HON. C. B. WILLIAMS (South) [10.45]: I oppose the motion, on the ground that country members are entitled to some consideration. The position is all very well for metropolitan members. I understood from the Minister that the Bill would be taken into Committee to-night. As an opponent of the Government I have extended every courtesy and consideration to the Leader of the House. The Minister says he he recognises that, but in fact he does not. A week or two ago I had to pair with another member in order to allow him to reach his home on Friday. The division has shown that only five members are opposed to the measure. Why not go into Committee now and thus enable country members to leave for their homes on Thursday evening? If the Committee stage is delayed until to-morrow, country members will have to spend a day in Perth uselessly. Why does the Minister seek to penalise his opponents? If the Bill is vitally important, it should be dealt with to-night. Then country members could proceed to their homes as usual. I must vote against the motion.

HON. J. M. DREW (Central) [10.48]: I hope Mr. Williams will not persist in his attitude. It is most unusual to endeavour to take the conduct of business out of the hands of the Leader of the House. No doubt the Minister has carefully considered the position. Numerous amendments have been suggested, and they are not on the Notice Paper, so that we have not had the opportunity of studying them. I would regard it as a serious responsibility if I attempted to take the business out of the Leader's hands.

THE MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES (Hon. C. F. Baxter—East—in reply) [10.49]: I regret that Mr. Williams feels aggrieved. Personally I am quite prepared to proceed with the Committee stage to-night, but two or three hon. members have told me that they would like time for consideration. In postponing the Committee stage until to-morrow, I thought I was meeting the convenience of members generally.

Hon. J. Cornell: The postponement will suit 24 out of 25 members.

Question put and passed.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

1, Trustees' Powers.

2, Mortgagees' Rights Restriction.

Received from the Assembly.

House adjourned at 10.52 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 5th August, 1931.

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

QUESTION—FARM LABOUR, EXPLOITATION.

Mr. RAPHAEL asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Is he aware that farmers who have assigned their estates and are working under trustees, have received instructions from their trustees to dispense with their permanent farm hands and engage labour from Blackboy Hill and Hovea camps, or the road boards of their districts? 2, If so, will he take action to prevent this exploitation by trustees in obtaining farm labour at the expense of the State?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, No. 2, Answered by No. 1.

QUESTION—TAXATION RETURNS, LODGMENT.

Mr. RAPHAEL asked the Treasurer: 1, Is he aware that notwithstanding that all land and income tax returns must be lodged by the 31st August in each year, extensions of time up to the 31st December have been granted—without penalty for late return—to some persons in which to lodge their returns? 2, If so, will he take action to rectify this anomaly by either extending the time for lodging land and income tax returns to the 31st December in each year, or by ensuring that the penalty for late lodgment is enforced in the case of all returns lodged after the 31st August, irrespective of whether extension of time for lodging has been granted?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS (for the Treasurer) replied: 1, The department insist on the lodgment of all returns on the due date, but where satisfactory evidence is forthcoming and the circumstances warrant, extensions of time are granted up to the 31st October; only in very special cases are extensions granted beyond this date. Returns lodged beyond the due date without approval are subject to penalty. 2, No.

QUESTION—COAL TENDERS.

Mr. WANSBROUGH (without notice) asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Is it a fact that the Government are calling tenders for the supply of 8,000 tons of Newcastle coal? 2, Will the Minister, before accepting any tender, give the House an opportunity of discussing the economic loss to the State which would result from buying coal outside Western Australia?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Yes. 2, No.

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. C. G. Latham—York) [4.37]: I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the following Bills to be introduced and their second reading moved at this sitting:—1, Fremantle (Skinner-street) Disused Cemetery Amendment Bill; 2, Pearling Act Amendment Bill; 3, Fire Brigades (Sinking Fund) Bill.

Question put and passed.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have counted the House; there is an absolute majority present, and there is no dissentient voice.

BILL—FREMANTLE (SKINNER-ST.) DISUSED CEMETERY AMENDMENT.

Introduced by the Minister for Lands, and read a first time.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. C. G. Latham—York) [4.40] in moving the second reading said: I propose to ask the House to agree to dispense with a sitting to-morrow, and to adjourn until Tuesday next. My object is that hon. members may have the three Bills I have mentioned before them on Tuesday next and be well acquainted with their contents. The Bill just introduced provides for the re-vesting of certain lands, now vested in the trustees of the Fremantle cemetery, in the Fremantle City Council. The land in question is at present controlled under the Fremantle (Skinner-street) Disused Cemetery Act of 1899. Since 1905 application has been made to various Governments for the conversion of this cemetery into a park for recreation purposes. It is now proposed that the bodies interred in the cemetery shall be re-interred in the Carrington-street cemetery. It has been pointed out to various holders of the portfolio of Lands that the vaults in the Skinner-street cemetery were being destroyed, that the fencing was being knocked down, and that animals were allowed to stray on the ground. Further, it has been pointed out that the public have made a thoroughfare of the cemetery site. The member for Fremantle (Mr. Sleeman) has once or twice suggested to me the introduction of this measure. The passing of the Bill will enable the Fremantle City Council to spend money on the re-interment of the bodies, and on the cleaning up of the ground. Thereupon it will be proclaimed a Class A reserve. The cemetery was originally vested in certain religious bodies. After they had ceased to take interest in it, it was transferred to a board who have from time to time permitted the re-interment of bodies from the cemetery. A large number of the persons buried there are now without near relatives, and the passing of the measure will enable the Fre-

mantle City Council to do what they desire. It is not intended that the cemetery shall be used as a park until the Government are perfectly satisfied that all the bodies have been re-interred and that everything is in order. I shall not proceed further with the Bill to-night. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Sleeman, debate adjourned.

BILL—PEARLING ACT AMENDMENT.

First Reading.

Introduced by the Chief Secretary and read a first time.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. N. Keenan—Nedlands) [4.45] in moving the second reading said: This is a particularly small measure to amend the Pearling Act by providing that the fee for a ship license for a ship used merely as a tender to a pearling ship, and not used in the actual fishing for pearl shell or pearls, may be fixed from time to time by the Minister at such lesser fee than £10 as he may think fit. Here we have an illustration of the lack of wisdom in not leaving to regulations matters which require elasticity, which require change from time to time. Unfortunately the fees are all stated in the Schedule to the Act, and so they cannot be altered without coming before Parliament. An amendment was made to the Act in 1922, but the fees in the Schedule were not touched. Originally it was provided that the fee for a ship license should be £10, and so it has remained. But the pearling industry at present is in a very parlous state, and those interested have endeavoured to get a small measure of relief. For that purpose they have petitioned the chief inspector of pearling to secure a reduction in the fee for vessels that take no part in the actual fishing, but merely carry out stores and bring back shell. The chief inspector has recommended a reduction in the fee and, as I have explained, owing to the fees being fixed by schedule it is necessary to come to the House for approval. That is the whole of the Bill, a very small matter indeed. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Coverley, debate adjourned.

BILL—FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT.

Introduced by the Chief Secretary and read a first time.

BILL—TRUSTEES' POWERS.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—FIREARMS AND GUNS.

Council's Message.

Message from the Council received and read, notifying that it had agreed to the amendment made by the Assembly on Amendment No. 1 made by the Council.

BILL—MORTGAGEES' RIGHTS RESTRICTION.

In Committee.

Mr. Richardson in the Chair, the Minister for Lands in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Interpretation:

Mr. NORTH: I move an amendment—

That there be added at the end of the definition of "mortgage" the words "or otherwise."

Some contracts of sale are paid, not by instalments, but by lump sum. The amendment will meet such cases.

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

Clauses 3 to 5—agreed to.

Clause 6—Application of Act:

Mr. KENNEALLY: When the Minister was replying to the second-reading debate, I raised the question of the advisability of excluding from the operations of this measure those who come under the Tenants, Purchasers, and Mortgagors' Relief Act. Subclause 2 of this clause provides that this Bill shall not apply to any mortgage or lease to which the Tenants, Purchasers, and Mortgagors' Relief Act, 1930, is applicable. That will create the position that if the money

was raised prior to the commencement of that Act, those who raised it will not come within the purview of this measure. So if the mortgagee desired to call up the money he would be entitled to do so, since he would be specifically excluded from the provisions of this Bill.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Under the Bill the mortgagee cannot take possession of land without an order of the court, whereas in the other case the mortgagor has to make the application. It is possible that there might be some slight overlapping, but it is by no means probable, inasmuch as under the Tenants, Purchasers, and Mortgagors' Relief Act, the mortgagor has to make application, while under the Bill the mortgagee has to go to the court before he can foreclose or dispossess a man of his land. I do not think the hon. member need worry about the point, but the Chief Secretary may be able to explain it better than I have done.

