

license. A farmer's vehicle may break down, and very often his neighbour takes the other man's wheat to the siding. For doing that he is expected to take out a carrier's license. I move an amendment—

That paragraph (a) be struck out.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: I understand the amendment refers more to the carriage of passengers than of goods, and is not brought forward at the instigation of the grape growers.

The HONORARY MINISTER: If a settler is merely obliging a neighbour, I am sure we can leave it to the local authority to deal with the matter fairly and equitably. In some districts deliberate attempts have been made to avoid taking out licenses, and because of the word "regularly" the authorities have been unable to take proceedings against them.

Hon. W. J. MANN: What does the word "regularly" mean?

The HONORARY MINISTER: The interpretation is left to the determination of the court, which has found great difficulty in dealing with cases in which evasions have occurred. The use of this word has hampered the authorities to a very large extent. I do not think action would be taken against one person who was merely helping another out of a difficulty.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I know of men who have had their ordinary licenses suspended because they have helped their neighbours.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: If the word "regularly" is struck out of the Act, numbers of people who are struggling for a living will be adversely affected. The local authorities are not likely to take a lenient view of even a slight offence of this kind, but will read the Act as it appears on the statute-book. People should not be rendered liable to prosecution for helping others. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I support the amendment. I am informed that in the grape-growing districts men have been proceeded against by the local authorities because they did some carting for their neighbours. When the matter was referred to the department the officials said, "You have got us there; we shall have to amend the Act." I am opposed to doing anything that savours of an injury to our primary industries.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I support Mr. Thomson's proposal. Paragraph (a) will undoubtedly impose restrictions upon numbers of people. In Kalgoorlie the taxi drivers tried to stop private car owners from driving their friends to the railway station. I am not going to do anything that will prevent people from giving me a free ride.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 6.15 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 10th October, 1935.

	PAGE
Bills: Workers' Homes Act Amendment (No. 2), 1R.	1054
Betting Control, 1R.	1055
Financial Emergency Act Amendment, Com. report	1056
Industries Assistance Act Continuance, returned	1056
Annual Estimates, 1935-36: Votes and Items discussed	1056
Premier	1057
Treasurer	1057
Minister for Forests	1059
Minister for Justice	1073

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

BILL—WORKERS' HOMES ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

First Reading.

MR. NORTH (Claremont) [4.35]: On behalf of the member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) I move—

That leave be given to introduce this Bill.

MR. LAMBERT (Yilgarn-Coolgardie) [4.36]: In view of the Bill to amend the Workers' Homes Act now before this House, is it competent to move for leave to introduce another Bill to amend that Act?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes. I do not yet know the amendment or amendments proposed by the Bill.

Leave given.

Bill introduced, and read a first time.

BILL—BETTING CONTROL.

Introduced by Mr. Marshall, and read a first time.

BILL—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

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

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1935-36.

In Committee of Supply.

Debate resumed from the 1st October, on the Treasurer's Financial Statement, and on the Annual Estimates; Mr. Sleeman in the Chair.

Vote—Legislative Council, £1,742:

Vote put and passed.

This concluded the general debate.

Votes—Legislative Assembly, £2,374; Joint House Committee, £4,017—agreed to.

Vote—Joint Printing Committee, £4,541:

Item, Reporters, £3,855:

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I do not know whether the members of the Joint Printing Committee are aware of it, but in this State there is going to be a great shortage of verbatim reporters. Unless "Hansard" is at some future date to pass out of existence, the Joint Printing Committee ought to make some arrangement to secure junior reporters, so that we shall have men capable of taking up the work of the present reporters. I do not for a moment suggest that the present members of the "Hansard" staff are not capable of doing their work; but if one or two fell ill at the same time, there would be great difficulty in filling their positions. The Joint Printing Committee might see whether they cannot encourage some of the younger men in the State to take up shorthand reporting. Nearly the whole of the shorthand work in Western Australia is done by women and girls. I do not know that it is desirable to have girls on the "Hansard" reporting staff; I doubt whether they would be physically capable of doing the work, which frequently extends over very long hours, and in any case, they would be totally unsuitable for it. One or two junior reporters should

be encouraged to come along and demonstrate whether they can do the work. I point out these things to the Joint Printing Committee for their grave consideration.

Mr. WITHERS: For the information of the Leader of the Opposition I may state that the Joint Printing Committee have met and considered the question he has just raised, and have made a recommendation along the lines suggested by the hon. gentleman.

The PREMIER: I have received from the Joint Printing Committee a request about this matter, and it is now under my consideration. At the same time, I feel bound to say that no greater strain is imposed upon the "Hansard" staff in this session than has been the case in years gone by.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Certainly not. Probably the strain during this session is not as great.

The PREMIER: That is all I have to say about the matter.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Joint Library Committee, £260:

Mr. LAMBERT: How often do the Joint House, Joint Printing and Joint Library Committees meet? I understand, whether correctly or incorrectly, that the Joint Printing Committee meet very seldom. When did the committee meet last, and how many times have they met during the currency of this Parliament? There is a considerable amount of work to be done by that committee. An enormous amount of information should filter into this Parliament and into the Parliamentary library. If the committee were active, much literature helpful to members would be made available. I would like to know from a member of the committee how often they have met during, say, the last two years, and what endeavours they have made to procure literature especially serviceable to Parliament. Several times have I suggested that we should send to America and other places for literature. There is a great deal of literature dealing with all phases of manufacturing, economic and all other activities, which would be very useful to members if made available in our library. However, if the Library Committee are doing nothing at all to secure suitable literature, there is no opportunity to make it available to those members who desire it. The library is getting into a most deplorable state. I under-

stand that a lot of our books have been sent to the Public Library.

Mr. Raphael: And some are to be found straying about the House.

Mr. LAMBERT: There are many works on technical matters which it is only necessary for the Library Committee to write for to have sent along free of cost, books such as law books.

The Minister for Justice: You can get nothing free of cost.

Mr. LAMBERT: There are valuable technical books on mining and agriculture, but we do not see them here. Again, in our newspaper room there is a whole lot of rubbish. If the Library Committee are not prepared to meet and discuss these matters, they ought to be removed by the House. There was a time when we used to get every bulletin issued by the Department of Agriculture, but we never see them here now.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Oh yes, many of them.

Mr. LAMBERT: I protest against the inactivity of the Library Committee. We have a right to know whether the Vote for our library is justified. All that is ever added to the library are a few works of fiction. I get bulletins dealing with dehydration and viticulture, and our Library Committee could get the same. We have a right to know when last that committee met. The member for Greenough (Mr. Patrick) is on that committee, so perhaps he will tell us when last they met, and what books they purchased.

Mr. PATRICK: As a member of the committee I presume that the Speaker, or some other authority, is responsible for calling us together. However, I have never been asked to attend a meeting. If the hon. member has any concrete proposal to put before the Library Committee, no doubt they will hold a meeting at which to deal with it. As for what that committee do with the money supplied under this Vote, I can only say that £260 for the rebinding of books, and all incidentals, is certainly not extravagant.

Mr. LAMBERT: This is not a matter of buying a few novels with which to entertain members at week-ends.

Mr. Rodoreda: The committee do not even do that.

Mr. LAMBERT: That is so. There are valuable books and pamphlets issued by various departments in America, Canada,

England and elsewhere dealing with almost every aspect of our social, economic and domestic life; yet we never see one of them here, merely because the Library Committee are utterly inactive.

Mr. North: Would you be in favour of Russian works and information being put into the library?

Mr. LAMBERT: If that would be acceptable to the hon. member, I should not be opposed to it. It is a matter for the hon. member's decision, but I fancy his ideals are more revolutionary than those to be found in Russia.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member cannot discuss the member for Claremont on this Vote.

Mr. LAMBERT: We on the Joint House Committee have to meet and regulate everything inside Parliament House.

Mr. Thorn: And you have even cut out our boxes of matches.

Mr. LAMBERT: Only for non-payers.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is nothing about boxes of matches in this Vote.

Mr. LAMBERT: It is a slur on the Library Committee that I am not able to get any information as to when the committee last met. They are the servants of Parliament, just as are the members of the Joint House Committee and other committees. They have never made any endeavour to bring the library up to date. Numbers of the bookshelves in the library are barren to-day, and a lot of our books were sent to the Public Library. I do not know by whose authority that was done. Parliament House should be the repository for books in the parliamentary library, and they ought not to be under Dr. Battye, or anybody else. The Library Committee should be securing pamphlets on the League of Nations, on economics, on agriculture, and on mining or any other activity, so that members could get information as to what is going on in other parts of the world. The Mines Department has a library, under a decent old chap, but it is in the basement, and one has to crawl through prison-like vaults to reach it, and so no one has any idea as to what literature is to be found there. I suggest to the Library Committee that if they are prepared to continue in their positions, they should render some little service to Parliament.

Miss HOLMAN: As a member of the castigated Library Committee, I wish to say that the hon. member is on an entirely wrong

track. If he were complaining about the large amount of money we spend, there would be something in it, but it is ridiculous for any member to stand up here and say the Library Committee should secure technical informative works from all over the world when we have only £260 to spend on all library purposes, including re-binding of books. I agree that our library should be well stocked, but the money is not available with which to do it. Whenever there has been a request for a special book, notably a book on economics, that book has been procured, if at all possible. It is of no use complaining of the state of the library when we have no money to spend on additional books. As for books being sent away, it must be remembered that there are rooms in Parliament House which are over-stocked with books. If the Parliament House building were added to and finished, there would be sufficient room for a decent library.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I should not like it to go forth that the remarks made by the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie are justified. My experience is that when a member asks for any particular book, generally he can get it. Moreover, I think the library is well stocked. Of course, we could do more if more money were available, but considering the limited amount the committee have to spend, the library is certainly well stocked. Whenever I want a book, generally I can find it in the library. We should encourage those who devote a good deal of time to maintaining the library and keeping it up to date. The member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie has special opportunities for securing publications. The hon. member is evidently on the free list of certain publications issued by the Government of Japan, as I spent a very interesting hour perusing translations which the hon. member made available.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is not in order in discussing the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The hon. member spoke of the need for adding to our library technical books dealing with various activities, and I was merely mentioning that he evidently was on the free list of Japanese publications. The hon. member would not expect to find such publications in the Parliamentary Library, but that is not to say that the library is not up-to-date.

Mr. LAMBERT: It is a matter not of expenditure but of activity and interest.

Miss Holman: Governed by expenditure.

Mr. LAMBERT: Newspapers receive free copies of books, and I think it would be worth intimating to London publishers through the Agent-General that we have a library. There is no need for expenditure. In the United States the Bureau of Mines, the Bureau of Agriculture and the Bureau of Standards issue wonderful publications that would be of interest to some members, and if those departments were communicated with, our Parliamentary Library would be placed on the free list.

Mr. MARSHALL: Shall I be in order in moving that the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie be added to the Joint Library Committee?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member would be out of order.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Premier's Department, £17,964:

Item, Royal Visit, 1934, £1,208.

Hon. N. KEENAN: Why is £1,208 to be spent this year on the Royal Visit of 1934? Is the amount to cover late bills?

The PREMIER: The Royal visit last year was conducted on very inexpensive lines. The only function of a public nature of expense to the Government was the garden party. On the occasion of previous Royal visits, a banquet, two balls and a garden party were held. The total cost of the Royal visit of 1934, including Railway Department services, was £2,817. The amount now provided includes a delayed recoup to the Railway Department of £1,128.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Governor's Establishment, £2,007:

Item, Upkeep of Gardens, Perth and Albany (including wages) £1,200.

Mr. MARSHALL: I enter my annual protest against this expenditure. A State Governor and State Government houses constitute a luxury that Western Australia cannot afford to maintain. I know that my remarks will not be regarded as being directed against the Lieut.-Governor, because I have voiced them in the past. I cannot see any necessity for a State Governor or his establishment.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot discuss the Governor under this item.

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not intend to; I am speaking of the expenditure on the Governor's establishment. What purpose does the institution serve the people? While there is occasion to tax the people as at present, the proceeds should not be expended in this way.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The item is largely for labour.

Mr. MARSHALL: Money might be spent on unprofitable labour.

Mr. Raphael: Misdirected labour.

Mr. MARSHALL: If we are going to employ men at this cost, we should get some return for it. I have been endeavouring to get money for roads to develop the State, but I have been told that no money is available for the purpose. Yet £1,200 a year can be found for the upkeep of the Governor's establishment.

Mr. North: It is a smaller burden than is carried in the other States.

Mr. MARSHALL: The amount does not count. Taxation is not justified unless it produces useful results. For this expenditure, there is no return to the taxpayers. Wells along stock routes are of vital importance to the country, and there is no money available to provide them. Money is wanted for roads and schools in my electorate, but none is available. If the £1,200 were divided amongst the road boards in my electorate for one year only, the needs of those districts would be greatly relieved. Later in the Estimates I intend to complain of a shortage of money for material requirements. The Government would be well advised to lease or sell Government house sites. The Perth site would serve a useful purpose for a town hall.

Mr. Raphael: That is the idea.

Mr. MARSHALL: While many urgent needs in my electorate remain unsatisfied, I shall continue to protest against this expenditure.

