AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. W. Price
Mr. Bath	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Collier	Mr. Swan
Mr. Gill	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Gourley	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Heitmann	Mr. Walker
Mr. Holman	Mr. Ware
Mr. Horan	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Troy
Mr. Johnson	(*Teller*).
Mr. McDowall	

NOES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Jacoby
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Layman
Mr. Carson	Mr. Male
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Monger
Mr. Davies	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Draper	Mr. Osborn
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. J. Price
Mr. George	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Hardwick	(*Teller*).
Mr. Hayward	

Question thus negatived.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: With the permission of the House I would like to make an explanation with regard to some statements made to-night, and also with regard to my intention concerning the battery charges.

Mr Holman: Why did you not do it before?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Because the rules of the House would not allow me to do so. I only want the consent of the House to make the statement, otherwise I will sit down.

Mr. Holman: Very well, then.

Mr. Heitmann: I object to the Minister making any explanation.

Mr. Underwood: So do I.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Then I regret I cannot make the explanation.

QUESTION—COUNCIL ELECTORS' QUALIFICATIONS.

Mr. BATH asked the Attorney General: What is the exact interpretation placed by his department on the terms—(*a*) clear annual value, and (*b*.) annual ratable value in the clauses of the Constitution Act specifying the qualifications of electors for the Legislative Council?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL replied: (*a*.) Clear Annual Value.—The annual amount which the dwelling house or land would ordinarily let at, deducting rates and taxes. (*b*.) Annual Ratable Value.—The valuation of the municipal council or roads board.

House adjourned at 10.32 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 2nd November, 1909.

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

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Minister for Mines: Reports and returns in accordance with Sections 54 and 83 of "The Government Railways Act, 1904."

By the Premier: 1, Report of the Superintendent of Public Charities for 1908-09. 2, By-laws of the Municipality of Leederville.

ASSENT TO BILLS (3).

Message from His Excellency the Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills:—

1, Bills of Sale Act Amendment;
2, Licensed Surveyors;
3, Sea Carriage of Goods.

QUESTION—PUBLIC SERVICE CLASSIFICATION.

Minimum Salaries.

Mr. GEORGE asked the Premier: 1, In cases where the value of the position

held by a civil servant has been fixed by classification and the occupant of such position has been receiving a salary below such classification, is it the intention of the Government to pay up to the classification value in the present financial year, and from the date of such classification? 2, What was the approximate date on which the classification of the Public Service Commissioner was to come into force? 3, Had each officer's classification been put into force on the date of same, what would be the total amount up to June 30, 1909, which the Treasury would have paid? 4, Had No. 3 been put into force, and the annual increments of classification also, what would be the total amount up to June 30, 1909, which the Treasury would have paid? 5, Does the amount included in the Estimates provide that each officer will receive from the date of his classification (*a.*) the minimum salary of his position (*b.*) plus such annual increments as may be provided for in the classification? 6, If not, why not?

The PREMIER replied: 1, The intention of the Government is to pay as from the 1st July last the minimum classification of all officers—professional, clerical, and general. 2, The clerical on 6th September, 1906; the professional on 29th January, 1908; the general on 15th October, 1909; the supplementary clerical on 12th February, 1908; and the supplementary professional on 15th October, 1909. 3, In view of the immensity of labour which would be incurred in such a calculation, I would ask the hon. member not to press the question. Some 1,200 officers are concerned, and the transfers, promotions, retirements, and subsequent refilling of positions at the minima, etcetera, have been so numerous that the calculation becomes necessarily a very involved one. 4, Partly answered by No. 3. The only statutory annual increments are those provided under Section 27 of the Public Service Act for officers drawing less than £100. These increments have been paid year by year. In addition approximately one-third of the officers under the Public Service Act have received individual increases amounting in the aggregate to £8,632, exclusive of the increases now provided for on the present Estimates. 5, (*a.*) The minimum will be paid as from the 1st July last. (*b.*) There are no statutory annual classification increments. 6, The financial position of the State demanded postponement of increases, which have, therefore, been granted on a deferred system, while at the same time the Commissioner's reductions were not taken immediate advantage of, but given effect to on a practically corresponding scale.

QUESTION—RAILWAY WORKSHOPS, SHOW HOLIDAY.

Mr. FOULKES (without notice) asked the Minister for Mines: Have arrangements been made whereby the employees of the locomotive workshops at Midland Junction can have the opportunity of visiting the Royal Show at Claremont tomorrow afternoon?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: My attention was not drawn to this matter until a few moments ago, and I have not had time to consult the Premier and the Commissioner of Railways in regard to it. We have an enormous amount of work in hand at the workshops and the question of allowing these men off would need to be referred to the responsible officers. I think it is too late to take any action in that regard unless action has already been taken.

BILL—TRANSFER OF LAND ACT AMENDMENT.

Introduced by the Premier (for the Attorney General) and read a first time.

BILL — METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY, SEWERAGE, AND DRAINAGE.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 26th October; Mr. Daglish in the Chair; the Minister for Works in charge of the Bill.

Clause 81—Cost of drains, by whom payable:

Mr. JOHNSON moved an amendment—

That all the words after "owner," in line 3, be struck out.

Under the clause the Government pro-

posed to compel the occupier or the tenant of any premises to pay an increased rent to the extent of 8 per cent. towards the cost of constructing the works. It was not the province of the House to interfere between the owner and the tenant, for that was purely a matter for mutual arrangement between the two. It was questionable whether it was just to ask the tenant to pay any special impost. A permanent improvement to the property was being provided and the work was of no particular value to the tenant. Certainly the tenant had the use of it, but he paid rates for that, and there was no reason why he should pay an impost in addition to those rates. If the owner stipulated that the occupier had to pay the rates, then the weekly rental would be less; but if the owner paid the rates, then the occupier would have to pay more rent. It was purely an arrangement between the two. It was only a reasonable proposal that the tenant should pay the sewerage rate; but that he should pay an increased impost in the shape of rent in addition to the rate was distinctly unfair. Quite apart from that it would be a very difficult matter to arrive at an equitable amount. Why was 8 per cent. fixed upon?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: One could understand the hon. member combating the amount proposed to be charged, but could not for a moment understand his action in combating the principle. The hon. member had said it was no province of the Government to interfere between the owner and the tenant, and argued further that when the tenant had the use of the convenience he paid for it in the rates imposed by the Minister. The hon. member was wrong in both premises. In the first place if Parliament said to the owner: "You shall do certain work in connection with your property, you shall expend certain moneys," as was proposed to be done under the Bill, surely it was the province of Parliament in equity to see that a reasonable return was made to the owner for the expenditure of that money. On the other hand, the occupier or tenant did not pay in his rates for the use of the connections. He paid in his rates for the whole scheme, the maintenance, the up-keep, the main drains and reticulation, but when it came to household connections there was no payment included in the rate levied to cover their cost. That was a matter between him and the owner of the property he occupied. Let the hon. member look at it from this point of view. If Parliament were to enact that the owner of a building should provide additional accommodation in a house he owned, in the shape of additional rooms, would it be equitable to say that the tenant of the house, who was enjoying the use of those extra rooms, should not pay a fair thing in the way of additional rental for the improved building? Would it be contended that the rates imposed on the property would be also sufficient to cover the additional rental? The two things were absolutely distinct. One was payment to a local authority——

Mr. Johnson: For conveniences provided.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No; one was payment to a local authority for conveniences provided outside of the property, but the other was for the use of the additional accommodation, which the owner was compelled to provide by Act of Parliament. Surely the principle was a fair one.

Mr. Angwin: But the conveniences you are to supply will cost less than those provided at present, both to the tenant and to the landlord.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If the cost were less then the tenant surely should not object to pay something to the owner for the money he spent in providing such conveniences.

Mr. Scaddan: The tenant cannot take the conveniences away.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: They were there for his use.

Mr. Scaddan: He pays for them in his rates.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: He did nothing of the kind, as the tenant paid rates for the general sewerage works and the drains, not for the household connections, which had to be paid for by the owner. If the principle were so das-

tardly, why was it that in every sewerage Act in the Eastern States the same principle applied?

Mr. Angwin: That does not prove it is the right principle.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Anyhow, it proved that the principle could not be so inequitable as had been suggested.

Mr. Scaddan: They are all landlord Parliaments in the East.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No; the Parliaments were there to do justice between man and man. Even in South Australia it was provided in the original Act that 7 per cent. should be paid. Under the amending Act the rate was fixed at 5 per cent., while in Victoria, New South Wales and New Zealand it was also provided that 5 per cent. should be added to the rental on the value of the house connections put in. Equity demanded that some consideration should be given to the owner, who provided the additional facilities for the benefit of the tenant for the time being.

Mr. Jacoby: A charge of 8 per cent. is very high.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The amount was made up of 5 per cent. on the money expended, and 3 per cent. calculated as depreciation on the connections. The owner was responsible for all repairs.

Mr. Jacoby: You make the tenant pay.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: In the Eastern States it was provided that the occupier should be responsible for all repairs, but in this Bill the owner was to be responsible. Therefore, the owner was entitled to some additional percentage which would cover maintenance and depreciation of works, which the tenant had the advantage of using. However, he was not wedded to 8 per cent., but the principle should be established, for it had been proved to be right elsewhere.

Mr. JOHNSON: Some members might believe in the principle and would desire to reduce the amount of 8 per cent. It would not be permissible for them to do so, however, if his amendment were put; consequently if it were the desire of members he would withdraw his amendment temporarily. Personally he objected to the whole principle but he did not want to prevent members from moving to reduce the rate.

