and then place the responsibility on individuals. They ask people to come to a country where there is no work for them. If the Government are sincere in their migration policy, it is up to them to have work ready for migrants on their arrival. The mismanagement of the migration scheme is having a bad effect upon Australian manhood. As Mr. Moore put it, where five months ago men were getting £2 10s. a week and keep for ordinary unskilled farm work, to-day they cannot get more than £2. That is the position created by the Government, a position which has led to a reduction in the Australian workers' standard of living. That reduction is the reason why numbers of our Australian people are leaving this State for the East. The loss to Western Australia is a heavy one,

as is evident when one calls to mind the cost of settling migrants under the Imperial scheme. The farmers in this Chamber could give us a fair idea of what it costs to make out of an ordinary active migrant a good farmer. It would cost, I suppose, something like £200 per head. Through this mismanagement by the Government we are driving skilled bush workers out of the State and reducing below the ordinary standard of living those who cannot get away. As Mr. Hickey said, we are on the edge of a volcano. During this debate the North-West members have put up telling arguments for the development of the North-West, and the Country Party members also have put up a case for their constituents. But all their splendid schemes must fall to the ground unless supported by the rank and file. Although the working class of this city have shown wonderful restraint, there must come a time when the leaders of the Labour movement will have to take a stand. Once they do that, the history of Australian workmen will contain a disastrous chapter. Still it must be so if this attempt to force down the workers' standard of living be continued; a stand will be made and a bitter fight put up against the employers.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Cannot you pull together with the employers more than you have done in the past?

The PRESIDENT: I take it this is not a threat.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: No, certainly not. I am merely pointing to the seriousness of the industrial position. During the last six months the industrial leaders have advised their rank and file to avoid any industrial trouble; but we cannot always do that, and so I should like to impress on the House the seriousness of the position, for sooner or later we shall have to take a firm stand against the continued attempt on the part of the employers to reduce the standard of living.

Hon. J. Nicholson: What you want is more industries to absorb the unemployed.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: We want steady work provided for those brought out here, instead of their being merely furnished with a fortnight's job. To-day we seem to be engaged converting splendid Englishmen into hoboes.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Would you not have more industries to absorb the unemployed if you were to do away with State enterprises?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: It is a good thing we have State enterprises to provide as much employment as they do. They are the policemen of industry.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Yes, the policeman that locks everybody else up!

Hon. E. H. GRAY: We require the State enterprises to police the profiteering of private enterprise. I have been very much concerned with the laxity in factory inspection. The department is starved for inspectors. It is impossible for the industries to be controlled by the small departmental staff. In any industry where the workers are not strongly organised, the young people have to



suffer unless proper inspection is provided. Until a week ago a certain factory in this State was working 30 or 40 girls from 7 a.m. to 6 p.m., without overtime pay; and in the same factory younger girls were working from 8 a.m. to 7 p.m. without any break for tea, and without the 1s. 6d. tea money.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Why can you not remedy that?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I did remedy it. I am merely quoting it as an instance of what is going on. I brought it under the notice of the department, and it was remedied at once. A week or two ago we had the box factory riot, when the girls took the law into their hands and did a good deal of damage.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: But I thought they denied having done it!

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Well, somebody did it. When the Government failed to carry out the law those girls took the law into their own hands and did quite a lot of damage. In the circumstances they were entitled to do so. The department should provide better factory inspection. During the debate we have talked millions of pounds. In listening I have been struck with the inescapable idea that we are nothing but a nation of hypocrites. We sit here for hours discussing great and important activities, yet we cannot look after the people supported by the State. We talk grandly about our butter production, but the inmates of the Hospital for the Insane, drawn from all sections of the community, are fed on margarine. I approached the Colonial Secretary with this protest, but he treated it as a joke and declared that margarine was good food.

Hon. J. A. Greig: It is more wholesome than is butter.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: My father was an English labourer working for 18s. a week. When I was a boy he was earning 16s. a week, yet he would not have margarine in the house. Margarine should not be tolerated anywhere in Australia. It causes discontent amongst those who have to eat it, and that it should be used in the Hospital for the Insane amounts, in very many individual instances, to positive hardship. The inmates of the Old Men's Home are supplied with butter, but those in the Old Women's Home have to accept margarine. It would be an insult to the intelligence of members if I asked them to agree that these old women were entitled to butter. They should get butter to a greater extent than the men. I have tried quietly to work with the departmental officers but they have treated me with derision. I ask the Leader of the House to consider this matter, because the Colonial Secretary has regarded it as a joke. The old people should be granted these small concessions, which will not amount to much at the end of the year. The Government should no longer countenance such a state of affairs. My main reason for rising is to support the points put forward by Mr. Moore on the immigration policy and also to support Mr. Hickey in his state-

ments. It is time, in the interests of the country, that the Government improved their policy, so that they may not force down the standard of living of the Australian workmen, and not be the means of forcing into the gutter so many of the young fellows who have come out from the Old Country.

Hon. E. ROSE (South-West) [11.47]: I congratulate the Leader of the House on the way in which he handled the second reading of this Bill. We have been discussing a sum of something like 10 million pounds. It is wonderful how readily the Leader of the House has fallen into the place of his predecessor. I notice that a sum of £900,000 is on the Estimates for group settlement. That policy is costing the country a great deal of money, but I hope it will turn out an unqualified success. In the South-West is some of the finest country in Australia for group settlement. If properly managed, I think the settlers will make a success of their undertaking. A lot has been said about the Peel estate and the value of the land there. I have not seen it, but from what Mr. Holmes has stated there appear to be at least 18,000 acres of good swamp land. If properly drained and cleared, the swamp land in the South-West is worth anything from £20 to £100 an acre. There is coastal land and river flats near Bunbury that, when cleared and drained, people would not take £100 an acre for. Some of the settlers there have taken £150 worth of produce off one acre in a year. If the Peel estate contains 18,000 acres of this class of country, it will form a very valuable asset. In the further South-West, along the Margaret River and in the Pemberton district, a lot of money has been wasted in establishing groups without giving them proper facilities for transport for their goods and for their produce. Money has been spent in clearing roads and forming them without any provision having been made for travelling them. A few months ago the roads were like quagmires, and it was almost impossible to get from one group to another. The expense in this direction has been enormous. The railway from Busselton to Margaret River is not yet completed. If the Government do not hurry up it will not be finished before the coming winter. This is the time to put the roads into proper condition, while the country is dry. There is a sum of £100,000 on the Estimates for new roads and bridges. There should be at least a quarter of a million spent on the roads within a few months if they are to be in order before the wet season begins. The winter starts in May. Unless the Government take advantage of the dry months, during which they can cart stone and gravel for the roads and have them properly formed and drained, we shall be in the same dilemma next winter that we were in during the previous one. It is no use putting people on the land unless proper roads are provided for them. In the South-West we have a heavy rainfall and a long winter, and it is out of the question

to expect people to send their produce to market at reasonable cost if they have no road facilities. It is the same thing throughout the South-West. There must be drainage and good roads. We want feeder roads for our railways. In cases where our railways are not paying, good roads should be laid down so that people may cart their produce along them to the railways at a reasonable figure. More produce would thus be brought into the city than is the case to-day. We are importing from the Eastern States a great deal of produce that ought to be grown here. If we grew it here we should give employment to a number of farmers for years to come. That produce can be and will be produced in Western Australia. It is a crying shame that we should have sent about 150 millions sterling out of Western Australia during the last 25 or 30 years for that which could have been produced in the State. We have been keeping the Eastern States going in order to supply our wants when we should have been supplying them ourselves.

Hon. A. Burvell: We are doing it still.

