

one moment, even to hint that I have any particular benefit, or that I should have any undue interest in passing a measure of this sort, is, I think, going much too far. I do not know the tramway company in the matter; I do not know any individual property-owner in the matter; I know the petitioners whom I have had to consider, and I know the public authorities who have had to put the matter before me, including the hon. members representing the district, and at their request I have been out and seen and traversed the different routes and examined the question, and I have come to the conclusion that this is the proper attitude to take up, the attitude which I have taken up, to introduce this measure and to ask the House to pass it, not in the interests of any company or individual, but in the interests of the great majority of the residents and ratepayers of the neighbourhood.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

House adjourned at 11.33 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 18th November, 1909.

	PAGE
Friendly Societies Select Committee, Extension of time	1463
Bills: Land Act Amendment, 1R.	1463
Agricultural Lands Purchase, Leave, 1R.	1463
Abattoirs, Council's amendments	1464
Public Education Endowment, Council's Amendment	1473
North Perth Tramways Act Amendment, Com.	1474
Land Act Special Lease, Council's Amendment	1475
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, Com.	1475

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

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES SELECT COMMITTEE.

Extension of time.

Mr. BOLTON moved—

That the time for bringing up the report of the Friendly Societies Select Committee be extended for one fortnight.

The chairman of the select committee had been desirous of making an interim report that day, but in his absence he (Mr. Bolton) desired to move for the extension of time for a fortnight. The chairman of the committee desired to say that certain friendly societies on the goldfields had requested to have their officials called to give evidence. The select committee had met during the last fortnight on several occasions, but they would be unable to submit their final report before a fortnight's time.

Question put and passed.

BILL—LAND ACT AMENDMENT.

Introduced by the Premier and read a first time.

BILL—AGRICULTURAL LANDS PURCHASE.

Leave—First Reading.

The PREMIER (Hon. N. J. Moore) moved—

For leave to introduce a Bill for "An Act to make better provision for the purchase of lands suitable for immediate settlement and for facilitating settlement on the land."

Mr. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret): There did not appear to be any necessity for this Bill at the present time, or at all events it could not be described as being urgent. At the close of the session with so much work in front of us this measure need not be brought down. We had been led to believe from the land agents in the various districts, and at the land agencies in the Eastern States and elsewhere, that there was plenty of Crown land in Western Australia available for settlement. It was not a wise proposition for the Government to repurchase lands when

this state of affairs existed. The Government should not spend money in buying private lands while the finances were in their present position. So long as there was a sufficient quantity of Crown land available for settlement within a fair distance of railway communication members should not be asked to give the Government authority to buy back other areas. There had been numerous speeches of condemnation in this House and in the country made by people who stated that the Government were practically misleading the public as to the land available for settlement. It had been said that the Crown lands were not what they were represented to be by the Government. He did not desire to oppose, with any great force, the measure at this stage, but he intended to have the measure thoroughly debated in all its stages after the second reading had been moved.

The PREMIER (in reply): The measure was introduced with the object of increasing the amount of money available for repurchasing estates from £200,000 to £400,000. The authority for the former amount had been absorbed, and it was anticipated that the additional sum would be needed.

Mr. Underwood: Let the Government sell some of the millions of acres of Government land painted green on the map.

The PREMIER: Anyone would think that this money was being expended by the Government, and that there was no return for it. The sum of £200,000 had been spent, but it was always coming back to the Government, who did not lose by the transaction. With the money the Government repurchased estates and sold them again after adding 10 per cent. to the cost, and allowing for surveys and other improvements. The people purchased the estates and thus enabled a certain amount of traffic to go to the Railway Department. It was wise that that should be done. There was not the least doubt that arguments would be advanced on the second reading which would convince members, such as the member for Mount Margaret, that it was advisable in the best interests of the State that the Bill should be passed.

Question put and passed.

Bill introduced and read a first time.

BILL—ABATTOIRS.

Council's Amendments.

Schedule of three amendments made by the Legislative Council, now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Daglish in the Chair; the Minister for Lands in charge of the Bill.

No. 1, Clause 6, Subclause 1, Paragraph (m)—Strike out the word "the" in line 2.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS moved—

That the Council's amendment be agreed to.

It was obvious that the word should be inserted.

Question passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 2, Clause 9, paragraph (d.)—Before the word "order" insert "written."

The MINISTER FOR LANDS moved—

That the Council's amendment be agreed to.

There was no objection to the word "written" being inserted before "order"; it would not interfere with the efficiency of the Bill.

Mr. BATH: A number of instances could be conceived in which it might be very inconvenient for the officer to have to supply a written order to carry out some instructions which he might give to any person. There were circumstances in which there could be no difficulty whatever for an officer to supply a written order, but this would mean that in his rounds in visiting abattoirs, or carrying out his duties, if he had to go back to his office to write out an order, while he was away another breach might be committed. The amendment was not necessary, and we should rely upon the discretion of the officer that he would not give an order which would be unreasonable.

The Premier: It would do away with the likelihood of any dispute afterwards.

Mr. BATH: The trouble that was foreseen was not because of the zeal of those who would carry out the duties under the Bill, but the difficulty was generally the other way, the lack of zeal and neglect in administration. Under these circumstances one did not like to see an obstacle put in the way of a zealous officer carrying out his duties.

Mr. BOLTON: There had been occasions when it had been necessary to protect officers who had said that they had given verbal orders, and whose statement had been denied by the people in high positions before whom the officer had to appear. It would not be difficult for an officer to tear a leaf from his pocket book and write an order on that. The procedure would certainly be a safeguard, and the amendment should be agreed to.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: There would be no difficulty whatever about giving a written order; in fact, it would be just as easy to give a written order as a verbal order. The member who had just sat down had occasion to accompany him (the Minister) on an inspection, where it was found that two officers had given contrary orders. If these orders had been written there would have been no trouble whatever. If the amendment were passed it would assist in the control of the work.

Mr. TAYLOR: From what the Minister said, if we accepted the amendment it would be absolutely necessary to furnish a written order; verbal instructions would be of no value. It was not always necessary to issue written instructions. The measure would give power to the Government to appoint inspectors as a protection to the public, and these inspectors were to be men who would use their powers with credit to themselves and for the benefit of the public. Inspectors occupying these positions would not consider the loss that might fall to the stock owner. If a beast were not fit for human consumption it would be the inspector's duty to say so and have it destroyed: but if the amendment were carried it might hamper him if he had to go away and secure a written order. While on this subject attention ought to be drawn to a report which appeared some four or five

weeks ago in the *Mirror* about the condition of the slaughter yards in Kalgoorlie. There were also some photographs in that journal showing a number of carcasses with flies on them.

The Minister for Lands: All that will be altered.

Mr. TAYLOR: If the Minister did not alter that state of affairs the community would soon be considerably altered. It was the most shocking account, if it were true—and there was no reason to doubt its accuracy—that had ever been in print; it was equal, in fact, to what one would expect to read in *The Jungle*. Decisive action should be taken; every power should be given to an inspector, and he should not be hampered.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The reason given by the Minister in favour of the adoption of the amendment did not impress one. If the Minister thought that the officer would be better with a written order, it seemed ridiculous to believe that this written order would make the officer more competent. As a matter of fact it would interfere with the carrying out of his work if he had to go away and write it out. Why did not the police give a written notice to a burglar that they intended to arrest him? It seemed that where it was a matter of property, the property was well hemmed in and well represented, too. He protested against the amendment being passed. It was unnecessary and would act detrimentally against the inspectors.

Mr. FOULKES: The amendment afforded the best protection that the inspector would have. If a defendant were taken to court, all that it would be necessary for him to do would be to come forward with a couple of witnesses and swear that no verbal order had been given to him: the result would be that the magistrate would dismiss the proceedings. He would be obliged to dismiss the case, and that was no reason why the Committee should support the amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR: The argument of the member for Claremont was fallacious. It was well known that when an inspector condemned a carcass he not only did that but he ordered its destruction, and then he followed it to the place where it

was destroyed. The member for Claremont must be aware that unless the inspector actually saw to the destruction of the carcasses, the written order would be of no avail. The inspector had to follow the carcass.

Mr. Jacoby: And take possession of it.

Mr. TAYLOR: It was useless unless he did take possession of it.

Mr. Jacoby: Then what is the use of an order at all?

Mr. TAYLOR: As the result of the amendment the inspector would be found hanging on to the carcass with one hand while with the other he felt about for pen and ink. Surely it was known that it was not sufficient for an inspector to order a carcass to be destroyed. If the inspector did not himself see to the destruction of the carcass, no notice would be taken of his order. An inspector not only attended at the slaughter yards and inspected the stock, but he saw to it that the condemned stuff was destroyed. That was his most important work. It was the following up of the carcasses to see that they were destroyed that took up the inspector's time.

The Minister for Lands: We will confiscate at these abattoirs.

Mr. TAYLOR: Possibly the Minister intended to confiscate. Some of the inspectors had altogether too big an area to go over.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was getting away from the question, which was as to whether or not the order should be written.

Mr. TAYLOR: The order in itself would be altogether ineffective. The urgency of the question did not permit of an inspector walking away from a diseased carcass, for a person who would attempt to put a bad carcass on the market would make no scruples about disregarding the order of the inspector.

Mr. Gordon: What are they doing while the inspector is away seeing that the carcass is destroyed?

Mr. TAYLOR: At such times they were probably preparing more cronk carcasses in the hopes of dodging the inspector next time. It was absurd for the Minister to try and foist on the Committee the amendment for a written instruction.

The Minister for Lands: Under this measure we will confiscate all unfit meat.

Mr. TAYLOR: And what would the Minister do with it? Would he leave it hanging at the abattoirs, or would he send it out to the civil servants who had gone on the land? If the Government were going to confiscate why ask for a written order from the inspector? Would not a diseased carcass carry its own written order for destruction? The amendment was an insult to the intelligence of hon. members.

Mr. SCADDAN: While agreeing that the Committee ought to be careful to protect the public he thought the Committee would be going the right way about meeting that obligation by accepting the amendment. We had many different classes of inspectors in the State, and in some instances when prosecutions had been commenced by different departments on the strength of verbal instructions by inspectors the defendants had sworn that they had received no such verbal instructions, whereupon the cases had been thrown out. Certainly the inspector should issue a written order. There would be no need for him to carry about pen and ink, for an indelible pencil would serve the purpose. The inspector could keep his order in duplicate as a safeguard against the plea that no such order had been issued. All the orders issued in the abattoirs would not necessarily be in connection with the destruction or confiscation of a beast. There were numbers of parts of beasts which might be condemned and ordered to be destroyed, but which would not affect the remainder of the beast. Moreover, there was not merely the duty of inspecting the beasts themselves, but also of inspecting the surroundings and the general management of the abattoirs. The Committee would be the more effectively protecting the public by providing for a written order than by being content with verbal instructions to be issued by the inspector.