Mr. KENNEALLY: Before the Chief Secretary speaks I suggest that since the Minister for Lands implies there is no reason for Subclause 2, it ought to be removed. I fear that by excluding those people from the purview of the Bill we may defeat the object of that portion of the Act, and I am sure that is not the intention of the Government. I suggest it would be safer to strike out Subclause 2.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Under the Tenants, Purchasers, and Mortgagors' Relief Act certain rights are conferred on mortgagors. If we were to pass this Bill without this Subclause 2, which preserves all those rights, it might be contended that the right given to a mortgagor under this Bill did affect the right the same mortgagor would have had under the Act recited. We want this subclause in order that there shall be no interference with the rights to which a mortgagor is entitled under the Tenants, Purchasers, and Mortgagors' Relief Act. Therefore this measure is not to affect in any way the Tenants, Purchasers, and Mortgagors' Relief Act. If a person has some right under that Act, he will retain the right, but only by reason of this subclause. Otherwise it might be contended that this measure, being a later Act of Parliament, should override the other.

Mr. SLEEMAN: A mortgagor, under the Act of last year, would not be entitled to the same benefits as a mortgagor under this measure.

The Chief Secretary: If he were, those privileges would continue.

Mr. SLEEMAN: If a mortgagor under the 1930 Act desires relief in respect of a mortgage over his dwelling, he has to apply to the court for it, whereas under this measure a mortgagee cannot call up his mortgage unless he obtains an order of the court.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The Chief Secretary's explanation does not cover the point I raised. The subclause proposes to exclude any mortgage or lease to which the Act of last year is applicable. Consequently, a person coming within the purview of the existing Act would have his rights restricted to that Act. Under that statute a mortgagor has to apply to the court, and the court may grant relief to a limited extent only. A protection order may be granted for three months and, on the expiration of that period, a further application has to be made. Such a person, however, might wish to take advantage of this measure. The existing Act is limited in its operation to December, 1931, whereas this measure is to continue until December, 1932. A mortgagor might obtain far more benefit from this measure than from the existing Act. Do the Government intend that a mortgage dating back previous to the 1st October, 1930, shall not come within the scope of this measure? If so, a mortgagee would have the right to call up his mortgage. Protective legislation of this kind should apply to all.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The Tenants, Purchasers and Mortgagors' Relief Act deals with mortgages over dwellings. This measure deals with mortgages over land.

The Minister for Lands: You could not separate a dwelling from the land.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: But the definition of mortgage in the Act of last year definitely mentions a mortgage granted over any dwelling. It seems to be a legal question as to how far one would overlap the other.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Tenants, Purchasers and Mortgagors' Relief Act gave protection as from a date in October, 1930. This measure will come into operation when proclaimed, and there will be a considerable interval between the period covered by the existing Act and by this measure when it becomes a statute. There is some difference between the definitions of "mortgage" in the two measures. In the Act of last year "mortgage" means an instrument or agreement granting security for repayment of

moneys over any dwelling, and includes an agreement for sale of a dwelling which has not been completed by conveyance or transfer and under which the purchase money is payable by instalments, but not by way of rent. In this Bill "mortgage" is defined as security granted over any land, and also an agreement for the sale of land which has not been completed by conveyance or transfer under which the purchase money is payable by instalments, whether such instalments are described as rent or otherwise. If a mortgagor came within the purview of last year's Act, he would be entitled to exercise his rights. Any statute contradicting an earlier law must be taken to repeal it.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: Subclause 2 would specifically debar any repeal.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes, and that is the object we wish to achieve. We want to enable persons having rights under the 1930 Act to exercise them.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: The conditions under this Bill are much more liberal.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Then a person could exercise his rights under this measure.

Mr. Kenneally: No, he would be excluded by Subclause 2.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If it was a mortgage of a dwelling as distinguished from a mortgage of land—though it is difficult to see how there could be a mortgage of a dwelling apart from land—and relief could be obtained under the existing Act, it would not come under this measure. The two measures provide different remedies, though there is a point of contact. I suggest that, as there is some doubt, the question should be deferred to permit of further consideration.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: The two measures differ in that this Bill places the responsibility for foreclosure on the mortgagee.

The Chief Secretary: That is only a matter of procedure.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: Under the Act of last year, the responsibility was on the mortgagor to make application. This measure is more liberal in the protection provided for mortgagors. The Bill protects people who are subject to a mortgage, and under it the mortgagee cannot do anything against the interests of the mortgagor. A mortgagee under this Bill cannot foreclose on a mortgagor without leave of the court. If he did so, the mortgagor would say, "You have no right to foreclose because of this legislation." The other man would say, "I have a right to foreclose unless you take action. Your case comes under the Tenants' and Mortgagors' Act, and that Act bars you from coming under the provisions of this later legislation." If people are given better conditions under this Bill than under the Tenants, Mortgagors and Purchasers' Relief Act, it is very much better they should retain those conditions. It would do no harm to delete the subclause.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The subclause could be worded in a manner to preserve all existing rights under the Tenants, Purchasers and Mortgagors' Relief Act. It would be unwise not to preserve the rights of all parties who acquired rights under that Act. The subclause could be merely one to preserve existing rights.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I know it is desired to pass the third reading of this Bill as quickly as possible. The safest course would be to delete the subclause, and, if it were found to be a necessary part of the Bill, it could be reinserted in another place.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It is necessary to hurry this Bill through both Houses as quickly as possible. After this no one is likely to use the Tenants, Purchasers and Mortgagors' Relief Act, except as it applies to rent. What we want to do is to preserve any rights that people have under that Act. I will get the Chief Secretary to go into the question with the Crown Solicitor and draft something that will meet requirements.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Then it is understood, if we let this pass, it will be reviewed in another place.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I will undertake to discuss the matter with a chosen member of the Opposition, so that we can draft an amendment that will be satisfactory.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 7 to 10—agreed to.

Clause 11—Restriction of rights of creditors to issue execution against land:

Mr. SAMPSON: This clause may impose an injustice on a judgment creditor, who would be deprived of any rights he may have in respect of a judgment debtor's land if he obtained judgment in excess of £50. Unless something is done to protect the

judgment creditor, the debtor would have opportunities to transfer or otherwise deal with the land, notwithstanding the judgment. A judgment creditor should be allowed to register his rights or warrant of execution against the land, which could remain so registered until the judgment was satisfied. This would entail an amendment to Section 14 of the Transfer of Land Act Amendment Act, 1909. I do not want to see the rights of the judgment creditor lost, and propose to move an amendment to provide that the writ would be held in suspense until some later period, and so prevent the land from being transferred or otherwise dealt with. I move an amendment—

That the following proviso be added:—"Provided that the judgment creditor shall be permitted to register his writ of fi. fa. or warrant of execution against the land, such judgment to remain so registered until the judgment is satisfied.

Mr. Withers: You mean until Judgment Day.

Mr. PARKER: The clause should be amended. As it now stands, a man cannot issue any process of execution. It is the usual practice to issue a writ of fi. fa. straight away, and put it against the land to prevent any dealings in it until judgment is secured. The clause prevents this in the case of any amount over £50. It should be amended to provide that a person may register his writ of fi. fa., but not act upon it for the time being. It is also necessary to extend the time over which the warrant or fi. fa. holds good.

Mr. Kenneally: You should not keep a sword over a man's head all the while.

Mr. PARKER: But it is all a question of protection for the public. The present system is working very well. If a man has a just debt to pay he should make arrangements accordingly, so that it is not a question of a sword hanging over his head. In my opinion, it is essential to amend the clause so as to adequately protect the judgment creditor.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It is not correct to say that the clause as drafted will prevent any judgment creditor issuing a process where the sum to be recovered exceeds £50. It will only prevent him doing so except by leave of the Supreme Court. It is obvious that the restriction is limited to those cases in which a judge of the Supreme Court thinks the restriction should apply. Secondly, in order to give effect to the amendment moved by the member for Swan, it would be necessary to amend the Transfer of Land Act. Otherwise his remedy would be ineffective, because at the end of four months it would cease to operate.

Mr. Sampson: It would be improper to allow the clause to go through as it is.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The amendment suggested by the hon. member by itself would be valueless. I think he explained that.

Mr. Sampson: I think I already explained that to the Minister.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Then I presume he understands the position still better. It seems to me that the hon. member has ignored the fact that a judge would be scarcely likely to refuse leave where protection was required.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: Would not a caveat assist?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not know that it would be appropriate. The judge could make an order allowing the judgment creditor to proceed on condition that after the order was issued it would lie dormant. It would not be any protection for the public in the sense that a search at the Titles Office would not reveal any order against the property because that order would be through another department. In the present crisis, we shall be faced with all kinds of difficulties and no doubt anyone buying land will make a more complete search than in normal times. Speaking not on behalf of the Government who are submitting the Bill, but as amicus curiae, I assure the member for Swan that his amendment, if agreed to, would be quite valueless unless another Act were amended, and no Bill for that purpose is before the House.

Mr. SAMPSON: I disagree with the Minister with reference to the search. My amendment merely asks that judgment shall be held in suspense. A caveat would not achieve what is required, for that process is for a different purpose. After judgment has been issued, there is nothing in Clause 11 to prevent the owner of the land from disposing of it. There is the further point regarding the writ lasting for four months only. I suggest my amendment is reasonable, even if it means that the Transfer of Land Act will have to be amended.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The amendment does not appeal to me. Cases that will be dealt

with under the provisions of the Bill will be of a varying description. The Bill wisely provides that certain procedure shall be adopted, and the court will have full power to deal with applications according to circumstances. Relief will not be granted unless it is just and equitable. Even so, the court can impose terms and conditions. Naturally a solicitor making application to the court would see that steps were taken to adequately protect his client. We should leave the clause in general terms.