Mr. GEORGE: It really made no difference whether the clause was passed as it stood or as proposed to be altered. The Minister had argued from a point of view that all tenancies were the subject of leases.

The Minister for Works: So they are.

Mr. GEORGE: Some of them might be, but the great bulk of tenancies to be affected by the Bill would be what were known as small house properties. It was absolutely impossible for such tenants to pay. It was an impossibility, almost an absurdity, to expect that the persons who were the largest class of tenants in this State, the weekly tenants, would pay this charge in the way that was laid down in the Bill. It was all very well for the Minister to say that it was only just, if the State compelled the landlord to expend money on his property, that he should get a return from his tenant; but at the present time in Perth, Fremantle, and in many other places, if the landlord were to attempt to get five, or four, or even two per cent. for the purpose proposed he would immediately lose his tenant, because there were hundreds, in fact thousands, of empty houses. In all these cases the payment should be made by the owner, and the State should not make the tax so that the owner could not pay it. Why should we burden the statute book with a clause which would be inoperative?

The HONORARY MINISTER: If members would read the clause carefully they would see that it would not apply in practice to the small tenant. If a lease was entered into with a landlord and improvements were made to the property subsequently, it was right that the lessee should be asked to pay a percentage on the cost of those improvements, and so it should be with regard to house connections. If the connection existed when the lease was first prepared there was no doubt that the tenant would have been asked to pay a slightly increased rental. It was not proposed now that the tenant should pay for the house connections, but simply for the use of them.

Hon. members should disabuse their minds that the proposal in any way affected the week to week tenants; it did nothing of the sort, it only applied to those properties in Perth and Fremantle, more particularly, which were the subject of long leases.

Mr. BROWN: The owner of a property should be entitled to some percentage for the expenditure incurred in regard to the sewerage system but it should be specifically stated that that payment should not apply to leases already in existence. An owner must be expected to get some extra percentage in connection with such works when a lease was being drawn up. The proposal would receive his support if it only applied to leases; it would be absurd to attempt to enforce it on weekly or monthly tenants.

[*Mr. Taylor took the Chair.*]

Mr. ANGWIN: The member for Fremantle had stated that the clause would not apply to small tenants.

The Honorary Minister: In practice.

Mr. ANGWIN: Not at the present time, because there was such a great number of these properties available. Would it not be possible for a lease to be drawn up whereby a landlord would have to pay all the rates and taxes? It was anticipated when this scheme was completed that the rates would be less than they were under the present system, and thereby the landlord would be effecting a saving. The Minister would then come along and say, "we want you to increase your rent to the extent of 8 per cent." The Minister had stated that under the new order of the things the tenant, by having reduced rates and taxes to pay, would reap the benefit. The matter, however, was one that should be left entirely with the landlord and the tenant.

Mr. Davies: Not with regard to leases.

Mr. ANGWIN: It all depended on the conditions. While a lease might be made binding in one instance, in which case it would be just, in another instance it might be the reverse. The Committee should not say whether a lease would be detrimental to the landlord or to the lessee.

Mr. JOHNSON: The fact that the clause would apply only to existing leases was the most objectionable part of it. The stipulation was made in the Bill that there should be an increase of 8 per cent. on the cost of the sewerage installations, but as it had been pointed out there were leases and leases, and when we made it possible we could rest assured that the landlord in every case would avail himself of the full power which was provided in the clause. Of course it would not apply to the ordinary weekly tenant; but the fact that it would be applied to leases was, to him, highly objectionable. The Minister had argued that the sewerage conections were of equal value in respect to all houses.

The Minister for Works: No; I said the principle was the same.

Mr. JOHNSON: Clearly the sewerage connections were of no value to the tenant except for the convenience they afforded.

Mr. Davies: They will save his pocket to the extent of the difference in rates.

Mr. JOHNSON: It was to be remembered that a tenant might be on a lease under which the owner paid the rates. However, it was clear that the sewerage connections would be of no value to the tenant except from a health point of view; and for the convenience he would derive, he would have to pay the rates. Notwithstanding what the Minister had said, it was the tenant, the occupier, who would have to pay . It would be wiser to leave the matter to be fixed up between the landlord and the tenant.

[*Mr. Daglish resumed the Chair.*]

Mr. OSBORN: In some cases the occupier would get a distinct advantage by the sewerage scheme. To-day the occupier was paying for the services provided; indirectly or directly he was paying to the contractor. Where the pan service applied it meant that the occupier had to pay it.

Mr. Angwin: Not in all localities.

Mr. OSBORN: So far as he knew the practice obtained in all localities. As

for future leases, the tenant about to lease a property would know exactly what he was entering into. The clause would not apply to other than existing leases and lessees, and it was only reasonable to assume that the payments for the sewerage connections were not contemplated in existing leases. Yet the landlord would be compelled to connect up with the system, and, consequently, he should be given the right to ask the occupier to provide something for the additional convenience. The smaller occupier would not suffer at all, because he would go elsewhere if the landlord attempted to unduly raise his rent. The clause could do no harm, and therefore should be permitted to remain.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It should be remembered that it was not possible to legislate for any one class of property in a Bill such as that before the Committee; and, although it might be true that the smaller property owner would be unable at the present juncture to recover from increased rental the interest on the cost of the connections, yet that did not affect the principle. In the case of large buildings let for a number of years, the connections for which would involve an outlay of £200 or £300, it would be absolutely unfair not to provide that the owner should get some return on the expenditure of that money. As for the small tenant, he had the cure in his own hands; if he did not like the terms proposed by the landlord he would go out. Surely if a tenant received an advantage he was justly entitled to pay something for the increased facilities. If, for instance, Parliament legislated that every house should be fitted with a bath-room, hon. members would insist upon a provision that the tenant, who was to have the benefit of the bath-room, should pay something for the convenience.

Mr. Scaddan: But is not the basis of the Bill the general benefit of public health?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes; that, and the convenience of the tenant. He (the Minister) did not want anything unfair in the Bill, but he wanted to deal with principles. If the principle was right, let it remain; certainly it would work out all right.

Mr. SCADDAN: In the event of the Committee agreeing to retain the words could the percentage be diminished?

Mr. JOHNSON: The words should be struck out because of the principle of the matter. He would still object if the percentage was reduced to 3 per cent., but if members first wished to reduce the percentage, he had no objection to withdrawing his amendment to give them the opportunity of moving in that direction. He asked leave to withdraw his amendment.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS objected. Evidently the member for Guildford would not agree to a reduction. The principle should first be decided.

The CHAIRMAN: I must put the amendment.

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

Ayes	.. .. ..	21
Noes	.. .. ..	20
Majority for	.. ..	1

AYES.	
Mr. Angwin	Mr. McDowall
Mr. Bath	Mr. Monger
Mr. Brown	Mr. W. Price
Mr. Collier	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Gill	Mr. Swan
Mr. Gourley	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Heitmann	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Holman	Mr. Walker
Mr. Horan	Mr. Ware
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Troy
Mr. Johnson	(*Teller*).

NOES.	
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Male
Mr. Carson	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. N. J. Moore
Mr. Davies	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Draper	Mr. Osborn
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. J. Price
Mr. George	Mr. Quinlan
Mr. Gregory	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Hayward	(*Teller*).
Mr. Layman	

Amendment thus passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 82—Persons liable for payment for compulsory drainage may agree to pay by deferred payments:

Mr. BROWN moved an amendment—

That the word "twelve" before "quarterly instalments" in Subclause 1, line 7, be struck out with a view to inserting "twenty."

Mr. Scaddan: Make it twenty-four.

The Minister for Works: I agree to make it twenty-four.

Amendment (to strike out "twelve") passed.

Mr. BROWN moved an amendment—

That "twenty-four" be inserted.

Mr. SCADDAN: Did the Minister desire to make it 24 quarterly instalments in order to suit the owner, seeing that now the owner was compelled to pay all expenses in connection with fittings?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: There was no wish to put one's desire before the Committee. We had already decided to use the occupier as a means of collecting the money. The clause had nothing to do with the question raised.

Amendment (to insert "twenty-four") passed.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS moved a further amendment—

That the following be added as Subclause 3: "The obligation of an occupier under an agreement made pursuant to this section shall cease in respect of any instalments becoming due thereunder after his tenancy shall have determined, but without prejudice to the right of the Minister to recover such instalments from the owner."

This was in pursuance of a promise given when the matter was previously discussed.

Amendment passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 83 to 92—agreed to.

Clause 93—What shall be rateable property:

The MINISTER FOR WORKS moved an amendment—

That the following be inserted as Paragraph (b): "Land vested in or in the use and occupation of a local authority and not held or occupied by any tenant under the local authority."

This was in order to exempt municipal or roads board property.

Mr. BROWN: The whole clause should be struck out. All buildings receiving services should pay for those services.

The Minister for Works: They will.

Mr. BROWN: The Government buildings in Perth, the police barracks, schools, and other institutions were now paying for services costing about £2,000 per annum. Surely we were not going to throw on the ratepayers the responsibility of meeting that sum.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was anticipating discussion on the clause. The amendment moved by the Minister must be first of all put. Later on the Committee would have the opportunity of negativing the clause as it stood or as it might be amended. That would be the time to discuss the question raised by the hon. member.

