

Clause 269 (consequential) negatived.

Clause 270—Examination of school children:

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Committee in discussing this clause had inserted a provision enabling dentists to examine the teeth of school children. It was intended to insert after "dentist" the words "or any oculist," but obviously the drafting of the provision would be wrong, so that he would deal with the amendment when the Bill was before another place.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 276—By-laws to be laid before Parliament:

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This clause was merely submitted for consideration: there was no amendment to be moved.

Mr. Bath: The Minister for Mines promised an amendment.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Minister for Mines did not promise to move an amendment to this clause. The hon. member for Kanowna raised certain points with regard to the clause.

Mr. Bath: It was the hon. member for Pilbara.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It was one of those members, and recommitment was promised in order to enable them to move an amendment. It was pleasing to notice that both members were absent and it was to be hoped that none would step into the breach.

Clause passed.

Clause 294—Notice of action:

The MINISTER FOR WORKS moved an amendment—

That in line 7 after the word "abode" the words "or business" be inserted, also at the end of line 8 "if any" be inserted.

The clause would then provide that an action should not be brought against a local authority "until the expiration of one month after notice in writing has been served on such local authority, member, officer, or person, stating the cause of action, and the name and place of abode or business of the intended plaintiff, and of his solicitor if any."

Amendment passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Bill again reported with further amendments.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

The PREMIER (Hon. Frank Wilson): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn to 7.30 p.m. to-morrow.

Question passed.

House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 24th November, 1910.

	PAGE
Questions postponed	1731
Papers: Education Department, Assistant Inspector	1731
Bill: Health, recommitment	1732
Annual Estimates, 1910-11, general debate	1743

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 7.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS POSTPONED.

The PREMIER (Hon. Frank Wilson): Owing to the holiday, Ministers have been unable to get replies prepared to the questions on the Notice Paper, and consequently I ask that they be postponed till Tuesday.

Mr. Seaddan: Is that for all questions?

The PREMIER: Yes; including those for to-morrow morning. It has been impossible to get the replies to-day.

PAPERS — EDUCATION DEPARTMENT. ASSISTANT INSPECTOR.

On motion by Mr. PRICE ordered: "That all papers and correspondence between the Education Department and the Public Service Commissioner in connection with the appointment of an assistant

inspector of schools be laid on the Table of the House."

BILL—HEALTH.

To recommit.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It would be necessary to recommit the Bill with a view to the further consideration of certain clauses. He moved—

That the Bill be recommitted to admit of the amendment of Clauses 45 and 255.

Mr. WALKER: An amendment should have been moved to Clause 276 on the previous evening, but, owing to an accident, the member in charge of the amendment was out of the Chamber when the clause was reached. He moved an amendment—

That Clause 276 be added to the clauses to be reconsidered on recommitment.

Amendment passed.

Mr. ANGWIN moved a further amendment—

That Clause 276 also be reconsidered.

This clause had had a good deal of consideration, had in fact been discussed for the greater part of the day on Friday last. Hon. members had then come to a decision which, last night, they had hurriedly reversed without due consideration, and under certain influence which had been exercised on members outside of the Chamber, and within the Chamber also.

Mr. Draper: Is that influence not present to-night?

Mr. ANGWIN: No; hence his endeavour to get the clause reconsidered. When the strangers' gallery was full of members of the fair sex connected with certain well known institutions there was a possibility of members on the spur of the moment casting their vote in a way they would not do if there were no ladies in the gallery. On Friday last, when the clause had been so fully discussed, no such fascinating influence was present, and he felt justified in coming to the conclusion that the decision arrived at last night might have been different had

the ladies referred to been absent from the gallery. In New Zealand there was no examination board, but the Governor from time to time appointed persons as examiners. He trusted that the Minister would raise no objection to the recommitment of that clause.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It was with regret that he had to ask the Committee to act contrary to the desire of the hon. member. The Committee had not only considered Clause 256 at the Committee stage but also at length on recommitment, and a great deal of time had been given to the deliberation of its merits. Throughout the consideration of the Bill he had only attempted to carry out what he believed to be the desire of the Committee, and the recommitment of Clause 45 this evening was only at the desire of members generally; because it had been understood that the other Chamber would not have power to deal with financial matters, and that it was necessary, therefore, if we wished to give local authorities the money necessary to carry out their works, to increase their rating powers while the Bill was before the Assembly. The recommitment of Clause 255 was on account of an error in connection with an amendment moved by the member for West Perth; while in agreeing to the recommitment of Clause 276, at the instance of the member for Kanowna, he was doing so because notice of an amendment had been some omission and reconsideration was necessary. The hon. member for East Fremantle should endeavour to bring influence to bear on another place to have inserted the amendment he proposed.

Mr. Angwin: I know I have no chance there.

Mr. Price: What about Clause 270. dealing with the examination of school children?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That could be attended to in another place. He would see that it was fixed up there.

Mr. JACOBY: The Bill had been so altered when previously under consideration that it was impossible for members to know exactly in what form the particular clause now stood.

Mr. Angwin: "Two matrons" are to be on the board.

Mr. JACOBY: The only copy of the Bill before members was one that did not represent the present position, and, therefore, they were unable to give the motion of the hon. member proper consideration.

The Minister for Mines: You have had it before you twice.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member can see by the *Votes and Proceedings* what has been done.

Mr. JACOBY: The *Votes and Proceedings* for the previous sitting were not before hon. members, and he suggested for Mr. Speaker's consideration that it might be advisable to maintain a file of the Minutes for each member. That used to be the practice some years ago. It was very awkward to deal with a big measure which had been recommitted two or three times, and the clauses of which had been considerably altered. At the present moment the hon. member was asking the Committee to reconsider a clause, the form of which hon. members did not know.

Amendment put and passed.

Question as amended agreed to; the Bill recommitted.

Recommittal.

Mr. Taylor in the Chair; the Minister for Mines in charge of the Bill.

Clause 45—Power to levy general health rate:

The MINISTER FOR MINES moved an amendment.

That in paragraph (a) the words "one penny-farthing" be struck out and "threepence" inserted in lieu.

When members were dealing with that clause on the previous evening the member for Brown Hill had succeeded in carrying an amendment which provided that the taxation should be on the unimproved value only, but that amendment had not provided any maximum amount which could be levied by the local authority. He (the Minister) had then

moved, in accordance with the clause as it had originally stood, that the maximum amount of taxation should be one penny-farthing in the pound on the capital unimproved value of the land in fee simple in any special district declared by the Governor-in-Council to be a district in which the higher rate of taxation should be allowed, and in other districts three-farthings. After that had been carried there seemed to be a general expression of opinion that, particularly in the smaller districts, power to rate up to one penny-farthing would not be sufficient to enable the local authorities to carry on their work, and that it would be necessary to amend the clause so as to give greater powers of taxation. On the advice of the department that, now that the right to tax on the annual value had been struck out rating powers of one penny-farthing and three-farthings respectively would not be sufficient, he intended to ask the Committee to strike out the words "one penny-farthing," which applied to districts declared by the Governor, and to insert "threepence" in lieu, and in other districts to delete "three-farthings," and insert "twopence." The department considered that such maximums would be sufficient to enable the local authorities to carry out their work.

Amendment (to strike out "one penny-farthing") put and passed.

Mr. JACOBY: There was a doubt in his mind as to whether a rate of threepence would be sufficient, because the unimproved value of well situated blocks, even in large townships, was not likely to be much more than £100 on the average, and even on a rate of threepence the taxation would be only about 25s. per annum. He felt confident that the local governing bodies would be asking for an amendment almost as soon as the Bill was passed, in the direction of giving them increased rating powers. Unless a decent revenue was got from the central blocks it would be necessary to put on a larger rate, which would strike particularly heavy on the rural grounds in the district.

The Minister for Mines: Twopence-halfpenny is the maximum for roads boards.

Mr. JACOBY: There might be some difficulty in getting a higher maximum carried right through Parliament, and therefore he would not move an amendment but would content himself with expressing his doubts as to the sufficiency of threepence.

Amendment (to insert "threepence") put and passed.

On motion by the MINISTER FOR MINES clause further amended by the striking out of paragraph (b) the words "three-farthings" and inserting "two-pence" in lieu.

Clause 255.—Local authority may make by-laws for private hospitals:

The MINISTER FOR MINES moved an amendment—

That the following proviso be added to the clause:—"Provided that no premises which are not registered as a private hospital at the time of the passing of this Act shall be registered after such time as a private hospital unless such premises are at least 15 feet from the nearest boundary of the land of any adjoining owner or occupier."

Had it not been for the necessity to move the amendments just disposed of this particular amendment would have been moved in another Chamber, but as a promise was given to move in this direction, the opportunity was now taken. It would be remembered that when this amendment was before the Committee the member for Kanowna objected to it because a similar amendment had already been defeated, and the Speaker ruled the amendment out of order.

Mr. Bolton: Why have you made it a Government amendment?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: A promise was given to the member for West Perth that this provision would be made, but on the former recommitment it was overlooked. The amendment in no sense affected those private hospitals registered prior to the passing of the Act. The objection raised to the amendment which was moved by the member for Perth (Mr. Brown) in this direction was that it was made retrospective. The amendment now before the members was not retrospective, and there seemed no

reasonable objection to it, because all private hospitals should observe proper sanitary and healthy conditions.

