

appeared thereon at the time of the issue of the roll were entitled to vote, but he also said that supplementary rolls would be issued every three months. A supplementary roll had for its object the striking off of those persons who had lost their qualification and the adding of new names. It was provided that every three months a new roll would be issued and certified to as being correct. In such circumstances surely members would not say that Mr. Buzacott was not entitled to that point, at least, to meet the claim made by his opponent Mr. Gregory. No one was aware of the fact that the Attorney General was not correct in his interpretation of his own Bill until the Court decided. If he had been consulted as to the petition being lodged in Court, the Attorney General must have stood by the words he used in this Chamber. If he made the statement in all good faith as a legal gentleman, he should at least be able to realise that a layman would take his word for it. Until the Court gave their decision Mr. Buzacott was not aware, nor was any other layman and very few legal men, that persons who were on the roll would be unable to vote. If the Court had followed the precedent laid down in the Holmes and Angwin case, Mr. Gregory would have been compelled to pay portion of the costs. The decision was given on one point only, and as usual, if 20 points are submitted and the Judge can find one on which to give a decision he lets the 19 others remain undecided, and so permits 19 points to be brought up on future occasions for the benefit of the lawyers. That went on every day. When one asked for a decision on the undecided points a Judge would say, "Wait till they come before me." That meant more Judges, lawyers, and expense to the community generally. This was the case in connection with the Buzacott appeal. The Judge gave a decision on one point which upset the election, and Mr. Buzacott had to pay the cost of bringing all Mr. Gregory's witnesses to the Court to give evidence on points which were undecided. Surely the member for Roebourne would say that it would be unfair to ask Mr. Buzacott to bear the whole of the expense of the petition. It was agreed that Mr.

Carson was the victim of circumstances and should receive compensation for the expenses he was put to, but in the case of Mr. Buzacott the Government might have recouped him for the whole of his expenses.

Mr. OSBORN: The member for Ivanhoe had not thrown any light on the matter. He (Mr. Osborn) had not moved as a personal matter; he had nothing against either Mr. Buzacott or Mr. Carson but it was a case in which a precedent should not be established. He might have made himself plainer if some of the "children" on the opposite side of the House had gone outside to play.

The CHAIRMAN: That remark would have to be withdrawn.

Mr. OSBORN: It would be withdrawn with pleasure but at least hon. members opposite should restrain their mirth and permit a member's remarks to be heard.

Item, Members of Parliament representing electorates beyond limit of State railway system—grant towards travelling expenses, £120:

Progress reported.

*House adjourned at 11.26 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Wednesday, 17th November, 1909.*

	PAGE
Questions: Old-age Pensions .. ..	1427
Jam Factory, State Assistance .. ..	1428
Sitting day, additional .. ..	1428
Annual Estimates, Votes and Items discussed ..	1431
Bill: North Perth Tramways Act Amendment, 2n.	1451

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

### QUESTION—OLD-AGE PENSIONS.

Mr. ANGWIN asked the Premier: Is the Premier aware that penniless persons on making application to the Commonwealth for old-age pensions to relieve the State from the amounts paid by the State,

are not being granted 10s. per week, and in some cases the State has to make up the deficiency?

The PREMIER replied: I have been informed that applicants for old-age pensions who have been in receipt of State relief have been refused the full amount of old-age pension, such State relief having been calculated as annual income, and the measure of pension reduced accordingly.

#### QUESTION—JAM FACTORY, STATE ASSISTANCE.

Mr. ANGWIN asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Have the Government granted any money as a loan or gift to any private company or person for the purpose of opening a factory to manufacture jam or deal with fruit in any manner? 2, If so, what is the name of company or persons, and what interest is charged? 3, If not, is it the intention of the Government to make such grant or loan? 4, Do the Government intend to make known to the public the conditions on which such loans can be availed of, so that all persons dealing in fruit may avail themselves of such loans if necessary?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, No. 2, Answered by No. 1. 3, Yes, to the Donnybrook Co-operative Fruit Preserving Company. 4, Each application to the Government for assistance for the purpose of encouraging the industry will be treated on its merits.

#### SITTING DAY, ADDITIONAL.

The PREMIER (Hon. N. J. Moore) moved—

*That in addition to the days already provided the House do meet for the despatch of business on Friday, 19th November, and every subsequent Friday for the remainder of the session at 4.30 p.m.; and do sit until 6.15 p.m. if necessary, and, if requisite, from 7.30 p.m. onwards.*

Mr. BATH (Brown Hill): Hon. members on the Opposition side of the House had shown a readiness to facilitate the

business, and on a previous occasion when it had been desired to take away one private members' day per fortnight, there had been a general expression of willingness to sit an extra day per week in order to avoid that contingency. But unless some questions of importance were to be dealt with, he failed to see the necessity for the extra sitting day. In the Governor's Speech, as also in the Premier's policy speech, two measures had been promised for this session, namely, the Licensing Bill and an amendment of the Constitution, providing for the reduction of the franchise for another place. A solemn promise had been given to the country that these measures would be dealt with during the present session, and he was willing, not only to sit an extra day, but also to extend the session for just as long as might be necessary, in order that that promise might be redeemed. So far as the amendment of the Constitution was concerned, while hon. members might differ in regard to some of the details there would be no unnecessary delay occasioned by Opposition members in dealing with the measure. The measure had been faithfully promised, and if respect for Parliament was to be maintained, that promise should be redeemed. The same thing applied to the Licensing Bill which was admittedly a non-party measure. Then there were other matters, such as the Workers' Compensation Act Amendment Bill introduced by the hon. member for Dundas, and the discussion on the treatment of country and goldfields hospitals. These were important matters upon which finality should be reached, and if hon. members were to be asked to sit an extra day per week some assurance should be given them that these matters would be gone on with. Again, many hon. members would be inconvenienced if the House were to sit next Friday as they had already made arrangements for that day. That being so, he thought the Premier might amend his motion to read "November the 26th" instead of "November the 19th."

The PREMIER (in reply): It was with the idea of redeeming the pledges made in regard to the two Bills men-

tioned by the hon. member that the extra day was being asked for. It was most inconvenient indeed for Ministers, but it was recognised that the measures on the Notice Paper should be dealt with as far as possible, as well as the Bill dealing with the amendment of the Constitution, of which he had intended to give notice this afternoon. As a matter of fact the Bill was being printed, and he expected to give notice of it on the following day. In regard to the Licensing Bill it had been accepted as a non-party measure and an opportunity would be given for its full discussion. So, too, with respect to the other matters referred to by the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Heitmann: What about the Health Bill?

The PREMIER: The Health Bill ought to be finally dealt with. It had been before the House three sessions, and he was more particularly desirous of passing it seeing that it contained an important division dealing with the adulteration of food. In regard to the suggestion that the motion should be amended, he was quite prepared to adopt it if it would meet the convenience of the members of the Opposition.

Mr. Bath: What about the Workers' Compensation Act Amendment Bill?

The PREMIER: Opportunity would be given for the consideration of that, and of the hospital question.

The MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H. Gregory) moved as an amendment—

*That "19th" be struck out and "26th" inserted in lieu.*

Amendment passed.

Mr. ANGWIN moved a further amendment—

*That the words "and on Monday, the 29th November" be inserted after "26th November."*

The PREMIER: The amendment should not be pressed. It was in deference to the wishes of the leader of the Opposition that the previous amendment had been passed, so that members would not be inconvenienced by meeting on the next Friday without due notice. The hon. member's amendment would prove very inconvenient for country members.

who would find it impossible to reach the House in time to attend the sitting on Monday. It was all very well for those members resident in Perth, but it would be inconvenient for those with their homes away from Perth, say along the Great Southern Railway or the Geraldton Railway.

Mr. SCADDAN: There was nothing in the reason advanced by the Premier, because those members of the House who were business men and desired to go into the country to transact business would not be able to do so if the House sat on Fridays. We might just as well get on with the business and close up the session by sitting on Mondays as well as on Fridays. It would be as well also if the House sat earlier, because members generally wasted a couple of hours after lunch waiting for the House to meet at 4.30, and the tea adjournment was generally reached before any business was transacted.

Mr. Taylor: Why all this hurry? Why not come back after Christmas?

Mr. SCADDAN: If the House sat after Christmas we generally met later for the subsequent session. There were two or three Bills of considerable importance that should be dealt with, so that the Premier could keep his pledge to the country. One of them was the Licensing Bill. We could deal with that at the Monday sittings until it was finally concluded, and as members from agricultural districts apparently had no large concern in the Licensing Bill, because often they were not in the Chamber when the measure was under discussion, they need not worry about being in attendance. The amendment should be carried.

Mr. JOHNSON: The business of the session should be finished as early as possible. When gentlemen undertook to serve as members of Parliament they should realise that it was their duty to devote all their attention to political matters during the session, and that the recess was the time in which they should attend to other business: but the whole consideration seemed to be given to studying the convenience of business men so that they could conduct their business

during the session and in addition have the whole of the recess to do it. He (Mr. Johnson) devoted the whole of his time to Parliament during the session, and looked to the recess to recoup himself for the financial losses he sustained during the session; but why should he be sacrificed year after year in the interests of those who did not take their political duties as seriously as they should do if they did their duty to the country? He appealed to the Premier to try to get through the business before Christmas so that the House could go into recess and so that members could attend to private affairs. It was regrettable the matter should be regarded from this point of view, but the pittance members received was so small that it was absolutely essential in the interests of a man's family and in his own interests that this feature of the question should be studied. He would sit on Saturdays to get through so that the recess could be reached at the earliest possible moment, and with that idea he supported the amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD opposed the amendment. Three days a week were sufficient; but as it was the intention of the Government to close the session before Christmas, and as there was a great deal of business to be dealt with, he was prepared to sit four days to get through the business. He preferred meeting at 2.30 o'clock instead of sitting on Mondays. Many members would seriously agree with this proposal, particularly those country members of whom the Premier spoke. Country members had to wait about Perth nearly all day on Tuesday until 4.30 o'clock, with practically nothing to do, so that they were wasting nearly the whole of the time they spent in the City on the day the House sat. It was no use moving in the direction, because an amendment from the Opposition would not be carried, but he strongly urged on the Premier the advisability of meeting at an earlier hour.

Mr. ANGWIN: Three days a week would be quite sufficient were it not for the fact that the Government evidently intended to terminate the session at an early date. The mere fact that the Gov-

ernment were asking for the extra day a week showed what their desire was with regard to prorogation. It was in order to give members a chance of dealing with the many matters before the House that he had suggested sitting on Mondays as well. It was only by members meeting every day in the week that this House would be able to deal properly with the important matters on the Notice Paper and prorogue before Christmas. If the course he suggested were not adopted it would be impossible to deal with anything like all the business on the Notice Paper.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. SCADDAN moved a further amendment—

*That "1.30" be struck out and "2.30" inserted in lieu.*

The PREMIER: Would it not be better if that amendment came later on in the session? There were still 23 working days.

Mr. HOLMAN: Unless an earlier start were made each day everything would be rushed through in a few days at the end of the session. There were many important measures before the House requiring careful consideration. These were quite apart from the Estimates, which had only just been started. When we came to the Mines and Railway Estimates, there would be some lengthy discussions, especially considering the way in which matters in connection with these departments were now being carried on. The same with regard to the Works Estimates, while the Attorney General would not be let off lightly. It would be better to sit a little earlier in the day now than allow everything to drift until the last few sittings of the year. In spite of the fact that there were 23 days this side of Christmas he could not see how it would be possible to get through between now and then. It was a certainty that Parliament would meet again after Christmas. The Premier should give an outline of what business the Government intended to bring forward before the prorogation. Many matters would have to be dropped, and if the Government indicated these to members they would be spared much time in considering and working at those particular Bills. There were on the Notice Paper 38 Orders of the Day, some of

which would take almost the 23 sittings themselves to get through, without taking into consideration the Estimates and the extra measures still to be brought down. The Loan Estimates had also yet to be considered.

Amendment put and negatived.

The PREMIER: As near as possible he would give members an outline of what the Government proposed should be done with the various matters on the Notice Paper. So far as the Estimates were concerned he hoped, with the assistance of the Opposition, to get through them all right. Then there was the North Perth Tramways Act Amendment Bill, which was not a contentious matter. However, we had had experience of non-contentious matters before, and he sincerely hoped the Bill would be treated in a different way from the Nedlands Tramway Bill of last session. The Abattoirs Bill, the Public Education Endowment Bill, and the Land Act Special Lease Bill called for some slight attention in order to deal with amendments proposed by another place, and not much debate need be expected upon them. With regard to the Agricultural Bank Act Amendment Bill there were two amendments to consider which should not create delay, and the same might be said of the Settled Land Act Amendment Bill. Then there was the Health Bill which the Government sincerely hoped would be passed by the House this time, as it had been so often before this and another Chamber.

Mr. Angwin: There would be a lot of amendments.

The PREMIER: The consideration of the measure would probably take some time. The Influx of Criminals Prevention Bill was not very urgent, and might be struck off the Notice Paper. So far as the Licensing Bill was concerned the Government were anxious that it should go through. He could not convince members that he was sincere in this, but they must have seen from the fact that the Bill was introduced within a fortnight of the House meeting that the Government were anxious to give members an opportunity of doing what they liked with the measure. The Employment Brokers Bill should take no time, and the same might be said of the

Redemption of Annuities Bill. The Police Bill was not a very important matter.

