

constantly at work after we resume, I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn to Tuesday, the 27th September.

Question passed.

House adjourned at 6.2 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 6th September, 1910.

	PAGE
Papers presented	597
Questions: Railway passenger increase	597
Railway Locomotives—Disablenents and repair, Patent Ash-pan	597
Esperance Railway, Report of Advisory Board	598
Railway Running Sheds	598
Geological survey, Yilgarn	598
Metropolitan Water Supply	598
Land selection, Nunnajin	598
School premises, Victoria Park	599
Tobacco allowance, Old Men's Homes	599
Agent General, Appointment	599
Chairman of Committees, Temporary	599
Assent to Supply Bill	611
Bills: Roads, 2a, select committee	600
General Loan and Inscribed Stock, 2a	611
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, 2a., Com.	613

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

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Premier: Grading and pay of Police Force (return ordered on motion by Mr. Collier).

By the Attorney General: Report of the Department of Land Titles for the year ended 30th June, 1910.

QUESTION—RAILWAY PASSENGER INCREASE.

Mr. BATH asked the Minister for Railways: What was the amount of increase in passenger receipts on the metropolitan-suburban railway service for the months of July and August?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: The amount of increase for the months of July and August, 1910, in comparison with similar period last year, was £6,089 12s. 1d.

QUESTIONS (2)—RAILWAY LOCOMOTIVES.

Disablenents and Repairs.

Mr. BOLTON asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Is the Minister aware that several locomotive disablenents or breakdowns have taken place during the past few months owing to the breakage of crank pins? 2, Is he aware of the dangerous nature of such accidents? 3, To what cause does he attribute the accidents? 4, In view of the increasing traffic, the heavy loading of engines, and their consequent state of disrepair, will he take immediate steps to provide further locomotives to enable thorough repairs to be effected to those in use, and in the meantime see that the loading of engines is not as excessive?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Yes. Two locomotives have been disabled within the last six months through breakage of crank pins. 2, Although undesirable, such occurrences are not considered dangerous. 3, Fatigue. 4, The locomotives in use at present are in an efficient state of repair, and the loading is not excessive. Drawings for additional engines are now in hand.

Patent Ash-pan.

Mr. BOLTON asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Did the Railway Department recently try the "Hill's patent" locomotive ash-pan? 2, If so, what was the nature of the test and the result of same? 3, Does the department intend making use of this patent? 4, If so, when? 5, If not, for what reason?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Yes. 2, Ordinary service in goldfields district. Falling into disuse. 3, No. 4, Answered by No. 3. 5, On account of its initial cost being £54. against present standard £23. Not suitable for agricultural area.

QUESTION — ESPERANCE RAILWAY, REPORT OF ADVISORY BOARD.

Mr. BATH asked the Premier: Will he indicate the probable date when the Railway Advisory Board will commence their examination of the country between Norseman and Esperance?

The PREMIER replied: Instructions have already been issued for a classification of the country referred to as early as possible. After the completion of the classification the Advisory Board will make a further examination.

QUESTION—RAILWAY RUNNING SHEDS.

Mr. DAGLISH asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Is he aware that the Railway Department has a large reserve extending from Subiaco to Karrakatta which was set apart some years ago as a site for running sheds? 2, Were plans for running sheds to be located there prepared during the term of Mr. W. J. George as Railway Commissioner? 3, For what reason has the department delayed the construction of the sheds in accordance with those plans? 4, What area of railway land is available at East Perth as a site for running sheds? 5, Would this area suffice? 6, If not, will it be necessary for the department to purchase land from private owners? 7, What area of land will have to be so acquired? 8, What is the estimated cost of such purchase? 9, Will Parliament be afforded an opportunity of discussing this question before the department is definitely committed to the East Perth site?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Yes. Reserve 8888, 112½ acres; 2 roods 7 perches of this reserve is leased to the Subiaco Municipal Council for electric lighting station. 2, No. 3, Answered by No. 2. 4, Nil. 5, Answered by No. 4. 6, Yes, if it is decided to erect running sheds at East Perth. 7, About 20 acres. 8, This cannot be approximated until such time as the site has been selected. 9, Parliament will certainly have an opportunity of discussing the Loan Estimates, which will

include provision for the new locomotive depot. The question of cost and convenience of traffic working will be considered by the Commissioner, and his recommendation will receive the careful attention of Cabinet before a definite decision is arrived at.

QUESTION—GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, YILGARN.

Mr. HORAN asked the Minister for Mines: Will he place upon the Estimates of the current year a sum of money to adequately test by thorough geological survey the auriferous belt extending through the Yilgarn electorate to Black Range?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: Provision is being made on this year's Estimates for a substantial increase in the staff of the geological survey; the order in which the work will be undertaken will be decided after the recommendation of the Government Geologist has been received.

QUESTION—METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. HORAN asked the Minister for Works: 1, Is it the intention of the Government during this session to take in hand the matter of a water supply to the metropolitan area? 2, If so, from what source is it intended to draw supplies?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1 and 2, The whole question of a further water supply for the metropolitan area is now being inquired into by the departmental engineers. A new storage reservoir at King's Park is in hand, and the auxiliary supply is being improved.

QUESTION—LAND SELECTION, NUNAJIN.

Mr. OSBORN asked the Minister for Lands: 1, What are the names of the successful applicants for the undermentioned blocks of land in the Avon district, Nunajin Springs area, 15332, 15333, 15334, and 15335? 2, How long has each applicant been in the State? 3, What are

the qualifications of each successful applicant that has entitled him to preference? 4, Did any of the successful applicants ever own land in this State? 5, If so, what did they do with it? 6, Did they hold land at the time these blocks were allotted? 7, Are they all married, and what family?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, Loc. 15332 granted to Alan S. Cooper; Loc. 15334 granted to Peter McCarthy; Loc. 15335 granted to Alfred E. Ottaway; Loc. 15333 granted to Spencer Smith. 2, Alan S. Cooper, 14 months; Peter McCarthy, 18 years at least; Spencer Smith, 17 months; Alfred E. Ottaway, 18 years. 3, In the opinion of the board the blocks were granted to the most suitable applicants. 4, No. 5, answered by 4. 6, Also answered by 4. 7, Alan S. Cooper, single; Peter McCarthy, married, three boys—18, 15, and 12—and one girl, aged 16; Spencer Smith, single; A. E. Ottaway, married, one girl, aged two years. In the case of Messrs. Cooper and Smith, both of these applicants, who are students at the State farm, Narrogin, have personally applied before the Land Board on four different occasions, viz., twice at Beverley, once at Northam, and once at Perth, all prior to the board in question.

QUESTION — SCHOOL PREMISES, VICTORIA PARK.

Mr. PRICE asked the Minister for Education: 1, Has the Victoria Park local board of health served a notice upon the Minister for Education condemning the local State school? 2, Have the Central Board of Health officers made a report on the building? If so, what was the nature of such report? 3, Have any reports been made on the buildings by officers of the architectural division. Public Works Department? If so, to what effect? 4, Has the erection of a new building been officially recommended? 5, Has the Minister vetoed such recommendation? If so, on what grounds? 6, What course does the Minister propose to adopt with the present

buildings to prevent any epidemic of sickness?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, A notice was served declaring that the premises had been certified to be a nuisance by the local board of health, by reason of the accumulation of water on the playground. 2, Yes. 3, Yes. 4, Yes, but not immediately. 5, No. 6, Cement channels are to be placed round the buildings, and the ground is to be raised and graded. The Principal Medical Officer states that there is no reason to anticipate an epidemic.

QUESTION — TOBACCO ALLOW- ANCE, OLD MEN'S HOMES.

Mr. WALKER asked the Premier: 1, How many ounces of tobacco per week were allowed the inmates at the Old Men's Homes at Claremont, Fremantle, and Geraldton? 2, Has there been any cessation, or diminution, lately, in the quantity formerly granted at the Old Men's Home at Claremont? 3, If so, will he be good enough to state the reasons assigned for such withdrawal?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Claremont, 440ozs. per week; average number of inmates in daily residence, 345. Fremantle, 116ozs. per week; average number in daily residence, 96. The Geraldton home was closed two years ago. 2, No; slightly increased. 3, Answered by No. 2.

QUESTION — AGENT-GENERAL, APPOINTMENT.

Mr. SCADDAN asked the Premier (without notice): When does the Premier propose to make a statement in connection with the appointment of Agent-General?

The PREMIER replied: I shall be prepared to make a statement next week.

CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES, TEMPORARY.

Mr. SPEAKER announced that he had nominated Mr. Foulkes (Claremont) and Mr. Taylor (Mt. Margaret) to act as temporary Chairmen of Committees.

BILL—ROADS.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 1st September.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (Pilbara): In criticising this Bill I wish it to be understood that I have no intention of being antagonistic, as I reckon the Government have done their best to bring the measure up to date. When I say that they have done their best I do not, for one moment, say they have succeeded; but at least they have made an advance on previous Acts; and when this is passed we will not be more than 20 or 30 years behind the times. One of the most important questions to be dealt with in connection with local government is the reduction in the very large number of municipalities and roads boards we have. There is no doubt few members of the House would attempt to argue that great economy cannot be effected and better work done by a reduction in the number of local bodies. Why there has not been an attempt to carry that reduction into effect I do not know, unless it may be that the present Government are not desirous of exerting themselves or entering into an argument with the various municipalities and town clerks of Perth and other places. In regard to Perth it is undoubted that the saving of many thousands of pounds could be effected if the Perth municipality were to control all, what may be termed, the metropolitan districts of the City. The same would apply again to Fremantle, and to a lesser extent to Midland Junction. Again, at Kalgoorlie, there are three local governing bodies, the Kalgoorlie municipality, the Boulder municipality, and the Kalgoorlie roads board, with three secretaries, three sets of officers, and three lots of advertisements regarding balance sheets and all notices; in fact, half their expenditure is triplicated—not duplicated but triplicated; and the whole of it could be carried out more effectively if there were one local governing body instead of three. It seems to me it is a positive duty of any Government not to advise these various

municipalities and roads boards to combine, but to compel them to combine.

Mr. Angwin: On what grounds?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: On general economic and commonsense grounds.

Mr. Angwin: Why is it the larger bodies have the heaviest rates to pay?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Because the smaller bodies do not do any work at all except to pay their mayors three per cent., and salaries to clerks and various officers.

Mr. Angwin: That is all you know about it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The hon. member for East Fremantle knows a great deal about this subject, and I am coming to the conclusion that he does not know anything about any other subject, and if he were to confine his efforts to municipal government only it would be to the advantage of this State. There is a provision made in this Bill that the Governor-in-Council has power to combine two or more roads boards or I believe a municipality and a roads board, and I would strongly urge the Minister to combine some of them. I have not the slightest shadow of doubt that it would be of advantage and benefit to the people of Western Australia if many of these bodies were combined. I would give an instance of my own case. I have a small piece of land in the Perth roads board district, and I have been informed by that board that they cannot make a road out my way because they are blocked off from the main road by a dead end to the roads in the Maylands roads board district. There is no reason whatever why the Perth roads board should not be combined with Maylands and then we would have a system of road making. We would be able to make main roads right through, and it would be possible to have roads constructed off them. The system is that a main road runs from Perth to Maylands, and the roads board at Maylands make their roads practically from their town hall towards the outer edges of their district, and at the outer end the road is not made. The Perth Roads Board cannot start to make their road because there is too much left

unmade, and they cannot get to work until Maylands has completed their portion. This is only one instance. I am sure you, Mr. Speaker, and every hon. member, know of many other instances. There is no reason in my mind why all these boards and municipalities should have to go to the extra expense of paying officers, renting buildings in which to hold meetings, and publish public notices, etc. All this kind of thing prevents the economical construction of roads in the various portions of Western Australia. I would say that it is the duty of the Minister controlling this department to endeavour to combine all these boards. The Act provides for this, and for notice to be given, and boards are called upon to show sufficient reason why they should not be combined. If I were the Minister I do not think there is a roads board around Perth that would show me sufficient reason, and if they did I would feel inclined to stop their subsidies to see if they would alter their reasons. I am going to oppose municipal and roads board subsidies to the utmost extent while this system prevails, because paying subsidies is only an encouragement of this wasteful extravagance. Coming to the Bill, there are a few good points in it, and there are some that are not so good. There are a few amendments which appeared in the old Bill, and there are many which are absolutely necessary and which have not been made. I would take the question first of all of voting, and the election of a board. We find in Clause 29 that the old system of electing officers, or members of the board has been perpetuated, that is, the system that the more land and the higher the value of the land held by any owner or occupier the larger the number of votes he is allowed to have. We will never have satisfactory local government or any other kind of government until we have enacted a system of one ratepayer one vote. While we give votes to the extent of land held, then we will not have satisfactory local government. Again, in this clause we find that not only have some people four votes holding a certain amount of property, but that some of the ratepayers may even have twelve votes, and I would point out to the Minister for