Mr. PARKER: There seems to be a misunderstanding. First of all the clause means building up law costs against the man who is endeavouring to get his money, because after judgment is obtained, there will be a number of affidavits and applications to the court, all of which mean additional cost and delay. The business will be done hurriedly I suggest the clause be redrafted so as to allow warrants to issue, but execution shall be subject to an order of the judge. That means that effect will not be given to the warrant unless the court grants permission. That would be a more reasonable and cheaper way. The phase regarding the four month period to which the member for Swan has referred, is rather a serious matter because when a warrant is lodged, a party is required to sell the land within four months, at the end of which period the warrant ceases to have effect. Even if it means an amendment to the Transfer of Land Act, that position could be dealt with.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: While I do not pretend to have any great legal knowledge, I would point out that when the Bill was drafted, consideration was given to Clause 8 along the lines referred to by the member for East Perth. It was considered that a judge would take any steps deemed necessary to protect the rights of the mortgagee as well as those of the mortgagor. The same applies to Clause 11. The court will not grant relief unless it is fair and equitable that such relief should be afforded. A judge will have to take into consideration that a person who is going to obtain relief is not going to secure it by imposing on someone else. I assure the hon. member that if it is found there is insufficient protection an amendment can be inserted in another place. The Commissioner of Titles drafted the Bill and he must have had a knowledge of what he was doing.

Mr. SAMPSON: I am positive that the clause will have to be amended. The difficulty is that it cannot be amended here because it is desired to pass the Bill through its remaining stages to-night. I have no desire to impede its progress and so I suggest that the Minister give the House an assurance that he will discuss the matter with the Leader of another place with the object of having inserted, when it reaches the other House, the necessary amendment to Clause 11.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I will give an undertaking that I will discuss the clause with Dr. Stow. He may not have viewed it from the aspect raised by the hon. member. If it should be necessary to do so we will draft an amendment, have it inserted in another place, and we shall then have the opportunity to discuss it here again.

Mr. SAMPSON: By permission of the House I will withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clauses 12 to 19, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

Suspension of Standing Orders.

On motion by the Minister for Lands, so much of the Standing Orders suspended as to enable the Bill to be taken through its remaining stages at the present sitting.

Recommittal.

On motion by Minister for Lands, Bill recommitted for the purpose of further considering Clause 2.

In Committee.

Mr. Richardson in the Chair, the Minister for Lands in charge of the Bill.

Clause 2—Interpretation:

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I move—

That in line 13 the words "or otherwise" be struck out.

We can strike out these words which were inserted in the Committee stage a little while ago and that will enable us to get the Bill through its remaining stages and another place will be able to deal with it to-morrow. The two words can be re-inserted in another place.

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

Bill again reported with a further amendment and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

BILL—ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

MR. MILLINGTON (Mt. Hawthorn) [5.56]: The Bill has been introduced to give the Minister power to appoint a knocker-down at the Midland Abattoirs. I remember being accused by the present Premier of introducing legislation of a trifling nature. I will not describe this as being trifling, but it comes perilously close to that definition. What I want to know is not so much about the power that is being asked by the Minister, which might be all right, but why it should be necessary to pass a special Act of Parliament to give the Minister authority he already possesses. Undoubtedly if under the present Abattoirs Act the Minister has not the power to regulate the knocking-down of bullocks in the works he controls, I do not know that any other special Act or an amendment to the Abattoirs Act will give him that power. Undeniably, he can carry out his desire by an amicable arrangement, and that is being done at the other two abattoirs—Kalgoorlie and Fremantle—by a Government employee who works under an Arbitration Court award. He is classed as a slaughterman's labourer, and there is no difficulty. A difficulty exists at Midland Junction where there are those who do not conform to the award, the slaughterman's section being a section of that award. Under that award the slaughterman's labourer is the man who is qualified to knock down bullocks. But the difficulty there is that there are certain knockers who are working under contract. Thereby they contravene the award; they take a contract to kill and there are no means for enforcing the award or ensuring that either butchers or slaughtermen or those doing the contracting conform to the award rates. Because of that boys are employed by the contractors to do the knocking-down, and of course the boys are incompetent; but I am sure that the slaughtermen's labourers who do the work are thoroughly competent, and that in their case no cruelty occurs in connection with the knocking-down of bullocks. The whole difficulty has arisen because of those who endeavour to evade the award and employ boys or others incompetent to do the knocking-down. The whole difficulty could be overcome, without an Act of Parliament, by the simple issue of a regulation that no one without the qualifications of a slaughterman's labourer shall knock down a bullock. I do not know whether the Minister intends to go further than is suggested in the marginal note reading—

> No person shall knock down cattle unless appointed by the Minister.

The clause, however, says—

> "Knocking down" means the dealing of a blow to any animal.

Hon. A. McCallum: What is a man to do if a bullock attacks him? If he knocks the bullock down, he breaks the law.

Mr. MILLINGTON: I was going to suggest that this should not apply to animals other than oxen. I presume the power is required for the knocking-down of oxen only. The Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals have suggested that sheep should be stunned before being bled. I do not know whether the Minister intends to take power to comply with that request. I assume, however, that the marginal note is right, and that the clause will be restricted to oxen.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: It might also apply to sticking pigs.

Mr. H. W. Mann: It is quite possible with pigs, but not with sheep.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: Sometimes there is a lot of trouble with pigs.

Mr. H. W. Mann: It is quite possible to stun pigs.

Mr. MILLINGTON: Does the Minister intend to appoint a Government employee to do the whole of the knocking-down at Midland Junction? Is that why this additional power is required?

The Minister for Agriculture: Do you want an answer to that question now?

Mr. MILLINGTON: Certainly. It makes all the difference. At present there are slaughtermen's labourers whose business it is to drive the stock up. Are they to stand by while the Government employee knocks bullocks down? That work is part of their business, and they can do it. If a Government employee does the whole of the knocking-down, the contractors who are now evad-

ing the award and so working under cheaper conditions than the master butchers who conform to the award will be given an advantage. They will not need to employ slaughtermen's labourers, whereas master butchers do at present employ slaughtermen's labourers with the slaughtermen. If the clause means merely that the Minister desires to ensure that competent men shall do the work, there is no objection. He can then issue a license to a slaughterman's labourer who is competent, and refuse it to one who is not. As to the slaughtering of stock there has to be an amicable arrangement between the master butchers regarding the slaughterman. The master butchers have to take it in turn to drive up their bullocks in lots of, say, three. As one lot are driven up, the slaughterman's labourer knocks them down and the slaughtering proceeds while the other master butcher takes his turn. If the master butchers have to depend on one man, the amicable arrangement may to some extent be dislocated. I do not know that the whole difficulty cannot be overcome by a regulation from the Controller of Abattoirs, who I presume is chiefly anxious not to offend those who do the killing by contract. If the Minister wishes to alter the existing system at Midland Junction to the system operating in Fremantle and Kalgoorlie, by appointing a Government employee, it will mean the appointment at Midland Junction of an additional man for whom there is not full-time work. The slaughterman's labourer will still be necessary, and will have to stand by while the Government employee does the work. I wish to make further inquiries into the matter. I presume this is not one of the Bills which need to be rushed through. I am rather suspicious as to why an amendment of the Act is required. It seems to me that the Minister must have encountered some opposition to his proposal, and finding that he cannot carry it out by agreement he proposes to do it by an enactment. At present there is considerable difficulty at the Midland Junction abattoirs, because the master slaughtermen who observe the award are naturally at a disadvantage as compared with those who dodge its conditions and do the work at contract rates which are not disclosed. Therefore it seems to me there must be something behind this proposal other than the power sought. It is only at Midland Junction that a section of the masters are dodging the award, and it is only there this question has arisen. I do not think the Minister should by an enactment assist those who are dodging the Arbitration Court award, and give them an advantage over those who observe the award. I know that to some extent the members of the union are to blame; but they say that they are forced into the position and that, other work not being available, they have taken on this contract at rates unknown. Undoubtedly they are working below the rates prescribed by the award, but that fact does not make the meat killed at the Midland Junction abattoirs any cheaper to the public. The retail butchers may pay a little less, but there is no advantage to the public. The Minister would do well to be careful before disturbing the existing conditions of work at the Midland Junction abattoirs. There should be some valid reason before that is done. Therefore I ask him the pertinent question whether under this Bill he proposes to license competent men already employed as slaughtermen's labourers, or proposes to displace those men, prohibit them from doing that work, and appoint a new man to do the whole of the knocking-down? Unless I can get the assurance I require, I shall certainly oppose the Bill. Otherwise I have no objection to it. Men appointed to do the knocking-down should certainly have the qualifications of a slaughterman's labourer. That is the case at Kalgoorlie and Fremantle, and the men receive the pay of a slaughterman's labourer. I wish to be assured that the Bill will be restricted to the knocking-down of oxen, and that the men already doing the work properly shall not be displaced. I am given to understand that some of them are 100 per cent. efficient. The extremely competent man employed at Wyndham has, I believe, been known to take as many as four whacks at a bullock with a particularly thick skull. It shows that one cannot always depend on the first crack. What complaints has the Minister had on the subject? They must have been drastic, to warrant the introduction of this Bill. Will the Minister say that the qualified slaughtermen's labourers at the Midland Junction abattoirs are incompetent and have been responsible for the infliction of undue pain in slaughtering? I think the hon. gentleman, if he inquires, will find that the whole difficulty has arisen from those who do the work by contract and employ incompetent labourers at less than union