Mr. Heitmann: It will be if you bring it down.

The PREMIER: The amendment of the Standing Orders should be dealt with.

Mr. Walker: It will be no good doing that this session.

The PREMIER: The Permanent Reserves Rededication Bill was a five minutes' measure, also the Transfer of Land Act Amendment Bill. The Land and Income Tax Bill only consisted of two clauses, and was merely a re-enactment of the present Act. There was an absolute necessity for it to be passed. Then there was the Electoral Act Amendment Bill, which should be dealt with.

Mr. Hudson: You might get the Bill brought into line with the Federal Act, but you will not get the other clauses of the measure through.

The PREMIER: There were three railway Bills which the Minister hoped to be in a position to bring before the House for the second reading next week. The Workers' Compensation Act Amendment Bill would be considered, while the Coal Mines Regulation Act Amendment Bill was a private measure. So far as other Government Bills were concerned, notice would be given of an amendment to the Constitution Act on the following day, while of the two Bills of which notice had been given to-day, one was a small amendment of the Land Act and the other was a measure increasing the amount available for re-purchased estates, from £200,000 to £400,000. As to the other matters brought on by private members, the Government would be very glad to give members the chance of discussing them as opportunity offered. There was nothing very formidable in the measures to which he had alluded, and so long as members were reasonable they might well become law.

Question as amended put and passed.

#### ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1909-10.

##### *In Committee of Supply.*

Resumed from the previous day: Mr. Daglish in the Chair.

Treasury Department and Administrative Branches (Hon. N. J. Moore, Treasurer).

Vote—*Miscellaneous*, £73,540:

Item, Members of Parliament representing electorates beyond limits of State railway system—Grants towards travelling expenses, £120:

Mr. HEITMANN: Would the Treasurer supply to the Committee information as to the operation of this amount?

The PREMIER: The details of the expenditure were not in his possession, but the sum represented what was paid for steamer fares and coach fares beyond the limits of the railway system.

Mr. Heitmann: Does it mean merely to the centre of the electorate?

The PREMIER: To their head quarters. Attention might be called to the fact that it was only recently that this assistance was granted to members. Some members lived a great distance from the capital, and considerable expenditure was forced upon them in travelling between the capital and their electorates. A member whose residence was in his electorate, which was far away from Perth, had to spend six months of the year in the City and then returned to his electorate, and where that was beyond the limits of the railway system it was only fair that the State should contribute towards his travelling expenses.

Mr. HEITMANN: It would cost something like £18 or £20 in fares, if he desired to return to his electorate accompanied by his wife and family. Some consideration should be shown to members who were thus situated, and at any rate a pass ought to be issued to the member's wife and family. It was not desired that they should be permitted to travel anywhere they liked in the State, but the pass should certainly be issued to the member's family when they desired to return to the electorate the member represented and which might be a considerable distance from the metropolis.

\* The PREMIER: The request was not an unreasonable one, and might well receive the consideration of the Government.

Mr. Scaddan: You said that twelve months ago.

The PREMIER: As far as Federal members were concerned they were al-

lowed return fares for their wives and families once in each session; and a similar thing might be done in this State.

Mr. HOLMAN: There was another matter which might receive consideration at the hands of the Premier while the Committee were on this particular item, and that was the question of postage and telegrams. Many members had a good deal of correspondence to transact with their electorates and often there were many centres, and a number of public bodies, in their electorates and they should not be called upon to pay the expenses of postage and telegrams out of their own pockets. In the pre-Federation days all the letters on public business were franked.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was wide of the item.

Mr. HOLMAN: The desire was merely to ask whether the Premier could extend the item in the direction of meeting the expenses members incurred through postage and telegrams.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member could ask a question in the House on that subject in the ordinary way.

Mr. HOLMAN: At any rate members in this State should have the same privilege which was accorded to Federal members as far as railway passes for their wives and families were concerned and the Premier ought to give an assurance that these passes would be granted.

Mr. SCADDAN: The matter was previously brought under the notice of the Premier.

The Premier: I recollect about the postage, but not the free passes.

Mr. SCADDAN: It was pointed out that the wives of Federal members had passes issued to them, and fares paid, and that moreover they were permitted to break their journey when travelling between Melbourne and their homes. It was not asking too much to expect the Government of this State to give a similar concession to the wives of members when they were travelling to and from their electorates, at least once a year. The question did not require consideration, and the Premier should give an answer straight away.

Mr. WALKER: In New South Wales any time a member desired to travel with his wife, all that was necessary was to write to the Commissioner and he issued a pass, not for once a year to a particular constituency, but at any time. As this kind of thing did not cost the country anything, there was no reason why the privilege should be denied, more particularly as it was a privilege which was granted in the other States.

The PREMIER: Are you sure about that?

Mr. WALKER: When ever a member of the New South Wales Parliament accompanied by his wife, wanted to travel, all that was necessary was to give a notification and a pass was issued. It was not looked upon as a privilege there, but as a right. The rule he believed also applied to Victoria, and in both States many members took advantage of the fact that they could get their wives franked from one State to the other.

The PREMIER: It had been the custom in Victoria until it was found that the practice was considerably abused. Hon. members there had not contented themselves with travelling with their wives, but had travelled with other ladies.

Mr. Walker: That would not happen here.

The PREMIER: It could not happen here. Knowing hon. members as he did, he felt safe in affirming that. He would give the matter consideration, and if it seemed to him reasonable he would offer no objection to falling into line with the other States.

Item, Entertaining American Fleet, £10:

Mr. ANGWIN: Could some information be afforded in respect to this item?

The PREMIER: It was a balance required to meet outstanding claims. As far as he knew there were no others. The last was in regard to the use of the hall at Albany.

Mr. ANGWIN: Was this the claim made by a certain church for having been deprived of the use of the hall at Albany?

The PREMIER: This amount did not represent the payment of that claim. In

view of the fact that it was found necessary to secure the Town Hall in order to make preparations for the functions, such a claim had been put in for the fare of a clergyman to Albany and also by way of recompense for anticipatory collections. The reception committee, however, had failed to see the justification for a claim of that character.

Item, Refund on fines incurred under the Police Act, 1892, £1,000:

Mr. ANGWIN: Some information should be vouchsafed in respect to this item.

The PREMIER: It would be seen that provision had been made last year for repayment to the extent of £6,610. Of this amount £5,872 had been expended. This £1,000 was practically the balance of the refund. It was in respect to claims by certain municipalities which had not been fully audited before the close of the financial year.

Item, Subsidy to municipalities on general rates, £20,940:

Mr. ANGWIN: The amount had been considerably reduced. This was one of the items on which the Government had shown a decided weakness. It seemed that the Government were removing from their own shoulders to those of other people the responsibility of raising the revenue; that while unwilling themselves to make any increase in taxation they were casting the onus upon the municipalities. Had it not been for these subsidies to municipalities and for the hospitals there would have been very little economy shown throughout the Estimates. These municipalities were entitled to every consideration, and the reduction shown was altogether too great. He sincerely regretted that he could not move to increase the item, and he hoped the Government would give the matter closer attention. He could only reason that the apathy notoriously existing in respect to municipal affairs was responsible for the attitude adopted by the Government towards the municipalities. The matter had not yet reached the people, but when it did, there would be a grand outcry against the parsimony of the Government.

Mr. BROWN moved as an amendment—

*That after "municipalities" the words "in proportion to the amounts raised" be inserted.*

The CHAIRMAN: No amendment changing the destination of a vote could be taken.

Mr. BROWN: It was not intended to change the destination of the vote.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment could not be taken.

Mr. BROWN: That was much to be regretted. It was the intention of the Government to make distinctions in this vote with respect to the various municipalities. All that was asked was that the municipalities should share alike, and that it should not be in the hands of the Minister to differentiate between the towns. In years gone by the Russeton roads board had been favourably treated in a marked manner as compared with other roads boards, and his object in moving the amendment was to avoid any such experience among the municipalities.

Mr. WALKER: It was essential to the welfare of the State that there should be some differentiation exercised. To pay the same sum to a municipality solvent and flourishing as to one struggling under financial difficulties seemed altogether inconsistent. He objected to the reduction of the municipal subsidies, because by this a great wrong was being done to districts in the developmental stage. While it was right enough to economise in respect to the old established municipalities, to exercise the pruning knife in regard to the mining townships which were being built up for the benefit of the whole State was positively cruel. Many outlying bodies had to maintain roads 30 or 40 miles long, roads necessary to support the mining industry and to give channels of communication for prospectors; and to expect those bodies to rate property where there was no property rateable and to maintain those roads, was an absurdity. The consequence of this determination on the part of the Government must mean a lessening of public spirit in the small municipalities and roads boards out-back, and further, it

must mean a deterioration in the condition of the highways in those districts. In some municipalities the very utmost was done that could be done and the people could not bear a greater burden, yet this step imposed one. The Government were only shifting their responsibilities and were compelling taxation by an indirect method. They were placing into the hands of minor bodies, who, perhaps, did not to the same extent realise their responsibilities, this important power of taxation; and the effect of conferring this power of taxation upon those lesser bodies would mean that they would have to raise the deficit brought about by the reduction of the subsidy by placing taxation on new settlers. What was the good of making people immune from taxation under the land tax and telling the roads boards to collect the deficiency? Yet that was done. These boards could place any value they liked upon properties newly taken up by selectors, and in consequence they could so tax these new settlers as to cripple them. In fact this policy would not save the general taxpayer one farthing in expenses, while at the same time it would act as a hindrance and drawback to the development of the country, and it must, to a certain extent, penalise new settlers on the land. It was the policy of the Government and we could not now alter it, but it was a deleterious one and must be harmful. He was going to say it was cowardly, this shirking of responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot use that word.

Mr. WALKER: One could say a policy was cowardly without there being any imputation of wrongful motives.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not reflect.

Mr. WALKER: There was no reflection on anything but the policy, that of placing the responsibility on to other shoulders. Was not that cowardly?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not accuse Ministers of a cowardly act, or of a cowardly policy; it was unparliamentary.

Mr. WALKER: What conduct was that—



The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must withdraw the word.

Mr. WALKER: In regard to what? How was the word applied? Whose motives were imputed? He would obey the Chair respectfully, but he would like to be directed as to how he had imputed wrongful motives or dishonourable conduct to any person or body by saying that the policy of shifting responsibility was cowardly. That was the statement he had made, and he respectfully submitted that it could be expressed in no other way. The conduct of shifting on to other shoulders a responsibility that had hitherto been placed on our shoulders was of a cowardly character. The Government, in this change of policy, were doing an act that was wrongful to the country and would discourage municipalities and harass new settlers, and would do general wrong in preventing or limiting the possibilities of development in outback centres. Development implied assistance not retrenchment, further help not retardation; but from the Government we got retardation and limitation of the possibilities of development, and discouragement to industries outside the metropolis. Against that policy he took objection. It would recoil upon the Government. If that were all it would be little, but the policy would be deleterious to the State as a whole, and would delay development that would otherwise be possible in other circumstances.

Mr. SWAN: Members representing country constituencies were not the only ill-treated ones in this regard. The policy of the Government in regard to these subsidies was to reduce them all round; but at the same time to apply a maximum amount of subsidy payable to any municipality; and, unfortunately, the municipality of Perth was the only one to whom that maximum applied. In 1907 Perth received £12,000 by way of subsidy, in 1908 it received £8,929, and in 1909 it received £6,000, but under the new proposal the amount payable for 1910 would be £2,000. This would show the difficulties under which Perth would be labouring when the new system came into operation.

The Premier: It will do away with that credit balance of £10,000.

Mr. SWAN: Probably the fact of the Perth municipality having a credit balance of £10,000 had something to do with the arranging of a maximum of £2,000.

The Minister for Works: No.

Mr. SWAN: That £10,000 might have accumulated through a wise policy on the part of the municipality, and the municipality should not be penalised for adopting a policy of thrift.

Mr. Brown: It represents uncompleted works.

Mr. SWAN: Perth had no objection to the reduced subsidies, but objected to being singled out as the one municipality to suffer beyond all others.

The Premier: They had been receiving differential treatment; all through there had been five grades of municipalities.

Mr. SWAN: The treatment of Perth would be too drastic. No doubt we should look more after the country electorates because city electorates were well able to look after themselves; but without any desire to be parochial he strongly protested against any injustice to Perth in the allocation of the subsidy under the system proposed.

Mr. DRAPER: While one recognised the need for cutting down municipal subsidies generally, the application of the conditions under which the subsidy was to be paid would, perhaps unintentionally, fall very hardly on the municipality of Perth. If the Government found themselves in the position of unwillingly being compelled to reduce the municipal subsidies, that reduction should be shared equally and proportionately amongst all the municipalities. No doubt it was in the minds of the Government that Perth could, to a certain extent, take care of itself because it happened to have a credit balance for the time being of £10,000. That balance might be on paper, or it might not, but it was probably obtained through unduly cutting down the ordinary services throughout the municipality. If those services were not to be continued Perth would no longer be a credit to the State, but in a short time would become a disgrace. We must consider Perth as the capital of the State, and the first impression visitors got

of the State were of Perth, and it became a matter, therefore, of concern to the whole State that the municipal affairs of Perth should be properly and effectively conducted, of course having regard to due economy. When the Government sent out the circular proposing a maximum subsidy, they had probably not considered this question in all its aspects, and had relied apparently on a credit balance, which was somewhat fictitious and which he (Mr. Draper) had not the slightest hesitation in saying would be very soon exhausted if the administration of Perth were to be properly carried out. The present proposal of the Government was to pay 3s. in the pound on the amount of any general rates, with a maximum of £2,000 and a minimum of £50. If Perth were to get a share in the same proportion as other municipalities they would receive £5,084 instead of £2,000. There was, therefore, a drop of £3,000 under what Perth might fairly look to as being the amount they should receive during this financial year. It was to be hoped the Government would reconsider the matter and see whether what might be regarded as a somewhat unjust differentiation against Perth could not be avoided.