Mr. ANGWIN: One could congratulate the Minister on the persistence displayed in regard to this amendment, seeing the Ministry had opposed a similar amendment on a former occasion. But if it was necessary that all future private hospitals should be a certain distance from neighbouring boundaries, there should be the same necessity in regard to existing private hospitals. The amendment that the member for Perth had moved was, therefore, a proper one, because it would provide protection for all people, whereas the amendment now moved at the instigation of the member for West Perth merely provided protection for a limited number of people. There would be ample power if the clause stood without the amendment, because in every district the people would have power by their votes to elect members to the local authorities to prohibit the registration of private hospitals except under certain conditions. It was apparent that the Government had been influenced by the indignation of the member for West Perth at the defeat of the proposal of the member for Perth. The hon. member was concerned because West Perth was looked upon as a likely spot for the establishment of private hospitals. The amendment certainly pointed out a danger in regard to private hospitals; but while it would prevent future danger, existing dangers would be allowed to continue. We might easily extend the prohibition to existing hospitals, as was intended by the amendment moved by the member for Perth. In reconsidering their attitude towards that amendment, the Government might have been compelled to alter it slightly to have it in order for submission to the Committee, but on recommitment they were not similarly bound, and the original proposal of the member for Perth could now have been submitted. The provision would then apply to all private hospitals, those now existing and those to be established in the future.

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

Clause 256—The Nurses' Registration Board:

Mr. ANGWIN: This clause provided for the appointment of a registration board, which would take the powers to a large extent out of the hands of the Commissioner and the Minister. If a board of this kind was formed there was not the least doubt that, though the Minister had the control, he would loyally abide by the decision of the board. We ought to endeavour to apply conditions similar to those which existed in New Zealand, where there was no registration board and where the registrar was the Inspector General of Hospitals, no doubt a position similar to that of Principal Medical Officer in this State. It would be advisable after the adoption of the amendment on the previous evening to place this matter entirely in the hands of the Commissioner under the control of the Minister. By doing so the Governor in Council would then have the power to appoint a Commissioner instead of the Nurses' Registration Board for the examination of midwives for registration under the Act. The New Zealand Act, as far as could be gathered, had worked fairly satisfactorily without a board, and believing that the decision arrived at on the previous evening did not have that same consideration as the decision arrived at previously, it was his intention to try, if possible, to get hon. members to agree to strike out that sub-clause relating to the board. He moved an amendment—

That Subclause 2—"The Board shall consist of five members"—be struck out.

Mr. BATH: The hon. member had made a mistake in moving for recommittal in connection with this clause. If he moved to strike out the subclause there would be necessitated other amendments in other clauses. The amendment, therefore, would be altogether futile.

Mr. HEITMANN: The attitude of the member for East Fremantle could not be understood. Day after day the hon. member fought for the representation of a certain association on this board.

Mr. Angwin: And you defeated it.

Mr. HEITMANN: And because it was defeated the hon. member said, "Now we do not want any representation on the board." And this was the hon. member

who, time after time, pleaded that we might have a board, and that the profession might have representatives on that board. The hon. member had looked for a safeguard for several days in order to secure the representation of his association.

Mr. Angwin: Not my association.

Mr. HEITMANN: The association the hon. member fought for. There certainly should be a board, and, therefore, it was his intention to vote against the amendment.

Mr. ANGWIN: The member for Brown Hill knew well that it was nothing new to alter a clause in the Bill, and that if other clauses required to be altered in consequence, that it could be done in another place. In that way the clauses would be brought into line. That had been done repeatedly and could be done in this case. Certain nurses in the State would not be protected under this board, and there was the possibility, seeing that they had been denied the right of representation on this board, of getting justice done to these nurses if the Commissioner were the board and the Minister were in control of the Commissioner. If anything were done in the nature of an injustice, the Minister then could be brought to book by Parliament; but if a board were in power there would be the same cry that the board were protected by an Act of Parliament.

Mr. BOLTON: It was his desire to see the association, which was established through the efforts of the late Dr. Haynes, represented on the board, and if the hon. member's amendment would have that effect it would receive support. The amendment, however, would not have that effect. He could only place a little faith in the board and in the Minister, and hope that justice would be done, and that the nurses would have fair treatment and representation if necessary.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 276—By-laws to be laid before Parliament:

Mr. WALKER moved an amendment—

That the following words be added at the end of the clause:—"And the Min-

ister in charge thereof shall move that they be referred to a select committee for examination and report."

There was no desire to go over the arguments which had been adduced when the matter was previously before the Committee.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The desire of the hon. member had his sympathy. It had to be remembered in connection with almost every Bill that went through the House that certain powers were given the Governor to make regulations. On all matters pertaining to the administration of the State, regulations and by-laws were continually being made sufficient to necessitate double the printing required by the Acts passed in a session. He did not think it would be possible to induce members to carry out the work if all regulations, including by-laws made under the numerous local authorities, had to be referred to a select committee for examination and report. What was required was some facility to enable any member of the House who might consider that certain regulations were unsatisfactory to bring his grievance before the House and have that regulation discussed. He (the Minister) was in sympathy with the hon. member, but was afraid that the amendment would, in effect, ask members to do something which they would not be prepared to do. He was not sure whether he was right in saying the amendment ought to be made in the Interpretation Act: certainly some amendment of the existing conditions should be made, but whether or not it should be through the Interpretation Act he was not quite sure. The matter required careful consideration. We should have a method by which any member could secure the discussion in Parliament of any regulation which he might consider undesirable. The amendment represented a very considerable change. It had never been asked for in any other Parliament in Australia, and it was clear that the hon. member was seeking to introduce into our institutions something having all the characteristics of novelty. Most careful consideration should be given to this question, and we should endeavour to learn what would be the ultimate result of the amendment if

carried. In his opinion it would be unworkable, and on that ground he opposed it.

Mr. WALKER: The reason for moving the amendment here, and not in the Interpretation Act, was because we were dealing with regulations here. He agreed that all regulations made under important measures should be submitted to a select committee but, unfortunately, we had not the Interpretation Act open to amendment to-night, nor were we likely to have an amendment of that Act before us during the remnant of the session. The point was that here we could make the amendment in one of the most important Bills ever submitted to the Chamber. It was in the provisions for the carrying out of the measure that its good or evil would become manifest. It was through the continuous regulations that we were to put in practice the provisions made in the numerous clauses of the measure. Acts had been hindered in consequence of unwise regulations framed for the purpose of giving them effect, and sometimes regulations had modified and, to a certain extent, altered the law: consequently, the regulations under any Act were just as important as the Act itself. The Minister had admitted that the method we had of treating these regulations was calculated to leave them neglected, so far as supervision, revision, or consideration was concerned. The regulations were brought up as a matter of form and laid on the Table by a motion that did not appear on the business paper; and they remained on the Table unscanned, for members were not in the habit of going to the Table and successively taking each paper and perusing it for the pleasure of the thing. The consequence was that these regulations were placed on the Table and automatically became law, while not one member in ten was aware of the character of any one of such regulations. Another reason for desiring the amendment was that so niggardly had the State become in respect to its printing bill that hon. members had no chance of privately studying any papers, however important they might be, without first going to the trouble of moving that the papers be printed. The papers were tabled in the form in

which they left the Minister's office, and at most only one member at a time could read them. There was no other State in the Commonwealth so niggardly in that respect as Western Australia. In all other States by-laws and regulations were printed and circulated amongst members, so that at least every member of the House could have a copy and, if necessary, forward another copy to the local authorities in his electorate for their consideration and revision before the stipulated 30 days had expired. To overcome this omission in this Legislature it was necessary that the attention of the House should be specifically drawn to the regulations tabled, and that they should be referred to a select committee. Indeed it would be wise if, when regulations of an important character were brought up, we should consider them seriatim in Committee and go through those regulations as we had previously gone through the clauses of the Bill. What was the answer to his amendment? Merely that if we agreed to it in respect to this Bill we should agree to it in respect to all, and that it would be giving select committees an extraordinary amount of work which in all probability would be neglected. Further than that, the Minister had declared it to be a new experiment. If so, it was one the necessity for which had been rendered manifest by the complaints made of regulations in connection with other Acts. However, he did not see that it was new, because in England everything in connection with Bills were referred to standing committees. There, when a Bill was read a second time, it was referred to one of the many standing committees, unless the House otherwise decided. There was a standing committee in England which, for instance, dealt with all matters relating to Scotland. Where any measure affecting Scotland was concerned, it automatically went to the Scotch standing committee before it was considered by the House.

The Attorney General: This discussion would have been guillotined long ago under the English procedure.

Mr. WALKER: Undoubtedly our procedure allowed tremendous latitude. His

argument was that in England they made provision for minimising the need for discussion by referring a Bill to a standing committee who threshed the whole matter out. There could be no objection to allowing the amendment to go through, and be worked as an experiment. Surely it was not too much to ask select committees to examine a set of by-laws relating to the health of the State. If there was any patriotism at all in the Chamber, members could not object to such a course. Only recently the Roads Bill had been referred to a select committee, and such committees on occasion saved considerable time, as had been the case with the Police Offences Bill. He trusted that the Minister would not persist in his opposition to the amendment, which although an innovation was an innovation in the right direction. The failure of the machinery hitherto was a justification for adding that new cog to the wheel.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The argument of the member for Kanowna was somewhat misleading, because his main complaint was that no opportunity was allowed to members of discussing and dealing with regulations and by-laws under the existing conditions. The hon. member had also contended that members should have an opportunity of sitting on select committees, and presumably taking evidence, and spending a lot of time in the consideration of those regulations and by-laws, although we could not expect them now to even read the minutes of the House or the weekly *Hansard* in which records were kept of all papers laid on the Table, and go to the trouble of walking to the Table and reading the papers.

Mr. Walker: Is not that your experience?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: His experience was that members had not neglected their duty in the past. The hon. member's objection was that when a member had found a regulation with which he did not agree, he had no opportunity of bringing it before the House. What the hon. member wanted then was the opportunity of getting a discussion in the Chamber.

Mr. Walker: Of dealing with the whole matter.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The amendment as it was worded referred to all regulations and by-laws made under the Act. The Act provided first of all for the making of by-laws by about 118 local boards of health, which not only made original by-laws, but amended them from time to time. During the present session, up to the time of the publication of the last *Hansard* five boards of health had put amendments of by-laws on the Table. Under the amendment five select committees would therefore have been necessary in connection with this one Act.

Mr. Walker: They would have all been referred to the same committee.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Then, what the hon. member was referring to was not a select committee, but a standing committee.