Works that some adjustment is most seriously required. For instance, it is provided that a ratepayer shall be entitled to vote for every ward wherein the land of such a person is situated. Therefore, if a ratepayer owns or occupies land exceeding in value £25 in three wards, that is £75 in all, he has nine votes, whereas another ratepayer may hold more land in one ward and he has only four votes. One ratepayer may hold land, the annual value of which is £100 and have nine votes—three votes in each ward, while another man may hold as many thousands' worth in one ward and have only one vote. If we are to have so much property for so many votes we must carry that out to the fullest extent. There is no justification for giving a man an extra vote because he has property in various wards. I think and feel sure that the Minister will agree with me in this connection. The proposition that gives the man who has a few small blocks of land, which may be separated, three times the voting power that is given to the man who has equally as much land in one place, is not tenable from any point of view. Again, it has been provided that on certain questions only the resident owners have a vote, and of course not the occupier. This is so with regard to loans. When a loan is being proposed, the vote is taken of the resident owners and the non-resident owner has no vote at all. I contend if you are giving a vote to owners, it must also be given to the absentee as well as the resident owner because he is responsible for the rates just as much as the man living there. I would point out that this may occur, and can occur, and that a man would be under a great disadvantage. In my own case I have some land at Tammin, partly in the Kellerberrin roads board district and partly in the Meckering roads board district. I may be living in the Meckering district and using all the land in one block, yet I would not have a vote in the Kellerberrin district with regard to the floating of a loan. This is one of the things that the Minister who introduced the Bill ought to remedy. There is one other question with regard to votes that I have always protested against, and that

is where it is provided that a ratepayer shall not have a vote unless his rates are paid. This I think is a relic of the old system of trying to prevent people from having a vote. There is no justification for this for the reason that the owner is liable for the rates, and if he is liable he should have a vote. Furthermore it is not only provided that he is liable, but he is also liable for 8 per cent. per annum interest on the unpaid rates. If we are going to punish him by fines in the way of interest, it is not fair to attempt to punish him by taking his vote from him. Any man who is liable for rates is entitled to vote. The idea of taking a vote from a man to induce him to pay his rates is always ineffective and always will be. As I intend to touch on this question further on, what I have said will suffice for the present. There is one other point with regard to votes that I desire to refer to, and it is one which requires the careful attention of the Minister and this House, and that is with regard to postal votes. It is provided in the Bill that any person by applying to a returning officer, a justice of the peace, or other person appointed, may obtain a postal vote, and it is perpetuating that system of voting of which we had a sample in Subiaco, and which I trust the member for that district will speak upon in this House. The system is that some justice of the peace who may be in an impecunious position, like the ordinary member of Parliament, is appealed to by a candidate to take his book around, and get postal votes. The system has worked badly in the past. It has been found that a postal officer has been able to find out for whom an elector voted, and if that elector voted against the officer's own particular candidate the vote never went in at all. It has also been suggested, with fairly strong grounds of proof, that the votes have been altered, and when we allow postal votes to be taken in that manner we have no safeguard in their manipulation. It is quite possible for the returning officer to take from the envelope the paper marked by the elector, mark one himself, and put that into the envelope. According to the clause any elector who for certain reasons will not be at the

poll, "may at any time within one month previous to the date of any election apply to a returning officer, or to any magistrate, justice of the peace, or other person appointed by the Minister in that behalf, to vote under the provisions of this section." As I have said, the system has been to get some respectable citizen appointed as postal vote officer, and send him throughout the districts collecting these postal votes. No doubt in the past they have been manipulated for the purpose of securing votes for the candidate whom the returning officer desired to see elected. I hope an amendment will be made in this clause providing, as is provided for in respect of Parliamentary elections, that no postal vote can be taken except at the residence or business place of the postal vote officer; and I trust when that has been done considerable care will be taken in respect to the appointing of these postal vote officers. Again, in connection with the nomination of candidates the paper has to be signed by three ratepayers. I do not think it should be necessary for a roads board candidate to have signatures on his nomination paper when we can elect a member of this House without them. I am also opposed to the deposit of £2 by any candidate. I contend that all these positions should be open to everybody, and that no bar should be put in the way of any man contesting these positions. There has been and still is a lack of candidates, and I think anything that could possibly be considered an obstacle in the way of a candidate nominating should be removed from the Bill. I see that one of the greatest flaws we have had in the past, and one that is included in almost all our measures of this description, is retained in this Bill, namely, the giving of power to the board to distrain on the goods of the tenant for unpaid rates. There is not a ghost of an argument to support this, either in justice or in equity. It is a relic of the old idea that the tenant was the chattel-slave of the land-owner. We find throughout the Bill that the land-owners, and I am one myself, are most

tenderly dealt with, and the tenant is not given a chance at all. I hold that we land-owners, big and small, hold our land by the grace of the Crown and under condition that we will obey all Acts past or future; and if we do not fulfil these conditions the land can be or should be taken from us. The best way to compel any land-owner to pay his rates is, in the case of his not paying them, to take his land from him and sell it to somebody else who will pay the rates. The rates are not on the tenant's chattels, they are on the land, and the land should be responsible for the payment of the rates. If they be not paid then by all means sell the land and allow somebody else to have it, somebody who will pay the rates. Again, it is provided in the Bill that the chairman of the board can seize the chattels of the tenant within one month if the rates be not paid; that is to say, within one month after default he may put the bailiffs in and distrain not only for the rates but for any costs that may have been incurred. On the other hand it is provided that if there be no tenant and no chattels on the land, the land-owner is to have five years in which to pay his rates. To me it seems that if the land-owner has five years grace the tenant should also have five years; indeed I would give him 50 years in which to pay. He does not own the land, and in my opinion should not have to pay the rates on it.

The Minister for Works: You would not give him a vote?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I am not particular whether he has a vote or not, but I say we should not distrain on the chattels. They are not what the rates are on. The rates are on the land, and the land should be made to pay. There is no justification whatever for the provision, and I trust the Government will see their way clear to removing it from the measure. Whether or not the Minister removes it I am confident it will be removed by the House in the course of a few years' time. It would, perhaps, be better from the Minister's point of view that it be removed with his acquiescence rather than in spite of him. One small matter here

to which I am opposed is in regard to certain powers given to the board. Necessarily the board are given powers to do many things; but it is here provided that the board should have power to prohibit bathing in the sea. I am opposed to giving anybody the power to prevent a citizen bathing in the sea. I remember, when not full grown, running miles with my clothes under my arm from a policeman who was chasing me for having bathed in a river. It is, I think, highly discreditable to prevent anybody from bathing. It is a clean, healthy exercise and should rather be encouraged.

Member: Where is that power given?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: In Subclause 36 of Clause 182. I hold that while it is necessary, perhaps, to allow a roads board power to prevent bathing under certain circumstances, such as where the water is being used for domestic purposes, in all other cases people should be allowed to bathe where they like. I would give the board power to stipulate for the wearing of certain costumes, but I claim that people should be allowed to bathe whenever and wherever they have a chance. If ever I become Colonial Secretary and find a policeman running in a boy for bathing, I will send that policeman out to the centre of the State where he will not get a wash for six years. I trust this subclause will be amended when we get into Committee. Another clause that requires considerable attention is that giving the board power to charge £8 per annum on unpaid rates. In the first place it should be clearly laid down what this means, whether it means £8 per cent. per annum or 13s. 4d. per cent. per month. However I am not at all convinced that it is desirable to put a fine on; but even if it is, I am of opinion that 8 per cent. is far too high. No board could get 8 per cent. on their money, and, in my opinion, there is nothing to be gained by these pains and penalties in regard to the non-payment of rates. There is one sure way of obtaining our rates and I say let us adopt that; leave out these harassing pin pricks, and deal with the question

as it deserves to be dealt with. I am opposed to 8 per cent. and, indeed, I am opposed to the charging of interest on unpaid rates at all. One or two matters which should have been in the Bill I fail to find there. I asked the Minister when he was introducing the Bill if there was any provision in respect to a block of land owned by one person and lying in two different roads board districts. So far as I can see there is no provision of that sort. What has arisen in my own experience is this : having a block of land which is partly in two roads districts I have received demands from both boards. In reply to the first demand I wrote explaining how my land was situated. The board wrote back saying that as the larger part of my land was in their district I should pay them. I did so, and since that the other board have put in a demand. I have not paid them yet, and I am wondering how I stand. I feel that something should be put in this Bill to let ratepayers know exactly where they are in such a case.

The Minister for Works: It is already provided for.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Another matter is in regard to the payment of arrears of rates on land that has been forfeited to the Crown and taken up by a new tenant. I am referring to conditional purchase land. If land has been forfeited, the rates, I think, should cease. If the board does not collect the rates before the holder forfeits, I do not think the board are entitled to have any rates; or, at least, if so entitled, these rates should be recovered from the Government and not from the new tenant. This is another of my experiences with the land. I found I had to pay four years' rates on a block of land I took up under conditional purchase direct from the Crown. There is no justification whatever in my being called upon to pay these rates. I do not think I should pay them. The Crown Solicitor, who must have had his early training under the famous statesman, George Reid, since all his decisions are of the "yes-no" order, says in regard to this

that he is of opinion the tenant might be liable; at the same time he does not think it advisable that the tenant should pay it. I do not think it advisable he should pay; he should not be asked to do so. As a matter of fact the man who held the land has paid something to the Government for which he has had no compensation. He has paid the application money and a half-year's rent; then if he throws it up he has had no benefit from it, whereas the Government has had the benefit of his money. He should, therefore, be clear of all debts on that land. A man taking up land should know his liability, and my opinion is that the payment of his application fee and first year's rent should be his total liability. If he does not like to go on with it then he should be finished with all liability, and if the board did not collect what was due from him before he forfeited the land they should not be allowed to do so afterwards, and they should not be allowed to collect from anyone else. I hope the Minister will agree to an amendment in Committee providing for this proposition, as well as one or two others I have spoken about. Another matter I wish to refer to is with regard to the drafting of the Bill. I must say at the outset that it is, perhaps, one of the poorest efforts of draftsmanship we have ever witnessed. I am of opinion that a most drastic alteration is necessary in the whole system of drafting Parliamentary measures. Apparently the draftsman gets a dictionary of synonyms, and when he wants to use certain words he looks through his list of synonyms and puts in everyone of them and then concludes, "or any other case whatsoever." He could have said that to begin with without the verbiage. This is a relic of 300 years ago. It seems that our lawyers and Judges cannot possibly do anything that has not been done by someone who is now deservedly dead. I would point out also that not only are there these very depressing cases of verbiage, but there is ambiguity and bad grammar. What could be worse than that? To give some idea of what I refer to I will give one or two examples. I am not antagonistic to the measure, and I hope

the Minister for Works will give me and this House some assistance in improving the draftsmanship. Take Clause 5, for instance, which deals with the interpretation of terms. It is provided in delightfully legal language that in the Act, unless the context requires otherwise, such and such a word shall mean so and so. This evidently means that unless a judge or lawyer—they are all the same—thinks otherwise, and they always think otherwise, the meaning shall be as it is set down. In fact, we keep some thousands of men in Australia to earn a more or less—

Mr. Hudson: Precarious livelihood.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Yes, precarious livelihood by "thinking otherwise." If they do not think otherwise they profess that they do so, and build up costs just the same. "Unless the context otherwise requires." There is a lovely definition; one does not know if it means what it seems to or not. Then as to cases of excessive verbiage. "Cycle" means and includes a bicycle, tricycle, or other velocipede, or motor cycle." All that is unnecessary. Again the definition of "engine" is, "Engine means any steam lorry, traction, or other engine, or machine on its own wheels, and includes a street roller whether driven by steam or horse power." Has any member ever seen a horse driving a steam roller? The point I am trying to make, however, is the excessive verbiage. The definition of a "motor car" is, "Motor car means and includes any motor car, automobile, motor carriage, or other carriage or vehicle propelled either partly or wholly by any volatile spirit or electricity, or by any means other than animal power." Therefore, it means a traction engine, steam lorry, and many other things. Further on we come to the definition of "vehicle," which is, "Vehicle means any carriage, cart, dray, lorry, van, omnibus, trap, hand-cart, or other conveyance whatsoever, with or without springs." Therefore, it means all the vehicles previously mentioned; also it means a wheel-barrow, a hand-barrow, a perambulator, or an invalid's chair. Surely in definitions there should be some attempt made to define.