Mr. McDOWALL: One could understand the attitude of the member for West Perth, but not the opinion expressed by the member for North Perth, who advocated that money should be taken out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund to improve private property. That was all municipal subsidies amounted to. The chief effect of the subsidies was to prevent property owners from being properly taxed. It was only reasonable that people who obtained the benefit of the expenditure of money should tax themselves to pay for the work. There was nothing unfair in a maximum of £2,000. The city of Melbourne only received, when he was in Victoria, a subsidy of £1,000.

The Minister for Works: They get nothing now.

Mr. McDOWALL: The city of Melbourne had various sources of revenue, so also had Perth. In the latter place the roads now were made, and works were nothing like so necessary in the metropolitan area as they were in the out-back

municipal districts. The recommendation of the Government should be acceptable to at least the Opposition side of the House.

Mr. Angwin: It is not.

Mr. McDOWALL: So far as he understood the policy of the Labour party subsidies of this kind should be entirely abolished, and property owners should be made to improve their own properties. He heartily supported the Government in their introduction of the grading system.

Mr. BROWN moved an amendment—

*That the item be reduced by £10.*

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment being only for a nominal reduction of the item could not be accepted.

Mr. BROWN moved an amendment—

*That the item be reduced by £50.*

The CHAIRMAN: The sum of £50 was but a nominal reduction on a vote of this kind, and could not be accepted.

Mr. Brown: Evidently you will take no amendment.

Mr. ANGWIN: The argument of the member for Coolgardie that municipal subsidies were spent to benefit the property owner was of no importance, as all money spent by the State went to benefit private property. Again, it was ridiculous for that member to compare the cities of Melbourne and Perth, the latter being only some 10 or 12 years old. Was the hon. member the mouthpiece of the Opposition side of the House? If that hon. member understood the policy of the Labour party he would know it was not to cut down sums voted for the assistance of the people of the State. It was an easy system of economising for the Government to knock money off municipal subsidies, and evidently that was why the present step was adopted. It was much easier for them to do that than to curtail certain items of expenditure which ought to be reduced. It was to be regretted that the vote could not be increased. The municipalities had assisted the Government considerably in the building up of the State and were entitled to every consideration. There was no opportunity given to municipalities to levy the taxes which the Government had not the backbone to levy themselves. It was impossible for muni-

cipalities to improve their towns unless they had the money to do it with. Owing to the reduction, the funds would be very short, and it must be admitted that the curtailment was altogether too heavy.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The Government should have struck out the item. Members argued that it was the duty of the Government to make roads, but the roads were made merely to improve the property of private owners. When the Government wanted new taxation they went to the land owners for it, and the member for West Perth opposed the proposal right up to the third reading, and practically all the land owners of Western Australia were in opposition to the tax. If the land owners opposed the tax they should not get any subsidy. Under the subsidy system those who owned no land, those who lived in tents and bush humpies, had to pay in order to improve the property of the land owners of Perth and Fremantle, their contributions being through both direct and indirect taxes. The differentiation proposal, which had the effect of cutting something off the subsidy of Perth, was a fair one, and it was to be regretted the reduction was not greater. The streets of Perth were made years ago with a subsidy which was very large, and now it was only fair that the City council should receive less subsidy than those places further out where roads had not yet been made.

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

The PREMIER: The good work that the municipalities had done throughout the State had been generally recognised, and in making the reduction it was only done after careful inquiry, and on the reports which had been presented by the Auditor General and the Under Treasurer. The scheme submitted was practically on the suggestion of those officers. It was the intention of the Government to make a considerable reduction, and on the officers named being asked to suggest an equitable scheme, the proposal which had been set forth was the one they promulgated. Those who had studied municipal matters were aware that there had always been a big distinction as far as the alloca-

tion of the municipal subsidies was concerned. That was to say that the smaller the municipality the greater the amount per capita it received. Up to 1903 all municipalities received an equal amount, but after that a proposal was introduced by Mr. Gardiner under which the various municipalities were graded. There were five grades, and they received subsidies in proportion to the amounts raised. For instance a municipality striking a rate of 1s. 6d. in the £ received a subsidy of 25s. in the pound, and that was reduced proportionately, the reduction being 1s. 3d. for every additional reduction of a penny in the amount of the general rate. In the case of municipalities of the 5th class, such as Beverley and Broad Arrow, if they struck a rate of 1s. they would receive 17s. 6d., municipalities of the 4th class, such as Albany, Bunbury, Claremont and Collie received 15s. 9d.; municipalities of the 3rd class, such as Boulder and Kalgoorlie received 14s.; municipalities of the 2nd class, such as Fremantle received 10s. 6d., while Perth, which was graded as a first-class municipality, received 7s. It was recognised then that it was advisable to differentiate in the treatment, and it was realised that in establishing a new municipality provision should be made for the payment of a double subsidy for the first year of that municipality's existence. In connection with this reduction in subsidies it had been stated in this Chamber some two or three years ago that it would be advisable to wipe out the municipal subsidies altogether. The Government however said they preferred that the wiping out of the subsidy should be spread over a period so that the municipalities might have an opportunity of adjusting their finances to suit the altered circumstances. That was what had been done, and the scheme now proposed was practically on those lines. In the case of some of the municipalities in the Eastern States no subsidies were paid at all. In Queensland no subsidy was paid to municipalities. In New South Wales no subsidy was paid except where a municipality had a right under an old Act which had not yet run out. In Victoria there was a fixed proportion paid up to June, 1910. After

that date payments were to have been made on the rates collected, but the cities and towns did not participate in this distribution. In South Australia the municipalities were paid 5s. in the pound on the general rate. In Tasmania the cities were excluded from participating in the subsidy. The South Australian proposal was practically on the same lines as that which it was proposed to adopt in this State. It had been stated by the member for North Perth that Perth had suffered a considerable reduction, but it might be pointed out that in 1907-8 they received £8,000, and last year £6,000, and that during the last 15 years Perth had received a very considerable amount. They started the year 1895 with £5,816, and last year received £6,776, and in the intervening years they received varying amounts. In some years the Treasurer paid 10s. in the pound, and sometimes pound for pound. Throughout those 15 years Perth received in all no less a sum than £175,400 in Government subsidies, and taking into comparison what had been paid to the cities in the Eastern States it could not be contented that Perth had not been liberally dealt with. At the same time it had to be realised that it was only in the last few years that Perth had made any great strides, and naturally that had been given consideration in the allocation of the subsidies. The reduction of the subsidies should have the effect of reducing the cost of administration which undoubtedly was very high, and with the advent of new legislation to enable roads boards and municipalities to combine, a large saving should be effected. As far as Bunbury was concerned there was a roads board secretary's office almost opposite that of the town clerk, and there was no reason at all why there should be two sets of officers to carry out municipal and roads board duties. It had been pointed out that on the Murchison there was a municipality at Cue, another at Day Dawn, and a roads board and a water board all within a radius of a few miles, and the fact that they were not all receiving the same amount of subsidy should induce them to cast around for ways and means whereby they could reduce their expenses. With regard to the statement that there

could be differentiation in the distribution of the subsidies, this question of distribution was left entirely in the hands of the Treasury, and the officers of that department had a scale under which they paid. Members could rest assured that the whole question had been carefully considered, and it was only after going into the matter thoroughly that the proposal that the Government had set forth was adopted. It should certainly have the effect of cutting down expenses, and considered on the whole it could only be regarded as fair and equitable, having in view the different circumstances of the various municipalities of the State.

Mr. SWAN: No exception could be taken to the reduction of the subsidies, and he would go so far as to say that it would be quite reasonable to consider the advisability of doing away with them altogether, but one point on which he disagreed with the present position was that Perth had suffered out of all proportion. On the lower basis fixed by the Government the £2,000 maximum did not apply to any municipality except Perth, and if the Government would give slight consideration to this question he would be satisfied. It was too big a reduction to make in Perth in proportion to the other municipalities. As far as the comparison between Perth and cities in the Eastern States was concerned, Perth had to be admitted to be in earlier stages of development, and there was a greater percentage of non-rateable property in the area controlled by the Perth council.

Mr. TAYLOR: The Government were withholding from the local governing bodies certain moneys which hitherto had been provided out of the Consolidated Revenue. This meant that these moneys would have to be raised locally. The Premier had argued that it would tend to make the local governing bodies reduce their administration costs. But while the Government themselves were increasing the burden of taxation on the people, they were also increasing their administrative work, and, more than that, were getting further into debt every day. The Government should sweep their own doorway

first. There was a breaking point somewhere, and the people could not afford to be taxed by a Government who were spending the revenue not too wisely, and were at the same time withholding from the local governing bodies funds which they had been accustomed to receive in the past, and which were necessary for the carrying out of their services. He was not dealing with the principle of subsidising these local bodies, for that was a question apart. The question was whether the Government were just in drastically reducing the subsidy, and thus increasing local taxation.

**Mr. FOULKES:** The Premier had stated that the Government were arranging to grade these municipalities, but the Committee had heard nothing as to the system of grading to be adopted. What, for instance, was to be the standard of wealth and poverty as regards these municipalities? It did not follow that because a municipality had a large revenue that it was wealthy. A municipality might be small with a small revenue, and yet be exceedingly rich. Notwithstanding this it seemed that the smaller municipalities were to get a larger grant in proportion to their income than were the large municipalities. Thus £2,000 per annum was to be the maximum for Perth; yet that municipality might easily be in a poorer way than another which could claim only £200 a year. It was to be remembered that the demands on, say, Busselton as a municipality were very small in comparison with those made upon Fremantle and Claremont. With regard to Perth one could but recognise that there was a great deal of Government property within the city boundaries which could not be rated. For this reason £2,000 a year was practically no subsidy at all, and no doubt the municipality would gladly exchange that subsidy for the right to tax the Government property in the City.

**Mr. HARDWICK:** It was little wonder that so many members were expressing their disapprobation of the drastic attempt at retrenchment in respect to the municipal subsidies. The member for Claremont might well state that the Perth city council would gladly forego the right

to the subsidy if they were allowed to tax the Government property, for it had been computed that in those circumstances the council would receive something in the neighbourhood of £30,000 per annum. The proposed reduction would certainly mean an increase in local taxation. This was especially unfortunate in respect to Perth, because with the exception perhaps of such as was along the main streets, much of the city property was not returning a fair amount of interest on the capital invested. The Government would be wise in liberalising their views in respect to the subsidies.

Item, Parks, recreation grounds, etc.—  
Grants for maintenance and improvements  
£3,500:

**Mr. BATH:** For several years past the annual subsidy granted to King's Park was included in this general item for parks, recreation grounds, etc.; and although there had been a continuous reduction for the last five or six years, that reduction, to a very great extent, had been borne by the country parks, and not by the King's Park Board. Thus, it would be found that in 1904-5 the total item had amounted to £7,500, of which King's Park Board received £3,000; in 1905-6 the total item had amounted to £6,892, of which the King's Park Board received £2,500; in 1906-7 the total amount was reduced to £5,912, of which King's Park Board received £2,300; in 1907-8 the total amount was £4,300, and of this £2,300 went to the King's Park Board; in 1908-9 the total was further reduced to £3,745, but still the King's Park Board got £2,300. Now, there was a further reduction in the total amount of £245, leaving the amount on the Estimates £3,500; but the amount of £2,300 granted to the King's Park Board was left untouched. Since 1904-5 the total for parks generally had been reduced by £4,000, while King's Park only suffered a reduction of £700. King's Park received 36 per cent. of the vote in 1905-6, and this year would receive 65 per cent. It was an altogether unfair allocation of the vote. Only £1,200 would be available for parks and reserves throughout the State. If a reduction was to be made King's Park should suffer

that reduction in the same proportion as other parks, and it was to be hoped this degree of equity would be observed by the Treasurer in distributing the vote. Unfortunately if one moved to reduce the item the country parks would probably suffer; but if the King's Park grant stood separate, hon. members could express their dissent from the present method of distribution by reducing the King's Park vote in the same proportion as had been done in regard to other parks.

Mr. JOHNSON: Last year, omitting the expenditure on King's Park and Monger's Lake, there was only £1,000 available for distribution throughout the State, and that money was distributed among 23 electorates. The Guildford electorate contained four recreation grounds of a deserving character, but not a penny of the grant was received by them, although another constituency, whose representative boasted that he could get special consideration from the Government and based his claim for election on the fact that he could do more than the sitting member was doing, and, being elected, was apparently fulfilling his promises, was able to get no less than 11 cuts out of the £1,000. That member got £125 out of the £1,000. That was the member for Swan.

Mr. JACOBY, on a point of order, asked that the member be called upon to withdraw the statement. During the last election he had never made any such statement or anything approaching it. It was absolutely untrue that he made such a statement.

Mr. Johnson had taken the newspaper reports.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must withdraw.

Mr. Johnson withdrew, but the newspapers, he trusted, would be more accurate in reporting the hon. member.

