

hope the Bill will be passed speedily so that the municipality may get the plant which is so urgently required.

On motion by Hon. J. Cornell debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.7 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 6th November, 1928.

	PAGE
Select Committee: Town Planning and Development Bill, extension of time ...	1652
Bills: Electoral Districts Act Amendment, 2a. ...	1652
Dog Act Amendment, returned ...	1654
Quarry Railway Extension, 2a. ...	1654
Education, Com. ...	1656
Land Tax and Income Tax, Com. report ...	1665
Annual Estimates, votes and items discussed ...	1668
Mines Department ...	1668
Public Health Department ...	1676
Medical ...	1676

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

SELECT COMMITTEE—TOWN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT BILL.

Extension of Time.

On motion by Mr. Clydesdale, the time for bringing up the select committee's report was extended to the 20th November.

BILL—ELECTORAL DISTRICTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Third Reading.

THE PREMIER (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [4.35]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR. THOMSON (Katanning) [4.36]: I move—

That this Order of the Day be adjourned to enable me, in accordance with Standing Order 297, to place a notice on the Notice Paper.

Motion put and negatived.

MR. THOMSON: I move an amendment—

That "now" be struck out with a view to inserting other words.

Hon. G. Taylor: You must give reason for that.

MR. THOMSON: I propose to do so. Some of them will be personal, whilst other will be as showing that the House should have an opportunity for further considering the Bill. In 1923, when a similar Bill was adopted, the discussion started at 2.4 p.m. on Thursday, the 25th January, and was completed at 7.47 p.m. on the Friday after a continuous sitting of 29¼ hours.

The Minister for Justice: There was a lot of opposition to that Bill.

MR. THOMSON: The motion I had desired to move was on similar lines to one which the Premier himself moved in this House on a Bill of the same character, namely, that the Bill be referred to a select committee. Had I been here during the second reading, I would have endeavoured to have the Bill referred to a select committee in exactly the same terms as the Premier himself moved in 1923. One of the reasons why I am asking that this Bill be deferred or recommitted is that members should have an opportunity to go more closely into it than they have done. For a Bill providing for a redistribution of seats to be introduced on the Tuesday and pass all its stages except the third reading by the Thursday certainly is something quite unusual. I want to give some of the reasons why I do not think the Bill is quite fair. We find that the population of the metropolitan area is 1,131 persons to the square mile of that area.

MR. Marshall: On a point of order. I should like a ruling as to whether the hon. member is in order in discussing the nature of the Bill on a motion to postpone the third reading of the Bill.

Hon. G. Taylor: Not to postpone.

MR. SPEAKER: Up to the present the hon. member is giving his reasons for proposing to omit the word "now," and he is in order.

MR. THOMSON: That is to say, in an area of 136 square miles we have 154,873 persons. Taking so much of the rest of the State as is considered rural, which includes all country towns, we have an area of 975,730 square miles with an average of .013 persons per square mile.

Mr. North: Do those figures include Fremantle?

Mr. THOMSON: No, I have not included Fremantle. I know that in such a Bill we do not altogether relate the votes to the area under consideration. But we know that the Government did accept that principle and urged this House to accept it when the main roads grant was made available by the Federal Government on a basis of three-fifths of the population and two-fifths of the area of the State. Therefore I maintain that, in respect of at least some of the seats, this House should in justice appoint a select committee to go carefully into the schedule submitted to us, with a view to proposing amendments that might be more acceptable to some members of the House. Going back to the 5th December, 1922, we find the Premier made this statement—

It seems to me this Bill was considered, not with a view to conserving the public interests and giving fair, reasonable and equitable representation, but largely as to its effect on the political parties in this State. There can be no question about that. Those districts responsible mainly, if not entirely, for the majority sitting behind the Government have been generously treated.

We might be able to deal with that phase on this occasion if we had a select committee, the members of which would be able to go carefully into the position. On page 1984 of "Hansard" for 1922 we find the same hon. gentleman saying "that the grouping of the central goldfields, introduced in 1911, was the most notorious, outrageous, gerrymandering Act ever perpetrated." Some of us might be excused if we said that even in the Bill before us is a certain amount of gerrymandering. One might ask why an electorate like Bunbury should have a minimum of 3,305 electors, why Albany should have a minimum of 3,305 electors and why Northam also should have a minimum of 3,305 electors? But what do we find to-day? We find in the Bill we are considering that there are four seats held by Ministers of the Crown, namely, Boulder, Brownhill-Ivanhoe, Hannans and Kalgoorlie—

Mr. Lutey: Brown Hill-Ivanhoe is not held by a Minister of the Crown.

Mr. THOMSON: Well, those four seats are held by three Ministers of the Crown and the Chairman of Committees who, perhaps, will one day have the honour to be a Minister of the Crown. One never knows. However, I am just drawing attention to the fact

that those seats have a minimum of 1,583 electors. I should like to ask, in the language of the Premier in 1923, why those seats should have such a small quota, while the agricultural seats have a quota of 3,305? Why should Bunbury, Geraldton and Albany have a minimum of 3,305 while the populous towns of Brown Hill-Ivanhoe, and Kalgoorlie and Boulder have a minimum of 1,583, representing an advantage over the agricultural districts of 1,722 electors?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I have allowed the hon. member to proceed with a view to ascertaining exactly the purpose he had in view in moving that the word "now" be omitted, and I find he is discussing the appointment of a select committee to consider the Bill. That is distinctly out of order. I refer the hon. member to Standing Order 292—

No motion for referring the Bill to a select committee shall be considered after the Chairman of the Committee of the whole House shall have been reported on the Bill.

The Chairman of Committees has reported, and therefore it is impossible now to move a motion for the appointment of a select committee. Accordingly the hon. member is out of order in discussing a matter that is not before the House, and cannot at any future stage of the Bill be before the House.

Mr. THOMSON: Very well, Sir, I shall not disagree with your ruling, though I thought the matter was covered by Standing Order 297, which reads—

No amendment shall be made in, and no new clauses shall be added to, any Bill recommit-
ted on the third reading, unless notice thereof has been previously given.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is an entirely different point.

Mr. THOMSON: However, I am giving my reasons why the third reading should not be carried while the Bill is in its present form. I am drawing the attention of the House to the analogy of the position in 1903, when the members of the present Government considered it unfair that goldfields towns should have a larger quota than they have at present. From my point of view the four goldfields towns should certainly have the same quota as the agricultural seats. It is remarkable how opinions change as the result of occupancy of the Treasury bench. The present Premier said in 1923 that it was an absolute farce to submit the

matter to a commission, as office boys could make a subdivision of the electorate in accordance with the instructions laid down in the Bill. One might retort that what was a farce at that date has now become, in the Government's opinion, something very desirable.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: A virtue.

Mr. THOMSON: The Leader of the Opposition must feel gratified that notwithstanding the 27½ hours' strenuous opposition he and his Cabinet encountered in connection with the Bill of 1923, the principle of that Bill has been accepted now as a foundation and framework for a redistribution of seats. I desire to refresh the memories of some members who are supporting the Bill. The 1923 measure was debated clause by clause and letter by letter. A strenuous opposition to it was led by Mr. Angwin, who on page 2898 is reported as saying—

The goldfields have not, under this Bill, the representation they deserve. The North-West should retain four seats, which would have an average of 1,064 electors. The goldfields should be united instead of being in two areas.

Later he says the goldfields should have ten seats. On page 2900 he states—

The largest agricultural district in this State, Northam, is right on the doorstep of Perth, and it will have a minimum of 2,995 electors. Yet when we come to Kalgoorlie, 400 miles away, the Premier requires a quota of 3,413. In Avon he will probably give a quota of about 2,400. Is that a just redistribution of seats? This is one of the biggest scandals in the history of the Chamber. It is worse than the 1911 redistribution, which the people so emphatically condemned.

The then Deputy Leader of the Opposition also moved the following proviso:—

Provided that the electors in each district of the goldfields central area shall not exceed the average of the electors in the agricultural area.

Those views, expressed by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, were ably supported by all the members of the party. One clause of the 1923 Bill was debated for 5½ hours. I congratulate the then Opposition on the excellent fight they put up.

The Minister for Mines: There is a more reasonable Bill now.

Mr. THOMSON: I fail to see that the position is more reasonable when the minimum for the goldfields central towns is 1,583 electors. I have as many electors as that in the town of Katanning. One may reasonably contend that similar considera-

tion should be extended to the agricultural districts. I strongly support the remark of the member for Subiaco (Mr. Richardson), that it was a pity more people were not out in the country producing wealth instead of living in the metropolitan area. For the information of the House I wish to quote from the "Statistical Abstract" figures of wealth production for last year. Agriculture produced £11,803,584, the pastoral industry £5,378,815, dairying and poultry and bee farming £1,643,863, forestry and fisheries £2,673,301, and mining £2,466,581; a total of £23,966,144. Dividing that total by the number of electors, 105,823, shows that the production of wealth was slightly over £226 per adult, male or female. Manufacturing in the metropolitan area produced £5,849,916, which total, divided by the number of electors, 108,866, shows a production of wealth equal to approximately £45 per head. Taking the matter from a wealth-producing point of view—a point which should receive consideration—the quotas of the Bill are not such as will give equitable and just representation to those who are carrying the burden and producing the wealth of this State. Accordingly I move my amendment.

Amendment put, and negatived on the voices.

Mr. THOMSON: Divide!

The Minister for Railways: There was only one aye.

The SPEAKER: I am not sure.

Mr. THOMSON: Very well, Mr. Speaker, let it go.

Question put and passed.

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

BILL—DOG ACT AMENDMENT.

Returned from the Council with amendments.

BILL—QUARRY RAILWAY EXTENSION.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 30th October.

HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL (Northam) [4.59]: I am glad that we are to have another industry established in this

State, an industry producing a commodity for which we pay so much. Before the Bill passes through Committee, however, there are some points that require consideration. One is that the proposed railway will cross various streets. I do not know whether the local authorities have been consulted on that matter. The point is that it is a fairly long line of railway, and other industries may be established in the vicinity. It will be a privately-owned railway and I think we should make provision that will enable sidings to be put in wherever they may be required should other industries be established. To do so would be to do merely what is right. The company will have the right to take the railway across streets and over property. I do not think we should give them the authority that is sought in the Bill unless the Government retain the right to construct sidings if necessary. There is another point that should receive consideration. I refer to the extraordinary clause that provides that the company may use any kind of fuel in the engines. I do not know whether that refers to refuse from the works when they are in operation. I do not know whether the burning of that material would cause a nuisance to the people in this locality. If the Minister will look into these points, particularly into the question of reserving the right to put in sidings, and to the reason for the inclusion of the extraordinary clause regarding the burning of fuel, I shall be content to allow the Bill to go through. We ought to do all we can to encourage the establishment of industries in our midst and to see that they are not unduly loaded by payments due to the Government for services that may, or may not, be rendered, and to the municipality concerned in respect of other considerations. We should all welcome the proposal to establish such an extensive industry, and I am glad to lend my support to the Bill.

MR. LINDSAY (Toodyay) [5.3]: The members of the Country Party also have pleasure in supporting the Bill. It may at least have the result of enabling the people of this State to have a store of sugar on hand and thus avoid the possibility of again being placed on rations, should there be a recurrence of troubles that have

caused difficulties in the past. I believe this is the last chain in the establishment of works of this description at various Australian ports, and I trust that it will result in the employment of a number of people as well as providing reserve stores of sugar. When the Minister introduced the Bill, he regretted the fact that the refinery was to be established on the banks of the river. We may all regret that fact, but at the same time it is much better to have the factory established even on the banks of the river, rather than not have it established at all. I am glad to support the second reading of the Bill for the establishment of an industry that is so necessary for Western Australia.

MR. LATHAM (York) [5.4]: I hope that, as the result of the passing of this legislation, encouragement will be given to the people of the northern portions of the State to commence growing sugar cane. That question has been mentioned here several times, and if the motion that has been moved by the member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo) is carried, it will probably lead to the growing of sugar cane in the North. There is no advantage to be gained in encouraging the people there to go in for that industry, unless we provide means for dealing with their product down south. If the company lends encouragement to the people in the North to go in for that industry, the production will be very considerable. I hope the works will prove successful and that many people will go in for sugar cane production. I also hope that it will enable us to make use of our sugar beet that can be grown so successfully in Western Australia and particularly in the Avon valley, in the low-lying parts where the ground has the appearance of being salty. At the present time the sugar beet is used for feeding to stock. I have seen some beautiful samples of sugar beet and I hope the factory that will be established at North Fremantle, will prove so successful that it will be able to take all the sugar beet that can be produced here, as well as the sugar cane. I hope the factory will be established at an early date.

On motion by Mr. Chesson, debate adjourned.