It is provided that a trap is a vehicle. The member for North Fremantle is somewhat interested in that trade, and I think if anyone went to him and asked him the price of a trap he would want to know what the customer was talking about. There is no vehicle technically known as a trap. A trap is a carriage, or a cart, or anything else.

Mr. Walker: Also a policeman.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I have had sufficient of policemen for the last day or two. When we have a man drafting definitions he should give us something more definite than, for instance, "a trap." There are many other examples of this kind of language. For instance, we have the definition of a public highway, which is as follows:—"Public highway includes any inland lake, whether natural or artificial, and any navigable water vested in the board on which boats are used or ply for hire." Is it possible to ply for hire in a boat without using it? It would have been quite sufficient to say, "on which boats are used." One might just as well describe abattoirs as places where sheep are killed and converted into mutton. Again, I would ask members if it is possible for an inanimate object, one constructed of wood and iron, etcetera, to ply for hire. I have heard of a boatman plying for hire, but never a boat. I trust we shall have something a little better than this in our Acts of Parliament, particularly in the definition sections. Again, we have another definition which, in my opinion, is not only excessive in verbiage but is confusing as well; that is the one referring to "public notice," which says, "Public notice means notice by advertisement in the *Government Gazette*." I would like the Minister to pay attention to this for, in my opinion, the sentence should be stopped there, but it goes on to say, "but the board may give notice of any matter or thing by such additional means as to the board may seem fit." That has nothing to do with the publication of the notice in the *Government Gazette*. Of course they may give notice of any matter or thing they think fit. If it is intended that this public notice should be provided for it should be in-

serted in some other part of the measure. We will have to alter that sentence, for it is absolutely confusing as it is, as well as being verbose. There is another example of this over-tendency to insert words which are absolutely useless. We find it in the definition of the word "road." "Road means any land notified in the *Government Gazette* as a road, or as a main or minor road." The words "main or minor road" are excessive. Then in regard to townsites. The definition of that is, "Town or townsite means any land constituted, defined, or reserved as the site of a town or village under the Land Act, 1898." There is no provision in the Land Act for a village; as a matter of fact there are no villages in Australia. If we look up the question we will find that a village means, "a small assemblage of houses comprising less than a town." We do not provide in any Act for anything less than a town. There is no such word technically as a village in Australia. These words may confuse, not only the layman but also the lawyers themselves. There is one great point, however, which, no doubt, the member for West Perth will appreciate, and that is that these definitions help to pile up the costs.

Mr. Hudson: Hear, hear.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The member for Dundas is included in my remark. There is one particular example of excessive verbiage I wish to give, that being Clause 266, which says:—

The works and undertakings hereinafter specified shall be deemed works and undertakings within the meaning of this part of the Act (that is to say), (1.) The opening, making, paving, or partial paving of roads and footways, the diverting, altering, or increasing the width of any road or footways or the kerbing thereof. (2.) The raising, lowering, or altering of the ground or soil of any road. (3.) The construction, purchase, and establishment of bridges, culverts, ferries, wharves, and jetties. (4.) The construction, enlargement, and alteration of sewers and drains and works connected with sewerage and

drainage under the powers conferred on the board by any Act relating to public health, and the purchase or erection of machinery for the treatment of refuse. (5.) The purchase of lands and materials, and the making of compensation to the owner of any land purchased for any of the foregoing purposes. (6.) Any other works whatsoever.

Why could not the draftsman have started and said "any works whatsoever."

The Minister for Works: Why not finish reading the clause.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The clause concludes, "approved by the Governor." Then the question arises—wigs and gowns get costs on this point—whether that applies to all of the works, or whether certain of them can be constructed by the board without the approval of the Governor.

Mr. Heitmann: Six-and-eightpence out at once.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Much more than that; long conference, 13s. 4d., sending wires, 7s. 6d., etcetera. There should be something much more definite in the description, for it cannot be understood from the clause whether only the works referred to can be constructed by the board without the approval of the Governor, or whether approval must be obtained for all work. If it means that only those works can be constructed with the approval of the Governor, there are many others that should be inserted in the clause. This clause undoubtedly leaves room for the lawyers and the judges to put in days and days at arguing as to whether Subclause 6 applies to the whole of the works mentioned, or whether it stands on its own. The clause wants redrafting. Subclause 5 says, "The purchase of lands and material and the making of compensation to the owner of any land purchased for any of the foregoing purposes." For any purchased land you make no compensation. When you pay a man for land you do not compensate him. Why the draftsman has put that into the Bill I cannot make out. It is neither sense.

rhyme, nor reason. I hope the Bill will be returned to the draftsman for a little bit of patching up. Again, we have "the raising, lowering, or altering of the ground or soil." Now, what is the difference between ground and soil? Can the Minister for Lands tell me? And, if it is necessary to specify "soil" it should also be necessary to specify sand, grit, gravel, rock, or any other kind of material, whether it is diamondiferous, stanniferous, or containing any other mineral. When you think of the awful possibility the draftsman had in his mind, one can imagine him to be in a whirl. Again, we find that some of the definitions are made undoubtedly ambiguous and misleading. The first one I will draw attention to refers to the "unauthorised occupation of any Crown lands." I hold that there cannot be occupation of Crown lands unless it is authorised. This definition wants defining, not only for the purpose of this Bill, but for one or two other Acts, particularly the Mining Act. How can a person be in possession of land without authority? Occupation, according to the dictionary, means possession. There is nothing in the Bill which says that a man has to pay rates or anything else. You cannot pay rates; you have no right or title to land unless you possess it. A man may be entitled, perhaps by the grace of God to occupy some part of the world, at the same time he cannot occupy Crown land without authority. He has no title to it; he is not in possession of it; he is merely camped there. If he can occupy it, we should have a definition, and it is up to the draftsman to give us a definition of "unauthorised occupation of Crown land." I am of opinion that such a thing cannot be done. If it can be done we want to know in what cases. Again, we find in Clause 234 a most peculiar sentence, in the same category of ambiguity. It says—

(1.) The amount of any rates made and levied under this Act, together with interest thereon at the rate of eight pounds per centum per annum from the time when the same became payable, shall be payable, in the first

instance, by the ratable occupier of the land rated.

(2.) The amount of such rates and interest may also, at the option of the board, be recovered from the ratable owner of the land rated.

That gives one the impression that it is possible to rate the occupier and the owner. The word "also" means "him as well," "the other fellow too." If the draftsman does not know any better than to put in I am of opinion that when we establish a university we should have a chair or scholarship, or prize at anyrate, for draftsmanship; because a good draftsman is very badly wanted in Australia. What we are in need of is a good Parliamentary draftsman. Hundreds of thousands of pounds have been spent in Australia because the Acts of Parliament do not say what they mean in language that ordinary men can read. There seems to be no attempt to get out of the frightful depressing system that has been in vogue for 300 years or more. What we want is a good draftsman. We have had one example of a good Parliamentary draftsman, Mr. C. C. Kingston, and his example might well be followed. If we have not better draftsmen than is disclosed by our Acts, it is time that we got one. There are plenty of men in Australia who could draft Bills better than we have them, and if we cannot get better drafted Bills then it would be as well to spend a few hundreds, or perhaps a few thousands of pounds so that we might get Bills drafted in a proper manner.

Mr. Bolton: There is the Arbitration Act.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: It is not only the Arbitration Act, but every Act we have is the same, and once they come before the Court the Judges have no idea really what the Acts mean. Again, it is impossible for any ordinary man to read an Act of Parliament; he gets hold of it, strikes one of the phrases such as I have been reading, comes across a whirl of words and verbiage, hurls the Act at the door, kicks the cat, and goes out and gets drunk. When a man takes

his first glass that leads him to gloom and misery, and an early grave, it is, I believe, through trying to read an Act of Parliament. I intend to support the second reading of this Bill, and I trust when we get into Committee some alteration will be made. I trust, and I feel sure my trust will be honoured, that the Minister for Works will not treat this Bill in the manner that some Bills have been treated here, that every clause and every word in it must be passed, but that he will realise that this side of the House desires a workable measure passed and that it is our endeavour to make the Bill a workable one.

Mr. ANGWIN (East Fremantle): It is not my intention to go into the Bill in the same manner as the member for Pilbara, because I do not enter into this discussion with any grievance as the member for Pilbara has done. He started to criticise the Bill by pointing out to members a grievance he has against the Perth roads board because he cannot get a road near his own property. It is no wonder to me when a man is suffering from a grievance such as the hon. member does that he is not responsible for the statements he makes. I think members will excuse the hon. member from the attempt he has made to try and point out that the Bill has been badly drafted, and is presented in such a way that no one can understand it except members of the legal profession. I am pleased though that the hon. member told us to-day that he is a land owner and he has approached the clauses in the Bill, except one or two, from the view of the property owner. I am glad the hon. member is in accord with a large number of people in other countries in pointing out that only one vote should be allowed to a ratepayer at an election to roads boards. I am pleased to know that New South Wales in 1906 adopted that principle. The Local Government Act there provides that each ratepayer shall have one vote for one candidate. As far as municipalities are concerned, the same provision was adopted in New Zealand and South Australia, and in almost every other part of the world outside Western

Australia. In England, I believe, not only has the principle of one vote one occupier been adopted, but it is made compulsory that persons must reside for a certain period of six months in a district to qualify for a vote there before exercising it. I am hoping that as far as Western Australia is concerned in the Roads Bill we shall be able to alter the system of voting as a preliminary to carrying the same system into our Municipal Act. We know that in the Roads Act the system of rating on the unimproved value was first introduced. Why not extend it further and introduce a system of one occupier one vote as far as the roads boards are concerned, and bring both democratic principles into our Roads Act to start with. I have heard of no grievance against adopting the principle of rating on the unimproved value by the roads boards of the State. There is one matter in the Bill to which I intend to refer, that is dealing with the powers given to the Minister to compel the various local authorities to unite for the express purpose of maintaining bridges throughout the State. No matter where a roads board district may be situated, if it is the opinion of the Minister that the residents in the area find it necessary to cross a bridge, even though it be miles away from the district, the Minister may, if he so desires it, compel the roads board for that district to contribute towards the upkeep of that bridge. Clause 152 contains the provision for the maintenance of bridges to be taken in hand by roads boards whose boundaries are divided by a watercourse, but there is a proviso which says—

Provided that the Minister may certify that any bridge or ferry is necessary to provide such passage, and that such passage cannot be conveniently so provided directly between places within the area, and may thereupon choose for that purpose some suitable situation outside or partly outside such area.

To give an instance in connection with this, take the Melville road district. As far as crossing the river Swan is concerned, the people in that district have on the Western side of their boundary to go

about a mile through the East Fremantle municipality to cross by the North Fremantle bridge, which is one of our public bridges and has been in existence for many years; and on the other hand they can go in the Eastern direction through South Perth and cross the river by the bridge which connects with Perth, yet the power given in the proviso to this clause will enable the Minister to compel the Melville roads board to contribute to the upkeep of either of these bridges, that at North Fremantle or that at Perth. I maintain that in such circumstances the roads board will be placed in an unfortunate position because they will not know the time when the Minister may call upon them to contribute to the support of those bridges. The Minister says that the clause providing for exemption from rates is provided in England. At the commencement of each year the roads board has to make up an estimate of the year's expenditure and to strike a rate for the express purpose of carrying out the estimate, and I cannot see why a person who has invested money in the erection of buildings should be exempted from any portion of his liability for rates during the whole of that year covered by the estimate. I maintain it would be a matter almost of impossibility for any roads board to carry on its works financially or satisfactorily if an exemption such as this is to be passed in this measure. I notice there is no provision whereby the rate can be increased during the year. If anything should take place, if property should increase in value, or if the landlord has a large increase in rent during the year, there is no provision whereby the roads board can increase its ratable value; but if the owner of the property has his property vacant over three months provision is made whereby he can be exempted. Now, I maintain, that what is sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander, and if a provision such as this should be inserted in a Roads Board Bill, another provision should be inserted whereby the roads board should have the power to increase its rates. I am pleased, indeed, to see the clause in this Bill which has been objected to so strongly by the

member for Pilbara, that is, the clause in regard to voting on loans. We know that on many occasions it is a matter of impossibility for people residing in various districts, more particularly where any area gets thickly populated, to carry out the improvements they desire, because absentee owners on nearly every occasion prohibit the people of the district from borrowing to carry out the improvements they wish. This Bill provides that the roads board may borrow money for any particular area within its boundaries so that it will not be necessary for the whole area to be rated for any particular work that it is wished to carry out. I maintain that in instances such as this it is necessary that those who reside in the particular area are the persons to decide whether the loan should be raised or not, but if we include the absentee owners, as has been the case in the past with local governing bodies, then these people who wish to carry out improvements surrounding their particular homes or residences will be unable to carry them out owing to objections raised by those who live many miles away. The member for Pilbara is evidently in such a position that he is on the boundary of two road districts covering a considerable area, but each roads board will only rate for the value of the land in its particular area, so the hon. member will not pay the whole rate to both roads boards. I believe it is the intention of the Minister for Works to refer this Bill to a select committee. If that is so, no doubt there are many clauses which may be improved. Seeing that the Bill has just been placed on the Table, I hope members will have the opportunity to confer with the various roads boards in their districts to see if there are clauses which may be remedied. I support the second reading, and I hope the Bill will be referred to a select committee.