The PREMIER: The hon. member's remarks, I consider, are entirely out of place. Surely he understands that a necessary connection between a Dominion and the British Government is a Governor or Lieut.-Governor, and that a residence must be provided for him. The hon. member talks about the expenditure of £1,200. I ask him if it would be possible for roads, wells or schools to be established in this State if we cut off our connection with Great Britain, which is what

the hon. member asks? There would not be many roads, railways or water supplies here if we were left to our own resources. It is not fair to the State to argue about the cost of the British connection with us. The Governor's establishment is part of our connection with the British Empire, the Home authorities. The people of this State would not advance very far if we cut our connection with what is to-day associated with the Old Country.

Mr. MARSHALL: To a degree I endorse the remarks of the Premier, but would ask of what value this State would be to the Motherland, were it not for what we have done to develop it. How many Governors would there have been but for that development? Logically, we would not want a Governor at all were it not for the activities of the people of the State. We cannot produce wealth without assistance from the Government, and if we did not produce it we would not be of much value to the Motherland. This expenditure ought not to be incurred whilst the State is in its present financial difficulty.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: You want a Governor at no cost.

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not want a State Governor at all.

The PREMIER: Neither do I.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Governor-General should suffice to maintain our connection with the Motherland.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Executive Council, £5—agreed to.

Vote—London Agency, £9,581:

Mr. SAMPSON: I understand there are no Western Australians on the staff of the Agent-General. If that staff is to give its best services, it is essential that members of it should have an intimate knowledge of conditions here. That would be helpful to callers and to the State in general. It would be competent for the Government, when vacancies occur, to select persons who are best qualified to carry out the work. I suggest they should give consideration to that point.

Vote put and passed.

Votes—Public Service Commissioner, £1,259; Government Motor Car Service, £2,172; Printing, £53,792—agreed to.

Vote—Tourist Bureau, £2,050:

Mr. SAMPSON: This bureau offers to the Government an opportunity to gain revenue and also to make the State better known. Western Australia has much to show travellers—the Caves, wildflowers and many beauty spots. The money provided on the Estimates does not permit of the necessary publicity in other countries. If more money were provided for this purpose, it would come back twenty or fifty-fold.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Literary and Scientific Grants, £10,380:

Mr. NEEDHAM: Apparently no provision is made on the Estimates for a circulating library. Good as the existing library is, it would serve a far more useful purpose if people were allowed to take books away. I understand that certain persons are privileged to do that, but not the public in general. Most of the books must be read within the building. Young people are often handicapped in their studies because they cannot take books away.

The Minister for Justice: Many people visit the library in the evening.

Mr. NEEDHAM: I should like to see the good work extended by the establishment of a circulating library.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Fisheries, £4,197:

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: I should like to draw the attention of the Premier to the devastation that is now being caused by the kangaroo, on whose skin the Government collect a royalty when it is marketed. I urge upon the Treasurer to remove that royalty. Will he assist those settlers who are now in dire circumstances owing to the ravages of the kangaroo by foregoing the small amount he collects by way of royalty? On some stations and farms there are more kangaroos than sheep.

The Premier: I hope to be able to remove the royalty on kangaroo skins at no distant date.

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: I am satisfied.

Hon. N. KEENAN: The Fisheries Department is much undermanned and in consequence there is grave danger of coastal fishing being seriously affected. In my opinion, this is a very serious matter. Those

who know the coast are aware that in the past there were many excellent fishing grounds that are now practically useless because a certain class of fisherman has systematically destroyed fish over a long period. There is no possibility of stopping that practice with the present staff or the boats available. In the waters between Fremantle and Rockingham there is scarcely a chance of getting a schnapper or jewfish although formerly fish were plentiful there. Similarly, well-known fishing grounds further south are practically worked out simply because of the quantity of immature fish that have been destroyed. Some time ago I travelled down the coast in a small launch and the fishermen we saw thought we were agents of the Fisheries Department. There was a great hubbub and the men dragged their net in with celerity in order to avoid trouble. I can assure the Premier that if he were to make inquiries from the Chief Inspector, Mr. Aldrich, he would find out that the facts are beyond doubt. Fish is a necessary alternative diet from a health point of view, and it is of importance that we shall preserve our fishing grounds. A little while ago a society was formed to deal with the matter from the private fisherman's point of view, but an organisation of that description cannot go far. The society has no authority and little funds, and its inspectors can do nothing. I ask the Premier whether he can see his way clear to increase the Vote and so enable the fishing grounds to be better policed.

The PREMIER: I agree with what the hon. member has said. We propose to employ a full-time inspector on the work, instead of a part-time officer.

Mr. THORN: I support the remarks of the member for Nedlands. I have seen the fishermen he refers to netting regularly and throwing all the small fry on the beach. If they took any interest in the future of the fishing industry, they would be decent enough to put the small fish back in the sea.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Their nets must have too small a mesh.

Mr. THORN: These people destroy millions of fish every year. A larger proportion of the coast should be closed against these fishermen. One of the finest bays in the State is that near Rockingham. It is a natural breeding ground for fish and there is one small channel only between Garden Island and Point Peron. It provides the

fish with an ideal sanctuary. It is our duty to preserve the industry and not allow these people to destroy so many young fish.

Mr. Marshall: They are mostly foreigners.

Mr. THORN: Yes, practically all the fishermen I refer to are foreigners. The industry is valuable and well worth protecting. Not only should we close a larger area against net fishing, but we should force the use of a larger mesh. With reference to the kangaroo pest, representations have been made to the department, and I simply desire to bring under the notice of the Premier the fact that there are two properties not far from Perth where the kangaroos are absolutely eating the people out. Those properties are on the Moore River within 40 or 50 miles of Perth. The holders of the property can hunt the kangaroos but they are not allowed to shoot outside the boundaries of their holdings, without special permission having been received from the authorities. Two years ago they were granted the necessary permission, and on those two properties they shot 5,000 kangaroos.

The Premier: How big were the properties?

Mr. THORN: They were grazing holdings on the coastal areas adjacent to Gingin and the Moore River. The properties were taken up for spelling cattle, the beasts being brought back inland after a while for fattening. If the people concerned cannot secure similar permission again, I am afraid they will have to look for something else to do. The trouble is that there are some people who will not stick to kangaroo shooting but indulge in it only when they require a few extra shillings. Those are the people who complain against such permission being granted.

The Minister for Justice: Prices affected the position, too.

Mr. THORN: That has something to do with it. I hope the Government will not attach too much importance to the objections raised by the section I have referred to.

Mr. RAPHAEL: My attention has been drawn by a number of bird trappers and dealers to the hampering effect of the restrictions on the trapping of birds in the North-West. The chairman of the Parks and Gardens Board laid down the restrictions under which the date for trapping has been altered from the 1st September to the 1st October.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member cannot discuss the Parks and Gardens Board on this item.

Mr. RAPHAEL: I will discuss it with reference to the provision for inspectors. The controllers of the Zoological Gardens, which is a governmental activity, have entered into active competition with private bird dealers. I do not think the Premier knows much about this matter; he is not a bird lover.

The Premier: I have about 200 of them at home, although I confess I do not know much about them.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The hon. member cannot discuss the Zoological Gardens.

Mr. RAPHAEL: The hon. member does not know what I can discuss.

Hon. C. G. Latham: On a point of order, is the member for Victoria Park in order in discussing the Zoological Gardens, seeing that we have already passed the Zoological Gardens Vote under Division No. 15?

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Victoria Park is not in order in discussing the Zoological Gardens.

Mr. RAPHAEL: I hope that next year the season for bird trapping will commence on the 1st September again. That will enable the exporters of birds to have an opportunity to participate in the business. It will mean tens of thousands of pounds to the State if the restrictions are lifted.

Mr. WANSBROUGH: I do not altogether agree with the total abolition of netting. Some people think that if we close certain waters, it will assist in fish breeding. That is wrong because not half our fishing grounds are breeding grounds. Albany Harbour is not a breeding ground; it is really a hospital. The fish enter the harbour and if they are not caught, they go back to the deep water as soon as they are recovered. I was pleased to hear the Premier say that it was intended to appoint a full-time inspector, and I hope he will provide that official with some suitable conveyance. Recently two inspectors were sent to the south coast, but the people who were illegally net fishing there knew the inspectors were on their way before they had travelled any distance. The result was that when the inspectors arrived at their destination, they found the fishermen on the shore reading quite happily. The worst feature of it is that the offenders are not Britishers; in fact, they are not white people at all. These people are getting away with the fish,

and it is time that a permanent inspector, with a suitable conveyance, was appointed to deal with the problem.

Mr. Thorn: They used to fire a gun from here when the inspectors left.

Mr. WANSBROUGH: I know of one place along the Great Southern where the people are kept posted as to where the inspector is. The inspector should have a free hand to go where he likes and when he likes, and when the Premier is appointing an inspector I hope he will consider the various phases I have submitted.

Mr. STUBBS: The scarcity of fish in the rivers and estuaries is alarming to me as one who has taken a good deal of interest in the fishing industry for the past 40 years. It was quite a common thing a few years ago to be able to make a good catch of flounder in the Swan River in the space of a few hours. I venture to say that if anyone went fishing now and sat all day in a boat, he would be lucky indeed if he got one fish. For this state of affairs the thousands of cormorants that are to be seen on the river are largely responsible. Everyone is aware of the capacity of these birds for catching and eating fish. I have seen them swallowing fish as long as themselves. It is not an uncommon sight to see a cormorant bring to the surface a cobbler 15 or 18 inches long and, after a struggle, get it down his throat and very soon afterwards dive for more. I am not joking when I say that a bird can eat three or four pounds weight of fish per day, and there are thousands of cormorants on the river. Illegal netting is also responsible for the disappearance of fish, and that shows the need for policing the waters. It is quite a common thing to see nets stretched across the Murray River the waters of which, at one time, were beautiful fishing grounds. I ask the Premier to make available a little more money so that additional inspectors may be appointed; otherwise it will be a matter of only a short time when people will have to pay for fish double the price that is being asked to-day. Nine out of every ten fish we see exposed in the windows of shops controlled by Greeks at the present time have the eyes sunk into the back of the head, proving that they have been dead for months. That is to say, they have been frozen for months, and naturally cannot be compared with freshly-caught fish.

Unless steps are taken to protect the waters along the coast and in the rivers and estuaries, it will be only a matter of time before fish will be a scarce commodity, and the price will be very high.

Mr. CROSS: I wish to call attention to a practice that is sometimes indulged in in the upper reaches of the rivers, which should be stopped, that is the dynamiting of fish. Two months ago I was invited to inspect the damage that had been done to the Kent street weir where someone had dynamited fish the day before. In the process of dynamiting the fish they had done considerable damage to the weir. People who do that sort of thing should be severely dealt with. The Leader of the National Party referred to the formation in Western Australia of a society for the protection of fish spawning grounds. I should like the Premier, if possible, to make available a grant of, say, a few hundred pounds to assist that society in carrying on its work. The money could be expended under the control of the Fisheries Department. It is imperative that action be taken to protect our rivers and estuaries because of the manner in which they are being depleted of fish. What the member for Wagin said is not in the least degree exaggerated, and something should be done before the position becomes hopeless.

Mr. McLARTY: I desire to appeal for transport facilities for the inspectors. If the officers are to do their work properly, it is necessary that they should have both road and water transport facilities. As pointed out by the member for Wagin, in my district there is a very large area of water. As everyone knows, it is close to the metropolitan area, and it is impossible for an inspector properly to police the waters unless he has means of rapid transport. In days gone by farmers could get a cartload of fish from natives at the Serpentine River by giving them one or two sticks of tobacco. Indeed, the fish were so plentiful that some farmers used them as manure. The position is not quite as bad as was painted by the member for Wagin, who declared that it was not possible to get a bite for hours at a time.

Mr. Stubbs: I know; I have tried it.

Mr. McLARTY: Fish is still to be obtained in abundance in the Murray River, but the close proximity of that river to the metropolitan area has led to a great deal of

illegal net fishing. Men go there at night in motor trucks carrying a boat on the truck, and launching it in the river. They put their nets out, and it is not their concern how many under-sized fish they throw on to the banks. If an inspector has to police that great stretch of water, it is necessary that he should have water and road transport facilities. The acclimatisation committee is doing good work in trying to acclimatise fish in suitable waters, and their efforts should be encouraged. There are a number of rivers and lakes close to the metropolitan area into which fish could be placed and bred, but if we continue as we have been doing, in a short time there will be no fish at all.

MR. COVERLEY: I, too, desire to make a request for the appointment of an inspector in the electorate I represent for the purpose of protecting the fauna in that part of the State. I am aware that there are just as many birds trapped in the Northern Territory and taken by motor truck to the Eastern States. Of course that is legitimate trade. The Fisheries Department do what they can to protect the fauna in the far North, and I have no complaint to make. I have received the utmost courtesy and assistance from the department. The dates for trapping are governed by the seasonal conditions, and while the department may say they will declare the season open on the 1st September in a particular year, it may be necessary to postpone the opening until October or November, which is, in my opinion, the proper thing to do. The department are requested by trappers to open the season as early as possible because they are anxious to get on with their business. On the other hand, the department may receive a request from dealers in birds to postpone the opening of the season, which of course, would be better business from their point of view. The only way to overcome the matter would be for the department to have an inspector appointed and sent to the North-West in August. The department must accept the advice, very often from people interested in the trapping of birds. I am aware that the department have a legal adviser in Kimberley, but he himself actually buys birds and sells them. I say without fear of contradiction that in some cases his judgment is swayed by the orders he receives to trap birds for sale. Thousands of pounds have been spent in my electorate in buying birds. Ten years ago there were perhaps two bird trap-

pers in the district while to-day there may be a dozen. The business is very remunerative, and is looked forward to as a seasonal occupation by many Kimberley residents. In the interests alike of trappers, dealers, and the department, the Minister controlling Fisheries should appoint an inspector to go North for a few months during the season. An hon. member referred to the export of birds. That is a matter controlled not by the State but by the Commonwealth, and our State Fisheries Department is not responsible. I hope the Premier will give consideration to my request for an inspector to be sent North about August for the purpose of advising the department of seasonal prospects and other particulars required.