Mr. Holman: Was the member for Swan in order in saying that the remarks of the member for Guildford were absolutely untrue?

The CHAIRMAN: No. The member for Swan must withdraw.

Mr. Jacoby withdrew the remark.

Mr. JOHNSON: Bedfordale received £25, Armadale, Chidlow's Well, Kelmescott, Lion Mill, Mundaring, Parkerville, Sawyer's Valley, Smith's Mill, Upper Darling and Wooroloo each received £10. These were all in the hon. member's electorate, yet Guildford electorate received no assistance. In order to get a proportion of this vote had members to get on the Government doormat, or to get on their hands and knees and pray and grovel for the grants? How did the member for Swan get this special consideration? If there was a particular channel the Minister should say what it was so that members could all get fair consideration. After all, the point was as to whether it was a fair method of granting these lump sum votes and then allowing the Minister to distribute them at his own sweet will. The illustration given of the distribution of this vote was sufficient to convince hon. members that when the Minister for Works proposed in the course of the Estimates to introduce another lump sum for distribution strong exception should be taken to it because the method of distribution was distinctly unfair.

The Minister for Works: What has the Minister for Works to do with it?

Mr. JOHNSON: The Minister for Works was proposing to introduce a lump sum vote to be distributed.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not discuss that.

Mr. JOHNSON: What special features did the Swan electorate possess that Guildford did not? Why was he refused consideration while the member for Swan got so much? Were members sitting in Opposition not to participate in the vote, or was the vote distributed honestly without regard to which side of the House on which a member sat?

The PREMIER: A glance at page 53 of the *Public Accounts* would show that there was no justification for the remarks just made. Among some of the grants distributed from this vote were:—Boulder, Coolgardie and Southern Cross each £50, Day Dawn £75, Monger's Lake £450, Brown Hill, Collie, East Fremantle, Gwalia, South Kalgoorlie, Koroona, Laverton, Leonora, Meekatharra, Mount Mag-

net, Morgans, North Perth, Sandstone and Trafalgar each £25, Malcolm £15, and Pinjin £10. Any fair-minded man would realise that, whatever the faults of the Government might be in this direction, there were no cases of spoils to the victors. As a matter of fact there was not a penny for the Bunbury electorate. The amounts were for new centres. As far as the Swan electorate was concerned an expenditure of £10 among heavily timbered country was hardly appreciable. It might be a curious coincidence that there were more in the electorate of the member for Swan, but there was only £125 spent in the electorate, whereas £450 was spent in one sum in an Opposition member's constituency, and there was a sum of £75 for Day Dawn, and large sums for other places. It might appear at the first blush that some undue consideration was given, but inquiry showed that the grant was was only given in cases of new centres, and votes were not given to older established municipalities for municipal parks. So far as King's Park was concerned, it would be a pity to see any reduction. King's Park was one of the features of the City. It was one of the parks appreciated by the whole of the people of the City. Its management was most economical, and it was for the credit of the State generally that the park should be kept up. It was always recognised as one of the distinct features of the City, and the money was well spent. The practice of including the grant for King's Park among the parks and reserves vote had been followed for some two or three years, but from the *Public Accounts* members could see how the allocation was made.

Mr. SCADDAN: This was not a question of what Guildford or Swan got. Certainly the Guildford people could go to King's Park or Monger's Lake. The point was that the metropolitan area was getting all the spoils. Of the £3,745 spent last year £2,855 was spent in the metropolitan area, and that did not include the 11 "cuts" Swan got out of it. It left less than £1,000 for the rest of the State. Repeated application had been made to the Treasurer for a small grant to fence a particular reserve that it might

become revenue producing, and then the people controlling it would be prepared to make the necessary improvements; but the Treasury would not dream of it because it would cost £25; yet we found £450 for Monger's Lake, just adjoining the City, where we already spent over £2,000 in beautifying King's Park. If King's Park was to be beautified why also spend £450 on a spot a couple of miles away? The goldfields should have more attention than the metropolitan district, because in the metropolis the people had natural surroundings where they could get plenty of recreation of a character that could not be got on the fields. In Kalgoorlie and Boulder the municipalities maintained public parks, which, if they were in the metropolitan area, would immediately be called national parks and the Government would spend a couple of thousand pounds a year on them; yet the goldfields people had to maintain these parks and pay a fair amount for water for them.

The Minister for Works: Perth municipality also maintains parks.

Mr. SCADDAN: King's Park was not kept up by the municipality of Perth.

The Minister for Works: It belongs to the Government.

Mr. SCADDAN: Hundreds of people on the goldfields had never seen it and were never likely to see it while the Railway Department made differential railway rates against them. Not only in this case but in others the Government showed special consideration to residents of the metropolitan area. Other people in the State besides those in the metropolitan area should enjoy the expenditure of this money. He had no objection to a certain amount being spent in keeping up King's Park. As it was, however, no facilities were afforded to the people on the fields to see the beauties of the national park, for although the Government made special reductions in railway fares between Fremantle and Albany—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not discuss that.

Mr. SCADDAN: The people on the fields should be given facilities to visit King's Park. The Government should give consideration to the residents of the

out-back districts who had to contribute to the upkeep of the national parks.

Mr. SWAN: In order to prevent any misunderstanding it would, perhaps, be as well to inform members that although there was a sum of £25 on the Estimates for parks in North Perth, nothing was to be spent in his electorate.

Mr. Scaddan: Is there no place named Bayswater?

Mr. SWAN: Yes: and there was a recreation ground there practically useless to the people. The residents of Bayswater showed a great willingness to help themselves, and, consequently they deserved more consideration than those who looked to the Government for everything. The people there applied to the Government for sufficient money to make the recreation ground fit for use, but up to date he had not heard of the request being granted. The people of North Perth received no advantage under this vote over those people living in the country districts.

The PREMIER: Out of a total of £3,745 spent last year there was a sum of £1,000 distributed over the whole of the State, apart from the sums spent on King's Park and Monger's Lake. Of that sum £620 was spent on the fields and £380 elsewhere.

Mr. SCADDAN: It was unfair for the Premier to make a statement of that kind. What he (Mr. Scaddan) had said was that £3,745 was spent last year and that of that sum £2,855 was expended in the metropolitan area. Was not that correct?

The Premier: I never said it was not. You tried to make out a grievance.

Mr. SCADDAN: The sum was spent as follows:—Belmont, £15; Buckland Hill, £10; East Fremantle, £25; Monger's Lake, £450; Peppermint Grove, £30; King's Park, £2,300; and North Perth, £25. That left £890 for the rest of the State.

Mr. GILL: It was surprising to hear the member for Ivanhoe take exception to the votes for King's Park and Monger's Lake. Quite a short time ago the people of the fields complained that there was no place in Western Australia fit to

spend a holiday in, and that in consequence they went to the Eastern States. Now that the Government were improving the natural beauty spots one would think the goldfields people would appreciate their action. The Government had done well in this respect, not only for Perth but for the whole of the State. King's Park was a place that anyone on the fields or elsewhere should be proud of. If there were difficulties with regard to railway communication surely they should be overcome, and would be if members did their duty. With regard to Monger's Lake, that was one of the finest spots in Western Australia, and the £450 spent last year was well spent. There was a lake there we might well be proud of. Thanks to the Minister for Works the leakage there had been stopped. It was no argument that because the people on the fields had no natural beauty spots we should not have them on the coast.

Mr. KEENAN: All members must regret that the amount available for grants towards parks and reserves, outside of King's Park, was so small. It was surprising to find that of that small amount £450 had been spent at Monger's Lake, whereas the money should have been debited to some other vote. Money spent in parks and reserves should be but small grants of not exceeding £150, and to take from the total the sum of £450 for one park was to leave all the rest of the State in the position that only miserable grants could be made to meet their wants. The amount of £50 allocated to Kalgoorlie was but a fleabite compared with the amount spent by the local bodies there. One park alone at Kalgoorlie cost the municipality £1,000 a year to maintain. The sum of £50 was about one-fourth of the amount the local people paid the Government for water for that park. Owing to the climatic conditions local bodies on the fields had to spend far more than the people on the coast, and yet Monger's Lake received last year one-ninth of the total vote. We recognised that economy was imposed on the Government, and that it was necessary to keep this vote to a minimum, but the Treasurer should promise that no lump sum like £450 should be distributed this year



out of the vote. If the Treasurer found that people in a certain locality were putting their hands in their own pockets, he might pay them more consideration when allocating the vote than those who asked for grants and never did anything in the way of making local contributions.

Mr. TAYLOR: Whatever justification there might be for the expenditure of so much money on King's Park, none would deny that the park was a credit to the City and to Western Australia. While he had no desire to curtail in any way the expenditure on the upkeep of King's Park, or of any other park in the metropolitan area, still it must not be forgotten that out of the vote of £3,500 the sum of £2,300 was to be spent on King's Park, leaving £1,200 for the other recreation grounds throughout the State. If there be justification for expenditure in Perth, there must be greater justification for larger expenditure in the out-lying districts. If we took away the recreation reserves from the people in out-back centres we took away from them every form of out-door amusement that they had. It behoved the Committee to at once urge upon the Government the necessity for increasing the vote. In Perth, and even in Kalgoorlie, there were attractions which other places did not possess, and it should be the duty of the Government to do all in their power to make those other places as attractive as possible by providing grants for recreation purposes. There was no desire to say anything against the Government for having provided large sums of money for King's Park or for Monger's Lake, but as other members had stated large sums for those places should not be taken from the general vote for parks and reserves. Whatever attitude the Committee took, it was to be hoped that it would indicate to the Government that they should not further reduce the vote as far as the outlying centres were concerned.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: It was to be regretted that the state of the finances would not allow a larger vote for the purposes of parks and reserves. He thoroughly concurred in the expenditure of money on King's Park, and he could conscientiously support the amount which

had been spent at Monger's Lake. The latter was one of the places the Government should endeavour to beautify and maintain for the people, not only of Leederville but of the whole of the State. In common with the member for Mount Margaret he agreed that more liberal treatment should be accorded to the out-back places, but it would always be somewhat difficult in connection with a vote of this description to treat all electorates alike, and it was an easy matter on the Estimates to find that one electorate had received a sum of money and another had not. The Government should see their way clear to increase the vote in the future, not only for parks in Perth but for parks and reserves out-back.

Mr. HOLMAN: Some of the City members appeared to be of the opinion that the people on the goldfields who desired recreation should come to Perth for it, but it was not always possible for them to do that. There were recreation grounds on the goldfields, but on account of the heat that was experienced there in the summer it was necessary that shelter sheds should be provided, and when it was desired to carry out such works it was found almost impossible to get a few pounds from the Government. Time after time applications were made for grants to improve recreation reserves on the goldfields where there were no beauty spots, and the people who made these applications were entitled to a little more consideration than had been shown them in the past. Those people out-back were denied the advantages for recreation which those who lived nearer the coast enjoyed. In Perth we had one of the best sheets of water to be found in the Commonwealth, and there were recreation grounds, reserves, gardens and places of amusement; yet in some of the goldfields towns there was nothing at all. No one objected to the expenditure of money in the direction of beautifying King's Park or Monger's Lake, but as other members had pointed out it should not be taken from the parks vote.

Mr. GOURLEY: There was no desire on his part to take exception to the vote for King's Park or the money expended at Monger's Lake. As far as King's Park was concerned it was a pleasure to take a

stroll round that beauty spot, and the money that had been spent at Monger's Lake could also be said to have been justified, but with regard to the money spent on the goldfields he would refer to the amount put down for Gwalia. The people there went to considerable expense in making a recreation ground, and in material and labour they spent close on £300. Then they wrote to the Minister asking for a grant, stating they desired to lay on water, and after erecting a fence they had not sufficient money to put up wire netting around the ground. The result was that the labour expended in planting trees was practically lost, for depredating goats destroyed the trees. An application was made to the Government to lay on water to the park, but the Government could not see their way clear to advance any money for that work. At Gwalia there was a State hotel, and it was a place of importance. There were no fewer than a thousand people there, and they had no recreation ground whatever; and though they had a piece of ground there the Government could not see their way to advance the Gwalia progress association a sum of money sufficient to improve that ground so that it might be utilised by the people for the purposes of enjoyment. The vote was too small, and the Government would be justified in increasing it to £5,000.

Mr. HUDSON: It was to be hoped that the Premier would carry out his expressed intention of allocating the money in the direction of opening up new parks and reserves for people in out-back settlements. If he would do that there would not again be the same amount of criticism on this item.

Item, Police Benefit Fund—pound for pound subsidy, £2,500:

Mr. HOLMAN: Were the details of this expenditure available? Over £2,500 had been spent last year. Some information should be available, more particularly as the fund had not been very well administered in the past.

The PREMIER: In order that the hon. member might have the information asked for, the balance sheet of the fund would be placed upon the Table. Further information would be made available to hon.

members before the police vote was reached.

Mr. HOLMAN: If the details were made available before the police vote was reached it would save considerable discussion on that division.

Item, Retiring allowances, £3,000:

Mr. HUDSON: A case recently brought under notice had presented some remarkable features. An officer who had been in the employment of the Government for the last 17 years had received notice that he was to be retired. In consequence of this, that officer had made preparations for going on the land with his sons. But whilst that officer was desirous of making his home on the land, the Government were doing all they could to prevent him accomplishing his object, for he had now been informed that instead of being retired he would be transferred to another department where, as a matter of fact, he would be asked to perform work distasteful to him.