Mr. Walker: Call it that if you please. I will accept that amendment.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The amendment related only to by-laws under the one Act. The hon. member's argument, if it applied at all, applied not only to the Health Act, but to every other Act which gave the local or central authorities power to make regulations or by-laws. The hon. member had dealt not only with public health, but the regulations and by-laws of public bodies generally. There had been laid on the Table this session by-laws or amendments of by-laws totalling 33, made under different Acts of Parliament. Were we to have 33 select committees? or were we to have a standing committee which would deal with these 33 matters?—and the 33 might be 66 before the session was ended—or were we to have two or three standing committees to deal with different classes of legislation? He was anxious to learn what the hon. member was seeking. The Committee should not pass an amendment hurriedly which was likely to be unworkable, and not, on the grounds that members had not done the work which they had had an opportunity of doing, ask them to do something which would entail about ten times as much work. The amendment referred to

"the Minister in charge," and so long as the Colonial Secretary was in another place the "Minister in charge" would be there.

Mr. Walker: The Minister for Mines is in charge of the Bill now.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Bill referred to the Minister for Health, and the statutory duties could not be delegated.

Mr. Walker: These duties can be delegated to the Minister in charge of the regulations when they are laid on the Table.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It was expressly provided that the Colonial Secretary should be Minister for Health.

Mr. Walker: But who would lay the by-laws under this Bill on the Table of the House?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That was not the question.

Mr. Walker: It is the question; that Minister would be in charge of them.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: "The Minister in charge" was not the Minister in charge of the regulations for the time being, but the Minister in charge of the administration of the Bill. The hon. member recognised that that was so.

Mr. Walker: No, I do not.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: On the ground that in the past members had not done their duty we were proposing to delegate their duties by appointing a committee of five.

Mr. Scaddan: You did that with the Roads Bill.

Mr. Walker: And the Police Offences Bill.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Committee of the House was going to consider the Roads Bill, and if the leader of the Opposition assured him that that was not so, he would be very much surprised. If the members of the House could not be trusted to do their duty in regard to these regulations and by-laws, were they then to ask—

Mr. Scaddan: You are quibbling now. Would we not discuss the report of the select committee?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The select committee's report might, or might not be discussed. Presumably that report would be either that the regulations were harmless, or that they were harmful, and the House would say either yes or no. It was not likely that we would do other than endorse the committee's opinions, unless it was for party purposes. He hoped that hon. members would not carry an amendment which was likely to be inoperative and delegate to a few members of the House a large amount of work with probably no satisfactory results accruing from it. There would not be a very strong objection if the hon. member for Kanowna would propose, instead of the amendment which he had moved, that the regulations under this Bill—regulations which could be made only by the central authority, whether it were the nurses' board or the Commissioner—should be printed and circulated to hon. members.

Mr. Scaddan: That is no good.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Was it the regulations or the by-laws that were being objected to?

Mr. Bolton: Mostly the regulations, I think.

Mr. Walker: You know that both are objected to.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The by-laws of a local body had only a local interest.

Mr. Walker: The regulations are of course the chief thing. If I agree to a compromise, will you adopt it?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Would the hon. member be satisfied if the regulations were circulated in printed form?

Mr. Walker: That is not enough.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The regulations would not then be lost in the manner in which the hon. member said they were lost, and so escape attention.

Mr. Walker: That is an improvement but it is not enough.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If that course were adopted there might be a possibility of meeting the hon. member.

Mr. SCADDAN: In connection with regulations and by-laws members of Par-

liament entirely shirked their duties. There were regulations framed to-day that, if they were debated seriatim in the House, would not be passed, for instance the charge of £20 for a plumber's license fee under the metropolitan water supply. Parliament would never have agreed to such a by-law, yet power was given to a Minister to make a regulation such as this, and Parliament could not deal with it. True, the regulations were placed on the Table, but it was useless to say members could object to them. It would be absurd for a member to object when the Minister was moving to place the regulations on the Table. They were not seen in many cases until they were laid on the Table. A member was expected to read through the whole of the regulations and by-laws laid on the Table to see whether there was anything in them objectionable or not in keeping with the Act or with the powers granted to Ministers by Parliament; and if there was anything of the sort, the member was expected to table and carry a motion to disallow the objectionable regulation, and was also expected to get the Legislative Council to agree to his motion. It was a position members could not be expected to take up; it was asking too much of them. The proper course was to appoint a certain number of members to review these regulations and see that they were in keeping with the Acts under which they were framed and draw the attention of the House to anything not in the best interests of the community.

The Minister for Mines: Would it not be better to do it generally?

Mr. SCADDAN: But what guarantee have we that this will be done?

The Attorney General: You can move to amend the Standing Orders.

Mr. SCADDAN: That might not meet the case. It was better to be sure in a matter of such vital importance. Too much power was given to Ministers to make regulations. By careful drafting a regulation could be made to actually contravene the provisions of the Act. Until members had an assurance from the Minister that a general provision would be made, the Minister was not justified in

asking that the matter be not pressed on this occasion. In regard to the argument of the Minister for Works, that 50 members would be shirking their duty in passing it on to four or five, exactly the same thing was done when a Bill was referred to a select committee. The select committee prepared a report and submitted it to the Chamber and there was no responsibility taken from the House.

Mr. BATH: Although nominally there was power given to members to review regulations, as a matter of experience it was a power that members had not the right to exercise. The only opportunity to disallow a regulation was on private members' day; but private members' business was postponed from week to week and, in the rush at the end of the session, thrown overboard. There was a great deal in the argument that a considerable amount of legislation was circumvented by means of regulations. Even if a member was desirous of doing his duty and of reviewing all regulations laid on the Table, it would be a physical impossibility. The amendment moved by the member for Kanowna would logically have to be applied to regulations under other Acts, and the House would be dissolved into select committees, the members of which would be continually engaged, in addition to their other work, in considering regulations and by-laws under different Statutes, and there would be a danger of our reverting to the American system of standing committees that had already practically robbed the House of Representatives of its control in money expenditure. He suggested that some time after regulations were laid on the Table the Minister should move that they be approved, and then if any member thought a regulation was objectionable he would have the opportunity, on the Minister's motion, of dealing with it and of moving to amend or delete it as was considered necessary.

Mr. Walker: Does the Minister accept that compromise?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The arguments brought forward by the hon. member should be sufficient to justify our refusing to accept the amendment. If any action was taken at all it should apply

to all matters and should be well considered. As was pointed out by the Minister for Works, the amendment would compel the Minister in another place to submit the regulations in the Assembly. A wiser course to pursue would be to have some general amendment to the Standing Orders, and the hon. member could well ask for a select committee to consider the best means of carrying what he desired into effect. If we adopted the suggestion of the member for Brown Hill it would create an enormous amount of work in the Chamber, and would raise many discussions that might be avoided. However, when we approached a considerable change in the whole business of the House, something entirely novel to any State in Australia, we should give serious consideration to the matter before finally moving. Having brought the matter up, the hon. member might now drop it so far as this Bill was concerned and bring forward a motion which would deal generally with the regulations framed in all departments of the service.

Mr. WALKER: The Minister for Mines had used his stock arguments. Every amendment to any Bill that was brought up from the Opposition side of the House was answered by "Wait until a general measure dealing with the subject is brought down; wait until there is another chance on some other Bill; deal with it somewhere else; deal with it in the interpretation Act; deal with it in the Standing Orders; anywhere but now and here."

The Minister for Works: Anywhere but the wrong place.

Mr. WALKER: The Minister for Works had made a speech which threw some justifiable suspicions upon his sincerity in these arguments.

The Minister for Works: That is a stock statement.

Mr. WALKER: It was not a stock statement, but it was a stock fact on the part of the hon. member. The hon. member had tried to throw dust in the eyes of hon. members by using arguments of that kind, that if this amendment were carried the Colonial Secretary, who would have the administration of this measure

when it became law, would have to come into this Chamber.

The Minister for Mines: I did not say that.

Mr. WALKER: These regulations had to be laid on the Table of the Assembly and on the Table of another place; why not make it statutory that even there they should be considered. Had the Minister read the amendment? The amendment read:—"All regulations and by-laws shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament within 30 days of the making thereof, if Parliament is then in session, and if not, within 30 days after the next meeting of Parliament." What were to be laid on the Table? All regulations and by-laws. Who laid regulations and by-laws upon the Table? The Minister in charge.

The Minister for Mines: Who is the Minister?

Mr. WALKER: Whoever was in charge of these regulations when he laid them on the Table.

The Minister for Mines: The definition tells you distinctly who the Minister is.

Mr. WALKER: The Minister in charge of the regulations when laid on the Table. What was the good of trying to humbug with quibbles of this sort. The Minister for Mines was in charge of this Bill at the present time and the Colonial Secretary would administer it when it became an Act. Would the Minister for Mines say that the Colonial Secretary would have to go to the Legislative Assembly?

The Minister for Mines: Read the definition.

Mr. WALKER: The Minister for Mines knew what was meant by "in charge of the regulations when laid upon the Table." The Minister understood English and he should not try to fool men of common sense who were neither children, babies, nor fools. The Minister knew that whenever regulations were brought before the House affecting the House, they would have to be laid on the Table by the Minister in this Chamber, and that Minister would be in charge of the regulations, and that he would have to move that they should be referred to a select committee. The Minister only pretended that he did not understand. Members could tell beforehand, when there was an

amendment that he did not approve of before the Committee, what the Minister intended to say. The Minister would declare, "Deal with it somewhere else; wait for another time; the Cabinet by-and-bye will deal with it; have a conference with my officers; anything but attend to it now." The Minister for Works, with light ingenuity, not ingenuousness, was trying to draw a red herring across the path when he said that the amendment practically proposed to relegate the duties of the House to four or five. The amendment did nothing of the sort; it proposed to put upon the House extra duties, not only the extra duties of four or five, but the extra duties of every member of this House when the report of that four or five was submitted to them. It would bring members to the toe-line, so to speak; it would compel everyone to read and examine these regulations and by-laws. That was what was meant, and to shuffle out of responsibility and to try to mislead the Committee in this way was not becoming of a Minister of the Crown.