Hon. E. ROSE: Even now we send away £2,000,000 a year to the Eastern States for produce that should be grown here. People ask, what is the use of putting settlers on the land if there is no market for their produce? I would point out that we have a better market at our doors than any other State in Australia, and we can go on exporting for years to come. That, however, is not particularly the concern of the Government. If the Government did undertake the finding of markets it would mean another State trading concern, with the employment of a large staff of officials, whose time would be occupied in disposing of the produce of the settlers. For water supply, irrigation and drainage a sum of £30,000 has been allowed. That is too small an amount to be spent upon the country requirements. I am pleased the Government have realised the necessity for establishing an agricultural college. We have fought for this for many years, and have up to the present fought in vain. I am glad to see a sum of £30,000 on the Estimates for this institution, which is badly needed. During the last three years Western Australian boys have taken first passes in the agricultural college in South Australia. This year Mr. Money's son has taken first honours at that college. This is a great credit to him. We should be proud that we have boys in this State who can do that sort of thing. If this can be done with boys that are sent out of Western Australia, we can imagine what would happen if we had our own agricultural college. Not many parents can afford to send their sons to the Eastern States and give them an agricultural education, but, if the facilities were provided here, things would be altogether different. If we had our own agricultural college it would soon be filled, and we should be able to turn out smart agriculturists who would be of great benefit to the State. There is an item on the Estimates

"Land settlement for soldiers; improvements and purchases of estates, £30,000." I thought the purchase of estates for soldiers had been completed long ago and yet this amount appears on the Estimates. The majority of the soldiers have been on the land for the last two years, and I am surprised to see this amount here. A lot has been said about the North-West. We in the South are pleased to see that the money has been distributed in opening up different parts of the State—the goldfields, the North-West and the wheat areas. During the last day or two we have passed railways which will cost about a million pounds, chiefly for the eastern wheat belt. We in the South-West have had about 5½ miles of railway passed. That is the deviation in connection with the Flinders Bay-Margaret River railway. That is our whack. A little money was passed last year, but none of our railways had any money spent on them. We do not complain for we want to see the country opened up. We are in favour of decentralisation. We want our ports opened up so that the hinterland people may have shipping facilities to export their produce as cheaply as possible. In the South-West we have not had the consideration due to the importance of the district.

Hon. J. Duffell: What about the Jarnadup-Denmark railway?

Hon. E. ROSE: That will come later. From the Collie coalfield hundreds of thousands of tons have been drawn. Years ago I advocated a railway that would go to Bunbury and provide better transport facilities for coal, wheat and timber.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You should have an electric railway.

Hon. E. ROSE: That railway has been advocated in Parliament and by the engineers. It was suggested that another line should be constructed through the Ferguson to Bunbury, which would provide a better grade and easier transport. The present means of communication are very congested. I have seen the line completely blocked because of the wheat, coal and timber freights. Mr. Lynn will bear me out in this. The present line is not capable of coping with the traffic that exists now and will come later on. There is no doubt the Lake Grace-Newdegate line, which has now been authorised, will still further increase the traffic on that line. Mr. Miles has referred to the Bunbury harbour. A lot of money has been spent there, but the position is not satisfactory owing to the silting up that is taking place. On Sunday last I walked along the breakwater and for three-quarters of the way at one stage I was able to walk along the sand which has silted up inside the harbour. It drifts northward the whole time. It is washed up by the sea between the rocks of the breakwater and piles up inside. Unless steps are taken promptly to dredge the harbour more quickly, it will not be possible for ships to make use of the harbour. Unfortunately the make-

shifts that have been tried so far are of no avail. The breakwater was extended and then later the jetty was increased in length, running parallel with the breakwater. This has not proved satisfactory and at the present time we have six or eight feet less depth at the end of the jetty than we had two years ago. That will give hon. members some idea of how rapidly the harbour is silting up. A small dredge is employed in the harbour, but it is useless. One or two loads of sand are taken out of the harbour each day and dumped into the ocean a few miles out. The sand, of course, is washed back into the harbour. That sort of thing is useless. I have spoken several times on this matter and the only reply I have received from the Government is that they do not know what to do. If the Government have not the engineers who can grapple with the problem, it is their duty to secure the services of an engineer from Europe or America who can report on the matter. Such an engineer should decide whether we should have a mainland harbour or an inner harbour. No matter what the cost may be that responsibility should be shouldered by the Government. The breakwater and jetty have cost over £400,000. In order to maintain Bunbury as an important shipping centre, the expenditure of funds to secure some expert opinion on this question would be fully warranted. Last year 135 vessels entered the harbour and handled about 500,000 tons of cargo. Before the war Bunbury was the third largest exporting port in Australia, let alone Western Australia. At the present time it occupies about sixth position. If we had proper facilities Bunbury could quickly regain its status as the third or fourth port of Australia. It is impossible for large steamers to enter the port and not more than a couple of boats can load in deep water at the one time. I have often endeavoured to find out what the policy of the Government is regarding the Bunbury harbour. Unfortunately I cannot ascertain that they have a policy. Unless the Government secure the assistance of a first-class engineer we will have the trouble with us for all time. With the opening up of the country behind Bunbury the export trade must increase considerably. Large quantities of wheat, coal, timber and other products are exported from Bunbury. In those circumstances, Bunbury should receive more attention at the hands of the Government than it has had in the past. A large belt of coastal land is under offer to the Government for group settlement purposes. I hope the Government will avail themselves of that offer for the area comprises some of the finest land in the State. When that area is brought under cultivation, we shall have large quantities of produce to be shipped away from Bunbury and that will be impossible unless something is done regarding the harbour. The fruit crops of Bridgetown, Donnybrook and other centres should be exported from Bunbury, and cool stores are required at the port. We cannot erect those stores because there is no certainty about the

future regarding the harbour. If the present state of affairs continues it will not be many years before the boys will be playing cricket and football between the jetty and the breakwater. I am sorry to have to speak in this strain concerning the harbour, because I know the Leader of the House, as a representative of that part of the State, is a member of the Government and has been interested in this matter. I do not know what action he has taken since he has become a Minister. I know that he will do his best to secure some improvement. We have dealt with a number of railways but I would like to remind the House that the South-West has been promised several railways for some years past. No mention is made of them in the Appropriation Bill or the Loan Bill. I refer to the railway to connect the Bridgetown-Jarndup line with the Great Southern railway, somewhere near Mt. Barker. When that line is constructed it will open up some fine country including a belt of timber country. Then there is the Boyup Brook southwards line which will also serve a number of settlers who are not 10 miles, but up to 30 miles, from a railway. They have to cart their produce over that distance, and hon. members will realise that that is impossible in the South-West where the roads are so bad. Great possibilities are ahead of the South-West and the Government should lend more assistance to that part of the State than they have done during the last few years. In some respects the South-West is progressing satisfactorily. It comprises one of the finest areas for mixed farming to be found in Western Australia. I was pleased to hear Mr. Miles refer to dairying, mixed farming and pig raising. I believe that these industries, together with root crops, on small areas will be the salvation not only of the South-West but of the whole of Western Australia. The butter factory we have at Bunbury is turning out nearly 15 tons of butter a week. That will give hon. members some idea of the progress made in the dairying industry there. We hope that before the lapse of many years, more factories will be established with a similar output. Mr. Macfarlane can bear me out when I say that dairying operations have greatly increased and holdings have been improved with clovers and other grasses. This progress has been so marked that in another three or four years there will be very little dairy produce imported into Western Australia. I do not know whether, with the taxation imposed here, we shall be able to successfully compete against the Eastern States, but I am hopeful that as the country is capable of carrying a larger population the position will be rectified. I support the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move—

*That the debate be adjourned till 2.30 p.m. to-day.*

I am not fit to continue the debate at this early hour of the morning.

The Minister for Education: Neither am I in a fit state to continue, but I have to do so.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: We have no right to do the country's business at this hour of the morning, when we are exhausted.

Motion put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes	..	..	..	7
Noes	..	..	..	14
Majority against				7

#### AYES.

Hon. J. A. Greig	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. J. J. Holmes
Hon. A. Lovekin	(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Hon. W. Carroll	Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. J. W. Hickey	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. W. Kirwan	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. R. J. Lynn	Hon. A. Burvill
	(Teller.)

Motion thus negatived.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. Ewing—South-West—in reply) [12.15]: I thank hon. members for the generous support they have given to the Bill. There are only one or two matters to which I wish to refer in reply. I ask members not to take umbrage if I do not reply to everything they have said. I assure them that I have taken notes of what has transpired during the debate, and that every question of importance will receive consideration. It is my intention to submit to the Ministers interested the matters that affect their departments. They will receive detailed reports from me of what has transpired in the course of this debate. I thank Mr. Rose for his courteous remarks and assure him that the work of effecting improvements at the Bunbury harbour has not been lost sight of by the Government; that in fact what it is best to do is receiving earnest attention.

Hon. E. Rose: But we have heard that so often

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I am very much concerned about it, because I represent the same province as does the hon. member.