MR. FOX: Exaggerated statements have been made as to the number of small fish destroyed in enclosures. I have spoken to fishermen—men whose livelihood is gained by fishing—and they tell me that their custom is to throw back the small fish. One of the reasons why the fish on our coasts have become depleted is the intense fishing that has been going on during the last 30 or 40 years. Even 30 years ago it was easy to catch fish in Fremantle Harbour. Since then, however, shooting has gone on there, and has killed thousands of fish. Shooting is going on in the harbour now. Some years ago a ship came into the harbour on fire. Her holds had to be flooded, and she was carrying dynamite. The result was that many thousands of fish were killed. As pointed out by the member for Wagin, the number of shags on the river is responsible for the destruction of many fish. If a ban were placed on those birds, the fish in the river and also in the harbour would increase. I agree with the suggestion to subsidise the society that is attempting to breed trout and other fish in our rivers. The same attempt has been made in Victoria; and on my recent visit to that State I saw rivers, which had no fish when I was a boy, stocked with trout and other fish.

MR. RAPHAEL: I agree with part of what the member for Kimberley has said, but not with all of his remarks. In Eastern States bird shops I recently saw large numbers of Western Australian birds—in spite of the statement of the member for Kimberley as to transport of our birds overland to the Eastern States. I say definitely that on one train I saw 25,000 birds carried from

this State to New South Wales last year. That traffic is not being policed.

Mr. COVERLEY: There should be closer inspection.

Mr. RAPHAEL: I agree; but perhaps the inspectors either cannot or will not do their job. I do not know whether certain men are or are not getting preferential treatment in regard to trapping of birds, but I know that in Claremont a man has been selling native fauna for a month already though the trapping season does not open till the 1st October. And the birds he has been selling are young birds. I hope some action will be taken, even though the matter is one for the Commonwealth. Our zoological gardens can obtain permits to supply birds to other zoological gardens in other parts of the world. The same privilege should be granted to private individuals. I hope some action will be taken in that direction.

Mr. LAMBERT: When at Denmark recently, I was scandalised to see five or six cases filled with small garfish, five or six inches long, being despatched for sale in the metropolitan area. I hope the Premier will seriously consider the giving of a strong direction to the officer in charge of the Fisheries Department to have an area proclaimed in the Albany district. Many representations have been made to me on that subject. Years ago goldfielders went to Albany each year to fish. They never go now.

The Minister for Justice: They go to Esperance.

Mr. LAMBERT: No. There are few fish at Esperance. It is a shocking thing that people should be allowed to exploit the breeding grounds of fish, as I saw being done at Denmark on my last visit there.

Mr. WANSBROUGH: You saw that done not by permanent fishermen but by blow-in's.

Mr. LAMBERT: No; by permanent fishermen, from whom I bought some big fish. I hope that at the next meeting of the Loan Council or at the next Premiers' Conference our Premier will inform the Commonwealth Government that the time has arrived for providing an up-to-date motor-driven trawler for our coast. Fitted with adequate refrigeration, such a trawler could supply the metropolitan area with all its fish requirements, and at much lower prices. I do not suggest that the State should operate the trawler; it could be operated by a responsible company. One desirable result would be the removal of foreign control over our fish trade.

Mr. WATTS: I support the case put up by the member for Albany. In my electorate, Bremer Bay and Pallinup Estuary have been closed against net fishing for a number of years. I have been to considerable trouble in seeking information as to what is happening there, and have been informed—I believe, accurately—that approximately 17 tons of fish caught in nets have been removed from those areas during the last eight or 10 weeks. About six tons, I am advised, were removed during September.

Mr. Marshall: By whom?

Mr. WATTS: By a couple of fishermen. I cannot state whether they are British or otherwise.

Mr. WANSBROUGH: They are not British.

Mr. WATTS: I do not think they are. Whatever they may be, they are taking fish from closed waters and sending them away for sale. The result is that the people of the district, who have been accustomed to use those waters in summer time for holiday and camping purposes, and are desirous of continuing to do so, find themselves practically prevented from going there in summer, because the fish are not to be got. Many of them complain of the present position, and urge that steps be taken to have the law more strictly enforced in that area. I agree with the member for Albany that when an inspector is sent to those places, the information is spread by some kind of wireless. We have tried to discover whence the information comes; so far, however, unsuccessfully. When the inspector gets there, he finds the fishermen sitting quietly on the beach. Undoubtedly the illegal practice I have mentioned has been going on. The law should be amended so as to make prosecution easier. At present a man has to be found in possession of fish before he can be prosecuted. Frequently the inspector cannot bring a prosecution although he is morally convinced that an offence has been committed.

Vote put and passed.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

[Mr. Hegney took the Chair.]

Votes—Treasury, £23,378; Audit, £12,733; Compassionate Allowances, etc., £4,829; and Government Stores, £13,681—agreed to.

Vote—Taxation, £32,900:

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: I wish to draw the Premier's attention to the incidence of the entertainment tax respecting functions held to provide funds for the maintenance of hospitals in country districts. The efforts of the voluntary workers have been greatly hampered because of the imposition of the tax.

Mr. Cross: But exemption could be secured.

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: Perhaps the hon. member has been more fortunate than I, because I have not been able to secure exemption for the entertainments I have in mind.

Mr. Cross: There is definite provision for the granting of exemptions.

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: I have in mind the Moora and Dalwallinu hospitals in my electorate. The people run picture shows to raise funds for the hospitals, and the entertainment tax they have to pay represents a considerable burden. Applications have been made to the Premier, in his capacity as Treasurer, by those responsible for the entertainments in aid of those hospitals. Their requests for a remission of the entertainment tax has been refused. Certain expenses have to be incurred, and in connection with functions held in aid of the Moora hospital, it is necessary to pay the fireman who has to be present during the show. He and others who may be similarly placed show their interest in the movement by always refunding 50 per cent. of what they receive. Unfortunately the entertainments tax has to be paid whether a profit results or a loss is made. Should there be a wet night, people in the country cannot attend the show, which results in a loss, but the tax has still to be paid. From the 1st July, 1934, to the 28th February, 1935, the total receipts from picture shows held in aid of the Moora hospital funds represented £370 and the entertainments tax amounted to £31 10s. 10d. For the year ended the 30th June, 1935, the receipts from 34 picture shows in aid of the Dalwallinu hospital totalled £540 and the entertainments tax represented £73 4s.

Mr. Marshall: Do you say that you attempted to get a refund of the payments of tax and failed?

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: Yes. I understand that if the expenditure represents a

certain percentage of the receipts, no refund will be allowed.

Mr. Seward: Yes, 50 per cent.

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: In view of the fact that the efforts are made to provide funds for the hospitals, the remission of the taxation would be worth while because it would mean that so much less would be required from the hospital fund, which is raised by a special tax solely for hospital purposes. The fact that the taxation was remitted would also encourage country people to assist in the movement. I hope the Treasurer will endeavour to grant relief to those districts where the people are prepared to help themselves.

The PREMIER: The whole question of administration is not in the hands of the Treasurer.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: But the Treasurer has granted refunds of the tax.

The PREMIER: It is not in the hands of the Treasurer; it is a statutory matter.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Who administers the Act?

The PREMIER: The Taxation Department.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: In several instances you have granted a remission of the tax.

The PREMIER: Yes, occasionally, but only under exceptional circumstances.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: I am afraid I have not come under that category; other members have been more fortunate.

The PREMIER: If we are to say that this shall be exempt and that shall be exempt, where will we get to? The whole decision regarding how the tax shall be collected rests with the Commissioner of Taxation.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: He says he is bound by the Act and cannot remit the tax.

The PREMIER: And so am I.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: The Commissioner says that you as Treasurer are the only man who can do it, and you have done it.

The PREMIER: Yes, but only on account of exceptional circumstances.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Why not exempt all hospitals?

The PREMIER: If we started to do that, where would it end? No one would pay, and everyone would desire to be exempt. I do not think that the member for Irwin-Moore has a case at all.

Mr. Patrick: If the country people refused to run these picture shows, it would cost the Treasury more.

The PREMIER: That may be so, but the idea is too much abroad in the country to-day that the Government are getting all this money from the hospital tax, and those who contribute towards it consider it is not being used in the proper channel.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: No, that is not so in this instance.

The PREMIER: It is so in many quarters. The Act is administered strictly, and when representations have been made to me that the entertainments tax should be remitted, each application has been dealt with on its merits; we cannot deal with such matters on general lines.

Mr. Stubbs: When an application is made, you consider it on its merits?

The PREMIER: Yes, always; and we have frequently remitted the amount, but we cannot remit in every case.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Surely an entertainment that does not cost anything locally ought to be regarded as meritorious.

The PREMIER: When we receive an application from the Trotting Association I, as Treasurer, have to be careful about saying that we will not collect the tax. It is different, perhaps, with an entertainment in a country district which has been organised for the benefit of a hospital, but that is not to say that I am going to exempt a trotting meeting down here, which may mean as much as £700.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: A lot of the money taken at a trotting meeting goes in wages and other expenditure.

The PREMIER: Yes, but when the Government are asked to exempt a trotting meeting from which we might expect to get £700, it has to be remembered that the Government could just as well make a donation of £700 to the hospital, instead of letting the Trotting Association get the credit of making that donation. I have had applications from the Trotting Association and other racing people, sometimes involving up to £700, and I have said no. Then they have said that if I would remit the amount they would give it to the hospitals, whereupon I have retorted that the Government were just as capable of giving £700 to the hospitals as were the racing people. Whichever way it goes the amount will reach the hospital, the only difference

being that if I exempt the taxation the racing people will advertise that they themselves have given £700 to the hospitals, when actually they have not given 700 pence. The same thing applies to entertainments in country districts, so I do not think the hon. member has much ground for complaint.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: You are not encouraging voluntary effort.

The PREMIER: Some people do not understand what voluntary effort means.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: The people in the country do, for they are always making those efforts.

The PREMIER: If the taxation is remitted for a country entertainment it swells the amount donated by the district towards the hospital. If the taxation comes to the Government, then the Government have to provide the money for the hospital just the same. If the amount is remitted, it means that some people are getting credit for things they have not done.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: No.

The PREMIER: It is so. Whenever the entertainment tax is remitted, it means a contribution by the Government, but the local people want to get the credit for it.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: They are not doing it for an advertisement at all.

The PREMIER: I do not say they are looking for the advertisement; but will the amount be greater because the Government have remitted the tax?

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Of course it will.

The PREMIER: Of course it will not, for the Government have to find the money in the end. I resent the attitude of some sporting bodies who organise meetings for charity and then ask me to forego the amusement tax. It means that those people are able to announce in the paper that they have contributed to the hospital £600 or £700 more than they really have; because the £600 or £700 has been contributed by the Government, not by the sporting body at all.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: I do not mind giving the Government the whole of the credit, so long as I can get the money for the charity.

Mr. CROSS: For the benefit of the hon. member I should like to explain what I meant when I said it was possible to obtain the tax remission without approaching the Treasurer. The Act makes provision that where the expenses of organising a pic-

ture show or other entertainment do not exceed 50 per cent., the tax is exempted.

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: Everybody knows that.

Mr. CROSS: I have run perhaps 200 entertainments for various charities at one time or another, and on every occasion we have saved the tax without approaching the Treasurer at all. The explanation is that we have seen to it that the cost of the entertainment was kept below the 50 per cent. The hon. member could do the same, especially if he were to see the film companies and get them to donate the films. The actual cost of the films depends upon the number of times they have been released, so, with their own operator to project the films, the organisers of country entertainments ought to be able to get the films for very little. Of course if nearly all their receipts go to the film exchanges, it means very little left for the hospital.

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: Everybody knows perfectly well what the hon. member has told us. If the expenditure does not exceed 50 per cent. of the receipts, we can always get exemption from the Taxation Commissioner, who otherwise says the Treasurer is the only man who can make a refund.

The Premier: I question that. I do not think the Commissioner ever said the Treasurer could make a refund.

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: I think he has. The difficulty in country districts is to keep the expenditure below the 50 per cent. That is why the Commissioner cannot grant remission of the tax.

The Premier: I venture to say the Commissioner never said the Treasurer could remit it.

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: For the period I spoke of just now, our receipts were £370. Here is some of the expenditure we had to incur in the country, which possibly may not have to be incurred in South Perth. Hire of film £138; hire of hall £38.

The Premier: Who owns the hall?

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: The local road board.

The Premier: Should it not be let free?

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: The road board made a reduction and granted the use of the hall for a smaller charge than that made on any other occasion. Other items were—freight and cartage, £21; entertainment tax, £31; plant maintenance, £25; advertising, £39; firemen attendance, £15—half of that

was refunded by the local firemen—insurance, £1; miscellaneous, £11; music, £4; capital expenditure, plant purchase, £50; balance, £43. The Commissioner of Taxation cannot do anything in such circumstances. The only man who can grant a remission of taxation is the Premier.