BILL—EDUCATION.*In Committee.*

Mr. Lutey in the Chair; the Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 6—agreed to.

Clause 7—Appointment of officers:

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:
I move an amendment—

‘That at the end of Subclause 3 the following words be added:—“except as therein provided.”’

The subclause says that teachers shall not be subject to the Public Service Act, 1904, but the Director of Education and other officers are appointed under the provisions of that Act. It has not been the practice for teachers to be appointed by the Public Service Commissioner, but by the department.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Why, then, have a Public Service Commissioner?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The Public Service Commissioner has his hands fairly full with the work he has to undertake now. The department should deal with the appointment and transfer of teachers. The same practice is adopted in connection with the railways and the police.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Public Service Commissioner should have some say in the appointments referred to by the Minister. All public officials should be under the Public Service Act, and should have the right to any appointment within the service. I do not know why teachers should not have the same right as anyone else to enter the Public Service, but they cannot do so unless they are subject to the Act. Should a young man prove unsuitable as a teacher, he should have the right to join some other branch of the Public Service. I see nothing but advantage in having teachers brought under the provisions of the Public Service Act, and nothing so bad as subjecting them to the control of a Minister. The Minister for Agriculture was wrong when he said that the railways were controlled by the Minister for Railways.

The Minister for Railways: No, by the Railway Commissioner.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: He has the right to make appointments of officers with salaries up to £400 a year. All officers in the service should be at the call of the

Government to fill any positions for which they are better suited than is anyone else. Those not under the Act are suffering a disadvantage. An officer of this House cannot secure an appointment in the Civil Service. Probably 90 per cent. of the disadvantages that those outside the real service suffer is due to their not being under the Act and to there being no one to protect them. The clause provides that the Minister may transfer or promote teachers. Probably no one is so ill-equipped as the Minister for that job. Transfers and promotions should be made on the recommendation of the Director. I understand those words were struck out in another place.

The Minister for Justice: Put them in again.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I should be glad to do so if the Minister would temporarily withdraw his amendment. Of course the Minister could consult the Director, but it is not necessary that he should do so. All the teachers should be subject to the Public Service Act, even if they are not directly controlled by the Public Service Commissioner. They should certainly have the protection of the Act.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: In striking out the words mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition, another place took the view that as the measure was to be administered by the Minister, he should be directly responsible. The Director, however, would recommend and the effect would be the same.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Why have a Public Service Commissioner at all?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: This does not affect the position as regards the Public Service Commissioner, who will still deal with the appointment of the higher officials. It has not been the practice of the Public Service Commissioner to appoint teachers. When the Public Service Bill was under consideration in 1904, a select committee considered that teachers should be excluded from the Act and they were excluded.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I think they made a mistake.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I should oppose their being brought under the control of the Public Service Commissioner now. To allow the Leader of the Opposition to move his amendment, I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I move—

That after "may," in Subclause 2, the words "on the recommendation of the Director" be inserted.

The Public Service Commissioner does this work for other appointments and, if the Director is to do within the Education Department what the Public Service Commissioner does for the rest of the service, he should be required to recommend.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I agree with the amendment. The Director holds a highly technical position, and a layman such as the Minister would not be able to handle the staff so well. People could gain the ear of the member for the district to suggest that a certain teacher was too good for a certain school and should be transferred to a more congenial place where his salary would be higher, and the Minister might make the transfer. A transfer should be accompanied by a recommendation from the Director. It would then be more difficult for a teacher to secure a transfer in the manner I have suggested. The Director's first consideration would be the efficiency of the staff and political feelings would not weigh with him. If the Director's recommendation was not acted on by the Minister, Parliament could call him to account.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move an amendment—

That in Subclause 3 the words "except as therein provided" be added.

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

Clause 8—agreed to.

Clause 9—Power to establish and maintain schools:

Mr. THOMSON: An important phase of instruction appears to be totally ignored, and I hope the Minister will accept an amendment to give rural schools a definite place in the curriculum. The establishment of the Muresk Agricultural College is something for which we asked for years, but more attention should be given to rural education. Children are apparently educated on a curriculum applying to the whole of the State. I am not questioning the bene-

fits derived from the instruction imparted, but in the country districts we should have more specialists in rural industry. During our visit to the Midland districts last week, we had an excellent example of what could be accomplished by one teacher in the way of experimental plots. I believe the Government are appointing him an agricultural adviser. We have in Perth a Technical School where youths desirous of learning wool classing may obtain instruction. It would be interesting to know from the Minister in how many centres outside the metropolitan area wool classing is being taught. It seems to me that this is a clause in which the word "rural" should be inserted. I move an amendment—

That in line 7, between "elementary" and "secondary" the word "rural" be inserted.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The clause as drafted is all-embracing; it gives the Minister all the power he needs and the insertion of the word "rural" will not give any additional power. It cannot be said that the Government have not given attention to rural education.

Mr. Thomson: I did not suggest that.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Further, if the word "rural" is inserted, I presume we shall be expected to provide the teachers who will give that rural education. How can we possibly do that in small country centres? The hon. member also mentioned wool classing. We could not expect teachers in some of the country schools to be authorities on wool classing. I have discussed the matter with the Director of Agriculture and when we set out to give definite instruction in respect of agriculture it is necessary to provide someone who has the knowledge, and the ability to impart that knowledge to others. I assure the hon. member that everything that can be done will be done and that the clause as it is drafted will give all the authority that is required.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The inclusion of the word will not alter the Minister's responsibility. Therefore is it worth while opposing the amendment? We are already engaged in rural education and we might spend some money, perhaps, in providing suitable books. In that way we may be able to do more than by limited teaching that untrained people can give. I do not know that the amendment need be op-

posed, and I do not know that the hon. member need insist upon it. We shall get the same result either way.

Mr. THOMSON: I have been in the House 14 years and in that time the Education Estimates have been freely discussed on many occasions. All the same, we could count up the number of rural schools on the fingers of our hands. Now that we are dealing with an amendment to the Education Act, I think we might include in the Bill before us the proposal that I suggest.

The Minister for Railways: Is it not technical education?

Mr. THOMSON: Assuming it is, how many technical schools have we in the State? We have one in Kalgoorlie and one in the metropolitan area.

The Minister for Railways: We have classes all over the State dealing with technical subjects.

Mr. THOMSON: Generally speaking, technical education, as applied by the Education Department, has consisted of instructing boys in woodwork, plumbing, bricklaying, and the various crafts. If we go to the Technical School in Perth we find the students there learning wool classing, and that the greater part of the money being expended there is expended in technical education in its generally accepted meaning. If it is right that that should be so in the metropolitan area, we should lay it down as part and parcel of our education system that in country districts rural education should be part of the curriculum. I have heard it said that if an amendment does no good, it does not do any harm, in which case the amendment I have submitted should be allowed to pass.

The CHAIRMAN: Rural and technical, according to the manner in which the hon. member is arguing, are practically one and the same thing. Moreover, the hon. member's amendment may entail additional expense on the State and on that account I am doubtful whether it is in order.

Mr. THOMSON: I maintain that it will not involve additional expense.

Hon. G. Taylor: It would mean the appointment of more teachers or less attention being paid to other subjects.

Mr. THOMSON: Why should it? At Moora the other day there was one of the finest exhibits of wheat, and the greatest variety of seed wheats grown by school children, that I have ever seen.

The CHAIRMAN: I am disposed to think that this amendment will entail added cost.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: If that were so, the Minister himself could put it in.

Mr. THOMSON: It will not entail any extra expense, for we will not send out any more teachers into country districts than at present. But instead of training them as we do to-day on a set system, we shall be able to train certain of them in agricultural subjects. I urge the Minister to accept the amendment. It should be an instruction to the Education Department that more attention must be paid to rural education.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I do not oppose the amendment, but I think the Committee should be advised by the Minister as to whether there is any necessity for it.

The Premier: There is none.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Unless the teachers had received instruction in rural subjects, they would not be able to impart the knowledge to the children. It would be necessary to have a teacher trained in that subject, and he would travel from school to school, spending an hour or so at each, and that, of course, would mean additional expense to the department.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: In a State like this, particularly in the country, everybody's mind by tuition should be inclined to agriculture. If a child's mind is directed along the proper channel, nothing but good can come of it. In the past we have been given to understand that a plant growing in one district or one country will not grow in another. To-day we know that is wrong, but we know it only by reading. Potatoes, it is established, came from the Andes and spread the world over, while apples came from the shores of the Caspian Sea and spread the world over. Half-a-dozen books in the school library would serve to teach the children a very great deal about these things. It is the sort of knowledge that helps to broaden the mind, and it ought to be instilled into the children. It is easy enough to teach them to dig and fertilise and put in the seed, but broader ideas should be communicated to them. They should be taught why these things are done. They should be encouraged to read the story of the life of Burbanks, that eminent horticulturist. If we could afford the money to put such books into the school libraries, we should be doing a great deal

more to advance the cause of agriculture than by giving the children a little knowledge through teachers who themselves have not had time to acquire very great familiarity with the art of agriculture. In our technical schools we teach everything pertaining to mining, and in our high schools we teach chemistry and things pertaining to agriculture. In our smaller schools we should influence the children by providing a small library of attractive books, not so much on agriculture, as dealing with various phases of agriculture. Despite all that science has done, it is said that no acre in the world is doing all that it should be doing. We should help our children to develop the agricultural instinct. However, I believe that all these things are covered by the clause.

The Minister for Justice: Yes, you could not have a more embracing clause.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Well, if there is any doubt at all, we should have the word "rural" inserted.

Mr. LATHAM: There would be no harm in inserting the word. While in Canada I was struck with the system of education in the wheat-growing provinces. There the whole basis of the educational system is agriculture. Even in the cities, areas of land around the schools are devoted to rural education. I do not suppose we could apply to our country schools the same educational system as we can in the city, where we can establish technical schools: but we could give our children education on a rural system exactly like that in Canada, where their arithmetic and their reading are based on agriculture. No harm would be done if a great deal of attention were given to that in this State. Again, if we were to educate our city children to interest themselves in the rural industries, probably there would be a tendency to draw them from the city into country life. Instead of that, we keep our city children in the city, although many of the trades for which they are prepared in the technical schools are already over-supplied with labour. The only true opening in this State lies in the extension of the pastoral and agricultural industries. It would be very wise if we based all our education on rural education. I commend the hon. member for having moved the amendment, and I hope it will be agreed to.

Mr. THOMSON: Our party is particularly keen on rural education. At the last

elections it was one of the planks we placed before the people, namely greater opportunity in the schools to obtain rural knowledge. I find in the dictionary that "rural" means pertaining to the country, as distinct from city or town, and pertaining to agriculture or to farming. There is a great difference between technical education and rural education. I appeal to the Minister to accept the instruction which the amendment conveys not only to the present Government but to future Governments.

The Minister for Agriculture: Rural instruction is given in the schools now.

Mr. THOMSON: Yes, because certain teachers give it voluntarily. The inspector does not examine the children in regard to rural education. Rural industry being the lifeblood of Western Australia, is it not fair that country children should learn the things pertaining to it?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The member for Katanning has misconstrued my remarks. I do not oppose, and I do not think anyone opposes, rural education. According to the hon. member's dictionary definition, rural schools are distinct from city schools. To impart rural education, a teacher would need to be trained in rural matters himself. The Minister for Education would first have to send the teachers to be instructed in rural subjects. There is nothing to prevent teachers who have rural knowledge from imparting it to their pupils now. When the State is spending £700,000 a year on education, we should consider what value is being obtained.

The Minister for Agriculture: All the experts of the Agricultural Department lecture to the students at the Training College.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Then the object of the amendment can be carried out without loading up the Bill.

The Minister for Agriculture: It is being carried out.

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

Ayes	11
Noes	19
				—
Majority against	..			8
				—

AYES.

Mr. Ferguson	{	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Griffiths	{	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Latham	{	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Maley	{	Mr. C. F. Wanebrough
Mr. Mann	{	Mr. North
Sir James Mitchell	{	(Teller.)

NOM.

Mr. Chesson
Mr. Collier
Mr. Coverley
Mr. Cunningham
Miss Holman
Mr. Kenneally
Mr. Kennedy
Mr. Lambert
Mr. Lamond
Mr. McCallum

Mr. Millington
Mr. Munzie
Mr. Pantou
Mr. Rowe
Mr. Sleeman
Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Willcock
Mr. Withers
Mr. Wilson

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

ARMS.

Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Stubbs
Mr. George

NOM.

Mr. W. D. Johnson
Mr. Clydesdale
Mr. Corboy

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 10—Training of teachers:

Mr. THOMSON: Is any special consideration given to rural interests in the training of teachers?

The Minister for Agriculture: Yes, there is.