rates. I hope the Minister will permit time for full inquiry.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [7.30]: On many occasions from time to time there have been criticisms of the methods adopted in the slaughtering of stock. I warmly welcome the amendment brought down by the Minister. I am not particularly concerned whether the person who shall be authorised to knock down any animal in any abattoir shall be appointed or shall be approved, so long as one or other of those principles is adopted. Apart from what I have read and been able to learn of the methods adopted in other countries, I have no personal knowledge of the actual carrying on of slaughtering in our own abattoirs. As I have said, there have been many criticisms in the Press of what is stated to be unnecessary cruelty, and grisly tales have been told of the inefficient method adopted in stunning the beasts to be slaughtered for food.

The Minister for Agriculture: The tales have been exaggerated.

Mr. SAMPSON: I am glad to hear that, but I welcome the Bill, for it will mean that no person will be permitted to knock down an animal unless he has been appointed by the Minister. Then we shall no longer hear the statements repeated that those carrying out this work have aimed many blows at the head of a beast before it has been rendered unconscious. All over the world the importance of more humane killing is being stressed. When, with the Minister for Lands, I visited the Birmingham Agricultural Show, we had an opportunity to learn something of the methods adopted in countries perhaps more advanced than our own. In the Old Country, in the United States, and in Canada there has been considerable improvement in the method of killing.

Mr. Marshall: How do they kill the goats in Malta?

Mr. SAMPSON: It is not necessary to go into that. From the utilitarian standpoint there is the important point that injuries done to the beast detract from the food value of the meat. That always results when an animal is tortured, and there has been torture, if what we hear is true. I will support the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Angelo in the Chair, the Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—No person to knock down cattle unless appointed by the Minister:

Mr. SLEEMAN: On the second reading I understood the Minister to say that at Fremantle and Kalgoorlie the knocking-down was done in a natural manner, but that at Midland Junction the method adopted was not so satisfactory. The Bill, it seems, is to apply to Midland Junction; but there are other places besides Midland Junction where slaughtering is done, and I want to know what the Minister proposes to do about those places. Surely it is just as bad to slaughter stock by wrong methods at Katanning as it is at Midland Junction. In small towns it might be difficult to administer the Bill, but in all large centres where stock is slaughtered the Bill should be made to apply.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: In the metropolitan area, to which the Bill applies, there are abattoirs at Fremantle and at Midland Junction. What I want is to ensure that the same system shall apply at Midland Junction as applies at Fremantle and Kalgoorlie. That is the whole purpose of the Bill. If, as time goes on, it becomes necessary to have other abattoir districts proclaimed, that can then be done.

Mr. SLEEMAN: It seems the Minister has an idea that Midland Junction is the only place where slaughtering is not done properly and efficiently. I say it is just as bad to ill-treat a beast at Bunbury or at Albany as it is at Midland Junction.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is a matter for the police.

Mr. SLEEMAN: If the Minister desires to prevent animals from being tortured, he should make the Bill apply to the whole State; not restrict it to any particular centre.

Mr. MILLINGTON: What does the Minister propose to do if this additional power be given? We are entitled to know whether he proposes to appoint a full-time man to do the knocking-down, or whether he proposes to grant permits to competent slaughtermen's labourers who at present do the work, and thus prohibit incompetents from doing it. Does he propose to take

away the work from competent men who have been doing it, and appoint somebody else to do it?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It is not of vital importance what my intentions may be, whether to license one man to do the work at Midland Junction or whether to license every slaughterman's labourer who is competent to do the work. What I intend to do in the future should not enter into consideration at this stage. The member for Mt. Hawthorn, when in charge of the department, attempted but failed to do what I am now seeking to do. He failed because the employees prevented him from carrying it out, just as they have prevented me, in turn. This is the only method by which it can be done. Owing to the conditions existing at Midland Junction the Controller of Abattoirs supplies the abattoirs space and the butchers do their own killing. The controller cannot interfere with the operation of slaughtering. If there is any unnecessary cruelty, it is the duty of the police to take action, as they have done on several occasions at Midland Junction, where there has been some little cruelty, but no great torture, as the member for Fremantle suggested. I want to do away with any cruelty at all.

Mr. Sleeman: In one town only.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: In the only abattoir in the State over which I have control and where there is need for improvement. Actually I have control over three abattoirs, but in two of them, Fremantle and Kalgoorlie, what I propose is already in existence.

Mr. MILLINGTON: I want the Minister to tell us what he proposes to do when he gets this power. It is true that in my time as Minister the officials put up this very proposal. I consulted those concerned, and they satisfied me that it was not practicable. Even now, I think that instead of overcoming the difficulty it will set up another difficulty. The Minister is not prepared to comply with an Arbitration Court award. He proposes to evade it. This is another instance of invalidating an Arbitration Court award. I thought the only valid reason for doing that was the depression. I cannot see that the Minister is entitled to contract outside the Act. Slaughtermen are provided for in the existing award, while slaughtermen's labourers are particularly mentioned and this is part of their work. If the award applied all round, there would be no difficulty, but there are contractors working at Midland Junction—the only place where they are working—and that is where the trouble has occurred. Instead of slaughtermen's labourers doing the work incompetents and boys are employed.

The Minister for Agriculture: Are not the men at Fremantle and Kalgoorlie complying with the award?

Mr. MILLINGTON: Yes, because there is no contracting at those abattoirs.

The Minister for Agriculture: The same men could do it at Midland Junction.

Mr. MILLINGTON: Certain contractors are evading the award. A slaughterman must have a labourer while working on beef, and the award provides that the labourer shall be employed full time on other work. The contractors employ, not slaughtermen's labourers, but boys.

Mr. H. W. Mann: Will not the Bill do away with the boys?

Mr. MILLINGTON: No. If a man is engaged to do all the knocking down, there will be no need for slaughtermen's labourers and the butchers will carry on with boys. As the Minister will not tell us what he proposes to do, I move an amendment—

> That the following proviso be added:—"Provided that no person shall be appointed for the purpose specified who is not employed as a slaughterman's labourer and subject to the conditions set out in the arbitration award dealing with the slaughtering industry."

I wish to ensure that the measure will not be used to over-ride an award. If the Minister would promise to grant a permit to the men already engaged in the industry, I would have no objection to the clause.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I cannot accept the amendment. No valid reason has been given for it. What would be my position if I wanted to employ an expert who had been knocking down cattle at Wyndham, Fremantle or Kalgoorlie, who was not a member of the union and not a slaughterman's labourer? It would be farcical.

Mr. MILLINGTON: The objection is not valid. The men who do the knocking down at Fremantle and Kalgoorlie are slaughtermen's labourers and members of the union.

Mr. Sleeman: And also those at Wyndham.

Mr. MILLINGTON: Yes. The fact of the Minister's opposing the amendment makes

me suspicious that he may flout the conditions of the award. Does the Minister wish to over-ride the award?

Mr. KENNEALLY: Unless the Minister desires to evade the award, he could do as he proposes by regulation.

Mr. Millington: Of course he could.

Mr. KENNEALLY: In the absence of an undertaking such as the member for Mt. Hawthorn has requested, the Minister lays himself open to the suspicion that he wishes to do something that he cannot do by regulation.

The Minister for Agriculture: I prefer to take the advice of the Crown Law Department rather than of the hon. member.

Mr. KENNEALLY: We are entitled to know where it is leading us. If the Minister has not the desired power, why does he not take us into his confidence? On the second reading he admitted that the work was being done competently. A little trouble occurred at Midland Junction, but not until the contracting system came into operation. Those who are working under the contract system evidently desire to put on Tom, Dick and Harry so as to avoid complying with the arbitration conditions.

Mr. H. W. Mann: Are not they doing it now?

Mr. KENNEALLY: This would give them the backing of the law. The Minister would be able to appoint anyone he desired to do the work, and when a change of Government occurred, his successor could appoint another man. Already this session there has been too much legislation to over-ride awards.

Mr. Doney: I believe it would take one man one hour per day to do the knocking down.

Mr. KENNEALLY: That might be so.

Mr. Doney: Then it could not interfere too much with existing conditions.

Mr. KENNEALLY: That would depend upon the number of bullocks killed.