The CHAIRMAN: That phase of the matter could not be discussed under the heading "Retiring allowances."

Mr. HUDSON: The officer was entitled to a retiring allowance and he (Mr. Hudson) would be pleased to learn that it was intended to give him his retiring allowance.

The CHAIRMAN: The discussion could not be allowed on this item. The hon. member would have another opportunity.

Mr. HUDSON: It seemed unlikely that there would be any other opportunity. The money which would be paid to the officer in question would come out of this item.

The CHAIRMAN: The case of a man who had not been called upon to retire could not be discussed under the heading "Retiring allowances." Obviously the fact that the officer had not been called upon to retire prevented that officer's case being dealt with under this heading.

Mr. HUDSON: Without any desire whatever to challenge the ruling of the Chair he would repeat that the officer had received notice of his intended retirement. Subsequently it had been decided not to retire him, but to place him in another position. However, if the Chairman

ruled the discussion out of order, he (Mr. Hudson) would submit.

Item, Royal Commission—Price of meat, £250:

Mr. ANGWIN: Already £977 had been expended in regard to this inquiry. Surely the cost of the sittings of this Royal Commission had not amounted to £977! The cost of this Commission had been positively extravagant and, judging by the result, it had been a sheer waste of money. Perhaps the Premier would give the Committee some information as to the total cost of the Commission and the actual result of the expenditure. If a small, unimportant Commission such as this had been was to cost all this money, he could only cry, "The Lord save us from commissions."

The PREMIER: As a matter of fact the item was for printing the report, which was a voluminous document. After consultation with members of the Commission it had been determined that it would be inadvisable to publish the report without the evidence. If the hon. member had read the report he would be in a position to judge as to the value of the work done by the Commission.

Mr. Collier: If the £250 had not been already expended in the printing of the report it might very well be saved.

The PREMIER: It had been expended.

Mr. COLLIER: Then it would be useless to move to strike it out. In his opinion the sum of £1,200 for the Commission was a sheer waste of money. It was the worst-spent money the State had laid out for many years past. It had been a most extravagant Commission and absolutely of no utility whatever. Not 5 per cent. of the members of the House had read the report, and nobody would dream of going through the evidence.

Mr. GORDON: Not having read the report neither the member for Boulder nor the member for East Fremantle was qualified to say whether or not the country had derived any benefit from the expenditure on the Commission. As a matter of fact the country had got full value for the money expended, and it had been generally admitted that the report was a good one.

Mr. SCADDAN: Only recently two or three conferences of local bodies had been held in an endeavour to arrive at a decision as to where the slaughter yards were to be established—the very point for the determination of which the Commission had been appointed. The Commission had carefully avoided the point put before them by the Government.

Item, Commission on interest paid by the London and Westminster Bank, the Crown agents and the banks in the Eastern States, £3,600:

Mr. JACOBY: Would the Minister give some details showing how the money was to be expended?

The PREMIER: Up to the 4th of April, 1901, the commission in respect to the management of loans by the London and Westminster Bank had cost the State £350 per million per annum for issues of stock to that date. For later issues the cost had been £250 per million up to the time the latest arrangements were made during the early part of last year. This included the cost of registration of issue. Under the latest arrangements made with the London and Westminster Bank the cost had been reduced to £150 per million. This covered the whole cost, the other charges remaining as hitherto. For instance, on Treasury Bills the only charge was 2s. 6d. per cent. on all interest paid. In respect to flotation of all loans 5s. per cent. was paid on the total amount. The hon. member would see that as a result of alterations made last year something like £4,000 or £5,000 had been saved.

Item, Contribution towards Admiralty survey of North-West coast, £7,500:

Mr. MALE: Would this amount cover the cost of further work next year?

The PREMIER: An arrangement was entered into with the Admiralty for a survey of the North-West coast. It was estimated that the cost of maintenance and of expenditure in connection with the survey would be about £30,000 per annum. Of this £15,000 was contributed by the Admiralty, and the balance of £15,000 was equally divided between the State and the Federal Government. It was anticipated the whole of the work to

be done thoroughly would take three years so in all probability this would be a recurring item for three years. The Admiralty had not so far called upon the State to pay its quota, but presumably this would have to be met before the end of the half year.

Item, *Government Gazette*, cost of production (exclusive of departmental supplements) and indices, £1,800:

Mr. HOLMAN: By the curtailment of the supply of copies of the *Government Gazette* to members inconvenience was caused. Why had these *Gazettes* been stopped?

The PREMIER: This question was discussed previously. At one time it was customary to send out *Gazettes* to every justice of the peace, mayor, chairman of a roads board, and officer of volunteers, and persons who occupied three or four positions often received three or four *Gazettes*. Instructions were given to avoid unnecessary expenditure as far as possible. Many members of Parliament intimated they were not desirous of receiving *Gazettes*. It would be a waste of money to send copies to members who did not open them; but where a member of Parliament intimated he would be glad to receive a copy of the *Gazette* no doubt arrangements could be made for him to receive it.

Item, Gwalia Hotel, maintenance, including salary and wages of manager, etcetera, £8,500:

Mr. GOURLEY: This vote included £508 for improvements. What improvements were to be made?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: A certain amount was contributed for the removal of an institute adjoining the hotel, and the area of the grounds was thereby considerably increased. This additional area was now being fenced in, and a large sum was being spent in up-to-date sanitary arrangements, septic tank, etcetera. Also trees were being planted, and it was hoped to have at the end of the year a plantation with grass plots, where residents of Gwalia could obtain a nice cool shade.

Mr. Gourley: Do you intend to put down a lawn tennis court?

Mr. Heitmann: Certainly, let them do so.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That information was not to hand but it would be pleasing if it could be done. It was well to spend a little of the profits made from the hotel to make the locality a little more comfortable for the people in the town without their necessarily coming into contact with the hotel.

Mr. GOURLEY: The Minister had not fulfilled a promise given to the Gwalia people with regard to a library and reading room. On every occasion the matter was brought forward the Minister refused to sanction a library and reading room.

The Minister for Mines: You said I had not kept my promise.

Mr. GOURLEY: A promise was made, he believed, to the Gwalia people some time ago that a library and reading room would be put up. At present the people had only the hotel to go to. He objected to expenditure on lawns and tree planting while other requirements for the people were neglected. Facilities were given to other centres and why not to Gwalia? As a protest against the promise of the Minister not being fulfilled he inteded to move to reduce the item by £50.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member was hardly fair in stating a promise was made in connection with this matter. Two years ago he had promised to construct a reading room in connection with the hotel and provide certain rules for the guidance of that room, but this was objected to by the local people, who desired to control the reading room themselves. That was why no action was taken.

Mr. Gourley: The objection was on account of the close proximity to the bar.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member could peruse all the communications that passed in connection with the matter. The improvements were carried out for the convenience of the people at Gwalia. There could be no reasonable objection to having grass plots and trees planted, and later on the question of whether a reading room should

be established could be considered. He would make no promise on account of the large sum we were now providing for improvements, but if the locality continued profitable the Government would be only too pleased to give consideration to the expenditure of money next year to make the place more comfortable for the people of the town.

Mr. SCADDAN: This matter was brought under the notice of the Minister some time ago. The Minister insisted that the reading room should be connected with the hotel building, with an entrance direct from the hotel, but the residents wanted the entrance from another street. The Minister wanted the entrance to come from the bar practically.

The Minister for Mines: No; that is wrong.

Mr. SCADDAN: The people wanted is disconnected from the hotel so that any person with objections to the hotel could use the reading room. In a matter of this kind, where the revenue was really derivable from one source only, the people of the district, it would be wise for the Minister to consult the desires of the people concerned in regard to any expenditure. No doubt the hotel was a convenience to the residents of Gwalia from every standpoint, but other facilities were not what they should be. The place should be made as attractive as possible and the revenue derived from the hotel should be spent for the benefit of the people of the town and not for the benefit of one section only.

Mr. TAYLOR: With regard to the proposed library and reading room at the State hotel the people were anxious to have an entry from the street, entirely disconnected from those portions of the hotel leading to the bar, and it was owing to the difference of opinion with regard to this that the trouble arose. As to the work proposed to be done for the purpose of improving the premises and gardens the idea was a good one, and he for one would not object to the Government laying out £500 in improving the place. We could well afford to do that and even to provide expenditure for a reading room as well. There was no pro-

position owned by the Government which was returning a better percentage of profit than the State hotel. The building had been made attractive, not so much from a drinking point of view as from the point of view of the comfort of the people. The Government should provide the people there with some form of intellectual recreation. The Minister should accept the proposals of the people, and erect a room for the library which would not be too close to the hotel bar.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: There was only one place where a room could be erected provided that it was attached to the hotel. The residents there desired that the room should be detached from the hotel; but if they desired to have a reading room entirely under their own control, it was their duty to approach the Premier and try and obtain a grant for the erection of one. In the present case the application was for a reading room in connection with the hotel. He was quite prepared to put up an additional room there which would adjoin the billiard room, with an entrance from the street. The Government desired to have an additional doorway leading from a passage of the hotel. That was essential, as the reading room would, to some extent, be under the control of the manager of the hotel. The local people were told that they could elect a committee to take charge of the room, subject to the control of the manager of the hotel, who was responsible to the Government for everything being kept in proper order. That, however, did not meet the wishes of the local residents. If the people would be satisfied with an arrangement whereby the manager would have some control it was quite possible that at an early date the Government might be able to give further consideration to the question of extending the building and providing additional accommodation. Many improvements were now being effected at Gwalia, and these improvements would be a great comfort to the people.

Mr. HOLMAN: Seeing that the Government derived a large revenue from the State hotel at Gwalia, would the Premier say whether it was proposed to extend the principle into other districts?

The CHAIRMAN: Discussion on the principle of establishing State hotels could not take place now.

Mr. HOLMAN: A sum amounting to a good many thousands of pounds had been returned from the hotel. Many visitors had told him that the hotel was as well conducted as any licensed house in the State; that the liquors were of the best quality, and that the manager prevented excessive drinking, and was very careful in complying with the liquor laws. Surely with such an example the principle should be extended.

The Premier: The new Licensing Bill provides for the establishment of State hotels.

Mr. HOLMAN: But under existing legislation no further licenses could be granted now. It would be very satisfactory if a State hotel could be established, say, at Yaloginda, while there were many other centres which would be suitable for the establishment of State hotels.

Mr. GOURLEY: Seeing that the people of Gwalia had endeavoured for some time to get the library erected, it was to be regretted that there was no provision on the Estimates for it this year. However, he was prepared to accept the assurance of the Minister that consideration would be given to the matter next year; therefore, he would not move an amendment for the reduction of the item.

Item, Incidental, £2,500:

Mr. SCADDAN: It was shown that last year the sum of £119 had been spent for maintenance of the Ministerial motor car. Various statements had been made as to the use and misuse of the Ministerial car, it having been said by some that the car would not work, and that if a certain firm were hard up for a job they would take the tyres off and put them on again, with the result that nice little pickings were obtained. It would also be interesting to know how many tyres had been renewed, and how many miles the car had travelled. It cost over £2 a week, which was exorbitant.

The Premier: You would not think so if you were running one.

Mr. SCADDAN: The car would not be kept long.

Mr. W. PRICE: Were any steps taken by the Government to ensure that the car was only to be used for Government purposes, in other words were the Ministers aware that there were rumours about to the effect that this car was used for other than Government work? In fact the car when not in actual use by the Government was used by the people in whose charge it was left.

The PREMIER: The amount of £119 could not be considered a very heavy charge for maintenance when it was remembered that the car had done a good many thousand miles over rough country. With regard to the statement made by the member for Albany, only last week he had heard that there were occasions when the car had been used for other than Government purposes, and arrangements had been made to stable the car in proximity to one of the Government offices, and for the employment of a Government servant to act as chauffeur.

Mr. COLLIER: Perhaps £119 was not an excessive amount for the upkeep of the car, provided the car did the work required of it; but he had been given to understand that the car was frequently unfit to take out of the shed, and that the Government in consequence had to hire other cars. Whatever the experience of Ministers had been, they were afraid to trust themselves in the Ministerial car on long journeys, and they therefore were obliged to hire another car at a considerable expense. He had also heard of the rumours concerning the use of this car for other than Ministerial purposes. He had been informed that it had been hired out to a doctor in the City for a trip to Mundaring, and that an account was afterwards sent to that doctor by the person who owned the place where the car was stabled. That was a very serious thing. There should be mechanics in the employ of the Government capable of repairing the car when it got out of order, and it should not be necessary to stable it with outside firms. If the rumours that had been referred to were correct, it was time that some change was made.

Mr. TAYLOR: If all the rumours heard about the travelling capacity of

this car were true, it was a great failure indeed. It was generally accepted that if Ministers did take this car out even on a short journey arrangements had to be made for a couple of cabs to follow so as to make sure that the Ministers would reach their destination. If the Government desired to have a car, it should be one that could negotiate any track that the Ministers required to travel over; but the car that the Government owned at the present time was one of those which it was almost impossible to keep in order, and, according to those who knew, it was about the worst in Perth. He did not know whether it was an old make, or whether the vendor thought that because the Government were buying he could palm off anything on to them, but it was evident that the Government would have to incur a larger expenditure before they could say that they had a car which would be equal to the necessities of the Government. The Government motor car should be the very best in the State.