The Minister for Works: Have you read your amendment?

Mr. WALKER: Did the hon. member want to be insulting?

The Minister for Works: No.

Mr. WALKER: The Minister for Works knew that he (Mr. Walker) had read the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: On a point of order. I desire to point out that the hon. member has accused me of trying to throw dust in his eyes and in the eyes of the Committee, and of trying to mislead the Committee, and then he asks me whether I wanted to insult him. I ask that the hon. member should be requested to withdraw each of these accusations.

Mr. WALKER: If these things were said in the course of debate, it was the duty of the Minister to draw attention to them at the time the slip was made.

The Minister for Works: There was no slip.

Mr. WALKER: Having allowed the matter to pass, it was disorderly now on the part of the Minister to go back upon it.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister for Works had asked that the member for Kanowna should be requested to withdraw the statements which were made. The hon. member should withdraw the remarks.

Mr. WALKER: In deference to the ruling of the Chairman, the remarks would be withdrawn.

Mr. Horan: No harm done.

Mr. WALKER: The argument of the Minister for Works had all the semblance of the arguments of a man who, for the purpose of debate and not of strict accuracy, put them in a peculiar form of verbiage, so that members not accustomed to his skill and acumen might fall a victim to his methods. There was no question that the amendment was perfectly clear and the purpose was peaceful and the wisdom of it was admitted even by the Minister for Mines. That Minister's very arguments that it should be put in another Bill or that the Standing Orders should be altered, or that it should be put in the Interpretation Act, showed that there was justification for the amendment. The only argument against it was that it applied to one measure instead of to many. The answer to that was that we were dealing with one measure and not many. This was the only Bill in which we could put the amendment. He was perfectly willing, however, to withdraw his amendment and support that suggested by the member for Brown Hill, but he was still of opinion that this was the best way that we ought to give regulations consideration and sifting. The member for Brown Hill over-estimated the labour which would be involved. A number of by-laws were formal and required no evidence and no sifting. Then, though there were 33 of them submitted during the present session, they were of a certain type and there would be no necessity to summon evidence with regard to them, but when we came to the vital element of regulations which might limit or might misdirect or contravene the law, it was necessary to give these regulations some attention, some sifting and consideration and revision both by a select committee and by the Committee of

the whole House. If we had done that in the past there would not have been so many complaints of injustice under the Goldfields Acts and there would not have been any difficulty over the Metropolitan Waterworks Act and a dozen other cases, of a like character. There was on the Notice Paper at the present time a motion to deal with one particular regulation that was obnoxious. This was in the hands of a private member who had to wait his opportunity to discuss it. That hon. member would have no chance of doing so this session, and goodness only knew whether or not he would have a chance next session. It was desired to facilitate that. If these by-laws were of a formal character not much difficulty would be experienced, the matter would be examined and the report would be favourable. Whether the report was favourable or not, the House could always, under the method that he (Mr. Walker) proposed, deal with them subsequently if it was desired to do so. It was to provide facilities and to give means for that purpose that the amendment was proposed. There was no desire on his part to enforce an apparently drastic amendment on the Committee; he would be content to go half-way so as to get something done, and, with the permission of the Committee, for the purpose of carrying that much towards what he aimed at, he would withdraw his amendment to enable the member for Brown Hill to move his.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Mr. BATH moved a further amendment—

That the following proviso be added: "Provided that where such regulations or by-laws are laid before both Houses of Parliament, the Minister submitting same shall give at least fourteen days' notice of motion that such regulations or by-laws shall be approved."

The MINISTER FOR MINES: According to his interpretation of the amendment this would mean both Houses of Parliament.

Mr. Bath: They will have to be laid before both Houses of Parliament.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: And in both Houses Ministers would have to

formally move that the regulations be approved? Without taking up any more time he would announce his opposition to the amendment.

Mr. ANGWIN: It seemed that before a regulation could be disagreed with such disagreement would have to be assented to by both Houses of Parliament. This was one of the things that required altering. In regard to regulations, particularly those framed by the Government, a vote from the Assembly alone should be sufficient for the throwing out of such regulations. Another place should have no say in the matter whatever. We knew that in times gone by—

The Minister for Mines: Before we started on the Health Bill.

Mr. ANGWIN: It was not clear what the Minister was alluding to. In times gone by regulations had been disapproved of in another place, and the Government had taken no notice whatever of such disapproval. This question of disapproving of regulations was a matter that should be left to members of the Assembly. He hoped the member for Brown Hill would alter his amendment in such manner as to allow members of the Assembly to secure the throwing out of a regulation without reference to another place. It might be said that if we carried such an amendment as he proposed, and sent it to another place, it would there be thrown out. Probably it would be. Anything sent to another place proposing to curtail the powers of another place would be thrown out; and this would go on until the people were sufficiently educated to throw out another place.

Amendment put and division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	19
Noes	20

Majority against .. 1

AYES.

Mr. Bath	Mr. O'Loghten
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Price
Mr. Collier	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Gill	Mr. Swan
Mr. Gourley	Mr. Troy
Mr. Heltmann	Mr. Walker
Mr. Holman	Mr. Ware
Mr. Horan	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Underwood
Mr. McDowall	(Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Male
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. Monger
Mr. Daglish	Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. Davies	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Osborn
Mr. Gordon	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Gregory	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. Layman
Mr. Harper	(Teller).
Mr. Jacoby	

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Bill again reported with further amendments.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1910-11.

In Committee of Supply.

Debate resumed from the 25th October, on the Treasurer's Financial Statement and the Annual Estimates; Mr. Taylor in the Chair.

Vote—His Excellency the Governor, £2,209.

Mr. Johnson: I suggest that the Order of the Day be adjourned, and that we go on with the next business. It is too late to go on with the Estimates now.

The Premier: Let us go on; the Leader the Opposition is ready.

Mr. Johnson: It is distinctly unfair; you will gain nothing by this.

Mr. SCADDAN (Ivanhoe): May I say that personally I have nothing to complain about in connection with the treatment I have received from the Premier so far as the consideration of the Estimates is concerned. On a previous occasion I had arranged to take up the discussion on the Estimates on the Thursday week after they were introduced, which allowed me nearly a fortnight to prepare my remarks, but owing to having contracted a cold I asked the Premier to postpone the consideration of the Estimates and he readily agreed to do so. I must admit, however, that he caught me napping to-night in bringing them on after a holiday when we have been receiving our Australian Fleet; and had it not been that I kept up my good record as a teetotaler I do not know that I should have been able to proceed. I desire at this stage to ask members of the Committee to extend me that consideration which they would extend to

even the Premier when delivering his Budget, because this is the first occasion that I have attempted in an official capacity, except as a private member, to discuss the financial proposals of any Government. But I have always held the view that the financial policy of the Government does not receive that consideration from members of this House that it warrants. Unfortunately, this does not apply only to the supporters of the Government, and I do not say that against the supporters of the present Government any more than the supporters of any other Government in Western Australia. They have all been ready to accept any financial proposals the Government bring down without any consideration whatsoever. I do not think that I know of one instance where the supporters of a Government have discussed the general financial policy of the Government they were supporting, and, after all, I believe they are in very much the same position as members sitting in opposition. It is not, I assume, like a Re-distribution of Seats Bill and cannot be hawked around amongst Government supporters, and their opinion asked before it is submitted to the House. I believe they have to wait till the Budget is delivered before they know the financial proposals for the current year, and are not in any better position to satisfy themselves about the financial proposals of the Government than are members of the Opposition. Apparently under existing conditions members are prepared to accept the Budget, in a large degree, as a matter of course. We set apart a night when the Treasurer will introduce his Budget, and members sit around and listen, but I doubt if there is any question as to the contents of the Budget, outside questions as to items in members' constituencies, that they know anything at all about. Unfortunately that is the position, and I have to admit that I too have been guilty in the past of accepting it in very much the same light. But let me say that I think the time has arrived when we should introduce our Estimates at the commencement of the term for which those Estimates will apply.

Mr. Jacoby: We cannot do it.

Mr. SCADDAN: The member for Swan should know that it can be done and is done in other parts of the world.

Mr. Horan: We have to wait for the financial statement of the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. SCADDAN: The introduction of the Federal Government's financial statement should not affect us at all. It may assist us in being more accurate, but, after all, the Treasurer estimates his expenditure and receipts for the current year largely from the receipts and expenditure from various quarters during the preceding year, and he can obtain that information regarding the Commonwealth receipts and expenditure just as easily as he can regarding his own receipts and expenditure. So that cannot be urged as a reason why the Estimates are not introduced until five months of the current year are passed. The whole thing resolves itself into a farce. I have seen the occasion when Government supporters have been convinced during the discussion of the Estimates that certain items appearing therein should not be permitted to remain, but when asked to support the deletion of those items they have stated, "How can we do it? the Government have already expended a portion of that sum; all we can do is to issue a warning to the Government that this must not occur again." Then it goes on again next year. I have in view the vote for the maintenance of main roads leading out of Perth. For four solid years I fought this question most strenuously and each year received exactly the same statement from country members on the Government side as to the reason why they could not support the deletion of the item. "We will warn the Government that it must not occur again," they said, but each year the same thing has happened. The Treasurer ought to be in the position early in July to submit the Estimates of receipts and expenditure for the current year just as well as he can in October or November. This year, unfortunately, the present Treasurer was not continuously in charge of the Treasury Department and did not take over control until three weeks before he delivered his Budget. It is astounding to think that the Govern-

ment were carrying on, and going about the State and asserting that their financial proposals were going to save the country, whilst the Premier had to admit a fortnight before the Budget was submitted that he had not looked at it. It remained me of a statement I once heard him make in the Chamber—"What is to be will be." That being the case, the whole thing has apparently become a matter of handing over the control of the finances, in a large measure, to the departmental officers and it is a dangerous thing to continue that practice any longer than is necessary. The time has arrived when the House should make it known to the Government that in future we must meet earlier in the year and receive the Estimates not later than August, when the Treasurer should be in a position to submit his financial proposals. It will be claimed I know, that the Treasurer is desirous of being as accurate as possible. Undoubtedly he is, whether he introduces his Budget early or late, but I would like to remind the House that the present Treasurer was over three years in charge of the Treasury, and on each occasion he introduced his Budget late.