Mr. THOMSON: If the word "rural" had been inserted in the last clause, it would have meant that special attention would have been given to the training in rural subjects.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Many teachers who go to country schools get only a 12-months' course at the college. The two-years' course is generally taken by the male teachers, and they do get an all-round knowledge, apart from the special subjects they take. They are given opportunities to gain knowledge of all the subjects which have been mentioned. I do not know that their special studies in this respect are described by the word "rural." They are given agricultural subjects, and so enthusiastic are they that they seek every opportunity to obtain instruction from the advisers of the Agricultural Colleges. As to the possession of sufficient knowledge to impart instruction in agriculture, I have to point out that even those men who have taken the diploma of agriculture and become associated with the Agricultural Department have to be trained before being sent out as agricultural advisers. I think it is asking too much that teachers should be qualified as agricultural advisers.

Mr. THOMSON: A portion of the curriculum at the Training College enables teachers, if they so desire, to specialise in agricultural science and agricultural knowledge generally.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. THOMSON: I would like to have it clearly defined so that in the training of our teachers, provision shall be made for those who desire to go in for agricultural education, to take up that subject as part and parcel of their work at the Training College. I trust the discussion will show that in the opinion of members sitting on the Opposition cross benches at least, not sufficient attention is devoted to rural education. I am sorry that the Minister has not been able to give us more information.

The Minister for Agriculture: You do not know what information you want!

Mr. THOMSON: That is not a generous remark for the Minister to make. I do know what I want, and I pushed my requirements to the point of a division, in which the Minister voted against me.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Minister for Agriculture: It is ungenerous for you to suggest that attention is not being paid to rural education.

Mr. THOMSON: I say that insufficient attention is paid to that phase of the work. The Minister is rather thin skinned. I did not condemn the present Government in this respect, but I condemned all Governments. If the cap fits, the Minister can wear it as he likes. I hope some good will arise from the discussion that has taken place.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 11 to 13—agreed to.

Clause 14—Reasonable excuse:

Mr. NORTH: The clause deals with what shall be deemed a reasonable excuse for non-attendance at school. Provision is made for the furnishing of an excuse within seven days and for the production of a medical certificate if required by the Minister. In the country districts it could so happen that a child would be ill and would have to stay away from school and yet be quite well again before the Minister could receive a report about the child, by which time it would be impossible for the medical certificate to be provided. In such circumstances, a medical certificate should not be required. I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to the clause:—"but only in those cases where subsequent investigation by a medical officer is practicable in the circumstances."

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The clause is more generous than the section

in the parent Act. Whereas an interval of seven days is allowed in the Act, the Bill goes further and provides that the excuse may be forwarded within such extended time as a court may deem reasonable in the circumstances. Then, again, the production of the medical certificate is necessary only if required by the Minister. The whole idea of the clause is that the regulations will not be as strict as at present.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 15—agreed to.

Clause 16—Penalties for neglect:

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The clause provides penalties for the neglect of a parent to send his child to school when that child is not less than six or more than 14 years of age. A child at 6 years is too young to be compelled to go to school. It will be time enough to compel him to go to school when he is eight years of age. I feel inclined to move an amendment to that effect, but I would be prepared to accept a compromise at seven years of age. In some instances children have to walk a mile or two to school, and a child six years of age is totally incapable of looking after himself on such a trip. I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of Subclause 1 the word "six" be struck out with a view to inserting "seven" in lieu.

Mr. STUBBS: I agree with the amendment, but there is a danger to be feared. It may be difficult to get the necessary attendance to keep schools open in some of the outback areas if we increase the minimum age to seven years.

Hon. G. Taylor: The amendment will merely mean removing the element of compulsion. Parents will be able to send their children to school, although those children may be less than six years of age.

Mr. Marshall: That is not so, because they will not take my child who is under six.

Mr. STUBBS: If we agree to the amendment, it will be necessary to recommit the Bill for the purpose of dealing with Clause 13, which refers to compulsory attendance and fixes the minimum age at not less than six years.

Hon. G. Taylor: We can amend the present clause, and deal with Clause 13 on recommitment.

Mr. STUBBS: I maintain that the enjoyment of sunshine and healthy recreation out of doors will be of more advantage to a young child than attendance at school at such a tender age. If the Minister can assure the Committee that the amendment, if agreed to, will not have the effect of closing up schools on account of insufficient attendances of children between the ages of seven years and 14 years, then I shall support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member should have moved his amendment to Clause 13. It would be much better not to deal with this clause until we have a decision on Clause 13 on recommitment. To consider the amendment now would be a contradiction of what the Committee has already passed.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: If the Minister will agree to recommit Clause 13 in order that the question might be discussed, I shall withdraw my amendment.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I have no objection to the principle being discussed on the recommitment of Clause 13.

Mr. DAVY: I cannot see why the discussion is out of order on this clause. Clause 13 sets forth the duty of a parent to send children of certain ages to school according to their distance from school, and Clause 16 provides penalties. It would be logical to impose a duty respecting certain children, and to have a penalty in respect of only some of those children. The amendment is that the penalty shall not be enforced except regarding children between the ages of eight and 14.

The Premier: It might cause confusion if we considered it now. I think we had better consider it on recommitment.

Mr. LATHAM: Then I ask the Committee to give greater consideration to the clause from the point of view raised by the member for Wagin. At present it is most difficult to keep certain schools open.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment is to be withdrawn.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: On the Minister's assurance that he will recommit the Bill to discuss Clauses 13 and 16, I ask leave to withdraw the amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 17—Employment of children of compulsory age.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:
I move an amendment—

That Subclause 4 be struck out.

The subclause reads—

A summons under this or any other section of this Act may, if the court thinks fit, be issued without payment of the prescribed fee for the summons or complaint, and such summons shall be deemed to have been duly served if it is sent by post as a registered letter addressed to the person summoned at his usual or last known place of abode.

I have no great objection to the subclause, except for the reason stated by the Crown Law Department that if this departure is to be made, it should take the form of an amendment to the Justices Act. If it were inserted in this measure, a similar provision might be deemed desirable in the Child Welfare Act, and to have exceptions distributed over different Acts would cause endless confusion. The provision was inserted in another place, and has much to commend it.

Mr. Davy: What is there to commend it?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It will simplify the procedure for notifying a parent. Instead of incurring the expense of serving a summons in the usual way, the summons may be served by post. Thus, parents would be relieved of some expense.

Mr. Marshall: How would it cause endless confusion? We do it under the Mining Act.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: There is more in the subclause than meets the eye. If a registered letter were sent, the person to whom it was addressed might not accept delivery. It is inadvisable to have an amendment to the Justices Act included in the Education Act.

Mr. DAVY: I agree with the Minister; I cannot see why there should be different ways of serving summonses. There may be some fairly serious offences under this measure—for instance, the offence of employing during school hours any child under the age of 14. Why such a summons should be issued without the small fee of 1s. for the summons and 2s. for service is difficult to understand.

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

Clauses 18, 19—agreed to.

Clause 20—Blind, deaf and mute children.

Mr. DAVY: I take it that if Clause 13 is amended an amendment to this clause will follow.

Hon. G. Taylor: It will be consequential.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 21—agreed to.

Clause 22—Parents and citizens' associations:

Mr. SAMPSON: An annual subscription of 1s. will entitle all persons to full membership. Is the Minister satisfied that that will not cause trouble? It is conceivable that the membership of some people would not be in the interests of such associations.

The Minister for Agriculture: What do you suggest?

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 23 to 32—agreed to.

Clause 33—Schools other than Government to keep registers of attendance and supply information:

Mr. NORTH: I would like to ask whether this clause will be interpreted literally. In other words, whether parents will be entitled to have their children away from school. There may be cases where the parents may be travelling to another place. Should a child be away four or five days, what action would be taken?

The Premier: Just the same as at a Government school.

The Minister for Agriculture: This is merely to do with the keeping of registers.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 34 to 36—agreed to.

Clause 37—Teachers' appeal board:

Mr. DAVY: Paragraph (d) of Subclause 5 has a familiar ring. It provides that the teacher may conduct his case in person or by an agent, but no legal practitioner shall appear on behalf of the appellant or the department. An attempt seems to be made in all these Acts regulating the right of appeal of civil servants to deprive them of the proper means of being represented.

The Premier: Legal practitioners do appear before the Public Service Appeal Board.

Mr. DAVY: Yes, but not before appeal boards such as this. There was a clause similar to this inserted in the Police Bill and under the Public Service Act a man has no right to have legal representation before an appeal board. True, legal representatives appear before the Public Service

Appeal Board, but that is not a tribunal to deal with an appeal against dismissal or in connection with the charge of an offence. Without mentioning any names I may allude to an experience I had a little while back. A man was charged with incompetence and was dismissed from the service. He desired to appeal, as he was allowed to do under the Act, and he came to me. I had to tell him that I could not appear for him. Although he was by no means a fool he was a singularly inarticulate person, and he could not battle it out for himself with his tongue. I have no doubt that if that man had been successfully represented the decision might have been other than that given. Under a clause of this sort where a man is charged with misconduct or a breach of regulations and is liable to be fined or transferred or reduced in grade or dismissed, he should be permitted to employ whom he chooses. I have no doubt whatever that in the past injustices have been suffered owing to the existence of legislation of this kind. I move an amendment—

That paragraph (d) of Subclause 5 be struck out.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I am not aware that teachers have asked that this should be deleted. If what the hon. member desires is permitted, inevitably it will become a general practice and then, of course, the question of expense will enter very seriously into the matter. I admit that probably more efficient representation will be secured by permitting legal representation, but in the past the practice has been, if the teacher has not been able to conduct his own case, to employ an officer of the association. I should say that a fair representation would thus be obtained. Although these officers have not a general knowledge of law, their knowledge of the Education Act and the regulations is intimate. If the representation that they have been permitted to have in the past had not been sufficient or satisfactory, I am sure they would have applied for permission to employ legal practitioners.

MR. LATHAM: I am not prepared to go quite as far as the member for West Perth. I should like to see that part of the clause remain which sets out that a teacher

may conduct his own case in person or by an agent.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: On both sides the best agents it is possible to get are employed.

MR. LATHAM: At any rate, I am not prepared to go quite so far as the member for West Perth desires.

HON. G. TAYLOR: I do not see why we should, by Act of Parliament, prevent an employee of the Government having the right to employ counsel if he so wishes. I know that when any of us gets into trouble we usually secure the best possible advice, at any rate, according to the length of the purse.

MR. DAVY: I find it difficult to understand the opposition to this amendment. It is not a matter of principle from the point of view of the department. It is not a matter for the union or any other body of people. The point is that a man may find himself dismissed for an offence, as for instance for being drunk in class, and it is proposed to give him an appeal. Yet it is not proposed to let him have a free choice of who shall put his case for him. The Minister for Railways has suggested that the union secretary, who perhaps might represent the teacher, would be just as skilled as the person representing the department. Even so, why should this one teacher be confined to the choice of one person in the world?

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: No, no!

MR. DAVY: But he is. His choice is between the one available person in the world who will be skilled, and all the rest of the world unskilled. It is proposed to cut off from him the right to employ counsel when he is fighting for his existence and that of his wife and children, and that he shall have to draw his advocate from two classes of people. One class contains one person, the union secretary—who might possibly be an enemy of the teacher—and the other class is all the unskilled persons in the world. What objection can there be to giving this teacher an unlimited choice as to who shall represent him? In the community we have a class of men specially trained in putting such cases, and yet it is decreed that they shall be debarred. As for the form of the amendment, I take notice of the objection raised by the member for York, who wants to see

the first portion of the paragraph left in. With the permission of the Committee, I will withdraw my amendment and substitute another.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. DAVY: I move an amendment—

That all words after "agent" in line 2 be struck out, and "or by a legal practitioner" inserted in lieu.

The CHAIRMAN: It would be better to strike out the words "but no" in line 2.

Mr. DAVY: Very well. If you, Sir, prefer that form, I will adopt it.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: On reflection I can quite realise why it is the teachers have not asked for this. If the permission were given it would become the practice for both sides to be represented by legal practitioners.

Mr. Stubbs: What is wrong with that?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It would not matter very much from the department's point of view, because we have the machinery of the Crown Law and its officers. But inevitably the teacher would be put to the expense of getting somebody equally skilled to put up his case. Naturally the teachers realise this, and so they have not asked to be represented by counsel. As to the other point raised by the member for West Perth, I could wish that all men outside the Government service had a concession as good as this of the appeal court, in which they could appear. This appeal board is a concession to those employed in the Government service. I can quite understand that the teachers themselves are satisfied that their representative is fully competent to conduct their cases so long as he has not to face a legal practitioner for the other side. Since this is the teachers' appeal board, set up in their interests, and since it is in their interests that it should be conducted in an inexpensive manner, I cannot accept the amendment, for it would give the department a distinct advantage over the appellants teachers.