Mr. BROWN (Perth): I am glad the hon. member has suggested that this Bill be referred to a select committee. I am sure members on both sides of the House who have had considerable experience in roads board administration would be only too willing to give time to

making this measure what it should be, a good and workable Bill. The Government are to be complimented on giving us such an exhaustive Bill. I have been through the greater portion of it, and I think it meets the requirements of the various portions of the State, but there are one of two clauses to which I take exception. One of the first is that exempting conditional purchase lands from paying the rates for three years while old settlers have been paying rates for years for the roads which have, to a certain extent, contributed to open up the new areas, and which the new settlers are now taking advantage of. There will be great difficulty, as mentioned by the member for East Fremantle, over the provision for the exemption of property non-occupied for a portion of the year. I think the clause is absolutely unworkable. I would like to see proxy voting done away with. As the member for East Fremantle has said, even on polls on loans it will have a tendency for the non-residents to squash the loans altogether. This is considerably emphasised at Osborne Park. There are possibly over 100 or 200 bona fide settlers, and either through indifference or through distance from the polling booth they do not vote. On the other hand we find the land-owner cutting up 100 acres or 200 acres of land into a thousand allotments, sold all over the State and practically valueless, and with the assistance of 60 or 80 proxy votes he can rule an election every time. So I think it would be a wise move to do away with proxy voting altogether. Another matter requiring attention is the question of the introduction of "owner," particularly in rate books. There are road districts extending over hundreds of square miles, and it is absolutely impossible to insert the names of the occupiers of the particular locations. I believe that nearly every person in a roads board is an owner. In fact it is recognised by the Government that the very foundation of the rate book is the owner, because they provide officers to make searches for the names of owners, and when owners transfer property they have to notify the roads boards so that the books can be kept up to date. I

think if the owner were looked to to pay the rates all through it would be well, at the same time giving the occupier power to utilise the vote if he wants to exercise the right. I think that would be a step in the right direction. One other provision I would like to see in the Bill is that the owner of land should be compelled to make all roads before subdividing for sale. I know a great many cases where roads have been cut irrespective of grades or anything at all, and these roads eventually cost the roads boards thousands of pounds far and away exceeding the value of the land itself.

Mr. George: Supposing he does not sell the land, would not the roads spoil the land?

Mr. BROWN: The owner would only cut up sufficient land to sell. If that had been done in the early days, instead of our having struggling road districts and small municipalities all along the railway route we would have had a solid town. But the system has been for a man to be allowed to cut up land a mile or two away from a station, and directly people settle there there is a clamour for a municipality. It not only penalises the existing local authority, but it also penalises the Government. If what I suggest becomes law not one-tenth of the land would be cut up for subdivision. The owners would have to pay a little extra out of their profit and the public would benefit. There is nothing to be gained by a long debate on this Bill. I desire to make it a good workable Bill, and I am quite sure the local authorities all over the State are looking forward to it, because it will enable a number of the small municipalities to dissolve and take advantage of the provisions of this Bill, more particularly in the direction of administration. I am sure the great bulk of the revenue in small municipalities goes in administration. It is my intention to move that the Bill be referred to a select committee.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Select Committee.

Mr. Brown moved that the Bill be referred to a select committee.

Mr. Scaddan: Is this done by arrangement?

The Minister for Works: I referred to it on the second reading. I said I had no objection to this course.

Question passed.

Ballot taken, and the following appointed a select committee, namely, Messrs. Angwin, Layman, Male, and Ware, with the mover (Mr. Brown), with the usual powers, and to report on 13th September.

ASSENT TO BILL.

Message from the Governor received and read, notifying assent to the Supply Bill, £1,053,875.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

BILL—GENERAL LOAN AND INSCRIBED STOCK.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 1st September.

Mr. SCADDAN (Ivanhoe): I desire to say but little at this stage in connection with the Bill. The Bill itself is more in the nature of a machinery measure which will permit of greater discussion when in Committee. I desire to say, too, I have had very much difficulty, whether because of my want of knowledge of public finance or because of the way the Bill is drafted, in following some of the clauses of this measure. They appear to me to be almost conflicting, at least they are very intricate and difficult to follow. Generally speaking I desire to give my support to the measure, which will at least have the effect of allowing Parliament to see at a glance our position in connection with the future raising of loans. There are, however, one or two matters in the Bill which I think the House should carefully consider before agreeing to. There is the question of "investment—how made," as provided in Clause 14. I agree that the trustees should be able to provide that the sinking fund of any inscribed stock or debentures may be invested on account of the sinking fund of any loan though raised at a later

date. That, of course, may mean a great saving to the State. But the main point is the provision dealing with the amount of sinking fund which shall be provided. In this connection I should like to say that even if we were to provide, as in other loans, a sinking fund to the extent of one per cent., it seems to me that it would be no guarantee that when loans are raised the provisions of this measure would be applied. For on looking up our Local Inscribed Stock Act of 1897 I find that it contains a provision that the sinking fund should be at the rate of $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per half-year, or a total of 3 per cent. per annum. This was eventually amended and made to read $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per annum. The Loan Act of 1884 provided for a sinking fund of 1 per cent., and in 1909 the Government, in the Loan Bill providing for the raising of a sum of £1,445,000 by loan for the construction of certain public works and other purposes, inserted the following clause:—

The contribution to the sinking fund for the repayment of the sum by this Act authorised to be raised, shall commence to accrue four years from the date of the first issue of the debentures or inscribed stock, and notwithstanding anything contained in the General Loan and Inscribed Stock Act, 1884, or the Local Inscribed Stock Act, 1897, shall be at the rate of one half of one per centum per annum.

Seeing that this is the method adopted by the present Government it seems to me that, after all, the passing of a measure of this kind is no safeguard against future Governments providing a special loan Act, as was done in this case, and contracting themselves out of an Act which should prevail until the Act itself is amended. In that connection I would like to say I think this country has long ago recognised that a 1 per cent. sinking fund is small enough. If the expenditure under loan Acts will not provide interest and a sinking fund of 1 per cent. per annum there is something radically wrong in the way we are spending that loan money. Under these circumstances I hope when we arrive in Committee—although I am doubtful whether we can do it, see—

ing that to increase the sinking fund really means making a charge on the public—the sinking fund will be increased to 1 per cent. to bring it into line with what I contend is the settled policy of the State in regard to sinking funds. Clauses 6 and 7 deal with the question of floatation charges and how it is proposed to dispose of any premiums which may be obtained in the floating of a loan. The Premier, in moving the second reading, said he thought the charges and expenses incurred in the raising or floatation of a loan should be charged against the loan itself; but the Auditor General expresses the opinion that it should be made a charge against Consolidated Revenue. I agree with the Auditor General in this regard. I think it should be made a charge on our current revenue and not on the loan itself; and to place a clause in the Bill, as the Premier has done, namely (clause 7, providing that any premiums that may be made on the floatation of a loan shall be paid into the General Loan Account, does not, in my opinion, carry sufficient virtue to get over the difficulty found in the previous clause. Personally I contend that the charges of raising a loan should be a direct charge on revenue and not on the loan itself. Clause 10, Subclause 2 reads as follows:—

If a loan is raised by two or more instalments, the contributions to the sinking fund shall commence to accrue on the total nominal amount of the loan four years after the issue of the first instalment of the inscribed stock or debentures, except in the case of a loan raised partly in London and partly in Australia, in which case the first contribution on account of the redemption of that portion raised in Australia shall commence to accrue four years after the date of the first issue made on account of such portion.

I may say I agree absolutely with that clause. As the Premier has stated, the position previously was a difficult one, and it is now made perfectly clear that the sinking fund shall not commence until four years after the whole of the loan has been actually raised. I have no ob-

jection to that clause. (Clause 15 provides—

In case a sinking fund should be insufficient to provide the necessary funds for the redemption of the inscribed stock or debentures when they shall have become due, the deficiency shall be made good out of the general revenues and assets of the State.

I have been trying to think out what is meant by "the assets of the State." Does it mean that any money which may be raised by any other loan is to be termed an asset? Does it provide for a loan for redemption purposes? Because, if not, it seems to me that that clause debars the raising of a loan for redemption purposes, unless we add the words "or as hereinafter provided." I find that in another clause provision is made for loans to be raised for redemption purposes. I am not perfectly clear on the point, and I would like the Premier to state what is meant by "general revenues and assets of the State." (Clause 16 reads—

In the case of debentures which may be exchanged or converted into inscribed stock under the provisions of this Act, the trustees shall determine what amount of the sinking funds held by them and created for the payment of such debentures shall be released; and in the determination of such question the trustees shall take into consideration the value of the whole investments held by them on account of such sinking funds, the amount of the debt remaining a charge on such sinking funds, and such other matters as the trustees may think fit to take into account.

But the very next clause goes on to say—

So much of the said sinking funds as may be released shall be converted into money and disposed of in such manner as the Governor may direct.

I think it should be definitely provided that any money realised should not be disposed of in any manner desired by the Government, but should be paid into the General Loan Fund or into a sink-

ing fund of another kind. This clause as it stands means that the money so realised might be paid into the General Revenue Account, which I contend is not at all desirable. As pointed out by the Premier the other clauses of the Bill are practically machinery clauses which will offer greater opportunities for discussion in Committee than at this stage; therefore just now I desire to give support to the second reading of the measure, hoping the Premier will, in accordance with his word, give further information as we proceed in Committee on the Bill.

The PREMIER (in reply): I would like to say I agree with the hon. member that the matters dealt with in the Bill can be better discussed when we come to the respective clauses. The hon. member said that 1 per cent. sinking fund is the settled policy of the country. As a matter of fact in the last two loans one-half per cent. sinking fund was provided for, and I understand all future Commonwealth loans will provide for one-half per cent. sinking fund.

Mr. Bath: But in our own case that will contravene the provisions in the Inscribed Stock Act.

The PREMIER: The Local Inscribed Stock Act provides for a sinking fund of $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Mr. Bath: In the Act of 1884 provision is made for 1 per cent.

The PREMIER: Of course, each loan Bill is dealt with separately, and the sinking fund for the particular loan is considered when the measure is before the House.

Mr. Bath: Not in all of them.

The PREMIER: The sinking fund is always included in the Bill.

Mr. Bath: That was not so until we decided to reduce the sinking fund.

The PREMIER: It was done in respect of the three preceding loans. In regard to the last clause referred to by the hon. member I may say that in some cases the one per cent. debenture loan sinking fund might have run on for ten years, or even 20 years; and when converted into inscribed stock these debentures might have another 30 or 40 years'

course to run, in which case it might be deemed necessary to realise some of the sinking fund as it would be more than sufficient to redeem the loan. This excess would be returned to revenue or otherwise disposed of—the hon. member says it should go to the General Loan Fund. However, that is a matter we can discuss when we get to Clause 16.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

[The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.]

BILL—AGRICULTURAL BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from 1st September.