The Premier: I do not propose to do it.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I do not know about a remission, but he could make a grant.

The Premier: You had better alter the Act.

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: I had hoped that the Premier would introduce an amending Bill so that where the cost of such an entertainment was beyond the control of the organisers and the local expenditure was reduced to a minimum, the tax might be remitted on the authority of the Commissioner, even though the expenditure exceeded 50 per cent. of the receipts. I do not suggest that the Act be amended to provide for every football and cricket match arranged in the name of charity, but laudable work done on a voluntary basis for the maintenance of a hospital should receive recognition.

Mr. MARSHALL: Either the member for Irwin-Moore was not quite fair, or I misunderstood him. He led me to believe that the work of conducting the entertainment was entirely voluntary.

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: All the labour was.

Mr. MARSHALL: What about the musicians? What about the road board? Could not they have been fair and made a refund?

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: The road board reduced their charge.

Mr. MARSHALL: What about the musicians?

Mr. Moloney: And £138 for films?

Mr. MARSHALL: That is a charge over which the local people have no control, but they should have control over local musicians. If the road board and others had evinced a spirit of charity, the expenses might have been kept within the 50 per cent. limit. I do not know whether the Premier has power to make a refund.

The Premier: I do not make refunds.

Mr. MARSHALL: For an entertainment at Meekatharra we have to pay more for railway freight and cartage, but with voluntary labour we can keep expenses within 50 per cent. of receipts. We have done that without imposing exorbitant admission

charges; in fact, children under 14 have been admitted free.

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: I wish to be perfectly fair. The £4 paid for music was incurred on a special occasion when the Hunt Club went to Moora and gave a special dance in aid of the hospital, which returned £17 17s. On that occasion the musicians were paid. For the other 52 entertainments the musician, a local resident, gave her services free. So far as I can see none of the local expenditure could be cut down. How could it be kept within the 50 per cent. when the total receipts were £370 and film hire alone was £138?

Vote put and passed.

Note—Workers' Homes Board, £15,045:

Item, Salaries, £12,191.

Mr. McLARTY: Is anything being done to speed up the activities of the board? A large number of applicants have been waiting for a long time. My dealings with the department have not been very satisfactory. I have approached the board on behalf of various applicants and have always been told there were up to 200 waiting.

Mr. Doney: At present 300.

The Premier: That is not correct.

Mr. Doney: I have been told that there are 300.

Mr. McLARTY: My information is that a considerable number are always waiting. The activities of the department should be speeded up. I do not know of any better way of spending loan money than through this channel. Several applicants I know of have offered excellent security, and the department would have been quite safe in accepting it. The proper housing of the people should be one of our first considerations. In my district it is very difficult to get houses. Perhaps the Treasurer will tell us if there is any chance of these people being provided with more homes.

The PREMIER: I agree it is one of the most important functions of the Government to provide homes for the people. I would point out, however, that it was left to the Labour Government to introduce the principle of workers' homes and bring down the first piece of legislation dealing with it. As so often happens in other cases of the kind, the Opposition do their best to defeat the legislation, but come

along afterwards to ask why the principle is not being extended.

Mr. McLARTY: The Nationalists promised workers' homes if they were re-elected.

The PREMIER: The hon. member is quite wrong. The Opposition certainly did not support the measure at the time. In my first year of office in the present Government I provided new capital to the extent of £50,000 for the expansion of the principle of workers' homes, and each year since we have provided money for the purpose. The hon. member now says we are not going fast enough. The idea of workers' homes would never have occurred to the hon. member's party but for the initiation of the principle by the Labour Government.

Mr. McLARTY: It was on our platform.

The PREMIER: No one ever heard that the Nationalists had put forward such a proposal.

Mr. McLARTY: The late Mr. Frank Wilson brought it forward.

The PREMIER: But did nothing. When we were out of office for three years not a pound did the Nationalist Government make available to the Workers' Homes Board.

Mr. North: Those were the days of big deficits.

The PREMIER: Which were due to wretched government. It was our policy which changed the whole situation, that to do with employment and that to do with the finances.

Mr. McDonald: Let us admit that you have all the virtues, and tell us what you are going to do.

The PREMIER: I do not propose to tell the electors now what I am going to do. I stand by what the Government have done, not by what they are going to do. I do not say we are going to do mighty things. There is no need for us to say what we are going to do. We stand by what we have done in the last 2½ years. We have done more with regard to workers' homes than any other party have done. For three years the previous Government did nothing to develop the principle of workers' homes.

Mr. McLARTY: But many homes were built during that time.

The PREMIER: Only out of the repayments that were coming in from those

who already had homes. Nothing was done by means of new capital.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Miscellaneous Services, £517,790:

Item, Expenses of repatriation of sundry persons.

Mr. McLARTY: I should like information on this item. Last year's vote was £1,000, and the expenditure £6,768, for which I understand about 70 persons were repatriated. How were they repatriated? I know of a few migrants who should be repatriated, not for political reasons but because they would be very much better at Home where they could be looked after, than if they were to remain in Western Australia. I do not favour sending Home people *holus bolus*, since they are our responsibility once they have got here. However, there are certain cases which, rightly, should be looked after by the British Government. How does last year's expenditure come to be so large as compared with the vote? I see that £3,500 is provided for the current financial year. This amount, I suppose, would send Home about 40 persons. Apparently the cost of repatriating a person is about £100.

The Minister for Justice: No; about £40.

The PREMIER: The Government, ever since taking office, have been besieged with requests from migrants to enable them to return to their original homes. Nearly all of these migrants came to Western Australia under the group settlement agreement. The understanding was that until they had repaid the cost of their passages to Western Australia, they would be indebted to Britain and to Australia. I shall not enter into an argument as to why they failed—whether the scheme failed or the migrants failed. However, we have had, and we have, calls every day from migrants who desire to return to Britain. They can, of course, get back only by the Western Australian Government paying their passages. If we were to send back all who request it, we should have to charter several ships. Each case is dealt with on its merits. Where it can be shown that the man and the wife and children would be better off if repatriated, we have provided funds for their return. However, they have first to satisfy the Government that they have friends at Home to whom to return, and that they have no future here. These matters are verified by the department. I would be the last man

in the world to deny to any person from the Old Country the opportunity to go back to his friends, more especially if it can be satisfactorily shown that he has no chance of making good here. If any member cares to move for a return showing the number of migrants repatriated and the circumstances of their repatriation, I shall be glad to present it. The British Government representative is opposed to Australian Governments finding funds for the return of these people. When I met him in Canberra last year, I asked him how he could expect me to refuse to find money for the return of migrants having friends in the Old Country. He replied, "I would not do it, because they came out here under certain conditions." "What is the use of that," I said, "when there is a doctor's certificate that the health of the migrant is had here, and not only that but a statement by the doctor that the medical certificate obtained in England for the purpose of enabling the migrant to come to Australia was a most improper certificate?" Without reflection on anybody, well-meaning men and women came here who were entirely unsuited to our life and our conditions, who should never have obtained a medical certificate qualifying them to come to this country.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Does the State pay the whole cost of repatriation?

The PREMIER: All of it. Neither the Commonwealth Government nor the British Government will accept any responsibility whatever for cost of repatriation. I assure hon. members that we have repatriated numerous migrants on humanitarian grounds alone. Careful inquiries have satisfied us that these migrants were men and women and children of a type that would never make good here, a type of no use to Australia. These migrants begged of us to find them passages home to their friends in the Old Country. It would have been cruel for us to keep them here, especially as they never would make good in Australia. I do not blame the people at all. It was a mistake in their selection at the outset. They were all right in their class and of their type, but entirely unsuitable for life in this country.

Mr. Needham: If they had been properly examined before leaving the Old Country, they would never have been sent out.

The PREMIER: They were supposed to have been properly medically examined.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Many of them were quite physically fit, but they were mentally deficient.

The PREMIER: That applied in some instances. The fact remains that the doctors at Home received 10s. per head for the examination of migrants. I can produce files to show that hundreds of men who happened to pass the medical examination in the Old Country, for which 10s. per head was paid to the doctors, were of such a type that the doctor who examined them here said they should never have been passed by the doctors at Home, and that no doctor in the world should have passed some of the men, who were suffering from all sorts of complaints before they made application to be sent to Australia.

Mr. Stubbs: Were some suffering from war wounds?

The PREMIER: I do not blame the men themselves. Some suffered from war wounds, while others suffered from hereditary defects and so forth. My examination of the files convinces me that doctors who were paid 10s. a head in England to examine migrants, did not care twopence about it.

Mr. Needham: They were engaged on a sort of mass production racket.

The PREMIER: Yes, at 10s. per head. I would be pleased to place the files on the Table; they would be illuminating for members. I would not stand in the way of those men and women being returned to their friends and people in the Old Country. They were lonely and hopeless here, and the medical certificates showed that not only were the men and women unable to make good in this country, but the same applied to their children. I know England does not want them back but because of the way immigration was handled in the past, we intend to continue sending them back. Of course the Government do not propose to do that in a wholesale fashion, but where we consider it is urgently necessary that an individual should be returned to his relatives, I think it will be regarded as merely charitable if we find the money to enable him to return to the Motherland.

Item. Refund to W.A. Trotting Association of taxes on charity meeting in aid of Youth and Motherhood Appeal, £712:

Mr. THORN: In view of the remarks of the member for Irwin-Moore regarding the refusal of a refund of entertainment tax to the Moora and Dalwallinu Hospital Fund

committees, I would like an explanation from the Premier regarding the item.

Mr. Needham: The meaning is clear enough.

Mr. THORN: But the Premier said he would not do this sort of thing.

Mr. Needham: The Premier said he had agreed to the remission in exceptional cases.

Mr. THORN: The Premier said that the Trotting Association had asked for a refund and had been refused. I think it would be better to make a straight-out donation rather than to do it in the way indicated in the Estimates.

Mr. Moloney: Do you object to the refund?

Mr. THORN: I do not object to it, and the hon. member cannot put it over me like that. The Premier said he would not take this action, but the Estimates show that he refunded to the Trotting Association £665 during the last financial year.

The Premier: I can easily explain that.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Forests, £21,924:

Mr. STUBBS: When the Premier, as Minister for Forests, introduced a Bill to amend the Forests Act with reference to the sandalwood reforestation fund, he gave a very clear explanation of the position. Members will appreciate the value of the sandalwood industry, and its threatened extinction some time ago. I trust the Premier will discuss with the Conservator of Forests, on his return from South Africa, the possibility of utilising a large area of suitable land in the Great Southern district for the reforestation of sandalwood. It would be in the interests of the State if an early start were made with the work. I understand difficulties were experienced with experiments in the growth of sandalwood some years ago. The young plants were destroyed by rabbits and other vermin, in consequence of which the experiment failed. After an experience of over 40 years in the Great Southern, from which part of the State tens of thousands of pounds' worth of sandalwood were exported, I feel convinced that we can grow large quantities on land from which the sandalwood was taken originally. It grew well throughout the district from Narrogin to the south coast.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Apart from the rabbits, sandalwood would probably grow there.

Mr. STUBBS: Surely it would not cost much to fence-off the holdings to be planted with sandalwood.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: It would be necessary to provide the netting.

Mr. STUBBS: The rainfall and the climatic conditions now are as good as they were 40 years ago, and I am sure the plant could be re-established in that area. I desire to pay a tribute to the Conservator of Forests and his officers for the manner in which they have utilised areas regarded as unsuitable for intense culture or grazing, by replanting the land with mallet. That has been done mostly around Narrogin, and I understand that very shortly the department intend proceeding with a bigger scheme in the Wagin district.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Rabbits will not touch mallet.

Mr. STUBBS: I urge the Premier to consider this matter.

Mr. NORTH: I desire to draw the Premier's attention to the desperate news that was cabled from America with regard to the wholesale erosion of soil and the loss of thousands of houses and farms, due to the failure, over a long period, to plant trees. I have no doubt this subject was of great interest to the Minister for Forests, and I should like to know whether the State has the matter well in hand, for such a catastrophe has never yet happened here. Also I should like to ask the Minister whether it would be possible to start some policy which would put a few of the trees back on to the wheatbelt. It may be said to be a local job, but we all know that very often a lead from the Government is of great value. That tragedy I have referred to was a terrible one, for hundreds of villages were denuded. So it is clear that the agricultural conscience spoken of the other night might well be converted into a forestry conscience, which would lead to a clear realisation of how nature punishes man when he goes against her rules. I urge on the Minister that he shall give both these matters serious consideration.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: I should like the Minister for Forests to give consideration to the present system of distribution of orders for sandalwood. As he knows, these orders are mostly confined to men who for many years past have earned their livelihood in the sandalwood industry. I have no objection to the methods employed; that is, the ap-

pointment of a board and the distribution of orders amongst the pullers according to the quantities presumed to be required. But I want the Minister to take into consideration that these men now have to go 70 or 80 miles from the railway to get into bush where they can cut sufficient sandalwood to supply the orders given to them. The board as a rule meets two or three times a year and distributes the orders to the registered pullers. But these men have to go so far for their wood, and the orders being rather small it is less profitable to them to-day than it was some seven years ago when they did not have to travel so far out. In conversation with a number of the pullers I have learnt that their difficulties would be greatly overcome if the quantities for the whole year could be estimated, so that they could be given orders to supply the total quantity likely to be required, instead of their having to go out 70 or 80 miles three or four times a year to pull the wood. I should like the Minister to have a talk with the Conservator with a view to seeing if the orders could not be made up into larger quantities.