The Premier: No; earlier than my predecessors.

Mr. SCADDAN: Only on one occasion. I am doubtful if we ever had the spectacle of a Minister being so incorrect in his Estimates as the present Treasurer was in those years.

The Premier: I was most accurate.

Mr. SCADDAN: The Premier might think so, but during the year 1906-7 he under-estimated his revenue to the tune of £190,000 odd, and his expenditure to the tune of £98,517. If that is accuracy it is a new term of which I heard nothing when I went to school. In 1907-8 we find a similar position; he then under-estimated his revenue by £16,979, and under-estimated his expenditure by £91,932. In 1908-9 he under-estimated his revenue by £123,565, and his expenditure by £19,502.

The Premier: Will you give the reasons why I under-estimated the revenue.

Mr. SCADDAN: I am not troubled for the moment what were the reasons that

the Treasurer gave, when introducing subsequent Estimates, for under-estimating his receipts and expenditure. But I contend that the expenditure of Government departments ought to be well within the prevision of the Treasurer, at least when he does not introduce his Estimates until three or four months of the financial year have expired. The British Budget shows that for the three years 1889-92 the total amount of expenditure was not less than £264,000,000, and the error was only £137,000, or roughly, 1s. per £100 of expenditure. I cannot understand that the expenditure of the departments in Western Australia can be compared for a moment with that in England.

The Premier: You have lumped the three years, have you?

Mr. SCADDAN: Yes; and if the Premier will take the trouble to total up the amount he will find that they run to a tremendous total. For the three years during which he was in charge of the Treasury he under-estimated his Estimates by £331,403, an average per year of £110,468, and his expenditure by £209,351, an average of £69,984, and I doubt if the total expenditure for the three years exceeded £10,000,000.

Mr. Johnson: There is a big advantage in under-estimating expenditure.

Mr. SCADDAN: I am quite aware that there is, and possibly the Treasurer is under-estimating it this year before the general election in order to hoodwink the electors when he appears before them. I am only quoting this to show that the Treasurer does not display that caution which is necessary, and that there is less excuse when he does not introduce his Estimates until three or four months of the year have expired. Here we have five months of the current financial year gone, and we have not touched the Estimates. We are going on in that haphazard method year after year, and yet Parliament, particularly the Legislative Assembly, boasts that, as representing the people, it has control of the finances of the country. It has nothing of the kind. Parliament's control of the finances is only a farce. We are getting into that position now that the finances of the coun-

try are in the hands of, and are absolutely controlled by, five or six Cabinet Ministers. I contend that the consideration of the Budget is probably the greatest task Parliament has to deal with during the year, and that in dealing with the Budget, Parliament, as acting for the people, should have full control of the finances of the State and be able to give authority or withhold it at discretion as the raising of revenue and as to the expenditure in the various departments of the State. It is true, of course, that, while Parliament has complete control over the revenues of the State, it has no control in any sense over an increase of taxation in any direction. That is reserved for the Ministers of the Crown. Increases can only take effect when introduced by Ministers by messages from the Crown. Outside that, however, Parliament should have, and should claim, full control of the finances of the State and of the departments. We can rejoice that no Parliamentary majority, big or small, forty votes or one as it has been lately in this Parliament, or use of special powers, can alter the hard facts of finance; and it is just that to which I wish to draw attention at the present moment. We hear Ministers, at different periods, particularly at agricultural shows and other places, boasting of the fact that the Government, the successors of the Moore and the Rason Governments, have introduced a spirited public works developmental policy. Let me say right here that so far as the Revenue Estimates are concerned it is nothing more than a myth. I do not think the present Government have been equalled for a less progressive policy of expenditure from revenue by any previous Government we have had in the State. Of course it is contended that they have not had the same amount of funds at their disposal that previous Governments have had, but this has been brought about in a large measure by the raising of loans for the purpose of doing work which is not of a reproductive nature. By this policy of continually adding to our loan indebtedness we, of course, are continually adding to the annual charges for interest and sinking fund

on our loans, until to-day we have reached the position that 28 per cent. or thereabouts of the total revenue from all sources during the current year will be taken up by these charges on loan account. Where is this going to end? Will the policy of the Government, as outlined in the present Estimates, and by different Ministers in different parts of the State, lead the people to have confidence that the Government will lessen the burden on them? I have no hesitation in saying, if the policy of constructing roads and bridges and erecting State batteries and other works of a similar nature from loan funds is to be pursued to the extent it has been by the present Government, we are going to be practically bankrupt before many years pass over our heads.

The Premier: No; there is not the slightest fear of it.

Mr. SCADDAN: Exactly the same statement as that has been made in other parts of the world. Thorold Rogers said that if there was anything to make him distrust a politician it was when that politician continually boasted of the splendid natural resources of his State, and used it for the purpose of obtaining unlimited loans.

The Attorney General: How long do you give us?

Mr. SCADDAN: In 1900 we spent 14 per cent. of our total revenue in loan charges, and now it is 28 per cent. If the Attorney General will work it out in proportion he will find it will not be very long before we will be bankrupt, if we continue the same process as the present Government are carrying out.

The Attorney General: I wish you would name the day.

Mr. SCADDAN: The Attorney General will probably not be here; but we will be saved from that calamity at the next general election by the people exercising their right of controlling the finances and placing in power a Government that will insist that all future loan moneys will be expended on purely reproductive works. In order that there may be no misunderstanding in the minds of the Government or the Press, particularly the *Daily News*, in connection with the policy of the La-

bour party as to loan funds, I may say we are not opposed to borrowing, but we do insist that that borrowing shall be used for reproductive works, and "reproductive," according to our way of interpreting it, means that the work shall produce working expenses, interest and sinking fund during its life. That ought to be plain enough for that magnificent journal which issues in the evening the daily news. They have been asking questions, and I have placed in the hands of the proprietor of the journal the proceedings of the last congress at Bunbury where our policy was formulated—it is not formulated by any members of this Chamber—in order that he may criticise it, or gain knowledge of the policy of this side of the House.

Mr. Troy: But why attach that importance to the *Daily News*?

Mr. SCADDAN: I do not, but there are certain people who read the paper, and I want all classes of the community to know that the policy of the party on this side of the House is one that will save them from disaster financially. Now, dealing with the boast of the present Government as to their progressive policy, I believe it was only a few weeks ago when the present Minister for Works, sitting then as a private member on the cross benches, severely criticised the Government in answer to a criticism made by the Attorney General on the Address-in-Reply when the Attorney General charged those who were previously on the Treasury bench with being a mark-time Government, or a Government which had a mark-time policy. The member for Subiaco, now the Minister for Works, clearly proved that, so far as the consolidated revenue was concerned, and largely from loan also, the policy of the Labour Government in 1904-5 was considerably more progressive than that of any succeeding Government, even that of to-day. We ought not to forget that the Government of 1904-5 were faced with a deficiency on their loan account, while the Government that succeeded in 1905-6, the Rason Government, had no less than £140,000 to the credit of loan account when they took office. The member for Subiaco was able to show that the Labour Government,

with a deficit on loan account, had expended more than that progressive Government known as the Rason Government. And with the exception, I believe, of expenditure on railways, the expenditure by the Labour Government from loan and revenue compares more than favourably with the expenditure of either the Moore or the Wilson Governments. I do not desire to go into figures to any great extent to prove that statement. I think the Treasurer will have to admit it. But while the Government boast of a progressive policy they do not definitely say in what direction they are making progress. I would like to know whether their progressive policy is anything more than building railway lines in agricultural districts; because, if that is all they have to show in support of their progressive developmental policy, I am afraid it is nothing more than a myth, as I said previously. A progressive public works policy is one that can only be justified so far as it is a policy that will assist in the development of every industry in the State. I know that all expenditure does assist an industry to some extent directly or indirectly, but our principal object should be, when expending money from loan or revenue, to assist in the development of our primary industries; and these I take to be the mineral industry, including gold, tin, copper, coal, etcetera, the agricultural industry, including horticulture and viticulture, and the pastoral and timber industries. If we set our minds upon the development of these industries, then the other industries, such as manufacturing, transport, railways and shipping, etcetera, must of necessity follow in the progress that will be caused by the expenditure of money in developing those I have mentioned. Apparently the Government's policy at the present time is merely to talk about development, while doing nothing. Undoubtedly they have built a considerable number of light agricultural railways, but the construction of light agricultural railways is not the alpha and omega of progress from a State standpoint. I hold that while they have been doing this, they are neglecting in some way the other primary industries, principally mining and timber, and also

the sub-industries of horticulture and viticulture. But the very development work they are doing to-day in the direction of constructing railways in agricultural districts is a policy which was formulated by the Government they have in season and out of season condemned since they have been in office. It was formulated by the Labour Government in 1904-5, and would have been put into operation just as vigorously, and probably with more satisfaction to the country, by the Labour Government had they remained in power. From the speeches made by different Labour Ministers, I have no doubt that, instead of doing the development in a haphazard manner like the present Government, that is, prompted in a large measure by political ends, the Labour Government would have had a proper and complete scheme of railway construction in agricultural districts, and would not have considered it from the standpoint of whether they would get support in one district or another.

Mr. Johnson: What did we appoint a Royal Commission for?