Mr. SCADDAN: It ought to be pointed out that for two months of this year the person who was stabling this car had made about £14 per month by hiring this car out.

The Premier: He will not do it again.

Mr. SCADDAN: Dealing with the matter of incidentals generally, it was noticed that there were one or two items of some interest referred to in Return 16 of the *Public Accounts*. One was the cost of the Premier's Conference at Hobart, £400 12s. 9d. It was to be supposed that the conference, which was recently held in Melbourne, and to which the Leader of the Opposition was invited, but which he did not attend, would cost an additional £400. There was another item that the people of Broome had incurred in connection with the entertainment of the Governor. The sum was £15, and it would be interesting to know how they entertained the late Governor and then charged the State for it.

The PREMIER: No member of the Chamber would cavil at the expenditure of £15 which was incurred in connection with the send-off to Sir Frederick Bedford at the last port of the State. The

Resident Magistrate, representing the Government, was instructed to entertain Sir Frederick Bedford in a fitting manner, and no one ought to cavil at the amount which was spent.

Mr. HOLMAN: For the Albany band contests £325 9s. 2d. had been provided, which was almost as much as it cost to send the Premier to the Conference. It seemed a big item.

The PREMIER: Probably a certain hon. member who was a fitting representative of the Bands Association would himself make some explanation. It was noticeable that while he was ready to criticise ordinary expenditure he consistently ignored anything that might tell against himself.

Mr. SCADDAN: As a matter of custom he never took exception to an item which he considered to have been wisely provided. He had not approached the Premier with any request to advance railway passes to the bandsmen who were going to Albany; but he understood that some influential gentleman had approached the Premier at Albany during the visit of the Fleet with the request for those passes and had been successful. In any case the Premier had taken a wise course, and this was the reason why he (Mr. Scaddan) had taken no exception to the item.

Item, Interest and exchange, £2,500:

Mr. JACOBY: How much of this amount was represented by exchange?

The PREMIER: The amount provided for interest on the overdraft at the London and Westminster Bank together with banking exchange on roads board orders drawn on the Treasurer, and the exchange on orders drawn by Treasury paymasters in the North-Western district as well as exchange between Western Australia and the Eastern States, and remittances to the Eastern States in payment of interest on local inscribed stock.

Item, Rewards for securing conviction of persons found damaging railway property, £200:

Mr. ANGWIN: Surely this should be a charge against the Railway Department.

The PREMIER: Whereas the fines used to be paid to the Railway Department they were now paid into the Treas-

sury. It amounted to the same thing, for the railways were debited with the expenses and credited with the fines.

Mr. ANGWIN: The answer was not wholly satisfactory. The Treasury would get the fines in any case.

The Minister for Mines: No; the fines previously went into the railway revenue.

The Premier: Now they are included in the judicial fines.

Mr. ANGWIN: If it were a private railway company the fines certainly would not go to the company. Why then should not the Railway Department be placed in the same position as a private company? The item ought to be in the Railway Estimates, and not under Miscellaneous Services. He moved—

*That the item be struck out.*

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Under previous by-laws the Railway Department had received all fines in connection with prosecutions which might take place for damage to railway property. The department offered rewards for convictions of persons who wilfully damaged the property, and formerly the fines had been paid into the department. Last year, however, the Act had been amended, and all the fines were now directed to the Treasury. In future if any rewards were granted and the fines were found to be sufficient to cover the rewards, the Railway Department would get those fines.

Mr. BATH: It mattered little whether the item appeared in the Treasury account or in the railway account, because, after all, the amount would have to be found. However, he would oppose the deletion of the item, because to his mind there were very few worse offences than that of deliberately damaging railway property, which belonged to the people of the State. It was an offence that could not be too severely punished.

Mr. ANGWIN: To delete the item from the Treasury Estimates was not necessarily to say that a reward should not be offered. It was a question of whether or not the railway accounts should be kept separately. This was an amount which should be paid by the Railway Department and not by the Treasury. He agreed with the leader of the Opposition that

any person wilfully destroying the property of the State should be severely punished. At the same time he still held that as the Railway Department did not pay the cost of the upkeep of the courts it was not entitled to the fines.

Amendment put and negatived.

Item, Specimens for Geological Museum, £700:

Mr. HOLMAN: This was a new item; were the specimens for the Perth Museum, or for the geological museum run in connection with the Mines Department?

The PREMIER: The specimens were for the geological museum in connection with the Mines Department.

Mr. HOLMAN: What specimens were they and from what part of the State did they come?

The PREMIER: It would be in the memory of hon. members that certain specimens had been obtained in connection with the Franco-British Exhibition. The item provided for the purchase of a certain number of these specimens with the object of forming a nucleus of a geological museum in the Mines Department. The specimens would be of value in connection with any future exhibitions.

Item, Subsidy South-East coast mail service, £750:

Mr. ANGWIN: When tenders were called was it known that the Government were also going to subsidise this mail service?

The PREMIER: Alternative tenders were called by the Commonwealth Government for carrying mails and also a certain amount of cargo, and in order to secure a better service the Government subsidised it to the extent of £700, the Commonwealth paying £3,250. The arrangement was that the "Ferret" should replace the "Maitland" and provide the necessary accommodation. The "Ferret" would carry 25 saloon and 40 steerage passengers, and would trade between Albany and Hopetoun. Freight was reduced to 17s. 6d., being a reduction of 5s. on the old rates. The arrangements were in the best interest of the development of the trade of the South-East portion of Western Australia.



Item, W.A. Chamber of Manufacturers, £100:

Mr. HOLMAN: This seemed to be a new grant to an influential body. How was it to be expended?

The PREMIER: This money was given on the lines adopted in other States, except that it was on a much smaller scale, with the idea of encouraging the manufacturing industry in the State and the use of our own products. Assistance was given to the same body some three years ago. It was understood they were going to hold another exhibition.

Mr. HOLMAN: So long as we had assurance as to the manner in which the money was spent; it was a deserving object to encourage people to go in for more manufactures in the State.

Vote put and passed.

Progress reported.

## BILL—NORTH PERTH TRAMWAYS ACT AMENDMENT.

### *Second Reading.*

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. F. Wilson) in moving the second reading said: This Bill is to confirm a provisional order for the alteration of the route of the tramlines in the North Perth municipality. In 1904 a provisional order was obtained to construct tramways (shown on the plan on the wall in black), and that provisional order included the carrying of a cross tramline from Fitzgerald-street down Forrest-street and Walcott-street to Beaufort-street. Now it is asked that permission be given to do away with that cross tramline and to carry tramlines, one from Beaufort-street down Walcott-street, and the other down Fitzgerald-street and Angove-street (as shown in red on the plan). The reason is that the City is extending in that direction and houses have been built up and a number of people are now considerably beyond the present tram terminus, so much so that they cannot have the facilities of which people who live nearer in are possessed. The old provisional order was from the City boundary in Fitzgerald-street to Forrest-street on the one hand, and on the other hand from the intersection of these streets along Forrest-street

and Walcott-street to the City boundary in Beaufort-street; but that provisional order, which was made at the time when the member for Guildford (Mr. Johnson) was Minister for Works, has not been fully carried out, and from time to time extensions of time have been granted in order that this suggested alteration might be taken into consideration. The last extension of the time asked for was to the 24th December next. Previously extension had been given to the 24th March in order that the people concerned might consider the proposed alteration; and I may here say it is the universal custom in connection with these provisional orders that if the local authority of the district concerned approve of any alteration or tramway construction, and if they have themselves taken power to construct, or have made an arrangement with some private corporation to construct or alter the tramline, so long as the Government are satisfied the safety of the travelling public is properly provided for, and that there are no chances of the tramway entering into serious competition with any Government undertaking in the way of railways or tramlines, and that there are no serious objections on the part of any large section of the community, the Government do not as a rule refuse the provisional order. Now I come to the point that in March last this provisional order was extended. There was in November a petition presented to the Government, signed by some 258 persons, against any alteration in the route, notwithstanding that the North Perth council had decided, by a small majority, that it was most desirable in their interests that the route should be altered. At that time, of course further application was then made for extension of the provisional order, and if that extension had not been granted the chances are that neither the one tramline set out in the original provisional order nor the other two now suggested would have been constructed. Therefore an extension of time was given up to the 24th December next: and now as the time is drawing near it is very necessary some decision should be arrived at. On the 15th January of this year a deputation waited upon my pre-

decessor, opposing the alteration, and the Minister at that time did not feel justified in taking any action, but suggested that he would let the matter stand over until the people had come to some more definite decision among themselves. A further extension of time was granted in order to keep the matter open, and so that that portion of the municipality should not be deprived of having the right to tramway construction on the original or proposed new route. Then there was an application made in July last to me seeking for a provisional order to alter the route, as depicted on the map hung in the Chamber. The arrangement the council had made with the Perth Tramway Company was to construct the tramline along Walcott-street and up Fitzgerald-street in place of the cross route down Forrest-street. The company agreed to give more chainage, 80 chains as against 60 chains in the previous route, and the council approached me and asked me to grant them a provisional order and introduce this measure to endorse it. When the notice was published calling for objections none other than the previous petition of last year was put in, so I came to the conclusion that the opposition, at any rate, which existed 12 months ago had become weakend to some extent, and that any opposition that did exist had been allayed. I promised to visit the district for myself. I carried out that promise and went around the whole of the routes proposed, examined that portion of the town, looked into the number of houses, as far as I was able, in the locality, and satisfied myself that the town of North Perth was extending in the direction of the proposed alteration of the tram route. I found that people were building further out who should have further facilities, and realised that if the cross line ran through Forrest-street it would, for a number of years, prevent any further extension towards the suburbs of the municipality; and I came to the conclusion that if the line were built there it would be the means of retarding, to some extent, the advancement of the municipality while it would not be any hardship to those who lived in the immediate vicinity of Forrest-

street if the alteration were granted. With regard to the petition signed last year in opposition to the alteration, out of 258 persons who signed it in favour of the Forrest-street route only 142 owned or occupied separate properties within what I term the district of advantage of that route, and out of these 142 as many as 62 had established their properties and their homes there prior to any provisional order whatever being issued or tramway constructed, so that really there were only 80 petitioners opposing the alteration, who may be termed bona fide oppositionists, who could by any stretch of imagination be affected by the non-completion of the Forrest-street route. The argument was put forth that the number of houses in the immediate vicinity of Forrest street had increased very largely, this being brought about in view of the fact that a tramway would be constructed there some time or other before the expiration of the provisional order. But on examination I found that other parts of this municipality had advanced with equal rapidity as that in the immediate vicinity of Forrest-street, and without a promise of a tramway at all, so I came to the conclusion that the fact of this Forrest-street route being included in the original provisional order had really little or no effect in regard to the building of new houses.

Mr. Scaddan: Had no effect on the deposit either.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The deposit is still held.

Mr. Scaddan: It should have been forfeited long ago.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Undoubtedly, no; the member does not know what he is talking about. The deposit is legally held by the Treasury in fulfilment of the extended provisional order. That order has been extended from time to time, and does not expire until the 24th December, so the deposit cannot be forfeited.

Mr. Scaddan: It should have been forfeited two years ago.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That may be the hon. member's opinion but that does not constitute a right of

forfeiture. It could not have been forfeited.

Mr. Scaddan: According to the Act it could have been.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: A week or two ago another petition, which was got up rapidly one night, was handed to me by the member for North Perth; it contained 306 signatures, and all those signing were in favour of the altered route. It was shown that although some of the signatures were from people who really were outside of the area of advantage in connection with this proposed alteration, yet there were a great many more persons signing it than signed the original one in opposition to the alteration. Strange to say, a very considerable number of the signatories also lived within the immediate vicinity of Forrest-street. No petitioner against the alteration, I may say at once, is more than 600 yards from the tramway service as it now exists, or as it will exist when the alteration is made. There is only one oppositionist to the alteration who is 600 yards away, and he located himself there in 1903. There are 51 who are between 400 and 600 yards away from the tramway service, and surely they cannot be very much hurt if they have to walk that distance for a tram. The balance who have opposed the alteration are all within 400 yards, so that members will agree with me that there can be no hardship in permitting this alteration to take place, as the bulk of the people are within 400 or 500 yards of the tramway service, even with the altered route as suggested by the municipal council. There is one matter that may be commented on, and that is the fact that Walcott-street, down which the tramline will run, belongs to two bodies, half of it being the property of the municipality of North Perth and the other half belonging to the Perth roads board district. Then there is the Mount Lawley district in that locality which is practically vacant now, as it has not been realised or built upon. The argument may be advanced that the tramline would benefit the owner of that property to a great extent. No doubt it will enable him to sell his land perhaps more readily

than he otherwise would have done, and possibly he will be able to get bigger prices, but I would point out that we would not be justified in refusing the great number of people who live in and about Fitzgerald-street, and between Walcott and Fitzgerald-streets, the facilities of the tram service because there is a private individual on the other side of Walcott-street who will derive benefit from its construction. The roads board will have the opportunity of increased taxation on that gentleman's estate. I hope they will take advantage of it and see that any increased value to the land will result in increased revenue to them in the shape of taxation. It appears to me that the town must extend in the direction indicated by the route proposed by the alteration. The member for the district will, I think, support me in this contention. The municipal council, composed of residents of the district, have been divided on the question for some time, but there has been a majority in favour of the alteration. They are very persistent and say that if their town is to progress as others have they must have this tramway facility, and I agree with them. I do not know that I need weary the House with further remarks in connection with this matter. It appears to me that the plan will enable members to realise that if they want, to some extent, to close down North Perth and retard its extension, they will refuse to endorse the new provisional order. The tram will, in that event, make a small circle and the people will be stopped from building further out. On the other hand, if we are to assist the council in their progressive movement—and there have been some hundreds of houses built there in the last few years—and allow those who have built their homes to the north of the existing service reasonable facilities, then we must agree to allow this concession and pass the Bill. If this is done we will enable the company to get to work and have a tram service provided, which the company undertake, by their agreement, to do in three months. That is part of the proposal of the provisional order, and as to the deposit which the member for Ivanhoe has referred to, that will be

held by the Treasury as a guarantee that the work will be expeditiously and properly carried out.