Mr. GEORGE: Take the case of municipal yards where water was to be used; would nothing be charged for that water?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Clause 59 gave power to charge on exempted properties for water supplied. Water would not be supplied unless it were paid for. Clause 122 if amended as he desired, would make it quite clear that the Government should have the power to charge also for sanitary services. The exemptions under this clause were simply those provided in similar Acts in the past whereby Crown and municipal properties, church properties, public hospitals, etcetera, were exempted from taxation; but it was not intended that any services should be rendered, either in the shape of supplying water or in reference to sewerage matters, that were not paid for. A charge would be made for actual services rendered.

Mr. George: Did that also apply to the cost for stormwater drainage?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No; exemptions of this description had always existed, and were such as were provided in the Roads and Municipal Acts. The principle was the same in this Bill as in previous legislation, and each exemption would bear its own explanation. There was no reason why these various bodies should not be charged for services rendered.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee could only discuss the present proposed new paragraph.

Mr. GEORGE: If the department rendered to a local authority a service which was of use to them, either through saving them expenditure of money, or by enabling them to make money, there should be power to compel them to pay for what they received. If they did not pay, those who did would have to pay an increased rate.

Mr. JOHNSON: It was difficult to understand what the Minister desired by the proposed new paragraph. It appeared that reference was made to unimproved lands owned by local authorities.

The Minister for Works: It refers to municipal yards, town halls, reserves, etcetera.

Mr. JOHNSON: Such were distinctly specified in a subsequent subclause. There must be some special purpose for the proposed new paragraph. If it were desired to exempt, say, municipal stables or yards, it was distinctly unfair, for a municipality might, and it was to be hoped would, enter into municipalisation on a large scale, and it would be distinctly unfair, if they took over services generally carried out by private enterprise, that they should be exempted from rating.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If the board proposed in the original measure had control over the works, they would never have rated their own property. They would not strike the rate for the town hall in Perth, for instance, for if they did they might just as well strike a rate on Government buildings, or the cathedral. They would be taking money from one pocket and putting it in another. By the proposed subclause the Minister was being placed in exactly the same position as the board would have been. It was very different when there was a distinct service to be rendered, for in that event the local authorities would be charged for the service at a price to be arranged. If water were supplied, or a number of connections for the sewerage system were provided, then a fair sum would be charged. In connection with the sanitary service, the local authority would be charged something equal to what they were now paying. That was the best way of getting out of the difficulty.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. SCADDAN moved an amendment—

That Paragraph (b) be struck out.

There was no reason why the residence of a minister of religion, who probably received £1,000 a year, should be exempt.

Mr. Foulkes: None of them receive £1,000 a year, or, at all events, only one.

Mr. SCADDAN: Why should his residence be exempted? That gentleman was receiving a high salary. There was no reason why religious bodies should be exempted from paying rates on their properties. He was not moving to eliminate the paragraph because he was in any way opposed to the churches, but no proper reason could be given why the churches should be exempt from paying their proportion of taxation. They were not charitable institutions by any means, for some of them were huge commercial concerns. These people had a certain income, and under those circumstances they were in a position to pay their taxes.

Mr. Osborn: They will pay for services rendered.

Mr. SCADDAN: The Bill would exempt them.

The Minister for Works: These people would be charged for services rendered.

Mr. SCADDAN: Was it proposed to do so?

The Minister for Works: Certainly. The hon. member would see in Clause 59 that they would be charged for water, and in Clause 122, for sewerage.

Mr. SCADDAN: If it was proposed to charge them for services why exempt them under the rating clauses?

Mr. JOHNSON: In the event of paragraph (b) not being struck out, would it be possible to move an amendment to strike out portion of that paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN: No.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Power was given to charge not only for services in connection with sewerage matters, but also for water supplied. It was

not intended that the services which would take the place of the present sanitary services should be given free, even to a minister of religion or religious bodies. It was asked that they should be exempted from rates just as was provided in the Municipalities Act, and members would find that the paragraph in the Bill was exactly the same as the subsection in the Municipalities Act. The object was obvious. Members might instance a church, or a cathedral; the rateable value of that property would be enormous and what would be the good of asking people to put their hands in their pockets to subscribe and maintain that place of worship and to find £200 or £300 a year as well with which to pay these rates. It would be equitable, if they were to lay a tap on the premises, that they should be charged for the water they might consume.

Mr. GEORGE: It was a matter which sooner or later would have to come within the province of practical affairs as to how far there should be exemptions with regard to taxation. The clause carried with it more than was thought. At first it provided that if a property belonged to a religious body and was used for the purpose of raising an income, it would be exempt. A little further on the clause exempted land if held exclusively for charitable purposes. The Committee, however, should see that in a case where land which was now held for charitable purposes, and was afterwards sold—or it might have been church land—that the State should be able to recoup itself from the profits of such sale, even though such land may have been exempt for a number of years previously.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was getting away from the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE: The paragraph could scarcely be referred to unless one spoke generally on the matter; however, it would not be wise to make the alteration the hon member had suggested.

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

Mr. SCADDAN: The attitude he had taken up in the matter did not constitute an attack on Christianity or on any other form of religion; it was simply an attack against the continuance of exempting these people from the payment of rates and taxes. Clergymen were continually to be heard intimating a desire that they should have the full rights of citizenship, and he, also, desired that they should have those rights. As a citizen he had to pay his taxes, and a clergyman should be privileged to do the same.

The Minister for Works: It cannot be done under the existing law.

Mr. SCADDAN: Some ministers of religion owned extensive property in the State; yet, because they happened to be clergymen, they were to be exempt from the payment of rates and taxes. It was not at all a fair proposal. In the very next clause it was proposed to exempt private schools being the property of a religious body. It all went to show that the trend of legislation was to relieve these religious people from their fair share of taxation, and to put the burden on others. It was no argument to say that some of the clergymen were receiving but miserable salaries, for on the other hand others of them were in most luxurious circumstances.

Mr. FOULKES: Strong exception should be taken to the language used by the member for Ivanhoe in regard to ministers of religion. That hon. member had made a most bitter attack upon the cloth. None but the member for Ivanhoe had heard of ministers asking to be clothed with the full rights of citizenship. What the phrase meant in this application was not clear, because clergymen had the right to vote at all Parliamentary elections.

Mr. Underwood: And they do not hesitate to come forward and vote for the commercial brigand every time.

Mr. FOULKES: Probably the interjection went to show exactly where the shoe pinched.

Mr. TAYLOR: It was very unfair for the member for Claremont to accuse the member for Ivanhoe, or any other member who desired to vote for the amendment, with entertaining ill-feeling

against the clergy. So far as he (Mr. Taylor) was concerned he had on two occasions strenuously endeavoured to place clergymen on the same footing as other people in respect to the payment of rates and taxes. Clergymen should receive at least such remuneration as would enable them to pay rates and taxes, as other persons had to do. If the clergymen paid taxes they could take their proper places at elections.

Mr. Angwin: It is a good job they are kept out.

Mr. TAYLOR: But they were not kept out at all; their voices were repeatedly heard at elections, and properly so too. They had their views on politics, and they exercised the franchise. Why then, should the clergy be exempt from the payment of rates any more than any other section of the community? The arguments that the clergy were paid but small salaries, and that many calls were made upon their charity, would not hold water. They should be put on exactly the same footing as other citizens so far as rates were concerned. Members should be able to express their views on a measure dealing with any section of the community without having it thrown in their teeth that they had a down on that section of the community, but apparently the member for Claremont was looking for some religious kudos.

Mr. JOHNSON: Though one might support the amendment to strike out the paragraph, one could not follow the debate where it developed into a religious question as to whether ministers of religion could afford to pay the rates. That was not a point we should discuss. We should simply deal with the land itself. We could exempt these lands if they were in some portion of the city where land was not valuable, but all the religious denominations were attempting to get hold of the most valuable parts of the City, so that by this paragraph we proposed to exempt from taxation some of the most valuable portions of our city. Was it fair to the other taxpayers that these wholesale exemptions should be given? Why should not the exemption be extended to other bodies whose objects were equally as laudable? The trades hall bodies were doing as much in the cause of humanity as ministers of religion. As the paragraph was too narrow in limiting the exemption to one body only working side by side with other bodies working in equally as good a cause, he supported striking it out. It was too objectionable, and the most objectionable part of it was the proposal to exempt residences of clergymen. The Bill proposed to extend exactly the same benefits to clergymen as to the ordinary citizens, so that there was no argument in favour of the exemption. It would be better if the amendment were withdrawn so that one might move to strike out this most objectionable part of the paragraph.

Mr. ANGWIN: No matter whether the residences of clergymen were rated or not the general public would have to pay the rates. It was a matter affecting almost every person in the State.

Mr. Heitmann: Hear, hear! We all belong to one church or another.

Mr. Underwood: You speak for yourself!

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. ANGWIN: If we put rates on the clergymen the church would have to pay them or the clergymen must get increased salaries which the congregations would have to provide. The Bill was slightly different to municipal or roads board rating, but the Minister for Works had given notice of an amendment that should relieve a good deal of the difficulty, because there would be a charge providing for sanitary services, and already we had provided for water charges. Therefore, the only thing the paragraph relieved clergymen from paying was the rating for stormwater drainage. The amendment might very well be withdrawn. We were all connected with some church or other.