Mr. Davy: You do not drag the Crown Law officers into the police court, where all your cases are conducted by a police officer.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Under the amendment inevitably it would become the practice to have legal practi-

tioners on both sides. The teachers are satisfied at present and have not asked that a legal practitioner should defend them.

Mr. STUBBS: I do not quite follow the Minister. Take a hypothetical case: a teacher with a big family is charged with a serious offence. He goes before the board, and the decision of the board takes away his living. He is dismissed from the service and he desires to appeal against the finding. In 19 instances out of 20 the teachers would be quite satisfied with the provisions of the Bill, contemplating lay advocates; but when it comes to a serious charge, say, a charge of immorality—

Hon. G. Taylor: The teacher would go into a law court then.

Mr. STUBBS: In such a case we should give that teacher the privilege, if he so desires it, of engaging counsel to defend him.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I was not impressed by the Minister's argument. The Minister pointed out that the lay advocates meeting each other would be able to put their cases fairly before the board. I think I would be justified in telling the Minister that in these cases there is any amount of advice that the Crown Law Department would give to the department and the department's representative.

The Premier: The law does not come into this.

The Minister for Agriculture: And on the other hand the union secretary would have no difficulty in consulting a lawyer.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: But the lay advocate cannot handle the advice given equally as well as the man who gives it. I cannot believe that the teachers are better satisfied with paragraph (d) than they would be with the right to employ a legal practitioner. There is no argument as regards curtailing a man's liberty.

The Premier: Last time they employed a legal man it cost them over £2,000. They went to the Privy Council and lost.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The Government themselves have gone to the Privy Council, and I remember one case in which the costs were £26,000. The clause cannot be defended. A man who has been 20 or 30 years in the department, and possibly has a wife and children, should be equipped with the best advice procurable when going before the board.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I hope the clause will be passed as printed. Where appeals are provided for various portions of the service, legal advocates are forbidden to both parties. That prohibition was made in the first instance on the application of the employees themselves, because legal assistance was so costly that the system proved to be to the disadvantage of the individual. It was said that unless a man had plenty of money, it was not worth his while to appeal. Hon. members opposite want to reintroduce the legal practitioner, and so again to place the employee at a disadvantage. Now both parties are on an equal footing.

Mr. DAVY: The previous speaker has put the collective view of the particular organisations with which he has come in contact. I am not concerned with any collective view on this clause. I am concerned with the view of the individual who happens to find himself charged with an offence, possibly going to his honour, for which he has been dismissed from his job. It is not a question then of the collective view of the union to which he happens to belong, but a question of him as an individual fighting for his rights. How can it be just to deprive him of any help available to him? Why should he not have the help of people particularly trained to help persons in that sort of trouble? Why not give the teachers a true right of appeal instead of a demi-semi right of appeal? I am not surprised that there has been no request for this amendment: the members of the teachers' executive have not had occasion to appeal, and do not expect ever to have occasion. But if one of them was dismissed for an offence and then was asked whether he thought it fair that he should be deprived of proper help before an appeal board, he would return an emphatic answer in the negative.

The Minister for Agriculture: The teachers have conferences and discuss all these things.

Mr. DAVY: I venture to say not one of them has ever been in a court of law or has ever been faced with the necessity of getting counsel to defend him. The union secretary may be an excellent chap, but the teacher may happen not to like him or not to trust him, so that the teacher would be reduced to conducting his own case before the board.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	21

Majority against 7

AYES.

Mr. Barnard	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Davy	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Latham	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. C. P. Wansbrough
Mr. Maley	Mr. North
Sir James Mitchell	(Teller.)
Mr. Sampson	

NOES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Millington
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Munro
Mr. Collier	Mr. Panton
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Rowe
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Sleeman
Miss Holman	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Wilcock
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Withers
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Lamond	(Teller.)

PAYS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Stubbs	Mr. W. D. Johnson
Mr. Mann	Mr. McCallum
Mr. George	Mr. Corboy

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 38, 39—agreed to.

Schedules 1 to 4, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—LAND TAX AND INCOME TAX.

In Committee.

Mr. Panton in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Grant of land tax and income tax for the year ending 30th June, 1929:

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: When we discussed the Bill, I pointed out that we shall be saving £427,000 per year because of the cancellation of payments to the sinking fund in London, and also in connection with payments on bonds held by the trustees in London. I do not know what the Premier proposes to do with the money, but seeing that the people have been taxed to pay that

amount into the sinking fund, I think they should be relieved correspondingly. The Premier will probably say that taxation has been reduced by the removal of the super-tax and the $33\frac{1}{3}$ reduction as well, but a special grant from the Federal Government enabled that to be done. Additional burdens have been placed upon the land owner, whose land tax was increased in order that there might be a reduction in railway freights. I would prefer to see the railway freights increased to the original figure and the tax taken off, for I think it would be fairer. It is not possible for the benefits of the decreased freight to be received by the consumers. On top of that there are the vermin taxes and other taxes as well. It must be remembered that when we tax agricultural land, we tax the agriculturists' raw material. I think the Premier should agree to reduce the land tax. I move an amendment—

That in line 2 of Subclause 1 "twopence" be struck out with a view to inserting the words "one penny" in lieu.

The PREMIER: I am sorry I cannot accept the amendment.

Hon. G. Taylor: How much would you lose?

The PREMIER: It is difficult to estimate, but, having regard to the difficulty experienced in squaring the ledger, I am sure I would lose more than I could afford. It is true that the land tax was increased four years ago, but that did not benefit the general revenue because railway freights were reduced to an amount equalling that which the Treasury gained by the increased tax. The suggestion that we should revert to the earlier arrangements is worthy of consideration. Our tax is higher than the land tax in some States but is considerably less than in others. If we compare the land taxes imposed in the various States, ours is not excessive. Ours is lower than that of Queensland, where the rate goes from 1d. up to 6d. in the pound, and 2d. in the pound on undeveloped land on big estates. In Tasmania the tax goes from $\frac{3}{4}$ d. in the pound to $3\frac{1}{4}$ d. in the pound. In South Australia the rate is about the same as ours. Recently their tax that was formerly $\frac{3}{4}$ d. in the pound was doubled, and in addition a super tax of 25 per cent. was imposed. In Victoria the tax is $\frac{1}{2}$ d. in the pound, plus a 5 per cent. super-tax,

while in New South Wales the tax is 1d. in the pound on all values outside municipal areas.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We will bring it down to the New South Wales basis.

Mr. Latham: Yes, we would agree to that.

The PREMIER: I am afraid we are not in a position to do that. In Victoria, for instance, it is possible for them to impose a low tax because of their large population and of the fact that nearly all their developmental work is done. Nevertheless Victoria will have to increase the taxation, or produce considerably more in view of the deficit that was started before the present Government assumed office. The results of the referendum on the Financial Agreement cannot be anticipated. If I started to disburse the £400,000 before it was certain that the referendum would result in an affirmative vote, we might land ourselves in difficulties.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But you have got the money.

The PREMIER: Having regard to the apathy that is apparent over the referendum, anything may happen. Any way I am sorry it is impossible to reduce taxation at present.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I do not want to remind the Premier of what he said when he was Leader of the Opposition, beyond mentioning that he often stressed the urgent necessity for reduced taxation.

The Premier: I think that is one of the things I did not do.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The Government in those days were not so financial as are the Government to-day. Less loan money was available, yet the Premier urged in those days, when he was Leader of the Opposition, that there was every justification for reduced taxation.

The Premier: But there was not justification in those days.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The then Leader of the Opposition said that there was.

The Premier: No.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I can well remember that each year we had meetings with the managers representing the Legislative Council.

The Premier: And we always stuck to you when we met their managers.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I think the Premier, when he was Leader of the Opposition, tried to wipe out part of my tax-

ation occasionally. I had promised that when our deficit reached a certain stage, I would reduce taxation. I think the Premier can anticipate the carrying of the referendum. I wish it were otherwise, and if I could defeat it I certainly would do so.

The Premier: Anything might happen.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes; I am anticipating that the Premier will get the money—over £400,000—and it certainly ought to relieve taxation. Again I urge the Premier to consider that it is a wrong principle to impose a tax on land in order that railway freights may be reduced. The principle is wrong because the people who pay the tax do not get the benefit of the reduced railway freights. Just imagine imposing two taxes for the destruction of vermin, on top of which landholders have to pay road board rates and various other taxes. Taxation in the aggregate is altogether too high. The Minister for Agricultural Water Supplies puts up at least one tax every session.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we shall deal with that tax when he brings it along.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: But we cannot go on paying his tax and these taxes.

The Premier: Then I shall stop his tax.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: No, we shall stop the Premier's taxes.

The Minister for Agricultural Water Supplies: My tax is all right.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister's tax is not under discussion.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Ought we to continue to charge 2d. in the pound on land, remembering all the other taxes imposed on the same bit of land? Landowners pay too much now. The road board rate saves the Premier revenue; the water rate goes into revenue.

The Premier: That is only for services rendered.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not think he always renders the service. The destruction of vermin is a national work, and yet that is made a charge against people who own land.

The Premier: We ought to repeal that tax.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Let us repeal it before we consider this tax.

The Premier: No, after we get this tax through.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Is the Premier quite serious?

The Premier: Personally I am.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If the Premier will postpone this Bill until he brings down the other measure, it will facilitate the passing of this one. I hope the Committee will agree to reduce the land tax to one penny. There is no need for this tax in view of the advantage the Premier is getting under the Financial Agreement, and we shall not have an opportunity to consider the matter again for another 12 months, by which time the Premier will have had 2½ years' benefit.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	19

Majority against .. 5

AYES.

Mr. Barnard	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Brown	Mr. Hampson
Mr. Davy	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Latham	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. C. P. Wansbrough
Mr. Maley	Mr. North

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Chesson	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Collier	Mr. Millington
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Munro
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Rowe
Miss Holman	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Withers
Mr. Lamond	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Lutey	

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. J. M. Smith	Mr. W. D. Johnson
Mr. Stubbs	Mr. Clydesdale
Mr. George	Mr. Corboy
Mr. Maon	Mr. McCallum

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I wish to refer to the matter of sheep sold just before shearing. It is quite unfair that a man should have to pay tax on income represented by the wool on the back of the sheep sold just before shearing and tax on the income after shearing. He has to pay twice. Then, too, it increases the value of all the sheep held by an individual. If he pays 30s. for a sheep, which includes 10s. for the fleece, when he takes the fleece from the sheep he pays income tax on the fleece a second time, and yet the sheep is retained on his books at the full price of 30s.

The Premier: Although 10s. of the price represented wool.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, on which he has already paid tax. I wish the Premier would go into the matter. I do not see why it cannot be adjusted by the department. It would apply only to sheep sold shortly before shearing.

The Minister for Justice: The Premier thoroughly understands that now.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It works considerable unfairness and probably retards sales.

The Minister for Justice: People will not buy sheep before shearing on that account.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The principle is wrong. I saw some sheep that were shorn in the north in September and were sent south and shorn at the end of January. That is a convenient way for people in the south to buy sheep, because they can be held for 18 months' wool and then fattened and sold. It is a profitable way for people in the South-West to handle sheep, and they should be encouraged to do it. Consequently, I am afraid the Minister for Justice will get into trouble with his electors if he does not support me. I know the Government always hesitate to bring down an amendment of the Assessment Act, but we should be able to deal with this one point.

The PREMIER: I shall consider the matter, but unless what the hon. member urges can be attained by means other than an amendment of the Assessment Act, it will be difficult. Members understand how difficult it is to deal with the Assessment Act. Once it is introduced, so many amendments are suggested. If we dealt with this one point this session, it could be done only by consent.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I shall agree to deal with only that point so far as this House is concerned.

The PREMIER: Another place might take upon itself to deal with the whole Act and amend the Title to bring it into conformity with the amendments made.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: If you put up an amendment, we will stick to it.

The PREMIER: I shall consider it. Of course, if another place amended the Act in many directions, there would be no alternative to dropping the Bill. I agree it is wrong to charge twice for the one fleece of wool—just before it is shorn and after it is shorn.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 3 to 6, Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1923-29.

In Committee of Supply.

Resumed from the 1st November; Mr. Lutey in the Chair.

Department of Mines (Hon. S. W. Munsie, Minister.)

Vote—Mines, £101,975: (Partly considered).

HON. G. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret) [9.17]: I have no fault to find with the Vote, nor can I complain about the administration of the department. I was pleased to hear the remarks of the Minister which tended to show that there was a chance of some improvement in the industry. We well remember last year that the Minister was somewhat depressed about the outlook, but it is satisfactory to know that this year he is hopeful of better results. I am not too clear about the Minister's remarks concerning the Golden Horseshoe. At any rate, I hope that the company will be able to put on men and begin operations so that they may liquidate their debt to the State. I understand that the company are endeavouring to raise a considerable sum of money for the purpose of putting the mine in order, but I do not know how far they have been successful in that direction. I suppose the Minister is satisfied that what the company propose to do will be accomplished.