Mr. BUTCHER: The amendment did not apply to carcass meat, but only to stock taken into abattoirs for slaughtering purposes. The carcass was dealt with under the Health Act. It was necessary

to have some means to prevent diseased stock being taken into abattoirs for the purpose of slaughtering, because beasts might be suffering from a disease that might not be detectable in the carcase. A written notice was necessary because it was hard to secure convictions on verbal orders.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: If in the court a witness said he had not heard the inspector giving a verbal order, it would be merely negative evidence. If a magistrate would not take the inspector's word as to a verbal order having been given, he would not accept the inspector's statement as to the correctness of a duplicate of a written order.

Mr. Seaddan: The inspector could get the person to sign the duplicate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: If we compelled written orders to be given, it would mean plenty of red tape and expense, and have little effect. In fact it would hamper the inspector beyond all reason. These orders would apply to everything in the abattoirs, and not only to the cattle taken in for slaughter. Of course the member for North Fremantle supported the amendment, but the hon. member would support almost anything in his own electorate. No reasons were advanced in support of the Council's amendment.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No order would be necessary once the beast was slaughtered, because if a diseased carcase was found it would be confiscated. It was necessary to have the abattoirs in order to have perfect control of the meat supply for the people, and it was necessary that the inspector's order should be obeyed in regard to many things in connection with the abattoirs, such as the feeding and the care of stock, the nature of the food and the supply of water for the stock, and in regard to cleanliness. The amendment decidedly improved the Bill.

Mr. BOLTON: In answer to the member for Port Hedland and Kellerberrin—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must refer to the member for Pilbara by his proper constituency.

Mr. BOLTON: The member for Pilbara, who had a knowledge of Port

Hedland and Kellerberrin, should also ascertain there were no abattoirs at North Fremantle. If there were he (Mr. Bolton) had too much sense to advocate them in the Chamber. He supported the amendment in order to protect the inspectors appointed to fight big combines who claimed orders were not given because they were not in writing. As a matter of fact the abattoirs were on the gold-fields, showing that he could raise his mind a little above his own electorate, which some members could not do.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 3—Clause 7—Add the following words:—"Except in the case of any abattoir established before the passing of this Act, and certified in writing by the Minister on the recommendation of the controller within three months after the passing of this Act to be an abattoir fit to continue registered and licensed under the provisions of the Health Act, 1898."

The MINISTER FOR LANDS moved—

That the Council's amendment be agreed to.

Mr. ANGWIN: Could we take an amendment to Clause 7 after dealing with an amendment to Clause 9?

The CHAIRMAN: The question was not the order of the clauses, but the order of the amendments of another place. The hon. member was quite in order.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: There were certain abattoirs, particularly at Robb's jetty, it was proposed to allow to be used. They had been erected at considerable cost, and it was necessary to allow them, so long as they were maintained and kept in a proper condition, to remain licensed. This was explained when the Bill was before the House. The idea was that the area on which the works were built should be excluded from the abattoir area which would, he hoped, soon be declared at Fremantle; but the amendment was an improvement on that idea because it gave the Government the power to continue the licenses now held by the owners of those abattoirs and made it necessary for the controller to immediately visit the abattoirs and cer-

tify that they were up to date in every detail and fit to be continued as licensed places for the slaughter of beasts. It did not follow that the Health Department would be compelled to license them, but one could take it that would be done under the Health Act. The works at Robb's jetty would be required for some time probably to deal with the cattle brought from the North. The idea was to erect abattoirs for the export of meat at North Fremantle and to have those abattoirs used by the butchers in the metropolitan area, at any rate for the present until the accommodation at North Fremantle was too limited for the purpose. His desire was to have every abattoir used in the metropolitan area up to date, and that any man who wished to set about the business of butchering should have some place for slaughtering. That the Government would provide at North Fremantle. There seemed to be no reason why we should not accept this amendment.

Mr. BATH: The proposal to accept the amendment might be modified by a proviso that the exception should not apply for longer than a stated period. It was recognised that as long as the abattoirs were properly conducted and conformed to the provisions of the Health Act it might be necessary to allow them to be continued until the new Act got into proper working order. Otherwise we would have chaos in connection with the slaughtering of stock for consumption. The efficacy of the measure would be dependent upon the concentration of inspection work in as few localities as possible. Would the Bill, when passed, be administered by the Stock Department or the Health Department?

The Minister for Lands: The abattoir areas will be administered through the Stock Department.

Mr. BATH: The provisions for inspection were mainly for the purpose of preventing the spread of tuberculosis by the consumption of infected stock. There could be no question that at the present time we had made a terrible mistake, to be fraught with evil consequences in the future, such as were almost unthought of

now, by handing over the control of dairy stock to the Stock Department. All now, by handing over the control of the Health Department, with its present departmental methods, it would not be much better. Those recognising the lack of administrative zeal in the Health Department would say we had done worse, judging by the report of the meeting the other night, by handing over the control to the Stock Department. Even with the Bill without the amendment there would be reason to doubt whether we would have sufficient inspection under it, but if the inspectors were to be charged with the extra duty of also inspecting abattoirs outside those constructed under the Bill, they would be clothed with a power they would not be able to carry out properly. As the Minister had said, there would, of course, be a transition stage during which matters should be allowed to continue to a certain extent as they were, but there should be an amendment to the amendment from another place providing that the exception should not apply for a longer term than, say, 12 or 18 months after the Act came into force.

The Minister for Lands: It is an annual license that can be discontinued at any time.

Mr. BATH: Those persons were given the power, and we recognised their right to registration, no limitation of time being expressed. He did not wish to make the term unreasonably short, but the Minister should protect the public and give an opportunity for effective administration in connection with the inspection of meat for consumption by limiting the proposal to a specified period.

The Honorary Minister: How about abattoirs which have been recently erected at a cost of £12,000 or £15,000?

Mr. BATH: There should be time given to them to make an adjustment. The Minister must recognise that the consideration of the public health was paramount. In the past his colleagues and he had done things which, to a certain extent, had been injurious to those owning stock. That was inseparable from Acts passed for the protection of public health. It was not to be denied that under the meas-

ure possibly those who had erected abattoirs of their own might suffer to some extent, but this must not be allowed to influence members in face of the paramount necessity for protecting the health of the public.

Mr. OSBORN: It was to be hoped the Minister would not entertain the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition at this juncture. Abattoirs had been erected at Robb's Jetty under the supervision of the proper authorities, and most of them had been erected at very great expense. Surely the Leader of the Opposition would not advocate that £12,000 or £15,000 of property should cease to exist in 18 months. The fact might be mentioned, that the abattoirs there were practically for the sole use of stock brought into the State by steamer. For that reason the site was the best that could possibly be obtained and much better than the site at North Fremantle. There was no need to put the purchaser to the cost of railing stock from Robb's jetty to North Fremantle, for if that were done it would immediately result in an increased price of meat to the consumer. If obstacles were put in the way of the purchaser and the butcher meat would go up in price. Stock from the Eastern States as well as from the North-West were landed at Robb's jetty and abattoirs would continue to exist there for some years, even if the Government might have to decide to take them over. It was necessary that they should be established there. There was no gainsaying the fact that thousands of head of stock were brought by vessel to the abattoirs at Robb's jetty. It would be easy later on to obviate any difficulty that might exist by bringing in an amending Bill to provide that abattoirs there should cease to exist.

Mr. W. PRICE: There was no necessity for the amendment suggested by another place. He was opposed to it in its entirety. Clause 3 of the Bill provided that the Government might declare districts, and power was also given to suspend the operation of the measure in any district. If the amendment were necessary abattoirs at present existing, providing they complied with the Health Act and were in accordance with present

requirements, might continue for an indefinite period, if they were kept in the same state of efficiency and cleanliness that they were at the present time. He had in his mind one district where there was a fight going on against the use of abattoirs erected by the State at a considerable cost.

The Minister for Lands: Where is that?

Mr. W. PRICE: At Kalgoorlie. We should not pass an amendment which would practically give to the owners of existing private abattoirs near Kalgoorlie the right to continue for an indefinite period. If the department were not prepared to force private abattoirs to close they could exempt a district without there being inserted in the Bill an amendment such as that proposed.

Mr. TAYLOR: There was a desire on the part of the Minister, in his ready acceptance of the amendment from another place, to hamper in every way possible the administration of the measure. There were Government abattoirs at Kalgoorlie which had never been used except in experimenting on bags of sand and a few cattle. When the bullocks were tried there was a holy muddle.

The Minister for Lands: That is not so.

Mr. TAYLOR: It was so. The Bill appeared to have been introduced with the object of legalising the abattoirs at Kalgoorlie. There had been a feeling for years that there should be public abattoirs on the goldfields and on the coast, and the introduction of the measure was evidently the result of a desire on the part of the Government to meet the wishes of the people in this respect. The existing slaughter yards, or so-called abattoirs, were so wholly unequal to requirements that it was thought necessary to bring in the measure. When the Bill was brought before this House previously the Minister assured members that all was right, and it went through without opposition from him, because he thought the measure was needed. So soon, however, as the Bill reached another Chamber, where vested interests had a very much larger proportion of representation, the great cattle kings, the representatives

of the people who had been exploiting the public for so long—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not reflect upon members of another place.

Mr. TAYLOR: The reference he had made was not to the members of another place but to those whom they represented. They were the people who were the cause of this Bill. The Minister was ready and willing to accept suggestions, amendments and rebuffs from another place. The Bill as brought down originally had quite a different object. There were abattoirs here recently constructed costing £10,000 or £12,000, and they should be up to date. Why should there be any subterfuges and not declare them abattoirs under the Bill. There should not be any dual control. The amendment gave control under the Public Health Act; why should the control not be under the Bill? Why did we require dual control for the slaughtering of stock for the markets? If the Minister was willing to agree to the amendment why did he not bring a similar proposal down when the Bill was originally before the House. The Minister should stick to this Bill. He must have been satisfied originally that it would meet all requirements; what had made him alter his opinion? The Committee should not give dual control, and the whole of the slaughtering in the State should come under the measure before the Committee. Probably the pressure of property had altered the Minister's opinion. It was impossible for the Minister to wholly remove the bad impression which had been given by the description of the condition of those slaughter houses referred to in the newspaper article. The abattoirs in Kalgoolie were not abattoirs at all; they were only a model and were only fit for one person to slaughter a few stock in, and had been absolutely condemned by everyone who had seen them.