Hon. J. W. Hickey: You also represent the Peel Estate.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It will not be long before something of value will be done in connection with the harbour at Bunbury. Mr. Gray read an extract from a file in connection with Mr. Stevenson's application for the right to work abandoned mining leases. I am astonished at the hon. member having been able to secure this information from a departmental file. I would like to know what file it is, and who placed it at

the hon. member's disposal. Of course, the hon. member was quite in order in using that information in support of his arguments when putting the position before the House. At the same time, I must consider whether things are quite right in the departments when it is possible for a member to have access to a file in that way. The hon. member could quite easily have obtained any information he desired by asking for it in this House. I feel sure, also, that the Minister for Mines would have been only too pleased to place at the hon. member's disposal any file of a confidential nature which could not have been brought down here. The Government have nothing to hide, but if there is a leakage in the service it will have to be investigated. It is a very serious thing, and I shall endeavour to find out how this information got out. I repeat, that the hon. member has every right to information in the possession of departments, and it will be readily given if he asks for it in the proper way.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Copies of that extract from the file were sent to several goldfields members. The information came from the department.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I am pleased to hear that. I had become quite alarmed.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: A number of goldfields members met at the Mines Department, and this information was placed at their disposal.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I wish the hon. member had mentioned that before. The impression on my mind was that this information had leaked out in an improper way.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Before leaving this subject, I would like an assurance that the proposed monopoly will not be granted.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I assure the hon. member that nothing has yet been done. So far as I know the matter has not been considered by the Government. It is a subject of some importance and will become a Cabinet matter before anything is done.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: I think goldfields members are unanimously opposed to it.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Their views must receive consideration. When I bring under the notice of the Minister for Mines the debate that has taken place here, I feel sure that the greatest care will be exercised to see that nothing of an injurious nature is done to the mining industry. In fairness to Mr. Scaddan, I should say that I am satisfied that if such a proposal was put before him he would be impressed with the value of it, and that he would act in regard to it in a manner that would be in the best interests of the State.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: It will be a most extraordinary thing if he can see any virtue in the proposal.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I take that remark from the hon. member in the spirit in which it is meant. I cannot

be held accountable for what the Minister for Mines may have done, but I am quite sure that whatever Mr. Scaddan does is, in his opinion, in the best interests of the State. It is well known that Mr. Scaddan is going out of the Ministry at the end of the year, and I know he will leave with the good wishes of every member of this House and another place as well. I admire the way in which Mr. Miles works and speaks for the North-West, and I was glad to hear his references to Sir James Connolly to-night. The hon. member and others have told me that Sir James Connolly did excellent work as Agent General, and if Sir James reads "Hansard" he will therein see that he is held in high esteem by members of this Chamber. We owe a good deal to Sir James Connolly for his efforts on behalf of Western Australia. I assure the hon. member that I never used the words "visionary scheme" in connection with his attitude towards the North-West. The episode took place at Fremantle, and the expression was used by somebody else, certainly not by me. As a matter of fact, I could not recognise my speech when I read it in the Press, because a third of what was reported was never uttered by me. I do not intend to refer to my notes, because if I do I may detain hon. members too long. I would have replied to hon. members at length but for the lateness of the hour. I am pleased that Mr. Holmes has got what he thinks is right in the interests of the State by the appointment of a commission of inquiry into the management of the Peel and Bateman estates. The Government have nothing to fear as the result of any investigation that may be made, and I am sure the hon. member and his colleagues will go closely into the matter and give an unbiassed opinion. I thank members for the close attention they have paid to the Appropriation Bill. I have often suggested that one must borrow money to get out of difficulties. Many a man has got out of difficulties by doing that.

Hon. J. W. Hickey: Only when his luck was in.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: There is no justification for borrowing money unless the State is worthy of it and unless the money is expended wisely.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee.*

Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3, Schedules A to C—agreed to.

Schedule D:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I do not believe in dealing with parochial questions, but as Mr. Miles and Mr. Stewart have referred to two matters that concern the metropolitan province, I wish to make a short explanation. Mr. Miles said the King's Park Board had prevented the waterworks department from

constructing as large a reservoir as they intended. The board are the caretakers of the park for the State. The land is vested in them as a Class A reserve and cannot be touched without an Act of Parliament. The department proposed to encroach within 32 ft. of May Drive, where there is an avenue of oak trees planted in honour of the fallen soldiers. They also proposed to erect a bank 27 ft. high with a batter of one in one. For the time the trees had grown—they are doing exceedingly well—the branches would have been touching the bank. As the department had plenty of room in its own area to make a reservoir of a different shape, the King's Park Board could not consent to their proposal. The department could have made the reservoir square, whereas they wanted to make it oblong. Instead of altering their plan they cut down the size of the reservoir by the equivalent of about five million gallons of water. The Government ought not to spend the money they are laying out on these additional reservoirs—£388,000 odd—when the outlay will only load the capital cost of the undertaking unnecessarily, because they required not storage but extra water. Instead of setting out to get extra water first and then building the reservoirs, they started the reservoirs first without having water to put in them. This scheme will load the people of the metropolitan area for years to come with enormous taxation—up to 3s. 9d. in the pound on heavy assessments, besides the price of the water—and there would have been no necessity for it had a proper and economic scheme of working been adopted. The methods remind one of a warehouseman putting shelves in his warehouse when he has no goods to sell. Hugh pipes have been laid on both sides of the river to Fremantle at heavy capital cost, and there will be no great quantity of water to go through them for years. Mr. Stewart said the Government ought not to provide money for the extension of the metropolitan waterworks, because the figures showed they were not paying. When I asked earlier in the session for a reduction in the price of industrial water, I said the department, instead of making a loss, were making a profit, notwithstanding that the official figures showed a loss. I explained where the difference came in. We were paying interest and sinking fund on debentures that had been paid off and we are still paying interest on them. That accounted for the sum of £8,000, whereas the loss shown was £6,000, so that the scheme, badly managed as it is, really showed a profit of £2,000. I have gone into the matter further and I find the facts are as stated, but the Government, as a result of their methods of finance, are taking money which properly belongs to the waterworks department. Certain debentures were borrowed at four per cent. interest, with one per cent. sinking fund. Instead of investing the one per cent. sinking fund and letting it accumulate over the period so as to redeem the loan, every time they get the sinking fund money they pay off debentures which a

carrying only a cheap rate of interest and use the money for other purposes, and thus show the scheme in debit. I referred this matter to the Auditor General, because I contended that if the sinking fund were invested as it should be and as we are entitled to have it invested, the scheme would be showing a profit instead of a loss. I have a letter from the Auditor General setting out the facts and concluding as follows:—

If there was a sinking fund of one per cent. earning five per cent. interest over a period of 41 years, this would provide approximately £188,000 more than is required to pay off the debentures.

Under the present methods of finance the Government will get that £188,000 and the scheme will show a loss. When the Government adopt such methods of finance, I hope members representing the country will not contend that the people of the metropolitan area are not paying their way. I consider it only right to my constituents to make this explanation.

Schedule put and passed.

Schedules E to G, Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

## BILL—LAND TAX AND INCOME TAX.

### *Assembly's further Message.*

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it was unable to make the amendments again requested by the Council and desiring the concurrence of the Council in the Bill as originally transmitted.

### *In Committee.*

Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

No. 1. Clause 6—Delete Subclause 1:

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move—

*That the Council's request No. 1 be no longer pressed.*

The conference has not been satisfactory, insofar as no agreement was arrived at. However, the Bill is still in our possession and this House has requested amendments which another place has refused to make. Hon. members have a perfect right to their opinions. My impression is that the confusion of figures practically thrown at hon. members by myself and Mr. Lovekin has left a doubt in the minds of many as to exactly where we stand. I have my opinion, which is backed up by the Commissioner of Taxation. Mr. Lovekin and others hold a different opinion. I do not think it possible for us to decide on the floor of this House either one way or the other. The vote which was taken here was a vote against the super tax. Many people hold that a supertax should not be imposed at present.

Hon. J. Duffell: It was introduced as a war emergency measure.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Yes. For some considerable time the Government were considering whether it would not be possible to do without the supertax this year. However, the tax was found to be necessary. If it was necessary before the Appropriation Bill was introduced here, it is still more necessary to-day, because the revenue from the supertax is essential to the State. Members voted as a matter of principle that the time had arrived when there should be no super tax. The Government earnestly desire to reduce taxation and the supertax is one that will receive the earliest consideration of the Government. Members, in voting as they did, well and truly showed the country what their opinions are. I uphold the rights and privileges of this Chamber, but members have strongly impressed upon the Government and another place the need for the reduction of taxation. If hon. members will not support me at this juncture, the position will be that the finances of Western Australia have been taken in hand by the Legislative Council. This Chamber is not supposed to be in charge of the finances.

Hon. V. Hainersley: We are sent here to represent the people.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: There is a difference in regard to finance between this House and the House which represents the people on the ordinary franchise.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The other House represents the people and we represent the taxpayers.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Quite so. This question is one of finance, and finance is largely in the hands of another place. Hon. members, having recorded their non-appreciation of this class of taxation, would not be justified in embarrassing the Government at this stage. There are other avenues of taxation, and the Government will give consideration to them at an early date and see whether the higher taxpayer cannot be relieved by a scheme which might be thought out before Parliament meets again. Hon. members will embarrass the Government if they do not carry the motion I have submitted. I have no fear of the result of a division on this point, not because I think members have changed their opinions, but because I know they will give consideration to the needs of the State.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: As one of the managers for this House, I desire to place before hon. members the position as it appears to me. I propose to move an amendment to the Minister's motion somewhat in these terms, "In reply to the Assembly's message, the Legislative Council informs the Legislative Assembly that, in view of the conditions imposed upon the managers for the Legislative Assembly, the representatives of the Legislative Council were unable effectively to discuss the differences between the two Houses. No agreement having been possible in the circumstances, the Legislative Council further

presses its request." When we pressed our request, a constitutional point was raised in another place.