The MINISTER FOR FORESTS: I have discussed this matter with the Conservator of Forests, for I happen to know the difficulties referred to by the hon. member. I think the grievances of the sandalwood pullers on the goldfields are gradually being overcome, and that the position this year is better than it has been for many years, owing to the increased quantities allotted to the pullers. During the last year we have had fewer complaints from those men than for years past. That is attributed to the fact that most of the sandalwood pullers have been giving up a good deal of their time to prospecting. I have not the figures here, but I can assure the hon. member that the orders allotted to the pullers on the goldfields are considerably in excess this year of what they have been during recent years. I am aware that forestry does not appeal to many people, perhaps to not many members of the House, but more particularly not to the outside public. I regret that attitude of mind.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: They want to see some results during their lives.

The MINISTER FOR FORESTS: May I take to myself a little credit? When I first assumed office, in the Scaddan Government in 1911, the Forests Department was

in charge of a man who was an office clerk, and who had been in charge of it for 17 years. He had no forestry training whatever, and during all those years of his administration our forests were being butchered without regard to future preservation. The first thing I did was to take steps to have a first-class forester appointed. We advertised all over the world for such a man. So careful was I about the appointment that I refused to make it until I could see the man. He was engaged in another British Dominion, but he got long-service leave and came out here. We had a talk and, being satisfied, I appointed him. From that day began our forest policy. In all the years that had gone before, no regard whatever had been paid to the future of our forests: they were cut here, there and everywhere, and were, in fact, butchered. So we started a forest policy. That officer left the department and was succeeded by the very capable Conservator we have to-day. Since that time we have had a forests policy. Forestry is a matter that does not appeal to the average politician because it brings no reward to him in his time. But we have to look forward and build for the future, for two or three generations to come, and, viewed in that light, the importance of our forests cannot be denied. I propose to give a few facts which I hope members will regard as important, because the results will be revealed, not while we are here, but later on. Very substantial improvement in the position of the timber industry was shown during last financial year. The production of sawn and hewn timber for the past three years has been as follows:—

Year ended	Sawn timber produced.	Hewn timber produced.
	Cub. ft.	Cub. ft.
30-6-33	4,292,000	526,000
30-6-34	5,888,000	1,961,000
30-6-35	8,337,000	2,820,000

Thus the production of milling timber showed an increase of 42 per cent. and hewn timber an increase of 44 per cent. over that of the previous year. The revival in the demand for jarrah is due largely to increased inquiries for railway sleepers from many parts of the world. There are also indications of an improving demand for jarrah and karri for flooring, railway wagon scantling, telegraph arms, mining lift guides, and a variety of other purposes. The increased activity in the sawmilling industry

is shown also by the fact that seven more mills, closed temporarily owing to the depressed state of the trade, reopened during the year. At the 30th June last, 40 mills were cutting timber from Crown lands. Of the sawn timber produced last year, 92 per cent. came from Crown lands. The increase in employment in the industry is greater than that indicated by the figures quoted, since the monthly production figures showed further increases towards the end of the financial year. At present there is every indication of further improvement in the sawn timber trade, as an increase has occurred since the 30th June last. The hewing industry is largely dependent on private property for supplies, and during 1934-35 approximately 70 per cent. of the hewn sleepers were obtained from that source. Working plan control of the whole of the sawmilling industry in the jarrah and karri forests was established in 1929. The jarrah working plan provided for a permanent cut of 460,000 loads per annum, a level to which the output of the jarrah mills was to be reduced in 10 years from its then high figure of 700,000 loads. The decline in the timber trade, owing to the world depression, has so far obviated any need for steps to be taken towards the limitation of mill intake. With the present revival, however, the total cut has again approached the permissible cut provided for under the working plan. To give an idea of the value of the industry, let me quote the revenue figures. The estimated revenue for 1935-36 is £126,000. The revenue for the year ended 30th June, 1935, amounted to £119,232, an increase of £29,336 on the previous year's collections. To assist in rehabilitating the industry following upon the depression, the Government allowed rebates on royalties and inspection fees during the past year amounting to £30,000, made up as follows:—

- 20 per cent. rebate on log royalties.
- 50 per cent. rebate on inspection fees on hewn sleepers from private property.
- 25 per cent. on inspection fees on hewn sleepers from Crown lands.
- 25 per cent. on inspection fees on all sawn timber.
- Special rebate of 5s. per load on all sawn timber from Crown lands exported beyond Australia.

It has been stated in some quarters that we have not assisted the industry, but those figures provide a convincing answer. Having regard to all those concessions, the rev-

enue increase, I submit, is very satisfactory. It is estimated that the major portion of this year's revenue, namely £117,000, will be derived from royalties, license fees, etc., and that £9,000 will be credited to departmental reimbursements. During 1935-36 it is proposed to expend £100,000 from loan funds, this amount being £44,375 less than in 1934-35. However, the national importance of reforestation has been recognised by the Commonwealth Government, due to the pressure brought to bear by the State Government.

Mr. Stubbs: Will some of that money be spent on the establishment of sandalwood?

The PREMIER: I intend to deal with that later. The Commonwealth Government now subsidise our expenditure on a pound-for-pound basis. As from May, 1935, the Commonwealth Government are finding £100,000 in order to supplement the forestry work of the State Government. Under the impetus given by this arrangement rapid and substantial additions are being made to the already large-scale forestry accomplishments that lie to the credit of the State. Altogether 49,429 acres have been treated for regeneration in the jarrah, karri and mallet forests, bringing the total area so far dealt with to 260,329 acres. Increased employment has thus been provided. It is intended to keep 1,100 men employed for the current 12 months in our jarrah and karri forests. This will mean a healthy life for those concerned, instead of their living on sustenance. It has been found possible to employ on lighter types of work men who, through physical disability, are unable to undertake heavy manual work, and have been put into the B and C classes. The engagement of these men on healthy outdoor work in the forests is an important step towards their rehabilitation in the industry. I have evidence from foremen in our forests to show that when men have been sent down there as belonging to the C class only a month or two has elapsed for them to be classified as A class men, consequent upon the improvement in the conditions under which they were living.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: I think I will have a month or two of that.

The PREMIER: We might all go down there. We know that a man who has spent many years in the city greatly improves in physique and general health from the

moment he gets into the bush. In a very short time a wonderful improvement is noticeable in him.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that matter comes under the Health Department.

The PREMIER: Men would never have to go to the Health Department if they went first to the Forests Department. It is our forests that enable men to regain their health. Although the funds provided are only an emergency aid to reforestation, being primarily an unemployment relief measure, it is hoped that funds from the Commonwealth for this work will not suffer any material reduction for at least some years if this rehabilitation of a national asset is to be completed. The Commonwealth first agreed to make this regular contribution for three years, but after further consideration they reduced it to a contribution of £100,000 for one year. To the State the work becomes a liability as well as an asset, with responsibility for protection, and tending young crops in subsequent years. I have little doubt that the Commonwealth will continue their financial assistance to such a national work as this. The leeway occasioned by the neglect in former years is gradually being overtaken. The following statement will show the scope of work undertaken in 1933-34:—

Jarrah forests: (a) 44,586 acres of heavily cut over jarrah forest has been treated for regeneration, and is by far the greatest annual acreage attained in Western Australia. Useless trees are cut out to allow for proper development of young growth. To assist in the protection of this growth, roads of access are opened up and each working unit—a compartment of approximately 500 acres—is surrounded by a fire line.

(b) Thinning and protection of re-growth took place over 18,465 acres. By this work it is assured that the dominants of the young stand are of good form and are freed from suppression by overtopping, useless trees. Here again compartments are approximately 500 acres in extent and firebreaked.

I do not know whether members understand what is meant by "the dominants of the young stand." I mean, young jarrah stems which are already taller and stronger than the surrounding regrowth and which require space and light for their best development. The experts cut off the ends that are not likely to succeed, and thereby allows the main stem to continue to grow. The area of karri forest treated for regeneration during last year was 3,623 acres, while on 277 acres of karri country where

the natural seed fall was deficient, seed was spot sown. In connection with the growth of mallet, in the unproductive poison country along the Great Southern railway 1,202 acres were cleared and sown with mallet seed. With respect to pine planting, a further 947 acres were planted with *pinus radiata* and *pinus pinaster*. The total area now under conifers is 9,204 acres. Some member referred to sandalwood.

Mr. Stubbs: The Great Southern would grow sandalwood.

The PREMIER: At a cost which precludes our going on with it. I have given a great deal of thought to the subject, and have provided money to the Forests Department for the re-growth of sandalwood. We know, however, from our experiments that the business is too costly. The young trees are stamped upon by stock and eaten down by rabbits. Sandalwood is a parasite and lives on hosts. It cannot grow by itself. It has to be fenced in, to begin with.

Mr. Stubbs: It lives with jam trees.

The PREMIER: It would cost an enormous sum to fence in a sufficient area for the growth of sandalwood.

Mr. Stubbs: Would it not pay to do it?

The PREMIER: That is not for me to say.

The Minister for Justice: It is of very slow growth.

Hon. C. G. Latham: We have 2,000 acres of young sandalwood that has been netted in for about three years.

The PREMIER: That is a comparatively small area.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It is a good start.

The PREMIER: I have figures to show that the experiments have been tried but the expense is too great.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It must have cost a great deal to keep down the rabbits alone.

The PREMIER: The cost would be too great for it to be worth while incurring the expense. The officers of the department are very keen on preserving our sandalwood, and whilst they do not say this is the last word on the subject, they do say the experiments have been altogether too costly. The attempt to grow sandalwood on a sufficiently large scale would hardly be worth while. It is slow-growing. When it is a small plant the rabbits eat it out and stock trample it down. Departmental experiments show wire-netting to be necessary.

Mr. Stubbs: It is only a matter of time when our sandalwood forests will be extinct?

The PREMIER: Undoubtedly. We must expect that. Our sandalwood will become extinct just as our aborigines are becoming extinct. However, what can be done? The march of civilisation always produces new ideas, which destroy what exists, what has gone before. We can preserve the sandalwood, but only at a cost that is not worth while. The member for Nelson is not here. I fear that all of us do not appreciate the great asset Western Australia has in its timbers. We should look to preserve for coming generations the extremely valuable timber resources of Western Australia.

Vote put and passed.

Department of Minister for Justice (Hon. J. C. Willcock, Minister).

Vote—Crown Law Offices, £77,529:

Mr. MANN: I desire to call the Minister's attention to the position of magistrates in country areas. The Northam magistrate, for instance, has to travel enormous distances. I hope the appointment of additional magistrates may be practicable, with a view to reducing some magisterial areas. Again, when the Commonwealth took over the State Savings Bank, the branches at York, Beverley and Bruce Rock were handed over to the Postal Department. The postmaster at each of those centres is certainly paid £25 additional, but he has no assistance whatever. Thus he gets no dinner-hour at all, the office having to be kept open continuously from 10 a.m. to 3 p.m. It is a considerable strain to have to remain on duty all day. When there is a rush, as in the case of the balance at the end of June, these men have to work additional hours.

Mr. STUBBS: In supporting the remarks of the previous speaker I wish to call the Minister's attention to the fact that the stipendiary magistrate of Albany has frequently to visit Ravensthorpe, which is in the eastern portion of my electorate. He has to travel to Wagin, and then go by train 130 or 140 miles and thereupon another hundred miles to Ravensthorpe and Hope-toun. The time is rapidly approaching when it will be necessary to station a magistrate and mining registrar at Ravensthorpe. Mining is advancing rapidly in that district.

A company has recently been floated with a capital of £250,000 for the purpose of re-opening several mines which have been idle for about 30 years. I ask the Minister, in the interests of justice, to have a magistrate stationed at either Ravensthorpe or Wagin. Many people with legal business have to travel long distances from Newdegate and Lake Grace to get their cases heard by a police magistrate at Wagin or at some other town where Warden Butler officiates.

Mr. McLARTY: I believe the Minister has been giving consideration to the establishment of additional courts at country centres. Will the hon. gentleman give consideration to the establishment of a court at Harvey? The Minister smiles; he has been considering the matter for a long time. There is a magistrate at Bunbury, and it should be comparatively easy for him to visit Harvey once or twice a month. Harvey district has grown rapidly during the last few years. If a resident of the district has a case before the local court, he must travel either to Bunbury or to Pinjarra—30-odd miles either way. Harvey is now a centre of sufficient importance to warrant the establishment of a court there. The erection of a courthouse is not asked for; the road board office would be made available to the magistrate. The department would not lose anything by adopting my suggestion.

Mr. WANSBROUGH: The magistrate at Albany is forced to travel on official business by train. If he has to go up country he may have to proceed by train to Katanning where he has to spend a night and all next day before he can continue his journey by rail to the town at which he has to sit.

Mr. Thorn: And you consider that a hardship?