Mr. Doney: The number is 25,000 a year, equal to about 100 per working day.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The award should be observed. The men now doing the work and provided for in the award should be permitted to continue. We are justified in being suspicious, particularly in view of our previous experience at Midland Junction. Until the contract system came into operation there we had no difficulty. Some Minister may now give all the work to the contractors and may refuse to give any slaughterman's labourer a permit. That will operate against the industry. Unless the Minister can give the assurance asked for I propose to vote for the proviso.

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

Ayes	.. .. ..	12
Noes	.. .. ..	20
Majority against	..	8

AYES.

Mr. Hegney	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Millington	Mr. Withers
Mr. Munsie	Mr. Corboy
	(*Teller.*)

NOES.

Mr. Barnard	Mr. McLarty
Mr. Brown	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Doney	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Latham	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Thorn
Mr. H. W. Mann	Mr. Wells
Mr. J. I. Mann	Mr. North
	(*Teller.*)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Wilson	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Panton	Mr. Parker
Mr. Walker	Mr. J. H. Smith

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

MOTION—SECESSION, REFERENDUM.

Debate resumed from 16th June on the following motion by Mr. H. W. Mann (Perth) as amended:—

That in the opinion of this House the Government should introduce a Bill to enable a referendum of the electors of Western Australia to be taken on the question:—"Are you in favour of Western Australia withdrawing from the Federation?"

MR. GRIFFITHS (Avon) [8.7]: I support the motion, and shall presently give cogent and substantial reasons for doing so. I shall also deal with the reasons which have prompted people to make this request. Before dealing with that phase I will show what led up to the motion being moved. It is practically stating the obvious to say that

there has been a long succession of repudiations of the letter, the spirit and the provisions of the Constitution of the Commonwealth over the last 20 years. This fact has become increasingly apparent to the minds of the people, and there is an ever-growing demand amongst them for a change. I will enumerate some of the things which have happened to cause this motion to be moved. In the first place there was a big rally at His Majesty's Theatre. The building was full to overflowing from the stalls to the gallery. Only once before have I seen a larger crowd in Perth, and that was when Mr. W. M. Hughes passed through on his way from England during the war. An enthusiastic meeting was then held in Pier-street. Three luncheon-hour addresses have been given in the town hall, the speakers being Mr. Hartney, Colonel Brazier and Mr. H. K. Watson. Last year's Primary Producers' Conference passed almost unanimously, after a heated debate, a motion in favour of secession and a referendum being taken. Another resolution was carried by the Wheat Growers' Union, the meeting being 100 per cent. in favour of secession. Then there was a deputation to the Premier, including representatives of every walk in life and every shade of political opinion from Labour to Country Party. The Katanning Road Board held a meeting, and circularised other road boards to hold similar meetings, urging that a referendum be taken. The Retail Grocers' Association passed a resolution favouring the same thing, and the Municipal Association and the National Party adopted the same course. An experimental canvass has been taken in Nedlands. Out of 680 people approached 651 signified themselves as being in favour of the referendum. Some 5,000 signatures have come into the office of the Dominion League, also urging that a referendum be taken. We believe from the information in our hands, and from experimental canvasses, that fully 80 per cent. of the people will be found to favour secession.

Mr. Wansbrough: Then you will wake up.

Mr. Angelo: How many branches of the league are there?

Mr. GRIFFITHS: There are 55. At the convention which was held yesterday 91 delegates were present. Certain people in this State are saying that this is simply the outcome of a noisy minority. I think when we reach the next general elections, if a referendum is not taken in the meantime, it will be found that this so-called noisy minority will prove to be a very substantial majority.

Mr. Wansbrough: I do not think so.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Perhaps the hon. member will have a rude awakening. Despite what the papers declare about this minority, I say that a very substantial majority of the people are utterly dissatisfied with the present condition of affairs. I do not think any member of this Chamber is satisfied with it. Something is wrong. The only plea put forward is that we cannot get out of Federation. If we are to lie down and merely say we cannot get out of it, we may as well remain hewers of wood and drawers of water for all time, and be the vassals of the other States.

Mr. Withers: We have to be shown the way first.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I will give the hon. member some information on the point.

Mr. Withers: I hope you can.

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Amongst other places meetings have been held at Geraldton, Busselton, Perenjori, Dalwallinu, Ballidu, Wongan Hills, Midland Junction (2), Bruce Rock (2), Kulin, Merredin (2), and other towns too numerous to mention. In the aggregate some 25,000 people have attended these meetings. At every meeting a motion has been carried unanimously in favour of a referendum being taken, and in favour of secession. I will now give some reasons that prompted people to come forward, and urge that steps should be taken to bring about a better state of affairs. The first charge that is made, and with which I agree, is in regard to the unfair distribution of revenues between the Commonwealth and the States, amounting practically to legalised robbery. I say that advisedly. Legal means have been found by various subterfuges to conceal large surplusses and devote them to purposes other than their return to the States, as was originally intended by the agreement we entered into when Federation was brought about. Sections 81 and 94 of the Commonwealth Constitution should be read in conjunction to show how the Constitution has been flouted and how the States have been cheated. Section 18 reads—

> All revenues or moneys raised or received by the executive of the Government of the Commonwealth shall form one consolidated revenue fund to be appropriated for the purposes of the Commonwealth in the manner

and subject to the liabilities and charges imposed by this Constitution.

That should be read in conjunction with Section 94 of the Constitution, which refers to the return of surplus revenue to the State. That section reads—

> After five years from the imposition of uniform duties of Customs and Excise, the Parliament may provide, on such basis as it deems fair, for the monthly payment to the several States of all surplus revenue of the Commonwealth.

It is significant that while following closely the Constitution of the United States of America, the framers of the Australian Constitution were careful to make one departure from the United States provisions, seeing that the latter contained the words, "or for the general welfare of the United States." It was considered that the inclusion of those words widened the appropriation powers of the Central Government of the United States of America. The omission of those words from our Constitution, and the tenor of the debates throughout the whole of the pre-Federal conventions, showed that the intention was in strict accordance with the words used in the Constitution. and that the powers of appropriation of the Commonwealth were to be limited to the purposes set out in the Constitution. It is noteworthy that in the United States, notwithstanding the greater powers vested in Congress, the great bulk of the revenue-raising is carried out by the States, and, generally speaking, the American Constitution recognises to a greater extent than is apparent in Australia, the obligations of the States towards the common taxpayers. In reading Quick & Garran's "Commentary" on the question of appropriations, we find some extraordinary conditions referred to as indicating how wide the appropriation powers of the Commonwealth were deemed to be. The boundless powers of appropriation are illustrated in such extraordinary directions as the Belgian grant, the Polar Expedition grant, the maternity bonus, the Bureau of Agriculture grant, and the grant for the Bureau of Scientific Research. I have read Section 94, which has to be taken in conjunction with Section 81, and it will be seen that our Constitution does not include the words that appear in the American Constitution relating to the general welfare of the country. That clearly shows that it was the intention of the framers of the Constitution to limit possible extravagances on the part of future Federal Governments. On a previous occasion, when opposing the Financial Agreement, I read extracts from various speakers to demonstrate the great anxiety displayed by those who attended the Federal Conventions at which the Constitution was framed, that restraint should be placed upon the Federal Treasury and no loophole left whereby the States should be deprived of what was rightfully theirs. At one conference Sir John Forrest said very fairly—

> There is no reason to suppose that the Federal Executive will squander money that is handed over to them in trust, so to speak, in building arsenals and forts, and by those means place the colonies in a position it would be difficult for them to pay their way.

I would point out that a lot of the surplus revenue has been appropriated by the Commonwealth Government in that very direction. Then, again, Mr. Isaacs, as he then was, said—

> If we are to preserve the Federation and not to expose the States to annihilation—and that is what complete control of the revenue might lead to—we ought to be very careful to do what I sought to do the other evening, ... the absolute necessity, if the consent of the States is to be obtained to a Commonwealth Constitution, of the States being made in some way secure from annihilation.

Sir George Turner, speaking particularly to the point, said—

> As the Bill now stands, the Federal Treasurer would have ample power to spend money in the erection and creation of arsenals and military colleges, and matters of that kind, which would eat up a large portion of the revenue. There could be no doubt that he would be extremely liable to have pressure brought to bear upon him to spend money in military and other directions, especially in times when there was anything like a war scare.

The member for Geraldton (Hon. J. C. Willcock), when I was quoting extracts some time ago, asked me to be more up to date. There is no reason to be more up to date on such a subject, because we must see what was the intention of those who framed the Commonwealth Constitution. For that reason I am quoting from the debates that took place at the time. Mr. C. C. Kingston made use of the following words:—

> You place a tremendous power in the hands of the Federal Government and the Federal Parliament in enabling them to regulate the mode of distribution of whatever surplus they

may have left, among the various States. I am appalled, and I use the word advisedly, at the contemplation of the possibilities which may arise out of such a state of things. The temptation to waste and extravagance is almost shocking.

Mr. Marshall: You are making a speech by reading what others have said.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I will make my speech in my own way.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will get on much better if he addresses the Chair.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Mr. Kingston proceeded—

> However honest the Federal Government and the Federal Parliament may be—and I attribute to them every honesty—with a sum of between £4,000,000 and £5,000,000 to work upon, we know there are possibilities, if not probabilities, of waste to the States which are interested in the surplus, and we shall be failing in our duty if we do not attempt to provide against that as far as we possibly can.