Mr. Heitmann: If we are not we should be.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Why should church property and particularly the

residences of clergymen be exempt any more than the residences of other citizens. A member of Parliament was required to pay taxes, and if so, everyone should pay them. There was no objection to clergymen. If one disagreed with their statements one could contradict them, and he would avail himself of the opportunity of contradicting some statements recently made by various peripatetic ecclesiastics. The clergyman was entitled to every right of citizenship, including the right to pay his rates. If one did not pay rates one should not claim the rights of citizenship. After all, the ministry was a profession to which people bound their children in the same way as apprentices to engineering, and when it came down to worldly matters the minister wanted his fee for christenings, weddings, or funerals, the scale being fixed by an "honourable understanding." Possibly we all belonged to some church or other. He belonged to the "church of life." When he required a minister to pray or preach for him he was prepared to pay for it and he was prepared to pay the tax on the house in which his minister resided.

Mr. GILL: If the amendment were to strike out the residences of the clergy one could support it, but seeing that it was to strike out the whole paragraph, he did not feel justified in supporting it because it would be doing a great injustice. If the rating were on the value of some of the churches, it would mean a considerable sum far beyond the services received. The amendment the Minister proposed to move, if altered to make it mandatory, should meet the desires of those who supported the amendment moved by the member for Ivanhoe. It would not be a very great hardship for a minister to pay the rates on his residence. The paragraph, however, dealt with all places of worship, and on that account he would oppose the amendment.

Mr. COLLIER: If churches had property in the centre of the City they must be prepared to take the responsibilities of the possession of such valuable property and pay the rates upon it. It was well known that some of the church bodies had been turned practically into political institutions, and one frequently read in the newspapers of ministers of religion taking upon themselves to deliver political sermons. Just previously to the last elections sermons were preached to the congregations in straight-out advocacy of certain candidates. That was on the goldfields, but a similar thing happened in the City, where one minister made a violent attack on the Labour party. The denominations also managed religious papers which propagated political views every week; therefore, those people should be compelled to pay for services rendered by the State just the same as any other institution had to. Every other member of the community had to shoulder the increased taxation, and so should the minister of religion. There were no reasonable or legitimate grounds for the exemption of these persons. Nowadays the ministers would not preach except from palaces in the centre of cities, but when Christ was on earth He did not have fine palaces to preach from, He was satisfied to go on the mountain tops. If Christianity were so far changed that it was impossible for a man to preach it except in a fine gilded palace in the centre of a large city then the denominations should be prepared to pay the same as anyone else. The churches were now commercial concerns. The idea of exempting a minister's residence was outrageous.

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

Ayes	.. .. ..	13
Noes	.. .. ..	29
	Majority against ..	16

AYES.

Mr. Collier	Mr. Swan
Mr. Gourley	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Holman	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Walker
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Ware
Mr. W. Price	Mr. Heitmann
Mr. Scaddan	*(Teller).*

NOES.	
Mr. Angwin	Mr. Horan
Mr. Bath	Mr. Jacoby
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Keenan
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Male
Mr. Carson	Mr. McDowall
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Davies	Mr. Monger
Mr. Draper	Mr. N. J. Moore
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Nanson
Mr. George	Mr. Osborn
Mr. Gill	Mr. J. Price
Mr. Gordon	Mr. Troy
Mr. Gregory	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. Layman
Mr. Hayward	*(Teller).*

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. SCADDAN moved an amendment—

That in paragraph (c.), lines 2 and 3, the words "private school (being the property of a religious body)" be struck out.

There was no reason why private schools conducted by religious bodies should be placed in a different position from those controlled by anyone else. It was rumoured in town that certain private schools had changed hands recently merely with the object of obtaining privileges under the Bill, and that they were now owned by religious bodies. The general taxpayer provided for State schools, and if other persons desired to run private schools, whether they were religious bodies or anyone else, they should pay the rates and taxes. The paragraph referred to all schools belonging to religious bodies. An instance of such a school was provided at Guildford. Previously it was a privately-owned school, but now it was controlled by and belonged to the Church of England, and was run on commercial lines. Why should that be exempt? Then there was the Christian Brothers' College, Perth, and the Methodist and Presbyterian schools, which were all commercial institutions and should pay rates.

Mr. Draper: They are not commercial institutions in the sense of making a profit other than for the purpose of education.

Mr. SCADDAN: They were certainly not run on philanthrophic lines. The present secondary schools chiefly served the purpose of providing class distinction as against State schools. He had always advocated that the State should extend educational facilities to go right through to the university. If this were done the best would be got from the citizens irrespective of whether they were the sons of rich or poor men. Why should there be a subsidy from the Government to private schools; why should they receive special privileges? It had been suggested that there was no longer State aid to denominational schools, but that it was still granted was apparent from the clause, which provided that such establishments should be exempt from rating. It would not be wise to continue this sort of thing. The sooner we broke down class distinctions which had been built up by these schools the better, for at the present time they catered solely for children of the better class. Whether these schools were controlled by private individuals or anyone else they were run for the purpose of providing education for a certain fee, and they endeavoured to provide that the fee should cover the cost of the institution; consequently, they should pay their taxes as other people did.

Mr. FOULKES: The Attorney General should give the Committee a definition of the term "private school." The member for Ivanhoe had referred to the case of a school which was run by a private individual and afterwards got into the hands of a religious body. Would that school, although it was run by a religious organisation, continue to be regarded as a private school? What did the term "private school" mean? Supposing a corporate body, or syndicate, or even a company of 100 people joined for the purpose of conducting a school; would that school be called a private one? If the words "being the property of a religious body" were struck out, although these schools were conducted by religious organisations they could still be treated as private schools. There were many schools conducted in the State, perhaps, by one, or two or three people; were they to be exempted from rates? If we exempted schools of religious organisations, private schools would also be entitled to exemption, because they were carrying on equally good work as schools of religious or-

ganisations. The Minister should agree to exempt all schools.

The HONORARY MINISTER: In a previous clause the Committee had agreed to the exemption from rating of land belonging to a religious brotherhood; some of these private schools belonged to different sects, and some were on land belonging to religious brotherhoods, whereas in other cases they simply belonged to denominations. The effect of the amendment moved by the member for Ivanhoe would be that we should have some schools belonging to a religious body exempted, and, on the other hand, we should have certain schools belonging to religious bodies which would be rated.

Mr. JOHNSON: The statement of the Honorary Minister showed how dangerous it was to introduce exemptions such as those proposed. Why should a private school, because it was conducted by a religious body, be exempted any more than a school run by a private individual. In Guildford there was a Church of England school that would be exempted under the clause, and not far away there was a private school conducted by Miss Bailey; not such a large school, but doing exactly similar work. It was true that she dealt with younger children, yet it was proposed that she should pay rates while the other institution close beside her should be exempted from taxation. That was distinctly unfair. Even if the amendment were agreed to, the Committee would still provide by a previous clause for schools to be exempted, providing the land was held by a religious brotherhood. It showed how dangerous it was to start exemptions of this sort. It would have been far better to have limited exemptions to Crown and municipal lands.

Mr. GEORGE: The first proviso of the clause said, that any land exempted by paragraphs b, c, and d, should be deemed ratable property, while the same was leased or occupied for any private purpose. Would the Minister inform the Committee what "private purpose" meant? Were all these institutions which had been referred to covered by this proviso?

Mr. FOULKES: Attention should also be called to the words "public school," preceding those which the member for Ivanhoe proposed to strike out. Any school that was conducted by a religious denomination could be regarded as a public school. These schools were available to any boy whose parents could afford to pay the fees. The best plan would be to put all the schools on the same footing, and it might be a good idea to strike out the words "public school" so that all the schools could be exempted.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The definition he would give to the Committee of "public school"—and it could be taken for what it was worth—was that it was a State school. All schools outside a State school were designated private schools within the meaning of the clause before the Committee. The member for Claremont anticipated a good deal of trouble with regard to these exemptions. But the same exemptions were already in the Municipalities Act; yet no serious trouble in regard to these exemptions had occurred in the administration of that Act.

Mr. George: The question has not been raised.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If it had not been raised under the Municipalities Act, was there any reason for supposing that it would be raised under this measure? The reason for the exemptions was, of course, that these church schools were conducted more or less in conjunction with the churches to which they belonged, and more or less were they conducted for religious purposes.

Mr. Underwood: Less for religious purposes, and more for money.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: In many instances, too, these church schools did not pay.

Mr. Seaddan: Yet they complain bitterly when there is talk of the State conducting secondary education.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Because if the State were going to provide secondary education and so make it absolutely impossible for the church schools to carry on, then the churches would not have the same grip on the juveniles of their particular faith. As for the meaning of the first paragraph, providing that the exemptions should not obtain where the pro-

perty was occupied for private purposes, the fair interpretation was that if the land were leased away from the church to a private individual then it would not be exempted. He had no very strong feeling one way or the other with regard to it, but he held that as the exemptions were already in the Municipalities Act it would be wise to allow them to stand in the Bill.

Mr. KEENAN: The Minister had expressed the belief that a public school was a school conducted by the State. That was not so. A public school was a school open to the public. If there were stringent conditions laid down, such as a proviso that all the scholars should be of one particular religion, then the institution would be a private school: but while it was open to any person who could pay the prescribed fee it was a public school. The member for Ivanhoe held it to be inadvisable to create these exemptions. From his (Mr. Keenan's) point of view all educational institutions should be encouraged by all reasonable means. Opportunities for education should not be restricted in any way. If all grades of education were being provided by the State, hon. members might think of removing these proposed exemptions. In existing circumstances, however, it would be unwise to start to impose these small burdens which of course, would have to be paid by the parents of the children attending the schools.

Mr. GILL: Having listened to the discussion, he had come to the conclusion that the best thing to do would be to wipe out the exemptions. The very statement that these schools were conducted chiefly for the purpose of giving religious instruction was enough to damn the whole provision. In a previous clause exemption had been granted for places of worship, and already provision had been made for educational instruction in State schools. Therefore there was no reason why these religious schools should be exempted. He would support the amendment.

Mr. BATH: The discussion had confirmed him in his intention to vote against the whole clause. There had been a good deal of discussion on the preceding paragraph, but as there was such a difference of opinion, and as that difference of opinion might lead to some securing preferential treatment and others receiving harsh treatment, it would be better to strike out the whole clause and provide another simply giving exemption to public buildings, and buildings used for charitable purposes, hospitals, and lands for parks and gardens and recreation reserves to which the people had free access.

Mr. FOULKES: The Minister for Works should give an explanation of the words "being the property of a religious body." Any school run by a religious body would come under the category of public and private schools, so that the words were unnecessary. Why should we exempt one class of school and refrain from exempting another class of school which was run on exactly the same lines as those on which schools run by religious denominations were conducted, and which gave a certain amount of religious teaching of a character to which no one could take exception? By accepting the suggestion to delete the words "being the property of a religious body" there would be little revenue lost, because, unfortunately, there were not many schools run by private individuals.

Mr. DRAPER: It would be well before the amendment was put to arrive at the exact meaning of the provision. Unfortunately, the word "public" was used. The Minister must have meant "State" schools. If "State" had been used the meaning of the rest of the paragraph would have been easy to construe. In a dictionary it was shown that "public school" had different meanings in Scotland, England, and America, so what it would mean in Western Australia was problematical. If it was intended that the contrast should be between "State" schools and "private" schools then all that was required in the subclause was to put in "State" instead of "public," and then to have "private schools being the property of a religious body." The proviso showed that so long as the land was leased or occupied for any private purpose it was to be deemed rateable, but what were private purposes? If "private" were to be construed in the

ordinary way we must also construe it in the same way as "private school," and there would be further confusion. The amendment might follow the lines of exempting State schools and private schools provided they belonged to and were managed by religious bodies. Otherwise the subclause might fail to be passed because some members considered it did not express what it purposed to express.

The Minister for Works: It is exactly the same in the Municipalities Act.

Mr. GEORGE: It appeared that if the land owned by a religious body was leased to someone else it became taxable, but the Minister did not explain why. It was no use juggling with the matter, and as the paragraph stood he (Mr. George) must support the amendment. It was only a few years since Parliament had settled the question that there should be no assistance to outside schools, but now apparently by a side wind assistance was to be given. That was a wrong principle. Either all schools, no matter who owned them, should pay the taxation, or none at all. Any school drawing fees should pay its full share of taxation as any other business. It was all nonsense to say that similar provision was in the Municipalities Act. If reform was necessary there was no reason why it should not be started in this Bill, and the Municipalities Act could be amended in this direction when the time came.

Mr. BOLTON: We had an Act passed to amend the law relating to public elementary education. That Act dealt with Government schools, not public schools, and Government schools were defined as any schools established under the Elementary Education Act, 1871. In the Act of 1871, "elementary school" did not include any school or department of a school at which ordinary payments in respect of the instruction of each scholar exceeded twelve pence a week. These definitions would make matters still more obscure. There was something ambiguous in the language of the paragraph, and until the Committee decided as to the meaning of "public or private school" the amendment should be supported, or we should accept the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition and strike out the clause until we thoroughly understood the question.

Mr. BROWN: According to the interpretation clause land included buildings. Therefore any building occupied and having the services would not be rated. He (Mr. Brown) favoured striking out these exemption clauses, but if the Minister proposed to make the proviso to Clause 122 mandatory in regard to the payment for services he would vote for the clause as it stood.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Subclause (b) provided that land belonging to a religious body or brotherhood should be exempted from taxation, therefore, to take a concrete instance, the Christian Brothers College would be exempt; but if the words proposed by the amendment to be struck out were excised it would mean that the Scotch College at Claremont and the Church of England school at Guildford, which were owned by religious bodies, would be rated; that would be manifestly unfair.

Mr. FOULKES: If the words "private school" were not struck out would it be in order subsequently to move an amendment that the words "being the property of a religious body" be struck out?

The CHAIRMAN: Not after the amendment had been voted upon.

Mr. FOULKES: Would it be in order to move now that the words "being the property of a religious body" be struck out.

The CHAIRMAN: It would be in order to move to amend the amendment by omitting the words "private school" from the amendment.

Mr. FOULKES moved an amendment on the amendment—

That the words "private school" be omitted from the amendment.

Mr. SCADDAN: If the interpretation of the member for Kalgoorlie as to "private school" were correct, then it was evident that there was some restriction in connection with a private school. That being so, it was right that such institutions should pay taxes. There evidently was the same difference between a private school and a State school as there

was between a public house and a club. In the latter case a hotel was open to the public, but one could get nothing until a certain fee was paid. A club was open to the general public, but with certain restrictions. So with the schools. The State school was open to the public with no restrictions, but in connection with a private school there were these restrictions. Then as to a public school, it appeared also that there were certain restrictions with regard thereto, and if that were so then it was a pity he had not included the words "public school" in his amendment. Take the case of the school at Guildford. Up to comparatively recently this was controlled by Mr. Harper and others, who spent a considerable amount of money in its establishment. It was very doubtful whether it paid. Taxes had then to be paid. Now it was controlled by a religious body and was exempt from taxation. There was no reason for the difference.

Mr. FOULKES: The Committee should support the principle, that if it were decided to relieve a certain class of schools from rates, all schools should be relieved without drawing a distinction between one school and another, whether carried on by a religious denomination or not. All must admit that every school carried on an exceedingly good work. It was true that the number of private schools was very few, and it was to be regretted there were not more as they did good work. The teaching there was exactly the same, looking at it from a purely educational point of view, as the teaching in the ordinary denominational schools. The religious teaching was quite as good as that in the denominational schools. Very few of the private schools could be described as sources of profit to the individuals carrying them on. It was known that as far as the Guildford school was concerned it was carried on for a considerable time at some loss. Very few private schools here returned a large amount of profit. They had to compete with the schools managed by religious denominations which had great forces behind them, more capital, and a certain number of people who, by ties of church, supported them. If the words "public school, private school" were left in the clause it would be immaterial whether the schools were the property of religious bodies or not, for all would be exempt from rating.

Mr. OSBORN: If this were a Municipal Act one could understand the exception which was being taken. It could not be understood why there was so much opposition, because the Bill provided that all these schools should pay for services rendered to them. If they were going to be charged where was the necessity for all the discussion as to whether their property should be termed rateable or not. If these people paid for what they received that would be sufficient.

Amendment on amendment (Mr. Foulkes's) put and negatived.

Amendment (Mr. Scaddan's) put and negatived.

Mr. JOHNSON moved an amendment—

That in line 4 of paragraph (c.) the words "Friendly Society's hall, Trades Union hall" be inserted after "gallery."

It was unfair to exempt one section and tax another. It was not possible to imagine a society or organisation which was as deserving of consideration as either of the two that he proposed should be added to the clause. Both these organisations were working on similar lines, and they were as self-sacrificing as others we knew of. If the Committee acted consistently they should not refuse to add these two bodies to the list in the paragraph. Friendly societies were as deserving as any educational body conducted by religious people, and trades union organisations were working in the interests of humanity side by side with religious bodies.

Mr. SCADDAN: No one would deny that these bodies were doing good work, and it was not asking too much that the Minister should agree to the amendment. In connection with the trades hall at Fremantle, there was no individual making a profit there; as a matter of fact, during the winter months that hall was let for educational and charitable pur-

poses, and it should certainly come under the exemption clauses.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The amendment would not receive his support. Friendly societies were mutual benefit societies, the members were banded together for their own benefit, and if the Committee were to exempt them they might just as well exempt a society like the A.M.P. Society, which did not make a profit and if it did make a profit it divided the money amongst its members just as friendly societies and other institutions of a similar kind did.

Mr. Bath: Religious congregations band together for mutual benefit.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Exactly; one was for a monetary benefit and the other for intellectual benefit.

Mr. COLLIER: The Committee were told that if they taxed ministers of religion the expenditure the latter would be called upon to bear would be such that they could ill-afford to meet; but no section of the community would feel the pressure of the proposed increased taxation more than the trades unions. The majority, or the whole of them, were a class of people who were the lowest paid section of the whole of the community. On the score of charity they were as much entitled to consideration as were the various heads of denominations. As a matter of fact, both the trades unions and friendly societies had done a great deal in the way of charity.

Mr. ANGWIN: There was no reason why the Minister should not accept the amendment. There was scarcely a hall in the metropolitan area that would come under the exemption. Most of the friendly societies' halls were let for private purposes, and the only trades hall was also let for private purposes.

Amendment put, and a division called for.

Mr. HUDSON: Would the Chairman give a ruling as to whether the Speaker was entitled to vote in his robes as Speaker; should he not vote merely as member for Toodyay?

The CHAIRMAN: There was no point of order in the question.

Division resulted as follows:—

Ayes	20
Noes	24
Majority against ..	4

AYES.	
Mr. Angwin	Mr. McDowall
Mr. Bath	Mr. W. Price
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Collier	Mr. Swan
Mr. Gill	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Gourley	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Heitmann	Mr. Walker
Mr. Holman	Mr. Ware
Mr. Horan	Mr. Troy
Mr. Hudson	*(Teller).*
Mr. Johnson	

NOES.	
Mr. Brown	Mr. Layman
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Male
Mr. Carson	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. Monger
Mr. Davies	Mr. N. J. Moore
Mr. Draper	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Osborn
Mr. George	Mr. J. Price
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Quinlan
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Hayward	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Jacoby	*(Teller).*
Mr. Keenan	

Amendment thus negatived.

[*Mr. Taylor took the Chair.*]

Mr. BATH: As already intimated, he intended to oppose the clause, feeling convinced that members had no clear knowledge as to where these proposed exemptions were leading. To his mind the clause could be made a great deal clearer in meaning, and could be compressed within one provision. If the clause were deleted, he would give notice of a new clause which would make all necessary provision for exemptions without any ambiguous provisoes.

Mr. JOHNSON: It was his intention to vote against the clause, not for the reasons given by the member for Brown Hill but because the exemptions were narrow, constituted class legislation, and were distinctly unfair to a section of the community. He would divide the Committee on the clause, and, if successful in having it rejected, he would reserve to himself the right of supporting or opposing the proposed new clause referred to by the member for Brown Hill.

[*Mr. Daglish resumed the Chair.*]

Clause as amended put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	.. .. ..	24
Noes	.. .. ..	19
Majority for	..	5

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Jacoby
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Keenan
Mr. Carson	Mr. Male
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Davies	Mr. Monger
Mr. Draper	Mr. N. J. Moore
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Nanson
Mr. George	Mr. Osborn
Mr. Gordon	Mr. J. Price
Mr. Gregory	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. Layman
Mr. Hayward	(*Teller*).
Mr. Horan	

NOES.

Mr. Bath	Mr. W. Price
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Brown	Mr. Swan
Mr. Collier	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Gill	Mr. Troy
Mr. Gourley	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Holman	Mr. Walker
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Ware
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Heitmann
Mr. McDowall	(*Teller*).

Clause as amended thus passed.

[*Mr. Taylor took the Chair.*]

Clause 94—agreed to.

Clause 95—Valuation:

Mr. JOHNSON: As appeared on the Notice Paper he intended to move to strike out the clause. The proper thing to do was to vote against the clause, but he had put the proposed amendment on the Notice Paper in order the more particularly to draw attention to the clause. It provided for rating on annual values. To this he was distinctly opposed, and more particularly in connection with a Bill of the sort. Under the principle of rating on annual values the mere fact of compelling the property owners to make the sewerage connections and so improve their property was to increase the annual values and with them the rates. Provision was made in the Bill giving the Minister the option of making the rating either on unimproved values or on the annual values. His object in opposing the clause was to make general the principle of rating on unimproved values. It was generally admitted throughout the State that the rating on unimproved values was the best system. We had it in the Roads Act, and the ill effects prophesied in connection with the system had not been fulfilled. It was admitted the system was advantageous in the agricultural districts, and it was admitted in connection with the metropolitan districts. It would be more equitable and fairer under this Bill, otherwise we asked people to improve their premises, and then taxed them for doing it.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member believed that all rating should be on the unimproved values instead of on the annual values, and tried to impress that view on the Committee, but the hon. member was wrong in saying that the system had been tried and proved satisfactory. It had not been thoroughly tried, and where tried even in the districts the hon. member referred to could hardly be said to have proved satisfactory.

Mr. Johnson: It is adopted by every board.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No; it was adopted in but few instances, and so far from being satisfactory it was found necessary in the Roads Act Amendment Bill, now being drafted, to make provision so that roads boards could rate town properties within their districts on the annual values notwithstanding the fact that they had adopted the unimproved values system for outlying portions of the districts. The roads boards found great difficulty under the system of unimproved value rating. The State first adopted the system of rating on unimproved values in passing the Roads Bill in 1902, but the basis was made optional. Several roads boards within the metropolitan area adopted the unimproved values system, but they were districts which more or less contained no big centre or town. There was no option given in the Municipalities Act. It was decreed the rates should be struck on the annual values only, and if we took away the option by this Bill we would give great trouble to the Minister controlling the works, and would absolutely alter

the incidence of taxation that obtained at present. A few figures would demonstrate this. The assessed annual value at Subiaco at a 1s. rate brought in, during the present year, £3,305 6s. The unimproved value of the municipality was £152,750. To give a return equal to that derived from the annual value would require a rate of 5.2d. in the pound. The Leederville municipality, at the present water rate of 1s. in the pound on the annual value, brought in £1,751 15s. 9d. The unimproved value of Leederville was £192,211, and in contradistinction to Subiaco a rate of 2.18d. in the pound on unimproved values would give the same return as the 1s. rate on the annual value. This showed that if we adopted the unimproved value system universally we would need to alter the incidence of taxation altogether, and would need to have a much higher taxation for Subiaco than could be imposed on Leederville. The hon. member would propose to limit the Minister to a maximum unimproved value. Would it be 1s. in the pound or 5.2d. in the pound as would be needed for Subiaco, or 2.18d. as required for Leederville, or would he make it 1⅛d. as would be required for Perth? The assessed annual value of Perth was £425,366, bringing in £21,268 on the 1s. water rate, whereas the unimproved value of Perth was £4,509,434, which to bring in the same amount as the 1s. rate on the annual value would only require a rate of 1⅛d. in the pound. These returns were based on figures supplied by the town clerks. Fremantle at the water rate of 6d. on the annual value returned £2,886. Having an unimproved value of £940,000 it would only require a rate of ¾d. in the pound on the unimproved values to give the same return. These illustrations showed the difficult position in which the Minister would be placed. It would be difficult to strike a rate.

Mr. Johnson: Not at all.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It would be pleasing to know how the hon. member would do it. Large properties in the centre of Perth gave further illustrations. There was one property with the rateable value of £1,280 which paid £64 on a 1s. rate. If that property were rated on the unimproved value with a rate of 2d. in the pound it would pay £373. Another property returning £68 15s. on the annual value would, at 2d. in the pound on the unimproved value, contribute £270; while a third property, which at present contributed £75 on the annual value, would contribute £260 on the unimproved value at 2d. in the pound. These properties were all fully improved. Directly we got to the suburban private residences, where the improvements were not of such value, the disparity was not so great. For instance, a suburban residence of £50 at present paid £2 10s. on the annual value, whereas at 2d. in the pound on a £5 a foot frontage it would pay £2 15s. It would be wiser for the Committee to decide that the option should remain in the Bill. If later on members wished to adopt a principle of such a wide, and such a sweeping character, they could do it in the Roads Act and Municipalities Act, and make it mandatory, though, in working, the roads boards found they needed the optional power so far as town lots were concerned. It seemed reasonable that the improvements on land should, at any rate bear this tax for water and sewerage services. These services were to be rendered to the buildings. Vacant blocks, although having to bear the rate for the general weal of the public health of the community, derived no benefit: they used no water, and did not need to be coupled up with the sewerage system.

Mr. Scaddan: You do not use a road with vacant land.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The owner of the vacant block got the unearned increment caused by the building of roads, and by the building of houses on neighbouring blocks, but in this Bill we provided a direct impost for services rendered. We would be doing wrong if we altered the system and made it mandatory to adopt the unimproved values rating. It would entail no end of bother and it would be difficult to strike a fair rate, and we would need to have a fair margin of safety to strike a fair rate that would apply equally between the municipalities and the roads boards. The Act

of 1904 gave the option. The Goldfields Water Supply Act gave no option, but allowed the rate on the annual value only. All our water Acts gave no option. This Bill did so. We could adopt the unimproved value system when it proved to be a workable proposition. When the roads boards had extended their unimproved values taxation and proved it to be a workable proposition, it would be time enough to adopt that system in regard to water rates if it was thought desirable.

Mr. BATH: The probable reason why some roads boards had not found the power to tax on the unimproved value satisfactory was because a maximum existed, and that maximum did not bear a fair relation to the limit they were empowered to impose upon the annual value. Probably the dissatisfaction would be removed if they were give a sufficient maximum to enable them to satisfy their needs and to carry on by taxation on the unimproved value of the land.

The Minister for Works: The same maximum does not apply outside of as within towns.

Mr. BATH: Another reason was that owing to the influence exercised by some big land owners on the roads boards, the valuation was low in comparison with the valuation imposed on smaller holdings, and the taxation was certainly not in ratio to the unimproved value. Those circumstances would tend to make the taxation on the unimproved values unsatisfactory, although it would be in no sense an argument against taxation on the unimproved value of land. Those who knew Subiaco and Leederville must accept with more than the proverbial grain of salt the capital value put on land in those suburbs, at £50,000 in Subiaco against £190,000 in Leederville. Surely there was a screw loose somewhere for the capital unimproved value in Subiaco quite equalled that at Leederville, if it were not greater. If there were such a disparity between the suburbs there would also be a disparity in the annual value. If the two districts were kept apart there would have to be a differential annual rate for Subiaco as compared with Leederville. To a certain extent Subiaco was an annexe of Perth, and much of the business was transacted in the City; therefore, the presence of that population in Subiaco really imparted an unearned increment to Perth property, so that in fixing the scheme of rating one must include Subiaco as part of the metropolitan district. So far as New South Wales was concerned, a very comprehensive local Government measure was adopted, in which the State was split up into local governing bodies. There was a provision by which the bodies were given power to rate on the unimproved value of land. This had proved very satisfactory.

The Minister for Works: It could not be done in Sydney.

Mr. BATH: Sydney was split up into many municipalities, and while the whole area really contributed to the great unimproved value of business blocks in the City, those blocks were separated from the central power and were constituted in municipalities. Once a Greater-Sydney scheme was carried into effect, and there was one big body, the rate would be equitably fixed, and more so by a tax on the unimproved value than on the annual value. The act of rating for water supply, or sewerage, was more than an attempt to recover payment for services supplied. It was as much a rate on the unearned increment as a rate for the purpose of constructing roads and footpaths, as the construction of a water scheme, sewerage and drainage works had a general effect in advancing the value of land in the area covered by that scheme, and to that extent the rate was something more than an attempt to secure a return for services rendered. It was an effort to secure for the body controlling it some of the value imparted to it. Members, such as the members for Murray and West Perth, complained about the high rates of taxes for local governing purposes. What was the reason? Take West Perth, for instance. In some of the streets there was one house on the side of a block, while the rest of the land was unoccupied, and under the present system of rating on the capital value, the man who had built a house and resided in it had to pay so much more in order to enable the owners of the unoccupied

blocks to obtain the unearned increment without effecting improvements. The same remark applied to the metropolitan area. The reason the rates were so high was that all these schemes had to be extended so far, not only past occupied premises but also past unoccupied premises. If by a scheme of rating, such as outlined by the member for Guildford, we could make it possible to have the unoccupied blocks contributing with the others to the carrying out of the scheme, those who had improved their properties would soon find relief. It was to be hoped the clause would be deleted.

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

Ayes	.. .. ..	23
Noes	.. .. ..	19
Majority for	..	4

AYES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Jacoby
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Keenan
Mr. Carson	Mr. Male
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Davies	Mr. Monger
Mr. Draper	Mr. N. J. Moore
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Nanson
Mr. George	Mr. Osborn
Mr. Gordon	Mr. J. Price
Mr. Gregory	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. Layman
Mr. Hayward	(*Teller*).

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Johnson
Mr. Bath	Mr. McDowall
Mr. Bolton	Mr. W. Price
Mr. Collier	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Gill	Mr. Swan
Mr. Gourley	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Heitmann	Mr. Walker
Mr. Holman	Mr. Ware
Mr. Horan	Mr. Troy
Mr. Hudson	(*Teller*).

Clause thus passed.

Clauses 96 and 97—agreed to.

Clauses 98 to 100—consequentially amended by inserting the word "Minister" in lieu of "chairman of or secretary to the board."

Clause 101—Clerks of local authorities to supply copy of ratebook:

Mr. BROWN moved—

That in line 2 of Subclause 2 the words "of one penny" be struck out and "fourpence" inserted in lieu.

It was never intended that the local authorities should supply a copy of the rate book at one penny per folio. In every law office threepence was given. In the majority of instances outside assistance had to be called in whenever work of this kind had to be performed, and it was simply sweating to pay 1d. Moreover, there should not be any restriction up to £50 as the subclause provided, and later he would move to strike that out.

Mr. ANGWIN: Was there any necessity for the roads board secretary or the town clerk to supply the information? Why could not the Minister employ someone to do this work independently of these officers? It was really imposing additional work on officers who had quite sufficient to do.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It would be hardly advisable for the Minister to have the right to send his own man into a municipal office to take charge of the rate books for the purpose of making a copy.

Mr. Angwin: They do it now.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It would be better to ask the municipal authorities to do the work. With regard to the amendment, the intention was to give sufficient remuneration. The amount of 1d. was already in the existing Act; at any rate, 4d. seemed to be an excessive price.

Mr. DRAPER: The work should not be done for 1d. per folio; the amount might be made 3d. per folio.

Mr. JOHNSON: It might not be advisable to make it compulsory that 4d. should be charged. The member for Perth should agree to strike out the words in the second line "of one penny" and insert in their place "at a rate not exceeding fourpence."

Mr. Brown: The suggestion would be acceptable.

Mr. GILL: Fourpence was a fair charge. There was a good deal of checking required, and very often officers had to employ assistance.

Mr. HUDSON: In these days of typewriters solicitors were enabled to make a profit upon 4d. That was the amount

allowed by the Supreme Court. This work, however, was manuscript work, and it would require more checking and more time than the average work on a typewriter for which 4d. was charged A charge of 4d., therefore, would be a reasonable rate.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. BROWN moved—

That in lines 3 and 4 the words "But not to exceed the sum of £50" be struck out.

Amendment passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 102 to 112—agreed to.

Clause 113—Land subject to storm-water rates:

Mr. DRAPER: It appeared unnecessary to have both a stormwater rate and also a sewerage rate. So far as Perth was concerned the sewerage rate would cover both storm-water and sewerage, the rate being a shilling in the pound. As the result of inquiries made. he was not satisfied that that would be sufficient in some of the districts affected by the Bill. If the Minister would be prepared to accept an amendment to Clause 115 to the effect that the two rates combined should not exceed 1s. 6d. in the pound there would be no need for further discussion on the point.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Since the second reading debate he had gone into the question of these rates, and had come to the conclusion that he could safely adopt a joint rate of 1s. 6d. for storm-water and sewerage. That was to say, not that a joint rate would be imposed, but that the aggregate of the two rates would not exceed 1s. 6d. He proposed to move accordingly when Clause 115 was reached.

Mr. JOHNSON: There was some difficulty in following the Minister on this point. It was understood that the storm-water rate would only be struck in a locality served by a storm-water drain. If that were so how could the Minister strike a uniform rate?

The Minister for Works: I do not propose to strike a joint rate.

Mr. JOHNSON: How then would the Minister accomplish it—did he propose to levy a rate of sixpence on storm-water?

The Minister for Works: No; I propose that the aggregate of the two rates shall not exceed 1s. 6d.

Mr. JOHNSON: In other words the Minister proposed to charge a sixpenny rate for storm-water drainage, for certainly he could not impose one shilling in one portion of a district and ninepence in another. It meant that a sixpenny rate would be imposed.

Mr. ANGWIN: It seemed that if it were found necessary to put down a storm-water drain in East Perth, the Minister was going to strike a rate in Subiaco to pay for that East Perth drain.

The Minister for Works: No.

Mr. ANGWIN: While under the Bill in certain ciricumstances relief was provided from the sewerage rate no relief was provided from the storm-water rate, in connection with which the district was dealt with as a whole.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If the hon. member would turn back to Clause 6 he would find how the area was subdivided. In that clause it was set out that the whole of the metropolitan area constituted a sewerage and drainage area, while it was provided that the area might be divided into storm-water districts, and defined. Up to the present they had not been defined. When Clause 115 was reached he would move an amendment providing that the two rates should not exceed 1s. 6d. in the aggregate.

Mr. Johnson: It will still be a sixpenny rate.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No, it might even be ninepence. For instance why should not the sewerage rate be reduced if it were found that the performance of the work cost less than had been anticipated. It would not follow that because he struck a shilling rate in one district, the rate would be one shilling in all districts.

Mr. DRAPER: According to the Minister, if the sewerage rate struck in, say, Perth district was tenpence in the pound, and the Governor were to proclaim East Perth a storm-water district

the storm-water rate in East Perth would not exceed eightpence in the pound. Was that a correct illustration of the provision which was to be made ?

The Minister for Works : Yes.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 114—agreed to.

Clause 115—Amount of rate :

The MINISTER FOR WORKS moved an amendment—

That all the words after "No," the first word of the clause, be struck out with a view to inserting other words.

Amendment passed.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS moved that the following be inserted :—

Water rate shall in any one year exceed (1) one shilling in the pound on the annual rateable value of the land rated, (2) two pence in the pound on the capital unimproved value of the land rated where the valuation is on the basis of the capital unimproved value of the land. The sewerage and stormwater rates taken together shall not in any one year exceed (3) one shilling and sixpence in the pound on the annual rateable value of the land rated, or (4) three pence in the pound on the capital unimproved value of the land rated where the valuation is on the basis of the capital unimproved value of the land. But the Minister may make and levy a minimum rate of the prescribed amount upon any land the annual rate of which would not exceed one pound.

Mr. JOHNSON : It was unfair to bring in a proposal altering the rating without putting it on the Notice Paper. It would be better to report progress when an important amendment like this was brought forward.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : More importance was attached to the amendment than it deserved. The only alteration was that the stormwater and sewerage rates had been bulked together, and a maximum of 1s. 6d. provided.

Mr. ANGWIN : Did the clause mean that there would be for a small block of land a minimum charge of £1 for stormwater and sewerage, and also a charge of £1 for water ?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : The intention was to give the Minister power to prescribe a minimum rate where the amount to be got out of the rateable value did not exceed £1.

Mr. Bath : Is that a pound for each separate rate ?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : Yes. The Minister would have power to collect £2. A minimum was provided in every Act. In Perth there was at present a minimum charge of £1 for a house, and 5s. for vacant land. The amount was fixed by regulation. For Fremantle and Claremont the minimum was 5s. fixed under the Act. At Midland £1 was charged for occupied land, and 10s. for vacant land, The minimum in this Bill could be fixed at 10s. or £1 for each block.

Mr. BROWN : Already in several portions of the metropolitan area the rates exceeded the value of the land, and if it was proposed to charge £1 per annum on each block, in a short time the Government would be the owner of the land in some portions of the district.

Mr. ANGWIN : It would be well to move an amendment to the clause by striking out the words "one pound" with a view to inserting "ten shillings."

Mr. BROWN : Hundreds of blocks in the locality set out in the map were only valued at £2, so that in one year the rates might equal the value of the land. Those blocks could be bought for £2 as they were rated on capital value of only £2 or £3.

The CHAIRMAN : It appeared evident that the member for East Fremantle desired to move an amendment under a misapprehension. His purpose would not be served by moving an amendment in the way he had indicated.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : If the member desired to move an amendment in the terms he had outlined there would be no objection and he would be quite prepared to accept the alteration.

Mr. DRAPER : What the member for East Fremantle evidently wished was to prevent a maximum rate of £2 being imposed on each block. The amendment he had indicated would not have that effect.

Mr. ANGWIN : In the circumstances and on further consideration he would

not move the amendment he had indicated.

Mr. DRAPER: With regard to the amendment moved by the Minister for Works, it would be well if after the word "amount" the words "not exceeding ten shillings" were inserted, and that the words "one pound" should be replaced by "ten shillings."

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That was really the intention of the amendment, and he would be quite prepared to insert the words suggested in his amendment if he were permitted to do so.

Mr. OSBORN: Would the rate be struck under the same system as municipal rates were; that was where there were two or more blocks grouped together the minimum struck was on the group and not on each separate block? Would the same system be adopted under the Bill as was the case at Midland Junction now, or would the minimum of ten shillings be charged on each of a number of blocks whether they were joined or not?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That rested entirely upon the assessment. At the present time the Government must take the assessment of the local authorities.

Mr. Osborn: That will meet the case.

Mr. JOHNSON: It was to be hoped the Minister would not take the local authorities' assessment.

The Minister for Works: We cannot help ourselves at present.

Mr. JOHNSON: The Midland Junction Council grouped certain blocks of land and made one assessment. It had been suggested that the minimum rate should be attached to them, but if a man went to a property owner and bought a block from the group, he would pay the same rate for one block as the proprietor did for 20 or 30 blocks. It had been suggested by a Midland Junction deputation to the ex-Minister for Works, that a certain side of a street sub-divided for sale should be grouped into one or two assessments and only be charged a minimum. On the other side of the street the land was sold and the man there who bought a block would pay the same as a man holding 30 blocks on the other side would do. A more pernicious and unfair system was never invented. He did not desire to threaten the Minister, but if that system were adopted the Minister would get a pretty rough time on his Estimates.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member's threats did not give him any concern at all. The hon. member could give him as rough a time as he had been in the habit of doing in the past; it would not have any effect; he would continue to administer the department according to his own ideas of justice and equity. At the present time the department took the local authorities' assessments, and that fact seemed to arouse the ire of the member for Guildford. It was impossible for the department to make their own valuations, but there was power given in the Bill to take any valuation that it was found could be adapted for the purposes of the department. The department could even take the land taxation officer's valuations, and could also take local authorities' assessments, or the department could have their own assessments, but at the commencement they had to avail themselves of the assessments already in existence. As time went on, however, anomalies would be remedied if they were found to exist. By leave he would alter his amendment, so that the clause would then read—

No water rate shall in any one year exceed, (1) one shilling in the pound on the annual rateable value of the land rated, (2) two pence in the pound on the capital unimproved value of the land rated where the valuation is on the basis of the capital unimproved value of the land. The sewerage and stormwater rate taken together shall not in any one year exceed (3) one shilling and sixpence in the pound on the annual rateable value of the land rated or (4) threepence in the pound on the capital unimproved value of the land rated where the valuation is on the basis of the capital unimproved value of the land. But the Minister may make and levy a minimum rate of the prescribed amount not exceeding ten shillings upon any land the annual rate of which would not exceed ten shillings.

Mr. ANGWIN: The amendment was put in such a way that the Minister would

be compelled to charge not less than ten shillings.

Amendment as altered, put and passed.

Clauses 116 to 120—agreed to.

Clause 121—Payment by measure when land rated :

Mr. BROWN moved—

That in line 5 the words "provided that the maximum price for the supply of water shall not exceed 1s. 6d. per thousand gallons" be added.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : The Committee should not agree to the insertion of this figure. No Minister would increase the price unnecessarily ; if he did he would be subjected in Parliament every year to an outcry from the people through their members. If the big scheme was carried, and it was hoped that it would be carried out in the not distant future, it was quite conceivable that at the inception the price might be slightly higher than the hon. member had named.

Mr. BROWN : The Committee should support the amendment. Eighteen pence for excess water was double the price paid in any other city in Australia. The amendment should command the support of the country and goldfields members alike.

Mr. JOHNSON : It was only reasonable to assume that the price for excess water would be less than that of the water supplied for rates paid. It was not expected that the price for excess water would reach 1s. 6d, in the area affected. At the same time it would be unwise for the Minister to agree to be bound down in the manner proposed.

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

Ayes	.. 16
Noes	.. 24
Majority against	.. 8

AYES.

Mr. Bath	Mr. McDowall
Mr. Brown	Mr. Monger
Mr. Collier	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Draper	Mr. Swan
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Walker
Mr. Gill	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. Heitmann
Mr. Holman	(*Teller*).
Mr. Jacoby	

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Male
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Butcher	Mr. N. J. Moore
Mr. Carson	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. Osborn
Mr. Davies	Mr. J. Price
Mr. Gourley	Mr. W. Price
Mr. Gordon	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Ware
Mr. Hayward	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Horan	Mr. Layman
Mr. Hudson	(*Teller*).
Mr. Johnson	

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT—ROYAL AGRICULTURAL SHOW.

The PREMIER : I move—

That the House at its rising do adjourn till Thursday next at 4.30 p.m.

Mr. BATH : I would like to know why we cannot arrange to adjourn till to-morrow at 7.30 p.m. Hon. members will find no difficulty in getting here at that hour, for it will give us ample time to return from the show. Personally I am quite prepared to come here to-morrow evening. I therefore move as an amendment—

That the House do adjourn till 7.30 p.m. to-morrow.

The PREMIER : I was under the impression that the suggestion met with the approval of the Leader of the Opposition, and that this adjournment was proposed at the request of a number of members. No doubt it will be a tiring day at the show from early in the morning till late in the afternoon, and generally members will not be prepared to meet in the evening. As a matter of fact last year the same procedure was adopted and I did not anticipate that any opposition would be given to-night.

Mr. SCADDAN : I am as desirous as any member of attending the show and the luncheon to hear the Premier and others speak of how the agricultural industry is progressing, but I have before me a statement made by the Premier at a function he attended the other night ; and I think it is time we knew who was responsible for the delay in the business

of the House. The Premier said, "While the business of Parliament had not progressed as rapidly as he would like to have seen it owing to the unnecessary motions for adjournment and so on, the fact that there had been delay did not lie at the doors of the Government." It is well to know that the delay in the present circumstances lies at the doors of the Government. I am satisfied members are prepared to come back to the House to-morrow evening to go on with the business of the country.

Mr. Heitmann: I am not for one.

Mr. SCADDAN: We have had to do without the hon. member frequently, and probably we will get on without him. It is as well to know that while the Premier can attend functions and complain about the business of the country being delayed, he can come to the next sitting of the House and ask for an adjournment for a whole day.

The Premier: At functions like that the whole of the speeches are not reported.

Mr. SCADDAN: Probably it is just as well. More ludicrous remarks were never made, particularly those from the Honorary Minister, and on the Estimates I will have an opportunity of replying to his remarks. At any rate we can meet to-morrow evening, and if the Premier is anxious to get on with business he cannot object.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I shall support the amendment, but I would prefer to meet at 4.30 o'clock to-morrow. I am anxious to get on with the business of the country, and with the member for Ivanhoe I wish the public to know who are wasting the time of the House. Further, I do not think it is necessary to go to the show and make party speeches. It is all right for the Government who want to go there to advance their party propaganda, and to use the show to advocate the great beneficence of fusions, various fusions and many fusions, and in general to curse the Labour party.

The Premier: I do not think there is anybody particularly anxious to make speeches at the show.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I protest against any waste of time in attending these party political functions; they are absolutely nothing else. I am anxious and prepared that the business of the country should be proceeded with. I consider it is just as important to consider the miners as the agriculturists. We were denied the opportunity of considering a question concerning the miners, but to-morrow we propose to miss a whole sitting in order to look at various cows and sheep. These shows are all right from a point of encouraging agriculture, but whom do they encourage? They encourage the agriculturists who do not need any encouragement—the anti-land-taxers who are the only people who show anything there, and do not need encouragement. I protest, and will continue to protest, not only against wasting the time of the House to attend these shows, but also against wasting the time of the country in supporting them.

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

Ayes	16
Noes	24
Majority against ..	8

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. J. Price
Mr. Bath	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Collier	Mr. Swan
Mr. Gill	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Gourley	Mr. Walker
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. Ware
Mr. Horan	Mr. Holman
Mr. Hudson	(*Teller*).
Mr. McDowall	

NOES.

Mr. Bolton	Mr. Johnson
Mr. Brown	Mr. Male
Mr. Carson	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. Monger
Mr. Daglish	Mr. N. J. Moore
Mr. Davies	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Draper	Mr. Osborn
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. J. Price
Mr. Gordon	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Gregory	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Hayward	Mr. Layman
Mr. Heitmann	(*Teller*).
Mr. Jacoby	

Amendment thus negatived.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 11.33 p.m.