Mr. Scaddan: Is that the deposit for £270?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes.

Mr. Scaddan: What about the interest accrued on it?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That goes back to the promoters when they construct the work.

Mr. Scaddan: But they did not comply with the original provisional order.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The order has been complied with, because it has been extended. It is the same as extending the time for a contract to construct a railway line. The contractor is bound down to do the work, say, in 12 months, but if unforeseen circumstances arise he may get an extension, and in such circumstances nothing is withheld from his deposit. There is power to give an extension of time.

Mr. Scaddan: Where is that power provided?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Under the Tramways Act the Governor-in-Council has power to extend the time as he thinks advisable. There is proper power, and there is no doubt it has been exercised by the Governor-in-Council. I beg to move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Mr. ANGWIN (East Fremantle): No doubt the Minister for Works will inform us whether the persons who have built their homes and have speculated every penny they possessed, and in all probability run themselves into debt to secure a home nearer the tramway route, have been protected, or whether any consideration has been given to them in the alteration of the route as now proposed. We must realise that numbers of persons when they know a tram line is to be constructed in a district will try if possible to purchase some land near that proposed route and build their homes there. The alteration of a route might be the means of doing a considerable injury to persons such as these, and every care should be taken and every matter con-

sidered before leave is given to alter a route for fear that it might injure these persons who have been induced to go to a place by the announcement that the tramway was going to be constructed there. In Fremantle a difficulty has taken place by the stoppage of tramways over certain lines, a good deal of disturbance has followed, and public meetings have been held. The other, however, is a worse aspect than the Fremantle instance, because at Fremantle they had the opportunity of electing a board which could compel trams to be run over the routes as laid down in the Act, but at North Perth it is the alteration of a route. I merely rose to ask for an assurance that no injury would be caused to those persons who have made their homes in the vicinity of the route as suggested in the present Act.

Mr. GILL (Balkatta): After having heard the Minister for Works deal with this Bill, there is not a great deal to be said in connection with it. The aspect of the question put forward by the member for East Fremantle is one that naturally appeals to members, and I suppose it is about the only objection that can be raised against the present proposal. I am given to understand, although I am not conversant with the original proposal from the council at North Perth, that the present proposal will not interfere very materially with any people living on the originally proposed route. There has been a certain amount of building going on in that street certainly, but after it was proposed to run the trams through Forrest-street there was an agitation set on foot for an alteration of the route. That being the case, I am satisfied that the people living in that locality will not be misled in connection with the present proposal. With regard to the building going on in Forrest-street, I might say there has not been as much building there as in some of the other streets nearer the city. In Chelmsford-road and Grosvenor-road there has been much more building than in Forrest-street. With regard to the Bill, I am satisfied if hon. members will look at the plan, and if they are conversant with North Perth, they can come to no other

conclusion than that it is a right and proper proposal that the tramway should be extended in two arms, as the proposal is laid down, into the back portion of the municipality of North Perth. By running the tramway on the original route down Fitzgerald-street, then across Forrest-street, to cut with Beaufort-street, it simply embraces one small corner of the municipality, and should that be insisted on it will mean that the tramway extension will be blocked for a number of years to the great detriment of that district. North Perth at the present time is extending rapidly, and I would be safe in saying that there are more building operations going on there than in any other suburb of Perth, and the elevations are so great that the district is consequently more attractive than the lower portions. That is the object of running the tram along Walcott-street, then further along Fitzgerald-street, and up Angove-street. When this was brought under the notice of the Minister for Works he stated as he told the House that he was not conversant with the district, and he would like to have a look for himself. He went for a run round the district, and he came to the conclusion that the present proposal was the right and proper one. Hon. members by looking at the plan can only come to the same conclusion. There is one other reason which prompts me to advocate this route, and it is that in the event of the original proposition being insisted on there is no possible hope of extending even one of those arms as seen on the map. At the present time there is a good deal of settlement along Fitzgerald-street, and Charles-street to the Wanneroo-road. If that arm is continued it will be of advantage to a great number of people who at present have no means of communication with the City other than by vehicle, unless they walk about a mile to the tram.

The Minister for Works: There are 200 houses there.

Mr. GILL: And there are a large number of people settled there too. In the event of the original proposal being insisted on, the company state they will

not carry the tram further along Fitzgerald-street. I am sure hon. members merely wish to do what is right for the district concerned, and has as been pointed out although there was an objection taken to the present proposal some time last year when a petition was presented and signed by 250 people, there has been no petition since. There has been one signed asking the member for North Perth to support the present proposal. I might say that the trams under this proposal will run into both districts. Balkatta and North Perth. I had not a petition presented to me because it was taken for granted that I would support the proposal. The member for North Perth has had a petition presented to him, and I am satisfied the new proposal will meet with the requirements of all the people in that district. There may be a few objections at the present time, but they are not serious. It had been pointed out by the Minister that no person in the centre of the block between the tram routes will be any great distance from the tram. I cannot see that any serious objection can be taken to the present proposal, especially as the people whom it mostly concerns are anxious that this matter should be pushed ahead, in order that they might get the line open for the Christmas traffic.

Mr. SCADDAN (Ivanhoe): I am not going to offer any objection to the proposed route, but I want to draw attention to the different treatment meted out to different persons. In the first instance I find that the Perth Tramway Company had a provisional order signed by Parliament on the 24th of December, 1904. That provisional order provided as follows:—

"On the signing of this provisional order, the promoter shall pay as a deposit into the hands of the Colonial Treasurer the sum of £270. The said deposit shall be held by the Colonial Treasurer until the before-mentioned tramway is in working order and open for traffic when the same shall be returned to the promoter with accrued interest (if any). Provided always, that such deposit shall be forfeited unless the works as shown on plans

P.W.D., W.A., Nos. 11137, 11138, 11139 are duly commenced and completed in accordance with paragraph 2 of this order."

Paragraph 2 reads as follows:—

"Subject to the provisions of the agreement referred to in Clause 21 of this provisional order, the promoter shall, within two years after the confirmation by Act of Parliament of this provisional order, complete and open for traffic that part of the tramways hereby authorised and described in Section 1 of the Schedule hereto, and shall, within two years from the date so fixed for the completion of the said first section, complete and open for traffic the tramways hereby authorised and described in Section 2 of the Schedule hereto."

The Minister for Works: Where does that bring you up to?

Mr. SCADDAN: To December, 1908. We are now approaching December, 1909, and the work is not completed.

The Minister for Works: What are the reasons?

Mr. SCADDAN: I do not care about the reasons. We passed an Act of Parliament giving this company certain powers—which they wanted, or they would not have put up a deposit. We passed the Act in good faith, and I want to know why the Minister has not forfeited the deposit.

The Minister for Works: Because the North Perth council asked for an extension of time.

Mr. SCADDAN: The council has no right to wish to break an Act of Parliament.

The Minister for Works: It has not been broken.

Mr. SCADDAN: It has. Section 15 of the Tramways Act of 1885 provides as follows:—

"If the promoters empowered by any provisional order under this Act to make a tramway do not, within two years from the date of the same, or within any shorter period described therein, complete the tramway and open

it for public traffic; or, if within one year from the date of the provisional order, or within such shorter time as is prescribed in the same, the works are not substantially commenced; or, if the works having been commenced are suspended without a reason sufficient in the opinion of the Commissioner of Railways to warrant such suspension, the powers given by the provisional order to the promoters for constructing such a tramway, executing such works, or otherwise in relation thereto, shall cease to be exercised unless the time be prolonged by the special direction of the Governor."

That is a provision which gives the Governor permission to extend the time provided in the provisional order, but it does not give any power to extend the time over which the deposit shall apply. It is absolutely useless passing these provisional orders, because Parliament can be overridden at any time. Without assigning any reason the Minister can extend the time indefinitely. I do not think it was intended by the Tramways Act that it should be so. These people have not carried out their contract, and their deposit should have been forfeited; but because they are an influential company the Minister is prepared to carry on without forfeiting the deposit, and to allow it to remain at interest as a deposit for a further extension of the tramway. I contend that this sort of thing should not be permitted. We have already granted a provisional order, and they have not complied with it, and now we are not even asking them to put up a further deposit. Now, take another aspect of the case. We had a Bill before the Chamber which we passed in 1907 to construct a tramway to Nedlands Park. I with others took up the position that if this particular syndicate were wanting a provisional order we should have a guarantee that they would carry out the work laid down in the provisional order. The Premier agreed to insert a clause in the Bill itself providing that a deposit of £1,000 should be put up as a guarantee that the syndicate would carry out the work set out in the provisional order, and run at least 9 trams daily for 10 years. There was no state-

ment there that the £1,000 with any interest that might accrue would be returned to the promoter in the event of his carrying out the work; and while he has carried out all the works provided in the provisional order, with the exception, of course, of the 9 trams, which will not be for 10 years, he cannot obtain his £1,000. By the time his 10 years' term is up he will have paid some £600 in interest, and will lose it all, because the Government intends to return his £1,000 without interest. But in respect to an influential company they are careful to provide that the company will get the deposit with interest, irrespective of whether or not they have carried out the works under the provisional order. The Minister was not attending to the interests of the country when he allowed this company to get out of their contract. I know nothing of the different routes which have been proposed, but looking at the plan I would say that the present route is much preferable to the one provided in the previous provisional order.

Mr. WALKER (Kanowna) I am inclined to think there is something in the contention of the member for Ivanhoe, otherwise why have two Bills? If the Minister retained the deposit paid under Act of 1904 what becomes of the new provisional order? It is an entirely different contract, requiring a different provisional order and a different Act of Parliament. Under the Act of Parliament passed in 1904 the terms and conditions of it are at an end.

The Minister for Works: This is an Act to authorise an alteration.

Mr. WALKER: The old one is defunct, for nothing has been done on any portion of the route. If the original provisional order has been extended then this Bill is not requisite. Nothing has been done under the old Act.

The Minister for Works: Yes; the tramway has been constructed, the major portion of the work has been done, but the Forrest-street extension has not been carried out.

Mr. WALKER: I am informed that not half of it has been done.

Mr. Gill: Yes, more than half.

Mr. WALKER: All of it should have been done in the time specified in the original contract. I want to know what special privilege this tramway company has over others.

The Minister for Works: It is not the tramway company, it is the North Perth municipal council who have asked for the extension of the time.

Mr. WALKER: Are they a party to the contract?

The Minister for Works: Yes.

Mr. WALKER: They are the consentors; the contract is between the Minister for Works and the tramway company, who are the promoters.

Mr. Gordon: For whose benefit is it?

Mr. WALKER: It is for everybody's benefit, but that has nothing to do with it. We cannot override Acts of Parliament in a supercilious manner; they cannot be overridden every time one who benefits requests it. An Act of Parliament requires an Act of Parliament to repeal it, and the Act of 1904 has not been repealed and stands a contract in the highest possible form. The contract has been broken, has terminated according to the terms of the Act itself, and yet there has been no surrender of the deposit. Are we to proceed on consistent lines, or to throw Acts of Parliament into the wastepaper basket? The contract has nothing to do with the North Perth council; they are not parties, except consenting or permitting.

The Minister for Works: That is a very essential portion of it. They carried out the negotiations and arranged the whole thing.

Mr. WALKER: I may have property which the Public Works Department may require for the purpose of making a road or a railway line, but I become no party to a contract for the construction if I say, "I give you the land," or "I will permit you to do it." I simply give no objection, I consent, but that does not make me a party to the contract. All I mean by saying I consent is that I will not interfere with your contract, that I give permission for your work. I do not care what the Daglish Government did in connection with the matter; the position is

this; we are violating an Act of Parliament.

The Minister for Works: Not at all.

Mr. WALKER: Yes; and completely.

The Minister for Works: I say, "No."

Mr. WALKER: I do not care what the hon. member says; he is speaking without knowledge in that respect.

The Minister for Works: I do not care what you say.

Mr. WALKER: I know the hon. member does not; it would be a good deal better if he did. The hon. member is apparently absolutely reckless in his interjection. It cannot be got over; the contract was made in 1904.

The Minister for Works: I have told you that half a dozen times.

Mr. WALKER: I need no reminding; I am only insisting on it that the contract has not been carried out.

The Minister for Works: The contract was carried out.

Mr. WALKER: The hon. member is talking stupidly. I know I am out of order in saying that.

The Minister for Works: Well, withdraw!

Mr. WALKER: I withdraw; but this is the position: what occult influence has this tramway over the Minister for Works?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Mr. Speaker, I object to that remark; the hon. member is insinuating that the tramway company had some influence over me to introduce this measure. I have not seen the tramway company or their manager. I have not spoken to him on the subject. I ask the hon. member to withdraw.