Mr. WANSBROUGH: No, but I consider his time could be better occupied. He has his own car, and I think the Government should pay him so much per mile for running costs. If that were done the magistrate could proceed expeditiously to wherever he had to go and thus save a lot of time. It would certainly relieve him from much annoyance in travelling by train and a consequent waste of time.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I ask the Minister to give some consideration to the position of coroners, particularly those who have to deal with important cases in the country districts. Frequently a business man, who happens to be a justice of the peace, is

called upon to act as a coroner, and sometimes the matters he has to deal with occupy two or three days. Would it not be possible to treat the coroners on the same basis as jurors and witnesses, and make some provision for remuneration?

The Minister for Justice: They do not deal with inquests that would last so long as you suggest.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Of course they do, particularly when there are manslaughter cases or similarly serious matters to inquire into.

The Minister for Justice: Not dealt with by a justice of the peace?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Yes, in the country districts. I remember one instance in which a coroner was away from his business for two days. All the evidence has to be taken in longhand, which entails a lot of work. It could be done more expeditiously if a shorthand writer were available. At one time magistrates had the advantage of typists in court who took down the evidence. I trust the Minister will give consideration to this matter.

Mr. MARSHALL: Here again I may be able to direct the Government along lines making for economy, or at least point out how money can be spent more productively. Quite a lot is wasted annually without much result. I was absent from the city when the Estimates were dealt with last year, but two years ago I drew the Minister's attention to the fact that Warden Butler had to travel to Wiluna to carry out his ordinary routine work. Before he had completed his work there he had to proceed to Cue to try a case in which a man was charged with an offence against a little girl. All the people associated with the case—the accused person, the little girl, the witnesses, the lawyers, and even the warden who had to deal with the trial—were in Wiluna. Nevertheless the whole lot had to leave Wiluna and proceed to Cue for the trial. Apparently it is again a matter of pouring water on a duck's back, because although I drew the Minister's attention to what happened in that instance, there has been a similar experience. I cannot understand it. I do not say that the warden was in Wiluna on the second occasion, but the fact remains that all those associated with the case had to proceed from Wiluna to Cue for the trial. As a judge could not be sent up to deal with the case, and the magistrate was appointed to undertake the duty, surely the matter

could have been attended to differently. In such circumstances, for God's sake let us permit the trial to take place where it can be dealt with most economically in the interests of all concerned. I suppose such cases have cost hundreds of pounds, and all that resulted was increased inconvenience for everyone concerned. This Vote covers what is known as the State Licensing Board. Ever since the depletion of the compensation fund, from which the operations of the board were paid for, I have objected to the taxpayers generally being compelled to contribute from Consolidated Revenue the expenses of that body. Since I spoke about this matter two years ago, I have noticed nothing that tended to convince me that my opinion was wrong. If I were inclined to be converted to the retention of the board, the behaviour of the chairman at least would influence me to enter an emphatic protest against the insulting, piggy manner of that individual.

Mr. Thorn: Anyway, the board is unnecessary now.

Mr. MARSHALL: Of course.

The Minister for Justice: I do not know about that.

Mr. MARSHALL: If the board is necessary, I claim at least for every person in my electorate the respectful treatment to which he is entitled. I had an opportunity of listening to this gentleman when dealing with an application, and I do not think the State could find a more brutal, insulting type of individual than the chairman of the Licensing Board. I did not imagine—I could not believe it if I had not heard the man and witnessed the incident—that an alleged magistrate could behave in the manner that that gentleman did. He is a most insulting type of individual. People who apply for licenses, irrespective of whether or not they are right in making the application, should be treated with courtesy, and those who attend to give evidence should be treated with respect. Fancy this individual, whose salary is paid by the taxpayers, telling the miners of Wiluna that the hotel accommodation was too classy for them and that they could live on a lower plane! It is a pretty state of affairs when this individual, who had to work fairly hard for his living at one time, can turn round and condemn his fellow men to a lower standard of living. And the way he behaved to people presenting their case was shameful in the last degree. He is not fit to be controlling

a piggery. Fancy his telling the miners of Wiluna what standard of living they should enjoy! It is a bit hot that the taxpayers should be taxed to keep him there to insult them. I am not speaking from hearsay, for I heard all about this gentleman the first time he visited Meekatharra. I approached two or three lawyers, but I could not get those gentleman to do anything more than to say, "We have to take the bad with the good." But he insulted even a lawyer, who picked up his books and walked out of court.

The Minister for Justice: That is not difficult—to insult counsel.

Mr. MARSHALL: No, but I have known this individual to be damnably insulting. He can go around the State and snub other people as much as he likes, but he is not going to do it in my electorate.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Why put him on to other people?

Mr. MARSHALL: The board itself is not required, is not necessary and never has been since it finished the reduction of licenses. Some members say the board has done good work. One would think we never had a reasonably good hotel in the State until this board came into existence.

The Minister for Justice: We certainly had a lot of bad ones.

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes, and we had a very bad law. But we have a new law now, and with the new law this board came into existence in 1921-22. But the board has had nothing to do with the creation of several admirable hotels, such as the Palace and the Commercial and the Royal Mail at Meekatharra. They were all erected before the board was thought of. Nor was the board in any way responsible for the excellent hotels in Fremantle and in many of the suburbs in the metropolitan area. Those hotels were built under the old law. All that the board has done has been to conform to the new law. The old system has never been tried out under the new law, and therefore the cost of the board is just wasted. Certain things have to be done before an applicant can get a license, and under the new law this would obtain just the same if we had the old administration. There is not one hotel in Wiluna superior to the Commercial or the Royal Mail in Meekatharra, which were erected long before the board was thought of. I did not mind so much while the compensation fund was in existence

and the board was paid from that fund, but I hate to see the board taking out of the taxpayers' pockets some £3,500 per annum to do a job that could be done as well by the local magistrates.

The Minister for Justice: That system was not nearly so good.

Mr. MARSHALL: There is the same old swan song; we get it from the Minister every time. I say that under the new law the old system of administration would be just as successful as the existing one.

The Minister for Justice: To bring back the old administration you would have to alter the law.

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes, but we would be saving the cost of the board. Why should our taxpayers bear that cost, remembering that when they go before the court they are insulted by the chairman. He is the most objectionable individual I have ever listened to. I have never come across anyone else so piggyish. I do not like the system on which the board is based. Here we have three men appointed for three years by the Government of the day. That is not a very good system. Their bread and butter is handed out to them with their appointment by the Government, and no matter how conscientious those men might be they are not likely to forget it. Suppose a member of the present Government was an applicant for an hotel license. I do not care how conscientious the members of the board may be, they have to thank the Government for their appointment and so I ask, is it likely that there would be any preference shown?

The Minister for Justice: Oh, surely that question would not arise.

Mr. MARSHALL: Three years ago, when I was speaking on this subject, the Minister for Lands stated that the magistrates could not very well be trusted. I do not wish to attack the Minister in his absence but, had he been here to-night, I would have turned up the passage in "Hansard" and quoted from it. That was his implication, namely, that magistrates would be likely to show leniency to certain individuals within the licensing district, and with whom they might be acquainted. As the position is to-day, there is even greater reason for suspicion. The sooner the board are abolished and we get back to the old system of administration and relieve the taxpayers of this expense,

the better it will be. I want the Minister to tell us clearly what the board have done that the magistrates could not do under the present Act. It is not fair to blame the old system for bad results. The results were bad because we were operating under a bad law.

Hon. C. G. Latham: An obsolete law.

Mr. MARSHALL: We amended the law and appointed the board, and they did their work of reducing licenses. They should then have been dismissed immediately, but they were appointed as a licensing board for the whole of the State, and ever since I have objected and I still object. The Government would be wise to dispense with the board and return to the old system of administration.

The Minister for Justice: We would have to alter the Act.

Mr. MARSHALL: I protest against the actions of the chairman of the board. I am not going to have him insulting miners and other people in my electorate. Say what we will against the old system, under it licensees struggled to get boarders and lodgers. It was considered a good advertisement if a licensee could attract a boarder from another hotel in the town. The chairman informed hotelkeepers in my electorate that they had no need to provide accommodation for local people. All they had to do was to provide good accommodation for Mr. Cahill and other travellers, and let the local people convert themselves into human camels and consume sufficient alcohol to keep the hotels going for his benefit.

Hon. C. G. Latham: What are the other members of the board about to allow him to do that?

Mr. MARSHALL: What was that?

Mr. Stubbs: What you said he did.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am not worrying about the members of the board. Not one of them should be occupying his present position, but I am not going to allow the chairman to behave as he behaved in my electorate. I was present and heard him. Decency is foreign to him. He told hotel licensees in my electorate that there was no occasion for them to provide accommodation for boarders. The licensees were advised to get rid of the boarders. He said to Mr. Carter, of the Commercial Hotel, Meekatharra, "I would advise you to get rid of those boarders. There is other accommoda-

tion for them. They are only common miners."

Mr. Stubbs: Under what section of the Act did he do that?

Mr. MARSHALL: The hon. member was present when the measure was passed. He will recall that Parliament intended that licensees should keep certain rooms available for travellers. Unfortunately that is the wording of the Act. Therefore, local people—permanent boarders—need not be accommodated. In our eagerness to ensure that travellers were provided for, we overlooked that local people were being excommunicated.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I believe that licensees could not refuse accommodation to a person.

Mr. MARSHALL: To a traveller they could not refuse accommodation, but to a local person they could. Local people were hunted out of the hotels in the Murchison under that man's advice. All the miners on the Murchison are now invited to drink sufficient beer to keep the hotels in existence for Mr. Cahill and other travellers to enjoy. When the railway was being constructed and accommodation on the trains was very limited, the same gentleman, then a member of the board—I think Mr. Lyon Johnston and the late Mr. Taylor were the other members—travelled to Meekatharra. They arranged with the stationmaster for a first-class compartment to be reserved for them, and when people who had paid first-class fares looked for seats in the train, they had to take second-class compartments to oblige Mr. Cahill. I meant to refer to that fact previously, but last year I missed this vote. I have not missed it on this occasion and I will not miss it in future.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I believe that last year we moved to reduce the vote by £1.

Mr. MARSHALL: The vote should be cut out entirely, and the taxpayers saved the expense of providing a luxurious job for an insulting individual such as he is. The sum of £3,000 would be sufficient to erect a badly-needed school, build a hospital or provide some of the water supplies that are so necessary in that part of the State. The Government would be well advised to give us this consideration and wipe the board out. The Government can expect to receive no quarter from me while they leave that individual in a position to go around my electorate insulting my people. I had an

opportunity to listen to his remarks and I assure members that he is a fair beauty. There is no doubt about that. He is a positive disgrace; that is what he is. I have entered my protest—

The Minister for Justice: Yes, I think you have.

Mr. MARSHALL: So long as I am a member of this House, so long as the board continue in existence, and so long as the taxpayers are called upon to pay the salaries and expenses of the board members, I will continue to protest bitterly. We cannot get schools in which to educate our children; we cannot get wells which are necessary in order to overland stock and we cannot get hospitals. The amount of the vote for one year would enable many of our needs to be met. But no, the Government would rather pay the money out in this way and starve the country of essential requirements for development. I will bear that gentleman in mind, and if ever he visits my electorate again, I will be in the corner to hear him. I marvel that some person has not left the witness box and pelted him out of the court.

The Minister for Justice: Oh, oh!

Mr. MARSHALL: The Minister has no idea—

The Minister for Justice: I have some idea.

Mr. MARSHALL: Unless he has sat in the court and listened to the chairman, he has no conception of him. I thought I knew him, but I did not know him at all until I heard him. Members have no conception of his behaviour when he is on the bench.

Mr. Stubbs: You evidently know him now.

Mr. MARSHALL: And he will know me. Fancy his insulting people who have to contribute 4d. in the pound taxation to pay his salary! Fancy his telling people to get out of the hotels, that they can get cheaper accommodation elsewhere, that hotel accommodation is for him, and that he is to have a reserved first-class compartment while other first-class passengers who have paid for their tickets travel second class!

Mr. MOLONEY: I have listened to the panegyric pronounced by the member for Murchison and must say I can quite appreciate that a shrinking violet like himself and the solicitors who appear before the licensing bench would possibly be overawed by this very virile and forceful chairman. If we are to accept the ex parte statement of

the hon. member we must look upon the chairman of the board as a terrible man, and the board itself as an excrescence that should be done away with. It is very easy to traduce men who have no opportunity to reply to the charges made against them. Possibly the hon. member is in order in the remarks he has made. I am just as conversant as he with the conditions operating in the liquor trade, and know what the circumstances were before the board was brought into existence. I do not know of the tragic happenings we have heard about at Wiluna, but I do know the members of the board. I am sure that Mr. Barker and Mr. Burgess would be the last people to condone any wrongful action on the part of their chairman. We are told by the member for Murchison that only silvertails can get accommodation at Wiluna, and that the workers are denied it. That is an extravagant statement, and shows that the hon. member does not know what he is talking about. Members of the board have given their personal attention to all aspects of the liquor trade, and have already effected many improvements throughout the State. Despite all he has said, the hon. member could not utter one word against the integrity of the board. I might say, too, that at times other people's manner can be obnoxious, and other people in their statements do not confine themselves strictly to the truth. I cannot allow members of the board to be traduced in this way, under the cloak of privilege, without voicing my protest. The board have carried out their functions in an efficient manner, and have administered the law in keeping with its principles. If the people of Wiluna have a grievance against the board, the onus is on them to get up a petition to the Government in connection with their case. I venture to say that if the hon. member's statements were examined in a court of law, they would not stand for a moment. I deprecate his attitude on this subject.