The Minister for Education: The Bill is gone if my motion is lost.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Another Bill can be brought down.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: If I am allowed to proceed I shall finish by telling the House that at the conference the Premier himself put that position, saying that if we laid this Bill aside, the only alternative would be to produce another Bill.

The Minister for Education: On a point of order, the Premier did not say that at all. Further, I do not think it is right to say what happened at the conference. I think it is a breach of the rights and privileges of Parliament to do so.

Hon. J. Duffell: But it was fully discussed in another place.

The Minister for Education: The Premier did not say that he would introduce another Bill, but that another session of Parliament would be necessary.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: That is so, and to produce another Bill.

The Minister for Education: But you did not say that.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I was going to say it. The Premier said he was going to produce another Bill at another session of Parliament.

The Minister for Education: He did not say that.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Why should we have another session of Parliament?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: What I think about the conference is that members and the country have a right to be informed of what happened. These matters have been discussed in another place, and I see no reason why the managers for this House should not give their views, so that both sides of the question may be known.

Hon. J. W. Hickey: Is that always done?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: It is not always done. However, last year it was done in another place and quite a false impression was created. I am not going to allow another false impression to be created and have this House put in the wrong when it is in the right.

Hon. J. W. Hickey: We should decide once and for all whether we will have the managers giving their views.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: If the House does not want to hear what I propose to say, I will sit down; but I think it my duty to inform the House of what has happened. If hon. members think I ought not to make this statement, it is open to them to say so, and I will not persist. When we pressed our requested amendment a constitutional point was taken in another place. It was said there that, although we had the right under the Constitution Act Amendment Act, 1921, to request an amendment, we had no right to press it. That was argued in another place and the Government were able to carry a motion in favour of a conference. By carrying

that motion they affirmed the principle that we had the right not only to request an amendment but to press the requested amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to point out that, while it is not out of order, it is unusual, under the procedure of this House, to reveal what has taken place at conferences other than the report that is always made to the House. In this instance that report had already been made to the House.

The Minister for Education: Hear, hear!

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The course I am taking may be unusual, but the conditions of this conference were quite unusual, even unique. When managers are appointed from each House, one expects those managers to go to the conference free and untettered, as provided by the Standing Orders and by the procedure of Parliament.

Hon. J. Duffell: That is borne out by the fact that the managers have to be unanimous in their decision.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: In this instance the managers for another place were not free, but had an embargo placed upon them that they must insist on the Bill as it stood. They were not managers at all, because there was nothing to manage. They were tied down before they came.

Hon. V. Hamersley: How was that done?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: By a resolution carried in another place after the conference managers had been appointed. This should be known, because the conference has failed, and that failure, if not explained, may rebound upon this House. I am not going to permit that. The Council's managers went to the conference with freedom to negotiate, freedom to point out the position as far as we were concerned. When we met the managers of another place we were advised that they had a resolution tied round them to the effect that it did not matter what case we put up to them, they were not free to accept anything but the Bill as it stood. In those circumstances, of course, the conference was bound to fail. As hon. members seem to think I ought not to proceed to say what took place in the conference, I will not pursue it any further. But precedent could not be found for the appointing of managers to a conference with their hands tied, so that they could not negotiate. The purpose of a conference is explained by "May" (page 390) as follows:—

When a Bill has been returned by either House to the other, with amendments which are disagreed to, a message is sent, or a conference is desired, by the House which disagrees to the amendment, to acquaint the other with the reasons for such disagreement, in order to reconcile their differences, and, if possible, by mutual concessions to arrive at an ultimate agreement. If such agreement cannot be secured, the Bill is lost for the session.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Then if the Bill is lost are we not out of order already?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: But we have a message from another place which also is out of order; because on precedent the Bill is lost to them, and nothing more can be done. But in this instance another message is sent to us asking that we reconsider our attitude and pass the Bill. Courtesy demands that we shall send a message in reply. That message in reply I have already indicated to the House. At the conference we desired to put up to the members of another place our facts and figures. I will not say what happened, but whatever we put up could have no effect, seeing that the managers for another place were bound. Last session it was common ground amongst those conducting the negotiations that £30,000 was wanted to meet certain exemptions granted to taxpayers said to be on the bread line, and we agreed to give the £30,000. When the tax rate was increased, we said the rate was much too high; because not only the difference of .001d. had to be taken into account, but there were other conditions, one being that for the first time the Bill provided that dividends should be taken into income, so that a higher tax rate might be imposed on the incomes. And there was the effect of the stabilisation of stocks to be taken into account, and which the year before was the basis on which we were trying to ascertain how to get the £30,000. Stocks had been depreciated by merchants and others the tax paid that year was particularly low, and it was expected that the taxpayers would reap the benefit next year. That is why we said to the Government "You will get, not £30,000, but £64,000 besides to recoup exemptions."

The Minister for Education: Others held different opinions.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I have a tremendous lot of supporters in this, and have met no one who has broken down the figures. I put up the figures in tabulated form on a cash basis, showing what we had received, what we had on our books and how we stood in respect of the £30,000. In putting it that way I was putting it in the best way for the Government. It showed that after paying for the exemptions they must have £64,105 to the good. The "West Australian," which looks after the interests of the Government as well as it possibly can, pointed out that we must not look at the cash basis as I had put it up, but must take it from the view point of the assessments. In the interests of the people who pay the tax I am prepared to take it up from that viewpoint rather than on the cash basis. When we do that, instead of having £64,000 we have £136,000.

The Minister for Education: The statement is absolutely ridiculous.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: It is easy to say that, but show me where it is ridiculous. The Minister tells us that the addition of .001d. meant £31,661. If that be so it is obvious that .007d. will give seven times £31,661. That cannot be disputed. That gives £221,627 which must be the total tax they could expect to receive for that year.

Hon. J. Duffell: But already they had been getting .006d.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: That is so. We are taking now the assessments irrespective of the cash basis. The figures the Minister gave us were the figures on the assessments for 1921. The Minister said "All this means £31,661 on the assessments." I say that if .001d. is equal to £31,661 then if we apply .007d. it must give the total tax for the year as £221,627. By the way, let me say that in 1922, although on that calculation £221,627 should have been paid, the total tax paid into revenue for that year was £320,000. The Minister tells us that the assessments for 1922, having been completed, are to be found in the 15th annual report of the Taxation Commissioner as £389,546. The assessments actually yielded that amount, whereas on the Minister's computation the assessments could only have yielded £221,627. If I take £31,661, the amount necessary to provide for the exemptions, we have £136,258 over, instead of £64,000, as on my cash basis. So I am quite willing to take it on the basis of the assessments, instead of the cash basis. But, of course, the cash basis I put up was the correct basis. The assessments mean nothing. The Commissioner puts up a lot of assessments, some of them are altered seven or eight times, all sorts of deductions are allowed, some people do not pay, and so the assessments mean nothing to the Treasurer. The way I put it up, the cash actually received, was the proper way and the best way in the interests of the Treasurer. I wanted to put up this case strongly at the conference, but it was no use when we found that the managers for another place had no authority to act. The people who impose the tax are represented by those in another place, but those who pay the tax are those represented by members in this House. If those who pay have no protection from this House, this House is of no value. If we take away from this House some measure of control over the taxes imposed, this House has little or no value, and the sooner it is got rid of the better; because all the reviewing work done here by 30 members could be done by one good solicitor at a couple of thousand pounds per annum.

Hon. H. Stewart: That is your opinion.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Yes. I think a solicitor could better do some of the things we have to do. But what we are here for is to represent the people who pay the taxes. With all due respect to members of another place, after all they mostly represent those who could put on their hats and walk away, leaving those with a stake in the country to foot the bill. In the circumstances we ought to do something to protect the people we represent. Last session we committed the people to a payment of £30,000 in order to relieve certain others, and we were quite willing to do that. We are willing still, but it is now discovered that instead of their paying £30,000 they are paying £90,000. We admit the Treasurer wants the money badly, but he must keep faith with



us, and he has no right to impose taxation amounting to £90,000 instead of £30,000. I move an amendment—

*That in reply to the Assembly's message, the Council informs the Assembly that in view of the condition imposed upon the managers for the Legislative Assembly, the managers of the Legislative Council were unable effectively to discuss the difference between the two Houses; no agreement having been possible in the circumstances, the Legislative Council further presses its request.*

**THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION:** It is a very difficult thing to follow the hon. member's figures, and I cannot find myself in unison with him. Mr. Lovekin now uses a sum of £126,000.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That is your basis.

**THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION:** At any rate, the figure is going up. If his amendment is carried it will mean the defeat of the Bill, and this House will have to take the responsibility of denying to the Government the necessary funds with which to carry on the affairs of State. Members should give the benefit of the doubt to the Government, who are doing all that is possible for the development of the State.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: I have no desire to disclose anything that transpired during the conference proceedings, but I am sorry the Assembly restricted its managers in the way it did. That was quite a wrong thing to do, because they came to the conference with their hands tied. In my opinion Mr. Lovekin's figures are correct. I regret that a resolution was carried in the Assembly resulting in this abortive conference.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: We all deplore the fact that the conference did not result in a satisfactory settlement, and that the managers of the Assembly were deprived of that freedom which it is the right of every House to give to its managers when they are appointed.

Hon. H. Stewart: It is the duty of the House to give that freedom to its managers.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I do not wish to injure the position for the Government, but how can the Government expect us, as representatives of the people, to agree to the request they have made that we should not insist upon this amendment that they had determined beforehand they would not agree to? If, as Mr. Gray said, there exists a serious condition of unemployment, that condition would be relieved if there were more industries established in the State. How can the Government relieve unemployment unless they provide means for establishing such industries? The only way to do this is by reducing taxation. We have suggested a means to the Assembly whereby people can be encouraged to establish industries here. If private enterprise is hampered by heavy taxation, industries will not be established in our midst. The Leader of the House should urge his colleagues to reconsider the matter and

ask the Assembly to pass a motion withdrawing the restrictions it placed upon its managers, so that this matter may be finalised.

**The Minister for Education:** It cannot be done.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I do not see why a further conference should not be held.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: It is suggested that a number of large firms are going to Victoria to establish their head offices there, so as to avoid the high taxation in this State.

Hon. J. Duffell: That is so.

Hon. J. Nicholson: We are losing population.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I will reply to Dr. Saw's remarks at a later stage. Mr Baldwin reduced the income tax by £50,000,000 in order to create employment and promote industry in England. Last March he reduced taxation by another £26,000,000 for the same reason, as the first reduction had relieved unemployment to such an extent and prevented the payment of doles. In a cable published here on Friday last we were given a resume of President Coolidge's manifesto. His domestic platform opens in this way:—

Congress should immediately reduce taxation in order to save the United States from the post-war economic disorders which have effected all nations. The tariff law should remain unchanged, its elastic provisions being sufficient to prevent inequalities. The Government-owned merchant marine should be transferred to private ownership.

The Right Hon. G. N. Barnes, Labour, Glasgow, in speaking in the House of Commons and dealing with unemployment, placed "the remedies for the existing state of things" under three heads. Plank No. 1 was—

More hearty co-operation between employers and workmen.

The second plank was—

An easement of the burden of taxation upon industry.

Hon. members should remember that I am quoting the views of a Labour man. His third plank was—

A greater degree of mutual aid amongst governments in an international scheme.

Those were the planks which suggested themselves to Mr. Barnes to overcome the difficulty regarding unemployment and the payment of doles. Applying that position here, hon. members must see that something should be done to reduce taxation in Western Australia. We propose to make a start by taking a paltry 7d. in the pound off the taxation. While the Government may consider that they will lose something in the immediate future, it will be profitable in the long run.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: May I suggest an addition to the motion to the effect that we request another conference on this question with another place.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Under the Standing Orders only one conference is possible.

The Minister for Education: That is right. Standing Order 333 deals with the point.

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

Ayes	..	..	8
Noes	..	..	11
Majority against			3

## AYES.

Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. A. Lovekin	(Teller.)
Hon. R. J. Lynn	

## NOES.

Hon. W. Carroll	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. A. Greig	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. J. W. Hickey	Hon. A. Burwill
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment no longer pressed.

No. 1. Clause 7.—Delete clause.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION : I move—

*That the Council's request No. 2 be no longer pressed.*

The second amendment we sought was to provide for the payment of the income tax in two moieties. The Government are afraid that if two moieties are permitted this year, the tax will not all be collected. On the other hand if, this year, the Government are allowed to have the tax collected in one moiety it will be possible to discuss the position and perhaps allow the payment in moieties in the future. The Government desire the one payment this year because half the year has already lapsed.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I regret that the Leader of the House has asked us not to press the amendment. The payment of the tax in one amount will be irksome for a large section of the community. I shall vote against the motion because it will inflict a hardship. The Government do not desire, I presume, to inflict a hardship upon anyone and while they may be inconvenienced by the non-receipt of taxation payments, they themselves are to blame for the position. They are to blame, too, for the way the business of this session has been conducted. For weeks we sat looking at each other without any business to do. I know it is excusable on the part of the Leader of the House, who has not had the experience of Mr. Colebatch. Mr. Colebatch, on the other hand, was always able to place legislation before us.

Hon. G. Potter: You do not blame the Leader of the House for that position!

Hon. J. DUFFELL: No, I am excusing him. The taxation payments should be allowed in two moieties as in the past. I hope the Leader of the House will give way and not press his motion.

Hon. H. STEWART: I ask for a ruling regarding Clause 7. I would refer you, Mr. Chairman, to Subsection 7 of Section 2 of the Constitution Act Amendment Act of 1921, wherein it is stated—

Bills imposing taxation shall deal only with the imposition of taxation, and any provision therein dealing with any other matter shall be of no effect.

I submit that the clause does not deal with the imposition of taxation and that it is not in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution Act Amendment Act.

The CHAIRMAN: I rule that Clause 7 is in order.

Hon. H. STEWART: I shall move to disagree with the Chairman's ruling.

The CHAIRMAN: Will you reduce your motion to writing?

Hon. G. W. Miles: Let it go.

Hon. H. STEWART: I will not proceed with the motion.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I will vote against the motion because of the insult offered to this Chamber by another place, who appointed their managers and refused to allow them to agree to any alteration. It is a direct insult to the Council to send managers to confer with our managers and yet tie their hands.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I impress upon hon. members that this is almost as important as the previous matter discussed by the Committee. If we do not get the tax in one payment this year, we shall receive only half the tax and the Government will be embarrassed. Since the matter was raised I have been advised that for this year it is most important the tax should be paid in one amount.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Minister refers to the embarrassment of the Government, but it is the Government who embarrass themselves, and now they are embarrassing the taxpayers by collecting £90,000 to make good the £30,000 they gave away. The Government have told the country that the difference between the people they represent and those who sit in Opposition is that the Government are in favour of private enterprise and the Opposition are in favour of State enterprise; and the Government, pronouncing a policy like that, come down at the end of the year with figures that show a loss of over £100,000 on the State trading concerns and have the audacity to declare that members are embarrassing them.

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

Ayes	..	..	11
Noes	..	..	7
Majority for			4

## AYES.

Hon. A. Burvill  
Hon. W. Carroll  
Hon. J. Ewing  
Hon. E. H. Gray  
Hon. J. A. Greig  
Hon. J. W. Hickey

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane  
Hon. E. Rose  
Hon. A. J. H. Saw  
Hon. H. Stewart  
Hon. G. Potter  
(Teller.)

## NOES.

Hon. J. Duffell  
Hon. E. H. Harris  
Hon. J. J. Holmes  
Hon. R. J. Lynn

Hon. G. W. Miles  
Hon. J. Nicholson  
Hon. H. Seddon  
(Teller.)

Question thus passed: the Council's amendment no longer pressed.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I wish to ask whether this Bill is in order in coming back to us after the managers have disagreed at the conference. According to "May," if an agreement is not arrived at, the Bill is lost for the session.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like the hon. member to quote that passage from "May."

Hon. G. W. MILES: It reads—

According to established uses, when the Bill has been returned by either House to the other with amendments which are disagreed to, a message is sent to say a conference is desired by the House which disagrees to the amendment to acquaint the other with the reasons for such disagreement in order to reconcile their difficulties and, if possible, by mutual concessions to arrive at an ultimate agreement. If such agreement cannot be secured, the Bill is lost for the session.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: What the hon. member quoted refers to amendments of Bills, a different thing altogether. If it related to an amendment before the House, the hon. member would be quite right, but there is no amendment before this House.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: We should not split straws on such a matter. A request for an amendment is precisely the same as an amendment made. To one class of Bill we can make amendments and to another we can request that amendments be made, and in both instances we can ask for a conference, and the conditions that apply to a conference apply equally to Bills. We can make requests or make amendments. I submit, whether it is a Bill that we can amend, or a Bill in which we can request that amendments be made, the same principle applies. "May" does not draw any distinction between Bills.

The CHAIRMAN: The quotation read by Mr. Miles does not carry the interpretation he placed upon it. A close reading of it seems to me to make it clear that it simply states an obvious Parliamentary truth. What it does say is that when all other means for settling differences between the two Houses have failed, the Bill is lost. We have not reached that stage, inasmuch as all means for arriving at a solution of the differences are not exhausted. Consequently, I rule that the Bill is in order.

Hon. G. W. Miles rose.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. member wish to dispute my ruling?

Hon. G. W. MILES: No, I wish to rise to another point of order. Standing Order 331 says—

At all conferences the managers for the Council shall be at liberty to confer freely by word of mouth with the managers of the Assembly.

I maintain, that if a resolution is carried in another place—

The CHAIRMAN: We have no official knowledge of a resolution having been carried in another place. What is the point of order?

Hon. G. W. Miles: That another place could not freely discuss the position with our managers.

The CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order because we have no official knowledge of a resolution having been carried in another place.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Read a third time and passed.

## BILL—VERMIN ACT AMENDMENT.

*Assembly's further Message.*

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it continued to disagree to the amendment made by the Council, and that the Bill had been laid aside.

## BILL—PUBLIC SERVICE APPEAL BOARD ACT AMENDMENT.

*Second Reading.*

Hon. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [2.2] in moving the second reading said: This Bill was introduced in another place by Capt. Carter. Under the Public Service Appeal Board Act of 1920, there is full provision for appeals and for the protection generally of members of the public service. The term "public servant" is given a specific meaning, and the interpretation section defines a public servant. Included in the public service are many persons filling more menial positions that do not entitle them to be classified as public servants. I refer to cleaners and such like employees. Such persons are provided for under the Public Service Appeal Board Act by Subsection 2 of Section 6, which reads:—

Any person employed in the public service at a daily or weekly rate of wages, who is not a public servant within the meaning of section two of this Act, shall be paid in accordance with any award or industrial agreement under the Industrial Arbitration Act, 1912, applicable to workers of his

class, whether such award or agreement is binding on the Crown or not. If any question shall arise as to which of several awards or agreements is applicable, the board shall determine which award or agreement shall apply.

The board has experienced difficulty in determining certain matters because of the wording of that subsection. The amendment proposes to strike out the latter portion and insert in lieu:—

If any question shall arise as to which of several awards or agreements is applicable, or as to whether any award is applicable or not, or as to what portion of any award or agreement is applicable to a particular person to whom this subsection applies, the board shall determine such question.

Full jurisdiction is given to the board. I understand the Government approve of the Bill. I move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc.*

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

Read a third time and passed.

## BILL—WOMEN'S LEGAL STATUS.

### *Second Reading.*

Hon. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [2.10] in moving the second reading said: The object of the Bill is to equalise the status in the community of women with that of men by removing all those disqualifications to which women at present are subject by reason of sex. It was necessary three years ago to amend the Constitution Act to extend to women the same rights as men enjoy to sit as members of Parliament. Under the Constitution Act the question was raised that women had not the same rights as had men. Section 7 provided that any man who had resided in the State for a certain term was qualified to be elected as a member, notwithstanding that at the time it was urged that under the Interpretation Act "male" included "female" or vice versa. It was recognised that the Constitution Act did not intend to confer upon women the same rights as were conferred upon men. Accordingly in 1920 Parliament passed the Parliament (Qualification of Women) Act, providing that a woman should not be disqualified by sex or marriage for being elected to and sitting as a member of Parliament. There are various vocations that women are debarred from entering by reasons of sex, and it is now desired to confer upon them the same rights as men enjoy. I move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [2.13]: Never before have I brought up in the House anything that concerns me personally, but I can see that quite a large additional expense will be imposed upon the proprietors of newspapers if this Bill be passed. Suppose we had ladies practising in the courts, we should have to employ lady reporters, because I am sure no male reporter could do justice to a lady appearing for a culprit if it were necessary to describe what she was wearing when appearing in the court. To describe dresses requires a somewhat technical knowledge and the male reporter does not learn that part of the business when studying his profession. Mr. Nicholson should spare us this large additional expense by inserting another clause—I am diffident about suggesting one because I am personally interested—so that ladies appearing in court shall be required to dress in male attire. It would be absolutely necessary to do that, because under the Criminal Code a woman who appears in public in male attire is liable to a penalty. If she is to appear in male attire in court, when defending some scoundrel, we must make provision for that in our laws. When a lady becomes a K.C. we might allow her to wear her little frills, knee-breeches, silk stockings, and buckled shoes. I hope the hon. member will help the newspapers by embodying an amendment covering this.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN (South) [2.17]: I am rather surprised that Mr. Lovekin should deal with the Bill at this hour in the morning in such a humorous fashion. It is a matter that ought to be viewed with gravity. The Bill is in accordance with the movement in progress all over the world where women are entering into all professions. I do not see why women in Australia should lag behind those in other parts of the world. I trust Mr. Lovekin's remarks will not imperil the fate of the Bill. It is rather difficult to know how many members are going to vote upon it at this late hour. It may be they have not given it the consideration that a Bill of this nature is entitled to receive. There are, however, many women's organisations in this State which are very interested in the measure, and are most anxious to see it passed. It is in accord with the legitimate aspirations of the sex, and I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan—in reply) [2.20]: We all view with a great deal of apprehension the point brought out by Mr. Lovekin with regard to the cost he may be involved in if this Bill is passed. I join with Mr. Kirwan in saying I trust the fears he has expressed so humorously will not be realised. He may rest assured that the Bill is calculated to increase the sale of his newspaper, because people will be interested in the accounts furnished by his reporters from time to time regarding the dress worn by those ladies who will appear in the courts and other places. I feel confident in assuring

him that the passing of this Bill will provide for him increased profits.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc.*

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

Read a third time and passed.

## BILL—LUNACY ACT AMENDMENT.

*Assembly's further Message.*

Message from the Assembly giving reasons for disagreeing to the amendment made by the Council now considered.

*In Committee.*

Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; Hon. J. W. Hickey, on behalf of Hon. T. Moore, in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The reasons given by the Assembly for not agreeing to the amendment made by the Council in Clause 2 are that, "The amendment will render the Bill inoperative." The amendment made by the Council was to add a proviso as follows—

Provided that this section shall not apply where a person is detained during His Majesty's pleasure under Section 653 of the Criminal Code.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I move—

*That the Council's amendment be insisted upon.*

I received a letter from Mr. Moore stating that he had to go away, and asking me to pair with him. I immediately telegraphed to him agreeing to do this. As a representative of the people in this Chamber it is my duty to protect them to the best of my ability. The Bill proposes to provide means for the liberation of a man suffering from homicidal tendencies. There is always a chance in such a case that when a man returns to his home his homicidal tendencies will again break out. In this view I am supported by the best authorities.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: I trust the amendment will not be insisted upon, although I appreciate the attitude adopted by Mr. Holmes in pairing with Mr. Moore. Mr. Holmes seems to have been the chief opponent to this Bill. He may be willing enough to do justice in other directions, but he is not doing justice by his opposition to this Bill to certain individuals who are incarcerated in the Claremont asylum. I obtained legal advice in writing. It reads—

The amendment carried by the Legislative Council is ridiculous and absurd. I think I said that by way of interjection.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot reflect upon any proceedings of the Legislative Council. He will have to withdraw that remark.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: I withdraw. May I read the legal advice I have received?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, if it is couched in respectful terms.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: You, Sir, are the best judge of that. The legal opinion continues—

It makes nonsense of the whole Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. member had better not proceed any further.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: The opinion also contains the following:—

The section of the principal Act which it is sought to amend contains, so far as this matter is concerned, the following phrase, which is the phrase governing the whole matter: "Unless he is detained therein for some other cause by process of law."

However, I am afraid, Sir, that having ruled me out of order in connection with the early part of this legal opinion you will do so right through. Under Mr. Holmes's amendment the Bill gets nowhere. Probably that is Mr. Holmes's object. Every person placed in an asylum, even if he has committed an indictable offence, should have the right to appeal to an authority to declare whether he should be liberated. Why should he not have the opportunity of appealing to a Supreme Court judge? The amendment should not be pressed.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I ask members to dismiss from their minds all questions of a personal character. To me the only question is this: if a man has, whilst insane, committed what would otherwise be a crime—homicide or murder—is he to have the right, after having been confined in a mental hospital and recovered his sanity, to be heard and to contest his case in open court? It is plain that at the present time such a man could be released by the Inspector General of the Insane advising the Governor in Council to that effect. I maintain that in the interests of justice such a man should have the right, if he can produce prima facie evidence that he has recovered his sanity, to have his case tried and his sanity proved in open court. That is a safer procedure than the other means, whereby he might be released by the Governor in Council acting on the recommendation of the Inspector General. It is because I am confident of the truth of my contentions that I have supported the Bill. If a man has committed homicide whilst insane, it would require the very strongest evidence that he has recovered his sanity and that it is safe to release him to go amongst the public. His release could be effected only after considerable difficulty, and after the lapse of considerable time.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I ask the Committee to vote against the amendment on humanitarian grounds. If we had a proper place as a mental hospital, it would be bad enough. But, knowing that the arrangements for the treatment of the insane at Claremont are not all they should be, members, I submit, must feel it incumbent on them to give a man confined there a chance. I understand that

there is a legal difficulty in the way, as the Act throws the whole responsibility on the Inspector General. The passing of this measure would help the Inspector General. Let us not condemn an unfortunate man to a living death.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I have been at some trouble to follow up the references that have been made to a defect in the Act. When a person who has committed homicide is found by a jury to have been insane at the time of the act, it is the duty of the judge to commit him to gaol. Whilst in gaol he is under medical supervision. If then found to be sane, he is held in gaol during His Majesty's pleasure. If found to be still insane, he is removed from the gaol to a lunatic asylum, and is held there during His Majesty's pleasure. Mr. Gray also said that it was manifestly unfair, as the asylum was not the place for such a man.

Hon. E. H. Gray: It is no place for an insane man, either.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Surely Mr. Gray does not suggest that I, or the Government, would keep a sane man in the asylum! Does he suggest that the Inspector General of the Insane would do such a thing?

Hon. E. H. Gray: But the Inspector General would not shoulder the responsibility involved in this matter.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Dr. Birmingham, of Fremantle, is a member of the board of visitors. I have known him for 30 years; he is a lovable, kind-hearted Irishman who would do no one an injury. He agrees with me that men of the description referred to should not be at large. Dr. Saw suggested that such cases should be dealt with before a judge. Surely he will admit that when it is a question of sanity or insanity, health or ill-health, it is not to a judge that one goes, but to a doctor.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: The judge would have medical evidence.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The judge would have evidence based on casual visits paid to the institution. I would prefer—I should think the Government, too, would adopt that attitude—to accept the advice of the medical man in charge of the asylum, who sees the patients from day to day.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I do not wish to give a silent vote on this question. I am the last man in the House who would advocate putting a man in gaol or in the asylum. I would always prefer to do something for such men and keep them out of those institutions. There are some cases, however, when, for the protection of the people themselves, they should be placed under restraint. I refer to people with homicidal tendencies. I know of a case in Adelaide in which the brother of a man holding a highly responsible position in that city, shot a man. The medical evidence was that he was not responsible for his act and that man was detained during His Majesty's pleasure. Having great influence behind him, it was only a short time before a large number of eminent medical men certi-

fied that he had recovered his sanity and was fit to be at large. The man was released and within three months, when coming down the steps of the Theatre Royal, he confronted an individual whom he did not know and, without any provocation, said, "See me clip his ear off."

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Was that man brought before a judge in open court?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Yes.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: That was an extraordinary thing! On what ground was he released?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I understand he was released because of the medical evidence. However, this man produced a revolver and clipped the individual's ear off. That man had distinct homicidal tendencies and that is the type of man who should be kept under restraint until, as Dr. Saw puts it, there is an absolute assurance that he is all right.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	9
Noes	..	..	..	7
Majority for				2

#### AYES.

Hon. W. Carroll	Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. J. A. Greig	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. A. Lovekin	(Teller.)

#### NOES

Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. W. Hickey	Hon. A. Burvill
Hon. J. Nicholson	(Teller.)

Question thus passed; the Council's amendment insisted upon.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: I move—

*That the Chairman do now leave the Chair.*

Question put and passed; Bill lapsed.

#### BILL.—JURY ACT AMENDMENT.

##### *Second Reading.*

Hon. J. W. HICKEY (Central) [2.56] in moving the second reading said: The question of trial by jury is not involved in the amendment contained in the Bill. It deals only with trial by a special jury. It has been long recognised in a democratic country like Australia that a man is entitled to be tried by his peers. That has been appreciated ever since at Eureka the first blow was struck for freedom in Australia. Unfortunately, we have not gained as much from the trials and tribulations of the people in those earlier days as we should. When anybody did something not in accordance with camp laws, there was immediately a roll up, and the crowd proceeded to deal with the offender. If a man be guilty

of an offence, he is entitled to be tried by his peers. I am not attacking the principle of trial by jury, but I say that trial by special jury is wrong. Under that system, if I can pay for a special jury I can get it. In my experience 90 per cent. of applications made by counsel for special juries have been granted. I do not anticipate any great opposition to the Bill, but neither do I want it to be said that I have not put up a case against special juries.

Hon. J. A. Greig: What are the chief objections to special juries?

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: I want to know what are the chief arguments in favour of special juries? Whenever a worker is arraigned before a tribunal and counsel asks for a special jury, the request is granted.

Hon. J. Duffell: He can only get a special jury on a special case.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: Tell me one case where a special jury has been refused! I have been tried by special jury, and since then I have seen tramping the streets of Perth some of those who found me guilty. What is good enough for the trying of a man under ordinary circumstances ought to be good enough for trying him under any circumstances. I do not see why a man should be a bank manager, a school teacher or the owner of real estate worth £500 before he can try a man charged with having refused to work with non-unionists. That was all I was guilty of. Yet a special jury had to be empanelled to convict me. We do not want to perpetuate those bad old days, and I hope the House will protest against the wicked system of special juries. I move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Hon. E. H. GRAY (West) [3.14]: The object of the Bill is to abolish special juries. It is said by medical authorities that a certain part of our anatomy is now useless. In the same way this special jury provision is now useless. At one time it was considered bad form to be educated. Even kings were unable to read or write. Education was confined to a restricted class. That accounts for special juries, which also are restricted to a select class. I appeal to the House to pass the Bill on the ground that justice should not be meted out by people of a special class. Wealth should not be considered the standard of knowledge, education or honour. The best types of men are not necessarily allied with wealth.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I move—

*That the debate be adjourned till Tuesday next.*

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

Ayes	..	..	..	..	14
Noes	..	..	..	..	4

Majority for .. 10

#### AYES.

Hon. W. Carroll	Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. J. A. Greig	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Seddoe
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. J. J. Holmes	(Teller.)
Hon. A. Lovekin	

#### NOES.

Hon. J. W. Hickey	Hon. E. H. Gray
Hon. J. W. Kirwan	(Teller.)
Hon. G. Potter	

Motion (adjournment) thus passed.

#### BILL.—APPROPRIATION.

Read a third time and passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT—CLOSE OF SESSION.

##### *Complimentary remarks.*

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. Ewing—South-West) [3.21]: I move—

*That the House at its rising adjourn till Thursday, the 27th December.*

Then Parliament will probably be prorogued by proclamation. We are all pleased, Sir, at the way the business has been conducted by you. My first session as Minister has been very interesting and pleasant, and I thank members for their generous treatment. The work has been arduous, but no matter what happens inside the House, we are all good friends outside. An election will take place before we meet again, and I am one of the unfortunates that have to face the electors. Without including myself, I hope those contesting the elections will be returned to carry on their useful work. Mr. Colebatch has written from London in the hope that his letter would reach me before the session closed, asking me to convey to yourself and members his best wishes for Christmas and the New Year. He said he was wonderfully well, and was taking over his duties and looked forward to being able to do something of value for Western Australia. I compliment the Chairman of Committees upon his first session's work in that capacity. His work has been thoroughly well done. I thank the staff for the able and careful manner in which they have carried out their duties. It is my pleasure to again testify to the efficiency of the "Hansard" staff. As a private member I always took opportunity to thank them for their work. I have no hesitation in saying, as I have said before, that no Parliament in Australia has a more efficient "Hansard" staff than we have in Western Australia to-day. I have found it necessary to make some very long speeches this session, and taking them right through these have been reported with scarcely an error. It is a wonderful performance and greatly to the credit of the staff. I extend to them my thanks for the

manner in which they have carried out their duties. In conclusion allow me to express my best wishes to all for a happy Christmas and a prosperous New Year.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN (South) [3.25]: I reciprocate the good wishes of the Leader of the House, and I am sure members generally sincerely hope he will have an enjoyable rest after the toil and turmoil of the session. He has been very kind in his appreciation of us, and we can join in congratulating him upon the manner in which he has carried out his work during the first session he has been in charge of the House. There are ten members that have to go out into the cold world next year and face the lists of an election, and I am sure I voice the opinion of members generally when I express the hope that all of them will be returned. If I had ten votes, I would certainly cast one for each of the retiring members. I must refer to the excellent spirit that prevails in this House. Without doubt members are animated by an earnest desire to do what is best in the interests of the country, and this accounts for the tone that exists. I thank the Leader of the House for his all too kind remarks regarding my first term as Chairman of Committees. The position has been peculiar inasmuch as so many of us were new to office. The Leader of the House was new, I was new, and the Clerk and other officers were new to their duties. The fact of our having got through is largely due to the kindness and consideration shown by members generally.

Hon. J. DUFFELL (Metropolitan-Suburban) [3.28]: I should like to add my meed of praise to those who have contributed to the success of our efforts this session. I endorse the remarks of the Leader of the House, and the Chairman of Committees. In the ten years I have been a member this is the first occasion on which I have joined in these felicitations. Let me pay a tribute, too, to the manner in which you, Sir, have filled the high office you occupy. Notwithstanding all the trials that have beset you during the session, you have carried out your duties with credit to yourself and satisfaction to the House. The Leader of the House has my highest regard for the manner in which he has carried out his duties during the first session under his leadership. Though we have not always seen eye to eye with him, yet in these closing moments we realise that he has done his duty and has done it well. With regard to "Hansard," I have arrived at the stage of never even checking the proofs sent to me for that purpose. I do not know what the "Hansard" reporters put in them, but I do know that my utterances in this Chamber are recorded, and I am quite prepared to rely upon the accuracy of Mr. Ramaciotti and his able staff. As regards our Clerk, the Usher of the Black Rod, the Clerk of Records, and the messengers, I feel that all have contributed to the success of the session. I trust that the retiring members will be again amongst us. Although we have passed through some trying

moments during this long sitting, I desire to offer my sincere congratulations and thanks to Mr. Lovekin for the work which he has devoted to the measures brought before us during this session. Next to the Leader of the House, Mr. Lovekin has been the hardest-worked man in this Chamber. I am under deep obligations to Mr. Lovekin for the guidance he has afforded me. I trust that on the eve of our going into recess Mr. Lovekin will not feel aggrieved because he, like some others of us, has not been able to carry into fruition that which he so much desired and concerning which he was so earnest. I trust that the hon. member will reconsider the decision he has voiced, and that we shall see him amongst us next session as fresh and vigorous as he has proved himself during the present one. I desire to express to you, Mr. President, and to all other members, my best wishes for Christmas and the New Year.

Question put and passed.

The PRESIDENT [3.33]: Mr. Ewing and hon. members, I wish to thank you all, and especially Mr. Ewing and Mr. Duffell, for the kind references made to me in the position which I occupy here, and in which you were good enough to place me two years ago. I also desire to place on record my appreciation of the universal courtesy which has been extended me during the whole of this session as well as the last. Differences of opinion must inevitably arise. If it were not so, there would be no necessity for Parliament, for elected members, or for a President. It has been my lot, perhaps a happy lot, at various periods of my life to travel around the world, thus having the opportunity of visiting a good many Houses of Parliament. I have been in Japan and seen the Legislature there, and I was amused to observe that the Japanese knew all about stone-walling, among other things. I have been in the Legislatures of Hawaii, the United States, Germany, England, and various other countries. Even at the risk of repetition I must say again that I have rarely seen a better debating House than the Legislative Council of Western Australia. We are fortunate in having all shades of political thought represented here. That is as it should be. It is our good fortune that we have members who are willing to submit their views in opposition to others, and they do it without any ill-feeling. They state their contentions most clearly, and everyone is respectful. All the measures which come before this Council receive the most careful consideration. Some member or another is sure to pick out the weak spots. Very little passes here that should not pass. We are sometimes accused of being a lot of old Conservatives. I believe that is the general idea. In fact, I have known new members to come here with that impression. But I have never seen members very anxious to get out of the place. It is an extraordinary thing that no one can point to an instance in which this House has blocked any legislation that was for the advantage of the State.



In view of all the legislation in favour of that class of people who think they are very hardly used—the Labour Party—they cannot complain of the legislation of this Council. They have got almost everything they want. I cannot conclude without complimenting the Leader of the House on the efficient manner in which he has carried out his duties. They are arduous duties, and require not only a great deal of thought and a certain amount of ability, but a high degree of tact. When I look at some of the members with whom the Leader of this House has to deal, I realise what consummate tact he must have to be able to part from all members in so friendly a spirit, after having been so successful with his Bills. I must also congratulate the Chairman of Committees. He, too, is new. I myself am only two years old as President. Having regard to the newness of almost the entire staff of the House, I think we may fairly congratulate ourselves on the results of the session. Again I thank you all for the remarks made regarding myself, and I wish you a very happy Christmas and a prosperous New Year.

*House adjourned at 3.40 a.m. (Friday).*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Thursday, 19th December, 1923.*

	PAGE
Privilege: Stamp Act Amendment Bill ... ..	2074
Questions: Gaol regulations ... ..	2074
Railways, loco. shops ... ..	2074
Ravenshorpe smelters ... ..	2075
Wyndham Meat Works, London agents ... ..	2075
Electoral rolls ... ..	2075
Motion: Apprenticeship system, to inquire by Royal Commission ... ..	2076
Bills: State Trading Concerns Act Amendment, 2R., defeated ... ..	2076
Loan, £3,763,000, Council's message ... ..	2081
Land Act Amendment, Council's amendments ... ..	2081
Lake Grace-Newdegate Railway, returned ... ..	2081
Brookton-Dale River Railway, returned ... ..	2081
Roads Closure (No. 2), returned ... ..	2081
Yarramony-Eastward Railway, returned ... ..	2081
Land Tax and Income Tax, Council's pressed requests ... ..	2081
Land Act Amendment, Council's amendments ... ..	2087
Vernin Act Amendment, Council's amendment ... ..	2087
Vernin Rate, all stages ... ..	2090
Opticians, discharged ... ..	2091
Land Tax and Income Tax, Conference, report, Council's message ... ..	2093
Vernin Act Amendment, Council's message ... ..	2094
W.A. Trustee, Executor, & Agency Co., Ltd., Act Amendment (Private), Council's message ... ..	2101
Land Tax and Income Tax, Council's further message ... ..	2105
Public Service Appeal Board Act Amendment, returned ... ..	2105
Women's Legal Status, returned ... ..	2105
Appropriation, returned ... ..	2105
Motions: Goldfields Pastoralists, price of scheme water ... ..	2091
Lunacy, Cunningham case ... ..	2092-4
Mining Leases, monopoly ... ..	2102
Close of Session, complimentary remarks ... ..	2105

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

## PRIVILEGE—STAMP ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Subiaco) [4.33]: On a matter of privilege, I wish to ask whether the Stamp Act Amendment Bill was recommended by Message from the Governor, and whether the fact was properly shown on the Clerk's certificate.

Mr. SPEAKER: Neither the Stamp Act Amendment Bill nor the Land Tax and Income Tax Bill was recommended by message from the Governor, and no such statement was made in the Clerk's certificate. Indeed no similar Bill has ever been so recommended during the period I have occupied the position of Speaker. The hon. member's question is due to a pardonable confusion of thought between the two classes of Money Bills—those imposing taxation and those appropriating revenue. If he will turn to the Constitution Act Amendment Act, 1921, he will see that while both these classes must originate in the Legislative Assembly, and both may not be amended by the Legislative Council, for one class only is a Governor's message required—Bills for the appropriation of revenue and moneys. This is clearly stated in Subsection 8 of Section 46, which the hon. member has before him in his copy of the Standing Orders. The hon. member may possibly have observed that the form of Message from the Governor is invariably "The Governor recommends that an appropriation be made for the purposes of a Bill, etc." Obviously such a recommendation would be out of place for Bills imposing taxation.

Hon. P. Collier: Move a vote of censure on the laws.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I wanted to find out the position.

Hon. P. Collier: They know not what they do.

## QUESTION—GAOL REGULATIONS.

Mr. MUNSIE asked the Premier: 1, Further to my question of the 6th inst., on what date were the Gaol regulations gazetted? 2, Is it his intention to place a copy of them on the Table at the next sitting of the House?

The PREMIER replied: 1, 19th January, 1923. 2, These regulations were laid on the Table of the House on 23rd January this year.

## QUESTION—RAILWAYS, LOCO. SHOPS.

Mr. HUGHES asked the Minister for Railways: 1, On what dates respectively were the seven lathes ordered, costing £4,853, referred to in the reply of the Minister for Railways of 27th November last? 2, Why did not the foreman turner at the loco. shops submit a report as to the number and style of machinery required by the Government Loco. Shops when the department was intending to spend the