Mr. PRICE (Albany): I do not intend taking up the time of the House in expatiating at length upon the Bill which is now before us. Its first recommendation is its brevity. One can almost regret that all the Bills are not so brief and so commendable as the one we are now dealing with. The solitary clause contained in this Bill is of, what one might almost say supreme importance in connection with the agricultural development of this State. As a matter of fact, the operations of the Agricultural Bank provide a pulse which clearly indicates the vitality of our agricultural activity; and when it becomes necessary, as it has, for the capital of that bank to be increased, it indicates in an unmistakable manner that the agricultural development policy is full of life and vigour. I am not of those who desire to unduly criticise the operations of the bank. Rather do I think there is a tendency on the part of the trustees occasionally to be somewhat over-cautious. On the last occasion a measure of this kind was before Parliament we had notes of warning sounded by members in this House and in another place against the tendency on the part of the trustees to loan the capital to the full value allowed by the Act which governs the operations of the bank; however, when we are here assured that during 14 years only £7 10s. has been written off as a bad debt, we can certainly congratulate the country on the fact of the bank being managed in the

manner which it has been managed during these 14 years. I certainly regret that in this instance the Minister has not seen his way clear to bring down a Bill providing for a larger augmentation of the capital of the bank, with the ultimate object of still further increasing the loans available to our settlers. The very fact that we find the private banks in order to assist the settlers are stepping in and taking over the loans which have been advanced by the Agricultural Bank and becoming responsible for them, is an indication that the security held by the bank is undoubtedly good; and I believe that is the fact in every case. It certainly has been in the past, otherwise the bad debts would undoubtedly be more than £7 10s. But were the amount available increased so as to allow the settlers an opportunity for procuring their agricultural implements, as desired in the Act as it now exists, then I think many of the reasons at present existing for the transfer of accounts from the State bank to the private institutions would be obviated. The Minister speaking on the second reading pointed out that the £100 at present made available for the purchase of agricultural implements was not sufficient in the majority of cases, with the result that when the settler desired to purchase machinery he had perforce to appeal to the private banking institution. The reason of that is the fact that £100 is by no means sufficient to achieve the object in view, namely, the purchase of locally manufactured agricultural machinery. The result is that the settler, finding the £100 which is made available not sufficient, has to turn round and appeal to the private institutions. Had the Minister provided in this Bill that the £100 should be made £250 or even more, and had he provided that instead of lending £750 the bank should be allowed to lend £1,000, then I think the benefits derived from the Act would have been proportionately increased, because we find to-day that the settlers on our land, unlike they were a few years ago, are going in for a vigorous development of their holdings, and the more we can encourage them in that

development the better it will be for the State, and more progress must undoubtedly follow. It has been stated by the Minister that only £1,200 has been authorised under the section allowing for the borrowing up to £100 for the purchase of agricultural machinery, and the Minister pointed out that in his opinion the reason a larger amount has not been applied for or authorised—I might say a larger amount has not been applied for because what has been applied for has been authorised under a section of this kind—was that there was a certain amount of prejudice against locally manufactured machinery in favour of that manufactured in the Eastern States. Were I assured that such was the only reason I would be content, but unfortunately a big bulk of the machinery now being used in the State is not that which is being manufactured in the Eastern section of the Commonwealth but is machinery which has been manufactured in America, and I certainly do not think it is desirable that we should perpetuate any system which is tending in that direction or in the direction of increasing the importation of machinery from any over-seas part of the world. Were the big bulk of machinery coming from the Eastern States I would be prepared to let the matter go; but although it cannot be done in connection with the Bill now before us, I hope during the next session of Parliament the Minister will have the pleasurable necessity of bringing down another measure like this, and that he will not only increase the amount which is desired by the bank to provide for its ordinary operations, but that he will also increase the amount so as to provide a larger loan, if necessary, for the settler, with the object of increasing the £100 now made available for the purchase of agricultural machinery. Furthermore, if the Minister for Lands is right in his contention in regard to the small amount which has been borrowed under this particular section, then we see the imperative necessity, not only for increasing the amount, but for providing for the State itself taking in

hand some means of providing this necessary machinery. When this matter was debated on a previous occasion in this Chamber we were assured that there were plenty of local manufacturers, private enterprise concerns, to provide the machinery required; but now we find the Minister assuring us that such is not a fact and that there are other reasons working to the detriment of this particular section of the Act. I think the majority of the members of this Chamber are of opinion that, were the Government to take in hand the manufacture of this machinery, not only would the expenditure of the money itself be of direct benefit to the State itself, but first of all we would be providing money for the assistance of our farmers, and in its secondary stage of evolution that money would be used for the payment of wages for State employees in the production of the machinery required by the farmers. Thereby we would be assured that the money we desired to be circulated in the State would not be going to another section of the globe. As I said before, if I were assured that the money was being expended in the Eastern States for the manufacture of machinery there, much of the objection would be removed; but the fact that a big bulk of it goes to America is sufficient warranty for me to protest against the existing condition. As I intimated before, I do not intend to unduly delay the second reading of this Bill. I can only congratulate the trustees of the bank on the splendid methods they have adopted and on the safeguards they have thrown around the loaning of the vast sum of money which has been placed under their control; but again let me express the hope that in the near future the operations of the bank will be so extended as to not exactly prevent, but at all events remove, the necessity for our settlers appealing to the private institutions.

Mr. Underwood: Why not amend this Bill?

Mr. PRICE: I am not yet prepared to do it; neither am I sure that the majority of the House are in favour of it; but at the same time I certainly think that any

measure having for its object the protection of the property of our settlers in the matter of loans upon such property and protecting them against the possibilities of that property being confiscated or resumed by the private banking institutions, must certainly appeal to members of the House. I intend to support the Bill. I regret the amount applied has not been larger, for the reasons I have already stated.

Mr. GEORGE (Murray): I also wish to add my little meed of satisfaction at the necessity that has arisen for increasing the capital of the Agricultural Bank. With the last speaker I am sanguine that the settlement in connection with our agricultural lands will be so wide and so extensive that it will not be very long before we will be asked to further extend the amount of money at the disposal of the Agricultural Bank. While I feel that, while also I am gratified at the idea that the operations of the bank have been conducted with so much safety, and with very much good to the country generally, I wish to impress on the Minister that good service requires to be treated properly. I do not think there is any institution in the world dealing with transactions of the magnitude and scope this bank deals with where the person in charge is so miserably paid as Mr. Paterson is. I have not arisen for the purpose of appearing as a special advocate for anyone, but this is a fitting opportunity to bring under the notice of the Minister and members the necessity for recognising merit wherever we find it. It is so easy in connection with the public service to pass perhaps a cheap sneer at the qualifications and the work done by those in charge.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is hardly in order in discussing this question at the present time.

Mr. GEORGE: I am just skirmishing.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There will be a chance on the Estimates.

Mr. GEORGE: I will leave the question of salary out, and deal with the question of merit. The capital that has to be attended to by the officials of the

bank approximate three million pounds, and will in time, I am sure, be equal to five million pounds. We all know the importance of the bank to settlers and to the country, and we also know that every safeguard that skill and experience can bring to bear is exercised in the allotting of this money, and I hope members when discussing this matter will bear in mind the merits of those to whom the success of this scheme is due—not only the chief, but all the staff. The Minister looks as if he intends to do justice to these men, so I will sit down.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (Pilbara): I have no intention of speaking at length on the Bill, but I would express my disappointment that the Minister has not seen fit to go further, also that the member for Albany is not prepared to move amendments to extend the operations of this measure. I have spoken on this question previously and will not repeat my remarks, but I will say in connection with the remarks made by the member for Murray to the effect that the whole success of this bank is due to the management, that I entirely disagree with him. In my opinion it would be impossible to find a man so foolish as to mismanage the bank under the present system. Considering the securities he has, and the money he has to lend, it would be impossible for the most foolish man on earth to go wrong.

Mr. George: The Government who framed the original Bill must have been a good one.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: That has nothing to do with it; it is the security of the lands of Western Australia, the creation of which the Government had no hand in. The bank can double or treble their transactions and still be within safe limits. The more they extend their business, the greater will be the benefit to the whole of Western Australia. I am very disappointed that the Government will not extend operations as they should do, and thus promote the progress of this country as it would be promoted if we had a Government with sufficient enthusiasm to push these

matters forward properly. I intend to support the Bill, but I do it rather disgustedly, because I am not supporting something considerably better.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

Clauses 1, 2—agreed to.

New clause—Amendment of 1906, No. 15, Section 28:

Mr. PRICE moved that the following be added to stand as Clause 3:—

Section 28 of the principal Act, as amended by Section 4 of the Agricultural Bank Act Amendment Act of 1909, is hereby amended by striking out the words "and (d)" in Sub-section 6.

At the present time the section read, "Advances may be made for the purposes specified in paragraphs (c) and (d) of Subsection 1 respectively to an amount not exceeding £100." Paragraph (c) stated, "the purchase of stock for breeding purposes," and paragraph (d) "for the purchase of agricultural machinery manufactured in Western Australia." By striking out "and (d)" the way would be paved for another new clause he intended to move, a further new clause providing that £250 should be made available for the purchase of machinery. We had not heard that any hardship had been imposed on settlers by the purchase of stock, and we had the assurance of the Minister that the amount available for the purchase of machinery was not sufficient.

The Minister for Lands: That remark was not made.

Mr. PRICE: It was stated by the Minister that when settlers desired to purchase machinery they had to appeal to the chartered banks who took over the liabilities and the Agricultural Bank was released. The position would be relieved if the sum were increased from £100 to £250. If the amount were increased there would be the further necessity of increasing the aggregate amount which the settler might obtain from the

bank. That would come later on. In view of the good work done by the bank, in view of the fact that they had ever exercised an over-cautiousness we might well allow the increased power proposed by the amendment.

Mr. BATH: It was not necessary for members to be provided with a copy of the Act in order that they might become acquainted with the purport of the amendment. The new clause moved by the member for Albany would if carried provide that paragraph (d.) which made provision for the loan of money for the purchase of machinery would not be subjected to the limitation of £100. If it was carried it would give the member for Albany the opportunity of moving another clause providing for the amount which he considered was necessary or which he considered was advisable should be loaned.

The Minister for Works: It will reduce the balance available for other works.

Mr. BATH: Oh, no.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The Minister for Lands should agree to report progress so that members might have the opportunity of seeing the amendment on the Notice Paper. The member for Brown Hill perhaps understood the amendment; he (Mr. Underwood) understood it also, but there were others to be considered. However, it had to be recognised that it was impossible to correctly draft an amendment under the conditions which were then being experienced. Another thing was that at this period of the session, Bills should not be taken into the Committee stage immediately after the second reading was passed.

Mr. WALKER: The only thing to be feared about the proposed amendment was that if it was carried the capital of the bank ought to be further increased. It was provided in the Bill to increase the capital of the bank by £500,000 and that was for the purpose of extending the operations of the bank generally. If the amendment were carried then the £500,000 would not go all round, so to speak. If the Committee were going to amend the Bill in such a direction he too would like to amend it in one or

two others. The proposed amendment and the Bill itself would not comprehensively amend the Act. It was proposed by the amendment to leave it to the discretion of the bank as to what was the machinery, as to where it could be procured, and as to what class should be purchased. The objection was that settlers were handicapped in their selection of the expenditure of money. It was not possible to buy all kinds of machinery even if they got £250. If the Committee dealt with such matters they should deal with them in such a way as to give the trustees of the bank more discretion instead of limiting it. But there was preliminary work to be done on a farm even before machinery was required, and preliminary work was more necessary than machinery. The Bill should not be amended in a lop-sided fashion; it would be preferable to see a Bill brought down which would more comprehensively and systematically amend the Act. The Bill before the Committee was merely for the purpose of increasing the capital of the bank.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The £100 which could be obtained had not been declared by him to be insufficient. It was merely calculated to provide the machinery required only for putting in a crop. If the Committee determined to increase this amount for the purchase of machinery, most assuredly it would be necessary to increase the bank's limit to £750. There would be an opportunity next year when the Bill came before Parliament again of bringing about the alteration that the hon. member desired. It might be pointed out also that where a settler was a married man, and it was desirable that every settler should be a married man, the money available for the purchase of machinery was doubled. A settler who had a wife was entitled to borrow from the Agricultural Bank £200 for machinery. Would hon. members generally and the member for Albany in particular take that side of the question into consideration? If they did so they would agree that £200 which could be obtained from the bank for purchasing machinery was as much as could be expected at the present time. Moreover,

there had been no great demand for the purchase of machinery in Western Australia. No great harm would be done if the amendment were withdrawn and allowed to stand over until next year. In the meantime the trustees of the bank would have an opportunity of enquiring fully into the matter and advising the Minister as to the requirements of the customers.

Mr. ANGLWIN: The Minister's remarks had knocked out the arguments of the member for Kanowna. The Minister had said the customers of the bank had not made any large demand for advances against machinery, and ascribed this to the fact that not much machinery was made in Western Australia. Surely this was a good reason why the amount should be increased; because such increase could not fail to encourage the local manufacture of machinery. During the last six months about £11,000 worth of machinery per month had been imported. It was the duty of the Government to reduce that amount, and they could only do so by increasing the amount to be borrowed from the Agricultural Bank. The long terms asked for by purchasers had something to do with the fact that so little machinery was made in the State. He knew of one or two merchants who had ceased importing machinery because of the long terms asked for by farmers. It was no secret that the manufacturers in the Eastern States were doing all they could to discourage enterprise in the direction of manufacturing machinery in Western Australia.