Mr. WALKER: I made no such assertion; I said "occult"; that means "unseen, or roundabout"; but if it is objectionable to the hon. member I will withdraw it again and again. But what influence has there been at work, or what agency is there that enables this company to get different treatment to ordinary companies? The member for Ivanhoe has pointed out a remarkable contrast. If the law had been carried out that deposit would have been taken over by the

State. The company should have lost the deposit on the contract of 1904. That has not been done. A new contract, an absolutely new contract is now made, and I say that for this new contract we should have had another £270, or a like sum, put into the hands of the Treasury as security. We have not received that. How can they avoid that portion of the contract now. We want more explanation than has been tendered to us to-night. This off-hand style of dealing with business of this character is not satisfactory. I know the Minister will say this is in effect the same contract, because part of the same route will be taken, and there will be a deviation in some portion. That is no answer at all, because in the first place the first contract was a complete one, and the member for West Perth, I think, will bear me out in this that all the terms of the contract are vital to a contract; that is to say, when a contract is drawn in one portion of which a line shall start from "A" and continue to "B," if the line does not on completion fulfil that term the contract has not been completed, it has been broken. The deposit was a security or a guarantee of good faith that the line would be carried over a certain, defined, specific route. It was not carried over that route and will never be; how then can it be said that the contract has been carried out. This contract is an entirely new one, specifying part of the old route with another route added to it. It is a different route, and, therefore, a different contract.

Mr. Scaddan: There is only 100 yards of the old route in it.

Mr. WALKER: And the rest is new ground. The contract is completely altered. If we get over contracts like that there is no contract that cannot be broken.

Mr. Angwin: It is not fair to those who purchased land.

Mr. WALKER: That is so, and that has an important bearing on the subject. I am now, however, dealing with the point particularly put forward by the member for Ivanhoe, that by some means or other the company have escaped their liabilities, and have received terms which, I venture



to think, ordinary contractors with the Government can scarcely expect to receive, and terms which in no instance have been given to those placed in a like situation.

Mr. HOLMAN: I move—

*That the debate be adjourned.*

Motion negatived.

Mr. SWAN (North Perth): Perhaps I am in the most unfortunate position of any member who has to deal with this particular question. While the member for Balkatta has, I suppose, the unanimous support of his constituents in the attitude he has taken up, those people affected by the alteration of this route whom I have the honour to represent are divided in their opinion as to what is the best thing to be done. I have had certain representations made to me by the East Ward Ratepayers' Association, which is practically the only portion of the North Perth municipality coming within my electorate, in favour of the continuation of the original route along Forrest-street. I have given some consideration to their representations, and have done my best to place their views before the Minister at various times. I also accompanied the Minister in his inspection of the proposed route as well as of the route originally laid down. Recently, as the Minister has pointed out, I received a petition from 306 of the residents of that particular locality in favour of the route proposed in the Bill, the second reading of which the Minister has moved to-night. Some residents of Forrest-street themselves signed the petition. Those in favour of the carrying out of the original route will consider themselves very much injured by the fact that I am prepared to support the Bill: but after giving some considerable study to the question I have come to the conclusion that the majority of the people I have the honour to represent, who are affected by this matter, are in favour of the alteration of the route, and on this ground I am prepared to support the Minister. So far as the allegation of the members for Ivanhoe and Kanowna are concerned, I will take no part in that discussion. They can thrash the legal

matter out for themselves as it does not affect me. My only trouble has been to try and arrive at what is best in the interests of my electorate. I am prepared to take the responsibility of saying that I believe this alteration is in the best interests of the majority of the people. The North Perth municipal council decided long ago as a council in favour of the alteration of the route, but as I have pointed out, the only portion of the municipality I represent is divided in its opinion. If members will closely study the map they will see that none of the people within Forrest-street itself will be badly served, so far as tramway facilities are concerned, if the proposed alteration is carried out. With regard to the point raised by the member for East Fremantle, certainly there are a few cases of people having built houses on the assumption that the route as originally proposed would be carried out.

Mr. Draper: Have there been no objections on that ground?

Mr. SWAN: Yes; there have been objections on the ground that some people invested money in property there because they understood that the line would be carried out. I have to take just as much responsibility in that connection as any other member. I believe at the present time, in the interests of the community generally, the altered route as proposed by the Minister should be carried out.

Mr. Seaddan: What about the breach of contract.

Mr. SWAN: So far as the legality of the thing is concerned, I am not going to deal with that. I recognise that possibly some few individuals might be unfairly treated, but I do not think that fact justifies us in inflicting an injustice on the large number of people who will be served. That extension, as pointed out by the member for Balkatta, is wholly in his electorate. The fact that there are people who have invested in property in Forrest-street, and the further fact that one side of Walcott-street is in the possession of a private person who has not done anything in the way of improving that land, are the only two features that I can see against the proposed variations

of the route. Hon. members will notice in carrying out the extension in Walcott-street, portion of the original route is being carried out, and any person in any portion of Forrest-street will be fairly well served by the proposed change. It is not necessary to speak at any length now. I feel there is some responsibility cast on my shoulders in this connection more than on other members, and as I believe that the best interests of the majority of the people will be served by the alteration of the route I intend to vote in that direction.

Mr. HOLMAN (Murchison): I would like the Honorary Minister to explain what was done on a previous occasion when he filled the position of Minister for Works, and when a similar proposal was put before him and when he refused to accede to it. He should give his reasons why he refused to go on with the proposal at that time. If the present Bill is carried it will inflict a great injustice on a large number of people who have been induced to invest their money in property thinking that they would have the convenience of the tramway service going past their doors. As soon as part of that locality has become thickly populated we find the tramway company are going to enhance the value of a private individual's property to a great extent by taking the tramway away from those who were originally led to believe they would receive the convenience. In doing that we are doing something which is unfair and practically immoral. We have heard members in the House speak about vested interests, and we should consider the poor people who thought they were going to have a certain convenience which is now to be denied them. The Honorary Minister had a similar request made to him some time back, and he refused to go with it. What influence has been used now, or what fresh facts have been put before the Minister for Works to lead him to support this measure and refuse to grant the adjournment of the debate at this hour? I do not think on a question like this, where it affects the interests of a large number of people, that we should be compelled

to listen to the few remarks he made and then allow the second reading to go through on the same night. This is not always done; members are allowed to go into a subject and get all the information they can in connection with it before the second reading is passed. To-night, simply because it affects the tramway company or a few private individuals, we are not to be given time for due deliberation. This is treating members in an unfair manner. I know that the ex-Minister for Works dealt with this question and he not only considered the facts that were placed before him, but I believe he undertook to travel over the two different routes to see for himself exactly what the position was, and he came to the conclusion that it was not wise to alter the route. I think we should have some more information than has been placed before us to-night, and until such time as we can have facts placed before us as to why the present route should be altered, we should stay our hands. I maintain from the knowledge I have of that part of the district that it would be advisable to construct the tramway along both routes. We should compel the tramway company to construct the line that was proposed some time ago, and if they desired to construct the tramway along the new route they should be permitted to do that as well. There is plenty of room for the two lines. I object to the tramway company being allowed to mislead and compel people to spend money in a district in the belief that a tramway is to be built there and then take away the advantage people expected to gain.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (in reply): The remarks of the member for Murchison can only be construed as a reflection upon the action of the North Perth Municipal Council, and his colleagues, the members for Balkatta and North Perth, both of whom have given substantial grounds for supporting the Bill. I must say that I resent the tone of the remarks of both the member for Murchison and the member for Kanowna.

Mr. Holman: You can resent them, but they are true.

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** The hon. member does not always say what is true, and on this occasion he is wide of the mark. Both hon. members seem to imply that there is some undereurrent, and that someone has approached the Minister. If he wants to know who has approached the Minister, I can tell him it was the mayor of North Perth and his councillors, and the members for Balcatta and North Perth; they were the only people who approached the Minister in connection with this matter.

**Mr. Walker:** Who signed this new provisional order?

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** I signed it.

**Mr. Walker:** Did you have any interview, or intercourse in any shape or form with the tramway company's officers?

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** None whatever.

**Mr. Walker:** You made them parties to the contract without their consent.

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** No, I did not. The North Perth Council had been negotiating for 12 months with the tramway company to have this route altered. The hon. member surely has sufficient common sense to understand a plain English statement that I have not had any negotiations with the tramway company. The original contract or agreement was between the North Perth council and the tramway.

**Mr. Holman:** Who approached the previous Minister for Works and prevented it going through last year?

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** How can I tell. The original agreement was between the North Perth council and the tramway company. The original provisional order was granted on that agreement. The second tramline, which it is now proposed to alter, was not to be completed until December, 1908. At the request of the council that provisional order was extended in order that they might carry on negotiations with the tramway company to get the route altered.

**Mr. Walker:** The promoter has made application to you for a further provisional order.

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** That application was made to my predecessor. I have not approached the tramway company.

**Mr. Walker:** They made an application to you.

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** I presume they made an application formally, the same as to the council; but that is not approaching me in the way the hon. member wishes to suggest. They had no desire to get something which someone else could not get. The action has been taken at the request of the representatives of the ratepayers of the North Perth municipality. They are the only people who came to me.

**Mr. Scaddan:** You allowed them to break an Act of Parliament.

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** No; I did not. The hon. member ought to know that if I had permitted them to break an Act of Parliament anybody could have proceeded against them for it; and who ought to have done so were, of course, the North Perth council, who are the people interested. They have a contract with the tramway company, and these hon. members would have us understand that there is something in this which should not be countenanced.

**Mr. Walker:** Wait till we get into Committee.

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** I am not going to be threatened by the member for Kanowna.

**Mr. Walker:** Neither will I be threatened by you.

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** I think the hon. member ought to listen to me quietly, as I have listened to him. If the hon. member will kindly keep quiet he will have an opportunity when in Committee to say just what he likes, so long as it is within the rules of debate. I maintain that when there is an agreement between the North Perth council and the tramway company, as there was in the original provisional order, if there is a breach of that agreement and the council are agreed that they will take proceedings in the interests of the ratepayers, certainly they have the right to do so. In this case whatever has been done has been done at the request of the North Perth

council. They wished to have an extension of time in order that they might make some alteration in the original agreement. Now, is there anything unreasonable in the Minister granting that extension of time, anything unreasonable in the Minister listening to the representatives of the municipality? Are we to be carried away by an expression of opinion hastily given by hon. members because they want to block something—

Mr. Walker: Is the Minister in order in charging members of the Opposition with a desire to block something? It is an imputation distinctly disorderly.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the Minister will withdraw that.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If it is out of order, certainly I will withdraw it. May I say "with the object of preventing the Bill from passing?"

Mr. Walker: No; that is another charge of obstruction.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Why, any hon. member has the right to prevent a Bill from passing if he is opposed to it.

Mr. Walker: If you do not impute dishonourable motives it may be right enough.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I never do, but perhaps, unfortunately, the hon. member cannot say as much.

Mr. Walker: I ask if it is not an imputation upon me—the statement that unfortunately I cannot say as much—is it not an imputation of dishonourable motives? I ask for a withdrawal.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the hon. Minister to withdraw; but I do so in the knowledge that the hon. member for Ivanhoe and other hon. members have been continually interjecting while the Minister was speaking. I have not called the hon. member to order.

Mr. Scaddan: Well, you should have done so when you had the chance.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will do so. The hon. member has been most annoying to the Minister.

Mr. Scaddan: I must take exception to your remarks. At the particular time when you rose—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will resume his seat. I have given expression

to my views, and if the hon. member does not obey me I shall go further.

Mr. Scaddan: You may go further. I am not here to be sat on by you or anyone else.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: You asked me to withdraw certain remarks; I will withdraw them. Let me say that in regard to this deposit the original provisional order provided for a sum of £270 to be put up as a deposit for the due carrying out of the work contained in that order. That deposit still lies in the Treasury because the original provisional order which expired on the 24th of December last—that is, in so far as this small portion of the tramway is concerned—has been legally extended by the Governor at the request of the North Perth Municipal Council. Therefore, there has been no breach of any nature; no illegal attitude or action in connection with the matter. And let me say at once that if there had been any thought of forfeiting that £270 the tramway company would have immediately constructed the line down Forrest-street and completed their provisional order. I understand, not only from the members for the district, but also from the mayor and councillors of the municipality, that the tramway company have time after time offered to carry out their original contract and build the tramline down Forrest-street: but that the company have, at the request of the mayor and councillors, refrained from carrying out that work in order that the consent of Parliament might possibly be obtained to an alteration. This position has been taken up because it is in the interests of a large majority of the people in the district, and I maintain it would be madness on my part, as Minister, to set myself up in judgment contrary to the local authority who are there to negotiate this matter and act for the ratepayers, and it would be presumption for me to set my opinion against the opinion of the member for the district and that of the member for the adjoining district—the two members who have inquired into the matter and have been approached by their constituents and asked to request me to introduce this measure. To suggest for

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

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*House adjourned at 11.33 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Thursday, 18th November, 1909.*

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

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

## FRIENDLY SOCIETIES SELECT COMMITTEE.

*Extension of time.*

Mr. BOLTON moved—

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

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

Question put and passed.

## BILL—LAND ACT AMENDMENT.

Introduced by the Premier and read a first time.

## BILL—AGRICULTURAL LANDS PURCHASE.

*Leave—First Reading.*

The PREMIER (Hon. N. J. Moore) moved—

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

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