There are many others whose remarks I could quote as well. What a difference is disclosed in the statement by Mr. Kingston compared with the position to-day. At the outset it was contemplated that the Commonwealth would have between £4,000,000 and £5,000,000. Whatever the fiscal policy of the States may have been, they depended generally upon the revenue derived from Customs and Excise. It was recognised that, with the handing over of the complete authority in these matters to the Commonwealth authorities, it would possibly lead to acute difficulties in the raising of funds for State purposes. It must not be forgotten that the specific matters handed over to the Commonwealth's control were never intended to absorb such a large percentage of the revenue. It was not contemplated that the Commonwealth activities would encroach so largely upon the State activities or upon the revenue that would be available to the States. It was thought that one quarter of the returns from Customs and Excise should be devoted to Commonwealth purposes. Permanent arrangements were made on definite principles, and those definite principles have been flouted, and the surplus revenue referred to in Section 94 of the Commonwealth Constitution has been devoted to purposes other than rightful ones. Those permanent provisions based on definite principles have been flagrantly violated by all Commonwealth Governments for the past 20 years. Quick and Garran, Professor Harrison Moore, Professor Peden, who holds the Chair of Law at the Sydney University and was chairman of the Royal Commission that reported on the Commonwealth Constitution, and two other legal members of that commission, are all agreed that the meaning of Section 94 of the Commonwealth Constitution is that Parliament is free to provide a basis of distribution, and that, on one basis or another, the Federal Government are compelled to distribute all surplus revenue amongst the States. By all sorts of subterfuges, large sums of money that should have been handed to the States have been used for other purposes. The very existence of such surpluses has provoked the Commonwealth to unmitigated extravagance and has led all Governments to embark upon undertakings entirely outside the scope of the Commonwealth and in defiance of the letter and spirit of the provisions of the Constitution. There has been money to burn. Whilst the States were compelled to borrow to meet public obligations that should have been discharged out of revenue, the Commonwealth has well and truly burnt the money at their disposal. Reference to the Commonwealth Year Books disclosed that in 1915-16 there was a surplus of £3,000,000: in 1917-18, nearly £2,000,000; in 1919-20, over £2,000,000; in 1920-21, a surplus of £893,521; in 1922-23, over £1,000,000, and in 1923-24, there was a surplus of over £2,500,000. I remarked just now that by a system of legalised robbery and manipulation, Commonwealth funds that should have gone to the States in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution, have been retained by the Commonwealth for various purposes. New South Wales took action against the Commonwealth to recover £160.000 that the State claimed as money payable by the Commonwealth on account of surplus revenue for the month of June, 1908, but the Federal High Court held that when moneys are duly appropriated out of Consolidated Revenue and allotted for special purposes, such as defence, old age pensions, etc., they might be treated as Commonwealth expenditure in the taking of accounts and the ascertainment of surplus revenue. The court, therefore, held that the Surplus Revenue Act of 1908 was a valid exercise of Federal power. We have in this State an example of how the Commonwealth wasted the revenue at

their disposal, money that should have gone to the States. There is the Henderson Naval Base where £720,970 has gone into the sea. There was the submarine scandal in which huge sums of money were wasted, and then there was the wicked waste at Jervis Bay.

Mr. Marshall: There was wicked waste at the Peel Estate.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: That is so, but I am not dealing with this matter from the standpoint of political parties at all. I am dealing with it from a Western Australian point of view, irrespective of party politics. The other day I read in the Press that Mr. Scullin had naively suggested that we should do away with the Agents Generals' offices in London on which the States spent £53,000 a year. On Australia House alone the Commonwealth have spent £150,000 annually. I am glad to see that the authorities are waking up at this stage and are cutting out much of that expenditure. I am enlarging on these matters, because I think the appropriation of the surplus revenue represents one of the most grievous charges that we can level against the Commonwealth Government. When we think of the wasteful extravagance that has been undertaken, we must remember the £7,000,000 spent in the construction of the trans-Australian line, which could have been constructed for £3,000,000 if the tender of Smith & Timms had been accepted. Then there is the wild cat capital at Canberra, which has cost the Australian people over £11,000,000 to date. There is the Northern Territory accumulated deficit which has accounted for another £11,000,000. Then we must remember the dreadful muddle the Federal authorities made of the war service homes on which over £12,000,000 was spent, and in the end they had to ask the States to take over the scheme.

Mr. Hegney: Which party was responsible for that?

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I have pointed out that I am not dealing with parties, but with the position as it has obtained under all Federal Governments. On the disastrous shipping venture, £8,000,000 was lost by the Federal Government and a further £30,000,000 has been spent on an inflated bureaucracy. There are three essentials of any federation: 1, The just balancing of the political powers of the parties; 2, the distribution of revenues according to responsibilities; 3, the securing of equal treatment of all parties under the laws of federation. We have very much to complain about in regard to all the things I have mentioned. I have said enough about the first charge.

Mr. Marshall: When are you going to start on the reasons for the referendum?

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I shall give the reasons why we have asked for a referendum, and I shall give reasons that will take some answering. If the hon. member expects to be able to explain away those reasons, he is more clever than I am.

Mr. Marshall: That is not flattering me.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Section 99 of the Commonwealth Constitution dealing with bonuses says—

> The Commonwealth shall not by any law or regulation of trade, commerce or revenue give preference to one State or part thereof over another State or any part thereof.

That is one thing about which we should be pretty sore, the direct assistance given to all the States during the past seven years. This amounted to no less a sum than £3,620,226, and of that sum Western Australia's quota was £37,746. This huge total was handed out to assist cotton, cotton yarn, iron and steel, sulphur, canned fruit, wine export and cattle export. Then there was assistance given under the Export Guarantee Act. This totalled £366,303, and of that sum Western Australia got £86. That total of £366,303 went towards assisting brown millet, canned fruits, the hop industry, citrus fruits, Doradilla grapes, Chanez grapes and herd testing. Western Australia received £6 for Chanez grapes and £80 for herd testing. Under "Other direct assistance" a sum of £987,014 was handed out, and of that total Western Australia got £57,378, mainly as rinderpest compensation, which, too, was entirely a Federal matter. I remember also that we had to raise Cain before we could get that money with which to pay compensation. Next we have the advances that are repayable, totalling £737,434. Of that figure Western Australia got £394,048, principally for wire and netting. The remainder went to assist the apple growers in Tasmania. The last allocation under the heading "Indirect assistance to industries" amounted to £12,796,062. This covers some 25 items, but I notice that Queensland seems again to be well favoured in that it was assisted for the prickly pear eradication and other items

such as cotton, cattle and the Grafton-South Brisbane railway. Western Australia has an item "trans line £458,094." Now let us see the attitude taken up by Queensland when Western Australia tried to secure a bonus on the production of gold. We saw such things in the newspapers as headlines reading, "The Western State seeks to plunder the other States." And remembering how Queensland had plundered the Commonwealth for its cotton, cotton yarn, sugar, bananas, peanuts, prickly pear eradication and many other things, we can only wonder what the mentality of the people in that State can be. When the question of the Wiluna gold mine guarantee of £300,000 was before the Senate, every Queensland member voted against it. Yet we find that a profit of £910,000 was made by the Colonial Sugar Refining Co. last year out of the king of bonussed industries! The Economic Commission a little time back found that bonuses, tariffs and prohibitions had given subsidies to favoured industries to the the extent of £36,000,000 per annum, or £6 per head of the then population. They found that the money had been distributed as follows:—Queensland, £8 per head per annum: Victoria, £7; New South Wales, £5 10s.: Tasmania, £4; South Australia, £3 14s.; and Western Australia, £3 12s. Section 101 of the Constitution provides that there shall be an interstate commission with such powers of adjudication and administration as the Parliament considers necessary. How has that section been honoured? The commission was brought into existence in 1913 under Act No. 32 of 1912 by the appointment of commissioners for seven years. When that period expired, no fresh appointments were made. Mr. Alfred Deakin spoke of the interstate commission as "the eyes and ears of the Constitution." Federal Governments have blinded and deafened the Constitution so far as its application to Western Australia and the weaker States are concerned. That commission, functioning as was intended by the framers of the Constitution, would have protected the State from injustice and secured the carrying out of Section 99 in letter and spirit. There are other sections of the Constitution to which the Parliament has given a different interpretation from that intended by the framers of the Constitution, and in each case an interpretation contrary to State interests. There has been an invasion of the sphere of the State savings banks; there has been imposed a land tax for the avowed purpose of breaking up large estates, a purpose which, whatever its merits, is outside the Constitutional power of the Commonwealth; there has also been the extension of the arbitration and conciliation power to cover all sorts of disputes, whether "manufactured" or otherwise, including those arising among employees of the States. The harm done to the Australian people by these strained interpretations of the Constitution is incalculable.