Mr. SCADDAN: For that very purpose, and that Commission, not in these words but in other words, recommended that there should be a definite scheme of constructing light railways in agricultural districts. Unfortunately the present Government have proceeded in their come-day-go-day style. If a railway was asked for they considered it, and if they thought it was going to assist them they built it, but if they thought it was not going to assist them they did not give it much consideration. I hold that is not the method of assisting the primary industries. The member for Subiaco during the Address-in-Reply also drew attention to the amounts spent from loan funds on development works by the Labour Government as compared with the Rason Government; but, even making comparison with the present Government, we find that, though the Moore Government spent more in 1909-10 than was spent in 1904-5, if we take from the total amount the sum spent on works transferred from revenue to loan account, there was more development work done

in 1904-5 than was done by the Moore Government in 1909-10. I find that from loan funds, for what is termed development work—I do not know whether the Treasurer will hold that it is development work, though I admit that all expenditure does assist all industries in some way directly or indirectly; I contend that directly developing an industry is spending money that is put into the industry and not to some other purpose—I find that under the heading of agricultural development there was a sum of £10,705 for the purpose of immigration taken from loan funds. This is altogether without other expenditure, such as £21,234 on roads and bridges from loan, £59,518 for public buildings, and £11,344 for the erection of State batteries, and no less than £40,000 for replacing obsolete rolling stock all from loan. All these items have now been transferred from revenue to loan, and it makes a tremendous difference in the amount of money expended from revenue. While the amount expended in these particular works in 1909-10 was greater from loan than in 1904-5; yet, if we place side by side with that the expenditure by the Labour Government from revenue and loan, it will be shown that the Labour Government expended more in the development of the various industries than either the Rason or the Moore Government did, or the Wilson Government now propose to do. I would point out that the revenue expenditure during 1904-5 on public works was somewhat as follows:—In that period there was spent on salaries £31,044; and as hon. members know, that is calculated on a proportionate basis, according to the amount of work done, from loan or revenue. In 1909-10—in order to show how much of our public works were constructed from loan—we might mention that there was £9,323 spent from revenue on salaries as compared with the figures for 1904-5 which I have just quoted. This shows that our Public Works Department to-day practically only exists for the purpose of expending Loan funds. In the Estimates for 1910-11 there is certainly a slight increase on the amount for 1909-10, the estimate being £10,500.

On Roads and Bridges in 1904-5 the Labour Government spent £120,100, and in 1909-10 the Moore Government only expended £38,000, while the estimate for 1910-11 is £53,704. In Harbours and Rivers the Labour Government expended £18,956 from Revenue, and in 1909/10 there was spent £10,300, while the estimate for 1910-11 is £11,418. In Water Supplies, etcetera, there was spent in 1904-5 £21,388 and in 1909-10 £5,668, while the present estimate is £6,857. During 1904-5 an amount of £7,167 was provided on the Estimates for Railway construction, and this has not re-appeared since the Labour Government went out of office. Under the heading of "Miscellaneous" in 1904-5 there was spent £1,100 and in 1909-10 £1,745, while the estimate for 1910-11 is £5,500. In Public Works in 1904-5 the amount of £173,581 was spent, while in 1909-10 the figures were £41,564, and the present estimate is £49,277. This makes the total for 1904-5, including sundries, £387,497: £129,428 on the Estimates of 1909-10, and £144,806 on the present Estimates. Where is the evidence of the progressive policy that we hear so much of from the present Premier and his colleagues at agricultural shows and other functions. During 1904-5, the "mark time period," which we hear spoken of even to-day, there was an actual expenditure of £337,927 from revenue, while this year we estimate the expenditure at £124,820, or very nearly £200,000 less than in 1904-5.

Mr. Walker: About one-third less.

Mr. SCADDAN: That is so; and yet we hear so much, even to-day from the newspapers and from the Government of the "mark time" policy of the Labour Government in 1904-5. The position, however, is as I have stated it. The amount the Labour Government spent from revenue on public works was one-third more than it is proposed to spend to-day. This is the much boasted progressive development policy of the Rason, Moore, and Wilson Governments. In 1904-5 we found from revenue for rolling stock the amount of £40,331 and for new works and improvements £13,716, a total of £54,000, and since 1908-9 the

amount for these items has been transferred to Loan. For the erection of State batteries the Labour Government in 1904-5 found £33,219, from revenue, and during the last four years the present Government have provided nothing from revenue but have expended £72,575 from loan. Let me say in passing that we have heard a lot in the past about our State battery system not paying; if the system could not pay when the batteries were constructed from revenue, how in the name of all that is good can a Government expect the batteries to pay, and how can they provide treatment for prospectors at reasonable rates, when these people are going to be charged interest and sinking fund on loan moneys expended on these works? How is it possible, I ask? It is only a subterfuge to use loan funds on these works and to make it appear that there is a progressive policy. Yet, when these people who are using trading concerns such as State batteries, in connection with which it is essential that they should have cheap facilities for treating ore, when they discover that they will have to pay interest and sinking fund on loan moneys we shall hear them complain against the action of the present Government, and I am of opinion that that time is not very far distant. I would refer to the fact that in 1904-5 the Labour Government expended £6,000 from Revenue under the Mines Development Act and the expenditure in this regard is now coming absolutely from loan. I am only pointing out these instances to show that the policy of the Government to-day, the Government which boasts about having squared the ledger, is a policy of transferring from revenue to loan.

Mr. Johnson: The most cowardly policy that can be adopted.

Mr. SCADDAN: What the member for Guildford states is absolutely correct. Let me say that the Chancellor of the Exchequer in England, Mr. Lloyd George, when he introduced his Budget, caused a considerable amount of criticism not only in Great Britain, but in the Colonies, while I notice that some of the monthly journals when criticising that Budget

gave Mr. Lloyd George credit for being an honest financier. These are the words of the *Contemporary Review*:—

It adds to the Chancellor's difficulties that he frames his Estimates at the close of an unfavourable year, the first set-back after an unparalleled period of prosperity

It is as well that we should compare a statesman like Mr. Lloyd George, who dealt with the position as he found it, with the great statesmen we hear so much about on our public platforms, such as the little man with the big heart, when placed in a similar position. The *Contemporary Review* article goes on—

Mr. Lloyd George has faced the problem with courage except in one particular. He does not veil the expenditure by unwholesome subterfuge, such as borrowing for ordinary expenditure. He meets the demand on the nation honestly and straightforwardly, and bases his proposals on principles which must condemn themselves generally to Liberals throughout the country.

Mr. Lloyd George did not borrow for ordinary expenditure, but that is what the Rason, Moore, and Wilson Governments have been doing since the Labour Government went out of office. I repeat the statement and apply it to these three Governments that they have "by unwholesome subterfuge borrowed for ordinary expenditure." This policy has been in operation for the past five years or more by the Rason, Moore, and Wilson Governments, and these Governments are being supported by people who term themselves Liberals without raising their voices against the continuance of that policy. This is leaving trouble for future Governments; it is increasing the burden of debt to such an extent that we will have difficulty in finding any revenue for development work at all. May I go further and say that this does not altogether make the position positively clean because we have to remember that the present Government have, ever since they have been in office, been reducing the amount that they have been providing for the local authorities, who also carry on development work. After all we have to recognise that the

work of the local authorities in a large measure assists in the development of industries, particularly in the outback districts, and by cutting off their subsidies or reducing them we have been crippling in a large measure the development of these primary industries. In order to show just what this policy is bringing us to, may I refer to the annual charge on Consolidated Revenue for the purpose of meeting our Loan indebtedness. The gross debt on the 30th June, 1905, was £16,642,773. In 1910 it was no less than £23,287,453, an increase of £7,197,165 in five years. The interest and sinking fund charges for the year 1904-5 were £764,933, which ought to be found, of course, from Consolidated Revenue. In 1910-11 the Treasurer estimates, after making a saving of about £18,000 in our interest charges, that the charge for sinking fund and interest will be no less than £1,051,387, an increase of £286,454 for interest and sinking fund charges in the past five years. Is that policy to continue? It is useless for the Treasurer to come here and say that our trading concerns are practically finding the whole of the interest and sinking fund charges on our public debt. They may be; we may make our trading concerns find more than interest and sinking fund charges, and yet we will not be in any better position than if they were paying even interest alone. The Treasurer smiles. Let me say that if we spend loan moneys on our trading concerns, such as we have been doing, we only do so for the purpose of assisting the development of our industries; there can be no object in spending loan moneys. If we are going to put such charges on the people who are using these trading concerns in order to make them meet sinking fund and interest, instead of assisting the development of our industries, it will retard them, because, as I have already stated, the charge necessary to meet our obligations will be exorbitant. In 1905, in round figures, the charge on our Consolidated Revenue for interest and sinking fund, in respect to loan, amounted to about 20 per cent. of our total revenue. In 1911, according to the Treasurer's own estimate, it will amount to about 28 per cent. of our total

revenue. Of our total revenue 28 per cent. will be taken up in meeting our loan charges. If that is the position on the strength of which the Treasurer feels proud, I think the Treasurer is proud of very little.

(*Mr. Foulkes took the Chair.*)

Mr. JOHNSON: Is it 28 per cent. of all revenue?

Mr. SCADDAN: Yes; all revenue from all sources, including that from the Commonwealth.

Mr. JOHNSON: About 50 per cent. of our internal revenue?

Mr. SCADDAN: Yes; fully 50 per cent. of our internal revenue. In reply to that we are told our population is increasing, and that while our total indebtedness has increased, the indebtedness per head of population has not increased to any extent. However, that is not borne out by the figures given to the Chamber by the Treasurer. I believe the gross indebtedness per head of the population in 1905 was £66 4s. 11d.; while in 1910 it was £82 8s. 4d. The net indebtedness compares somewhat better; in 1904 and 1905 it amounted to £61 19s. 5d.; while in 1910 the sum was £73 6s. 5d., or an increase of £11 7s. in five years. The Attorney General, I suppose, will claim that the State may go on borrowing to any extent so long as it is expending the money in trading concerns; because this can be the only logical conclusion or outcome of the statement made by the Premier when he boasted that our trading concerns were finding the interest and sinking fund on loan. But we cannot get out of the difficulty in that way, and I am afraid the policy of the present Government as shown during 1910 by the Moore Government, and since publicly announced by the Treasurer in different parts of the State, is going to land us in difficulties in the future. When at Wandering the Premier said—and, I suppose, as he was the first Premier to visit that place he had to say something remarkable—that he was going to find a considerable sum of money this year from Loan Fund to construct roads and bridges. The Premier is going to find it, perhaps, but

I trust the House is not going to permit him to spend it in that direction. I hope the House will cause the Premier to cry a halt in the spending of loan moneys on such works.