The Minister for Mines: I think they are only awaiting an engineer to arrive to examine the property.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: With reference to the Hidden Secret, I was glad to hear the Minister's hopeful remarks. I do not desire to say anything that will tend to damp the ardour of those who are carrying on development work, nor do I wish in any way to suggest to the Minister that he should do anything but what is right towards those who are carrying on genuine prospecting work, no matter who they may be. I was pleased to hear the Minister say that it is the intention of the Government to subsidise genuine companies, those that will put up a straightforward case, and whose intention it is to

bore for deep alluvial. In Western Australia deep alluvial has been found in only one district. It was really not deep alluvial as it is known in the Eastern States, but there is no reason, as the Minister has already said, why it should not also be found in and around the Golden Mile, and many other places as well. If it is found in one part of the State, I feel confident it will be found elsewhere, and if it should be found it will give the mining industry a great fillip and will solve the unemployed difficulty in one fell swoop. That is the policy that I hope the Government will foster. Speaking for my own district, I was pleased to hear the Minister say that there was a possibility of development work being again undertaken at the Lancefield Mine. Three or four years ago, when the present Minister for Lands held the Mines portfolio, I suggested that it would be wise if the Government devoted a large sum of money, say £20,000 or £30,000, towards carrying out boring operations on that mine. We know that when the mine was closed down the lowest level was at 800 feet, and that at that level there was a very big lode carrying good values. The ore, however, was very refractory and the machinery that was on the mine was obsolete. It was with the greatest difficulty that overhead charges could be met and it was not surprising to find that the mine had to be closed down. Boring operations should now be carried on to test the lode for another 200 or 300 feet, and if it is proved to exist, and values are maintained, the Government would then be in a position to tell the company what they would be prepared to do.

The Minister for Mines: The company have already got a boring reservation and they have agreed to pay the cost of the boring.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I am glad to hear that and I have every confidence that the boring will prove successful. From my own knowledge of the mine I know that it should have many years of life before it. At the time it was closed down, the Lancefield was looked upon by those who were engaged in operations there as one of the best they had ever worked in. If boring under systematic control is undertaken, the mine will be proved to be of great value. I compliment the Minister on his determination to assist these people. There is a general feeling amongst ordinary prospectors that big com-

panies should not be assisted, but no matter on which side of the House we may be seated, we must arrive at the conclusion that capital must be found if the industry is to be developed, that brawn and muscle in themselves are not sufficient. It was pleasing to hear the Minister's statements with reference to the Sons of Gwalia Mine. We know that some people were sceptical when the Government granted a loan to the Gwalia company. The Minister now informs us that the operations at that property during the last three or four months have been more than encouraging, and more than the company themselves expected when they started their latest development work. The figures that were supplied by the Minister regarding this mine, and the low cost of operating it, show that the averages are well maintained and prove that the assistance rendered by the Government will be of great advantage not only to the company but to the State as well. I wish that there were another ten or a dozen such mines operating under similar conditions and with prospects like those at the Sons of Gwalia. What struck me rather forcibly was what the Minister had to say with respect to the suggestion made some time back about supplying power for the mines on the Golden Mile. The Minister stated that the three experts, who were sent to Kalgoorlie to report and advise as to the capital cost of a power plant to supply current for the Kalgoorlie mines at a certain rate, estimated the cost of such a plant at £273,000. Then the Minister gave us the information that the Sons of Gwalia company by using suction gas were generating their own current at a third less cost than the scheme suggested by the three experts for Kalgoorlie would involve. In the interests of mining, and other industries as well, that in itself is of great value. When experts are asked to advise the Government on a big proposition such as the generation of electricity at a reduced rate so that a number of mines may be worked more economically, and they submit an estimate which afterwards is proved to be two-thirds higher than the actual cost of generating current on a mine considerably further away from civilisation, it gives rise to speculation. That information from Gwalia is not expert information, but it is practical knowledge. If that can be done there, it shows what a wonderful boon that experience at the Sons of Gwalia

will be to the company at Wiluna when their operations are in full blast in the course of a year or two. I have been dealing generally with the Minister's remarks. Coming down to the Estimates, I do not desire to offer any criticism to which exception can be taken. I have nothing but what is complimentary to say of the Mines Department. All the officers there are very ready to give every assistance to a member representing a mining constituency, and are most courteous with it. I find on the Estimates that the salary of the Under Secretary for Mines is still at £960, although all other Under Secretaries have reached their limit of £1,020. I understand they are all classified, but I do not know whether this is in accordance with the classification. I notice that last year we voted £960 for the Under Secretary of Mines and that there is no increase this year, although other officers have since reached their highest classification. I do not know why this officer should not be allowed to reach his limit. I make no complaint, for the officer concerned has not suggested anything to me about it. It is only that I noticed it on the Estimates. Perhaps the Minister in his reply will tell me the reason why this officer's salary has not been increased. As to any further remarks I may have to make, I will accept the Premier's advice and leave them till the Loan Estimates. The Premier is very anxious that we should leave all these matters till we get to the Loan Estimates; but then we are told we should have said what we had to say on the Revenue Estimates. I will reserve any further remarks for the Loan Estimates.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison) [9.35]: Those representing gold mining districts look upon these Estimates as being solely confined to the production of gold. That is not so, for other minerals are being produced and it is encouraging to know that some of them notably tin, asbestos and mica, are coming into prominence in the markets of the world. While keen attention is being paid to the production of gold, one is compelled to take a very broad view of the prospects of gold mining being carried on at a profit for any great length of time. Certainly the Minister's comparison between the costs of the production of gold at Gwalia and Leonora, as against the Golden Mile, encourages one to look with some con-

fidence to the future production of gold at a profit. That depends solely on the management of the mines of the Golden Mile. It depends upon whether the managers there are prepared to find the capital to re-condition their plants. There is no chance of costs being reduced at Kalgoorlie until the obsolete plants are re-conditioned and the obsolete working methods supplanted by something more up to date. Gwalia, it must be remembered, has had the good fortune to have installed an up-to-date plant, and as a result the mine is now being worked on the latest scientific methods. So it has a distinct advantage over mines longer established and which from time to time have merely added necessary accessories to their plants. From the point of view of future gold mining in the State, Wiluna probably is the most favoured centre. One can look forward with confidence to Wiluna being a very big producer in the near future. When I speak of Wiluna I do not wish it to be understood that in my opinion there are no other deposits worth the immediate attention of investors and even speculators Jimblebar, while not to be compared with Wiluna, is nevertheless a deposit of gold bearing ore well worthy of attention. The Government have done much to assist the prospectors there, and I am confident that that and other places will get favourable and immediate attention from the Government. It seems singular that every time the mining Estimates come up for discussion—this is the seventh occasion on which I have been present—it is nearly midnight and consequently one does not feel like going into the pros and cons at so late an hour. However, there are here just two matters of particular interest to me. The first is the Minister's attitude regarding an application that was made at Wiluna for the forfeiture of a lease. It is of no use talking about producing gold or wheat or any other commodity if we are going to hold out of a state of activity the factors necessary in producing that commodity. While one must excuse the Minister or the departmental officers for being as lenient as they can be, and while perhaps chiding them for being slow, one does expect that after all the safeguards have been taken they will stand up to the law of the land. For many years past there has been a certain gentleman playing a very prominent part in the

gold-mining industry; prominent in the direction that he has seemed to have a power or influence not to go into the active course of developing the auriferous belts of the State, a power or influence in holding up production of gold in this State. He purchases a gold mining tenement for a few shillings in some cases, and in other cases more expensively; but having purchased one, he applies for exemption and gets it.

Mr. Sleeman: Does he do that continually?

Mr. MARSHALL: It has been going on for the past 20 years. One can go to any part of the State and find monuments to this gentleman's desire to speculate in State assets to the advantage of himself. One can start at Kalgoorlie and go north—

Hon. G. Taylor: What is wrong with Southern Cross?

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes, one can start at Southern Cross and go right through, and he will find that for years this gentleman seems to have been able to do something that others cannot do.

Mr. J. H. Smith: He must have a pull somewhere.

Mr. Sampson: What are you doing, making charges against the Minister?

Mr. MARSHALL: I am not making charges against the Minister. Not only this Minister, but Ministers that were administering this department long before Labour came into the political life of this State, have done the same. It was going on then and is going on now. This gentleman certainly has spent some money in gold mining in this State. But in my electorate the only time he ever employed wages men was about 12 or 13 years ago in Wiluna. When he finished employing those men he left them with post-dated cheques that were never honoured. In other words, he cheated the wages men he employed, and it was the only time he employed any wages men in my electorate.

Mr. J. H. Smith: Had they not some remedy?

Mr. MARSHALL: Not against this man. He is outside the law. Why he gets these privileges I do not know. He knows the mining laws of Western Australia well. The Minister knows him well. This is what the man has done. He goes to Wiluna and buys a lease—I am informed—for £400 from a party of prospectors. Beyond the

purchase price he never puts a penny into the lease, but he immediately applies for exemption. A certain prospector, who could not be expected to be well up in the law, had applied for forfeiture of the lease on account of non-compliance with the conditions of the Mining Act as to working. The prospector's allegation was true: the lease was not being worked. It never will be worked while the Mines Department permit the man to hold it without working it.

Hon. G. Taylor: We do know he is holding it for speculative purposes.

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes. The same gentleman held the whole of Wiluna for 12 years. This lease was a good speculation. Its situation is right in what it is now hoped will prove one of the largest gold mining centres ever known in the State; and there is a possibility of the northern end going off as well. The company are working the lease now. This man has got all he wants out of it. Unfortunately some trouble arose owing to the prospector applying for forfeiture just as the warden happened to be visiting Wiluna to hear an application by the man for exemption. In my opinion the Minister should not, in the circumstances, have permitted this gentleman to retain the lease. The Minister points out that he has to be careful and considerate in his treatment of all interested in the gold-mining industry. I agree with him. But, having regard to the character of the individual who has never ventured anything whatever in Western Australian gold mining if there was a semblance of speculation in the matter, and considering the favours he has received at all times from the Mines Department, including the support of various Ministers, it is time he was asked either to work his leases or get out. I have here the Minister's minute on the application for forfeiture. It reads—

In regard to Mr. Lawson's complaint as to the non-posting of the notice and the hearing of the application for protection in open court, although I admit that a strict compliance with the requirements of the Act would involve both those procedures being adopted, I am also well aware that in practice it has been found quite impossible to comply with them, and they are not strictly insisted upon. To do so would, I feel sure, inflict considerable hardship on many backblock prospectors and mine owners.

I am well in the Minister's corner as to that. But this gentleman had an alternative. There were unemployed in Wiluna, and he could

have said to his agent, "Put the men on and hold the lease." The Minister took no notice of that aspect, but simply said, "It would be very hard to forfeit merely because a notice was not put up, and I will let him off." Claude de Bernales could have employed workless men at Wiluna, but he did not trouble to do so.

Mr. Latham: He is getting a pretty good advertisement as a promoter.

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes, and he would get a pretty lengthy period if he had justice done to him. He need not have put up the notice and the Minister could have exempted him. Still, the man had the alternative of employing some labour, and he did not avail himself of that alternative. There seems no use in wrangling about it. Apparently the man has some particular influence. He holds up this lease and other leases until he can sell. When he employs men, he gives them a post-dated cheque which is dishonoured.

Mr. Sampson: On a point of order, is a member of this Chamber justified in speaking of a citizen in this way?

Hon. G. Taylor: That is his responsibility.

Mr. Sampson: If wrong has been done, action can be taken in some other way, rather than take advantage of the privilege afforded by Parliament.

Mr. Davy: The hon. member is quite in order, but he is not very brave to do it here.

The CHAIRMAN: I thought the Chairman was asked to rule on the point of order, but I find there are other chairmen. The member for Murchison was certainly within the Standing Orders. What he said was, of course, his own responsibility.

Mr. Sampson: I do not know that there is any responsibility.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am not much troubled by the comments of the member for Swan.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no occasion to deal with them. The hon. member should deal with the Estimates.

Mr. MARSHALL: If the hon. member had been one of those men who left Wiluna with their swags up, their wives and children remaining to be dependent upon the storekeepers to keep them until the husbands got work elsewhere, he would not be so much concerned about this gentleman.

Mr. Sampson: There are courts.