Mr. PIESSE: Many members on the Ministerial side of the House had advocated increasing the maximum amount at present loaned by the bank; but it had been pointed out that if the maximum were increased the capital of the bank would also have to be considerably increased owing to the demands of an increasing number of clients. While in favour of increasing the maximum amount to be loaned he thought the amendment was not in the right direction. The primary object of the bank was to help the settler over the initial stages of the settlement of the land, and with this

end in view the bank lent money on security on which it would be impossible to get advances from the Associated Banks. At the same time it was quite easy for the selector to purchase the necessary agricultural machinery. For this purpose it was not necessary for the selector to find land security, and therefore he (Mr. Piesse) thought it would be better, if the maximum amount were to be increased, to increase the amount loaned on permanent improvements. It had been mentioned that the Associated Banks were taking over these accounts. He did not view this with any alarm, because he felt that the Agricultural Bank was fulfilling its proper function, namely, the helping of the settler during the early stages of his struggle on the land. Rather than agree with the amendment he would prefer to see the amount prescribed in the Act to be loaned on permanent improvements increased by the £150 named in the amendment. While members should do everything in their power to help the settler it was to be remembered that as custodians of the funds of the State they had to see that security was given for the money loaned. In this regard he knew of nothing that depreciated so quickly as agricultural machinery: therefore, any proposed increase in the loans to be advanced against that class of security should be viewed with great caution. On being once used a reaper and binder depreciated by, at least, one-third.

Mr. Collier: But the land will stand the security.

Mr. PIESSE: There was no getting away from the fact that the bank was lending £400 for improvements, and in many instances, of course, the security was by no means too much. He would repeat that rather than increase the amounts to be loaned against machinery it would be better to increase the amount loaned on permanent improvements.

Mr. OSBORN: The amendment was not in the right direction. He agreed with the last speaker, that as security agricultural implements were of the most precarious class. If Parliament were to authorise the bank to increase to £250

the amount to be loaned for the purchase of machinery, the trustees of the bank would take into consideration the security of the land—they would not consider the machinery as security at all.

Mr. Collier: You are answering your own argument.

Mr. OSBORN: No. It would necessarily follow that if the bank were instructed to loan up to £250 for the purchase of machinery the trustees would take into consideration the question of reducing the loan on permanent improvements. The carrying of the amendment would be doing something in the nature of an injustice to the new settler, and the small settler in particular. Last year he had contended that after a man had borrowed £750 from the Agricultural Bank he should be in a position to go to the Associated Banks for any further sums he might require for extensive improvements, and that the Agricultural Bank should be kept entirely for the use of the new and the small settler who required a start in life. He agreed that if any increase were to be made it should be in the amount to be loaned on permanent improvements.

Mr. BATH: When money was advanced by the bank for different purposes, such as clearing and fencing and the purchase of stock and machinery, the trustees took the whole of the security into consideration, and the settler had to lodge his lease instrument with the bank, so that there could be nothing precarious about the security offered for any advance made by the bank to enable a settler to purchase machinery. It was a fact that the bank limited the lending of money. Upon much of the land the Government were asking people to take up at the present time the bank intimated they were not prepared to advance at all.

The Minister for Lands: Not on much of it; on a little of it.

Mr. BATH: It was a fact that on quite a number of blocks the Agricultural Bank declined to make advances. The State had embarked on a policy admitted on all hands to be advantageous, and in doing so it was following the example

of other States which had found the policy equally advantageous.

The Minister for Lands: What other States?

Mr. BATH: South Australia.

The Minister for Lands: Not to the same extent.

Mr. BATH: We were following the example of South Australia. In that State there was a method adopted by which the necessary capital could be obtained for the bank to extend its operations to any extent it pleased.

The Minister for Lands: They have a capital of £3,000,000 and they advance to three-fourths.

Mr. BATH: There was ample opportunity for increasing the capital of our bank, not only to enable the purchase of locally made machinery, but also for all purposes that assisted the settlers. It was idle to say that the bank should only undertake the pioneering work, and that when estates were nicely improved by the aid of the State institution the private institutions should be allowed to reap the benefit. That was a policy entirely opposed to the best interests of the people of the State. It was the policy followed in connection with Ravenshorpe. The State pioneered the district and proved its capabilities and then handed it over to a private company. If it was good for the State to do the pioneering work it was good for the State—the people—to reap the advantage to be gained from their own pioneering. There was no stage in the operations of the farmer when assistance was more needed than after clearing operations were finished. The settler, with the assistance of the Agricultural Bank, got on very well with his clearing, if he was prepared to work; but it was when he desired to cultivate the land that difficulties arose and assistance was necessary. The settler had either to depend upon neighbours or contractors to put in his crop when they pleased or on their terms, or else to mortgage his future for the purchase of stock and machinery with which to cultivate by his own efforts. If assistance was necessary in order to clear

the land it was even more necessary for cultivating the land. Last year the Minister assured us that lands would be available for all whose claims were regarded as reasonable by the trustees of the bank, and hon. members deferred to the opinion of the Minister, but they could not acquiesce in that attitude every year unless there was a willingness displayed by the Minister to see that the capital was sufficient to provide for what was regarded as desirable by hon. members: otherwise members must take upon themselves to amend the Bill, and throw the onus on the Minister to provide the capital, in which case the Government would soon find it.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It was well to show thoroughly what was now being done by the bank. The hon. member referred to South Australia. Under the Advances to Settlers on Crown Lands Act of South Australia advances were made to a limit of £400 at not more than 15s. in the pound. That was quite different from our system. We did not follow the South Australian example, we did a great deal more, we really advanced to the full value of £600 spent on the land. Further than that, a man could go to the Lands Department and pay £12 10s., and if a block was allotted to him could get his authorisation from the Agricultural Bank straight away. This authorisation meant £400 full advance for the purposes of fencing, ringbarking, water conservation, and clearing; and in the wheat lands this would enable a man to fence in his holding, ringbark 600 acres, provide water, and clear 200 acres. This was all done by the trustees of the bank. Further than that, the bank paid one-half of the cost of clearing a second 300 acres, and found £100 for the purchase of breeding stock and £100 for the purchase of agricultural machinery, so that when the settler had his farm going, had these improvements made and had these horses on the land, he would himself have only found the limited sum of £150. Notwithstanding what the hon. member said, no other State did nearly as much for the settler as this State.

Mr. Bath: What about New Zealand?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: New Zealand did not approach us. Western Australia had absolutely pioneered the way in connection with this business. Probably the other States would follow suit. If the £500,000 asked for in this Bill was authorised the bank would have at its disposal for the coming year £741,000. It was true the bank had 6,000 customers to-day, and if each of these 6,000 customers availed himself of the £100 advance for machinery it would mean the enormous sum of £600,000. Surely in that there was plenty of opportunity in Western Australia for the borrowers and for the manufacturers? The member for Kaituma was quite right in saying that if more money was to be advanced it should be advanced for the work of further improving the land. But one could not admit that a greater advance was necessary. Any selector on our wheat lands would have a good farm when the £750 was spent. When he (the Minister) first introduced an amending Bill there was no money provided for purchasing agricultural machinery, and the advance was not nearly so liberal as it was now. The capital of the bank after 12 years was £600,000, while to-day he was asking that it should be made two and a half millions. Members would realise therefore that he had not been slow to grasp the opportunity. He would be most willing, if he thought it necessary, to meet the wishes of the member for Albany, but he did not think it necessary to do more than we were doing now. He merely desired to make it clear that on payment of £12 10s. a man would be able to receive up to £750. The total might be drawn in six months if the man could effect his improvements, but of course that only occurred in rare instances. Could anything more liberal be imagined?

Mr. TROY: Members should agree to the amendment as there was no obstacle against making this sum to be advanced for machinery larger, and at the same time making provision for a larger amount of money to be placed at the service of the Agricultural Bank. The Bill should be recommitted, and the

amount increased to three millions if necessary. If the development of the State needed it, and it were a sound investment, there was no reason why we should not increase the total. What were the objections to increasing the amount? In the first place it was urged that £100 was sufficient for the needs of the farmer in regard to agricultural machinery. That sum would not go far, as a harvester cost about £70, and a couple of good ploughs would make up the balance.

Mr. Heitmann: A harvester would cost up to £110.

Mr. TROY: It was said that a harvester would cost £100, and if so the whole sum would be eaten up, and what about the other machinery needed? It appeared, therefore, that the amount should be increased. The Minister for Lands had said that very little of the machinery was made in the State to date, therefore he appeared to deprecate money being provided to assist manufacturers in the Eastern States. The reason why agricultural machinery was not manufactured here was probably because, until very lately, there was not much opportunity, the demand was not very large, and not many men were engaged in the trade; but, owing to the great advance of agriculture, a large number of people were entering into the business of manufacturing agricultural machinery, and there should no longer exist the necessity to import from the Eastern States. Even if that were the case, there was an easy way of getting over the difficulty, and that was by letting the State manufacture the machinery at the Government workshops. The principle would assuredly be in operation here before many years, so we might just as well initiate it now. Members of the Opposition had been in favour of it for years, and if the Government would not initiate the principle a party would soon be sent to Parliament which would do so. The principle of the State manufacture of agricultural machinery was finding greater favour every day. The private manufacturer would not make machinery unless he could show a profit;

the State would not look for a profit, and, by making machinery, they would be putting the profit into the hands of the farmer himself. The arguments used by the members for Kanowna and Roubourne were somewhat amusing. They had said that the amount already provided for the purchase of agricultural machinery was sufficient for a farmer, and that if he wanted more he would be financed by the Associated Banks. Those gentlemen must know that the Associated Banks would not finance any farmer unless he had security, and if that security were good enough for the Associated Banks it would be good enough for the State. If the Government wanted to help the farmer they should prevent him from getting into the hands of the Associated Banks; as if those banks were appealed to the farmer would have to pay far higher interest on his loan than to the Agricultural Bank. If members on the Government side who pretended to be friends of the farmer desired to assist in a proper way, they should do their best to give the farmer every opportunity to obtain cheap money. The amendment should commend itself to the approval of every member who desired to see the agriculturist encouraged, for, if the amendment were carried, the farmer would be given an opportunity to buy his machinery at a decent price on which a cheap rate of interest would be charged.

Mr. GEORGE: No member had advocated the interests of the Associated Banks. What was said was that the security the Western Australian farmers were able to offer was so good that the Associated Banks were ready to take over the burden if necessary and assist the farmer on better terms than the Agricultural Bank were offering. That showed that the securities of the farmers were undeniable. The Minister had said that he had about £700,000 to deal with which was ample to carry him over until next session, when probably a wider Bill would be brought forward. That being so, there was no necessity for the amendment of the member for Albany, which was that we should increase the amount available for the purchase of agricultural machinery. At-

tached to the clause would be a proviso that the machinery should be manufactured in Western Australia. Members opposite were no more desirous than members on the Government side that machinery should be manufactured here, as all desired that every employment possible should be given to those in Western Australia. One had to consider the remarks of the member for Kanowna that there were some works upon which money could be spent to better purpose than on the purchase of machinery. The security on agricultural machinery was very slight, and the reason the price was so high, and that long terms were granted, was that the merchant or the manufacturer, who were the best judges of securities, felt they must have a big initiatory cost in order to see their own back again. For the first year or two the sum of £100 would be quite sufficient for the purchase of machinery by a man who had just taken up land. It certainly would not allow him to get a very extravagant plant, but that was rather an advantage than otherwise. Temptations were put before farmers by the agents of machinery merchants who induced many to get much more machinery than was absolutely necessary. There was a decided temptation among farmers to believe that if one machine did not bring luck in the way of a good crop the use of some other implement might retrieve the loss. Therefore another machine was bought, and additional expenditure, which was really unnecessary, was incurred. If one were hard up the expenses in the direction of purchasing machinery must be curtailed, and it was often wise that this should be so. There was one section in the Act which might have been altered with reason and that was Subsection (c) referring to the purchase of stock for breeding purposes.

Mr. Walker: If we alter that we must alter the other.

Mr. GEORGE: In connection with farming it was necessary to have horses and it was known that the Agricultural Bank would not advance money excepting on mares. The price of horses ranged from £50 to £80 and it was known that one horse was of little use to a man on a

farm. What he would like to see therefore was an alteration made to that subsection in the Act. As far as the manufacture of agricultural machinery in Western Australia was concerned, what was likely to be made within the State within the next few years would be amply covered by the £100.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Why not take a hand ourselves?

Mr. GEORGE: The State had its hands fairly full considering its population.

Member: What about the Midland workshops?

Mr. GEORGE: It was never calculated to construct agricultural implements at the Midland workshops. They were only large enough for the manufacture of the railway rolling stock and to carry out repairs. Of course if the State was prepared to spend another three or four hundred thousand pounds at these workshops that would be another question.

Mr. JACOBY: The amendment would not receive his support because he did not look upon it as a business proposition. It would allow only a small amount to be available for improvements which after all were far more urgent and certainly of greater advantage to the farmer. The occasion should not be allowed to pass without giving expression to the hope that the Minister would at an early date review the whole position as far as the Agricultural Bank was concerned. The position at the present time was that a farmer was taken along to a fairly financial stage and then dropped entirely and his business was transferred to other banks. That position should be made to disappear and the Agricultural Bank given sufficient power to take a farmer right through.

Mr. Scaddan: You are becoming a terrible socialist.

Mr. JACOBY: This was the position that he had always advocated with regard to the Agricultural Bank. The Savings Bank and the Agricultural Bank were institutions which should be amalgamated under a broad scheme and placed under the control of governors, and the business carried out in the manner that was done by every financial in-

stitution. It was absurd to carry a farmer through the most risky portion of his experience, establish him financially and then drop him altogether and allow other banks to take him up and make good money out of him. The land itself was the security and the amount advanced should be advanced for any specific object irrespective of what it was, provided the security was good.

[*Mr. Daglish took the Chair.*]

Mr. Scaddan: Even to buying his wheat and taking it out of the hands of a ring.

Mr. JACOBY: It was even possible that combined banks might take his wheat. There was no reason why that should not be done. Regarding the question of the manufacture of machinery, members should be reminded that very little could be manufactured in the State because many of the most useful machines were covered by patents. The anxiety of members to advocate State manufacture was more in the direction of benefiting the industrial classes rather than relieving the farmers.

Mr. Walker: It will do both together.

Mr. JACOBY: There was no question about the fact that the farmers as a body were entirely opposed to the scheme of State manufacture.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is going very wide of the matter.

Mr. JACOBY: Arguments on this question had been advanced by hon. members and he was merely replying to them. He hoped the Minister would be in the position to go into the general scheme of the increased powers of the Agricultural Bank, so that instead of losing the farmer at a stage when he might be of some use the bank would retain his business.

Mr. ANGWIN: It was rather surprising to find the stand the member for Swan was taking. When the Bill was before Parliament last session the hon. member complained because the Minister did not provide a sufficient sum of money to enable farmers to purchase machinery, and in the course of his remarks stated that it was a pity the Minister did not ask the House to increase the amount to

a sufficient sum to enable the farmer to be placed in the position to buy all necessary machinery. Now the hon. member expressed his intention of opposing that amendment which would have the effect of bringing about what he urged last session.

Mr. Jacoby: The amendment does not say so.

Mr. ANGWIN: That was because the hon. member for Albany would not move it. A further amendment would have to be moved to provide that. It was indeed surprising to find some hon. members supporting one thing one day and opposing it the next. This showed that they should not throw stones when they lived in glass houses. There was nothing in the amendment dealing with the State manufacture of machinery, but even the Minister would admit that by providing for the purchase of machinery out of the funds lent by the Agricultural Bank there would be a great tendency to increase the manufacture of this class of machinery in the State. The Minister had pointed out that the bank dealt very liberally with its customers. It was doubtful, however, whether that was really so because it was found that the price of land was being increased in the back country and the bank limited its advances to small amounts. The large number of people who were taking up land to-day would not only have to pay back to the bank the amount which they received but they would eventually have to pay twice as much. Under such conditions it was necessary that we should increase the amount loaned.

Mr. GILL: It was a pity that the member for Swan should have altered his views.

Mr. Jacoby: I have not altered them.

Mr. GILL: Last session the hon. member had said that we should make provision for the purchase of agricultural machinery.

Mr. Jacoby: I say the same to-night.

Mr. GILL: The hon. member would have an opportunity of putting that view into effect. If the amendment were carried it would be necessary to increase the total amount the bank could lend to

the farmer, and that, he thought, could be done without injury to anybody. For his part he was prepared to increase the amount to £1,000. When introducing the amending Act of last session the Minister had said the measure had the two-fold object of assisting the farmer and establishing the manufacture of agricultural implements in Western Australia. However, on the Minister's own showing, it had not achieved the latter part of the two-fold object.

The Minister for Lands: It has not had much chance yet.

Mr. GILL: That was so, but unfortunately the prospects of establishing these factories in Western Australia were not too bright. Manufacturers of the Eastern States and of America would prevent the establishment of such factories in Western Australia if possible. Their method of doing that lay in giving liberal terms on the time-payment system, a system which it would be impossible for a man to follow in Western Australia without a very large amount of capital. If the advances to be made to the farmer for the purchase of machinery were increased it would serve to provide the farmer with a means of paying cash for his machinery, and this might easily lead to the establishment of factories in our midst.

The Minister for Lands: He has the opportunity now of paying cash for his harvester.

Mr. GILL: Unfortunately our farmers had very little to spare for the first few years. In introducing the Bill last session the Minister had said—

So long as the farmer is willing to pay the freight from the East the Eastern manufacturer will continue to send stuff over here. There are many reasons for making the machinery over here. If we build up an army of manufacturers here they will all be taxpayers, and the increased revenue on them would mean something. A great many men will be required in this manufacture. If we are to be an Australian State of any consequence we must endeavour to foster local industries and make population possible.

It was with that idea that he (Mr. Gill) had supported the measure last session. To agree to the amendment and so increase the amount for the purchase of machinery would be a better means of establishing the manufacturing industries in the State than anything contained in the existing Act.

The Minister for Lands: The amount at present provided will cover the purchase of necessary implements.

Mr. GILL: But there were more important, and, consequently, more expensive machines which the farmer would require, and they could be made here just as well as they were being made in the Eastern States. It was simply a matter of providing sufficient inducement. He would support the amendment.

Mr. PRICE: The change of attitude adopted by the member for Swan in regard to the amendment was remarkable. Even the Minister himself had changed, but the member for Swan, who could see no virtue whatever in the proposed amendment, had said last year—

But the settler cannot put any area under corn until he has machinery, nor can he reap anything without machinery. He has to get a drill, a harvester and a cultivator, and he will require horses and harness. To start with he cannot get along without committing himself to a cash expenditure of at least £225, or a credit expenditure very much greater. It appears, therefore, in the circumstances, that to lend a man £100 only will get him into greater difficulties.

To have lent the settler £100 last session would have got him into greater difficulties; but to-day the hon. member was anxious to pursue that very course.

Mr. Jacoby: No.

Mr. PRICE: What were we to understand? The Minister also was opposed to the increase. Quite recently the Minister had said with regard to this provision—

The total authorisations to-day reach only £1,200. This is largely due to the fact that there is not much machinery made in Western Australia, while im-

ported machinery is more popular. It will not always be so, because in due course our manufacturers will come in line with the manufacturers of the Eastern States, and then our machinery will not require to be imported. We are doing all we can. Here again, private banks have done the work we proposed to do when this provision became law. They have taken over a very large number of our accounts, and nearly always they have taken over people who desire a larger advance with which to purchase more machinery.

Surely that was a statement definite and explicit. The Minister had said it might be read into his statement that he considered they should have a greater advance. If the English language meant anything that statement was as explicit as it could possibly be. The reason why the people had gone over to the Associated Banks was because they desired a larger advance with which to purchase more machinery. If members were prepared to vote on the facts he (Mr. Price) thought the definite and explicit statement of the Minister for Lands would be sufficient to satisfy them that the Minister himself realised the necessity for an increase of this amount. But the Minister, when saying that this State was doing so much for the settler, and that we were leading the way in this connection, must have been romancing at the expense of other States; for in New South Wales, where the Minister doubted if so much as £750 was advanced—

The Minister for Lands: No. They lend £500.

Mr. PRICE: As a matter of fact, in New South Wales sums up to £2,000 were advanced to the farmer.

The Minister for Lands: But not on the same terms.

Mr. PRICE: On the same terms as obtained in Western Australia. Victoria advanced up to £2,000. Queensland up to £800. and South Australia—with regard to which the Minister had pooh-poohed the suggestion that she was leading in this regard—loaned up to £5,000. New Zealand loaned up to £3,000, and, as a matter of fact, the only State in Austral-

asia which was not lending far more than Western Australia was Tasmania.

The Minister for Lands: Does any one of them lend up to the full value of the work done?

Mr. PRICE: The question under discussion had not been how the amount was loaned but what amount was loaned. The Minister had pointed out that we were lending up to the full value of the work done. It was a ridiculous statement to say that the whole £1,700,000 authorised had been lent out to the full extent of improvements, when only £7 10s. had been written off as a bad debt. The trustees with their business acumen saw that the security was sufficient for the advance, so why hesitate to lend £250 instead of £100 for the purchase of machinery made in the State, having in view, of course, an increase to the capital, a step that would be necessary, and which could be done on a recommitment? If 3,000 customers of the bank each applied for £150 it would mean £450,000 invested for agricultural machinery made in the State, and it would be a good thing for the State.

The Minister for Lands: That is why I introduced the clause last year.

Mr. PRICE: It was because he feared the section would be effective that the Minister now opposed this amendment. The Minister admitted the section was ineffective because only £1,200 was authorised. It was said this was on account of the machinery not being manufactured here; but if we made the amount larger and induced large numbers of the settlers to borrow from the Agricultural Bank instead of from the private banks the money with which to purchase machinery, we would induce the manufacturers to manufacture in the State, because they would realise this large sum was available for machinery made in Western Australia. We should give settlers every inducement to retain their accounts at the Agricultural Bank, and members who were so anxious last session to increase the capital should continue in that view and not condemn the amendment because it came from the Opposition. It was an amendment in the interests of the farmers, and the remark of the member for Swan about there being some ulterior object came

with very bad taste from the hon. member.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : Members were always anxious to take the opportunity of going one better than the Minister without having the responsibility of administering the Act. The Minister for Lands clearly showed the position of the bank and how the conditions were much superior to those in any other State. Yet the member for Albany, prompted by the member for Brown Hill, moved an amendment to revolutionise the measure introduced by the Minister. Of course, in the circumstances the Minister could not accept the amendment. Now, the member for Albany referred to institutions in South Australia and Queensland which were totally different from the Agricultural Bank. In South Australia the Advances to Settlers on Crown Lands Act passed in 1908 fixed the maximum to be advanced at £400 as against £750 in this State. If members wished to compare the powers of advancing on mortgage pure and simple it would be necessary to compare the Government Savings Bank, for instance, with the power to advance up to £5,000 as in New South Wales. The point was whether we were treating our settlers liberally.

The Minister for Lands : Half the total increase of the wheat production in Australia is due to our institution in Western Australia.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : We were doing as much as could be expected of us in the circumstances to assist the settler. Advances in Queensland under the Agricultural Bank Act of that State were limited to 10s. in the pound on the estimated value of the holding and must not exceed £800, so that before the settler could get an advance up to £800 he must have a holding worth £1,600. Compare that with our conditions. A settler could take up land, pay down £12 10s., and get £400 from the Agricultural Bank against improvements, that was the full value of his labour. If a man could put his labour into his land and execute certain improvements he could draw to the full value. No other State in Australia gave such terms. Very evidently the settler in Western Australia had much the best of

the deal. Then we had the member for Brown Hill, of course with his usual academic speech, saying that the Government did the pioneering and handed over to private companies and private enterprise, and instancing Ravensthorpe. One wondered where the Government had handed anything over in the nature of pioneering work at Ravensthorpe.

Mr. Scaddan : The smelters.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : Everyone knew that the smelters cost the State thousands of pounds in operations.

Mr. Bath : The Government sold more value in the dump than they got from the smelters.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : That was absolutely incorrect.

The CHAIRMAN : That is very foreign to the question.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : The argument had been used by the hon. member, but the illustration was an absurdity as the deal was a very good one for the State. He desired to protest against the Government being constantly charged with giving away the rights of the people. What the Minister had done in connection with this institution and land settlement showed he was alive to the possibilities and had done his best in the interests of the State. Because the Minister was controlling an institution with some degree of caution, members wanted him to go further and increase the amount for machinery from £100 to £250. Let us first wait and see how the present scheme answered. Up to the present it had not answered; the reason being that the machinery was not manufactured in Western Australia. What was the use of increasing the amount to be advanced on locally-made machinery when, up to the present, full advantage had not been taken of the amount now set down? There was no justification for the amendment. The Minister for Lands had made it clear that his intention was to foster local industry as much as possible. The reason farmers went to outside institutions was that the money from the Agricultural Bank could not be expended on imported machinery. If the £250 were to go to the farmer to get any machinery, whether manufactured in Western

Australia or imported, he could have understood the amendment, but where the £250 was restricted to locally manufactured machinery it was altogether a useless amendment. First exhaust the £100 limit and then an increased sum could be asked for.

Mr. Scaddan: What machinery can be obtained for £100?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Minister for Lands gave all the details, and pointed out that £100 was sufficient for a farm with 200 acres under crop, 300 acres cleared, and the balance ring-barked. If the amendment were carried, the capital must be greatly increased on the sum mentioned in the Bill, and there must also be an increase in the total amount to be advanced to a settler. Then there was the point clearly put by the member for Kanowna as to whether, if there were an increased amount, it should not be allowed for general improvements. There were rumours of one or two firms intending to commence the manufacture of agricultural machinery here, but it would take some time for them to get a start. He hoped it would be within the next twelve months, and that harvesters and other agricultural implements would be manufactured here to a large extent. Then, if the amount were too small it could be increased next session.

Mr. Price: Let it be increased now.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That was unnecessary, as £600,000 was available for settlers under the existing Act.

Mr. WALKER: The full amount allowed to a settler by the bank was not sufficient to see him through to a self-supporting stage. The amendment was somewhat lop-sided, for there were better ways of using the money than by spending an increased amount on machinery. If the hon. member would withdraw his proposed new clause, and increase the total amount of allocation from £750 to £1,000, allowing the settler to have the allocation of the loan made as he desired, for the purpose of developing his farm, proportionately between machinery, stock, clearing, water service, etcetera, there would not be much in dispute. The amount to be placed at the disposal of the bank would have to be increased

if we were to increase the scope of operations of new settlers. There was no gain-saying the fact that settlers were now harassed through want of means to carry on improvements, getting stock, etcetera. The limit was not large enough. As a matter of fact they could not get machinery now if they wanted it, for it was not made in the country. When all was said and done, it rested with the management whether the application was granted or not. It would be far better to leave the allocation to the discretion of the settler, who knew what he wanted, than to say he should have so much more money granted to him for the purchase of machinery alone. In order to carry out his suggestion it would be necessary to recommit the Bill so that the capital of the bank might be increased still further.

New clause put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	21
Noes	20

Majority for . . . 1

AYES.

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

NOES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Male
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Carson	Mr. Monger
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. Draper	Mr. Murphy
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Naeve
Mr. George	Mr. Osborn
Mr. Gordon	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Jacoby	(Teller).
Mr. Layman	

New clause thus passed.

New clause:

Mr. PRICE moved that the following be added as a new clause:—

Section 28 of the principal Act as amended by Section 4 of the Agricul-

tural Bank Act Amendment Act of 1909 is further amended by inserting a new subsection to stand as Subsection 7:—"Advances may be made for the purpose specified in paragraph (d) of Subsection 1 to an amount not exceeding two hundred and fifty pounds."

New clause put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	21
Nues	23

Majority against .. 2

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Bath	Mr. Price
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Swan
Mr. Collier	Mr. Taylor
Mr. GHI	Mr. Troy
Mr. Gourley	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Heitmann	Mr. Walker
Mr. Holman	Mr. Ware
Mr. Horan	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. McDowall	(Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Monger
Mr. Carson	Sir N. J. Moore
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. Draper	Mr. Murphy
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Nanson
Mr. George	Mr. Osborn
Mr. Gordon	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Quinlan
Mr. Harper	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Jacoby	Mr. Layman
Mr. Male	(Teller).

New clause thus negatived.

New clause:

Mr. PRICE moved that the following be added as a new clause:—

Section 28 of the principal Act as amended by Section 1 of the Agricultural Bank Act Amendment Act, 1909, is hereby amended by striking out the words "seven hundred and fifty" in the first proviso and inserting in lieu "one thousand."

Those hon. members who expressed themselves desirous of assisting settlers would not object to vote for the increased amount. The question of allocation under the different heads would not enter into the proposed amendment. No objection could be raised to the proposal.

Mr. BATH: By the votes which had just been taken the Committee had struck out the provision which limited the amount which could be loaned for the specific purpose of purchasing agricultural implements manufactured in Western Australia to £100, and money could be lent for the purchase of agricultural implements at the discretion of the trustees and without limitation of the amount. By making provision to increase the amount the trustees would be given power to provide for all specific purposes as mentioned in the principal Act, and there would be placed an additional amount at the disposal of the trustees for the purpose of increasing the sum which they could lend for the purchase of agricultural implements.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It would be necessary to recommit the Bill for the purpose of re-inserting the words which had been struck out. It was his intention to oppose the amendment; indeed he was surprised that it had been moved by the member for Albany without one word of explanation as to the use to which this additional money would be put. The member for Brown Hill would have the amount to be loaned for the purchase of machinery fixed at £250; but if the amendment had been carried it would have been useless, because machinery was not being made in Western Australia to any extent, and would not be for some time to come. The bank was providing sufficient inducement, as would be seen when hon. members recollected that one-half the total new area under crop in Australia was furnished by Western Australia, and that the increased area under crop this year would set up a demand for a thousand sets of agricultural machinery. Thus it would be seen that the demand did exist here as nowhere else in Australia. If the 6,000 clients of the bank were each to borrow from the bank the £100 provided for the purchase of machinery it would mean the enormous amount of £600,000. He would oppose the amendment.

Mr. ANGWIN: It was surprising that any member should be prepared to oppose

the amendment, seeing that its effect was merely to repose confidence in the trustees of the Agricultural Bank. It was not mandatory, it simply gave the trustees power to lend the money if they thought fit. Again, he had always been of opinion that when a Bill passed the second reading it became the property of the House, and that any member was justified in moving an amendment to the Bill. A great deal was heard of the cry of "the country first and party second"; but the Minister for Works apparently put Government first and country second when he argued that no member should try to amend a Government measure.

Mr. BOLTON: The effect of the amendment would be that the trustees of the Agricultural Bank would no longer be limited to the amount of £100. If the gross amount were increased from £750 to £1,000 it would give the trustees the right, if they thought fit, to lend more than £100 for machinery. Amendments issuing from the Opposition side of the House should be treated as amendments for the good of the country, and not be regarded as specially antagonistic to the Ministry. He desired that the settlers who were working their lands should know the true position, namely, that members on the Opposition side were prepared to advance them more than £100 for the purchase of machinery, but that Ministers were opposed to the proposal.

Mr. JACOBY: It had long been his contention that the advances made by the Agricultural Bank should depend more upon the actual security offered by the applicant. He would prefer to see the maximum amount to be loaned raised to £1,000 and all restrictions removed as to the purposes for which the money was to be applied, so long as it was for improving the property. The trustees should be permitted to lend the money, whether for actual improvements to the land or for stock, or for machinery, making sure, of course, that the security of the land was sufficient to cover the advance. He intended to support the amendment. Some years ago he had been chairman of a select committee which

unanimously reported in favour of the maximum amount to be loaned being raised to £1,000. When the Bill then under discussion went through the House the amount was reduced to £800, and subsequently to £500; still later it was raised to the present amount of £750. He was of opinion that the bank should take the farmer right through. Where could the harm be, so long as the funds of the State were properly protected?

The PREMIER: Some members who were enthusiastic in their support of the proposal to increase the amount had been equally demonstrative in their approval of a previous proposal to reduce the total amount from £1,000 to £500. In the latter case, it had been recognised that when a man wanted to borrow more than £750 there were other institutions to which he could apply. The object of the Agricultural Bank Act was to make advances to small men so that they might have an opportunity of carrying out certain improvements, and it had been realised that the State had only a certain amount of capital to be advanced. That was the reason why, in 1906, the alteration was made from £1,000 to £500. Subsequently, with the object of allowing for the purchase of agricultural machinery and of stock, an amendment had been made raising the total to £750; and that was all he was prepared to accept at the present time. The Government had outlined their policy with regard to the measure, and he did not think that when a Bill of this kind came before the House for the specific reason of having the capital of the bank increased, it was an opportune time for the making of so drastic an alteration as was proposed by the amendment.

Mr. SCADDAN: The amendment would not compel the trustees to lend £1,000 to any applicant for that amount: it was simply increasing the maximum that might be lent by the trustees if they thought desirable. After all, if a settler were just on the point of making a success it would be foolish to have to prevent that success simply because the trustees were restricted to the lending of a sum insufficient for the purpose. If an

additional £100, or even £200, would change failure into success the trustees should have power to lend that additional money. There was no compulsion in the matter; it was simply giving the trustees power to do that which was best in each individual case. The bank had been operating now for a considerable period. When first it started it had been, perhaps, wise to restrict the amount in order to make the then available capital cover as much ground as possible. Many settlers who had made use of the bank were today just on the point of success, and unless further assistance were granted to them they would have to go to the wall and let someone else reap the advantage of their work. The amendment did not put any compulsion on the trustees to advance to the full amount. Owing to the magnificent work the trustees had done we could leave it in their hands, so that if they considered an increased advance would assist a settler in any way they should be permitted to make it.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Hon. members should take into consideration the fact that the Minister was responsible for administering the Act, and that the Minister and the Treasurer were responsible for financing the bank. It was asking too much for members at a moment's notice to propose an amendment which would necessitate an increase of the capital of the bank by a million and a half to two million pounds.

Mr. Butcher: If this amendment is carried you will want six million pounds.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It was all very well to say the granting of loans was within the discretion of the trustees, but if the Act gave permission to draw up to the higher amount the money could be demanded. The system was to show against every block the amount that would be advanced by the bank, and there could be no refusal to advance to these amounts. Any refusal would have a very bad effect. Members should realise that it was carrying things too far to try to carry a matter over the heads of the Minister who already believed that the assistance given by the bank was very generous and far above any-

thing in the other States. Further, the member for Albany had had a week in which to give notice of this amendment.

Mr. Scaddan: You forced on the Committee stage.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: An important amendment of this nature should have been put on the Notice Paper.

Mr. Holman: We cannot do that until after the second reading.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: At any rate, it was to be hoped members would see that the amendment was not carried.

Mr. PRICE: During the second reading debate it was intimated that amendments might be moved, and the Minister for Lands immediately forced on the Committee stage. The proposal now would not interfere with the capital of the bank; it did not mean that the full amount of £1,000 would be loaned, and ample arguments had already been shown why the increase should be made. When a Bill was in Committee any member had a right to move an amendment. If the Government suffered defeat on this it would be their misfortune, but it would be the country's benefit.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS moved—

That progress be reported.

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

Ayes	22
Noes	21
				—
Majority for	1
				—

AYES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Monger
Mr. Carson	Sir N. J. Moore
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. Draper	Mr. Murphy
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Nanson
Mr. George	Mr. Osborn
Mr. Gordon	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Gregory	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Harper	Mr. Layman
Mr. Jacoby	
Mr. Male	

(Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Bath	Mr. Price
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Collier	Mr. Swan
Mr. Gill	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Gourley	Mr. Troy
Mr. Heitmann	Mr. Walker
Mr. Holman	Mr. Ware
Mr. Horan	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Underwood
Mr. McDowall	(Teller).

Motion thus passed; progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.53 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 7th September, 1910.

	PAGE
Papers presented	631
Questions: Perth Tramway Trouble, police services	631
Mining Registrar, Southern Cross	631
Judges' decisions upset	632
Immigrants, domestic servants	632
Land Selection, Esperance district	632
Railway second-class sleeping cars	632
Timber lease, conditions unfulfilled	633
State sawmill, equipment	633
Motions: Main roads, maintenance by State	633
University, to utilise Government House	644
Railway Advisory Board	648
Zamia Palm Eradication	649
Private Motions, continuation	648

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

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Premier: 1, Public Library, report for 1909-10; 2, Public Service List, 1910.

By the Attorney General: Return relating to fatalities on racecourses (ordered on motion by Mr. Daglish).

QUESTION — PERTH TRAMWAY TROUBLE, POLICE SERVICES.

Mr. HORAN asked the Attorney General: 1, Is it a fact that all extra police services rendered to banks, companies, or private individuals have always been paid

for by those concerned to the Police Department? 2, What scale of charges has it been customary to impose in such cases? 3, Has the Perth Tramway Company been charged for the extra services rendered by those police who had been specially employed in travelling on the tram cars during the tramway dispute? 4, If not, why not?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL replied:

1, Yes, when applied for, vide Regulation 544—

Police Regulation No. 544.

A sufficient number of police will be in attendance at all places of public resort where their services are likely to be required to preserve the public peace or prevent the commission of offences. When, however, the conductors of race meetings or other sports gatherings, or the managers of theatres, concerts, or other public gatherings require the services of members of the force to keep the grounds clear, maintain order during performances, or fulfil similar functions not properly belonging to the police, a charge will be made for the services of members of the force supplied for such purpose.

2, Under Police Regulation 545: For every constable for a full day and night, 13s. For every constable engaged for any shorter period, 1s. per hour. In the case of mounted constables an additional charge of 5s. per day or portion of a day will be made for each police horse. Where transport expenses are incurred these are charged in addition. 3, No. 4. The police are placed on the tram cars and tramway route for the protection of those on the cars.

QUESTION—MINING REGISTRAR, SOUTHERN CROSS.

Mr. HORAN asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Having regard to the increase of mining business at Southern Cross will he look into the matter of supplying assistance to the mining registrar, which question was raised by me some years ago? 2, Will he consult with the Public Service Commissioner and various departments concerned in order that this