The CHAIRMAN: That question did not touch the amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR: We were dealing with abattoirs.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member could not discuss that phase of the question. The subject to be discussed was the

question raised in the amendment, and the hon. member should confine his remarks to that.

Mr. TAYLOR: It was his desire to do so. These abattoirs were the very ones that were established before the passing of the Bill. If members could not discuss these abattoirs how were they going to put their views before the Committee? They could not discuss dairies, factories or piggeries. Members wanted to discuss abattoirs, and as far as he was concerned he would discuss them.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member could not go into the general question.

Mr. TAYLOR: It was his intention to go into the question of abattoirs established "before the passing of this Act," as stated in the amendment of another place; and the liberty of speech should not be curtailed if a man happened to be opposing the Government or if he was opposing something from another place.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not reflect on the Chair.

Mr. TAYLOR: There was no intention on his part of reflecting on the Chair. He was trying to force the position that he was entitled to discuss abattoirs erected "before the passing of this Act."

The CHAIRMAN: The question before the Committee was the amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR: The amendment excepted "abattoirs established before the passing of this Act." Those were the words and they conveyed, to his mind, exactly what he had been discussing and nothing else. The Minister desired those abattoirs to remain as abattoirs if they were licensed under the Health Act. If he (Mr. Taylor) were not allowed to discuss the abattoirs, the best thing to do would be to give the Government their own way, shut up Parliament, and gag the people. He was absolutely on sound ground under all the Standing Orders and all the rules of debate that he had ever read or had anything to do with. The amendment was absolutely unnecessary. The cause of the Bill was the dilapidated and degraded condition of some of the slaughter houses of the State.

Mr. Gordon: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. TAYLOR: We were now trying to rectify that condition of affairs. A

Meat Commission had been appointed at a big expense, and a select committee sat six years ago and recommended public abattoirs, and the Bill submitted to the House was for that purpose. Surely the Minister ought to endeavour, therefore, to stick to his Bill and impress upon the minds of the public that the abattoirs, whether they were built "after the passage of this Act" or before, would be up-to-date, and that every facility would be given for the despatch of carcasses to our markets in a clean and wholesome condition. There should be no desire to allow these rookeries, which were in existence over three months before the passing of this measure, to be legalised as slaughtering places under the Public Health Act even if they had previously held a license under that Act. Did the Minister think that members were asleep because the Opposition had assisted the Government in many respects, and were going to be ridden over rough shod? Certainly not. Members should reject the amendment.

Mr. GORDON: No one could agree with the hon. member when he said that the cause of this Bill being brought down be pointed out that a slaughter house already existing in the State. It might be pointed out that a slaughter house had been built at Fremantle at a cost of £40,000. Surely that could not be regarded as disreputable, especially when it had been admitted to be one of the most up-to-date in Australia. The hon. member had not been to Fremantle or he would not have criticised the slaughter houses in Western Australia in the manner that he had done. There were three at Fremantle, and not one had cost less than £20,000. The object of the abattoirs being built was to convenience all the smaller butchers who would be able to get their stock killed at the Government abattoirs. The inspection of abattoirs in Western Australia was well-nigh perfect, and was more up-to-date than any other in Australia. That had been proved beyond all doubt. The existing abattoirs should be protected. Nine years ago a resolution had been passed in Parliament affirming the desirability of erect-

ting public abattoirs. Subsequently he had moved that the resolution should be given effect to. This had been long before Messrs. Copley & Company had spent a shilling on abattoirs. That firm had written to the Government asking if it were intended to build public abattoirs because, if so, the firm had no desire to build for itself. So too with the other big meat firms. It was only because the Government had refused to erect abattoirs that Messrs. Copley & Company had been forced to spend £40,000 on a private establishment. For the same reason Messrs. Forrest, Emanuel had spent some £15,000 on improvements, and Messrs. Connor, Doherty & Durack also had spent a large amount on abattoirs. It would be most unfair if these abattoirs were now to be closed up.

Mr. Taylor: The Minister thought they would be when he brought his Bill down.

Mr. GORDON: To close them would be to inflict a manifest injustice. He would not hear the abattoirs of the State condemned as they had been by the member for Mount Margaret.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: On first bringing down the Bill he had told the House that the abattoirs at Robb's jetty would be exempt from the operation of the measure. He resented the imputation made by the hon. member who had suggested that he (the Minister) had been approached by the cattle kings. For his part he was glad to know that those so-called cattle kings had been enterprising enough to put up thoroughly good works, and he hoped that they would be protected.

Mr. Hudson: What control will be exercised over them?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The same control as would be exercised over the Government abattoirs. The only abattoirs he had in his mind were those at Robb's jetty. From his experience of the Kalgoorlie private abattoirs he could say there was not one which would have a chance of being licensed.

Mr. Taylor: I was only discussing those at Kalgoorlie.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Kalgoorlie abattoirs to which he was referring were those privately owned.

Mr. Brown: But you cannot use the public abattoirs at Kalgoorlie. You will have to license the private ones.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member knew nothing about it. That canard had been set going by the butchers up there who did not wish to use the public abattoirs. The Committee would not wish that licenses should be refused to the more reputable of the private abattoirs—abattoirs which had been properly built, and that, too, at a time when the Government were not prepared to face the expense. These abattoirs were up-to-date, and so long as they were maintained in this condition, they should be licensed. However, the license would only be an animal one, and it could be refused if there were any good ground for such refusal. After the Bill had passed the House it had been found that those private abattoirs at Robb's jetty would be better protected in the manner now suggested. Under the amendment the whole of the works would be included in the abattoir area. The control would be just the same as in the public abattoirs, and would be exerted not only over the meat slaughtered, but over the men engaged in the operations and the plant used in connection therewith. He hoped the Committee would agree to the amendment because it would appreciably improve the Bill.

Mr. BROWN: Probably nobody regretted more than did the Minister for Lands himself the fact that the Minister had to accept the position in which he found himself. If a select committee were to be appointed, they would find that the abattoirs in Kalgoorlie were the greatest monument of inexperience ever perpetrated in the State. Having regard to the present condition of the Government abattoirs at Kalgoorlie it was absolutely impossible to do away with the private slaughter houses, and use the public establishment. All who had any experience in these matters were agreed that the public abattoirs at Kalgoorlie were splendidly built, but that for accommodation and for practical purposes they were absolutely impossible.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was getting wide of the amendment.

Mr. BROWN: Nobody regretted more than the Minister himself that he had to accept this amendment which had been devised to help him out of the terrible condition of affairs he had got into owing to his inexperience of public abattoirs.

The Minister for Lands: Is the hon. member justified in saying that?

Mr. BROWN: If the Minister would appoint a select committee he would see the justification for it.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was not out of order.

Mr. WARE: The amendment should be supported if only for the reason that it would render the Bill abortive. He agreed with Mr. Brown that the public abattoirs at Kalgoorlie were far from answering the requirements of the district. The Minister had expended a considerable sum of money in connection with these abattoirs, and if the amendment were accepted and included in the Bill it would mean that any firm would have three months in which to build suitable abattoirs.

Hon. Members: You are wrong.

Mr. WARE: The owner of a private abattoir at the present time could make such alterations and additions to his establishment within three months that the health officer would have to recommend to the Minister, and the Minister would have to allow, such abattoirs to remain in existence. That was the way in which he read the amendment.

Hon. Members: You are wrong.

Mr. WARE: It was a cunningly devised plan from another place. When the abattoirs at Kalgoorlie were brought into operation it would be found that the conveniences there provided were altogether inadequate. He would support the amendment.

(Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.)

Mr. TAYLOR: Any remarks made by him in connection with abattoirs or slaughter houses had no reference to the abattoirs at Fremantle. His remarks were based on the condition of the slaughter yards at Kalgoorlie, and on the construction of the public abattoirs there. It was not fair on the part of the mem-

ber for Canning, whether the hon. member did it wilfully or not, to put words into his mouth he did not use. The Minister admitted the abattoirs at Kalgoorlie were not up to the standard, and that he had removed the trouble. There was not sufficient argument put before members to induce them to accept the amendment made by another place.

Mr. DAVIES: The amendment made by the Council should be agreed to. He had repeatedly asked the Minister to put this amendment in the Bill. There were seven or eight abattoirs at South Fremantle all within a radius of half a mile. They were all under regular and thorough inspection by the local authorities and the Central Board of Health, and there would be no harm done to the public by allowing them to exist. They had cost about £60,000 or £70,000, and consideration should be given to the people owning them. If consideration was not given to them in the Bill we would have to give compensation later on, and that would be a hardship for the State. In addition those people were paying £100 per acre per annum as rent for their places.

Mr. COLLIER dissented from the views expressed by the member for Mount Margaret and other members in regard to the public abattoirs at Kalgoorlie. It was distinctly unfair for the member for Perth to make a bald unsupported statement that the abattoirs were a waste of money and had proved of no use.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Perth was ruled out of order.

Mr. COLLIER realised that, but seeing that several members were permitted to say the money had been wasted, he ought to be allowed to briefly contradict the statement. As a member representing that part of the State, he had never heard from any person qualified, or whose authority was weighty, any such statement as those made by the members who condemned the abattoirs. The local governing bodies had not objected.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not pursue that subject.

Mr. COLLIER: Statements were made condemnatory of the abattoirs, and it was not fair for hon. members to make these statements without producing some facts

or evidence other than mere newspaper reports. The abattoirs were—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not pursue this.

Mr. COLLIER would not pursue it further, but desired to say that the member for Perth and several other members were allowed to make statements.

The CHAIRMAN: Those hon. members were ruled out of order.

Mr. COLLIER: The member for Hannans was not ruled out of order.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Hannans was quite in order.

Mr. COLLIER: The hon. member clearly made the same statements as the member for Mount Margaret.

The CHAIRMAN: That is not so.

Mr. COLLIER: Very well. Another opportunity would be found on the Estimates. There was no reason why the amendment should not be agreed to. It gave no additional power to what was in Clause 3, and if by agreeing to the amendment it would facilitate the passage of the Bill there was no reason why it should not be agreed to.

Mr. HUDSON: One gathered from the discussion that this was another illustration of the crudeness of draftsmanship in regard to these Bills. The Government had a tendency to bring down measures and allow amendments to be made and drafted without having knowledge of their effect. This was not the proper course to pursue, and caused a waste of time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: It seemed that the amendment was merely put in for the sake of making an amendment. The Minister would have just as much power without the amendment as with it.

Question passed: the Council's amendment agreed to.

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

BILL—PUBLIC EDUCATION EN- DOWMENT.

Council's Amendment.

Amendment made by the Legislative Council now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Daglish in the Chair, the Attorney General in charge of the Bill.

Clause 2.—Add the following sub-clause:—"The Trustees, other than the Minister of Education and the Inspector General of Schools, shall be appointed from time to time for not exceeding three years, and shall be eligible for re-appointment."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL moved—

That the Council's amendment be agreed to.

At present there was no limit to the time for which the trustees were appointed. No exception could be taken to limiting the term to three years. It would enable the Government to re-appoint any trustee who had acted satisfactorily and who desired to be re-appointed.

Question passed, the Council's amendment agreed to.

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

BILL—NORTH PERTH TRAMWAYS ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Mr. Daglish in the Chair; the Minister for Works in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Confirmation of provisional order:

Mr. SCADDAN: If this clause were passed could the Committee subsequently make an amendment to the provisional order?

The CHAIRMAN: When the clause was passed it really ratified the agreement to pass the provisional order; therefore, the clause, when adopted, confirmed the provisional order as it stood.

Mr. SCADDAN: In connection with the deposit which was to be held, the Government should see that the company carried out their part of the contract by completing the work in the time specified. Would the Minister provide a clause in the Bill that if the company did not comply with the provisional order the deposit would be forfeited. The company had already received some consideration, for they had not complied with the provisional

order, yet the deposit, which was a guarantee that they would carry out the provisions of that order, had not been forfeited, but had been used as a deposit for the provisional order set out in this Bill. No further extension of time should be allowed.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The company had been granted extension of time on two occasions, from December, 1908, to the 24th December of the present year. This extension had been granted at the request of the municipal council, and it was not fair to lay the blame for that on the tramway company who, he understood, were always prepared to carry out their original agreement to build the line along Forrest-street. The council, however, asked to have the time extended so that they might carry out their negotiations and have the desired alteration made. Unless for some very vital circumstance there would be no extension so far as he was concerned. Once the Bill was passed the company would have to carry out their contract up to date. He understood the line would be completed by Christmas, although the company were allowed three months in which to do the work. It would be hardly fair to ask that a clause be inserted in the Bill to the effect desired by the hon. member, for there might be something unforeseen happen which would warrant an extension of time. Supposing, for instance, there was a big flood, that would be a good excuse for an extension. The hon. member could have his assurance that it would be seen that the company would carry out their contract, and that no undue extension would be granted.

Mr. SCADDAN: Was it to be understood that in the event of the tramway being constructed the deposit would be returned immediately. What guarantee would there then be that they would run the service provided for in the original order.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If the company did not carry out their agreement with the council, the latter would have recourse against them at law, and the company certainly had ample assets for the recovery of damages. The sum of £270 was put up as a guarantee that the

company would construct the line according to the agreement. When they had fulfilled that portion of the bargain the guarantee would no longer be required and the money would be returned. The North Perth council would see that the agreement was kept.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 3 to 6—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment; the report adopted.

BILL—LAND ACT SPECIAL LEASE.

Council's Amendment.

Amendment made by the Legislative Council now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Daglish in the Chair; the Minister for Works in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—Add the following proviso: "Provided, also, that nothing in this Act or in the said special lease contained, shall exempt the lessees or their assigns from the operation of any law, statute or common, relating to public health."

The MINISTER FOR WORKS moved

That the Council's amendment be agreed to.

The amendment had been inserted to obviate any fear of the lessees, through the special Act, getting behind the Health Act. That was that if the work created a nuisance there should be no power to the lessees under their special Act to override the Health Act, and that there would be no protection against a charge for breaches of the Health Act. It was doubtful whether the clause was absolutely necessary, but it seemed to be a wise provision.

Question passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

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

BILL—AGRICULTURAL BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 9th November; Mr. Daglish in the Chair; the Minister for Lands in charge of the Bill.

Clause 4—Amendment of Section 28; bank may make advances to farmers and cultivators:

Mr. HEITMANN moved an amendment—

That in line 12 of paragraph (d.) of Subsection 1 of the proposed new section the words "in Western Australia" be struck out and "by the State" inserted in lieu.

The object of the amendment was to provide that the bank might, if the trustees thought fit, make advances for the purchase of agricultural machinery manufactured by the State of Western Australia. There was no doubt that the State could manufacture agricultural implements just as well as any private company, perhaps better. They could supply it to agriculturists far below the sum charged by private manufacturers. This had been found to be the case in the manufacture of many articles in the State such as, for instance, pipes. It had also been found that various State departments could more than hold their own with private enterprise. It had been proved by the Federal Royal Commission that the prices charged for the agricultural machinery were very high in comparison with the cost of production. If it were possible for the scheme of the Minister for Lands to be carried out, that was the manufacture of implements in the towns of the State, he (Mr. Heitmann) would not so much object to it, but he felt sure that the idea of the Minister was not practicable. It would be impossible for small shops to be built in Western Australia to compete with the manufacturers in other parts of the world, on account of the fact that the latter turned out such large numbers of these machines, and also on account of the understanding between them. It would be impossible for the small man to start, say, at Northam and in a small way supply the wants of the farmers, particularly in connection with the larger machinery such as harvesters. It was not known whether it was the intention that these should be made here or whether it was proposed that only the smaller machines required should be manufactured locally. But

whatever encouragement the Bill would give to the manufacturers, he was certain it would not be the means of bringing about the manufacture of harvesters. On the other hand, if the State were to undertake the manufacture of this machinery, although there would not be the small shops throughout the State, there would be a large number of men employed, where, at the present time, we had practically no men engaged. Further, we would be able to give the farmers the benefit of cheaper manufacture. He had listened to the objection of the member for Swan to State manufacture, and it seemed that the member's only objection was that too many civil servants were bad for the State. If the hon. member considered the matter he would find that the employees, at all events at the workshops at Midland Junction had proved that they could turn out work equal, if not superior to that of the private manufacturer, and at the same time they claimed no more consideration from the Government than they would from a private employer. The whole question was whether members were prepared to adopt the system of State manufacture or not. The sum of £100 provided in the Bill in connection with the purchase of locally made machinery was not sufficient, and even if it were £500 it would not be the means of breaking up the trust that existed in Australia at the present time.

Mr. GORDON: The amendment would receive his opposition for various reasons. The member for Cue had stated that no private firms would start a manufactory, but the hon. member's mind should be disabused of that idea. As a matter of fact, one factory had recently been started in anticipation of the Bill passing with this provision to give some assistance to farmers who purchased from the local manufacturer.

Mr. Jacoby: What kind of machinery; harvesters?

Mr. GORDON: It was intended to manufacture harvesters as well. The member for Swan could shake his head, but if harvesters could be manufactured in Victoria why could they not be made here. The gentleman who was starting

these works in the Canning electorate had already expended the sum of £900 in erecting buildings and putting in a siding, and it was his intention to manufacture every class of machinery farmers in Western Australia used. He had already secured the patent rights for different ploughs and also for harvesters.

Mr. Scaddan: What is his name?

Mr. GORDON: Mr. Haydon, and he had already manufactured a number of ploughs. It was not likely that private people would compete against the Government if the amendment was carried. It would have the effect of crushing many of those who had already started or who anticipated starting. There were others who had factories already established, and they were waiting for the Bill to go through. It would be a fatal move to establish State works in the face of private enterprise being willing to undertake this work.

Mr. BATH: On an amendment of this kind it was due to the members of the Committee that they should have the views of the Minister in charge of the Bill. Was he going to allow such an amendment to be put without giving his views?

The Attorney General: It has already been debated.

Mr. BATH: Members had not heard the views of the Minister for Lands.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: There were many reasons why the State should not undertake the manufacture of agricultural machinery. Speaking personally, he was entirely in favour of private enterprise doing this work. There were several questions which we should ask ourselves in connection with this matter. The first was whether we should centralise it; the second whether we should kill enterprise; and the third, should the State become the only employees of labour. These were very important questions. Centralisation would mean closing up many factories established throughout Western Australia. Notwithstanding that the member for Cue said otherwise, there were small factories existing in country towns at the present time. At Beverley there was a small factory.

Mr. O'Loughlin: Are they turning out harvesters?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The harvester was not the only machine required by the farmer. At Beverley they were making machinery, and at Pingelly there were particularly good workmen. At Northam also there were several of these shops. Even as far back as 20 years practically the whole of the machinery needed by the agriculturist, including the stripper, was made in Northam, and the machinery could be made there to-day and it was being made there. Were we to centralise to the detriment of a place like Geraldton and was Geraldton to pay freight on its manufactured implements from Midland Junction? Were we to centralise to the detriment of a place like Albany; or to the detriment of Northam or other centres throughout the State now engaged in the manufacture of agricultural implements? Was it realised by the Committee that centralisation would mean the throwing out of employment of men now settled in the country. These men had their own homes, and their sons were employed in the centres where they lived, and centralisation would mean that they would be taken from healthy surroundings and the pleasant environments of country districts to the metropolitan area. Was it desirable or right that such a thing should be suggested? The question was, were we to kill enterprise. Everyone knew that the manufacture of agricultural machinery was not very expensive work, at any rate at the beginning. Blacksmiths and tradesmen who started in a small way in the country had, no doubt, fairly large workshops, and these people who had commenced with small means had been able by sheer perseverance, and the support that they had received from the farmers, to establish themselves, and they now had comfortable businesses. Were we to kill these people to enable the State to manufacture in the metropolitan area? The number of agricultural implements needed by the farmer was considerable, and implements other than the stripper were more or less expensive affairs. Moreover, farmers required implements of

various patterns: no two farmers agreed as to a pattern. There were many parts even in a plough, and each could be improved upon, and a man in his own shop was careful to do all he could to beat his opponent and meet the wishes of his customers too. What would be the position if the Government were to manufacture all these implements? Let hon. members imagine a farmer approaching a Government official and saying that he wanted the mouldboard turned a little more this way or that way, or that he wanted some particular part stronger than it was being made. Did hon. members think he would get it? In such a case the manufacturer would not be subject to any competition, except indeed that from the other States, which might in the end kill the industry.

Mr. Heitmann: Yet you are asking the small men to pit themselves against this big competitor of which the Government are apparently afraid.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: All he was asking was that enterprise and energy might meet on equal terms. The big manufacturers in Melbourne could make a plough a little more cheaply than could a small man up country in Western Australia; but on the other hand the small man had the advantage of freight and other factors in his favour. Again, these manufacturers established in the country towns were growing with the development of the State. It was to be remembered that for some time past the agricultural industry had been particularly active, with the result that one-half of the total increase of area under crop in Australia during the last five years had been provided in this State. Surely that was sufficient justification for the desire to have the implements manufactured in the State. It was only fair that the enterprise of our own artificers in country towns should have its fair reward. One great reason for making the plough in the midst of the corn-fields was that the farmer could have his plough made in accordance with his own ideas, and could get the implement repaired by the maker. Again, the Harvester Commission had brought out pretty clearly the cost of selling through agents, and hon. members knew that there were many

agents travelling throughout this State.

The CHAIRMAN: The question before the Committee, as embodied in the amendment, was merely a proposal to empower the Agricultural Bank to lend money on agricultural machinery manufactured by the State of Western Australia. It was not a proposal that the State of Western Australia should undertake the manufacture of agricultural implements. Therefore, the Minister would be out of order if he discussed the academic question of State manufacture as against manufacture by private enterprise.

Mr. Bath: He has discussed it.

The CHAIRMAN: Hon. members should clearly understand that the question was really that of giving power to the trustees of the Agricultural Bank to make advances under certain conditions. If the amendment had embodied a proposition that the State should establish a factory for the manufacture of agricultural implements, he would have declined to accept it because it would then involve the expenditure of money, and therefore, would require to be introduced by Message.

Mr. Jacoby: That is what it does involve.

Mr. BATH: It would be hardly just to the Committee after the Minister had gone into this question, and indeed had almost completed his remarks, if other members were to be debarred, especially the member who had introduced the amendment.

The Attorney General: He can take a further opportunity by moving a motion.

Mr. BATH: Surely that was irony on the part of the Minister. It would be hardly just now to debar other hon. members from following on the lines pursued by the Minister for Lands.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister for Lands had been stopped when he (the Chairman) observed that the Minister was wandering, and he would have stopped the hon. member for Cue had he (the Chairman) noticed the exact purport of the amendment. It would certainly be wrong now, if, because two hon. members had somewhat overstepped the bounds, the

other 47 members were allowed to do the same.

Mr. Bath: It gives the Minister an undoubted advantage.

Mr. Jacoby: If the amendment were carried the State would have to undertake the manufacture of agricultural machinery, otherwise the amendment would be ineffective.

The CHAIRMAN: That could not be recognised. If that were so he would have to rule that the amendment was out of order. He could not recognise that any such obligation would be cast upon the State if the amendment were carried. If it were so he would have allowed the Minister to proceed.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The amendment meant that unless the State manufactured the machinery the bank would not be able to advance for the purchase of it. He had not heard the hon. member amending the wording of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: For the information of the Minister, the amendment was that the word "in" in line 12 be struck out with a view of inserting the words "by the State of."

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: If the amendment were carried the bank would not be empowered to advance against machinery unless that machinery were manufactured by the State. To that extent the amendment was opposed to the intentions of the Government. However if the question of State manufacture versus private enterprise could not be discussed, all he could do was to object to the amendment. It had not been his intention in bringing down the Bill that machinery should be manufactured by the State.

Mr. BATH: The proposal embodied in the Bill as submitted by the Minister for Lands provided for advancing money for the purchase of machinery manufactured in Western Australia. To that extent it offered a slight advantage in so far as it provided for the development and encouragement of a certain amount of manufacturing industry. However, the proposal as it was embodied in the Bill would be of very slight assistance to the farmer, because the question at issue,

from the farmer's point of view, was not so much where the machinery was procured as the cost of the machinery and its durability. The Minister and other hon. members who had spoken on the previous occasion had admitted that the State could manufacture the machinery more cheaply than could private manufacturers. This question of cheapness was not the most important one, for over and above it was the question of durability. That was the rock upon which the agriculturist was foundering in Western Australia. The machinery on the market was not as durable as would be any machinery manufactured by the State. The solidity of Government made machinery had been recognised by certain private manufacturers who, having taken contracts for locomotives, had gone to the Government workshops and had the locomotives manufactured there, afterwards putting them together in their own foundries. That was a practical recognition of the value of the work done in the Government workshops. Therefore, if the State would produce machinery cheaper and more durable than that now on the market it would confer an undoubted advantage on the agriculturist, to say nothing of the further advantage of having it manufactured within the State. The hon. member had said that the object was to decentralise the manufactures. But the hon. member must realise that to seriously make any such attempt would be to place himself in the position of Mrs. Partington with her broom. As a matter of fact the risk was that the centralisation would be effected in a country outside of Australia altogether. As far as those who manufactured for Australian requirements were concerned they had no power nor had they any market which would enable them to prevent that centralisation. The International Harvester Trust to-day controlled two-thirds of the output of the harvester machinery, and when a trust such as this could obtain that hold on the trade it was only a matter of convenience and opportunity to reach out for the other one-third. Let that come to pass, and this provision would be absolutely useless, because it would mean that the agriculturist here, as well as in other parts

of Australia, would be entirely in the grip of the International Harvester Trust or any other trust that might swallow that up. As a matter of fact the proposal of the member for Cue was the only one that could obviate it. There was a publication with which the member for Swan was connected which stated that if the proposal of the member for Cue was agreed to it would mean that the purchaser would have to put up with dear and inefficient machinery. As a matter of fact that was what was produced by private enterprise, and it was to prevent it that State manufacture was advocated as the only effective remedy. It was desired to secure the advantage the Minister for Works asked for, namely the manufacture of the machinery in the State, and also to go further and to have a greater advantage that the purchaser would know he had purchased an article without having to pay for an army of parasites, and that the article was of good workmanship and would stand tests which the machinery he now bought would not.

Mr. JACORY: The effect of the amendment would be to defeat the operation of this advance by the bank, because there would be no Government machinery available. Even if there were, it did not follow it would be cheaper or more efficient than the machinery that could now be purchased. It had yet to be demonstrated that machinery manufactured by the Government was cheaper than that manufactured under existing conditions. The Minister for Lands thought the Government could supply phosphatic guano rock at about 30s. a ton. The price was ultimately fixed at £2 10s. a ton, but when it was landed at Fremantle it must have actually cost the Government £7 a ton. That was an illustration of State enterprise.

Mr. Bath: The hon. member knowing the inaccessibility cannot use that as a reasonable argument.

Mr. JACORY: If a contract had been let it would probably have been landed at a third of the cost. There was no concrete instance of State-manufactured machinery being cheaper.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is wandering from the amendment.

Mr. JACOBY: Could not one reply to the arguments of the Leader of the Opposition? The principle involved was the State manufacture of machinery, and in replying to the arguments advanced by the Leader of the Opposition he trusted not to exceed the liberty the Chair was prepared to allow. In Government enterprise there was a continuous tendency to manage by regulation after regulation, and when a regulation was found to be defective fresh regulations were issued.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was altogether wide of the amendment. The amendment was not a proposition that the State should do anything. It was a proposition to give power to the Agricultural Bank to lend money on certain conditions, and only that.

Mr. JACOBY: If power were given under the Bill to lend money under these conditions, they could only become effective with the State manufacture of machinery.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee could not consider any question of that sort. That could be dealt with by a motion brought before the House in the ordinary fashion after notice. At present only the amendment could be discussed. If every principle involved in every clause of a Bill were to be discussed at length, the work of the Committee could not be done.

Mr. JACOBY: As that was the only principle involved in the clause, and as we could not discuss it, it was no use speaking on the matter at all.

Mr. TAYLOR: It appeared the object of the amendment was to prevent the Government subsidising machinery made in Western Australia so that if the amendment were carried the Government would have to make the machinery.

The CHAIRMAN: There was nothing of that sort embodied in the amendment. The amendment was that the Agricultural Bank should make advances on machinery on certain conditions, and a discussion on the question of State manufacture versus manufacture by private firms was inadmissible.

Mr. WALKER: The amendment made it impossible for the bank to lend money on machinery other than State-manufac-

tured machinery. Therefore it would make it impossible for the bank to lend money at all on machinery, because there was no State manufactory in existence. It was ruled the amendment would not authorise the State to start the manufacture, and the Bill would be nullified if the amendment were carried. The clause might as well be struck out at once, because nobody would be able to get money from the bank for the purchase of machinery as it was not compulsory upon the Government to start the manufacture. It was practically inserting a clause which said, "You cannot borrow money from the bank." He preferred that the amendment be withdrawn, and that in a specific resolution of the House instructions should be given to the Government to commence the manufacture of agricultural machinery: or if it could be done he would prefer the use of the words "manufactured in the State by the Government or private firms." That would permit the bank to advance money on the machinery now available until we had Government manufacture. If the amendment were out of order there was no alternative but to vote for the efficacy of the bank in its present condition, and to vote against that which would restrict the operations of the bank.

Mr. HEITMANN: The discussion had gone in a different direction from that he had anticipated. His idea was to test the feeling of the House as to the manufacture of machinery by the State. While he believed that was desirable, he did not want to prevent the farmers, in the event of the amendment being carried, having the use of the money from the bank. If the amendment were carried and the Government failed to erect State manufactories the farmers would not be permitted to use the money from the bank for the purpose of purchasing agricultural machinery. He intended to ask the permission of the Committee to withdraw the amendment. The Government were prepared to vote money—

The CHAIRMAN: The member was going beyond the amendment.

Mr. HEITMANN asked permission to withdraw the amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. SCADDAN: Would it be in order to move to insert after the words "Western Australia," "provided, however, that such agricultural machinery shall be manufactured by the State Government?"

The CHAIRMAN: The member would be perfectly in order, but a discussion on the question of the State manufacture of machinery would not be allowed.

Mr. JOHNSON proposed to ask the Minister to accept an amendment, that after the word "provided" the words "employees engaged thereon are paid the prescribed wages and" be added. The object was to get a guarantee that the employees engaged in the manufacture of this machinery should be engaged at wages recognised as sufficient.

Mr. SCADDAN: In connection with the matter he had brought forward would he be in order in moving that the following words be added:—"and such machinery shall be manufactured by the Government of Western Australia?"

The CHAIRMAN: That amendment could not be accepted. It would be in order to move such a thing in a general motion before the House.

Mr. SCADDAN: On what ground could the amendment not be accepted?

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment was foreign to the purposes of the Bill. If the member wanted an additional reason, it was that the amendment would require to be accompanied by a Message, which, he understood, the hon. member did not possess.

Mr. SCADDAN: Did the Chairman rule that the amendment was out of order because it was not accompanied by a Message?

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment was foreign to the subject matter of the Bill, and in addition it would require a Message.

Mr. SCADDAN: In these circumstances he would have to move to dissent from the Chairman's ruling.

The CHAIRMAN: The member could put his dissent in writing, but he could not make a speech on it.

Mr. Scaddan submitted his dissent in writing.

Dissent from Chairman's Ruling.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Ivanhoe proposed to insert a provision to the effect that the State should manufacture machinery, with a view, as he understood it, of instructing the Government that a State manufactory should be established. He had ruled that out of order as it would be an appropriation of public money and could not be accepted unless accompanied by a Message. He had also ruled that the amendment was foreign to the purposes of the Bill, and for that reason he could not accept it. The hon. member had now handed in his dissent from that ruling, which would, therefore, be submitted to his Honour the Speaker.

The SPEAKER resumed the Chair, and the Chairman reported that the member for Ivanhoe had dissented from his ruling. The member had desired to move an amendment to insert in the Bill a proviso that the Government should establish a State manufactory for agricultural implements, but he had ruled that such a proviso could not be inserted as the member had no Message, and because the amendment was foreign to the purposes of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no alternative but to confirm the ruling of the Chairman of Committees. That ruling is correct, and there is plenty of authority to support it.

Mr. SCADDAN: Do you rule that the Chairman's ruling is correct?

Mr. SPEAKER: I confirm the Chairman's ruling.

Mr. SCADDAN: The whole of his ruling?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Dissent from Speaker's ruling.

Mr. SCADDAN: Then I desire to dissent from your ruling on the ground that already this session you have ruled that a Bill that does not make an actual appropriation of money from the revenue does not require a Message. I refer you to the Health Bill, wherein you stated that although there was provision for certain expenditure from Consolidated Revenue Fund the money would not be ex-

pending under the Bill until such time as the amount was brought before this House in the Estimates and an appropriation made on a Message from the Governor; therefore, it would not require a Message. I desire to dissent from your ruling on this occasion as it is absolutely contrary to your previous ruling this session. This amendment would not mean an actual appropriation from the Treasury, according to your previous ruling; but would only permit the State to do something that would require an appropriation at a later stage; thus your ruling on the present occasion is contrary to the one given by you on the 12th October, wherein you said—

"I am quite prepared to give a ruling on this point. I do not know whether it is desirable to discuss the question any further. All the arguments come down to the one point, that is, whether this Bill gives the power to appropriate. I have no hesitation in saying that it does not. I think the case was aptly put by the member for West Perth."

The amendment, if inserted, will not make an appropriation; if it does, and requires a Message, the Health Bill did also. I move—

That your ruling be dissented from.

Mr. DAGLISH: On a point of order, I would like to ask whether there is anything before the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that my ruling be disagreed with.

Mr. DAGLISH: The motion has not been seconded. If it is not seconded the House is still in Committee.

Mr. Taylor: I second the motion.

Mr. WALKER: I am compelled to say that the ruling of the Chairman, and Mr. Speaker's ruling in confirmation, are perfectly correct. The mere act of appropriation by passing a vote on the Estimates does not constitute the whole features of appropriation. When a command is made from the Assembly which will necessitate appropriation it is virtually the first step of an appropriation, and, therefore, involves the expenditure of money, and in such circumstances would require introduction by Message from the Governor. I think that point

should be emphasised. We should never depart from it again so long as we are governed by the rules of Parliament as constituted by our Constitution and our Standing Orders. The ruling before, although undoubtedly in contrast to the present one, may be defended by some; certainly I cannot defend it to-night. When this is put to the vote I shall vote to confirm, as far as the vote can do it, the opinion expressed by the Chairman of Committees and yourself in confirmation.

Mr. SCADDAN: It was a remark made by the Chairman of Committees that caused me to dissent; not that I disagreed altogether with it, but I did so in order to put this House right in connection with the matter. I had in my mind the ruling Mr. Speaker had previously given, and I found on looking up the question, that it was on all-fours with this, and I then purposely asked the Chairman of Committees to give a ruling on the amendment I framed in order to commit the Government to the manufacture of machinery so that the matter might be submitted to you. You have given your ruling that it does require a Message, and I ask leave now to withdraw my motion.

Motion (dissent) by leave withdrawn.

Committee Resumed.

Mr. JOHNSON moved an amendment—

That after the word "that," in the first line of the proviso to Subsection 1 of the proposed new section, the words "employees engaged thereon are paid the prescribed wages and" be inserted.

The object of inserting the provision was to give the Government an opportunity of assuring farmers that the machinery would be made under fair conditions. The Minister time and time again in the House and in the country had given assurances that he desired to see every man get a fair wage, and especially those working for the State. That being so, it was only desired to insert these words to give power to the Minister to prescribe conditions under which machinery should be manufactured.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: There was no objection to the amendment if the prescribed wages were to be the wages prescribed by the Arbitration Court. The Government were just as anxious as members opposite to see that fair wages were paid to those employed in our industries.

Mr. JOHNSON: It was understood that the Arbitration Court ruled the rate of wages in this State.

Mr. BATH: Whatever might be said with regard to the Arbitration Court prescribing the rates of wages, it was not advisable in a case such as this to make it necessary to go to the Arbitration Court in order to ascertain the wages. That course ought to be unnecessary. Where it was possible to fix up a matter without having to resort to the Arbitration Court, it should be done. The matter would be a very simple one, and why should these people be compelled to go to the Arbitration Court.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD moved an amendment—

That in line 3 of Subsection 3 of the proposed new section the word "four" be struck out and "five" inserted in lieu.

His object was to increase the amount of money that should be lent by the Bank to settlers in the State for improvements and otherwise. From his experience among farmers in the State he was convinced that £500 would not be too large an amount for improving land in the State. The Minister had said it required 1,000 acres for a man with a family to live on in the wheat country. To clear that land at £1 an acre or 25s., it would be seen that even an amount of £500 would not go very far. The Minister's own words were that if a man took up 1,000 acres of land he required to have it cleared, and the improvements recognised by the bank were chiefly clearing. The land also had to be fenced, and there was a good deal of expenditure necessary in connection with the conservation of water. Improvements also had to be made on the land in the way of eradicating poison. All this was with regard to wheat land.

On the other hand, if a man went into the jarrah country where it would cost anything up to £20 an acre to clear, most members would recognise that £500 was little enough for that work. It was certain there would be an increase of land values in this State in the not distant future, and any land cleared and brought under cultivation would be worth considerably more than the cost of clearing; therefore, there was no risk on the part of the bank, as the interest charged fully paid for the cost of management and left a slight margin of profit. It was advisable not only in the interests of those who were endeavouring to open up the lands of the State, but it was advisable in the interests of the community that we should extend the borrowing powers as far as the amendment suggested. It had worked well in New Zealand, where they lent up to £3,000. Of course, a man who could do without borrowing was better off. At the same time, it was a difficult position for a man starting with a small capital to make a success of agriculture in this State. The object of the bank was to assist to bring our lands under cultivation, and to do that it was necessary to increase the amount that might be borrowed. He was not in the least antagonistic to the Minister. He had thought the question out and had spoken to many agriculturists on it, and the general opinion was that the amount proposed was not too much, while it would confer a very great benefit upon those settled on the land.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Unfortunately it was necessary to disagree with the hon. member. The amendment could not be accepted. No one would be more willing than himself to grant further accommodation to the people on the land if it were possible to do so. To some extent he agreed with the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition on the second reading. On that occasion Mr. Bath had expressed the fear that with a large number of people settling on the land any liberalisation of the amount to be advanced would place the State in some difficulty in respect to finding the necessary funds. The Government desired

that the money distributed by the bank should reach as many as possible. The £400 would give a man a fair start, in addition to which a further advance of £250 was provided on a 50 per cent. valuation. He could not accept the amendment, for the reason that having gone thoroughly into the matter he believed that the best possible was now being done for the people on the land.

Mr. BATH: The amendment put him in a difficulty inasmuch as while he was in sympathy with the object of the amendment, his view of the question was that the amount which could be granted to farmers was entirely dependent upon the resources at the disposal of the Minister in charge of the bank. If there were sufficient money to give every man a reasonable chance of securing a loan he (Mr. Bath) would not mind if the maximum were set at £1,000 or even £2,000. He would lend the money right up to the resources of the bank, at the same time intimating that every man who put in a claim for a loan was to have a reasonable chance of securing it. He was satisfied that if the question were approached with the intention of making the Agricultural Bank as useful as possible we would extend the functions of the Savings Bank, and so double or treble the amount now available for the use of the Agricultural Bank. However, at the present time the reserves of the Savings Bank were only something like 1s. 6d. in the pound on liabilities, which, of course, was altogether too low to maintain the credit to the State in an emergency. So unless we could be assured that the resources available would be increased we would be making a mistake in increasing the amount of the advance.

Mr. JOHNSON: For the reason that he believed we could safely lend up to the amount specified in the amendment he would support the amendment. The Minister for Lands and the Leader of the Opposition had virtually agreed to the amendment, although the latter withheld his support on the grounds that there was some doubt as to the sufficiency of the funds at the disposal of the bank. Under the Bill an increase of capital was being

provided, and while the development of the State justified it we could go on increasing the capital. Again, the Agricultural Bank was not limited to borrowing from the Savings Bank and, consequently, was not dependent on the funds of the Savings Bank although, of course, it was desirable that the Agricultural Bank should rely as much as possible upon the Savings Bank.

Mr. Bath: They would have to pay higher interest if they borrowed from outside sources.

Mr. JOHNSON: The administrative expenses of the Agricultural Bank were very low indeed, and to-day they were charging 5 per cent. The trustees could borrow money at a slightly higher rate, and still have sufficient to administer the bank without increasing the 5 per cent. already charged to settlers. There would be no danger at all in the amendment, providing the resources of Western Australia justified the expenditure of the money; and of this there could be no doubt whatever. The Minister himself had no doubt of the soundness of the proposition, but was opposing it for the same financial reasons as had actuated the Leader of the Opposition. These objections, however, could very easily be overcome. The Bill constituted the most liberal amendment to the bank Act we had yet had, for we were now proposing to assist the man on the land to make his land produce. Under the old methods we had assisted him to prepare the land for producing, and immediately he had reached that stage we had handed him over to private enterprise. This had now been overcome, and the Bill proposed to assist the settler in actually producing from his land. Having thus widened the scope of the bank, we would be fully justified in enlarging the amount of the advances.

Mr. JACOBY: In supporting the amendment he would remind hon. members that a select committee appointed three or four Parliaments ago to inquire into the question had reported in favour of the amount of advances being increased to £1,000. Subsequent legislation had contemplated going as high as £300 and it had been mainly owing to the timidity

of the then representatives of labour that the amount had not been so increased. He was particularly pleased to think that those members, having now seen what the Agricultural Bank could do, were prepared to increase its opportunities for beneficent work. So small was the amount at the present time that it only carried a farmer to that stage when he could no longer afford to do business with the Agricultural Bank. It created a big security upon which the farmer was not able to realise to the full in order to still further extend his holding. In some instances that security would suffice to raise £1,200 at a private bank, an amount which was, of course, beyond the scope of the Agricultural Bank. It was a pity that the Agricultural Bank could not take the farmer further along the road to comfortable circumstances than it was doing to-day. The features of the bank which were so advantageous to the farmer were, first of all the system of extended payments and, in the second place, the comparatively low rate of interest. But when the bank had carried a farmer over a certain distance the farmer found that he wanted greater borrowing powers than could be exercised at the Agricultural Bank, and as he could not utilise his securities—which were, of course, mortgaged to the Agricultural Bank—he had to go to an ordinary bank, and by paying $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. or 2 per cent. higher interest, secure the money to repay the Agricultural Bank in order that he might do further business with the private institution. A large number of farmers had been repaying advances from the bank. If the bank could extend its operations to help them still further, it would empower the farmer to do far more, that was if they could get equal advantages from the money from the Agricultural Bank to those they got from the money from the ordinary banks. These ordinary banks dealt liberally with the farmers. The conditions were much better to-day in regard to farming securities than they were some years ago. The banks welcomed the establishment and the extension of the Agricultural Bank because the Agricultural Bank had expert knowledge as to agricultural securities, and they recognised

that the more powerful and prosperous farmers became the better they would be able to extend their businesses. No risk would be taken in extending the operations of the Agricultural Bank because of the safeguards adopted by the trustees. The point raised by the Leader of the Opposition as to the amount of money likely to be available for the bank, were its operations extended, was worthy of consideration; but the Agricultural Bank was not necessarily restricted to the Savings Bank for its money; and certainly the deposits in the Savings Bank would naturally increase with the extension of settlement, though perhaps not as speedily as would be sufficient to meet with the requirements of the bank. In addition to the ordinary directions in which money could be made available by the issue of mortgage bonds and other similar devices, if the Government, grappled seriously with one matter they could place the State in possession of more than ample funds for financing the bank. We had two and a quarter millions in our sinking fund account in London where it operated to make money cheaper for the English borrower. It was a pity it did not operate to the same extent in Western Australia. It was doubtful whether a motion appearing on the Notice Paper in reference to this subject would be discussed this session, but if it came on it could be shown what great advantage it would be to the State to remove the sinking fund to Western Australia. One means by which it could be invested would be the Agricultural Bank. He supported any amendment that would extend the money the bank was empowered to advance to farmers within reasonable limits. In going to £1,000 we would not be going beyond a reasonable amount, and we would be able to give more facilities to the customers of the bank.

Mr. OSBORN: An advance to £750 was a reasonable concession to any person about to settle on the land. The purpose for which the bank was established was to assist the poor man. If we borrowed money from any other source than the Savings Bank for the needs of the Agricultural Bank, it would necessarily follow we must increase the interest

charged on the advances by the Agricultural Bank. No good object would be gained by increasing the amount that could be advanced. Certainly the smaller the amount advanced the greater would be the number of advances that could be made. It was more for the sake of the man who was residing in the town who was anxious to develop country property that £1,000 would be necessary. The sum of £750 was all the man intending to settle on the land was likely to ask for. The man who would ask for £1,000 would be more a speculator in landed property, one who borrowed from the bank in order to become a speculator.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: At present the advance on full value was £600, consisting of £400 to prepare the land, £100 for stock, and, as was proposed in the Bill, £100 for machinery; and this with the additional advance of £150 against half value of 300 acres, would enable the settler to clear 530 acres of land, making the total advance £750, which, though not a large sum, was a liberal sum. The trustees after 14 years of experience of the operations of the bank had come to the conclusion that this was sufficient to enable the farmer to farm successfully and in a fairly large way. The chances were that by the time a man finished clearing 530 acres he would not be out of pocket. Any man taking a contract should make something out of it. If the man did the work himself he should have the expenditure of £550 on the land and be £550 to the good. Notwithstanding anything said in regard to the work done in New Zealand, there was no measure in operation in the world that was anything approaching the liberality of this measure.

MR. TAYLOR: If the capital at the disposal of the Minister were limited and the amount able to be borrowed were increased it would mean naturally that the number of those given help would be reduced. That must be the effect if the capital were limited. The argument of the member for Roebourne was that a person could borrow £750 from the bank for the purpose of making a home and would be a genuine and bona fide settler, whereas a man who wanted to borrow £250 more

than that sum would be a speculator or a bloated capitalist. Surely it could not be contended that the margin of £250 marked the difference between the two.

MR. OSBORN: I did not say that.

MR. TAYLOR: The member opposed the amendment on the ground that he thought £750 was a fair and legitimate amount for a bona fide settler; but that £1,000 would make a man a speculator? There were a great many factors which would make it legitimate for a man to borrow £1,000 as against another wanting only £750. For instance, a man with a large family of grown-up sons would want a larger area of land than the man with a small family who had no one to assist him, and consequently he would gain no greater benefit from borrowing £1,000 than the latter would from borrowing £600. However, the chief argument against the proposed amendment was that if there were not sufficient capital the result would be to reduce the number of those who could get assistance.

MR. JOHNSON: The Minister has plenty of capital to work on.

MR. TAYLOR: It was doubtful whether that was correct.

MR. BUTCHER: Why not establish a State bank at once.

MR. TAYLOR: Nothing would be more pleasing to him than to be speaking that night in favour of the establishment of such an institution. The manner in which Governments had come to the assistance of private banks which had failed at various times in Australia, Canada, and elsewhere clearly showed that if the Government established a bank of their own they would be able to work it satisfactorily. The chief argument used to secure the passage of the parent measure was that it would help the small farmer, the working man, who wanted to make a home for himself and his family, and become a permanent settler. We now had gone beyond that stage, for we had arrived at the position that there was a desire to help those people who were in a fair position, and enable them to extend their operations, therefore the contention was raised that the power to borrow up to £1,000 should be granted. If the Minister were satisfied that he had sufficient

money to warrant the increase of the amount, then the amendment was worthy of all support.

Mr. Underwood: If he has not the money let him get it.

Mr. TAYLOR: On the other hand, if the Minister felt that the capital was insufficient to warrant this increase then the amendment should be negatived. It was no use passing a provision that would not be operative. He would have liked to assist the member for Pilbara in passing his amendment, but he was of opinion that the result would be to restrict the operations of the bank, therefore, it would be unwise to pass it.

Mr. WALKER: The best course to adopt would be to allow the clause to pass as it stood, and at another stage the opportunity could be taken of making ample provision for a matter of this sort by means of the establishment of a State bank. At present the measure only dealt with certain funds of the Savings Bank.

Mr. Underwood: The hon. member is wrong there for there is nothing about the Savings Bank in the parent Act.

Mr. WALKER: Whether included in the parent Act or not the present system was for the money to be obtained from the Savings Bank, which was the source of capital. It was unsafe to make further withdrawals from that institution. We were trustees as much for the lenders to the Savings Bank as we were of the Consolidated Revenue. What was the use of increasing the sum to £1,000 if the capital only allowed £500 to be lent. The result of passing the amendment might well be that some persons would have to go without any assistance. The question of the foundation of a State bank could not be considered at this stage, and the present Bill merely provided the first step towards the establishment of higher things. The member should withdraw the amendment.

Mr. Underwood: The member has no intention of doing so.

Mr. WALKER: Then the member for Pilbara would make the Bill ridiculous if he carried the amendment. The statement as to the amount a man could borrow was already fixed in the preceding clauses of the Bill, and those amounts

could not be altered unless the present amendment were withdrawn. Sub-clause 3 provided "Advances for the purposes specified in paragraph (a) of Subsection 1 may be made on an amount not exceeding £400 to the full value of the improvements proposed to be made."

Mr. Underwood: That was not what the Committee were dealing with.

Mr. WALKER was under the impression that it was. He begged the hon. member's pardon.

Mr. PIESSE: The introduction of the amending Bill was welcomed. From experience he had gained in his own particular part of the district he knew that the maximum amount that had been previously lent by the bank was altogether insufficient. The amendment in the Bill to provide that the maximum should be increased from £500 to £750 would confer a great benefit on the agriculturists of the State. He was, to some extent, in sympathy with the amendment that had been moved by the member for Pilbara, but with the Minister and the Leader of the Opposition, and other members who had expressed their views, he was afraid with the great increase taking place in agriculture, that the capital available would be insufficient for requirements. Hon. members in discussing this matter had lost sight of the fact that we had at the present time some 5,000 accounts operating with the Agricultural Bank, and it was simply a matter of multiplying those 5,000 accounts by £250, which was the increase proposed in the Bill, in order to know that if every customer of the bank availed himself of the maximum amount, the bank would require a further million and a quarter of money. He would not say that every customer would avail himself of the full amount; at the same time one must look at the matter from a business point of view and be prepared to make provision for the money being required. He was satisfied that with the introduction of the measure great benefit and assistance would be afforded many of the settlers, and he would not be one to vote for an amendment which might, to some extent, prevent some of our settlers from receiving the assistance that it was necessary they

should receive. The member for Swan had pointed out that in many cases the advances had not been sufficient to help the settlers after they had got over the initial difficulties. From experience, however, he (Mr. Piesse) knew that in many cases there had been hardships in that direction. There were many instances in which some of the farmers were forced to place their farms upon the market for the reason that the amount available would not be sufficient to meet pressing requirements. It might be possible to provide an extra £250 in special cases; that was, where a customer had already received the maximum amount of £750, and provided that the security was sufficient to warrant that advance being made. He did not want it to be understood that he was in any way suggesting that the amount should be loaned as prescribed by the present amending Bill, but special provision might be made to allow the trustees in exceptional cases to advance this further £250 to enable a farmer to pay off an existing liability. In many cases it was known that the Agricultural Bank had advanced an increased amount on additional security, and, therefore, it would be a fair proposition to give the trustees power to make the additional advance under special circumstances. That would be the means of preventing many of the farmers having to place their small farms upon the market. The amendment would not receive his support for the reason indicated, and, further, if the Committee carried the amendment as moved by the member for Pilbara, we would be increasing our responsibility, as far as advances were concerned, to the full amount of the improvements. The present amount providing for £400 was reasonable, and when it was considered that a further advance of £200 could be obtained, £100 for machinery and another £100 for stock, it was quite as much as the State could afford without further security. If funds were available he would be only too pleased to support the increase to £1,000, but if the Committee agreed to the increase the bank would not have sufficient capital, and if the maximum amount were

availed of there would be altogether insufficient funds to meet the advances. He therefore felt that while he was in sympathy, to a certain extent, with the amendment, he regretted that at that juncture he could not see his way to support it.

[Mr. Taylor took the Chair.]

Mr. OSBORN: The Bill made it clear that where two or more owners were united they could borrow separately. If a man and his wife had separate areas both could borrow to the extent of £750 each, and thus they would have £1,500 with which to effect the improvements they might desire to make.

Mr. BATH: In any event, as a preliminary to moving the amendment which had been submitted by the member for Pilbara there should have been an amendment made to Clause 3, which provided for an increase of the capital from a million and a half to two millions. Last year the amount loaned was £352,000 on 2,668 applications, and in view of the settlement that was going on, this year it was likely to be £500,000. The increase in the Savings Bank funds was less than £200,000. It was realised that under the original Agricultural Bank Act the Minister had power to issue mortgage bonds for the purpose of raising capital for the bank; but actual experience had shown that side by side with the policy of borrowing money for developmental purposes, it was impossible to use this power for raising the funds of the Agricultural Bank. The same thing applied to the goldfields water supply and the metropolitan water supply. They had power to raise money from other sources, but they had not been able to avail themselves of that power. As a matter of necessity they had to rely on the amount which was available from the reserves in the Savings Bank.

Mr. Jacoby: The Savings Bank is looking for investments.

Mr. BATH: The hon. member had only to turn up the records to find out the amount which had been loaned by the Agricultural Bank was £1,365,000. The only available amount which the Savings Bank had was about £350,000. That, of course,

had to be kept in reserve for ordinary requirements, and that was the amount which they had available for the investments the member for Swan talked about. The time might arrive when with the pressure of work in other directions lightened, this power to raise money on mortgage bonds might be utilised, and if we deliberately set ourselves to the task of extending the operations of the bank there would be no difficulty whatever in raising the amount necessary to lend the additional sums asked for by the member for Pilbara. However, at the present time the capital would have to be accepted as it was embodied in the Bill and, taking into consideration the amount borrowed last year and the certainty of a progressive increase for the ensuing year, it was an entirely insufficient capital to provide for the increase named. As a preliminary to increasing the amount must come the consideration of ways and means of providing the capital. If this were done, the member for Pilbara could count upon him (Mr. Bath) and others as ardent supporters of the proposal to increase the useful functions of the Agricultural Bank. There was just one view which he (Mr. Bath) wished to disclaim in regard to the bank. As one who believed in institutions of the kind he would not like to convey the impression that he believed in them for one section of the community only. He believed that every man in the community was a citizen, and he would be sorry to convey the impression that in his view State institutions should be regarded as a form of benevolence.

Mr. JOHNSON: It was difficult to follow the arguments of the Leader of the Opposition in connection with the capital of these institutions. Mr. Bath seemed to run away with the idea that because we had only provided a £500,000 increase of capital the whole of it would be required to meet the demands upon the Agricultural Bank, and that should the bank be empowered to loan up to £750, and possibly up to £1,000, there would not be sufficient capital to meet the requirements. But in 1907 the capital had been increased by £500,000, and that increase had gone after two years. This time it was proposed

to increase the capital again by £500,000, and next year it could be still further increased.

Mr. Bath: Last year we loaned nearly one-half of the total amount loaned in all the time the bank has been in existence.

Mr. JOHNSON: On looking up the Savings Bank returns it was found that the Agricultural Bank to date had limited its borrowing to the Savings Bank, or in other words, it had raised no money outside the Savings Bank. Yet to-day the Agricultural Bank had only raised £840,000 from the Savings Bank.

The Minister for Lands: There are repayments.

Mr. JOHNSON: That was the point. The Agricultural Bank had not used anything like the authorised capital.

The Minister for Works: They are pledged far beyond that.

Mr. JOHNSON: Still they had not used the capital. The requirements of the bank did not demand that the capital should be increased by £500,000 under the Bill. He was not opposed to the increase but he wished to point out that it was not a pressing need.

The Minister for Works: Your capital must cover your pledges.

Mr. JOHNSON: Yes; but the bank had a fair margin to work upon still, and there was any amount of money in the Savings Bank to meet the requirements up to the £2,000,000 authorised.

Mr. Bath: It increased by £170,000 last year.

Mr. JOHNSON: Still the Agricultural Bank had only drawn on the Savings Bank to the extent of £840,000. At the same time it was noticed that the Government had drawn local inscribed stock to the extent of £748,000. There was no necessity for the Government to draw on the Savings Bank for that purpose. Again there were Treasury Bills to the amount of £17,000. If we were going to confine the borrowing of the Agricultural Bank to the Savings Bank the Government need not draw these other amounts from the Savings Bank funds. The extra capital could easily be financed from the Savings Bank funds if it were necessary. But it was not necessary because it could be raised from other sources.

Mr. Bath: It is all borrowing.

Mr. JOHNSON: But we were not limited to borrowing from the Savings Bank, and if we were, there was sufficient in that bank to meet all requirements. If the Leader of the Opposition really believed that the increased loan proposed by the member for Pilbara was in the best interests of the agricultural industry he had no alternative to supporting the amendment.

Mr. Bath: You would have to cut out your other borrowings.

Mr. JOHNSON: There was no possible objection to borrowing for works of this description. It had been admitted by members on both sides of the House that the amendment was in the best interests of the agricultural industry. That being so, the amendment ought to be supported, more particularly when it was realised that the capital of the Agricultural Bank could, if necessary, be increased next year, that the Savings Bank was quite equal to the demands if we were limited to that institution, and further, that we were by no means so limited. He trusted that the amendment would be accepted.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The authorisations of the bank up to the 30th June amounted to £1,365,000. The authorisations of last year had been £351,000. The hon. member would see from this that the bank had advanced pretty well to the extent of its present capital of £1,500,000 while it should be understood that the bank might be called upon at any moment to pay up the balance. On the 30th June the bank had had over £800,000 from the Savings Bank; but hon. members would realise that the money could not be used more than once, and that, the authorisation being exhausted, the money had to be returned. The Agricultural Bank had been repaid £169,000, so the amount actually advanced on the 30th of June was a little over one million and a half. Consequently, it would be seen that the authorisation of one and a half million pounds was exhausted. This increase of £500,000, making a capital of £2,000,000 would only be sufficient to carry the bank over the year with the increased advance at £750.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: There was no doubt that we could get the money if we required it.

The Premier: At a price.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: At about 3¾ per cent.

The Premier: Not at the present time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: If we had a fairly good Treasurer it would be a comparatively easy matter. We could always borrow it at 4 per cent. or under, and one per cent. would pay for the cost of management of the bank. The Minister had shown that last year the authorisation had amounted to £350,000, and allowing that there was going to be an increase this year, we had £500,000 with which to meet it. There was a big difference between authorisation and advance; many people made applications to the bank for money because they thought they might want it, and a great number of those who so applied never drew the money. Taking that into consideration £500,000 would allow an ample margin to work upon. The member for Katanning had said that it would be advisable under special circumstances to give power to increase the amount advanced. That was the very proposal of the amendment. The amendment did not compel the bank manager to lend the amount of money. It merely laid it down that the bank manager, if he saw fit, might lend. Therefore, if it was desired to have a provision by which an extra amount could be loaned under such circumstances the amendment must be acceptable. If in making his calculations the manager concluded that he could not lend £1,000 to all, he could cut it down to £750. As for the statement made by the Minister, the proposal was that the word "four" be struck out, and "five" inserted in Subsection 3. That was to say, that £500 would be loaned for the purpose of making improvements. The Minister spoke as if this money were loaned on the fact that the farmer was going to make improvements. It was altogether different. The money was not lent until the improvements were made, though the farmer was required to have the application in before starting to make the improvements, and the bank took as security the whole

of the land. The Minister could not regard the farmers as mere machines, and could not mathematically consider they could do so much on so much. Sickness, loss of stock and hundreds of happenings threw the farmers back. It was time members dropped the line of argument that it was not the intention of the original Act. We had to deal with the present and future, and not with the intention of past Parliaments. An altogether wrong impression was given as to the funds available. If it was the desire to increase the advances, it would be the duty of the Minister to find the funds. If the Minister could find the money he could lend up to £1,000, and if he could not find it he need not lend over £750.

Mr. ANGWIN: It was surprising the Minister admitted funds were not available.

The Premier: With a capital of two millions. If you want it you must increase the capital.

Mr. ANGWIN: That could be done. It had been done previously. The money could be obtained. There were many funds that had to be deposited with the Treasurer that were lent out by the Treasurer to private banks on fixed deposit. That money could be handed over to the Agricultural Bank with safety. The security was quite good enough so long as the money was repaid. There would have been much more land under cultivation if the farmers had not suffered from want of funds. Private banks had been offering to take up land and assist the farmers to go further. They had been touting for business to get hold of land as security. Knowing the land was proper security, and believing the statement of the Minister in regard to the development of the country, he supported the amendment because the trustees of the bank would not over-value the work carried out in connection with loans advanced by the bank.

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

Ayes	19
Noes	20

Majority against .. 1

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. McDowall
Mr. Bolton	Mr. O'Loughlin
Mr. Collier	Mr. W. Price
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Swan
Mr. Gill	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Holman	Mr. Ware
Mr. Hudson	Mr. A. A. Willson
Mr. Jacoby	Mr. Heftmann
Mr. Johnson	(Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Bath	Mr. N. J. Moore
Mr. Brown	Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Davies	Mr. Osborn
Mr. Draper	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Gregory	Mr. J. Price
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. Walker
Mr. Hayward	Mr. F. Willson
Mr. Layman	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Male	(Teller).
Mr. Mitchell	

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, put and passed.

Clause 5—The Deputy Managing Trustee:

Mr. ANGWIN: Would a deputy manager be appointed while the manager was in the State, or ill and unable to attend to his duties?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It was desired to avoid the trouble of having to get an Executive Council order appointing a deputy manager each time the manager was away. The deputy manager would act as managing trustee during the absence of the manager.

Clause passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

House adjourned at 10.48 p.m.