The Premier: Will you go without roads?

Mr. SCADDAN: We will have to go without roads in the future if the Government continue this policy, because we will have no revenue to spend. It is useless to spend £20,000 from Loan Fund on roads and bridges if in years to come we have to find an equal amount from our revenue to meet our indebtedness, plus interest on that loan.

Mr. JOHNSON: We have £25,000 windfall from Bullfinch to go on with.

Mr. SCADDAN: We have not that amount yet; we have only a percentage of it, and it remains to be seen whether we will ever get the balance. Dealing with the question of loans, I want to refer to a noted authority on the question of finance, Henry C. Adams in *Public Debts*, a work that can be found in the library. Not only is it a matter affecting the finance of the future, but the very principle of self-government is affected. The writer states as follows:—

The most obvious, as perhaps the most serious, of the political tendencies that accompany credit financiering, is found in the relation it bears to constitutional government. Its workings in this regard may be very shortly and very definitely stated. The funding system stands opposed to the full realisation of self-government. This is not at all difficult to understand. As self-government was secured through a struggle for mastery over the public purse, so must it be maintained through the exercise by the people of complete control over public expenditure. Money is the vital principle of the body politic; the public treasury is the heart of the State: control over public supplies means control over public affairs. Any method of procedure, therefore, by which a public servant can veil the true meaning of his acts, or which allows the Government to enter upon any great enterprise without bringing the

fact fairly to the knowledge of the public, must work against the realisation of the constitutional idea. This is exactly the state of affairs introduced by a free use of public credit. Under ordinary circumstances, popular attention cannot be drawn to public acts, except they touch the pockets of the voters through an increase in taxes; and it follows that a government whose expenditures are met by resort to loans may, for a time, administer affairs independently of those who must finally settle the account.

Mark the words he uses, "May for a time." But no Government can continue for all time; and I may say, without being regarded as a prophet, I can forecast that the people of the State will very soon awake to the necessity of stopping the Government expending loan money in the fashion they have been doing during the past few years. It has been brought home to-day, because the amount of money now being found from revenue is so small as compared with previous years that the people are beginning to ask why. And it is useless for the Treasurer to continue saying it is because of the shrinkage in the amount received from the Commonwealth, because people will not be gulled with that for all time. The reason, of course, is that so much of our revenue has to go in the direction of paying loan charges. I suppose the Treasurer will urge, for I remember he has urged it before, that the question of loan moneys may be better dealt with on the Loan Estimates. But I contend it should be dealt with on the general Revenue Estimates, because it so affects the expenditure of our moneys and the raising of our revenue that we cannot overlook it when dealing with the general financial policy of the Government. As I stated previously, the party on this (Opposition) side of the House do not object to the use of loan moneys, but we insist that those moneys shall be used in reproductive works. Thorold Rogers states—

There are occasions on which a Government spends, not more than perhaps its people could pay, but more than it is politic to exact. In such a case it

borrow. It may borrow, as has been done in England, from its own people, that is, from those whom in theory it might tax, but does not think it would be wise or just to put to such sacrifices. That is just the position we have arrived at in Western Australia. Governments in the past, the Rason Government in particular, declined to tax the people in order to meet the difficulties with which we were faced, and by a subterfuge, which has been continued by the Moore and the Wilson Governments, our revenue expenditure has been transferred to loan. But sooner or later the Government will have to face the position and meet it honestly. We are told, of course, by all those newspapers and politicians who believe in expenditure of loan moneys, that we are handing down a beautiful asset to posterity. What a beautiful asset we are handing down in this loan expenditure! And why should we of to-day find moneys to hand down an asset to posterity? Thorold Rogers has something to say on that point also, which may be refreshing to those hon. members who are continually talking on that question. He states—

Again, it is a question of the greatest importance as to whether a present difficulty justifies the burdening of future industry, the restraint of a coming generation. There is a commonplace with some reasoners on this subject, that the generation to come succeeds to a splendid inheritance, which the wisdom of a past age has protected, but, of necessity, has burdened. But what may the future generation say about the legitimacy of the charge. They may retort that the charge was, after all, a gambling debt, which the riper intelligence of a later age has analysed and detected. . . . Is the future to be indefinitely pledged to the errors of the past? And then when we remember that all finance is inevitably based on the contribution of those who work for wages, and cannot escape the tax-gatherers, what may they say in the future who have no share in the inheritance?

This is not a labour man speaking; this is a professor of political economy.

The Premier: Is he not a socialist?

Mr. SCADDAN: No; he is not a socialist.

Mr. O'Loughlen: It is good stuff, anyway.

Mr. Bath: He is one of the leading authorities.

Mr. SCADDAN: The wage earner of the future under the present social system will have just as much share in the inheritance as we have to-day, and no more. He will have to bear the burden just as we are having to bear it through the expenditure of Loan Funds. Thorold Rogers continues—

For, I repeat, it is a maxim in finance, that the sufferings of a nation, when taxation is heavy, are the sufferings of the poor, that beyond naked confiscation, or as a statesman has said, by the ransom of their property only, can taxation really touch the rich.

That being the case, it appears to me that when the wage-earner of this State awakens to the fact that he is only handing down to posterity a continuance of the social conditions under which he is living to-day, conditions which are not satisfactory in any regard from his standpoint, and that he is to-day providing revenue for the purpose of carrying on the State, he will compel the Government to cry a halt in expending loan moneys in the fashion in which they are expending them. I could quote other authorities if it were necessary, but I think I have quoted sufficient to prove the truth of what I have been saying, that this policy should be put an end to at the earliest possible opportunity.

Mr. Underwood: Quote the opinions of members of this House.

Mr. SCADDAN: I do not know that it is necessary to quote the opinions of the various members of this Chamber, because they varied so much the other evening. They ought to have an opportunity of collecting their thoughts and of arriving at exactly what they mean. I think I have made clear what is the position of the party on this side in regard to the expenditure of Loan Funds. It is well to consider also that the present Government, as well as the Moore and Rason Governments, found a considerable

amount of money from the sale of Government property—property which was bought by the use of Loan Funds—and instead of using the proceeds of the sale of that property for the purpose of the redemption of our loan or meeting the sinking fund charges on loan (which I contend is the proper way of dealing with them) they have used it for general revenue purposes, for the construction of roads and bridges, and in other like ways. From 1904 to June of this year the receipts from the sale of Government property totalled £159,287, and not less than £153,401 of that sum represents property bought from Loan Funds. We have expended during five years £99,582 of this money on roads, bridges, and public buildings principally. That is loan money, and might I say that I believe the amount of £153,000, which is the result of the Government property sales, would really represent an expenditure of something like £300,000 or £400,000 of loan money in the first instance, and that is now being used for the construction of roads and bridges throughout the State. No less than £43,978 of that amount has been from the sale of railway stocks and simultaneously we cease transferring an amount of £40,000 from general revenue to replace obsolete rolling stock. Thus we have a sum of £43,978 of the proceeds of the sale of Government property which has been bought out of loan used by the Government for revenue purposes; and it is astounding to think that members supporting the Government, as well as Opposition members, have allowed the position to continue as they have done during the last three or four years. The policy of the Government is one of just doing what they choose with the funds of the State, so long as they can depend upon all their members when the Estimates are brought down. Only the other evening, when discussing the Southern Cross-Bullfinch Railway, we had the admission of the Premier that he was going to anticipate what Parliament would do in the future, and provide the money for the construction of this work out of Loan Funds. Without any authorisation from Parliament he was going to do an

illegal act. As I said previously, if the people claim anything at all from constitutional Government, it is the right to control the expenditure of public revenue, but in actions like these where is the safety from the public standpoint? There is none whatever. The Government can do what they like and rely on their supporters not only acquiescing but eventually legalising what was an illegal act.

The Premier: Many of the members on your side supported that Bill.

Mr. SCADDAN: That is true, and I voted for it myself. But one of the members fell foul of the Premier because he insisted on discussing the authorisation of the expenditure from loan moneys, and we eventually compelled the Government to bring down a Bill to get Parliamentary authorisation for the expenditure.

The Premier: I volunteered to do so.

Mr. SCADDAN: The Premier knows that members on this side of the House were determined that before that Bill passed they would get an assurance from the Government that the authority of the House would be obtained before the money could be expended.

The Premier: What you wanted to do was to discuss the question of constructing it out of revenue.

Mr. SCADDAN: I admit that we wanted to discuss that, but before that I stated that we should insist on the Government asking Parliament for authority to spend the money. We did not want the Government to commence the construction from loan funds without authority and then come to Parliament to endorse their action.

The Premier: You could have refused.