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes, but one wants to keep wide of courts. A man who employs miners for months on end and leaves them with three months' wages owing to walk out with their swags up, the wives and children being dependent on the storekeepers, should be in Fremantle gaol. I am sorry the Minister permitted Claude de Bernales to get the six months' exemption. The lease is merely put by and tucked away with the rest, and will be sold when it is profitable to sell. De Bernales will never work it.

Mr. Sampson: I wonder whether you would say any of that outside?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. S. W. Munsie—Hannans—in reply) [9.55]: The member for Pilbara raised a point with regard to the boring at Braeside. He stated that the first bore put down at Braeside was put down on the footwall side of the lode, which of course is not customary. The hon. member said he anticipated there was some explanation of the adoption of that course. Mr. Blatchford, the Government Geologist, was sent to Braeside for the purpose of planning up to 15 sites for bores. He planned only 13, keeping two in reserve. In this instance the Government are subsidising to the extent of £1 for each £2 provided by the company. The company have agreed to find £10,000 if the Government find £5,000 for the purpose of testing Braeside by deep boring. The first bore was put down on the footwall side, and the company sent their representative, an English mining engineer, to inspect the site selected by Mr. Blatchford. The mining engineer agreed absolutely with Mr. Blatchford in placing No. 1 bore on the footwall side. The principal reason was the expense of getting wood and water to the hanging-wall side. The country was exceptionally difficult, and both experts agreed that the lode could be tested to a sufficient depth by a shallower hole in the ridge on the footwall than by going to the hanging-wall side and incurring additional expenditure. That is the only reason put forward, and I think it a good reason. I believe another bore was put down on the footwall side as well. The balance will be on the hanging-wall. The hon. member also expressed the hope that the Government would do something in response to the repeated requests made

by himself and the local residents for some diamond drilling at Marble Bar and in the Nullagine district. In reply I can state that the Government have already taken into consideration the possibility of having boring done at Marble Bar and Nullagine. Let me say at the outset that I as Minister cannot say that the company who are doing the boring at Braeside will agree to continue boring anywhere else when they have completed that contract. They are contractors, and not employed by the Government.

Mr. Teesdale: Is it not Government plant?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: No. The company found the plant to do the boring. The Mines Department have already decided that before the company are near the completion of their present contract Mr. Blatchford or Mr. Wilson shall be sent north for the purpose of ascertaining the best places in which to bore at Marble Bar and Nullagine, and also to ascertain from the company whether they are prepared to do any further boring, and if so at what cost. I assure the hon. member that if the company are reasonable in regard to cost, the Government are prepared to assist to find the money needed for the boring in question. But I can give the hon. member no guarantee, because I do not know whether the company are prepared to take the boring on. There is not much else to reply to, except the matter raised by the member for Mt. Margaret with regard to Horseshoe. Certainly the Horseshoe Company are still paying interest, and it has to be borne in mind that £51,500 of the amount of £56,500 was arranged through the Treasury, and not through the Mines Department. The Government have not yet paid one penny. The bank have advanced the money on condition that the company pay a certain rate of interest for the loan. While the bank are satisfied and the company pay the interest we cannot interfere, and, what is more, do not intend to interfere. If they continue to find the money that enables them to pay the interest on the loan, it is a matter between them and the bank. The bank will not foreclose while they continue to pay their interest. Should they fail in this respect, the bank would come to us as guarantors. I am satisfied that if the report of the gentleman who has been engaged upon the examination and sampling of the Horse-

shoe Mine is satisfactory, the company will be able to raise sufficient capital not only to repay the loans from the bank and from the Government, but to provide sufficient to enable the mine to be put in proper working order again. I understand that he has completed his work. Reference was also made to the salary received by the Under Secretary for Mines. All I can say is that the salary paid to him is as fixed by the Public Service Commissioner. The Minister has nothing to do with that.

Mr. Teesdale: Has he received his statutory increases?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes, every increase due has been paid to him. The next matter I wish to refer to is the question of the application for the forfeiture of a lease at Wiluna to which the member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall) referred. He mentioned one of the gentleman by name, and he suggested that he had no right to the lease at all. That was as good as saying that the forfeiture of the lease should not have been granted. I want hon. members to know the facts. An application was lodged for the forfeiture of the lease, but not from the present holder. He had nothing to do with the lease at the time. The application was lodged on the ground of non-compliance with labour conditions. I have looked through the files, and I believe that the man who made the application for forfeiture was justified in the course he adopted, and that he should have secured the lease. He did not get it because the warden recommended the imposition of a fine instead of the forfeiture of the lease. Subsequently Mr. Claude de Bernales paid £400 cash over the counter to the holders of the lease, and purchased it.

Mr. Teesdale: What was wrong with that?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Nothing. Mr. de Bernales has held leases for many years, and he had nothing to do with the application for forfeiture in this instance. The man concerned contended that the labour conditions were not being complied with, and he searched for three days, subsequent to which he lodged his application for forfeiture. Notwithstanding that, the warden recommended the imposition of a fine and later Mr. de Bernales bought the lease from the original holder. This matter has nothing whatever to do with Mr. de Bernales, and that gentleman has been interested in the lease for barely four months. As Minister for Mines, I do not care whether it is Mr

de Bernales or any other man, for everyone will get equal consideration from me, and each will get equal justice.

Mr. Teesdale: Hear, hear! Even if one man is worth 10s. whereas another may be worth £10,000.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I may just as well mention the fact to hon. members now in case some question crops up about it later on. Mr. de Bernales has been interesting himself in various mining propositions and he has asked me certain questions. He asked me whether I was prepared to do certain things under the Mining Act—by taking action in directions I am empowered to do under that legislation—and I have pledged my word to him that if he does what he proposes, I will give him certain protection in respect of mining areas in this State.

Mr. Teesdale: Quite right, too.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I will not mention any district because other people might try to get in first. He came to me and mentioned a mine that had not been worked for over five years. He told me I could ascertain the facts through the departmental officers, and I did so. He told me he believed he could get a fairly substantial sum of money to enable him to re-open that mine, and to erect up-to-date machinery to assist in the operations. He told me that he could not undertake to raise that money inside six months, and that it was no good going to people in England or elsewhere with a view to raising capital on the mere assertion that he knew of a lease he could get if he had sufficient capital to work it properly. He said that it was no good going with such a tale whereas it was absolutely essential that he should be in a position to say, "I have got a lease"

Mr. Teesdale: Hear, hear!

The MINISTER FOR MINES: He assured me that if he could get the necessary protection, he would be able to go on with it. I wish to say that if he comes to me with other similar propositions, I shall be prepared to give him six months' exemption in respect of any mine that he can show me has not been worked for four years. I will give him the necessary protection and grant him exemption to enable him to raise the capital. I am prepared to give him or any other person all the protection required under similar conditions.

Mr. Sampson: You are prepared to assist those who will raise capital to encourage gold mining.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes. I want to see that type of man encouraged.

Mr. Marshall: Is it not a fact that de Bernales has been granted exemption?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes.

Mr. Marshall: And he has spent nothing on his lease?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: No, but he paid the purchase price of £400 to the holder of the lease. What for? Is it suggested that he paid £400 merely to lose it?

Mr. Marshall: No, he hopes to make £4,000 out of it for himself.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: And I say more power to him. If the other man had got it, he would have worked the lease himself; but if he had received an offer of £4,000, would not he have taken it too?

Mr. Marshall: But he would have worked the lease!

The MINISTER FOR MINES: There is nothing to prevent him working the lease now. The conditions under which Mr. de Bernales secured exemption in respect of the lease provided that he has to let a tribute to any man who may desire to secure it, and it must be free of royalty. Thus any man who takes a tribute from Mr. de Bernales in respect of that lease has not to pay a penny for the privilege. Any man can go on to the mine and work the lease on tribute to-morrow.

Mr. Marshall: Is it not a fact that this man's agent went into court and said that the other man should not get the lease because he could not work it?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: As a matter of fact, that statement was made. At that time, however, Mr. de Bernales had nothing whatever to do with it. The man, who is his agent now, went into court and advanced one reason why the lease should not be forfeited, and that was that the oxidized zone had been worked out and only the sulphides remained.

Mr. Marshall: That was incorrect.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: At any rate, that was the statement made, and he suggested that if the other man had got hold of the lease without any capital at his back, he could not have worked it. In his reply to that statement, the other man said he had no intention of going into the old workings,

but there was something else he wanted to work.

Mr. Marshall: That is correct; it was on the south side.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: At that stage, Mr. de Bernales did not hold the lease at all; the other man held it. After Mr. de Bernales had paid £400 for the lease and had applied for exemption, the other man came along and opposed the exemption. In view of that I made it one of the conditions of the exemption that if a man decided to take a tribute on the lease, he should be able to do so without the payment of a royalty. Mr. de Bernales was prepared to accept that condition, and that is the condition that applies to-day. If this man knows there is a lode on the eastern side that has not been touched, he can work it from the surface, and he will be better off than if he were paying the survey fees and all the other charges. He can go on to it and work without the payment of a penny.

Mr. Marshall: And if this man uncovers anything of value, it is merely telling Mr. de Bernales where his wealth is.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: We passed the sections regarding tributers in the Mining Act some time ago, and under its provisions all tributaries must be registered to be legal. If this man were to take a tribute on the lease and register it, Mr. de Bernales could not put him off inside 12 months. Thus the man would be protected for 12 months. Mr. de Bernales cannot do now what he could have done in the past, and in the event of anything of value being discovered, put the tributers off straight away.

Mr. Marshall: If Lawson accepted a tribute and found something good at the end of 11 months, what would happen then?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The Act provides that he shall receive six months' notice before he can be put off. So that means that at any rate he will have six months' notice.

Mr. Marshall: And leave the deposit to Mr. de Bernales.

Mr. Latham: That is a fair proposition.

Mr. Marshall: I am not saying anything about that phase.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I know Mr. de Bernales and have spoken to him. I do not know the other two gentlemen, although one of them came to me with the member for Mt. Margaret (Hon. G. Taylor)

and the member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall). But the other individuals in the case I do not know and have never seen. It seems strange that this man, by his own statement, has lived for 15 years in the Leonora district and that those other people have held that lease all the time and practically done nothing on it. And he waits till the Wiluna company take up all their leases, and then suddenly discovers that he wants to work some particular part of this lease. Why? He wants the lease for the same reason as Mr. de Bernales wanted the lease, namely, to get rid of it to the Wiluna company.

Hon. G. Taylor: I do not think you are quite right in that. I know all three of the parties. I know the whole of the circumstances.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I do not know the other two at all. I know only the facts as they appear on the file. I still say that irrespective of what he found on a 24-acre lease adjoining the Wiluna leases, the better values he found the higher the price the Wiluna company would have offered for it and the sooner he would have sold it.

Hon. G. Taylor: The Wiluna company will not purchase it now.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: No, they will have nothing to do with it.

Mr. Marshall: They used that in evidence, too.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: There is nothing further I wish to say. I thought it only fair that I should make that statement in reply to the statements made by the member for Murchison. Generally I wish to thank members for their kind remarks regarding the Mining Estimates, and to hope they will now allow them to go through without much further discussion.

Vote put and passed.

Department of Public Health (Hon. S. W. Munsie, Minister).

Vote—Medical, £171,758.

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH
(Hon. S. W. Munsie—Hannans) [10.13]: I do not intend to say much about the Medical Department on this occasion, nor will I have a great deal to say about Public Health. Members will see there is an increase of approximately £4,000 in the

Vote for the Medical Department. That increase will not this year give any advantages to the hospitals or institutions that were in existence last year. The principal reason, almost the sole reason, for the increase is the building of the new hospital ward at the Old Men's Home. That ward cost about £16,000 to build, and it provides 38 hospital beds. It is that ward and its furnishing and lighting that is responsible for the increase.

Hon. G. Taylor: And I suppose they have had to increase their staff?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Yes; from memory I may say there are seven orderlies and five nurses in that ward. The increase generally in the number of patients during the last 12 months, I may show in the following way: At Government hospitals patients occupying beds have increased from 327 to 345, or an increase of 18 per day throughout the year; at public hospitals the increase has been from 573 to 590, or an increase of 17; and at committee controlled hospitals the increase has been from 120 to 139, or an increase of 19. This gives a total increase of 54 beds per day during last year. At the end of the preceding financial year, according to the statements supplied with the Estimates, we anticipated a surplus of £8,000 from the entertainments tax. During the last financial year the whole of that surplus, with the exception of £348, was utilised in hospital services. And during this last year we used the £37,000 odd that was collected and also the £8,000 odd from the entertainments tax with the exception of the £384 that was in reserve at the end of the last financial year. In other words, during the 1927 period we spent from the entertainments tax £41,737. The various efforts made throughout the State—all efforts, button days, sweeps, collections of every description, entertainment, all forms of giving, including direct giving, the appeals for the hospitals, last year resulted in a return of only £20,000 odd. That was the total amount raised.