Mr. THORN: I am casting no reflection on the Licensing Board when I say that I have heard on many occasions that the chairman puts the fear of God into publicans, and that he does not always treat them as decently as he might. The time has come when the board should be abolished. It has served its purpose. It was appointed under the Licenses Reduction Act, and has now carried out all its duties. Practically every hotel the police did not want, or was diffi-

cult for them to control, has been delicensed.

The Minister for Justice: You are now saying that the board is dominated by the police.

Mr. THORN: Not at all. I maintain that the board has ceased to function as a licenses reduction board. The Minister knows that the police desired that certain hotels should no longer be carried on. These establishments were far-removed from police stations, and were difficult to control. Most of them have now been closed.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: I suppose you know that in some cases licenses were granted in opposition to the police.

Mr. THORN: There was always trouble with these particular hotels, and they were delicensed. Publicans who were constantly offending against the Act were put out of business. Throughout the State we have many excellent hotels, which are conducted in a satisfactory way. We also have a good police force. Is there any longer a necessity to keep this board in being? Here is the chairman at £850 with two colleagues at £750. Such positions exist while we here on much smaller salaries are criticised year in and year out. If we receive an increase or obtain a restoration, there is much comment. This wonderful board represents an unnecessary expense. If we reverted to the old system, magistrates could easily discharge the board's functions. The police control the licenses.

Mr. Raphael: And there are liquor inspectors.

Mr. THORN: Yes. The board may go and look at a hotel and say "Knock in a window there", and that window costs the State a lot of money. With a great deal in the speech of the member for Murchison I do not agree, but I do share his view that the board have served their purpose and are no longer required. Therefore I move—

That the vote be reduced by £1.

Mr. Raphael: The board should be cut out altogether.

Mr. LAMBERT: I do not quite know what is the grievance of the member for Murchison against the Licenses Reduction Board.

Mr. Marshall: It is a pretty general grievance.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The board are now licensing magistrates.

Mr. LAMBERT: Our original Licensing Act was a very different measure prior to the passing of the amending legislation of 1922. At that time district magistrates were empowered to grant licenses, and licensing courts sat throughout the State. To co-ordinate the administration of the licensing law, the amendment Act was passed, being a replica of similar legislation which had operated well in both Victoria and New South Wales. Initially our board did excellent work, closing numerous unneeded hotels and bringing the liquor trade under reasonable control. The severest critic of the board must admit that our licensing law is administered much better now than was the case prior to the passing of the amending legislation. If it is urged that the police have done the work, I say that the police did it until the passing of the amendment Act.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: The Commissioner of Police could do all the work of the board.

Mr. LAMBERT: If we spend a paltry three or four thousand pounds on the proper administration of the licensing law, we are making an excellent investment. On the goldfields many hotels were vainly striving to compete with each other, and the board closed many of them. I admit that I have disagreed with some of the board's decisions. They closed a hotel in my electorate.

Mr. Thorn: Are the board responsible for the administration of hotels in your district?

Mr. LAMBERT: Yes.

Mr. Thorn: They are not. The police do that work.

Mr. LAMBERT: If Parliament wanted the Act to be properly policed, the members of the police force concerned in that work should have been placed under the control of the Licenses Reduction Board. I said the same thing here years ago. Under the amending legislation the board have certain functions to discharge, and they discharge them well. We can be proud of the administration of our licensing law. The Commissioner of Police has the same powers to-day as he had in 1910, or 1915, or 1920—until the amending legislation was passed. The administration of the licensing laws was such that Parliament desired to rectify anomalies. Hotels were

struggling against each other under dying conditions, so to speak.

The Minister for Justice: A living death.

Mr. LAMBERT: Yes, if we can apply that term. A Royal Commission investigated the conditions in the trade and as a result legislation was passed setting up the Licenses Reduction Board. I dissociate myself entirely from the criticism of the personnel of the board. If the member for Murchison has a grievance against any member of the board, that is his concern, not mine. From the standpoint of State-wide operations, the Licensing Board stand in an unassailable position. In earlier days the custom was for two justices of the peace and the resident magistrate to sit as a licensing court to decide whether applications for licenses should be granted. In Kalgoorlie 32 licenses were granted in the main street, and at Coolgardie there were 20 or 22 licenses.

Mr. Moloney: That is what the member for Toodyay wants now.

Mr. LAMBERT: In Southern Cross five or six licenses were granted. Right through out the goldfields areas licenses were allowed almost indiscriminately.

Hon. C. G. Latham: And they are doing it almost indiscriminately now.

The Minister for Justice: No.

Hon. C. G. Latham: What about the license at Nedlands? There was no justification for that.

Mr. Moloney: So you say.

Mr. LAMBERT: At any rate, the people of the district concerned have a right to express their views by way of a petition lodged with the board.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Then you say the board should grant the license on receipt of a petition?

Mr. LAMBERT: The board would deal with the application and decide whether the license should be granted or whether the petition should be rejected. To take a single instance and base condemnation of the board on it, is wrong. The other day the board granted a license at Palmer's Find. I felt that the hotel should be in a different position, but the board, with a full knowledge of the position and the evidence that was placed before them, granted the application as requested. If we were to revert to the old system under which we had little or no control over the licensing laws, it would be a retrograde step. I have always found the members of the Licensing Board

most helpful and courteous. I do not know how they treat the public ordinarily, but I know that some people ought to be treated in such a manner that they will get a clear and definite understanding of the position. There must be rigid control of the licensing laws. While the board must make exceptions owing to the climatic conditions on the goldfields, I do not think anyone in the metropolitan area at least has questioned their decisions.

Hon. C. G. Latham: But the board never sit to deal with cases against licensees.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: You can always get a drink at a club after hours.

Mr. LAMBERT: That is true, but the clubs are in a much better position from the standpoint of control because they are fully aware that if they do not carry out the provisions of the Act, it is within the province of the Licensing Board to refuse to renew their license.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That is not very easy to do.

Mr. LAMBERT: The board have control of the situation.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It is the endorsement of their license of which they stand in greatest fear.

The Minister for Justice: What have they to fear?

Hon. C. G. Latham: The board have nothing to do with that.

The Minister for Justice: Yes, they are the people who will review the license when it is presented for renewal.

Mr. LAMBERT: I have heard the amending Act we passed in 1922 referred to in various terms, but the fact remains that to-day we can be proud of the manner in which our licensing laws are administered. If the Leader of the Opposition desires the Licensing Board to deal with cases against publicans, or if he wishes the administration of the Act to be carried out by the police under the direction of the board, it is within his province to move in that direction. While I have sharply disagreed with some of the decisions of the board, particularly with regard to the reduction in the number of hotels in my electorate, it would be a retrograde step to revert to the old system. I am satisfied that the board desire to give a decision fair to all parties. I do think the board are rather exacting in the amount of money they demand to be spent on hotels in mining towns. However, that is all in the right direction for it pre-

cludes the building of mere beer houses. I do not know exactly what the member for Murchison wants but—

Mr. Marshall: Don't worry about my troubles. I can look after them myself, without you standing there for half an hour saying the same thing over and over again.

Mr. LAMBERT: I am desirous of helping the hon. member.

Mr. Raphael: You couldn't help yourself.

Mr. LAMBERT: I have had no complaints in my district against the licensing board, and I hope there will be no departure made from the principles embodied in the Act.

Mr. BOYLE: I do not wish to criticise the personnel of the board. I am rather astonished that the member for Murchison could have bottled up all that wrath all this time. I recollect the control of the liquor traffic under the system of a magistrate and two justices, and I can say without hesitation there is no comparison between the efficiency of the board system and that of the old resident magistrate with the two justices. The odds are overwhelmingly in favour of the existing system. We have in Western Australia the finest liquor control Act in Australia. The administration of the Act is a police measure. The licensing board takes the licensing requirements of the State as a whole. Under the old system the local magistrates had regard only to the respective districts in which they were operating, whereas to-day we have a more statesman-like conception of the requirements. It is a tremendously big State and the Licensing Board travels all over the State. The member for Murchison referred to the accommodation for boarders in Wiluna. The Act provides that the accommodation in a city hotel must be 12 rooms in addition to those occupied by the licensee and his family, and in the country six rooms over and above those required by the licensee. The police interpret it as their duty to see that those rooms are kept for the travelling public. Indeed, the principle underlying the Act is, not the sale of liquor, but the accommodation of the travelling public.

Mr. Raphael: What about the Alhambra Bars, known as The Dive?

Mr. BOYLE: Yes, that is the one exception to the rule. In the licensing of new pre-

nuises to-day the license becomes a prize to the person who can put up the most money. That is an entirely objectionable feature of the Act. We have an example at Yellow-dine, a new field not yet proven. There we had the spectacle of an unholy scramble for a liquor monopoly—for that is what it means—in that district, and £15,000 was the price paid in the cost of the premises, without the premium to be paid under the Act. By the time the premium is paid that house will have cost, say, £18,000. How can it be commercially or morally justified in the results to be obtained? But there is the danger, that in an over-capitalised hotel practices have to be resorted to which are condemned in other sections of the Act. It is illogical to expect that an over-capitalised licensed house can strictly comply with the law and pay its way. I suggest to the Minister an amendment to the Act. In the Workers' Homes Board we have a principle laid down. They set up three types of homes which may be chosen according to the financial status of the applicant. Why not set up three types of hotel buildings suitable for various localities, put the maximum capital cost on those hotel buildings and give the license to the most suitable person, not the person with the most money? Consider the old system in Albany. I suppose Albany furnishes one of the most striking examples of the over-capitalisation of hotels existing in Australia to-day. Under the old system, when a magistrate and two justices sat, every hotel in the town was rebuilt beyond its capacity to pay interest on the total capital cost. To-day there are in that town eight hotels capitalised at least 50 per cent. over the remotest possibility of their ever paying. The member for Albany knows that. The old system was a vicious one. I do not like to direct attention to any particular occupant of a magisterial position. The man I have in mind was estimable, honest and just in every way, but he had an absolute obsession to make the hotels in that town the best in Western Australia, and that was done at the expense of the owners. To-day the Premier Hotel, opposite the Town Hall, is for sale for £4,500, and the capital cost was between £11,000 and £12,000. Even allowing for existing depressed conditions, the disparity is too great.

Mr. Wansbrough: The London Hotel was sold for £4,000 last week.

[Mr. Sleeman took the Chair.]

Mr. BOYLE: The Licensing Board with a full sense of responsibility, could take the State as a whole, and if my suggestion were adopted there would be less over-capitalisation. I cannot support the motion to reduce the vote. The personnel of the present board does not enter into the matter. There may be something in what the member for Murchison said regarding the chairman. I do not know. If there is, I do not think this was the place to ventilate it. The hon. member should have brought his case before the responsible Minister who surely has some disciplinary control over magistrates.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I do not think he has.

Mr. Marshall: Over their decisions there is no control whatever.

Mr. BOYLE: I am not dealing with their decisions. I am referring to the gross acts of discourtesy mentioned by the hon. member.

Mr. Marshall: Go to Wiluna and see how you get on.

Mr. BOYLE: I would not defend gross discourtesy to anyone. I am amazed to think that it has continued so long. Not only Wiluna but the whole State is interested in the matter.

Mr. Marshall: Did you ever read the Kalgoorlie newspapers on the subject?

Mr. BOYLE: The Licensing Board has been charged with most important functions. They have power to grant or refuse licenses; they control the whole of the liquor trade of the State and the provision of accommodation for the travelling public. Their power is enormous. If they are allowed to brow-beat anyone—I am loth to think that Mr. Burgess or Mr. Barker would lend himself to it—

Mr. Marshall: I did not mention the name of either of those gentlemen.

Mr. BOYLE: I am astonished that either should remain quiescent during an act of gross discourtesy by the chairman.

Mr. Marshall: Do not say that I mentioned their names: I mentioned the chairman.

Mr. BOYLE: But they sat on the bench with the chairman.

Mr. Marshall: I will repeat what I said about Cahill any time.

Mr. BOYLE: I will not support the motion for reducing the vote.

Mr. WATTS: I do not propose to associate myself with any attack on the per-

sonnel of the Licensing Board, although I am fairly well acquainted with those gentlemen from another angle than that known to members of this Chamber. I think the time has arrived when we should give serious consideration to the question of altering the administration of the Licensing Act by dispensing with the board as constituted. The old Act was bad in itself; it was no good at all. Under it, inexperienced justices had as much or more say than the magistrate, and that was totally unsatisfactory. It would be a good idea, it seems to me, to appoint the stipendiary magistrates to deal with the licensing districts. Stipendiary magistrates are men of undoubted standing and probity, and there is no question that they could handle the business satisfactorily. I mention that partly because of the view, mentioned by the member for Wagon and the member for Beverley, that more stipendiary magistrates are required in portions of the State, and the money at present expended on the Licensing Board might well be used for the payment of such magistrates and the provision of better local facilities. The stipendiary magistrate, when appointed, could very well deal with the question of licensing hotel premises. It must be admitted, I think, that the present Act is entirely satisfactory. It requires no alteration; there is no occasion to alter anything except the administration. I suggest that the stipendiary magistrate system be given careful consideration, and for those reasons I propose to support the reduction of the vote.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The Minister should certainly take cognisance of the charges made against the chairman of the Licensing Board by the member for Murchison. If the statements made by the hon. member are true, some disciplinary action should be taken. Under the Act the Minister can do nothing, but when the time for re-appointment occurs, surely the matter could be given consideration. To me it seems to be a very serious matter. The member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie spoke about the powers of the licensing magistrates. They have nothing whatever to do with the control of hotels. All they do is to issue new licenses and deal with the renewal of licenses. They may inspect accommodation, but there is nothing in the Act to say that they shall do so.