Mr. Kenneally: Now we are getting to the fly in the ointment.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: The fly in the ointment is just this: I represent a country constituency and I know that the agricultural industry is down and out. Western Australia must wake up to the fact that it cannot carry on under existing conditions. We have spoken about the tariff having run mad. It has run mad: the tariff charges are monstrous. The position of the Western Australian farmer under Federation is at once humiliating and intolerable. Despite the fact that 93 per cent. of the nations of the world admit agricultural machinery and accessories duty free, the Federal tariff imposes monstrous burdens upon the primary producers of this State. Here are some of the crushing tariff charges: On a harvester, 40 per cent.; on a spring-tooth cultivator the duty is £10; on wire nettting and fencing wire the duty is 40 per cent.: on all farm machinery and implements 20 to 35 per cent. A Canadian reaper and binder costs in Canada £47, but if imported into Western Australia is has to pay a duty of £26 15s., or a total of £73 15s.

Mr. Sleeman: Why not patronise local industry?

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Because we cannot make these implements here.

Mr. Sleeman: Of course we can.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Surely the overseas freight should give sufficient protection to the industry here.

Mr. Marshall: A lot of the farmers who use the local machinery leave it out exposed to all weathers and then they blame the machinery.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: That has nothing whatever to do with my argument about the excessive tariff. Here is another interesting item. In 1902 Mr. George McLellan, who lives in Kellerberrin, had to take off

1,000 acres of crop, and bought three harvesters for £183. This will show what was the position then. For £183 he bought three six-feet harvesters. If a Sunshine harvester is needed to-day, another £17 has to be added to the £183 in order to get even one. That will show how the tariff has run mad as regards agricultural implements. In 1914 a harvester cost £108, in 1920 it cost £177, 64 per cent. increase in six years. Again, under the arbitrary powers possessed by the Minister for Customs, a consignment of binder twine coming into Western Australia should have paid a duty of £4 but was charged duty to the extent of £44. Our own Government formerly imported steel girders at a landed cost of £180. The Broken Hill Company stated that they would get machinery to make the girders in Australia. Our Government thereupon ceased to order abroad. Now they are not getting as good an article as formerly, but they are paying £325 for what originally cost £180. We had Mr. Scullin telling us to grow more wheat.

Mr. Sleeman: What about Sir James Mitchell in this morning's paper saying that we do not grow enough and should grow more?

Mr. GRIFFITHS: But Sir James Mitchell has not done what Mr. Scullin did. Immediately the Federal Government induced the farmer to grow more wheat, they put an additional duty on his cornsacks, on his sacks for super, on his phosphatic rock for super, on his sulphur, and on his nitre. A question was recently asked in this Chamber what amount of duty had been collected, and was the amount going to be returned, and were the imposts to be removed. The reply was that the Government of this State could not say. The primage duty imposed on 66,000,000 cornsacks amounted to £88,000, the primage duty on 12,000,000 sacks for super to £16,000, on phosphatic rock to £32,000, on 125,000 tons of sulphur to £22,750, and on nitre to £1,000; making a grand total of £159,750. Those duties were imposed as soon as the Federal Government had persuaded our farmers to grow more wheat. "Grow more wheat, and we will put on a bit more duty!" The Federal Government imposed a villanous export duty on sheepskins, which they repealed when they found that they had killed the trade. The duty was imposed for the sake of a few miserable fellmongeries in Melbourne. However, the trade was lost and there was nothing for the fellmongeries to do. The amount of all these duties would come in very useful to the farmer in the present condition of affairs. The Commonwealth has set about the task of dismembering itself. Unless a radical alteration is brought about, the Federation will fall to pieces.

The Minister for Railways: The screws are loose now.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Then there is the proposed wheat pool of 1930, about which such a great song was made. Under the condition proposed, New South Wales would have met four per cent. of the loss, if any —and certainly there would have been a loss —Queensland and Victoria each 6½ per cent., South Australia 10 per cent., and Western Australia no less than 30 per cent. And then people talk about the wheat pool which we had the temerity to turn down! As regards the much-boomed Federal Aid Roads Grant, the Federal Government, under the guise of that grant, put a tax of 2d. on petrol, the tax having now been raised to 7d. It was trumpeted forth that the Federal Government were to give £2,000,000 a year for road construction. However, they got about £3,000,000 out of the tax on petrol. Now they are getting considerably more. It is a pure farce to talk about a Federal Aid Roads Grant. That grant was really the means of swelling the Federal revenue. We suffer not only as regards imported goods, but on those we are compelled to obtain from the Eastern States. They are manufactured in the Eastern States, and Western Australia is feeding up the sugar barons and the big manufacturers in the East. The Arbitration Court and the tariff have been chasing one another to try and overtake each other; and the vicious circle has constantly added to the cost of living. There have to be duties, I know; but protection is a damned thing that has run mad. We buy from the Eastern States £8,000,000 worth of goods annually, and they take from us about £1,500,000 worth. The member for Geraldton (Hon. J. C. Willcock) recently said that we had an extensive market in the East. It is an extensive market indeed! It sells to us about £8,000,000 worth annually and takes from us £1,500,000 worth annually. A condensed milk factory was started in Western Australia, and immediately Nestles came along to start another. The same thing occurred with regard to jam manufacture. The late Mr. Hawter of Mullalyup was on a visit to Tasmania and went

over Sir Henry Jones's factory. He made many inquiries, and Sir Henry said, "I see you are very interested. Why?" He replied, "I think of going in for something of this sort in Western Australia." Sir Henry patted him on the back and said, "Don't you do it. We have too good a market over there. If you start over there, we will simply swamp you." An effort was made to start a condensed milk factory here, and Nestles came over to start one—I believe at Waroona.

Mr. Sampson: We do not mind that. We do mind the dumping.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Our people should not be bled in the way they are bled to-day. If we seceded from the Federation, the Eastern States would have to mend their ways and compete with the outside world, with Great Britain for instance. I am a great believer in trade within the Empire. If there was a boundary between Western Australia and the East, the Eastern States would have to compete. At present they have a market preserved for them and do just as they like. I was told to-day that a man mixed up with a prominent Eastern Australian firm said, "You have no chance of getting in. Four-fifths of the businesses of this class are run by the Eastern States, and we can swamp you every time." I asked the name of the firm in question, and was told it was Messrs. Lysaght. Enough said! As regards duplication and overlapping, the Chief Secretary has stated that Western Australia could not afford this expensive luxury of Federation. It is a luxury that has resulted in duplication of almost every department. Dr. Maloney asked in the Federal House of Representatives how many officers at £1,000 a year and over were in the employ of the Federal Public Service in 1913: and he was told that there were 33, at a total cost of £52,000 per annum. He also asked how many of such officers there were in 1929. The reply was, not 33, but 183 officials at £1,000 and over, the total annual cost of them being £286,789. This State has a Health Department, which is a fine department. The Eastern States have their Health Departments, and many cities in Eastern Australia maintain a health service. Public health has been very well looked after throughout Australia. But the Commonwealth must start another Health Department. It began with one officer, Dr. Cumpston, at £1,000 a year in 1913. In 1929 the Federal Health Department comprised leading officials as follows, all with their sub-departments and assistants:—

	£
Dr. Cumpston	1,800
Senior Medical Officer	1,020
Chief Quarantine Officer, Victoria	1,112
Chief Quarantine Officer, New South Wales	1,012
Director of Tropical Hygiene	1,250
Director of Veterinary Hygiene	1,012
Director of Epidimiology	1,250
Director of Tuberculosis	1,300
Assistant Serum Laboratory	1,300
Assistant, Health Laboratory	1,020
Radium Adviser	2,000
Director of School of Public Health	1,500
	£15,576

Mr. Hegney: Do you want to put them all out of work?

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I do not bother about interjections. A lot of those officers are duplicated. Is that what we have this great Commonwealth for?

The Minister for Railways: It makes them feel important.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: That has been the trouble. The Commonwealth felt so important that it reached out for more power all the time. The member for Perth (Mr. H. W. Mann) in moving the motion said that Mr. Watson was an accredited accountant, that he had published certain figures, and that they had never been challenged. Thereupon the member for South Fremantle (Hon. A. McCallum) interjected that they had been challenged the country over, and that the Chief Secretary at Nedlands had proved them to be wrong. The member for South Fremantle himself was wrong, and he must have known that he was wrong. I will quote an extract from the "West Australian's" report of the Chief Secretary's speech at Nedlands:—

> Mr. H. K. Watson makes it appear that secession would benefit Western Australia to the extent of about two millions a year. I have a calculation made on the same basis as that put forward by a committee appointed by Mr. Hill, the Premier of South Australia, to prepare a case for submission to the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Commonwealth Public Accounts, setting out the disabilities of South Australia under Federation. This Committee showed that if South Australia seceded, on the assumption of imposition of the same Customs, that State would benefit by about £2,000,000. The calculation which I have had prepared on exactly similar lines to that appearing in the South Australian case shows that Western Australia would, after making full provision for all present Commonwealth expenditure in

Western Australia, benefit to an amount of £1,600,000 per annum.