Hon. G. Taylor: Including your tax?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: No, I am referring to efforts made to raise money for hospitals. Of that sum, £10,032 was raised by the Children's Hospital appeal, and £6,000 by the Perth Hospital appeal. The public generally have done magnificently, particularly in regard to committee hospitals. But when all is said and done the

amount raised by those means amounts to less than £30,000. I am of opinion that the effort of collection has been worth considerably more than that. In my opinion it is not the right method.

Mr. Lindsay: You mean the effort of collecting?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Yes. While I do not want to cast any aspersions on any person or organisation, I think it will be admitted by every member who has taken a particular interest in this subject that the methods adopted to raise funds for hospitals in some instances have resulted in considerably more than 50 per cent. of the total amount collected going in expenses.

Members: Shame!

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: The method is wasteful in the extreme.

Mr. Lindsay: Quite true.

[*Mr. Lambert took the Chair.*]

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Tomorrow I hope to have the privilege of introducing a Bill which, if passed, will obviate that sort of thing in future. Some people might be under the impression that we are extravagant in the control of our hospitals but I wish to assure members that the management of our hospitals compares more than favourably with that of hospitals in the other capitals of the Commonwealth.

Hon. G. Taylor: It always did.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Yes, not only now but at all periods.

Hon. G. Taylor: For the last 20 years at any rate.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Take our bigger hospitals: The Perth Hospital can be compared with the Prince Alfred Hospital in Melbourne or the leading hospital in Sydney, Brisbane or Adelaide, and our cost per patient per day will be found to be less. Consequently, no one can accuse us of extravagance in that direction.

Hon. G. Taylor: And I think our efficiency equals theirs.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: In most things it does, but the Perth Hospital is not as up-to-date in some of the methods of treatment, or the experiments made with regard to treatment, as are some of the bigger institutions in the Eastern States. As a matter of fact, each of the leading hospitals in the four Eastern capitals already has what we at present are only trying to

get, namely, deep therapy and radium treatment apparatus.

Hon. G. Taylor: The other States have not had it very long.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: No; Adelaide has just installed its apparatus and so has Brisbane. Sydney and Melbourne have had it for about 18 months.

Hon. G. Taylor: When those cities were as young as Perth they had nothing like the facilities we have.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Extensive alterations and additions have been made to the Wagin hospital. There has been considerable expenditure on the resumption of property adjoining the Bunbury and Busselton hospitals to allow of needed extensions. A new V.D. ward has been provided at Bunbury and alterations and renovations have been made at Geraldton to provide more accommodation for patients. A new drainage scheme has been provided at Margaret River, as well as improvements to the drainage at Collie. Then there are the 88 beds at the Old Men's Home to which I have already referred. Extensive additions have been made to the King Edward Memorial Hospital, and to the Bunbury, Busselton, Carnarvon, Broome, Northam, Margaret River and Merredin hospitals, and a new and up-to-date hot water service has been provided at Kalgoorlie. During the year assisted hospitals were completed at Pemberton, Quairading and Goomalling, and additions have been provided at Wiluna and Bruce Rock. A new ward block has been erected at the Fremantle hospital. The erection of hospitals has been approved for Narembeen and Three Springs, as well as extensive additions at Kununoppin. New hospitals at the following centres are at present under consideration:—Morawa, Harvey, Mt. Barker, Donnybrook, Fitzroy Crossing and Kulin. Regarding hospitals departmentally managed, some are very small and relatively costly, particularly those in the North-West. In spite of that, however, the daily average cost of all departmental hospitals, which aggregate 345 beds occupied, is only 10s. 8d. That is inclusive of the expense of the North-West hospitals, some of which run to 18s. per day. Sometimes they have only one patient and the staff has to be maintained just the same.

Mr. Teesdale: And they get 6s. or 7s. back for it.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I need not say much more regarding the medical part, but I wish to say something about the public health side. The Estimates for the public health side show an increase of £489—not a very big increase. Work is going on in the Health Department now that is increasing yearly, but I feel certain that it is justified, and I believe the people of the State thoroughly appreciate what is being done from a preventive point of view. I honestly believe that the more we can educate the people from a preventive point of view, the less we shall have to spend to cure people in years to come. I consider it money spent in the right direction.

Hon. G. Taylor: By the people you mean the menfolk?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: There is no doubt that the womenfolk as well as the men appreciate it, and I shall quote evidence presently to prove it. The number of school children medically examined exceeded 14,000, over 3,000 of whom needed medical attention. That is equal to 22 per cent of the whole, but the figure does not include the total defects discovered, as for many of them medical attention was not necessary, and treatment for certain defects could be given in the home. It is expected that a greater number of children will be examined during the current year with a staff of three full-time officers instead of two full-time officers and one half-time officer as in the past. During the year an exchange of medical officers of schools has been effected with the authorities in Great Britain. I am pleased to say that in this movement Western Australia leads the other States of the Commonwealth. It is the first instance of such an exchange, and I am rather proud of the fact. I believe a medical officer of schools of Western Australia can gain much useful information and be of considerable value to the British Government by spending 12 months in the Old Country, gaining experience of the methods there and giving the Home authorities the benefit of what is being done here. I am satisfied Western Australia will gain by having an officer acquiring experience in the examination of school children particularly in the big cities of England and making available here the fruits of that experience.

Mr. Davy: You are referring to Dr. Stang, are you not?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Yes.

Mr. Davy: Who worked out that bright idea of an exchange?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I do not know exactly.

Mr. Davy: Did not she work it out herself?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: No, but she was pushful to get the job and I give her credit for it. I am pleased that Dr. Stang was selected. Since she has been in England I have had a couple of letters from her and I am satisfied she is the right woman in the right place because, when she requires information, she will not be put off. She will get what she is after, if it is possible to get it. Therefore I am pleased with the appointment. For school dental work we now have three full-time dental officers. A condition of their employment is that they shall put in two-thirds of each year in the country districts, and one-third in the metropolitan area. During the last year they have examined the teeth of over 14,000 children, and from a dental point of view that examination, like last year's, has disclosed most unsatisfactory conditions. I have here a return relating to one metropolitan school, to which I desire to draw attention in order to show the need for this class of work. It refers to children eight years of age and under. The number of children examined was 179. Treatment was completed for 89. Treatment was commenced, but not completed, for 13. Treatment could not be commenced for nine. The total number treated at the school was 111. The operations performed include silver amalgam fillings 69, copper amalgam fillings 208, silver nitrate treatments 140, copper cement fillings 41, extractions 227, and mouths cleaned 72. The average age of the children treated was 6½ years. The number of permanent teeth treated was 523, the number of temporary teeth 101. Here is the list of children examined and the number of bad teeth in each case. There were 18 children with no bad teeth, five with one bad tooth, nine with two bad teeth, 14 with three, 15 with four, 16 with five, the same number with six, 19 with seven, 16 with eight, 12 with nine, 10 with 10, eight with 11, the same number with 12, five with 13, two with 14, three with 15, two with 16, and one child with 19 de-

cayed teeth. Can anyone expect a child to grow up healthy under those conditions?

Member: I think that is pretty exaggerated.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: No. I undertake to say it can be vouched for.

Mr. Teesdale: What interest would the dentist have in exaggerating?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Out of 179 children eight years of age and under attending that school, only 18 did not require some treatment of their teeth. On top of that, nine out of those 18 had previously been treated. So that, in point of fact, there were only nine children out of 179 who did not require some dental treatment.

Hon. G. Taylor: That does not say much for the future generation.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: The facts convey to me that it is the Government's duty to do what they are doing in the employment of dental officers, and that it is up to the medical experts to ascertain the cause of those conditions. It is not much use continuing to treat the children year after year unless we get at the reason why so many require treatment.

Mr. Teesdale: Knock a bit off education and spend it on the children's teeth.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: That is what I believe should be done, and what I shall use my best efforts to get done in the near future. With regard to infant health work, fair progress has been made during the last year. Fourteen centres are now established, and I hope that during this year three or four more will be established. I have had it put up to me times out of number that the infant health centres were some new fad introduced by the Health Department or the Minister, that the Western Australian public did not need them, that the mothers of Western Australia would not bring their babies to them. I was convinced from the very first that the mothers would do so in the interests of the children themselves, and I am pleased to be able to quote figures proving that the mothers of Western Australia do want the welfare centres and do attend them. The return for the year from the 1st July, 1927, to the 30th June, 1928, shows that 12 centres working the full year and one centre that was in operation for only three months were attended by 5,087 infants. The statistics show that the total number of babies born in Western Australia dur-

ing the same year was 8,604. Thus 60 per cent. of the babies born in Western Australia attended one or other of the 13 infant welfare centres. That is a complete answer to the man or woman who says that the people of Western Australia do not want those centres.

Mr. Davy: But what is the catch?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: There is no catch at all.

Mr. Davy: Perhaps some babies attended a lot of times.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: No. These are individual babies. The total number of attendances of babies at centres was some 43,000. Those are individual babies, 5,087 different babies. I wish to say—and this applies more to country districts than to the metropolitan area—that the people most opposed to the infant welfare centres are the doctors. For what reason, I leave hon. members to guess. I say, knowing it to be true, that in many places opposition is pretty severe to the establishment of infant welfare centres, and that in the country districts especially the opposition comes from medical practitioners. I am positive that the mothers and the future mothers of Western Australia will ignore that opposition, and get the advice which, in my opinion, is of more benefit than that of doctors during that particular period of infant life. As to other activities, I regret that we have not been able to make more progress with regard to treatment of mental deficient. In the psychologist we have a lady who is certainly enthusiastic, and who I believe understands her work. Dr. Jones, the Commonwealth officer for investigation and treatment of mental deficient, who travels all the States of the Commonwealth, recently visited Western Australia and reported on the work being done by this State's psychologist. That report speaks for itself, but I may mention that he characterises the work done here as equal, if not superior, to that done in some of the Eastern States. Our psychologist to-day is working under great disadvantages. The chief disadvantage is the inadequate accommodation available for the training of mental deficient. I hope we shall be able to overcome that difficulty and that we shall be able to provide for the proper treatment of these children shortly. I have referred to other matters dealt with by legislation, and I hope to have the privilege to-morrow to introduce a Bill that will enable us to finance hospitals if the

measure is agreed to. I have pleasure in submitting the Estimates for the Health Department.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [10.41]: I am sure hon. members heard with astonishment the statement of the Minister regarding the condition of the teeth of the children in our schools. There is certainly something radically wrong.

Mr. Latham: It indicates a shortage of lime.

Mr. SAMPSON: There is probably some deficiency in the food that the children consume, and it is to be hoped that it will be ascertained what the deficiency is. It is suggested that there is an insufficiency of lime, and I have heard it said that goat's milk might overcome the difficulty, although I admit I am not an expert on goats. I wish to refer to the Wooroloo Sanatorium and the need for the installation of an X-ray plant there. Medical men who have visited the institution have pointed out the necessity for the provision of that plant at the sanatorium in the treatment of tuberculosis and kindred diseases. Unless it is provided, there is not the same chance of securing the best results from treatment. I understand the Minister discussed this question with some of the patients at Wooroloo and that he promised that when money was available, the plant would be provided. In response to a question I asked, the Minister was good enough to inform the House that a suitable plant could be obtained for £1,200. So keen are many of the patients to secure the advantages of an X-ray plant, that a deputation representing them was anxious to wait upon the Minister to stress the need for the plant. The Minister dealt with the matter sympathetically and indicated that he was aware of the great need for it and that it would be provided. The point is that those who are suffering from tuberculosis are urged to go to Wooroloo at an early stage thereby enabling the authorities to treat the disease from the inception, thus admitting of a greater chance to effect a cure. If it is a fact that it is impossible to combat the disease and to watch its progress effectively without the advantage of the X-ray plant, surely the expenditure of £1,200 would be amply justified. If the best facilities are not available in the shape of necessary equipment, it is discouraging

to the medical men in attendance but more so to the patients themselves.

The Premier: How many years is it since the medical men first asked for the provision of an X-ray plant?

Mr. SAMPSON: I understand it is only within the last few months that the necessity had been particularly stressed.

The Premier: They have gone on for years and it is only now that it is being particularly stressed.

Mr. SAMPSON: Various experts who have visited Wooroloo have pointed out the disadvantage of not having the plant.

Hon. G. Taylor: Have the medical men made application for the plant before?

The Minister for Health: Yes, four years ago.

Mr. SAMPSON: I am advised that this is the only institution of its kind in Australia that is without an X-ray plant.

The Minister for Health: I do not know about that, but the Wooroloo Sanatorium is the only institution of its kind in Australia: there is nothing to compare with it.