The Minister for Justice: They do.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: They may, but they could not possibly inspect the whole of the hotels in the State.

Mr. Moloney: They travel all over the State.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I know that they went to the North-West not long ago, but they do not go all over the State year by year. They would not be able to cover the whole of the State during their three-years' term. The police and the police magistrates control the Act. The police charge licensees with any violation of the Act, but those cases are not brought before the Licensing Board.

The Minister for Justice: They are considered when application is made for a renewal of a license.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Only for that. If a license is endorsed three times for offences it cannot be renewed. It would be very difficult for the tribunal to refuse to renew a license if no complaints had been made by the police.

The Minister for Justice: What if the house was not up to standard?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The police are always called to give evidence in all cases of renewals. They are responsible for the administration of the Act. The magistrates, not the licensing board, hear the cases. Originally there was some necessity for a board to reduce licenses. In effect two boards were set up, one under Section 21 of the Act, and one under Section 83. A fund was also provided for de-licensed publicans, but that has long since been exhausted.

Mr. Marshall: Some four years ago.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: We in our last year of office had insufficient money in the fund from which to make any further payments. There cannot now be any demand upon the board for a reduction of licenses. I may have said by interjection that it was unnecessary to grant a license at Nedlands, but that matter had nothing to do with me. The magistrates have power to refuse a license, although a petition is lodged in favour of it. We know how the public are influenced from time to time. In the Nedlands district dozens of people would say they were sorry they signed the petition. I know all the stories that have been told about that.

Mr. Lambert: Fifty per cent. of the hotels in York could be done away with.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Two hotels have been closed there since the hon. member visited the district. I am not going to say anything about the Licensing Board, but I do know we could well save £3,000 if we abolished it. Stipendiary magistrates could do the work comfortably. Last year I moved to reduce this vote by £1. I do not think members of the Committee then were satisfied about the position. We now have the evidence of the member for Murchison.

Mr. Moloney: Do you subscribe to that?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The hon. member has already told the Committee all about it, and is now asking me for advice. I support the amendment to reduce the Vote by £1. This will afford the Government an opportunity to save a few thousand pounds. There is very little work for the board to do to-day, and such work as does exist could be carried out by the police. I know of some stupid things that were introduced by the Licensing Board. The hotel at Quairading was compelled to instal a septic tank when there was so little water available that it had to be brought up in a bucket. Mosquito nets were also insisted upon. I would prefer to sleep without one to using one that had not been washed for some time.

[Mr. Hegney took the Chair.]

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The whole question of magistrates is being reviewed, particularly in connection with the activities on the goldfields, where it is necessary to effect some alteration. This may be done either by appointing another magistrate, or altering the boundaries of existing magisterial districts to make them more convenient.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Are you closing the general debate on the Vote?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: When the Estimates are moved and the general discussion ceases, my reply closes the debate. After remaining quiet for a long time the hon. member now wants to get up and say something.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: On a point of order! An amendment has been moved, and I wish to speak on the general discussion.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment will have to be disposed of first.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: That will not close the general discussion.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment is before the Chair at the moment.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Then I shall have an opportunity to speak generally on the Vote?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. The amendment is that the Vote be reduced by £1.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Then the Minister was wrong in saying that he was closing the debate.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: What is the Committee's reasoning in regard to the amendment? A vitriolic attack was made on the board by the member for Murchison. That attack was followed by expressions of opinion from other members that the time had come for the Government to consider seriously the alteration of the licensing law so as to place stipendiary magistrates in charge of licensing matters. Would the carrying of the motion mean that we agree with what the member for Murchison has said, or would it mean that the vote should be reduced by £1? There is no need for reduction of the vote in order that the Government may consider whether the board should be retained or not; that is a matter to be dealt with by legislation. The moving of a reduction for such a purpose is unheard of. How are we to take the result of voting on the motion? How do hon. members regard the motion for reduction?

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: As a motion directing the Government not to reappoint the board.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: One of the strong arguments for the alteration of the law—which alteration admittedly has been of great benefit—was the desirableness of one controlling authority to deal in a uniform manner with the granting or refusal of licensing petitions, so that the matter should not be bound up in the decision of one man. It was felt that a board of three persons should be appointed to undertake the responsible duty. There had been all sorts of innuendoes as to what had occurred in connection with the granting or refusal of licenses. It was alleged that local people had allowed their local feelings to sway their judgment, and that therefore we must do away with the old system of two justices, with local prejudice, deciding on applications. In some measure that was the reason for the appointment of the board. There was also the fact that at that time it was thought necessary by Parliament to reduce the number of licenses. My personal view is that the administration of the licensing law

so far as the administration has been within the purview of the board as now constituted has been of immense benefit to Western Australia. Anyone who has travelled the country districts and outback places will have noticed an immense difference in the hotels and the accommodation and conveniences provided in those localities since the appointment of the board. While members may deprecate some of the things done by the board, they must admit that the improvement in the conduct of licensed premises is largely due to the board.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It is due to the new Act. A coach and four could have been driven through the old Act.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: The improvement is due to the combination of the two.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The Leader of the Opposition was quite favourable to this legislation.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Because it would serve a useful purpose in closing unnecessary hotels.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The Leader of the Opposition can get some first-hand information concerning the work of the board from the report of the board.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I suppose the report was laid on the Table only to-day.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: It has been lying on the Table since the 15th August, nearly two months. Members are so interested in the work of the board that they do not read the board's report.

Hon. C. G. Latham: We know the board can be done without.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I do not know that. There are some things that are more expensive to do without than to retain. Since the board has been in control, fair and candid people will admit, there has been a vast improvement in the licensed premises of this State, and the larger proportion of that improvement is due to the board's activities. I advise hon. members to read the board's report, instead of offering criticism of the members of the board without adequate knowledge of, at all events, that document. I regret that the observations of the member for Murchison should have been made here in the manner in which they were made. The hon. member destroyed any value that could attach to his case by overstatement and extravagant language. If the position as he has stated it were one-fourth correct, there would have

been an uproar throughout the State against the board. Unless we are to believe that the board in the arid region of Wiluna suddenly went mad and entirely altered the method of procedure used by them all through the rest of the State—which is entirely unbelievable—

Mr. Marshall: Have you ever read the Kalgoorlie Press on this subject?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I know what has appeared in the Kalgoorlie Press.

Mr. Marshall: It is your job to defend the board, and it is my duty to tell the truth. Go and listen to the chairman in court.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I have listened to him in the court, and I know what has been going on. The chairman of the Licenses Reduction Board is no more infallible than is the member for Murchison. But the extravagant language and the tirade of abuse that the member for Murchison launched against the chairman of the Licensing Board destroyed the whole effectiveness of his remarks. If there has been this discourtesy on the part of the chairman or any member of the board, it could not have continued without some strong protest being received before now. I have heard some people express dissatisfaction with the chairman's attitude, but I have heard many more complain regarding what judges of the Supreme Court have said or done and ten times as many more complain regarding actions by stipendiary magistrates or resident magistrates.

Mr. Marshall: But they are not discourteous like this man.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I would not mind if the hon. member expressed his opinion in less extravagant language.

Mr. Marshall: I will stick to every word I said and will repeat it when you sit down.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The hon. member can do as he pleases.

Mr. Marshall: I know the man and have listened to him. I do not want the Minister to tell me what I should say. Let him mind his own business.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I am.

Mr. Marshall: I sat and listened to this man. Don't you tell me what I ought to say.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: If it had been a matter of discourtesy, one could have listened to the hon. member.

Mr. Marshall: It was more than a matter of discourtesy.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Had the chairman done anything like the hon. member suggested, there would have been many protests before this. The hon. member's extravagant language reminded me of the historical remark by Disraeli when he said that a member had become intoxicated with the exuberance of his own verbosity.

Mr. Marshall: That is one thing you will never be.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The hon. member said most extravagant things and charged the chairman with discourtesy and piggishness and reflected upon his personal appearance.

Mr. Marshall: He reflected upon the electors of Wiluna.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: That may be so.

Mr. Marshall: He will not do that and get away with it. I am here to defend them.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The hon. member can take his own steps with that object in view. But I want a clear indication of what the Committee intend to do regarding the reduction of the Vote by £1. Is it to be an endorsement of the attitude of the member for Murchison?

Mr. Marshall: I do not care what it is for.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The member for Murchison has been against the board for seven or eight years, long before the chairman was a member of it.

Mr. Marshall: I have always been consistent in my attitude since the compensation fund became depleted four or five years ago.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The administration of the Licensing Board has always been anathema to the hon. member.

Mr. Marshall: I do not believe in the taxpayers continuing to pay for them.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The Licensing Board have carried out most effective work and I hope the Committee, by their vote, will not support the extravagant language indulged in by the member for Murchison. If that is the object of the amendment, we can take a vote at once. As to the other aspect, what is the idea? I would like the mover of the amendment to say clearly what he meant. He said that because the member for Mur-

chison had spoken as he had, he would move the amendment.

Mr. Thorn: No.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: That was all I could gather in explanation for the reduction of the vote. If the hon. member thinks that the amendment of the Licensing Act is necessary, it is not essential to move for a reduction in the Vote.

Mr. Thorn: May I say why I moved the amendment?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I am merely going on what the hon. member said when he moved it. My impression was that he moved because the member for Murchison made the statement he did.

Mr. Thorn: Not at all.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: That is what the hon. member said.

Government members: Of course.

Mr. Thorn: Cut that out! I said I considered the board was no longer necessary because it had done its work.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Is that any reason for moving a reduction in the Vote?

Mr. Thorn: It is an indication to the Government that we desire to abolish the board.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: That involves an amendment of the Act. If we desire an Act to be amended, do we always move to reduce the Estimates affected in order to indicate that desire?

Mr. Thorn: Is it not always the procedure in the Federal Parliament and State Parliaments, when it is desired that a position should be abolished, to move for a reduction in the Estimates?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: No, not when it is a matter of altering the law.

Mr. Patrick: A similar amendment was moved last year for the same purpose.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: No.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: For goodness sake, let us have order! Why all this talk across the Chamber?

Hon. C. G. Latham: Are you back again?

Hon. W. D. Johnson: I do not desire to be here all night listening to this rubbish.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I want to know the reason for the move to reduce the Vote.

The CHAIRMAN: I want members to understand that when I put the amend-

ment, it will decide the issue. If anyone desires to discuss the Vote, he must do so now, or he will not have the opportunity.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: You have arrived at that decision since I spoke.

The CHAIRMAN: That is my ruling now.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I am surprised at that ruling. The Chairman said I would have a suitable opportunity to reply. Now, by your altered ruling, you say that the general debate can continue. I will bow to your ruling, but I will have no opportunity to reply to other statements. That is not the proper way to carry on the business of the Committee.

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: I would ask the Minister, when he replies—

The Minister for Justice: I cannot reply at all, in view of the Chairman's ruling.

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: I want the Minister to give me some information regarding witness fees.

The Minister for Justice: I will be out of order if I reply.

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: Leave that to the Chairman to decide.

The Minister for Justice: He has decided.

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: The scale of witness fees has been in existence since the early days, and it is altogether inequitable now. I had occasion to give evidence in a case some time ago and other witnesses included an auctioneer, a foreman carpenter, a farmer and a farm labourer. The auctioneer was regarded as a professional man and was paid £1 1s. The foreman carpenter received £1 1s. I, as a farmer, received 15s. and the farm labourer received 10s. or 12s. A farmer may be subpoenaed to give evidence when he is in the middle of harvesting, seeding or shearing, and he should be entitled to receive at least as much as the professional man or the carpenter. Such payments fail to recognise the relative importance of witnesses. I ask the Minister to give the matter consideration with a view to seeing that a scale of charges that will be more equitable is adopted.

Amendment (that the Vote be reduced by £1) put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	13
Noes	17
					—
Majority against	4
					—

AYES

Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Latham	Mr. Seward
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Mann	Mr. Waite
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Welsh
Mr. North	Mr. Doney
Mr. Patrick	

(Teller)

NOES

Mr. Boyle	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Clothier	Mr. Needham
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Cross	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Fox	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Wise
Mr. Millington	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Moloney	

(Teller)

PAIR.

AYE.	NO.
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Collier

Amendment thus negatived.

Vote put and passed.

Progress reported.

BILL—INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE ACT CONTINUANCE.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

House adjourned at 11.5 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 15th October, 1935.

	PAGE
Assent to Bills	1086
Questions: Agricultural Bank—1, Resignation of G. M. Cornell; 2, Motor car fleet; 3, Commissioners' appointment	1087
Select Committee: Constitution Acts Amendment Act, 1899, Amendment Bill, extension of time	1087
Bills: Financial Emergency Act Amendment, 1R.	1087
Brands Act Amendment, 3R.	1087
Droving Act Amendment, 3R.	1087
Rural Relief Fund, further recom.	1087
Traffic Act Amendment, Com.	1092

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

ASSENT TO BILLS.

Messages from the Lieut.-Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills:—

- 1, Cremation Act Amendment.
- 2, Land Tax and Income Tax.
- 3, Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment.