

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

Ayes	...	...	14
Noes	...	...	8

Majority for ... 6

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Bath	Mr. Atkins
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Diamond	Mr. Hopkins
Mr. Hastie	Mr. James
Mr. Holman	Mr. Pigott
Mr. Illingworth	Sir J. G. Lee Steere
Mr. Jacoby	Mr. Stone
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Higham (Teller).
Mr. Moran	
Mr. Reid	
Mr. Taylor	
Mr. Wallace	
Mr. Yelverton	
Mr. Burgess (Teller).	

Amendment thus passed.

THE PREMIER: While anxious to see the passage of the Bill, he must candidly admit that no matter how strongly he felt on the Chinese question, he could not for one moment connect his name with a provision such as that just agreed to by a majority; and he would have to drop the Bill unless the addition to the schedule was eliminated on recom-mital. Members should bear in mind that the Chinese came to the State under certain conditions, and that it would be a gross and crying injustice if we adopted legislation so as to prevent their carrying on the trades and occupations they had been allowed to follow in the past. We had in the Bill imposed on them certain conditions not imposed on other workers, notably in the definition of "factory" and in respect of the hours of labour in laundries. He hoped the Committee would not go farther. He had conceded much; but to-morrow morning members would doubtless perceive that if the vote just passed were indorsed, we should be doing a grave injustice to men who, whatever their faults, were entitled to live.

Schedule as amended agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at two minutes past 10 o'clock, until the next day.

## Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 29th October, 1903.

	PAGE
Stock Department and Swine Fever, Notice of question and motion	1778
Questions: Stock Department, Procedure in recent Inquiry, also Dismissal of Officers	1779
Liquor Inspection, Return delayed	1780
Government Gardens, Inquiry	1780
Jarrahwood Railway, Train Service	1780
Bills: Roads Act Amendment, first reading	1780
Water Supply (enabling powers for localities), second reading	1780
Dog Bill, second reading, in Committee, reported	1783
Pharmacy and Poisons Act Amendment, in Committee, reported	1788
Merchant Shipping Act Application, second reading	1788
Companies Duty Act Continuance, second reading, in Committee, reported	1791
Administration (probate), Council's suggested amendments	1791
Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs, second reading; referred to Select Committee	1794
Municipal Institutions Act Amendment, Re-committal, reported	1795
Early Closing Act Amendment, second reading, in Committee, progress (9 p.m. Saturday Amendment)	1798
Annual Estimates, debate on Financial Policy resumed, progress	18.0

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 2:30 o'clock, p.m.

#### PRAYERS.

#### PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the MINISTER FOR WORKS: By-laws of Yalgoo and North-East Coolgardie Roads Boards.

By the MINISTER FOR LANDS: Department of Agriculture, Annual Report.

Ordered, to lie on the table.

#### STOCK DEPARTMENT AND SWINE FEVER.

##### NOTICE OF A QUESTION.

MR. MORAN gave notice that on the next Tuesday he would ask the Minister for Lands the following question: 1. When he made his corrected statement re diseases in pigs in this State, and quoted his Acting Chief Inspector of Stock as follows, "I have visited the piggery of Mr. Leslie, of Bayswater, yesterday, and found that among his pigs two were suffering from swine fever," did he know that up to that time already 90 pigs had died at Mr. Leslie's place. 2. If he knew, why did he deliberately keep back the information from the House. 3. If he did not know it, did his inspector know it.

THE SPEAKER: It was not quite a proper question to put to a Minister,

whether he "deliberately kept back" information.

MR. MORAN: The word "deliberately" would be erased.

#### NOTICE OF MOTION—INQUIRY.

[Later, the Stock Department was again referred to.]

MR. MORAN: I ask the Premier whether he intends to give me an early opportunity of moving the motion regarding the need for a select committee to inquire into the Stock Department? If not, I will move to strike out the notice of motion.

THE PREMIER: The hon. member will have an opportunity while the House is in session.

MR. MORAN: Why not now? It is a formal matter.

THE PREMIER: I submit it is not a formal matter. There is too much for the Stock Department to do now in connection with the swine disease, to allow the officers to be worried and harassed by an inquiry by a select committee.

MR. MORAN: That is one way of hushing it up.

#### QUESTIONS—STOCK DEPARTMENT.

##### PROCEDURE IN RECENT INQUIRY.

MR. WALLACE asked the Premier: 1, Why were instructions given the Crown Solicitor to forward the departmental files dealing with the charges made by the Stock Department against Forrest, Emanuel, & Co. to Coolgardie, with instructions to proceed against D'Arcy Uhr instead of Forrest, Emanuel, & Co. 2, Why the Chief Inspector of Stock was not permitted to proceed in law against Forrest, Emanuel, & Co., as he requested, instead of the case being submitted to inquiry by Mr. Roe *in camera*. 3, Why the matter was taken out of Mr. Roe's hands and dealt with by the Minister for Lands without reference to Mr. Roe. 4, Why the Chief Inspector of Stock was not allowed the services of counsel or shorthand clerk at the inquiry, although he offered to bear the expense of same. 5, Whether he was aware that the decision that no counsel be allowed either party was only arrived at after Mr. Burt, K.C., declined the offer of James & Darbyshire to act on behalf of Forrest, Emanuel, & Co.

THE PREMIER replied: 1, When a summary offence is alleged to have been committed, the usual practice adopted is to prosecute the actual offender where the offence was committed and the witnesses reside. The suggestion that Messrs. Forrest, Emanuel, & Co. should be charged in Perth for an offence committed by Mr. Uhr in Coolgardie, and that witnesses should be brought from Coolgardie for that purpose, was so unusual that my attention was called to it by the Crown Law Officers, and I at once directed that the usual practice should be adopted. 2, Certain charges were made against Messrs. Forrest, Emanuel, & Co. under the protection of Parliamentary privilege. Under such circumstances the person making the charges could not complain because the persons charged availed themselves of the only means of placing their reply before the public. 3, The matter was not dealt with by Mr. Roe because he could not deal with it in a reasonable time on account of other work. The matter had been pending so long that farther suspension was undesirable, and as the Minister for Lands was, at my request, prepared to deal with the matter, there was no need for farther delay. 4, When persons or firms complain to any Minister of the conduct of an officer, it is not right that either party to the dispute should be subjected to the expense of providing solicitor and counsel. Full and adequate notes were taken, and the evidence read over and signed by the witnesses. The Minister can and should decide all such complaints, and not frighten members of the public by the fear of having to incur heavy expense before their complaints can be heard. 5, No, I was not so aware; but had I been so, the fact that both Mr. Burt and Messrs. James and Darbyshire lost an opportunity of earning fees would not have influenced me.

##### DISMISSAL OF OFFICERS.

MR. WALLACE asked the Minister for Lands: What were the reasons for the dismissal of Inspector Stephens and the man Wood, in charge of Owen's Anchorage Quarantine Yard?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: The re-organisation of the Stock Department necessitated the retirement

of Inspector Stephens, there being no work available on which the Stock Department could employ him. He was, in consequence, given a position in the Health Department. Mr. Wood was retired in order that a man more accustomed to stock, and better capable of filling the position, should be appointed.

#### QUESTION—LIQUOR INSPECTION, RETURN DELAYED.

MR. FOULKES asked the Treasurer: What is the reason for the delay in supplying the return asked for with regard to the quality of liquor sold in the licensed houses in the State.

THE TREASURER replied: The nature of the questions necessitated reference to a number of outstations, from some of which replies have not yet been received. Every effort is being made to obtain the information desired at the earliest possible moment.

MR. FOULKES: Will the Treasurer lay on the table of the House such information as he has already obtained, so that we may not wait till the other is obtained?

THE TREASURER: I will.

#### QUESTION—GOVERNMENT GARDENS, INQUIRY.

MR. DAGLISH asked the Premier: Whether the Government propose to act upon the recommendation of the Public Service Commission, that an independent inquiry be made into the administration of the Government Gardens.

THE PREMIER replied: Yes; the Colonial Secretary has the matter in hand.

#### QUESTION—JARRAHWOOD RAILWAY, TRAIN SERVICE.

MR. YELVERTON asked the PREMIER: 1. Whether it is the intention of the Government to carry out the promise made by the Premier to a deputation which waited upon him on the 5th August last, that the rails which had been taken up on the Jarrahwood Railway would be at once relaid, and that a horse service might be established. 2. If so, when the rails will be relaid and a weekly or fortnightly train service established as promised him personally in September last.

THE PREMIER replied: 1, I promised the rails should be relaid, and this

shall be done. 2, I made no such promise. I hoped at the time that a service would be run by the Timber Company, and so informed the honourable member; but difficulties have been raised to such a course by the Railway Department.

#### ROADS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Introduced by the MINISTER FOR WORKS and read a first time.

#### WATER SUPPLY BILL.

##### ENABLING POWERS FOR LOCALITIES.

##### SECOND READING.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. C. H. Rason): In moving the second reading of this Bill, I should like to point out that for some time past it has been urged by those competent to express an opinion on the subject, that the future of Australia depends to a great extent on the question of water conservation and water supply; and for some time past I have seized every opportunity afforded to me of urging this view upon the people of Western Australia. It is undoubtedly very desirable that public attention should be directed to this very important question; but it is also equally desirable that effort in this direction shall, if possible, be local effort properly directed and properly applied and, if possible, conducted by local authorities. The Bill now submitted is to a very great extent merely a machinery Bill which will enable this desirable object to be attained. The Bill is somewhat lengthy. Had the system been adopted of simply saying that the provisions of the Goldfields Water Supply Act shall apply for the purpose of this Bill also, it would have been a Bill of very few clauses indeed; but hon. members, I think, will agree that an Act such as this, giving to local authorities power to arrange their own water supply, is better to be self-contained. Therefore hon. members will, I trust, take my assurance that nearly the whole of the machinery clauses of this Bill, and in fact nearly the whole of the clauses of the Bill, are an exact copy of the Goldfields Water Supply Act passed last session. It will be seen that the Governor may, by Order-in-Council, constitute the district of a local authority, or the districts of two or more local authorities

or any part of a district, into a water area, and may constitute a water board therein. Where a water authority is constituted, if the boundaries of that water area are co-extensive with the boundaries of any local authority, the local authority will also be the water authority; but if there is no such local authority, the Governor by Order-in-Council may appoint a local authority, part of whose district is within the water area, to be the water authority, or he may appoint a water authority with an election of its members or with the appointment of its members done by the Governor, or with partly elected and partly nominated members. Where there is an existing local authority, its acts and its proceedings and the proceedings of its servants will be governed, except where contrary or inconsistent with the provisions of this Bill, by its own local regulations; but where there are no such regulations the clauses from 13 to the end of that part of the Bill will operate, merely providing the regulations for the conduct of meetings and procedure.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Does a municipality become the water authority?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Where the boundaries of a municipality are co-extensive with the boundaries of a water area, then the municipality will be the water authority within that area. I should like to point out—and I may as well state it here, as this is a proper opportunity—that this Bill is not intended to deal with very large towns; and it must not be confounded with the Perth and Metropolitan Water Supply Bill, which is now in print and will shortly be introduced. The Bill before us is to meet the requirements of places such as Cue and Broome, in some of which there is already a water supply which there is no proper machinery for managing. In the case of Cue, a scheme has already been devised by the Minister for Mines and his officers, for the supply of the town and district with water; the local people are quite willing to assume the financial burden of the work; but without this Bill there is no power to make proper regulations for the conduct of the scheme and the raising of the rates. In the case of Broome also very similar conditions obtain. The Government have a water supply there, which

can, with great advantage to the local residents and the State as a whole, be transferred to a local authority. Many similar instances now exist, and many will hereafter arise. By Clause 36—

The Governor may from time to time, by Order-in-Council, place under the temporary management and control of a water authority, or may absolutely vest in a water authority, any water reserve or catchment area, or any waterworks or reservoir begun, constructed, or provided for out of moneys appropriated by Parliament.

In that regard, by Clause 108 members will see that—

On the constitution of a water area the Minister shall, if the Governor so directs, prepare a statement of such waterworks as may have been, before or after the commencement of this Act, constructed out of public money, and shall determine the amount expended upon such works to be charged against the water authority.

So that when there is a transfer of existing works, a fair proportion of the cost of those works will be transferred as a debit against the water authority then constituted; and in the case of fresh works, if constructed by the Government the cost will be debited against the water authority. The interests of the general public are safeguarded by Clauses 40 to 45 inclusive. It will be seen that the water authority, before undertaking the construction of works in the water area, must cause necessary surveys and levels to be taken, and plans, specifications, and sections to be prepared; must advertise in the *Government Gazette* and in one or more newspapers circulating in the district a description of the proposed works, the localities in which they will be constructed, the purposes for which they are to be constructed, and the parts of the water area which are intended to be supplied with water. Plans, specifications, etcetera, must be left open to inspection by any person interested, at reasonable hours; and plans, sections, specifications, and books of reference and estimates must be deposited in the office of the Minister. An objection may be lodged with the Minister within a month from the date of the last publication of the advertisement. If, after the expiration of a month, the Minister is satisfied that the provisions of the Act have been complied with, that the revenue estimated to be derived from the proposed works is

sufficient to justify the undertaking, that the works if carried out in the manner desired will be for the public benefit, and that the objections, if any, lodged are not sufficient to require the approval of the Governor to be withheld from the proposed scheme, then the Minister will recommend it for the approval of the Governor. Provision is made in the Bill whereby local boards so constituted may raise money by debentures; and the Treasurer is authorised to make advances from the Savings Bank funds for any such purpose. By Clause 109 members will see that—

All moneys received by a water authority from rates, charges, rents, or otherwise under this Act, shall be carried to the account of a fund to be called the "Water Fund," and such fund shall be applied in manner following, that is to say:

- (1.) In defraying the expenses incurred in the maintenance and management of the works, and the conduct of the business of the water authority;
- (2.) In payment of the interest and contributions to the sinking fund in respect of any loan raised by the water authority;
- (3.) In payment of any interest or instalments of principal or contributions to the sinking fund due in respect of any money advanced to the water authority by the Colonial Treasurer;
- (4.) In the construction, extension, and improvement of works.

The rest of the Bill is a copy of the Goldfields Water Supply Act of last session. No powers are given either to the Government or to any local authority, other than those contained in that Act. I think I need only point out that no hardship has arisen from the operation of the Act, which has been in force for a considerable time, and has proved itself to be an eminently workable measure, satisfactory alike to the Government and the public. Therefore I have every confidence in submitting this Bill to hon. members for their consideration. I have not thought it necessary, nor indeed is it necessary, to refer to clauses other than those to which I have referred; this being to all intents and purposes a machinery Bill, making provisions for the purposes mentioned. I beg leave to move the second reading.

MR. F. ILLINGWORTH (Cue): I have every pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill, for I know it materially affects the constituency I have

the honour to represent. The position at Cue is now very critical. The whole district is threatened to be deprived entirely of its water supply within perhaps a month or six weeks; and our only chance of getting assistance will be by training water from the different points at which it can most easily be obtained. We did hope that by this time a scheme suggested by the local council and approved by the Minister would have been nearly completed; but there have been various hindrances. Those hindrances, however, are calculated to work some good; because I think the scheme which it is now intended to carry out will cost considerably less than the original scheme, and will be in all respects quite as effective. We shall, however, soon have upon us the difficulties which arise in the summer months; and the new clauses in the Bill will give the municipal council power to proceed with the work which they desire; and what is useful to Cue as a district must be useful to other districts also. I thank the Minister and the Government for introducing this Bill, and hope we shall speedily get it on the statute book, so that the work to which I have referred may proceed.

MR. C. J. MORAN (West Perth): Only yesterday was this Bill laid on the table. I must enter a protest against the practice of laying Bills on the table on the second reading—for that is what this practically means. I am certain that no member in the Chamber can undertake the careful study of the important legislation proposed in the so-called machinery Bills we have had during this session. It is quite impossible to do so, especially when such Bills are crowded into the House in a bunch. If the Opposition members have to take the Minister's word for a great deal, that may be unsatisfactory; for there is nothing uncomplimentary to the Government in my saying that no member sitting in Opposition should take their word about any measure of this kind. It is the duty of members in Opposition to criticise, and not in such matters to take the word of a Minister. It is impossible for us to wade through all the clauses of this Bill, giving them the close attention they demand; but I hope the Committee stage will be postponed for at least a few days. During the interval we shall be able to get what

expert advice we can; and this is necessary, for I have too often discovered lurking in these long Bills provisions presumably inserted by mistake, but involving great principles. We had a Railway Bill last session, and that Bill contained certain provisions which went through the Chamber unnoticed, and which amounted almost to the confiscation of people's property. When the matter was brought under my notice I thought that there was some use in a second Chamber. I hope the Committee stage of the Bill will be put off for one week. I do not intend to oppose the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### DOG BILL.

#### SECOND READING.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Walter James), in moving the second reading, said : This Bill, in nearly all its clauses, re-enacts the present law and deals with the registration of dogs and the way in which unregistered dogs may be dealt with. The two main amendments are that a registered dog must wear a label, and provisions giving a more effective control over unregistered dogs. Clause 4, which deals with the definition of owner, is substantially the law as it was in 1888. Clause 5 provides the time when dogs shall be registered. Clause 6 deals with the registration officers, the registration authority being municipal councils or roads boards as the case may be. Clause 8 provides that the registration officer shall make out a receipt for the registration fee in the form provided and a duplicate thereof, and enter upon them the regulation number of the dog. He must deliver to the owner or the person making the registration the receipt and a registration label numbered according to the registration. Clause 9 provides that "Every registration label shall be a metal disc or plate of the prescribed size and shape, on which shall be inscribed the name of the district, the year of registration, and the registration number." The Bill provides for annual registration, and a registration effected in one district shall prevail throughout the State. The Bill also provides what is to be done in the case of change of ownership. Clause 19 provides

what is to be done in case of false registration or the collar or disc being removed. It provides that any dog found wandering at large may be seized and kept by the police or any authorized officer of a local authority, and if the dog is not claimed and 1s. 6d. for its keep paid by the owner within three days from the time of the seizure it may be destroyed or sold. In the case of a sale, the proceeds shall belong and be paid into the funds of the local authority. If any dog at the time of the seizure has a collar round its neck with a registration label for the current year affixed, it shall not be destroyed or sold until after the expiration of 48 hours from the service upon the registered owner of a notice. That is really the effective clause of the Bill. A penalty is provided for non-registration, and any unregistered dog or a dog not bearing the symbols of registration may be seized and dealt with under Clause 19. Clause 21 will commend itself to members. It says :—

If any slut is at large in any street, road, or public place while she is in heat, the owner shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding five pounds.

MR. BURGESS : How can you carry out that in the country?

THE PREMIER : There may be a difficulty in carrying it out in some parts of the State, but as a general rule it is a very desirable clause.

MR. ATKINS : Suppose somebody steals the collar from the dog?

THE PREMIER : Then it is deemed to be unregistered.

MR. ATKINS : The owner has 48 hours in which to find the dog.

THE PREMIER : Yes; there would be no difficulty in doing that, because if a dog is missing it will be known at once that the dog is in the hands of the local authority.

MR. ATKINS : It may be or it may not be.

THE PREMIER : Where else is it likely to be?

MR. ATKINS : In the street. A dog of mine was lost three days, but turned up again.

THE PREMIER : Assuming that the hon. member's registered dog was deprived of its collar—I am sure that is not likely, for like the hon. member it will stick to all it has got—supposing that happened

to the dog and it was missing, that dog would have to be three days with the local authority before they could destroy it. A person who missed a dog for two or three days would at once go to the local authority; and to enable the local authority to carry out the provisions of the Bill, they must have a recognised place for dogs to be kept for the three days.

MR. ATKINS: It is hardly time enough.

THE PREMIER: The Perth City Council have asked for the Bill for the last three years; they say it is very necessary in Perth, and judging from the number of spare dogs about I think it is desirable.

MR. ATKINS: There is plenty of power if they will carry out the law, but they want more law.

THE PREMIER: The method we have now for dealing with unregistered dogs is most unsatisfactory, and it is extremely difficult to tell if a dog is registered or not, and having found out whether a dog is registered one must get an order from a justice. The object of registration is to provide that unregistered dogs may be destroyed. I do not think members will find that any hardship will accrue, because if a dog is without a collar, the collar having been taken from it before the owner becomes aware of it, the animal is seized by the local authority and is dealt with under Clause 19. Directly a dog is missing, the owner at once applies to the local authority to know if they have the dog. There may be some difficulty in applying Clause 21 throughout the State, but it is necessary. If a slut in that condition is found droving sheep in the bush no charge can be laid.

MR. BURGESS: It might be done for spite.

THE PREMIER: People are not actuated by spite. While a slut is in the control of a drover it is not at large.

MR. ATKINS: The difficulty is that the owner may not know that the slut is on heat, for when a slut is coming on heat it clears out from home.

THE PREMIER: There may be difficulty in that, but it is a most objectionable thing. Clause 22 gives power to the owner or occupier of any enclosed field, paddock, yard or other place in which

sheep or cattle are confined to shoot or destroy any dog found at large, whether the owner of the dog is known or not, but it is not lawful to shoot or destroy any dog if accompanied and under the control of the owner or any other person.

MR. ATKINS: If it is killing sheep or doing some damage?

THE PREMIER: Not when it is under the control of the owner. A dog must not be in an enclosed field or paddock; if a dog is there it ought not to be and it can be destroyed.

MR. ATKINS: It would be rough to destroy a man's dog because it was running through a paddock.

THE PREMIER: No one would suggest that. Some of the owners of property use their proprietary rights in an objectionable manner, but those persons are in the small minority. Clauses 23, 24, and 25 are old sections re-enacted and Clause 26 is consequential.

MR. BURGESS: Clause 23 is not similar to the old Act.

THE PREMIER: I think it is practically, it is substantially the same as the present law. The other clauses of the Bill are consequential, only being slight amendments about using labels, obsolete labels and counterfeit labels. Clause 29 empowers an aboriginal native to keep one unregistered male dog, and there is power that if the dog belonging to an aboriginal native is found to be suffering from a contagious or dangerous disease it may be destroyed. Most of the provisions of the Bill are machinery provisions. I move the second reading, and I hope the House will pass the measure.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### IN COMMITTEE.

MR. HARPER in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 18—agreed to.

Clause 19—Power to seize stray dogs:

MR. HAYWARD: Would the police administer the measure? Under the present Act, the fees being handed over to the roads boards, the police could take no action at all in compelling registration, consequently half the dogs in the country districts were not registered at all.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Proceeds of the sale of dogs found wandering at large would, under this measure,

go to the local authority instead of to the Treasury. Both the police and the local authorities would have power to act.

MR. HAYWARD: Would the police see that the dogs were licensed?

MR. JACOBY: The matter would be in the hands of the roads boards.

Clause passed.

Clauses 21 to 35—agreed to.

MR. HAYWARD: On the Notice Paper were amendments in the name of the member for East Fremantle. In the absence of the hon. member could he (Mr. Hayward) move these amendments?

THE PREMIER: We ought not to agree to those amendments. A person ought not to have to decide whether a dog belonged to a pack of hounds.

MR. HAYWARD: Anyone who knew what a dog was would have no doubt on the point.

THE PREMIER: People were not compelled to keep registration labels on dogs; the only risk run through the absence of a label being that an animal might be seized and held for three days. If there were a label, notice would have to be given of the seizure of the animal. It was suggested by these amendments that the provision giving to owners of enclosed land power to shoot a dog found trespassing should not apply to hounds; but it would not be right to make that exception.

MR. HAYWARD: Hounds were apt to get lost on their way home, and under this Bill they could be shot if found trespassing on enclosed land.

THE PREMIER: Private dogs were just as valuable as hounds, and there was a greater risk of a private dog going astray than a dog belonging to a pack.

MR. HAYWARD: No. Exceptions were always made in regard to hounds. People did not care to stay here, because there was not sufficient in the shape of sport. Moreover, hunting was the only sport free from gambling.

THE PREMIER: If any hardship arose, he would be glad to assist the hon. member in having the measure amended, but, in his opinion, there would be no hardship.

First, Second, and Third Schedules—agreed to.

Fourth Schedule:

MR. WALLACE moved as an amendment:—

That "7s. 6d." in line 1 be struck out, with a view of inserting "£1" in lieu.

It was desirable to get rid of a number of dogs. If a person had a dog worth keeping, he would not complain of an increase of the registration fee from 7s. 6d. to £1. If the fee were only 7s. 6d. the place would continue to be overrun with the greatest variety of mongrels to be found in the world. He had no desire to increase the fee for dogs tending sheep or cattle, but we ought to increase the amounts on the first two items. People who kept a lot of puppies for monetary purposes should be made to pay much more than the sum named in the schedule.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: It was to be hoped the hon. member would not press the amendment. One recognised that dogs were becoming a great nuisance about towns, but there were many poor people who liked to keep a dog and who paid the license fee. If the Act were properly enforced with the fees as shown in this schedule the nuisance would be abolished, or at all events limited. If the fees were made higher they would be a hardship, and would lead to many attempts at evasion. The fees were higher than under the old Act, which enabled anyone not within the limits of a townsite to keep a dog on paying 5s. Under this measure that did not apply except with regard to dogs tending sheep or cattle.

MR. WALLACE pressed his amendment. It was easy for the Government to pretend sympathy when they were not really sympathetic. One could not afford to agree with the poor person who wanted to keep a dog. That dog was not only a nuisance but a positive danger.

THE PREMIER: Was not £1 too high a fee?

MR. WALLACE: No.

MR. BURGESS suggested that the fee should be 10s. for a dog and 15s. for a slut. To make the fee £1 would mean that the animals would not be licensed. The Act was not carried out, and roads boards should get the assistance of the police in carrying it out; but an increase in the fee would make no difference to the object sought to be attained.

MR. DAGLISH: The amendment should be defeated. The cost of keeping



a dog, with the price of meat so high, was very great, and the cost of the collar and disc had to be considered. There were many poor families to whom their dogs were the friends and playmates of the children, and there was no better animal than the domesticated dog. Such people should not be prevented from keeping their dogs. The complaints about dogs running loose would be adequately met by a strict enforcement of the law.

Amendment put and negatived.

MR. DAGLISH moved as an amendment—

That the words "for every pack of hounds not less than 10 *bona fide* kept together in kennel exclusively for the purpose of hunting, in lieu of any individual registration £2," be struck out.

Members of hunting clubs were quite able to pay an annual charge of 10s. 6d. for each hound. Hunting as practised in Western Australia was a very cruel sport, and it had the disadvantage of hastening the extinction of the brush kangaroo.

THE PREMIER: There was any amount of brush kangaroos.

MR. HAYWARD: These hounds were always kept in kennels, and were not allowed to roam about the country. They were kept at greater expense than ordinary dogs incurred, and a man had to be employed to look after them, so that hunt clubs were entitled to some consideration with regard to licenses.

Amendment negatived, and the schedule agreed to.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

#### PHARMACY AND POISONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

##### IN COMMITTEE.

MR. HARPER in the Chair; the PREMIER in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of 58 Vict., No. 35, Section 21:

THE PREMIER moved that the clause be struck out. The clause had been moved with the object of giving reciprocity to students coming from the Eastern States; but objection was taken on the ground that the Eastern States did not offer any reciprocity to Western Aus-

tralia. It would be better for the Pharmaceutical Council to inculcate the federal idea in the councils of the Eastern States. It was desired to put in new clauses.

Clause struck out.

Clause 3—Amendment of Section 38:

On motion by the PREMIER, clause struck out.

Clause 4—Provision in case of death and bankruptcy:

On motion by the PREMIER, clause struck out.

Clause 5—Amendment of 63 Vict., No. 36, Section 6:

THE PREMIER: This was merely a formal amendment. Clause 6 of the Pharmacy Act referred to a prior section in the Act, but instead of referring to Section 4, it mentioned Section 5. The error was rectified by the clause in the present Bill.

Clause passed.

New Clause—Amendment of Section 38:

THE PREMIER: When the Bill was discussed on the second reading, members agreed that a person not a pharmaceutical chemist should not be entitled to call himself such, but that there was no reason why a person should not be entitled to carry on the business of a chemist so long as he did so by means of a proper chemist. The principal Act was so worded in Section 38 that while it allowed a person with a properly registered manager to carry on the business of a chemist, it allowed the person to call himself a chemist. To this the chemists very properly objected, and it was desired to overcome the difficulty. He (the Premier) now moved that the following be added as a new clause:—

Section thirty-eight of the principal Act is struck out, and the following section is inserted in lieu thereof:—(1.) No person other than—(a.) A pharmaceutical chemist; or, (b.) A person or company registered under "The Companies Act, 1893," or Friendly Society registered under "The Friendly Societies Act," carrying on the business of a chemist or druggist, or of a pharmaceutical chemist by and under the personal supervision of a pharmaceutical chemist; or, (c.) A legally qualified medical practitioner; shall carry on the business of a chemist and druggist or pharmaceutical chemist. (2.) No person other than—(a.) A pharmaceutical chemist; or, (b.) A legally qualified medical practitioner, shall assume or use the title of pharmaceutical chemist, pharmacist, pharmacist,

chemist and druggist, dispensing chemist, dispensing druggist, homœopathic chemist, or other words of like import, or use or exhibit any title, term, or sign, which can be construed to mean that such person is qualified as a pharmaceutical chemist. (3.) Any person who offends against the provisions of this section shall be liable, on conviction, to a penalty not exceeding fifty pounds, or to imprisonment for any term not exceeding twelve months for every such offence.

The unqualified proprietor of the business must not call himself a chemist.

MR. TAYLOR: Was that necessary?

THE PREMIER: Surely. The clause provided that a chemist must be qualified; therefore we must not allow an unqualified man to call himself a chemist. The provision contained in paragraph (2).—"No person other than (a) a pharmaceutical chemist, or (b) a legally qualified medical practitioner, shall assume or use the title of a pharmaceutical chemist"—was highly desirable. A layman would have the privilege of carrying on the business, but must not be allowed to pass himself off as a chemist.

DR. HICKS: Why allow medical men to act as chemists? They were not necessarily qualified.

THE PREMIER: In the old country many medical men prepared their own medicines. Did the hon. member mean that none but those holding the Apothecaries' certificate were qualified?

DR. HICKS: Yes; for dispensing.

THE PREMIER: But was not every other certificate of higher grade than that? Did not the greater include the less?

DR. HICKS: No. Personally, he would prefer that a medical practitioner should not be allowed to act as a pharmaceutical chemist. In Perth and Fremantle much dummying was practised by medical men who received portions of fees paid to chemists; and the public were, in ignorance, indirectly paying fees to doctors through chemists. For a medical practitioner to keep an open shop was *infra dig.* He (Dr. Hicks) did not think that one-sixth of the medical men in the State were qualified to act as dispensers. True, in bygone times many doctors dispensed their own medicines; but they were then specially trained to do so. The average medical man's chemical course did not exceed three months, during which period the study of pharma-

ceutical chemistry occupied a few hours in each month. He moved that paragraph (b.) of Subclause 2 be struck out.

THE PREMIER: If the dispensing of drugs by a medical man was *infra dig.* or if any other objectionable practice had arisen in the profession, the medical council should deal with it. If the hon. member's amendment passed, doctors could still open chemists' shops on the plea that doctors were "persons," as mentioned in the clause.

DR. HICKS: Did the English Pharmacy Act permit medical men to dispense?

THE PREMIER: Yes.

MR. DAGLISH supported the amendment. If the member for Roebourne (Dr. Hicks) were correct, and only one-sixth of our medical men were competent to dispense, the new clause would be dangerous; for it would give to the incompetent five-sixths power which was refused to the rest of the community unless qualified by examination and registration. A medical man competent to dispense drugs could secure registration by the Pharmaceutical Council either on passing an examination or on producing proof of his capacity.

DR. HICKS said he would not trust one medical man in six to make up medical prescriptions; and to prevent their dispensing medicines would add to the dignity of the profession.

THE TREASURER: How about doctors in out-of-the-way places?

DR. HICKS: Exempt them from the operation of the clause. As a rule, back-blocks doctors were not so good as those in large towns, but were probably better dispensers than men more highly trained in medicine and surgery.

THE TREASURER: The hon. member (Dr. Hicks) opened up a serious vista for the State if we carried his amendment; for it would be useless to have Government medical officers anywhere if they were forbidden to dispense medicines. Evidently we had been taking a great risk for years; and so far the results did not appear disastrous, though the ground covered many blunders made by doctors. The amendment would evidently be dangerous.

MR. JACOBY: By the clause, people trading as a company had an advantage over an individual.

THE PREMIER: No.

Amendment negatived, and the clause passed.

New Clause:

MR. JACOBY moved that the following be added as a new clause:—

Section 31 of the principal Act is amended by striking out all the words after the word "thereon," in the third line, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "the name of the article, and the name and address of the vendor thereof, and shall also affix to such bottle, vessel, wrapper, or cover a separate label, containing thereon the word 'poison,' printed in letters not less than three-sixteenths of an inch in size."

The object of the amendment was to provide that poison should be more adequately labelled than was provided for in the principal Act, which stated that "no person shall sell any poison unless the bottle or other vessel, wrapper or cover, box or case immediately containing the same bears thereon the word 'poison' printed conspicuously, together with the name of the article and the name and address of the vendor thereof." He wished to provide that the word "poison" should be printed in letters three-sixteenths of an inch in size. He was aware of a case in which a mistake nearly occurred through the word "poison" being printed on a bottle in such small letters as to be easily overlooked. It would be wiser if the word "poison" were printed in letters of a certain size on the bottle. It was a common practice for the word "poison" to be in such small letters as to be unnoticed.

THE PREMIER: Section 31 of the Act had been amended.

[Sitting suspended for 10 minutes.]

MR. JACOBY: Having consulted the Premier, he found that his amendment required redrafting.

Amendment withdrawn.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

## MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT APPLICATION BILL.

### SECOND READING.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Walter James), in moving the second reading, said: This is a simple but very necessary measure, for at present we have no legislation of the sort. In all the other States a Bill of this nature has been passed, or

similar legislation has been dealt with in a Navigation Act, and we propose to adopt the provisions of the British Merchant Shipping Act of 1894. As members doubtless know, that Act is a code now, which has been most elaborately considered, and we possess the most recent legislation on the question in the old country. Part II. of that Act is applied by Clause 2 of this Bill to all British ships registered at, trading with, or being at any port in Western Australia, and to the owners, masters, and crews where such ships are within the jurisdiction of the State. We provide that wherever in Part II. the expression "Board of Trade" or "Board" occurs it shall mean and be read as "Governor," and where any reference is made to a particular class of officer, the Governor here shall have power to, if necessary, appoint a person who will exercise in regard to ships here the same duties as are exercised in the old country. Part II. of the Act deals with granting certificates of competency to masters and seamen, the duties of masters, apprenticeship to the sea service, licenses to supply seamen, engagement of seamen, agreements with Lascars, rating of seamen, discharge of seamen, payment of wages, advancement and allotment of wages, seamen's money orders and savings banks, rights of seamen in respect of wages, mode of recovering wages, power of Courts to rescind contracts, property of deceased seamen, reimbursement of relief to seamen's families, destitute seamen, leaving seamen abroad, distressed seamen, provisions, health and accommodation in shipping, and various matters of that nature.

MR. DAGLISH: Is that not within the province of the Federal Parliament?

THE PREMIER: They have not passed legislation at all, and it is very desirable to have legislation. As a matter of fact we should have had it some time ago. These provisions are found to be necessary, and this Bill is urged upon us by the Chief Harbour Master, who has control of these matters. This will simply apply to British ships trading to Fremantle and in the jurisdiction of Western Australia the powers and provisions which apply to British shipping throughout the world. I do not think the House will have much difficulty in agreeing to the

second reading, and giving us the necessary powers, which we have been using more because those over whom they are exercised are not aware we have had no legislation to enable us to enforce the provisions. [MEMBER: Are you sure of your ground?] Yes. What we propose has been done elsewhere. In the Eastern States they have either adopted that part or have had a subsequent Navigation Act.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Since Federation?

THE PREMIER: I do not know that it is since Federation; but the point alluded to is perfectly clear. There has been no legislation by the Federal Parliament yet, and when they do legislate, if their legislation comes into conflict with ours their legislation will control us, but until they pass legislation they have not the exclusive power.

MR. DAGLISH: When they have passed their legislation ours ceases to be effective, whether it conflicts with ours or not.

THE PREMIER: That is a question of exclusive jurisdiction. They have power to make those laws, and wherever those laws come into conflict with ours, ours must, I say, take second place. Members will recollect that in the Commonwealth Constitution Act there is an express clause saying that whenever any provisions of the Federal Act come into conflict with a State Act the provisions of the Federal Act shall prevail. By the Act exclusive jurisdiction is given to the Federal Parliament on certain matters, and in relation to matters outside those the Federal Parliament have power to legislate; but subject to their legislating we can legislate.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: You cannot both have power to legislate at the same time.

THE PREMIER: Oh, yes. In America that is the case; also in Canada, but not so much in Canada. You can have two authorities. For instance, the Federal Parliament can impose direct taxation, and so can we, but a section gives to the Federal Parliament exclusive jurisdiction over certain matters, and they possess it in relation to the transferred departments. Section 52 of the Commonwealth Constitution Act says:—

The Parliament shall, subject to this Constitution, have exclusive power to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of the Commonwealth with respect to 1, the seat

of Government . . . . . 2, matters relating to any department . . . . . 3, other matters declared by this Constitution to be within the inclusive power of this Parliament.

The Constitution gives the Federal Parliament power to make laws on the subject covered by this Bill, but it is not exclusive power. We are not prevented from passing legislation on the subject, although the Federal legislation overrides ours in case of any conflict. I think in the matter of treaties exclusive jurisdiction is given to the Commonwealth Parliament, among other matters declared by the Constitution to be under the exclusive power of the Commonwealth Parliament; but Section 51 does not declare that there is to be exclusive power in the matter of lighthouses, astronomy, quarantine, census of districts, weights and measures, and bills of exchange and promissory notes. We have power to deal with all these matters, and I think there is no doubt about it. I move the second reading.

MR. S. C. PIGOTT (West Kimberley): I think this Bill wants a little more consideration than is usually given by the general run of members in this House. In regard to Clause 2, without going into it in detail I believe that the provisions practically apply to all ships in Western Australia that are on the British register to-day.

THE PREMIER: While they are in our jurisdiction.

MR. PIGOTT: Whether we have this Bill or not.

THE PREMIER: We have now no power to grant certificates of competency.

MR. PIGOTT: Clause 2 has nothing to do with that. Part II. of the Merchant Shipping Act is on quite a different subject altogether.

THE PREMIER: That is to be applied.

MR. PIGOTT: With regard to the appointment in Western Australia of some person nominated by the Governor to have all the powers of a Board of Trade, I have some doubts as to whether such a course would be exactly wise. At the present day foreign vessels coming into our ports are under our laws only as long as they are in our ports, but we have no power to prevent a vessel coming into our ports or going away with whatever cargo or in whatever state of unseaworthiness the owner likes.

THE PREMIER: That is so.

MR. PIGOTT: I think it is the object of the Bill to control this matter, but I hope the Premier does not want to rush the Bill through, for I would like longer time to deal with it. I know that Sub-clause 1 of Clause 2 is useful, and that it will do away with the necessity for another Bill before the House—that relating to the pearling industry and the vessels in that trade, and will get over many difficulties that have been in force for many years in the North-West. To-day there are some pearling vessels registered and some unregistered. Those which are unregistered do not come under the Merchant Shipping Act, and the consequence is that magistrates have power to deal with men on these vessels in a summary way under an Act which does not apply to men on registered vessels. The Merchant Shipping Act, and especially Part II., is recognised all over the world to be about the best Act that could possibly be in force with regard to matters dealing with ships and ships' crews. Every protection is given to the seaman. He is protected with regard to his wages and his food, and in every other way. He cannot be forced to sail in a vessel that is unseaworthy. At the same time the owners and masters are protected. But when we deal with Sub-clause 2 of Clause 2 we deal with another question altogether. I cannot see why we cannot go straight out and form a Board of Trade of our own, if we are to have the powers of a Board of Trade given to any person in Western Australia.

THE PREMIER: We have not got shipping enough.

MR. PIGOTT: Why then give the power to any one person?

THE PREMIER: It must be given to someone. We have been exercising some of those powers, but have not got the right to do so.

MR. PIGOTT: Surely the clause is going to give you some farther powers?

THE PREMIER: Yes; we want the powers of Part II.

MR. PIGOTT: What powers in particular have you got?

THE PREMIER: You as a shipping man ought to know as much as I do.

MR. PIGOTT: We should have some farther explanation of this Bill. If the

Premier will adjourn the Committee stage I would like to obtain farther information. Under Sub-clause 2 a tremendous lot of matters will be brought forward, amongst others the question of examining masters and giving certificates. In regard to these I do not think it would be wise to give the power to one person.

THE PREMIER: We could appoint examiners just as the Board of Trade does.

MR. PIGOTT: We have no Board of Trade.

THE PREMIER: No; we do not want one.

MR. PIGOTT: In the case of a vessel being wrecked an inquiry must be held in a certain way by a board. There is an inquiry board now, but if this Bill is passed such would not be the case. The Bill will create many alterations.

MR. HIGHAM: The Government can appoint a marine board from time to time.

MR. PIGOTT: I hope the Premier will leave the Bill over for a week.

THE PREMIER (in reply as mover): I approach this Bill with the feeling that we are adopting a part of the British Merchant Shipping Act that is acknowledged to be the best Act dealing with shipping matters. In the past we have been applying the Act where we had no power to do so. Part II. applies to all sea-going vessels registered in Great Britain. It also applies to all sea-going ships bound from this State to Great Britain or a British possession. Clause 246 of the Merchant Shipping Act provides:—

If the legislature of a British possession, by any law, apply or adapt to any British ships registered at, trading with, or being at any port in that possession, and to the owners, masters, and crews of those ships, any provisions of this part of this Act which do not otherwise so apply, such law shall have effect throughout Her Majesty's dominions and in places where Her Majesty has jurisdiction, in the same manner as if it were enacted in this Act.

To give us efficient power we must apply this Act. There are ships registered out of Great Britain coming to our ports. Part II. refers to a Board of Trade, and we must have a similar authority here. We do not want a Board of Trade or a Marine Board, not having the necessary amount of trade, and probably because

there may be a Federal Act dealing with the question later on. It rests, however, with the Governor to appoint officers from time to time to hold inquiries without the great expense a permanent board would create in order to deal with the few cases that may arise. We need the provisions of Part II. because at any time the emergency may arise for them to be applied. The Committee stage can be adjourned as the hon. member desires. The hon. member has had such large shipping experience that he may be able to assist us considerably.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

# COMPANIES DUTY ACT CONTINUANCE BILL.

## SECOND READING.

**THE TREASURER** (Hon. James Gardiner): This is practically a Bill to continue Section 31 of the present Act, which expires on the 31st December of this year. That section says:—

The Companies Duty Act, 1899, is continued until the thirty-first day of December, one thousand nine hundred and three, but only—  
(a.) For the recovery of duties accrued due thereunder at the commencement of this Act; and (b.) In relation to dividends declared before the commencement of this Act, and for the recovery of the duties thereon; and (c.) For the recovery of penalties in connection therewith.

In moving the second reading of the Dividends Duties Act, and in discussing the clauses through Committee, I stated then (as I state now) that there would be little or no necessity to take steps for recovery except in those cases in which I was then proceeding. There is about a dozen of those cases left, and there has been a good deal of unnecessary delay—unintentional delay in some cases and intentional in others; with the result that unless we pass this Bill to continue the operation of the Act, I shall find that all the actions I have taken against these companies will, on the 31st December, be brought to nought by effluxion of time. Hence I ask the House to pass the Bill, which continues Section 31 of the principal Act. I do not think the Bill will inflict any hardship; because, as to most of the matters in dispute, we are now getting pretty close to some definite basis. There certainly is one case in which the company, the Midland

Railway Company, have said that if our contention is correct they will have to pay duty, but that if the decision be against them they will appeal and have the matter tested in the fullest possible manner by the courts; and the decision of that case will involve considerable delay. Clause 2 states:—

The Companies Duty Act, 1899, shall continue in force for the recovery of all duties due and payable and all penalties incurred to the end of the year one thousand nine hundred and two thereunder, until all such duties and penalties are paid and all proceedings for the recovery of the same are finally determined.

I may tell the House that I have carefully considered most of the matters which have been in dispute; and I perceive no necessity for taking any farther actions, save those which may be necessary against companies who are practically dependent on the decisions in other cases. Some such companies I have not proceeded against, because it has been recognised that decisions in pending cases will practically apply to them. I beg leave to move the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

## IN COMMITTEE.

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

## ADMINISTRATION BILL (PROBATE).

### COUNCIL'S SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS.

Schedule of 10 amendments suggested by the Legislative Council, now considered in Committee.

**MR. ILLINGWORTH** in the Chair.

No. 1.—Clause 14, strike out paragraph (a) in Subclause (1), and insert "(a) Where there is no issue surviving, to the whole."

**THE PREMIER**: The clause dealt with the method of dividing property of an intestate, and provided that if the net value did not exceed £500, the whole estate should go to the surviving wife or husband as the case might be, or if there were issue one-third went to the survivor and two-thirds to the issue. By the Council's suggestion, if a wife died leaving a husband, or *vice versa*, the whole property of the deceased would go to the survivor if there were no children and the

estate exceeded £500. That was hardly right. In case of a small estate the surviving wife or husband was fully protected; but when the estate was larger it was reasonable that any near blood relations who had been depending on the deceased should have consideration. A man might die leaving a parent, a brother, or a sister, whom he had been assisting; and by the Council's suggestion the whole of his property would go to his wife unless there were children. This would not be morally justifiable unless the estate were small. The Bill continued the existing law, that in cases of intestacy with children surviving one-third went to the surviving husband or wife and two-thirds to the children; and when no children survived half went to the husband or wife and half to the next of kin. Ample protection was given to those with small estates of £500 and under; but on large estates close blood relations had a moral claim. The adoption of the suggestion would be a departure from Australian legislation; nor did he know of any country in the British dominions which had altered the law as the Council desired it altered. He moved that the suggested amendment be not agreed to.

Question passed, and the suggestion negatived.

No. 2—Consequential amendment negatived.

No. 3—Clause 14, strike out Subclause (3):

THE PREMIER: Subclause (3) provided that any surviving husband or wife entitled to share in real property should accept the value of that share in lieu of partition if so desired. In many cases real property could not be divided; and if the beneficiaries could not agree among themselves it was sold, involving as a rule expensive litigation. The clause provided that if the wife was desired to do so by the other beneficiaries she should give them the real property and be given by them its full value in cash. In cases where the wife was entitled to one-half and the other beneficiaries to one-half, there was no reason why the wife should sell to them any more than they to her; but probably in most cases there would be children, who would receive two-thirds of the estate; and it was right that they should be allowed to decide whether they would retain the real property, which had

frequently to them a personal or a sentimental value. In lieu of partition the surviving wife or husband must take the value of the property in cash, or as might be agreed. The course provided by the clause would lead to less hardship than the alternative; and he moved that the suggested amendment be not agreed to.

Question passed, and the suggestion negatived.

No. 4—Clause 53, line 2, strike out "five" and insert "three":

THE PREMIER moved that the suggested amendment be not agreed to. This was one of the clauses providing a summary method by which probate or administration could be obtained for small estates. While the Bill passed through this House the amount was increased from £300 to £500, and the Council suggested the reinstatement of the original sum.

Question passed, and the suggestion negatived.

No. 5—Consequential amendment negatived.

No. 6—Clause 63, line 3, strike out "five" and insert "four":

THE PREMIER: This dealt with the clause which fixed the curator's commission, which the Council desired to reduce from five per cent. to four per cent. Four per cent. would probably be sufficient, and he moved that the suggested amendment be agreed to.

Question passed.

No. 7—Clause 88, Subclause (a), add the words "at the time of his death":

THE PREMIER: The clause provided that in case of death a valuation with particulars should be verified by affidavit; and Subclause (a) provided for "full particulars of the real and personal estate and the value thereof." The Council wished to add the words "at the time of his death." These words might make the intention clearer; and he moved that the suggested amendment be agreed to.

Question passed.

No. 8—Clause 96, paragraph 4, line 2, after "persons" insert the words "*bona fide* residents of and domiciled in Western Australia and":

THE PREMIER: The suggested amendment carried out the proposal agreed to in Committee. Members would recollect that we objected to allow a reduction of

duty to persons of near relationship when those persons were not resident in the State. We should have, as a consequential amendment, modified Clause 96 so as to apply the same principle to questions of settlement. We did provide as to ordinary wills and we should apply the same principle to settlements. He moved that the suggested amendment be agreed to.

Question passed.

No. 9—Verbal amendment agreed to.

No. 10—Add the following new clause :—

The Court may, by way of remuneration, allow to an executor or administrator for the time being, on passing his accounts, a commission not exceeding five pounds per cent. on the assets collected by such executor or administrator, including rents and income. No allowance shall be made to any executor or administrator who omits to pass his account pursuant to any order of the Court.

THE PREMIER: On two occasions this amendment had blocked the Administration Bill. It provided that the Court might by way of remuneration allow commission to an administrator or an executor. It was right, he thought, to allow an administrator commission but not an executor. While it was compulsory that someone must obtain administration, remuneration should be provided for the work done, but there was no obligation on an executor to carry out the work. He intended to move to amend the new clause by striking out the words "or executor" wherever they occurred. This was a valuable Bill containing over 130 clauses. It was very urgent and necessary, and both Houses had approved of nearly the whole of it, and even the amendments before the Committee were not important and were not likely to be insisted upon. The Upper House might do what we ought to do in cases of this kind where we had a consolidating Bill of great value, and some amendments which were new were desired to be inserted. It was wrong for members to say they would have that amendment or destroy the whole Bill. If an effort was made in the Bill to adopt something that was new and another Chamber disagreed with the new proposal, the other House would be perfectly justified in sticking to their opinion; but where the endeavour was to adopt a new law it was not right to say unless that

new proposal was agreed to the remaining 136 clauses of the Bill, on which both Houses agreed, should not come into force. That was hardly argument. If it was thought desirable that executors should have commission, a Bill should be introduced dealing with that matter. Where there was a matter on which a strong divergence of opinion existed it was well to keep that matter out of a Bill like this and deal with it separately and independently. He moved that in line 1 the words "executor or" be struck out.

MR. TAYLOR: The desire was to allow an administrator to be remunerated but not an executor?

THE PREMIER: The law would remain as it was to-day.

MR. TAYLOR: If a person were asked to act as an executor and no remuneration were provided, that person could refuse to act; but somebody must act as an administrator, therefore remuneration should be provided?

THE PREMIER: That was fair, for the reason that if a man when making his will did not provide remuneration for an executor he intended that the executor should act as a friend. That had been the practice for generations.

MR. BURGESS: The new clause fixed the remuneration at 5 per cent. for an administrator, which was rather high. He had known the Court grant 1 per cent. in large estates.

THE PREMIER: The clause said "not exceeding 5 per cent."

Amendment (the Premier's) passed, and "executor or" struck out.

THE PREMIER farther moved that between "accounts" and "commission" the word "a" be struck out, and "such" inserted in lieu. That would make it clear that it was within the discretion of the Court as to what commission should be granted.

Agreed to.

THE PREMIER moved that the words "executor or," in line three, be struck out; also, that the words "as the Court thinks just" be inserted after "income."

Agreed to.

THE PREMIER moved that in line four the words "executor or" be struck out.

Motion passed, and the suggested new clause as amended agreed to.



Resolutions reported, and the report adopted.

A committee, consisting of Mr. James, Mr. Pigott, and Mr. Burges, drew up reasons for disagreeing to five of the Council's suggested amendments and for amending the new clause.

Reasons adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

## FERTILISERS AND FEEDING STUFFS BILL.

### SECOND READING.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. J. M. Hopkins), in moving the second reading, said: This simple Bill is a measure of utility, and it will not only benefit the farming community who are large purchasers of the various kinds of fertilisers on the market, but will at the same time protect the honest trader against the dishonest trader, who we are led to believe is frequently selling an article inferior to that which it purports to be. We have a large area of second-class land in Western Australia, the development of which will depend entirely on the supply of suitable fertilisers at a minimum of cost. We have at the present time a Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Act, which this Bill will repeal. Members will bear in mind that in 1902 a select committee was appointed to report upon the Agricultural Bank, and the member for Beverley (Mr. Harper) moved—

That in view of the enormous development promised in the utilisation of our second-class lands through the use of commercial fertilisers, it is desirable that some effective means should be taken to insure the purchaser a knowledge of the value of such fertilisers, and that the select committee on the Agricultural Bank Extension be instructed to inquire into the subject, with the view of making recommendations thereon.

Speaking on that motion the hon. member said:—

The farmers have had considerable difficulty in arriving at the accurate value of these manures. This fact operates against their purchase; and I therefore ask the House to let the matter be referred to the select committee on the Agricultural Bank, with a view of their making some inquiries and suggestions.

That proposition was supported by the member for the Swan (Mr. Jacoby), who followed in a similar strain, and in consequence the functions of the select com-

mittee which had been appointed to inquire into the Agricultural Bank were extended, and members will see in the committee's report the evidence given by Mr. Teesdale Smith, Mr. Augustus Sharp, of Donnybrook; Mr. John Wishart, of Wanneroo; and Mr. Lindley Cowen, then Secretary of the Department of Agriculture. All their evidence goes to indicate that in many instances farmers have been duped, believing they had purchased a suitable fertiliser, and in one instance it was found that nothing more nor less than broken quartz had been palmed off in the shape of bonedust. The select committee, reporting on that occasion, said:—

The evidence given concerning the quality of the commercial fertilisers imported into the State goes to show that in the opinion of witnesses fraud is rampant in this trade; and if this is the case, it is not easy to over-estimate the great loss suffered by the agricultural industries. The Act now in force is stated to be unworkable in practice. It appears that the effect of such a large proportion of these fertilisers being adulterated is that their use is not so extensive as would be advisable. The suggestion was made that the difficulty could not be effectively overcome without making the importation of fertilisers a State monopoly. However, without going quite as far as this, though there is much to be said in its favour, the Committee suggest that, as the evidence shows that the local price is excessive and out of all proportion to (quite 40 per cent. above) that charged elsewhere in Australia, a trial shipment might be made by the Government in connection with the charter of a boat to take timber as back loading.

This all goes to indicate that after a careful inquiry by the select committee it was ascertained beyond a doubt that the Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Act which we have at the present time does not meet the requirements of the State, and in consequence of that this Bill has been introduced. It was pointed out, I think generally speaking, that a measure on the lines of the South Australian Act would meet our requirements, and we have as far as possible endeavoured to follow on the lines of the South Australian Act in connection with the drafting of this Bill. As members will see, this Bill repeals the Act of 1895. Clause 3 gives the interpretations and various descriptions. Clause 4 says it shall be unlawful to sell fertilisers unless the brand of those fertilisers and the minimum percentages are

registered in the prescribed manner at the Department of Agriculture in Perth; and under Clause 5 the particulars of any registered brand of fertiliser may be published in the *Government Gazette*. Any person who has registered the percentages of a fertiliser may amend them under Clause 6; and Clause 7, which is a very desirable one, provides for the branding of the various packages. In Clause 8 it is laid down that the seller shall give an invoice certificate to the buyer, stating the name and place of business of the seller, the registered brand of the fertiliser and the quantity sold, and the minimum percentages of analyses, including moisture; also that the seller shall before delivery durably mark or brand every sack, barrel, case or other package containing any portion of such fertiliser delivered in pursuance of such sale, with the registered brand of the fertiliser. Every certificate will under Clause 9 be deemed a warranty. Under Clause 12 it is required that 40 per cent. of bonedust must be derived from bones. The subclauses deal with other percentages. Under Clause 13 the Governor may appoint inspectors for the purposes of this measure; and the powers of inspectors are defined in Clause 14, which provides for the taking of samples. Clause 15 states how these samples are disposed of for the purposes of analysis. The result of the analysis may, under Clause 16, be published in the *Government Gazette*. Clause 18 entitles the buyer to an analysis if the regulations have been complied with, and the certificate given is accepted as evidence in the case of prosecution. The cost of the analysis will fall on the seller if the analysis is proved to go against him. The only point, I believe, likely to be debated in connection with this Bill will more particularly refer to the percentages from the fertilisers themselves, and for that reason it has been suggested, seeing there is apparently a difference of opinion between the gentleman who was analyst and the gentleman who now is analyst at the Agricultural Department, that the Bill should be referred to a select committee in order that the point may be fully inquired into; and I may say the object of the Government is that this measure shall not be a dead letter like the present Act, but that it shall meet

the requirements of the country. For that reason I am only too pleased to fall in with the wishes of those members who desire a select committee in order that we may have this point cleared up before the Bill becomes an Act. Clause 23 provides a remedy by a seller against a prior seller. Clause 24 states who may prosecute. I think the Bill is a very simple one, and that on glancing through it members will not have the slightest difficulty in perceiving its purport. I beg to move the second reading, and immediately that is passed I will, with the concurrence of the House, move that the measure be referred to a select committee, to report on the 5th November.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### SELECT COMMITTEE.

On motion by the MINISTER FOR LANDS, Bill referred to a select committee.

Ballot taken, and a committee appointed comprising Mr. Burges, Mr. Higham, Mr. Jacoby, Mr. Pigott, also Mr. Hopkins as mover; with power to call for persons and papers, and to sit during any adjournment of the House; to report on the 5th November.

#### MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

##### RECOMMITTAL.

On motion by MR. ATKINS, Bill re-committed for farther amendment to Clause 2, Subclause 3.

MR. ILLINGWORTH in the Chair; MR. PURKISS in charge of the Bill.

MR. ATKINS moved as a farther amendment:

That in the last line of Subclause 3 the words "person or public body" be struck out, and the words "every municipality, roads board, or local authority" inserted in lieu.

MR. PURKISS would not consent to the amendment. It would simply limit the supplying of stone to the particular municipality in which the quarry was being worked.

THE PREMIER: It was proposed to allow the sale of stone to other municipalities or roads boards.

MR. PURKISS: There would then be no objection to the amendment.

MR. DAGLISH: A number of municipalities obtained their material through

contractors. Why should these municipalities have to pay a higher price for doing so? Competition in the supply of material should not be restricted.

**THE PREMIER:** Judging from newspaper reports there was a difference of opinion in the Perth council on this subject. If the amendment was adopted other municipalities could carry on their works by day labour.

Amendment put and passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Bill reported with farther amendment.

# EARLY CLOSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

## SECOND READING.

**THE PREMIER (Hon. Walter James):** This is a Bill amending the existing Early Closing Act and to meet difficulties which have appeared in its operation. I will pass along the clauses as they appear here, in order to explain them to members. There is no reason why I should give a second-reading speech on a matter which is already familiar. Clause 2 defines a shop. It is substantially the same definition as in Section 2 of the old Act, but to save doubts we have put in the words "including any premises in which any business described in Schedule I. is carried on" in order to make it quite clear that the class of shop in Schedule I. is within the meaning of the Act. Clause 3 is a formal amendment of Section 3 of the Act. Section 3 of the Act provides that the Governor may, by proclamation, declare any municipality to be or cease to be a district. In the Bill we put in after the word "municipality" the words "or roads district or any part thereof," which will enable an early-closing district to be created not only in a municipality, as now, but in a roads district as well, if thought desirable. There are some roads districts which are practically suburban municipalities, and the Act needed amendment in that direction. By Clause 5 of this Bill we provide for the registration of small shops which have not the same hours of closing as other shops. It is not fair that these small shops should have the right to the advantages of Section 4 of the principal Act. We want to except small shops from this section which fixes the hours of all shops, because we have a special clause relating

to small shops. Section 4 of the Act therefore also requires amendment. We also in Clause 4 want to insert the words "Good Friday." It was an oversight in not having them inserted in the Act. In Clause 5 we deal with the closing time of small shops, those not mentioned in Schedule I. The shops set out in that clause are not set out in Schedule I. because they have different hours of closing. We travelled over these hours last session, and I do not propose to discuss their merits now. We provide by Subclause 4 a definition of a small shop. It is a place which is registered and where only one assistant is engaged or employed. Then we provide by Clause 6 the registration of shops as small shops. The person who registers as an assistant must occupy a certain relationship to the shopkeeper, and we state that no person of Asiatic, African, or Polynesian race shall be registered as the keeper of or an assistant in a small shop. Then we provide the penalty for every shopkeeper of a small shop who employs an unregistered assistant. In Clause 8 we provide that the provisions regarding the small shops shall apply in districts to be determined by the Governor. By Clause 9 we repeal Section 6 of the principal Act which relates to hairdressers, and we make a new provision to deal with this class in Clause 11. By Clause 10 we take the shops appearing in Schedule I. and divide them into three parts. Those appearing in Part I. and II. shall be open not later than nine o'clock and 10 o'clock respectively on the evening of every day except Saturday. At present there is no restriction on their hours of closing. On Saturdays and week days next preceding Christmas day, New Year's day, and Good Friday such shops can keep open not later than 11 o'clock. The shops in Part III. are left free. There is no closing time applied to them. This clause (10) obviates the difficulties of the last Act by prescribing the relations of the closing times. By the Bill the closing times for all hairdressers' shops shall be not later than half-past six o'clock in the evening of any day except Wednesday or Saturday, and 10 o'clock in the evening of Saturday. There was a contest last session as to whether the closing time should be half-past six or half-past seven, allowing an hour for tea. We pre-

scribe that the closing time shall be one o'clock on Wednesdays.

MR. MORAN: What is now the closing time for hairdressers?

THE PREMIER: Half-past six; but I am inclined to think it was half-past seven in the Bill brought down last year.

MR. TAYLOR: We altered it to half-past six.

THE PREMIER: There was a contest on the point of allowing an hour for tea, which was preferred in some parts of the goldfields.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes; at Kalgoorlie.

THE PREMIER: The reason advanced seemed to be very good—that if one came away from home after tea and desired to go out for the evening he came to work prepared to go out. The last paragraph—

But nothing in this section shall prevent the *bona fide* owner, or any one and no more of the *bona fide* owners of a hairdresser's shop from himself carrying on the business of a hairdresser until the hour of 10 o'clock p.m.

was inserted by the Legislative Council. This will allow a hairdresser owning a shop to carry on work himself.

MR. WALLACE: That will spoil the whole principle of early closing.

THE PREMIER: Strictly speaking hairdressers should not come under the Bill at all. A hairdresser's saloon is not a shop, though it might be so far as selling tobacco is concerned. To say that a hairdresser's saloon is a shop is straining the meaning of the word "shop." Clause 12 is also a formal amendment to make quite clear and remove all doubt which may arise in connection with Section 7 of the principal Act. Clause 13 is consequential on our fixing the closing time for shops for Parts I. and II. of Schedule I. Clause 14 deals with the limitation of the hours of labour of women and young persons under the age of 16. Section 12 of the principal Act fixes the hours of labour in shops for women and young persons under the age of 16 at nine hours a day, including meal times, except on one day of the week, when they are to be employed 12 hours, but allowing them to be employed for no longer a period than 53 hours in one week. In this Bill we cut down the maximum of 12 hours to 11½ hours, and cut down the number of hours per week from 53 hours to 52

hours. Clause 15 provides the limitation of the hours for barmen or waiters. The clause says:—

No person shall employ in a public-house, hotel, restaurant, or coffee palace a barman or waiter for a longer period than 56 hours in any one week, or a waitress or a boy under the age of 16 years for a longer period than 52 hours in any one week, exclusive of such time as may be allowed for meals.

MR. TAYLOR: There is no provision for barmaids.

THE PREMIER: They are dealt with under the Licensing Act.

MR. HIGHAM: Would a waitress be called a barmaid?

THE PREMIER: Hardly not. The principal amendments refer to small shops, and to the hours of closing for all classes of shops dealt with in Parts I. and II. of Schedule I. These are the two principal amendments. The others are of more or less importance, which are rendered necessary because in the working of the Act some slight oversights have been discovered. No doubt when this Bill becomes law and is in operation matters may be found which should be remedied. I move the second reading.

Question passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### IN COMMITTEE.

MR. ILLINGWORTH in the Chair; The PREMIER in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Manner of showing amendments:

MR. PIGOTT: Was the Bill to be applicable throughout the whole of the State?

THE PREMIER: No; only in certain districts.

Clause passed.

Clauses 3 and 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—Closing time for small shops:

MR. HIGHAM moved as an amendment—

That in line 5 the word "ten" be struck out and "nine" inserted in lieu.

This would make the small shops close at the same time as other shops.

Amendment passed.

MR. WALLACE moved that in line 27 the word "eight" be struck out and "six" inserted in lieu. If we were to have an Early Closing Bill in the interests of the employees and also in the

interests of white storekeepers against Asiatics, the hours must be restricted; Asiatics would keep open all night long if allowed. We were not giving a concession to our own people but to Asiatics. If the clause applied only to suburban shopkeepers it might alter his view.

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

Ayes	...	...	...	7
Noes	...	...	...	18
Majority against				11

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Bath	Mr. Atkins
Mr. Diamond	Mr. Burges
Mr. Holman	Mr. Daglish
Mr. Oats	Mr. Ewing
Mr. Reid	Mr. Ferguson
Mr. Wallace	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Taylor (Teller).	Mr. Gordon
	Mr. Hayward
	Mr. Hicks
	Mr. Holmes
	Mr. Hopkins
	Mr. James
	Mr. Moran
	Mr. Phillips
	Mr. Pigott
	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Yelverton
	Mr. Higham (Teller).

Amendment thus negative, and the clause as previously amended agreed to.

Clauses 6, 7, 8—agreed to.

Clause 9—Repeal of Section 6:

MR. MORAN: What was Section 6?

THE PREMIER: It referred to hair-dressers.

MR. MORAN: The opinion of the members and non-members of the Hair-dressers' Union was against an alteration of the present law. It appeared we were re-enacting later on what was the law now. The members of the union were satisfied with the present Act.

THE PREMIER: Clause 11, which referred to hairdressers, had been inserted in consequence of a question of drafting. "Hairdressers" had been taken out of the definition of "shops," because it was desired in a separate clause to deal with the opening time, the closing time, and the half-holiday of hairdressers. He would look into the matter.

Clause passed.

Clause 10—Closing time for certain exempted shops:

MR. PIGOTT: If we were to limit the hours during which shops could be kept open, why was there a distinction made in the case of certain businesses? Why should a butcher's shop keep open longer than a shop where tinned meat was sold?

Why not make the closing time for all shops uniform except there was special necessity?

THE PREMIER: This Bill was a step in advance of the law in existence. Nine o'clock was the closing hour for shops mentioned in the first part of the schedule and 10 for those in the second part. [MR. PIGOTT: Why?] Each member must make up his mind on that point. For instance, confectionery shops should be allowed to keep open till 10 o'clock, especially in summer time, for the sale of soft drinks. Vegetable shops might not be included in the same part. It was utterly absurd to say that we should draw a line between one class of shop and another. Personally he thought all shops might close earlier except those which sold refreshments in summer time.

MR. PIGOTT: Make all the shops mentioned in Parts I. and II. close at the same hour.

THE PREMIER: That would not work, for confectionery shops, milk shops, and fruit shops should remain open longer, especially in summer time, as they supplied a want. He did not know why the shops mentioned in Part I. should close earlier than those mentioned in Part II., but it had been the practice in the past for certain shops to remain open longer than other shops.

MR. PIGOTT: A railway book-stall should keep open after nine o'clock.

THE PREMIER: Very few persons utilised the railway book-stall after nine o'clock. One could not lay down any rule as to the closing time of particular classes of shops.

Clause passed.

Clause 11—Hairdressers' assistants:

MR. BATH: The member for Kalgoolie desired to move an amendment. Would the Premier give an opportunity on recommittal?

THE PREMIER: Yes. What did the hon. member (Mr. Johnson) want to do?

MR. BATH: The hon. member wanted a clause providing exemption.

THE PREMIER: Half-past seven?

MR. BATH: Yes.

MR. WALLACE moved as an amendment,

That the last paragraph be struck out.

Many hairdressers could conduct their businesses without employees. The Hair-

dressers' Association had a conference with the employers, and all agreed that the clause in the Bill of last year was exactly as they wished it to be. They desired a universal half-holiday and an earlier hour for closing on week-days, including Saturday nights, but the whole trend of the debate last year was against anything of that sort. A great deal of the gambling which went on was conducted in tobacconists' shops, and if there was a desire to restrict betting as far as possible, members should support his amendment.

Amendment passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 12 to 14—agreed to.

Clause 15—Hours of employment for barmen and waiters and waitresses:

MR. DAGLISH: Would the Premier agree to the insertion of another word or two, which would cover the case of the kitchen employees at these establishments? Very long hours were worked in kitchens.

THE PREMIER: In this clause we were dealing with employees who, in relation to their employers, stood in the same position as shop assistants did to shopkeepers.

Clause passed.

Clauses 16, 17—agreed to.

New Clause:

SIR JAMES G. LEE STEERE moved that the following be added as a clause:—

Sections 4, 5, and 9, and Schedule 2 of the principal Act are amended by substituting the word "nine" for the word "ten" wherever appearing in the said sections and schedule; provided, however, the hour for closing at nine o'clock on Saturday night shall be enforced only in the area as defined in the Second Schedule to this Act.

This new clause was proposed to carry out the idea he had last session when he made a similar proposal to amend the Act. Last year he proposed that shops should be shut at 9 o'clock instead of 10 on Saturday nights, and that was approved by everyone in the House and carried. Subsequently he was taken ill and unfortunately was not present—whether the result would have been different if he had been here he did not know—and he was surprised to find that the Bill had been recommitted by (he believed) the Government, and a motion made that the amendment previously carried should not be in the Bill, but

that the former hour of 10 o'clock should be inserted instead. He was told, but did not know whether it was correct, that this was in consequence of a deputation from the goldfields (he believed) having in the meantime interviewed the Premier and pointed out that it would be very inconvenient on the goldfields if shops were shut at 9 o'clock instead of 10 on Saturday nights. In his opinion, the hon. gentleman need not have given way altogether to the desire of the goldfields, because the goldfields might have been exempted, as he (Sir James) now proposed they should be, from the operation of this amendment. Whose interests were we serving by providing that shops should be kept open till 10 o'clock? Certainly not those of the assistants in the shops, who were principally affected. We were really pandering to the insensate nature of some of the general public who walked up and down the streets on Saturday nights and never thought of making purchases until nine o'clock. We forgot altogether the humanitarian point of view, which we ought to consider. We should endeavour to reduce the hours of labour of these young people, especially girls, who were working in these shops from, he believed, eight o'clock on Saturday morning till 11 o'clock at night. He thought many of these young people lived in the suburbs, and consequently did not reach home much before midnight. There were many reasons why we should try to put a stop to this, and enable these young people to reach home earlier. In South Australia an Act was passed two years ago compelling all shops to close at nine o'clock on Saturday night, whereas previously they had closed at 10. He was informed that in Bendigo and Ballarat, the two chief cities in Victoria next to Melbourne, a similar law had been passed, but he could not say whether by the local authority or by proclamation, or how it was done. He appealed to members to support him in his endeavour to put a stop to the intolerable evil of keeping persons, especially young girls, in these shops, and making them work so many hours during the day. He was informed by those who had communicated with the Early Closing Association that employers themselves in Perth, Fremantle, and the

suburbs were favourable to his proposal, and he was glad to think such was the case. The evil to which he referred existed principally, of course, in the drapery shops, and there should be no occasion for it, because people could do their shopping before nine o'clock if they liked, instead of walking up and down the streets, chatting and acting in what he called an insensate manner. He would like the closing at nine o'clock on Saturday nights to be universal, but in order to carry the amendment he had confined it to the places mentioned in the schedule. He had much pleasure in moving that the new clause be added to the Bill.

**THE PREMIER:** It would be wise to report progress, so that the fact that this new clause had been moved would become known. He thought that last session in dealing with this matter we were inclined to assist the Perth shop assistants, and when the matter was being discussed it was supposed that what would apply here would apply to the other parts of the State; but there was a general feeling that whilst we could close here at nine o'clock those in other parts of the State could not. When the fact that this amendment had been moved had become known we should soon hear from members the opinions of both sides. He moved that progress be reported.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

At 6-30, the **SPEAKER** left the Chair.

At 7-30, Chair resumed.

#### ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1902-3.

#### DEBATE ON FINANCIAL POLICY—SECOND DAY.

The Financial Statement having been made by the Colonial Treasurer in introducing the Annual Estimates, 6th October, and the first item moved, the debate was now resumed; Mr. **ILLINGWORTH** in the Chair.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER** (Hon. J. Gardiner): Before we start the general discussion on the Estimates, I should like to say that by the next sitting of the House I will have a copy of the Estimates ready for each member showing the actual expenditure as well as the vote for the year. Those items

which are the same as the appropriation will not be shown; but those in respect of which there is either excess expenditure or under expenditure will be indicated for the guidance of members as to the total of the vote.

**MR. S. C. PIGOTT** (West Kimberley): Those persons who have had the privilege of listening to the speech of the Treasurer cannot possibly have gone away without being fully impressed with one fact, that the finances of this State are undoubtedly at the present time in a sound position. And I think I am safe in saying that many people have congratulated the Treasurer on the able manner in which he put before the House and the country generally a statement of our finances, and the bright prospect which he foreshadowed for the State. And when to these expressions of congratulation I add my small contribution, I hope the Treasurer will accept it as being freely and sincerely given, notwithstanding any remarks I may make during the debates on these Estimates. After carefully going through the figures laid before us, I came to the conclusion—the truth of which will I think be admitted by every inhabitant of this State—that the people of the State as a whole have to pay an exceedingly large sum for the upkeep of the State Government. In considering these figures I think it advisable for certain purposes to eliminate from my calculations all reference to matters connected with our railways. When we add to our State taxation, exclusive of railways, the amount collected through the customs from the people of this State by the Commonwealth, we find that from all sources there is collected no less a sum than £2,431,000, or that sum is to be received during the current year. That, if we take the present population as 227,000, gives an average of £10 14s. 2d. per head. Presuming that amount to be collected, we next try to find out what becomes of the money. Let us take the total cost of administration as stated by the Treasurer, with the exception of one item which in this case also I have thought fit to leave out, an item of £136,000 which we pay for the education of our young people; we find that in administration expenses alone there is expended £1,242,000, or in other words per head of the population £5 9s. 5d.;

leaving to be expended for other purposes an amount of £1,189,000. Now the first charge on that balance is a charge which we must pay, which we do pay, which we have always paid, and which I hope we shall always be able to pay. That is the interest on our loans and our contributions to the sinking fund which we have established with a view to wiping out those liabilities. For this year the amount payable for interest and sinking fund is £713,500; so if we deduct that from the balance after paying administration expenses, we have left £475,500 which we are to expend as the Government and this House think will benefit the people of the State. The people pay in taxes £10 14s. 2d. per head; and after paying administration expenses, and a proportion of their liabilities in the way of interest and sinking fund, they have returnable to them an amount of £2 2s. 4d. per head. It seems to me that when we consider those facts, when we consider what a large sum is collected and what a small sum is returned, we must at once acknowledge that the Treasurer was right, that the financial prospects of this country are good; otherwise I fail to see how the people could submit to this huge expenditure, and submit to it so cheerfully as they have for some years past. But when I came to that result, and found that before next year, after all amounts are collected and the cost of administration and interest and sinking fund are paid, there is only a sum of £475,500 left, it certainly struck me that the Treasurer had omitted from his speech a reference to the most important phase of our financial position. That is in regard to what may happen, or what in all probability will happen, within a very few years when the bookkeeping period ceases, and the Federal Parliament decide, as I am inclined to think they will decide, to distribute their surplus amongst the different States on a population basis, reckoned on the population of the whole Commonwealth. Now we have been told—and though I have not examined the figures I think Sir George Turner is correct in his statement—that if the bookkeeping period were to cease to-day and the money were to be distributed on a population basis, there would be a heavy loss to this State; or in other words, this State would get back from the

Commonwealth £600,000 less per annum than it is getting to-day. When we consider that question we find that, notwithstanding we in this State contribute £10 14s. 2d. per head, yet, after paying the administration of departments and paying our liabilities on our debts, instead of having a surplus of £475,500 to be expended in what we think the best manner, we should have a deficit.

THE TREASURER: Do I understand the hon. member to eliminate railways on both sides of the account?

MR. PIGOTT: Yes.

THE TREASURER: Then you are making a mistake. A portion of the interest and sinking fund is contributed by the railways.

MR. PIGOTT: I have not lost sight of that fact. Our railways are now showing a profit; but there is no reason for saying they will always show a profit. Our loan liabilities must be paid, whether or not the railways pay.

THE TREASURER: But I thought you were dealing practically with the position as it now is.

MR. PIGOTT: I am. I have left out of this calculation both the railway revenue and the cost of administering the railways, but I am not debiting the railways with what we have to pay in the way of interest. I am taking the State debts; and I do not know why we should say that the railways are responsible for paying the interest on our State debts. We come to the fact that when the bookkeeping period ceases, instead of having a surplus to distribute after paying our administration expenditure we shall have a deficit. At present we have a surplus of £475,000; and if we are to lose £600,000 on the termination of the bookkeeping period we shall have a deficit of £125,000; and we shall not out of that deficit be able to pay for even the administration of our Education Department. But what must we do if the position three years hence with regard to our railways is the same as the position to-day? We must then try to force out of our railways a profit large enough to cover that deficit, and to cover the administration of our Education Department. I cannot understand why the Treasurer did not give us some idea of what he considers the best method of meeting this difficulty when it arises;



because that it will arise I feel absolutely certain that he has no doubt. We must face this difficulty; and in considering our finances to-day I think it but right that we should thresh out the matter, face the difficulty like men, and make some provision if we possibly can so that when these three years pass by we shall know what we are to do to meet the impending trouble. Again, in saying that this matter must have received consideration from the Government, I may mention that I noticed recently in the Press that at a dinner given in Perth, I think after the Treasurer had made his Budget Speech, the Premier thought fit to make some reference to an income tax. Now I think the people of Western Australia will not submit to any taxation other than that under which they suffer to-day, unless they are granted some reduction of the present burdens to an extent which will practically neutralise the effect of the new tax. That being so, we must admit that the future financial position of Western Australia is certainly grave. Unless we can bring to bear on the Federal authorities some pressure which will induce them to take over our loans and relieve us of our responsibilities with respect to them, and by some special means, after taking over those loans, pay interest out of the Federal pocket instead of out of our State pocket, I do not know how this State can continue without farther taxation, and very heavy taxation, if the book-keeping period is to cease and the Commonwealth surplus is to be distributed on a population basis.

MR. BATH: We shall have to pay interest just the same if the Federal Government take over the loans.

MR. PIGOTT: That is just the point. If the Federal Government take over our State debts, and pay the interest and sinking fund on those debts out of the amounts collected by the Government through the customs, the position, as the hon. member must agree, will be very different from what it will be if the Commonwealth take over the State debts and take over our railways or our railway revenue, as was proposed or mooted by the present Federal Treasurer. Another cause which will diminish our revenue, and which operated last year, is the reduction and ultimate abolition of the sliding scale duties. Now I am a free-

trader; and when we come to look at our finances I think we shall find that the policy of protection in Western Australia will bring about great calamities. I cannot for the life of me perceive how the people of Western Australia will be able to afford to pay such enormous taxation through the customs when the money so paid will not be returned to the people as it is to-day, but will be spent in some other part of the Commonwealth. I cannot perceive how in these circumstances we can go ahead; and it is for that reason I sympathise with the Treasurer in the matter of his loan policy; and I do after full consideration believe that we must be exceedingly careful before approaching any money market whatever for heavy loans for future public works. We must consider that though we are paying heavy taxes we are about to lose the benefit of their expenditure. I do not wish people to think that I am in this matter entirely parochial; but when we consider the debates in the Federal Parliament and the action taken by Federal Ministers, we must realise the gravity of the position and face it. While I speak on this point I wish to express my regret that our Treasurer did not see fit to lay on the table his Loan Estimates when presenting the House with the ordinary estimates of revenue. That would have made the consideration of the Estimates much more simple for members, and would have facilitated the criticism of the Government expenditure. I am sorry that the Loan Estimates are not before us, and that I am consequently debarred from making many remarks regarding the loan expenditure or the loan policy of the Government. The Treasurer is going very slowly indeed when he says that we are to spend only £750,000 out of loan moneys; and I think he has just cause to go slowly. But when we hear from him that this amount is to cover the expenditure on all public works to be constructed out of loan money, I fail to understand why we have in the Premier's policy speech a forecast of public works which will cost, on the rough estimate of a layman like myself, fully ten times the sum proposed by the Treasurer to be borrowed. Of course I do not think the Government expect to pay for all those works in one year; but when they talk

about building a railway here and another railway there, they do not say "You will not get these railways this year; you may get them ten years hence." If that is the position, I think the fact ought to be clearly and fairly put before the people. Having regard to loans, we must consider the present progressive state of our industries. We have heard from the Treasurer that every single industry in Western Australia is growing, and going ahead by leaps and bounds. If so, and if the Treasurer can foresee that our industries will continue to grow year by year, that new country will be opened up and a larger population settled in the State, then I think that even if we have to pay a high rate for our loans, if the Treasurer can see this bright prospect ahead of him he need not then be perhaps so cautious—though I might have been as cautious as he is in this case—as to say he will not go to the loan market. He has admitted that money cannot be borrowed at less than 4 per cent. But if 4 per cent. is a fair rate, and the ruling price, then, if we have important public works to be carried out, and if those works are to be revenue-producing both directly and indirectly, I fail to perceive why any Government should hesitate to borrow money for such special works even at 4 per cent. And I agree with the Treasurer when he says that whatever loan moneys we spend we must spend only on that class of work; and that is why I should like to see the Loan Estimates before us now, because I feel absolutely certain that there are included in those Loan Estimates many works which will not be revenue-producing at all. And that brings me to an item of expenditure which has to be paid out of our revenue for this year—an item for railway construction amounting to £80,000. And I think that the Treasurer, in putting that item amongst our ordinary expenditure, did so for the sake of advertisement. If he did, I congratulate him, because I think it a magnificent advertisement. But the question is, will it be read truly or read in the manner in which the Treasurer wishes it to be read? I do not think it will carry much weight. When we consider that we have only £475,000 out of this year's money to expend and £136,000 of that amount is to go to education, and also out of that

small amount we are to take £80,000 for expenditure on railway construction, the one work which is acknowledged throughout the whole of the world to be the most solid work on which loan money can be expended, I fail to see that any amount of kudos is to be gained. If we take the position to-day the Treasurer has, I admit, a happy 12 months ahead of him. He has in addition to the £475,000 a profit that he is to derive from the working of the railways amounting to £402,000. I think that will be found to be net, after deducting the expenditure from the revenue of our railways, and on top of that there is the amount of £231,000 saved out of last year's expenditure, so that in all we have £1,105,000 to be expended. When we consider that of the £1,105,000 over one-fifth has been saved from last year's money, it will be found if the moneys we are passing in this year's Estimates are to be expended during this year, that when the Budget speech is made next year instead of having £1,105,000 to expend probably we shall be £231,000 short. With regard to the £231,000 saved from last year, the Treasurer stated that £157,000 of that amount was made up from moneys not spent on authorised works. He also said that an amount of £47,000 odd was saved mostly, I understood him to say, by means of a less expenditure on railways in connection with water for the railways. That brings the surplus down to £204,000. There is one item on which there is undoubtedly an over-estimate expenditure and it was taken into consideration by the Treasurer when he gave us the statement of how the surplus was arrived at: I refer to the amount that was saved out of the writing off the stores. I dare say the hon. member will be able to explain this matter. It may be that I am in a mare's nest over it. We passed an item of £60,000 for the stores account, and instead of that only £30,000 was expended. If the amount is included in the Treasurer's miscellaneous receipts I do not think he stated so, for in the Treasurer's department the over-estimate was £1,033. This item at any rate makes up the total amount of the surplus; but the Treasurer has told us that with the exception of the amount of £157,000 from the railways the remainder was

practically saved by means of better administration, and I admit a lot of money was saved in administration. But when we consider that £47,000 of the money was saved through a benevolent Providence in giving us plenty of water, not much credit is to be attached to that. At the same time I should not blame the Treasurer if he brought forward his Budget showing no surplus at all, because if money is voted to be spent it should be expended provided the works are to be carried out. I am only speaking about the surplus in order to understand what is likely to happen next year. In all probability we shall have much less money to spend then; we shall have less money on account of there being no surplus this year, and we shall have less money because of the farther reduction of the sliding scale. I am pleased the Treasurer has forecast an extra revenue from railways this year, and I am also exceedingly pleased to have heard the statement in regard to the Goldfields Water Scheme. If these prophecies are fulfilled when the next year's Budget is placed before the House, we shall see a happier statement than perhaps we otherwise might have done. With regard to the item of stores, we heard from the Treasurer some time ago very grave remarks with regard to the administration of the stores department in years gone by. When we consider that after re-valuing the whole of the stock and writing it down to what is considered a fair market value basis—and everyone must admit when the Treasurer saves the amount which he does on stores they have been written down to their fair value—when we consider after all the years that the department has been carried on and after shall I say so many millions of stock being put through that department, when we find that to put these stores on their marketable basis we only have to write off £45,000, I think the administration of that department in years gone by must have been admirable. I hope the Treasurer will agree with me on that point, and I should like to have heard the hon. member say something to that effect. There is no doubt some previous Ministers felt very hurt at the remarks uttered by the Treasurer when he spoke about the stores department 12 months ago. With

regard to the expenditure of money during the coming 12 months, as I have said before we have £1,100,000 to spend, and we find the Government propose first of all to spend £136,000 on education.

THE TREASURER: That £136,000 you include twice.

MR. PIGOTT: I simply gave it before as an illustration of our future administration, showing that if the present policy of the Government is to be carried out the cost of the Education Department will have to be increased greatly. We are to spend £136,000 per annum on education and we are also to spend £87,000 on new railways. On charitable votes we are to spend £167,000 and on public buildings, water supply, roads boards, and harbours £434,000, a large amount; but all this money is paid in by the people who are to receive it. Again, there is an item of £75,000 to be spent between mining batteries and the purchase of ore, which is an item I do not know much about, but from the expressions of some members I think it should be spoken of favourably. We are spending £72,000 on the upkeep of our railways and I cannot understand why it is that this amount has not been charged up to the administration expenses of the railways.

THE TREASURER: Previously it was charged to loan.

MR. PIGOTT: Then I agree with the Treasurer that it should not be charged to loan, but I think it should be charged to ordinary administration; it is for keeping the rolling-stock in order. If we put the amount down as expended almost on new works, we cannot debit the amount to our railways and increase the capital cost. I do not think that is to be done. I hope this amount in any future statement made up by the Treasurer controlling this matter will be charged to ordinary administration. We do not wish to be led away by any false book-keeping; I do not think there is any intention to do that.

THE TREASURER: It is only an analysis of expenditure.

MR. PIGOTT: It is an analysis of expenditure, but it should be put down as expenditure on administration, not as outside expenditure. We give £65,000 to municipalities and the Commonwealth is to spend £67,000, I take it, in this

country. After all that money has been expended we are to have a surplus of £1,500. Looking down the list of proposals by the Government, I do not think that much of the money could be spent in many other ways that would be of more advantage to the State. Taking the proposals as a whole I think the list a good one. I do not find fault with the proposals in that regard; I do not say I could have suggested where the money could have been spent in any better manner. There was another matter mentioned by the Treasurer in his speech; it is in regard to the dividend duties and the shipping companies affected by those duties who have hitherto, as the Treasurer said, failed to pay the amounts due to the Government; but I think in justice to those companies a word might have been said to give the true state of affairs. I am given to understand that many of these companies have approached the Treasurer and offered to settle their dividend duty matters in any way which the Treasurer could suggest as being a fair way, but it appears to me there is some flaw in the Act by which there is no possible means of assessing what is the true amount of profit earned by the companies in Western Australia. I am given to understand that some of these companies have already paid something in the way of dividends.

**THE TREASURER:** Two of them.

**MR. PIGOTT:** I am also given to understand that the others, at any rate most of the others, have offered to pay on a basis accepted by the other States or on a basis to be submitted by the Treasurer so long as it was considered by the companies to be a fair rate. I think the Treasurer should not have black-guarded those people in the way he did in this House the other evening, without stating the true facts of the case, that those people had said that if the Treasurer himself would not accept their offers they would be only too glad to hear any suggestion from him in the way of assessing the amounts to be reckoned as profits. But I know where the difficulty crops up. A duty exactly similar to this is collected in New South Wales. That duty is assessed on the total amount of freights outward from the ports, and five per cent. on those freights is taken as recognised profits of the company, the

duty being charged as against that five per cent.—what is known as five per cent. on five per cent.

**THE TREASURER:** In New South Wales two and a-half per cent.

**MR. PIGOTT:** Two and a-half per cent. on five per cent. I think I am right in saying these shipping companies offered to pay duty at this end in exactly the same manner, but if that were acceptable I am afraid the amount collectable would be small, because the outward freight earned by those shipping companies from Western Australia is next to nothing.

**MR. DIAMOND:** What has that to do with it? They are not the people to say on what basis they have to pay; but we are.

**MR. PIGOTT:** I quite agree with the member for South Fremantle (Mr. Diamond). If the Treasurer would say what they should pay, they would be only too willing to pay it to-morrow.

**THE TREASURER:** The Act says they have to pay on profits.

**MR. PIGOTT:** The Act says they have to pay on profits; the profits made in Western Australia or in the world?

**MR. DIAMOND:** Western Australia.

**MR. PIGOTT:** Will the Treasurer tell me when, in the case of a colonial ship starting on a voyage between Adelaide and Fremantle, the revenue starts in Western Australia and when it ends?

**THE TREASURER:** Your shipping friends may do that, if they try.

**MR. PIGOTT:** My shipping friends may do that if they try, but I dare say if the Treasurer had met them in a fair manner they would have fallen in with his views. It appears to me that unless we alter this Act we shall never get finality. We have this evening had an extending Bill so that those duties may be collected, but until these cases are fought in Court the matter will not be settled, unless the Treasurer will state some basis upon which these moneys shall be paid.

**THE TREASURER:** I agreed to let the Court fix it two months ago, but, as usual, we have got no farther.

**MR. PIGOTT:** How long is it since the Treasurer first took out a writ against these companies?

**THE TREASURER:** About six months ago, and that was after giving them about two months to suggest a scheme.

MR. PIGOTT: All I wish to say in this regard is that I feel sorry for the remarks of the Treasurer. I do not think the hon. gentleman spoke fairly of these people; and my opinion is that if he had given members to understand that offers had been made, even if those offers did not suit him, members would not have gone away with the bad impression made on their minds by the Treasurer. I was pleased when the Treasurer stood up this evening before I took the floor of the House, and stated that he would hand round farther details of the Estimates. I do not like the form these Estimates are in. Last year we heard complaints about the form in which the Estimates were then laid before us, but I venture to think that everybody is with me when I say that last year they were in a far better form than they are this.

THE TREASURER: They are in absolutely the same form as those in all the other States, and those for the Commonwealth.

MR. PIGOTT: I quite agree, but the items of expenditure are not shown in such a way that members can see how much was spent and how much not spent. In all previous Estimates that information was given, and the Treasurer has seen fit to say he will supply that information. In that matter I thank him very much, and I think he will earn the thanks of all members. But there is another matter, and that is with regard to the salaries of our public servants. The Treasurer has drafted these Estimates in exactly the same form as that in which the Estimates are drafted in Victoria, but he has forgotten that in Victoria the public servants are classified, whereas in Western Australia there is no classification at all; and after what has occurred lately and what we have heard with regard to the great amount of discontent existing amongst the public servants in this State, I think it is the duty of every member to demand that the Estimates shall give us the full details of the salaries paid to our public servants, so that we can go into the matter. I will admit that the administrative expenses in this State are large, and that they must be so. I cannot see how they are to be brought down to anything like the same level as the cost of administration

in the other States; but we have been waiting over two years for something to be done with regard to our public servants, for the service to be put on a footing satisfactory to the employees as well as to Parliament and to the State in general; yet nothing has been accomplished. A Public Service Commission was appointed, but I believe it is becoming a generally acknowledged fact that the work of the Commission will be absolutely useless. One of those commissioners resigned, I take it, from that board several months ago, and I believe he went away in disgust. I understand that he could get no satisfaction. Why it was I do not know, but there is something wrong, and the sooner this question is taken in hand the better. There must be some way of dealing with it, and we cannot go on like this. We cannot go on having a service that is discontented, but we must give those people some satisfaction. Let us find some means by which we can put the service on a good footing; let us give to those men who are discontented and who are worth more money than they are getting, full, fair, and just pay; and let us weed out those men who are what are known as the drones. That there are many men in our public service who are underpaid I know to be an absolute fact. I know of cases where men who went into the service upwards of 15 years ago are receiving now £100 per annum less than they were getting at that time. Those men, professional men, came to this State and were given work.

THE TREASURER: Fifteen years ago?

MR. PIGOTT: Over 15 years ago. They were paid fairly good salaries and told that their salaries would be increased in a fair ratio. I do not know many of those men, but I know some. Think of a professional man taking a position in the Government service, and then settling down in this State, probably marrying, bringing up a small family, and doing all he can to save money and buy a house, perhaps paying for it through a building society or something of that kind. Then think of that man being kept waiting year after year and finding the promises made never fulfilled. Can we understand how it is that they have been so good and faithful as they have been up to the present time?

THE TREASURER: Can you give an instance, privately?

MR. PIGOTT: I know of one case, and I believe that case has been attended to; but if there is one case, there must be many others like it, otherwise we should not have the discontent which exists. If something more is wanted in justification of my remarks, I think we have only to look at that report of Mr. Whitton on the Auditor General's office. We find him recommending that men in that department shall be paid 100 per cent. more per annum than they are getting to-day. What does that mean? It means to my mind only one thing—and the Labour party ought to consider this—that we have been sweating our civil servants worse than any other State in the Commonwealth has ever done.

MR. TAYLOR: Is that the fault of the Labour party?

MR. PIGOTT: It is not, but I think that when the Public Service Commission estimates come before us it will be the duty of the Government to give this matter fair consideration; and it is not the duty of members, when a paltry increase of £10 or £20 per annum is recommended, to get up and move that the addition be struck out because the officer has been getting £200 or £300 a year. I have seen that done more than once in this House.

MR. TAYLOR: On principle.

MR. PIGOTT: Because the man does not belong to a union.

MR. TAYLOR: Oh, no. That is not fair.

MR. PIGOTT: I would like to see before this Committee details of the salaries paid to all members of our service. I know that some increases have been made, and that there have been some decreases, and it is not the duty of members of this House to go through the Estimates and endeavour to find out where the increases have been made and where there have been decreases. I think that is too big a task for the Treasurer to set us to do. We want details the same as previously. No Government should be ashamed, if they had given an increase, to say so in black and white. If I were Treasurer or Premier of this State, and I thought it my duty to have a man's salary increased, that salary should be increased, or, if the House did not approve of the

increase, I would ask them to take charge of the concern. But I cannot for the life of me see any reason why these Estimates should have been altered from their original form. Last year we had them in detail, but this year they are nothing more nor less than a blind to us. With regard to the analysis of expenditure last year, we are going to have that remedied, and at the same time I would like the Treasurer to say he will give us the details of our civil service. We want this question threshed out. I do not think it is a good thing that we should have public meetings or semi-public meetings of our civil service to complain about the service.

THE TREASURER: How would you like the information—as an analysis?

MR. PIGOTT: The same as last year, when every man's salary was down.

THE TREASURER: We will give all the information.

MR. PIGOTT: If I ask how much Jack Jones is getting in the Treasury, will you be able to tell me?

THE TREASURER: Do you want me to put in the Railway Estimates the name of every man who gets £150 a year?

MR. PIGOTT: No.

THE TREASURER: You see the difficulty?

MR. PIGOTT: I do; but the Treasurer knows there is no objection to having the Estimates brought down in their original form. Every expenditure should be plainly and clearly set before members. The question of expenditure is the most vital question that comes before this House. I do not know what the proposals of the Government are with reference to the public service, but I would like to know them; and in order that we may have some discussion in regard to these estimates and with regard to the civil service, so that I can form an opinion as to what members think in this matter and as to what they think ought to be done in the public service, I am going to move an amendment which I hope members will take in the light that I simply desire a discussion on the subject. I want to hear the general opinion on the state of the public service, and to hear if any remedies are to be offered, or whether men are to be employed or sacked as the Minister may think fit, or are to have their salaries increased or decreased at

the will of the Minister, or whether we should have a public service board. I want to know the general opinion so that a conclusion may be reached once and for all. I think that if it is threshed out on the open question of the estimates, the matter of our public service may be settled in a few months. I am absolutely certain there is a way of overcoming the difficulty. I feel confident that the people of Western Australia do not wish to have an underpaid public service, and I feel confident that the public servants themselves are quite willing to accept a fair wage for a fair day's work, while I am absolutely confident in saying that in our public service we have some of the most faithful, conscientious, and hard-working men in the Commonwealth. I have heard it threshed out in this House that no man shall work more than eight hours a day. How then is it that some of our public servants, because they do not, as the member for West Perth puts it, have strings round their trousers and grease spots on their hats, are allowed to work shall I say 100 hours per week, or shall I say over 100 hours per week, not for one week but for many weeks without getting any fixed remuneration? In cases I know of I can commend the procedure on the part of the Treasurer, for gratuities have been given.

**THE TREASURER:** The very advances you suggest.

**MR. PIGOTT:** We can understand, when this thing is brought to light, how there is so much discontent. In my own opinion, these men have not had fair treatment. Our service has grown, as I hope our industries will grow, by leaps and bounds. Departments have sprung up like mushrooms in the night, we might say, and we have more men in some departments than we require, the consequence being that good men have been underpaid. If members will look at Mr. Whitton's report they will see that what I have said is absolutely correct. He has, I believe, recommended increases absolutely at the rate of 100 per cent., and the dismissal of some men. This shows that there were too many men in the Audit Department, and that good men were underpaid. He did not recommend that these men were not worth the money, but said "This work is worth so

much, and that man is capable of doing it and should have the money: you will never have your work done well unless you pay men well." I hope that when I move an amendment for a reduction by £1 of the first item, members will know that I do so with the object of getting this question of the public service discussed. I move—

That the first item be reduced by £1.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The question is that the first item be reduced by £1.

**MR. C. J. MORAN:** I beg to move that progress be reported.

**THE PREMIER:** No; go on. Some other members may wish to speak.

[Motion not pressed.]

**MR. A. J. DIAMOND** (South Fremantle): I do not propose to go into the whole of the questions raised by the leader of the Opposition. We do not always agree, the hon. gentleman and myself, but I agree with very many of his remarks this evening. I must, however, join issue with him on the question of the Treasurer's treatment of inter-State steamship companies. I venture to say I am voicing not only my own opinion, but that of the vast majority of members of this House, when I say that the steamship companies behave very badly to this State, and that the Treasurer has at his back the opinion of the vast majority of members of this House. I am very sorry that the leader of the Opposition has taken up the position he has taken. It appears to me he virtually contends that because New South Wales charges a duty on profits made on freights from Sydney, we should not get any duty on the profits of the company in this State. The argument is precisely the same as the argument the mining people would use.

**MR. MORAN:** On a point of order, the question before the Committee is the first item, on which an amendment has been moved. Have we left the general discussion and gone to details? I maintain that we are discussing a distinct item and an amendment on it. Let us have this clearly understood.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The practice is that the discussion on the whole of the Estimates takes place on the first item. The member for South Fremantle is in order.

**THE PREMIER:** When an amendment is moved, the discussion is confined to that item.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The amendment of the leader of the Opposition (to reduce the first item by £1) was out of order. To be admissible for debate, the amendment must be for a substantial reduction of the vote. Properly, I should not have put the amendment.

**MR. DIAMOND:** On the shipping question which has been mentioned, I have some knowledge. For the last nine or ten years the inter-State steamship companies have practically made their profits out of Western Australia; and I say it is a shameful thing that they should try to evade their responsibility and not pay duty on the profits earned through their trade to this State. I do not think any reasonable man can deny the fact that it is not the shipper of the goods who provides the trade, but the man who purchases the goods. If the shipments from Sydney, Melbourne, and Adelaide were not ordered by Western Australian merchants they certainly would not have been shipped here. Consequently the duty on the profits should be levied in Western Australia. The mining people tell us that as in England they have to pay an income tax on profits from our mines, they should not pay any duty on dividends from the earnings in Western Australia. I do not think any member of this House will agree with them in that. The Treasurer has done great service to this State in endeavouring to force these people to pay a reasonable and fair duty on profits. They have been making them out of Western Australia, and not out of Sydney, Melbourne, or Adelaide; and I trust members will have regard to their duty to their constituents and support the Treasurer in any steps he may take to force these people to pay a fair and reasonable duty on profits which they unquestionably get out of the West Australian trade. I feel very strongly on this subject, and on one or two occasions I have had the pleasure of giving the Treasurer some information on it. I feel confident that this House will indorse any reasonable, fair, and proper action on the part of the Treasurer in trying to force these people to pay what they ought to pay on the profits they earn from this State; and I regret

exceedingly to hear the leader of the Opposition virtually defending the action of these people.

**MR. MORAN:** It would be a very poor House if they did not have someone to speak for them. Let us have both sides.

**MR. DIAMOND:** I am satisfied from a practical knowledge of the fact, and there are other members of this House who have an equally practical knowledge of the fact, that these people have been earning large profits from this State. It is an outrage to say that because they pay duty in Melbourne, Sydney, or Adelaide they should not pay it here. I for one will loyally support the Treasurer in his attempt to make these people pay duties, and I hope and trust the leader of the Opposition will not have many supporters for the view he has taken.

[**SIR JAMES G. LEE STEERE** took the Chair.]

**MR. F. ILLINGWORTH (Cue):** For the many years I have been in this House I have taken great interest in the Financial Statements made from time to time. I think for the most part the House would expect that I should make some remarks on any Budget Speech that might be made. Therefore I have to thank Sir James Lee Steere personally for having relieved me from the Chair for a little while, in order that I may satisfy myself in some respects, and I hope also in some respects hon. members. I regret that the House is small, but I regret more that the House was very small when the Financial Statement was delivered. Members who have heard me in previous years will remember that I have constantly expressed my regret that, year after year, the seats are comparatively empty when the great speech of the session is being delivered. In my criticisms of the Budgets I have always tried not only to be fair, but to endeavour to treat the subject in a manner worthy of its importance. I desire to express at the outset my great satisfaction at the method of the Treasurer in presenting to the House the facts concerning this State's affairs. I think that of all the speeches delivered during the last ten years the speech of the Treasurer was the most interesting; and I think I shall not go too far if I say it was the most able presentation of the affairs of the State



that has ever been delivered in this House. I do no injustice to those who have gone before, but I think it unequalled for the clearness of its portrayal of the State's affairs. No better exposition, at any rate, has ever been given. I express my own conviction, perhaps based on the effect which the speech itself had on me. When I say this, I say it in what I believe to be honesty and justice; and I trust that the few remarks I have to make to-night will be made in precisely the same spirit, and received by the House in the spirit in which they are made. I speak for the interests of this State, with no party view of things, but with an earnest desire to let the people of this State understand the difficulties through which we have to pass, and to suggest as far as I can those means by which we may best meet the difficulties and avail ourselves of the advantages which lie before us in this great State of Western Australia. There is a certainty that we are living in prosperous times. The Treasurer's speech was highly optimistic. I believe that optimism was fully justified by the circumstances in which we stand. I believe that the right note was struck in the speech, indicative of the spirit in which we should go forward in this State and continue to develop, as we have so well developed in the past, the great natural wealth of the country. I trust that the spirit of hopefulness which was displayed on that occasion not only to the House but to the country at large will increase and grow stronger, and that we shall continue to realise more and more as the years go by what an immense heritage we have in this State, a heritage for the proper development of which there is required a continuance of that energy and perseverance which in times past have been so fully manifested. I hope we shall continue to realise that there is scope in this State not only for 220,000 people but for 2,220,000; that there are resources in this country which will amply justify the adventurous spirits of the earth in coming here, and will richly reward not only the experiments but the investments of the most enterprising people scattered up and down this great world, and especially amongst English-speaking nations. We have only touched the fringe of the prosperity which

lies before us; and I trust that the prosperity which is with us will be a growing prosperity, as I believe it will if we only act wisely, and avert by careful management some of the difficulties which lie before us, which as men we must be prepared to meet, and not only to meet but to conquer. Difficulties lie in our way, and always will; but the true spirit in which we as a people should meet difficulties is not to be deterred by them but to rise superior to them, and to bring to bear on the problems which lie before us that judgment and that energy which are necessary to overcome difficulties and turn them into successes. Now this has in a large degree been the spirit displayed in years past, displayed particularly by perhaps the greatest optimist we have ever had in this House—Sir John Forrest. Oftentimes I have felt that he in his optimism went too far, and I have said so. At the same time, I have always admitted that his optimism was to a very great extent justified; and it has been more than justified by the actual results. One remark which I made when I closed my criticisms upon the great loan policy of Sir John Forrest, on an occasion when in one night in this House we voted authority to borrow £7,200,000, was that I believed the future of this State would justify the extreme optimism and venturesomeness of the Premier. I said that then, and the years have come to justify it. At the same time I thought then, and from many points of view am disposed to think still, that his policy was not the safest method of guiding the affairs of a country—to launch away with that dead certainty of security which was felt in those days. However, the present has justified the past. Now I think that the optimism expressed by the Colonial Treasurer will in future be justified; but as the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Pigott) has said, there are difficulties in the way which we must carefully consider. Before I go any farther I should like to touch upon those points which have been recently presented to the House by the leader of the Opposition. I recognise that there is much in what he said; but I think that we may look at other phases of the question. Firstly, I wish to suggest that we are taking too much for granted when we say that at the end of

the term proposed in the Federal Constitution Act the bookkeeping system must cease. There is no reason why it should. I sincerely hope that a sufficient sense of common justice will prevail in the Federal Parliament to prevent their applying a system which would be destructive or at least greatly injurious to this State, grossly unfair; so unfair that I think it must be apparent to every member of the Federal Parliament that this State, which has contributed to the Federal revenue something like £5 11s. per head of population as against the £2 5s. to £1 16s. contributed by the populations of the other States, should not at once be called on to submit to a division of the customs revenue on a population basis. I think that the very unfairness of the proposition will lead to its rejection; and that at any rate, if we have not a continuance of the bookkeeping system we shall have some arrangement for the division of the customs revenue which will be fairer to this State than the system proposed in the Constitution. I say that the first duty devolving on us as the people of this State, now that the Federal elections are approaching—and I should like to say this to every elector from one end of this State to the other—the first duty which devolves on us is to pledge every man who proposes to become a member of the Federal Parliament to maintain as far as this State is concerned an equitable system of dividing the customs revenue; and next to that, to endeavour to secure for this State that means of communication which we all so earnestly desire, the Transcontinental Railway. I hope that these two questions at least, and the conserving of State rights, will be the prominent questions put before candidates for the Federal Parliament, and that this State will send to that Parliament men pledged every man of them to watch the interest of this State as a primary duty, and the interests of the Commonwealth as a whole as a comparatively secondary duty. [MR. MORAN: Too late.] Granting the truth of what the hon. member states by implication in his interjection—that federation was a mistake—the fact remains that federation is a step which has been taken; and we must endeavour as wise men to make the best of mistakes and not the worst. [MR. MORAN:

We should have been wise before.] We may have been foolish to take the step; but admitting that it was foolish to enter federation, it cannot be foolish to make the best of the circumstances rather than the worst. We have certain representatives to be elected for the first time, and others who will continue to represent us in that Parliament; and in the eleven men who will represent this State I hope we shall find men who will place the wants and the rights of this State before that Parliament in such a manner as to convince that Parliament that justice ought to be and must be done; and I believe that if the facts are fairly stated, justice will be done to Western Australia. However, I do not look on it as a foregone conclusion that the bookkeeping period will end with the five years provided in the Commonwealth Act. There is another conclusion which the leader of the Opposition seemed to take for granted, and on which I wish to express my opinion, while at the same time expressing my dissent. There has been a suggestion that the Federal Government should take our loans and our railways. Now I think we have sufficient control of our own affairs to be able to decide whether they shall or shall not; and as far as I am concerned, I wish to express the conviction that this State ought not to transfer its debts and its obligations to the Federal Parliament; that it will not pay us to do so; and that above all things we ought not to part and must not part with the control of our railways.

MR. MORAN: Did you not advocate, when you were advocating federation, that the Federal Parliament should take over the State loans?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: No.

MR. MORAN: I can prove that you did.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Well, if I did I was foolish.

MR. MORAN: That was one of your planks.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I do not think it was. However, I am prepared to admit that I have made as many mistakes in my life as most men. I think I am as good at making mistakes as others are. Some people confess that they have made them—that is satisfactory; other people do not. I am prepared to admit I have made many mistakes; and if I live much

longer I expect to make many more. I have not much confidence in the man who sets himself up as infallible. He is a man I do not want to meet. I wish to speak on this proposal; I have spoken of it before, and I hope the importance of the question will induce the House to bear with me if I mention it again, for I hope on every possible occasion to speak of it. We have in this State a fine system of railways which have been cheaply constructed; they are necessary for the benefit of our State; the increase of our railway system is necessary for the development of our country and our resources; and the control of our railway system must remain in the hands of the State. The railway system will prove the sheet-anchor of our finance in the first place, and will in the second place prove the very best possible means of meeting our obligations. Now I wish to ask those members who are interrupting me by talking, to bear with me patiently. I hope the railways will never pass from the control of the State, and as the question of taking over the State loans is linked with the question of taking over the railways, the State must take the responsibility of its own loan policy. There is another reason. We have provided in this State for sinking funds for our loans. This is exceptional so far as Australia is concerned. Too much prominence cannot be given to that. We have heard so much of the policy lately that the Press is beginning to speak as if the initiation of the policy was to be laid at the feet of the present Government. We should understand that the Forrest Government from the first inception of a loan policy established this wise system of a sinking fund.

**THE TREASURER:** The Crown Agents did it.

**MR. ILLINGWORTH:** To a certain extent. No loan has ever been proposed in the House that has not had with it a contingent redemption sinking fund. I have always spoken in favour of this, and in connection with this matter I may say that during the time of the Leake Government the question of the investment of that fund was criticised openly. If members turn to *Hansard* they will find a question was asked in the House when I was Treasurer—an adverse ques-

tion I think it was; at any rate adverse comments were made on it at the time—as to the investment of the sinking fund, and I as Treasurer replied that we were investing the sinking fund in our bonds below par, and we considered that the wisest thing to do. I am glad the House approves of that policy, and that the Treasurer is acting on it. The leader of the Opposition seemed to lament that in two or three years time we should be losing control of the distribution of the customs revenue, and should be losing our railways. I do not think the hon. member meant from that standpoint that the Commonwealth Government would be sufficiently liberal to us if we did lose £70,000 or £80,000 a year as far as interest was concerned. I hope we shall be able to pay this in time, and get free from the liability. We have a grand State railway system which is increasing and developing, and which must be the sheet-anchor of the State. A good deal has been said about the loan policy. We do not know very much about the Government loan policy, and I am not going to speak of it at this moment. I want to suggest to members that we might take into consideration the fact that the taxation through the customs will be a decreasing quantity. I do not know if members have just thought of it from that standpoint. As our own products increase, and as the sliding scale passes away, our contributions to the Federal Government through the customs will steadily decrease. We are paying a very large sum in duty upon goods imported from New Zealand and other places, while we ought to produce those goods ourselves. We are preparing to produce them, and with increased land settlement we shall produce them. Therefore the margin suggested by the leader of the Opposition will not be as large as he forecasts. Again, there is an item I would like to notice; it is the great Goldfields Water Scheme. According to the proposals submitted by the Minister for Works we may reasonably expect that some, if not all, the expectations of the promoters of the scheme will be realised; which means that we shall have interest and sinking fund—a three per cent. sinking fund on nearly three millions of money—provided by the scheme itself.

I am prepared to admit that we shall not reach this point at once. I want to call attention to one fact. The leader of the Opposition stated that at an early date we should lose a certain sum by our customs, therefore we shall have so much less money for the purpose of meeting our engagements. We lose on the one hand and we look for a greater income from the Goldfields Water Scheme, from the Fremantle Harbour and other works, and I venture to say a greater income from the railway system than we have had in the past; and from these works, even should we be unfortunate enough to lose a large sum to the Federal Government in the way suggested, we shall have a considerable amount of revenue. So I say we may look forward hopefully even to the worst side of that question; even if we fail to impress our rights on the Federal Government and have to part with our revenue on a population basis. First I say the revenue will not be as great, consequently the loss will not be so great, for we shall produce more in the State than we are doing and we shall pay less duty on the things on which we are paying duty now; we shall also have more income from the expensive works which to-day are not yielding their fullest results, though their fullest results may not be realised, but much fuller results will be realised in the future than in the past. Looking at the Estimates we have to take into consideration the fact that we have a surplus of £231,000. That is the savings of last year and the savings of the previous year. It is a matter of regret to me that out of so much money the Government only propose to spend a matter of £87,000 upon reproductive works—railways and the like. I had hoped that with so large a surplus, and with the promises of reduction which we received in the repeated utterances of Ministers, we should have had a much larger sum of money available for the really practical work of the State inside of its annual expense of government. Say what we will about the management of the State, and while we admit to the fullest that it must be proportionately more costly than the other States, it must be generally recognised the State costs too much to govern. Out of the income received sufficient does not go for the

general increased productiveness of the State. Out of so large a revenue we ought to have more money available, and I believe if we managed our affairs better we should have a sufficiency of money to invest in reproductive works which would make us to a large extent independent of the London money market. With the revenue we receive we ought to be able to expend close on a million of money on public works in this State. Money seems to drift away from us in many ways, and instead of expending money on things which would make the State better—on reproductive works and so forth—the money seems to drift away year by year. When I saw the figures growing up from £123,000 when I was Treasurer, to £231,000—nearly a quarter of a million of money—I hoped the Government would have come down to the House and proposed some large reproductive works out of revenue. I expected that, I hoped for that; I expected to find money for the commencement of the Port Hedland railway, that a large section of this railway would have been provided for. I was disappointed that only £87,000 was allotted for this kind of work.

MR. MORAN: The principal trouble is to find out where to make the savings.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: We must admit that while only £87,000 is proposed to be expended for railways out of surplus, we have a matter of £75,000 for such useful works as batteries, the provision for treating copper ore, and the general development of mining.

MR. PIGOTT: Twenty-eight thousand pounds of that is for rabbits.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The provision for rabbits is part of it. I am afraid rabbits are not a reproductive expenditure, though in a sense the expenditure is reproductive because it may prove a saving, and I hope it will save us from loss. I want before I sit down, for I do not intend to keep the House long, just to say a word or two on the loan policy of the Government. I have said a great many things in praise of the Government; I have said them honestly. I am going to say something in their dispraise, and I shall say that equally honestly. I say right out I do not approve of borrowing money in Australia. I know I am saying what is unpopular, but I am saying it with a

firm conviction that I am saying the right thing. I say the borrowing of money in Australia is a matter of sentiment, and altogether too expensive. I want the Committee to look at facts. On the 18th of September, 1901, we raised a loan of £1,500,000 at 3 per cent.; that loan realised net £88 10s. 8d. in the £100. On the 30th June, 1902, some seven months afterwards, we raised a loan of £1,500,000 at  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. We got into the Treasury for that loan £100 15s. 4d. in the £100. The Treasurer discounted that and brought it back to £98 15s. 4d., by charging the loan with the repayment of £35,000 which was paid for advance interest. I want to argue that point for a moment, and I ask the Committee to follow me. If we had the whole of the money paid on the date the loan was made, we could have got practically no interest on the money. We gave one, two, three, and four months' time for the money to come in; the money came in five days before it was wanted; consequently I say that the £35,000 is not a fair charge to take off. We paid interest from the date the loan was raised, and that has been the custom in connection with loans of this character; 20 per cent. is paid down and the rest paid at the time stated. The brokers take up the loan and get the interest, and they sell on that basis of getting the interest from the time at which the loan is issued. That enables them to unload, and helps us in the location of the loan, and I contend that it is no loss to the State; because if we were to insist upon having the money laid down at once, we should not be able to use the whole of it. We give an opportunity to the brokers, and so get a larger price for the loan. On a  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. loan £100 15s. 4d. comes into the Treasury. The fact that we had to pay the same interest is only the same thing as having to pay on moneys in hand before we can use them. It is the same as if a man borrowed £10,000 to build a warehouse. When he makes that arrangement he has to pay interest from the date of that arrangement.

THE TREASURER: He gets the money.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: He does not really do so, but for practical purposes he does. I ask members whether we do not practically get the money ourselves? We

make our arrangements to get the money in time for the purposes intended. What are the actuarial figures in connection with a 4 per cent. loan? Taking a  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. loan at par, a 4 per cent. loan is worth £110 14s. 5d.; I will give the actuarial figures first and the actual figures afterwards. I say that granting a  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. loan is worth par—and our own loan was floated at over par—a 4 per cent. loan is worth £110 14s. 5d. That is the calculation of the actuary of this State. A 3 per cent. loan is worth only £89 5s. 7d., so that the 3 per cent. loan we raised and obtained net for £88 10s. 8d. was very nearly approaching the equal of a  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. loan at par. Will members compare the actuarial calculation with the facts? On last Saturday, October 24th, in London this was the condition of the loan market: The Victorian 4 per cents. were selling at £104, but the Victorian  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cents. were selling at £95 10s., the difference being £8 10s. In round figures the difference actuarially is £10. The Victorian 3 per cents. were selling at £86, this being £9 10s. below the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. loan, which substantiates the actuarial figure that the difference between a 3 per cent. loan and a  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. loan is about £10, and the difference between a  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. loan and a 4 per cent. loan also approaches the £10. I want the House and the country to grasp the fact when dealing with loan policy it makes a very considerable difference what interest we pay. A 4 per cent. loan, supposing  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. to be at par, should be at £110, while a 3 per cent. loan should be at £90. On Saturday last the quotations for New South Wales were: For 4 per cents. £107 10s., for  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cents. £97 10s., and for 3 per cents. £86; so as far as New South Wales is concerned the same difference exists in the actual market.

MR. PIGOTT: Do these loans all terminate at one time?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The difference on account of termination is only trifling, but the nearer one approaches the termination the more the price is affected. Queensland 4 per cents. were £106;  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cents. £94 10s., and 3 per cents. £87; so members will see that the same kind of graduation in the market exists. I want to emphasise this

difference of £10 between 3 per cents. and  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cents., and also between  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cents. and 4 per cents. I believe members do not understand it as fully as they might, or at any rate do not think so much of it as they ought to do, nor do I believe the people of this State think so much as they should of the rate we raise our loans at. New Zealand 4 per cents. stood at £107,  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cents. at £101, and 3 per cents. at £90; South Australian  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cents. £99, and 3 per cents. £87; Tasmanian  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cents. £99, and 3 per cents. £91. Last Saturday, Western Australian  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cents. stood at £96, and 3 per cents. at £86.

MR. MORAN: How do those Western Australian  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cents. compare with the other  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cents.?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Western Australian  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cents. £96, New Zealand £101, Queensland £94 10s., New South Wales £97 10s., Victorian £95 10s.

MR. MORAN: We are about the average.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Above the average. The question of our financial position rests largely upon the way in which we treat our brokers. It does not pay to borrow money in these States, because when we do so we set all our brokers and all the people in London against us, and place ourselves at a disadvantage. I wish to call attention to another point. The Treasurer admitted that he had made arrangements with the London and Westminster Bank to lend him a certain sum of money at  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. At the very time the Government are paying 4 per cent. in these States and have to send most of the money away to London at an exchange cost—because it must be remembered that we have to pay in London between £700,000 and £800,000 a year for interest and sinking fund—at the very time we are raising money here at 4 per cent., with some slight expenses off, our own Perth Council raises a 4 per cent. loan at a premium, so that absolutely Perth city makes a better bargain than the Treasurer.

THE TREASURER: Would not the hon. member like to compare New Zealand with Western Australia?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I have given New Zealand figures, and I do not wish

to hide anything. I am not speaking adversely to the Government, but I am stating what I believe to be honest facts for the benefit of this State. I want to impress upon the Committee that it is only a sentimental policy to borrow money in these States, and also to urge that the amount of money available for this kind of loan is very limited indeed. When we come to British consols we find that on the 16th October they were quoted at £89 12s. 6d., and members must realise that when we have British consols down to a figure like this and have the rate of interest of the Bank of England—which is the barometer of the money market of the world—down to £3 11s. 3d., a little over  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., we cannot expect to raise loans on the most advantageous terms. Let us face the fact that if we get a 3 per cent. loan floated and only receive £89 for it, that is just as good business as getting £100 for a  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. loan; and £100 for a  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. loan would be just as good as £110 for a 4 per cent. loan. The question comes to us whether if we are going to raise money we ought not to try and obtain it in the best market and at the best price. It is said, "Well, of course if you raise £100 and only get £90 for it, you have not so much to spend." That is only a question as to how much you raise. If you want £900,000, of course you have to float a million, and although we have to pay interest at 3 per cent. on a million and return the whole of the million, the transaction is just as good if we only get £89 for the £100 as if we received £100 and paid  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. [Interjection by MR. MORAN.] A State has no posterity. When we are dealing with questions of this character we are not dealing with it for our own lives, but for the life of the State, and will members fix the period of a State's life? This is the only point at issue. I give the Government every praise for all they have done, and I suppose there has never been a harder working Government than the present. I hold the conviction that the Government have done what is above all other things the right one, they have given their principal attention to administration.

MR. MORAN: What are the results?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: If the results have not been all that we could desire,

they have been all that the Ministry could accomplish.

MR. MORAN: That is a back-handed compliment.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The hon. member may call it a back-handed or front-handed compliment, but let us be honest and deal with facts. Does the hon. member suppose that any Government, does he suppose that the Government of which he was a member, could alter a condition which has been growing for 10 or 12 years, with the abuses that have arisen, and necessarily so, in the rush and turmoil of the work which has had to be done? Does he think the experiments we have had to put forward, the changes that had to be made, and the things that had to be done in a hurry could be accomplished without abuses growing up? For years I have said that what this country wanted was not so much legislation as administration.

MR. MORAN: Now the country has it.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The country has administration; and I wish we had less legislation. I blamed the Government for bringing in too much legislation. I told the Premier privately, and I think he will not object to my mentioning it publicly, that if he brought in three or four Bills it would be sufficient. If the member for West Perth would wait and speak when I have done I would like it better. I am not up to answer interrogations; I desire to speak on the Budget Speech. The good administration of the Government is telling. Changes are being made that I, as having been a little while in the Ministry, know ought to have been made, and I am very glad changes which are desirable are also being made with regard to policy. Although I disagree with the Government as much as most people, I am glad to see that they are giving due attention to their officers and to the services of the State. Would members say that the reforms in the Treasury Department, which they have been asking for for years, are nothing? Have we not complained of the Audit Department for years, and have we not complained of the Stores Account? It was an outrage that £600,000 or £700,000 should appear in our balance-sheet as stores. The matter is being remedied, but it is not

fully remedied as yet, though £250,000 would cover the whole of our stores at present. This is due to administration, and administration in the right direction. Would members say there was not good administration in the Works Department, so far as the water scheme is concerned? Has there not been good administration in the Mines Department? I am not going to say anything about the Law Department, because I do not know much about it; but the Premier has been the most energetic Minister in charge of that department. Administration is what we need, and I want to impress on the Government the fact that we are not getting as much out of our revenue as we should to develop our works. Too much money is going somewhere, and it is the duty of the Government, and of every Government, to keep the expenditure down to the necessary works required, and to save as much as possible for reproductive works. I argue that we can do it without a loan policy. At the same time I would not hesitate to go in for a loan policy for fuller development, even if we have to pay 4 per cent. for our money. However, we must be certain that the work is going to repay us the 4 per cent. with sinking fund as well. These are the questions to be faced. The Government had better give up the sentimental idea of borrowing money in these States. It is too expensive and too costly a luxury. We should face the London market even if we pay well for our money.

THE TREASURER: Victoria is doing well with her loan.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Victoria proposes to pay 108½ for a 4 per cent. loan. That only brings the 3½ per cent. back to £94. Even if a State has a loan at £94 it will be a better transaction to pay 3½ per cent. than 4 per cent. Wherever our loan is raised, in London or elsewhere, we have to send three-quarters of a million home to London, and will have exchange to pay. London is the best place to raise the money. Every shilling in this State ought to be directed to the development of the State. I have one word to add with regard to the Savings Bank fund. During the discussion last year the Treasurer criticised a remark I made when I said that 5s. in the pound

was a sufficient reserve fund. The Treasurer made his statement on the strength of some bank manager that 2s. 6d. was sufficient.

THE TREASURER: I said 2s. 11d.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: We will say 3s. I want to give the House one single fact. Members will perhaps know a banking institution in London called Birkbeck's, perhaps one of the soundest institutions next to the London and Westminster Bank, and Birkbeck keep all their funds liquid. What was the actual effect 20 months ago when there was a run on Birkbeck's bank? Before they could stop the panic they paid out 24½ per cent. of their gold. If that could happen to a sound banking institution, would anyone say that 3s. in the pound is a sufficient gold reserve in our Savings Bank? No bank manager in the world who understands the question would say that 3s. was a sufficient gold reserve.

THE TREASURER: You should take Australian statistics.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I am taking my own figures. We have a Savings Bank with two millions of the people's money, and we have invested nearly £1,800,000. I say the liquid portion of the fund is only about £200,000, and I think that is not safe and proper financing. The account ought to be put in a different position. While we are perfectly safe so far as the creditors are concerned, because the State is behind the bank, and if there was not a shilling there the State would have to and would find the money, the financial position is not a good one, and the Government are not wise in using so much of the Savings Bank money. The Government should be satisfied in raising a 3½ per cent. loan if they can get one. Next, they should go to London for the money; and next the works on which they are going to spend the money they borrow should be reproductive enough to pay 3½ per cent. with sinking fund. Again, the Government should make every effort in regard to the management of the State so as to reduce the expenditure, and place as much revenue as possible upon reproductive works. I believe the Government are moving in that direction, and because I believe that I desire to encourage them and to express my satisfaction at what they are doing. In many respects

I approve of the Government. In some respects I disapprove of them. That is natural. However, I wish to offer these remarks for what they are worth, and having done so, I thank hon. members for giving me the opportunity to do so and for listening to me so patiently.

On motion by Mr. HIGHAM, progress reported and leave given to sit again.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 9:40 o'clock, until the next Tuesday.

### Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 3rd November, 1903.

	PAGE
Question: Midland Railway Company's Lands	1818
Pastoral Leases, Kimberley—Explanation of error	1818
Bill: Companies Duty Act Continuance, first reading	1819
Bills for Public Bodies: Joint Standing Order Amendment, remarks on procedure	1819

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock, p.m.

#### PRAYERS.

#### PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: 1, Roads Act, 1902—(a.) By-laws of the Yalgoo District Roads Board; (b.) By-law of the North-East Coolgardie District Roads Board. 2, Collie Municipality—By-law made under "The Weights and Measures Act, 1899." 3, Western Australian Government Railways—Alterations to Classification and Rate Book. 4, Fremantle Harbour—Reports, etc., as to the best method of providing appliances and accommodation for dealing with cargo and vessels at Fremantle. 5, Department of Agriculture—Annual Report for the year ending 30th June, 1903.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: In reference to the report as to harbour