Mr. SCADDAN: It is all very well for the Premier to say that we could have refused. I contend it is no use raising an argument of that kind, because we do not want to refuse to endorse the action of the Government in spending loan funds. The Minister knows that he and his colleagues are not responsible. The responsibility, after all, is on the people whose money they are spending; then what is the use of complaining! We want to compel this Government, together with any other Government, to first of all get the authority of the representatives of the

people before they spend the people's money. I had intended to deal more fully with the expenditure of loan moneys, but I think I have said sufficient to show that we object to the attitude adopted by the Government, this subterfuge of veiling the expenditure by transferring from revenue to loan account for the ordinary expenditure of the State. That is what the Government have done in the past. There is still one thing I would like to refer to, and that is the question of the position of the State in relation to the Commonwealth. The other evening the Treasurer to my way of thinking was somewhat misleading in the statement he made in regard to the question of inter-State certificates. He pointed out that he was disappointed, together with his Government, who had done so much in the Federal elections to induce the people to accept the financial agreement submitted by the Fusion Government, because of the fact that the agreement was not accepted by a majority throughout the Commonwealth; and he repeats it on every occasion that he attempts to justify the position in which the Government find themselves in regard to the general revenue of the State. The Premier points out that several of the Federal representatives from this State had pledged themselves to support the financial agreement as submitted for a period of 25 years—in an Act, but not in the Constitution itself. I would like to say that I remember the Treasurer in the Perth Town Hall taking those Federal representatives, who had made that statement on a public platform, to task for having done so; because he pointed out that other Labour candidates in different parts of the Commonwealth took a totally different view. He made reference to Mr. Hughes, the Acting Prime Minister, and said that Mr. Hughes was not prepared to pledge himself to any period at all; that Mr. Hughes, although he considered the provisions of the financial agreement were just towards the States, would not pledge the Commonwealth for one year. To prove his argument before the people, and to induce them to vote in favour of the financial agreement, the Premier attempted to play off Mr. Hughes in Sydney against Mr.

Pearce and others in this State; but he might have been fair enough the other evening to have pointed out, while he made that statement on the public platform in order to get the people to accept the financial agreement, that the representatives of this State were true to their pledges and had endeavoured to get the financial agreement for 25 years, and that, though they failed in getting that period fixed, they were at least successful in defeating Mr. Hughes and others and in getting the period fixed at 10 years, during which term it cannot be touched unless the Commonwealth Parliament goes back on its pledges to the States, a thing it is not likely to do. And the Premier might have gone further and pointed out that one of the Western Australian representatives in the Senate moved an amendment to the Surplus Revenue Bill and made it not only for ten years but for all time unless Parliament otherwise alters it. It is now for a period of ten years, and thereafter it will continue until Parliament otherwise provides. So, after all, it may not be for a period of ten years only: it may be for a period of 25 years; it is a matter for the people who elect their representatives after the 10 years expire. The Premier says he regrets that the Commonwealth Government have abolished inter-State certificates, and he has explained what these meant. He went so far as to say that these certificates have in the past enabled a record to be kept of the per capita contribution of the State to the Federal customs and excise, and that these certificates had in the past been the ground, and the sole ground, for our claim for special consideration from the Commonwealth, and that the special importance of this could be gauged by the fact that it meant a credit to Western Australia of £1,117,000 to the end of June last. The Treasurer meant that this amount has been returned by inter-State transfers since the Commonwealth has been a fact, but it would lead members and the unassuming public to believe that he meant what was returned to the State during the previous financial year, whereas it was for the whole time Federation had been in existence. The Premier complains that the abolition of these inter-

State certificates will remove the opportunity for the State giving facts to show we are justified in claiming special consideration after the ten years have elapsed as provided in the Commonwealth Act. But it is not the sole ground for our claim for special consideration. Our claim for special consideration has been that the State has paid in per capita contribution a greater amount through the whole of the customs and excise, and not only from the standpoint of inter-State transfers. The amount of inter-State transfers is only 20 per cent. of the total amount contributed through customs and excise duties, so that, although inter-State certificates have been abolished, we still have a record of 80 per cent. of our payments to customs and excise in this State. So I do not know that it will weaken our argument in the slightest degree after the ten years have elapsed. Possibly it may do so, but I cannot see where it will weaken the argument to any great extent. At the end of ten years we will still have all the particulars with regard to the contribution per capita of the people of Western Australia through the customs and excise, that is in regard to articles introduced from abroad; and we shall then be in exactly the same position to argue for special treatment. It is a late hour, and I only desire now to deal with one or two matters of administration. I do not desire on the general discussion on the Budget to deal with the administration of the various departments; that can better be dealt with when we are discussing the departments under their particular divisions; but in connection with the reply given by the Premier to the civil servants, I would like to say that it cannot be considered satisfactory. The Premier read a reply given by his predecessor to the effect that if the condition of business allowed it it was the intention of Cabinet to amend certain sections of the Public Service Act this session. The Premier pointed out that this was the reply of his predecessor, but later on the Premier said time would not permit for an amendment of the Act this session, and that the Government would do it next session. I do not know why the Premier can make a statement at this stage that time will not

permit this session for the passing of the necessary amendment to the Act which the civil servants are so desirous of obtaining. I have questioned the Premier repeatedly as to when he proposed to close down the business of the session, but he does not know. He told me only yesterday that he expected to have to come back here after Christmas.

The Premier: I said so yesterday?

Mr. SCADDAN: Yes, yesterday.

The Premier: When?

Mr. SCADDAN: I asked the Premier whether it was worth while continuing sitting on Friday if we could not finish by Christmas, and the Premier said that we might as well continue sitting on Friday, even if we could not finish by Christmas.

The Premier: I beg your pardon, I never said we could not finish by Christmas.

Mr. SCADDAN: The Premier gave me that impression. He knows, however, that it will not be possible to get through the business of the session before Christmas unless he is going to number among the slaughtered innocents everything except the Redistribution of Seats Bill.

The Premier: Of course if you have made up your mind not to adjourn before Christmas, we shall not do so.

Mr. Johnson: You are in charge of the House.

Mr. SCADDAN: As the member for Guildford has interjected, the Premier is in charge of the House and it rests with him. In connection with this particular amendment to which I was referring, it is one which is essential to the welfare of the civil servants and it can be passed by the House in less than a week. There is no member I know on this side of the House and many on the Government side who would object to it; the majority would support the Government in getting it through at the earliest opportunity. There can be no excuse on the part of the Government that the condition of the business will not permit of this necessary amendment being brought down. I intended to deal, too, with the attitude of the Government towards the civil servants, who will be the losers for many

years if not for all time through the action of the Government in stopping the annual increments as has been done. I regret that the Premier has not seen fit to make provision to repay to the civil servants the sums of money which they have undoubtedly been robbed of. Then, while we are boasting of the progress we are making and of the splendid position we find ourselves in, we are still continuing to sweat the teachers in the Education Department. We find that throughout the Commonwealth the officers of all the departments, and particularly the Education departments, are having their minimum pay increased, while in this State, the teachers in our schools, those who are responsible for the education of the future nation, are probably the most sweated individuals in the community. We complain that we cannot get suitable teachers. Is it to be wondered at? We expect them to go into the back blocks and there under trying conditions, to work for a miserable pittance which is not a livelihood by any means. Our teachers are being sweated to-day, and yet we complain that we cannot find teachers of a suitable class. We can secure the services of good men if we pay salaries in proportion to the work we expect from them, but we shall never get them as long as we pay a sweating wage as we are doing. I would only briefly, in conclusion, state that on the perusal of the Estimates this year I find that most of the increases are in departments which are purely administrative. The only department that shows a decrease when the Estimates are compared with the Estimates of last year is one of the biggest departments of the State, that which controls the mining industry. We find there is a smaller amount of money provided on the Estimates this year for the Mines Department than was the case last year, yet the Premier boasts that this Government is giving attention to the development of the mining industry together with other industries throughout the State. We find that there are increases in the administration of the Colonial Treasurer's Department, the Colonial Secretary's Department, the Information Bureau, the

Observatory, the Registry, Public Gardens, and Rottneſt. All theſe ſhow increaſes, and not for a moment can the Treasuſer argue that any of theſe departments are going to aſſiſt the development of our primary induſtries. There is an increaſe in the Attorney General's Department, in the Crown Law, and in the Land Titles to the extent of over £1,000.

(Mr. Taylor reſumed the Chair.)

MR. SCADDAN: There is a decrease in the amount on the Estimates for the Mines Department as compared with laſt year's Estimates, of £1,740. We alſo find that there is a reduction in the Charities Department, and that, in fact, in all departments which are leaſt able to bear them, reductions have been made, while administrative departments ſhow increaſes. I might ſay here that the worſt feature is that £2,145 leſs is provided this year for outdoor relief and the maintenance of charitable inſtitutions. We are faced with the poſition that in recent months claims have been made to the Charities Department for aſſiſtance by thoſe who were in need of help and they were told that ſufficient funds were not available and they could not be provided for; yet we find that this year it is propoſed to make a further decrease. In the Medical and Public Health Department, another branch which ſhould ſhow an increaſe, becauſe we want to maintain the health of our community, there has been a decrease of £3,964 as compared with laſt year. In hoſpitals we find a decrease of £3,763 and all the hoſpitals of the State to-day are crying out for further financial aſſiſtance while the reply that they are getting is this further reduction of over £3,000. Generally ſpeaking the Estimates only ſhow that the Government are continuing to purſue a policy which is detrimental to the welfare of the State as a whole. The Government are increaſing the expenditure in the administrative departments and decreasing it in thoſe departments which are largely aſſiſting in the development of the State and which make for the well-being of the whole of our community. With theſe few remarks, I thank

hon. members for giving me the attention that they have done, particularly the Government ſupporters on the croſs benches. It only goes to ſhow that what I ſaid at the outſet of my remarks is correct, that the Government ſupporters take little or no intereſt in the financial policy of the Government and that they are prepared to accept it for what it may be worth. They ſay: "The Government are taking the reſponſibility and we will be able to get re-elected on the ſcore that we ſupported a Government irreſpective of whether the policy of that Government is good or not." The financial policy of the preſent Government has not received at the hands of the ſupporters of that Government the leaſt conſideration during the paſt four or five years. It is a ſtanding diſgrace to this Parliament that ſuch a condition of affairs ſhould be permitted to exiſt. I truſt that ſome of the remarks which I have made will bear fruit, ſuch as thoſe referring to the earlier meeting of Parliament, the earlier introduction of the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure, in order that Parliament may properly control the expenditure of public funds which has been conceded by greater authorities than myſelf to be a fundamental principle of government. Under exiſting conditions it is taking government out of the control of the people and placing it in the hands of half a dozen Cabinet Miniſters.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.