This is slightly less than the figure shown by Mr. Watson's return, but any difference is immaterial. I felt that in the interests of fair play these figures should be looked into, and I find that the Chief Secretary's figures were for 1928-29 while Mr. Watson's were for 1929-30. In Mr. Watson's year the Commonwealth took £200,000 more in taxation than in Mr. Keenan's year. That leaves a difference of £200,000, so far as we have gone. The Chief Secretary emphasised the fact that his statement had been prepared along the same lines as the statement produced by the committee which recently prepared the case for South Australia for presentation to the Public Accounts Committee. The committee in paragraph 96 of its report was careful to observe that the benefits would be greater than indicated in its statement, which by the way showed a gain to South Australia of over £2,000,000. That statement, and so far as I can gather the Chief Secretary's also, did not take into account the further saving that would be effected by the elimination of our share of the annual cost of items such as Canberra, the Federal Parliament, the High Court, the Federal Health, Audit, Crown Law, Electoral, Statistics and Forestry Departments, the Arbitration Court and the High Commissioner, etc., which services are already adequately catered for by the existing State departments. Bearing those facts in mind it will be observed that there is very little difference between the Chief Secretary's figures and those of Mr. Watson. Now I should like to repeat what I said when speaking against the Financial Agreement. Western Australia from 1890 to 1901, when she had her own Customs and Excise, was able to carry out a more spirited public works policy than any of the other States of Australia. When we entered Federation, Western Australia had an accumulated surplus of 16s. 2d. per head for every man, woman and child in the State. After we had had 10 years of Federation, with three-quarters of our Customs, we had to curtail our public works expenditure and go in for borrowing very largely. We then had this accumulated surplus reduced to 2s. 4d. per head. Then between 1910 and 1923 with the per capita allowance of 25s. per head and a special grant of £250,000 per annum reducible by £10,000 annually, we were wholly unable to pay our way. Now instead of a credit balance we have an accumulated deficit amounting to £17 18s. 4d. for every man, woman and child in the State. In 1900 we had a low revenue tariff from 5 per cent. to 20 per cent., and mining, agricultural and pastoral requirements were duty free. There was no land or income tax, no strangling Navigation Act, no sugar embargo, and we had all our own income from Customs and Excise. Now, in 1931, we have the highest and most vicious tariff in the world, two burdensome income taxes, two oppressive land taxes, two sets of probate duties, a special petrol tax, two amusements taxes, an oppressive Navigation Act, two Health Departments, two Public Works Departments and two Parliaments, the Federal one with roughly 30,000 employees and a pay sheet that has totalled nearly 11 millions.

Mr. Withers: You are making out a good case for unification.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: If we get unification, the Lord help us! This is the sort of thing we have been brought into under this wonderful Federation, with its one flag, one destiny, one people. Speaking of unification, let me tell the hon. member what the Leader of the Opposition said in 1926.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is nothing about unification in this motion.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: But unification is one of the things we have to fight against.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not before the House.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: It is one of the reasons against Federation and just as important a reason as any other. There is the statement made by Mr. Collier in which he pointed out that if unification came that would be the end of us as a State. Recently in Sydney Mr. Forde, the Minister for Customs, said he could not divulge Cabinet or caucus secrets, but he could say that they had earnestly under consideration the section of the Labour Party's platform providing for a referendum on the question of the abolition of State Parliaments, and to give the Federal Government more control over trade and commerce. They would then be able to put into operation their protective tariff policy. He said that one of the planks of their platform being seriously considered was that of a unified Government. The Leader of the Opposition here in this Chamber, and also when in Melbourne, said that if we

were to get unification we would be settled for all time. Among the things we complain of are the evasion of Section 94 of the Commonwealth Constitution, the interference with trade and commerce by unfair differentiation in regard to bonuses, trade agreements, embargoes and the like; the Interstate Commission—those mandatory clauses have been evaded ever since 1920—the interference with the State Savings Bank's sphere of operations, the imposition of the land tax, the invasion of arbitration and conciliation, the enormous growth of the Public Service, the duplication of services already well attended to by the State, the waste of money which should have have been handed over to the States, the steps taken to bring about unification, the default of New South Wales—of which seemingly we shall have to take our share when the final settlement comes—the base metals scandals, the gold steal, the burdens placed on industry, the sugar ramp, the stealing of the Forests Products Laboratory, the refusal to pay rinderpest compensation, the embargo on flour, the differential treatment meted out to Western Australia, the embargo on leather, the closing of Blackboy Camp and the taking of our men to Melbourne, and the imposition of duties on locomotives and rails. In Victoria they lifted the duty on electrical appliances for big works there, merely to enable them to bring in a lot of machinery duty free; whereas here we had to raise Cain to have some electrical appliances that could not be made in the Commonwealth brought into the State.

The Minister for Railways: That was a fraud absolutely.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Then, most of all, we complain of the tariff on the mining and farming industries. Recently there has been the Simon Commission sitting on India. It looks as though Burma is likely to be granted home rule.

Mr. Corboy: No, that is not so.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Why, you didn't know where Burma was when you were speaking the other night!

Mr. SPEAKER: Never mind Burma. The hon. member must confine himself to the disabilities of Western Australia.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: This is an analogous case.

Mr. SPEAKER: But we do not want you to bring in Burma. We must stick to the terms of the motion.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I have to give reasons for supporting the motion, and I was drawing a parallel between Western Australia and various parts of the world. In Rhodesia, they say that Bulawayo and Salisbury are too far away from Capetown. We say we are too far away from Canberra. We are 2,000 odd miles away and there are 2,000 odd reasons why we should not be united to Canberra. Over East they do not understand us at all. They cannot see the wide spaces, cannot see that the cities are built upon the back country. Whilst those people in the Eastern States really do not understand us sufficiently, it is not to be wondered at, for New South Wales has as many members in the Federal Parliament as have South Australia and Western Australia combined. What possible hope, then, have we of getting a fair deal? I have here something that Mr. Scaddan said a little time ago.

The Minister for Railways: It will be worth reading.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: He said there was no doubt that Federation had been a wonderfully good thing for the Eastern States. Mr. Keenan, before the Royal Commission in 1925, said that Federation might be purchased at too high a price, that it might be the view of many in this State, that although they had favoured Federation and still did so the price they were called upon to pay for it was too high. Mr. Scaddan said—

> Nearly all our big warehouses and business concerns, including our banking institutions, are merely branches operating under a head office in Sydney or Melbourne.

Mr. Sleeman: When did he say that?

Mr. GRIFFITHS: In 1925.

The Minister for Railways: And I could still say it.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Mr. A. J. Monger stated—

> Federation has been on trial for 24 years and has proved a disastrous experience for Western Australia.

There is a grave feeling of discontent in this State against Federation. The banks will no doubt keep as many farmers going as possible, but unless there is a radical alteration in the cost of production—the Government are doing all they can, but they cannot do everything—there will be a big exodus from the land. One-half of the farms will be vacated and one-half of the business premises in the city will be unoccupied.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Can you tell us of any country in the world that is not experiencing depression at the present time?

Mr. GRIFFITHS: We are dependent upon the agricultural industry and, if we do not lighten its burdens, particularly as regards the expensive luxury of Federation that is weighing unfairly and unjustly on the primary producers of this State, the industry will go out of existence. I know that other countries are in a bad position, but we have a remedy available to us. We could get back to solvency if we went the right way about it.

Mr. Corboy: Do you believe that getting out of Federation would raise the price of wheat?

Mr. GRIFFITHS: No, but it would reduce the cost of producing wheat.

Mr. Corboy: Would it make it profitable to sell wheat at 1s. 7d. a bushel?

Mr. GRIFFITHS: There is a feeling of revolt and rebellion throughout the agricultural areas.

Mr. Sleeman: Against the State Government?

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Against everybody. A poor Government is like a poor man. It is a crime to be poor.

Mr. Hegney: No, it is not.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: It is the world's opinion. The poor individual gets kicked from Dan to Beersheba, and the experience of a poor Government is the same. The Collier Government had £18,000,000, spread over six years, more than the present Government have had to spend, and they spent it and made good fellows of themselves. The present Government, owing to financial stringency, cannot do that. During the war, bad and all as conditions were then, there was money available. The year 1914 was not nearly so severe an ordeal for the country as the present time is proving. I appeal to members to grant the people who have asked for a referendum the right to voice their opinion. Secession is no mere phantom movement; it is a very solid movement. If members travelled the country, as I have done recently, they would realise that there is a very strong feeling in favour of a referendum. I guarantee that a referendum on secession would be carried by 80 per cent. of the people of this State.

On motion by Mr. North, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. C. G. Latham—York) [9.19]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till Tuesday, 11th August.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 9.20 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 6th August, 1931.

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

ASSENT TO BILL.

Message from the Administrator received and read notifying assent to the State Manufactures Description Bill.

BILL—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Minister for Country Water Supplies in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Commencement and operation:

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I move an amendment—

That all words after "proclamation" in line 2 be struck out.

If the clause were to stand as printed, the Bill would have a retrospective effect and would apply to all Public Service salaries as from the 9th July. This means that a