Mr. SAMPSON: It is a very fine institution, but I cannot agree that it is the only institution where tuberculosis is treated. In South Australia there is a hospital for consumptives in the Mt. Lofty Ranges, and I know there are other such institutions in other parts of Australia. I believe that at each such institution plants are installed such as are required at Wooroloo. Then again I do not know that any very great expense will be involved because I have ascertained that patients are required to attend in Perth for X-ray treatment.

The Minister for Health: Not treatment.

Mr. SAMPSON: No, X-ray examination. If that is so, there would not be very much cost involved; because, as will be seen in the Estimates, there is £200 set down in the fund to be provided for this purpose. In a short period this would pay for the necessary equipment for the sanatorium. The work could be done on the spot. The health of many of the patients is such that they cannot properly come to Perth, and some who should be X-rayed are not able to come at all. I believe the Minister has had inquiries made in respect of the sanatorium. The inquiry was made about four years ago, and certain recommendations were submitted. I regret that I do not know what those recommendations were. I should like to urge

that the X-ray equipment be provided. Scientists say that without X-ray equipment there can be no definite and certain knowledge as to the progress of the diseases treated there, nor any assurance as to how best to handle those diseases. I do urge that if it can be done, this X-ray plant should be provided. It would very nearly pay for itself in the saving of the amount now being spent on X-ray treatment in Perth.

HON. G. TAYLOR (Mt. Margaret) [10.53]: I desire to offer a few remarks on this Vote. I hope the Minister in future will be able to handle the Medical Vote, so far as it affects hospitals, without having to resort to any form of street collection. Those collections are most unsatisfactory, their cost is too great and they serve to pester the people. When we find that of £30,000 subscribed in that way, £16,000 was collected by two hospitals, we see that, while nobody is inclined to support heavy taxation, there is every justification for some form of taxation to relieve the people of these exasperating collections for hospitals. Long ago Parliament decided that it was the function of the Government to provide hospital treatment for indigent people. That principle has been laid down in all the States of the Commonwealth. That being so it is for Parliament to provide the necessary money by an equitable form of taxation, those who contribute participating in the benefits to be derived. I hope that when this proposed taxation comes down we shall be relieved of any further reports by the Minister controlling the department as to how much money has been collected here and how much there for the purpose of maintaining hospitals. Hospital charges in this State may appear to be very high, yet in comparison with those in other parts of the Commonwealth it is seen that they are not out of proportion. A little time ago a member interjected that people are better catered for in respect of hospital treatment in the Eastern States. I venture to say that when the population of the Eastern States was the same as ours is today, none of the Eastern States had hospitals equipped as well as those in Western Australia are equipped. It is pleasing to know that successive Governments have regarded it as a function of Government to help those in need of hospital treatment. In the near future we shall have a Bill dealing with hospital finance, and I hope the scheme to be adopted will prove

entirely successful. I am pleased to know the Government have arranged for hospital treatment at the Old Men's Home. From time to time in this House we have had discussions about the inadequate accommodation for those who are sick in that institution. I am sure the innovation will be of great benefit, and I am pleased to think the Government have supplied a nursing staff and a well-equipped hospital ward down there. The Wooroloo Sanatorium has been in existence for about 15 years, and we have been treating tubercular patients for about 24 years. In its earlier stages at Coolgardie, the sanatorium had not the same accommodation as is provided to-day at Wooroloo. It is generally believed by experts that of tubercular cases taken in their earlier stages something like 83 per cent. of cures can be effected.

Mr. Chesson : Those experts are pretty optimistic.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I am inclined to think so. From our experience at the Coolgardie Sanatorium, at the infectious branch of the Perth Hospital, located at Subiaco, and at the Wooroloo Sanatorium, one cannot set up any reliable record of successes and failures, because for the most part the patients admitted have been in an advanced stage of the disease. People do not like to be told that they are suffering from tuberculosis, and so they keep away from medical advisers and in consequence the treatment is seriously delayed. If there be any truth in the statement that the medical profession are able to cope with tuberculosis provided it is taken in its earlier stages, patients are very unwise in keeping away from the experts. It should be the function of the Wooroloo Sanatorium and of the Medical Department to induce people who feel that they have any lung trouble to at once avail themselves of the advice of the highest authority on tuberculosis. If the disease were taken in its earlier stages, no doubt we should have much better success in its treatment. Up to date we have not made much headway at Wooroloo, but that is because the patients will not go there until their ailment is well advanced.

Mr. Marshall: Other cases go there now, besides those with miners' phthisis.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: All cases of tuberculosis are accepted there, but many of them do not go until the disease is pretty well advanced. I am trying to strike a warning note to people who have any idea that they

are suffering from tuberculosis. No matter what their ages may be, they should go along to be treated for the disease. By that simple means a good deal of the trouble we have to-day would be removed.

MISS HOLMAN (Forrest) [11.0]: I wish to congratulate the Minister on the work of his department. I consider it a great thing that we have so many doctors and dentists attending to school children, but we have not yet sufficient. In my district there are a couple of schools the children of which have not yet been examined, although I was promised that the examination at one of the schools would be carried out 12 months ago. I know the Minister's ultimate object is to secure a travelling dental clinic, in order that the teeth of children in the country may be better attended to, and I for one would welcome the advent of such a clinic. In the South-West the cost of extractions and fillings, together with travelling expenses for mothers to get their children's teeth attended to, is something enormous; in fact, in many instances it is quite prohibitive. The teeth statistics mentioned by the Minister are dreadful, but we may take some consolation from the infant welfare work. Seeing that mothers are giving their children the natural food and are being taught by welfare clinics the essentials of the care of children, it should make for improvement in the teeth of the children, at any rate, of the children now growing up. Regarding the proposed tax for hospitals, I am glad the Minister intends to introduce legislation. I believe it will be for the benefit of the hospitals, but I am under no delusion in thinking that it will do away with street collections. I understand the tax is intended to create a hospital fund only and will not be devoted to charitable institutions at all. Consequently, the street collections and street sale of sweep tickets will continue as before. I should like the Minister to make provision to cover them also and thus do away with all collections in the streets. I was glad to hear about the new hospital established at the Old Men's Home, and I should like to know whether for the centenary a new home will be provided for the old women. The present home for women is a two-storied building and, according to my ideas, is not suitable for them. Apart from its unsuitability there are various disadvantages, and I should like to see something done. I know

that the Minister is doing as much as possible with the limited amount of money at his disposal, but we must hope for the best. I should like to see an X-ray plant installed at the Woorloo Sanatorium, because it might be the means of saving some patients in the early stages of the disease by affording them an opportunity to be examined and to obtain the necessary treatment. I am looking forward to the time when the doctors and dentists will be able to examine all the children in all the schools.

MR. LINDSAY (Toodyay) [11.3]: I listened with considerable interest to the Minister's ideas of subsidising hospitals in future. On several occasions I have dealt with the rate of subsidy paid by the Government per patient per day, but I have not been able to take the Minister to task, because the information before the House was not supplied by him. Now, however, we have information from the Minister and I find that the same anomalies that have existed in the past continue to exist. Although the figures before me deal with the year 1925-26 and we are now dealing with the year 1927-28, I consider that measures should be adopted to put assisted hospitals on something like an equal basis. It is not fair that one hospital should receive a subsidy from the Government of 10d. per patient per day, while another hospital receives 4s. 9d., both being the same class of hospital. I am aware that that disparity does not exist to-day, because I have succeeded in getting the Minister to increase the subsidies to two hospitals in my electorate, but it is not my fault that two of the hospitals in my district receive the lowest subsidy in the State. The Wyalcatchem and Woodanilling hospitals are situated in agricultural districts, and while Wyalcatchem receives 8½d. subsidy per patient per day, Woodanilling receives 4s. 9d.

The Minister for Health: The Woodanilling hospital does not come in the same category as the Wyalcatchem hospital.

MR. LINDSAY: I agree that the Woodanilling hospital is slightly smaller, according to the average number of beds occupied.

The Minister for Health: Woodanilling is purely a maternity hospital and we are subsidising the nurse.

MR. LINDSAY: That may be so, but I can mention another in order to draw a comparison. The Beverley hospital receives 1s.

4½d. and the Brookton hospital 2s. 3½d. per patient per day. The average number of beds occupied in the Beverley hospital is eight, while at Brookton the average is 1.4, but the people of the district have to make up the deficiency. In other words, the willing horse is still allowed to do an undue proportion of the work. The people of one district are allowed to collect more money than the people of other districts. To that I have taken exception in the past and I shall continue to do so.

The Minister for Health: You could draw similar comparisons between departmental hospitals, one of which, in the North-West, costs three times as much as one in the south.

MR. LINDSAY: I am dealing with assisted hospitals only. There should be some method by which Government subsidies could be paid on an equal basis to all such hospitals. It is not very nice for the people, who have been collecting the cash to keep their hospitals going, to find that another district 25, 50, or 100 miles away, is receiving three or four times as much money by way of Government subsidy. It is not fair. I have expressed that opinion on various occasions.

The Minister for Health: I do not think any one hospital is collecting three or four times as much as another.

MR. LINDSAY: The figures I am dealing with are headed "Rate of subsidy per patient per day," and that can mean only one thing—the subsidy paid by the Government to each hospital in respect of the number of patients per day in the hospital. Most of the figures for the various hospitals differ.

Hon. G. Taylor: Are the conditions comparable?

MR. LINDSAY: Certainly they are. I have not compared hospitals on the gold-fields or in districts adjacent to the agricultural areas with those in the agricultural areas. I have compared hospitals in the agricultural areas and they should be about the same.

The Minister for Health: I wish I could get them all the same.

MR. LINDSAY: In my district there are five hospitals, and each one of them is on a very low rate of subsidy.

The Minister for Health: They are on a higher subsidy than are hospitals in some districts not as fortunate as your district is.

Mr. LINDSAY: The Kellerberrin hospital receives 2s. 3½d. per patient per day, while Goomalling hospital receives only 10d. Surely there is something comparable between those two districts. Why should Kellerberrin have so much more than Goomalling? The Minister has told me that the subsidy is according to the number of patients; but that does not work out in practice. It is not very nice for me to be told by my electors, "You have got us only so much for our hospital, and we read that some other place has got three or four times that amount." There should be some basis for computing the grants. The Minister mentioned sweeps in aid of hospitals. In my district a sweep for that purpose was proposed, but on going into the proposal I found that the cost of collection would be over 40 per cent. of the entire proceeds. Thereupon I dropped the matter. I agree with the Minister that some other means of financing hospitals should be found. I also agree with the member for Forrest that even if a hospital tax were imposed, considerable numbers of sweeps would still be run. In my opinion the Minister was perfectly right in introducing a Bill to run sweeps for the benefit of hospitals, and if he re-introduces it I for one will support it. If a hospital tax does come about, the hospitals should be placed on something like an equal footing. If the subsidy is to be 6s. per day, let it be 6s. per day to all Government assisted hospitals in country districts. The last time I brought up this question, the member for Cue nearly bit my head off. At Cue the amount is 12s. 6½d. per day. However, I acknowledge that a goldfields hospital, built for a large population and now used for very few people, must be costly to run. But hospitals that are comparable should be placed on something like an equal footing. That is my reason for making these remarks.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 11.14 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 7th November, 1928.

	PAGE
Question: Land settlement, procedure ...	1683
Bills: Wheat Bags, 3s. ...	1684
Police Offences (Drugs), 3s., passed ...	1684
Jury Act Amendment, 3s., passed ...	1684
Bunbury Electric Lighting Act Amendment, 2s., Com. report ...	1684
Land Tax and Income Tax, 1s. ...	1684
Group Settlement Act Amendment, to refer to Select Committee, Com. ...	1684
Water Boards Act Amendment, 2s. ...	1687

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

QUESTION—LAND SETTLEMENT, PROCEDURE.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Is it a fact that—(a) On the 7th September last, all Crown land north of the Mullewa railway and east of the Geraldton-Ajana railway was withdrawn from selection? (b) Numerous applications had been made by selectors for land in this area, and deposits paid on such applications eighteen months before such withdrawal, and that the Lands Department have held, and are still holding, those deposits? (c) In anticipation of the applications being granted the applicants have incurred considerable expense in clearing and fencing the land for which their applications were made? 2, If these are the facts, do the Government consider that the treatment of the applicants is reasonable and proper, and that the procedure adopted is conducive to encouraging settlement on the land?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, (a) Yes. (b) About 35 applications, some of which were for 5,000 acres, and which had been made at various dates, were cancelled and the deposits were returned, or are being returned, to the applicants. (c) It is quite possible that in one or two cases improvements have been made. Applicants had no legal authority to do so. 2, It was considered advisable to withdraw the land from selection until a classification has been completed and the Government have information to guide them as to the area which should be granted to any one person. Some few pieces, which will not affect this principle, have been made available again.