

exceeding £3,889,736 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Western Australia, and a further sum not exceeding £144,218 from the Sale of Government Property Trust Account. Question put and passed.

Resolution reported and the report adopted.

BILLS (2) RETURNED FROM THE COUNCIL.

1, General Loan and Inscribed Stock Act Amendment (Without amendment).

2, Vermin Boards Act Amendment (With amendments.)

House adjourned at 8.55 a.m. (Thursday).

Legislative Council.

Thursday, 28th October, 1915.

	PAGE
Papers presented	2083
Charter of s.s. "Western Australia"	2083
Bills: Health Act Amendment, 3a.	2083
Land Act Amendment, 2a.	2084
Vermin Boards Act Amendment, returned	2083
Permanent Reserve, 1b.	2093
Road Closure, 1a.	2093
Licensing Act Amendment, continuation, Assembly's Message	2093
Perth Municipal Gas and Electric Lighting Act Amendment, 1a.	2094
Select Committee, Retirement of C. F. Gale, to adopt report	2094
Joint Select Committee, Horse-racing control, to adopt report	2096

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 3 p.m., and read prayers.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: 1, Midland Junction abattoirs and sale yards, audited accounts to 30th June, 1915. 2, Regulation under the Coal Mines Regulation Act.

CHARTER OF S.S. "WESTERN AUSTRALIA."

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [3.5]: I have to inform members that the State steamship "Western Australia" has been chartered by the British Government at a fee of £18,000 a year, the British Government taking all risks and bearing all expenses. The ship is to be used for the purpose of a hospital during the duration of the war.

BILL—HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT.

Third Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [3.5]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

Hon. W. PATRICK (Central) [3.6]: I do not intend to delay the Bill in its passage through the third reading, but desire to draw the attention of hon. members to the fact that one of the arguments which I used against the urgency of the Bill, especially, was that there was nothing to show in the official statistics that the health of this community was getting worse, but that on the other hand it was getting better. I quoted statistics showing that the disease with which this Bill deals is practically insignificant, compared with the population of the State, and that it certainly was not increasing. I backed up that statement by saying that the general death rate of Western Australia had fallen some 50 per cent. during the last 10 or 11 years, and that the infantile death rate had fallen to half of what it was 10 years ago. The debate has been of a very illuminating character, but to my astonishment, on the main argument which I used in reference to syphilis, it was stated by one of the chief members of the House, the member who by his position is most qualified to speak on the subject, that the statistics which I quoted were perfectly worthless. I must say that was a surprise to me. If, when we take up the statistics of Australia in reference

to any mortality table we are told that the statistics are worthless, what are we to believe in place of them? There is no doubt that if the statistics in reference to one disease are imperfect, it is only reasonable to believe that the disease exists to a greater extent than is shown by the statistics. On the same argument, the other mortality tables must be worthless, and those who die must be spread over the other diseases in the other tables. It is an extraordinary statement to make, for if we are not to depend on the official mortality statistics of Australia given by medical men what are we to depend upon? But while these mortality tables are said to be worthless they are apparently reliable in connection with the death of some pauper, some poor creature who was abandoned, uncared for by anyone, and left to die. The statistics in a case of this sort are said to be reliable, because as the person had no friend in the world there was no means of preventing the issue of a death certificate, in the form of the bar sinister of this abominable disease.

Hon. J. Cornell: They will not worry.

Hon. W. PATRICK: Dead men will ~~not worry~~, of course. There is something wrong if the official statistics of Australia are of such a nature as to be worthless in relation to any branch of mortality cases. They are perfectly irrefutable in one particular branch. The death rate of Western Australia and the general death rate during the last 10 or 11 years has fallen from 13.40 to 9.36; in other words, it has fallen 50 per cent. If one disease is increasing all other diseases must be decreasing. The infantile death rate, the rate which is supposed to be chiefly affected, has fallen from 142, ten or 11 years ago, to 71 in 1913. That is all I want to say to the House. Whatever anyone may say, if a person is not on safe grounds in quoting the official statistics of Australia, we are not on safe grounds anywhere.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and returned to the Legislative Assembly with amendments.

BILL—LAND ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading—Amendment, six months.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. J. CORNELL (South) [3.13]: I desire to extend my sympathy to the leader of the House in regard to the Bill which he now has charge of. It is rather remarkable that this Bill has been such a long while on the stocks. It is ostensibly to suit country members, but every one who has spoken so far is not satisfied with it. It does not go far enough in their opinion, or give them that measure of relief which they are desirous of having. I approach the matter from another standpoint. I am totally opposed to the Bill, root and branch. It has been said that the Bill was introduced as a result of a definite promise made by the Government. It is a Government measure and a Government measure only. It has not the endorsement or the backing of the Labour party. In all of the congresses of the Labour party, since the inception of the Labour party, this question has never been discussed, and though a promise was given, as stated by Mr. Carson, and was to some extent responsible for the return of the present Government in 1911, that promise was made as a Government promise and not as a party promise. Since 1911 another congress has sat and it formulated the policy for this Parliament, but the question of the repricing of land was never mentioned. I want members to know where I stand. I stand bound by the policy laid down by the congresses of the Labour party.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: Then you are not an independent critic?

Hon. J. CORNELL: It has been said that the object of the measure is to relieve struggling settlers. I have every sympathy for the struggling settlers. I know what it is to fight one's way through on the land. I have gone through it and have had that much of it that I have no desire to take it on again. But we must take into consideration that a measure such as this aims at the birthright of un-

born generations. Every child yet unborn has as much right to God's heritage as those who live to-day. The settlers have struggled, but as one who has been through the mill, I think if we weigh the hardships undergone by another section of the community we will find that their struggle is just as hard as the struggle of the settler, with this difference, that the settler takes up his land under our present system; he works and improves his land, and as population grows so does the value of that land improve. It has been said that the prices fixed by the late Government in 1910 were too high. Mr. Carson stated that it was on that cry to a certain extent that this Government were returned to power. Every election has been fought on the question of the non-alienation of land, and though this was a plank in the Labour party's platform at the 1911 election, still the Labour party won. Why is the price of the land too high? We know that we have gone through a succession of droughts. I venture to say that if we had four or five years such as this year the Government, five years hence, would not think the price of land was too high. Both the Minister for Lands and the Colonial Secretary when introducing the Bill said that the prices fixed in 1910 were much too high, when we remembered the maximum prices fixed before 1910. The Minister for Lands said that the land around Northam and Grass Valley was sold years before at 10s. an acre, but do we not know that land in Sydney was given away for a gallon of rum? It is no argument at all that we should alter the price of land to-day because the land which was alienated before 1910 was sold at too low a price. The Government have arrived at a method of repricing, so far as I can learn, on the questions of distance from railway, rainfall and fertility of soil. I agree that the distance from a railway is a reasonable basis on which to reprice land. It has been said that the rainfall is one of the main features surrounding the introduction of this measure. It has been said that Mr. Mitchell sent farmers out too far

from the safe rainfall belt, but we have gone through serious droughts, and if they continued, the land would be of no use to anyone. After all, this is a question of assumption. It in no way coincides with the chart put forward to the settlers by the late Government and I venture to say that if we have a succession of good seasons, not so good as this year, but closely approaching it, we will arrive at a different assumption from that which the Government have arrived at to-day on the question of fertility. We know that as far as wheat growing is concerned, if we have the rainfall we can very nearly make the fertility, but the fertility of the land is not altogether a factor which stands by itself. The fertility of the land to a great extent is dependent upon the person who is working it. There is one feature which has not yet been introduced by either Ministers in connection with the repricing, and I claim it is an essential feature. No regard has been paid to the increase of population. There is no one in this Chamber pessimistic enough to think that the population of Western Australia is not going to increase. If the population were to remain stationary, despite the rainfall, despite how one might tickle the soil, and despite the railways, the value would not increase. It is a generally accepted axiom that population alone adds to the value of the land. This Government should have hesitated before taking this step, and it should have given some consideration to the plank which stands in their platform, namely, the non-alienation of Crown land. I have said that the 1911 election was fought to a large extent on the non-alienation of Crown land plank of the platform and now claim that this Government have not kept in step or have not kept in accord with that plank. Since the inception of the Labour party in the political arena in Western Australia, that plank has always been in the platform, and it is a plank which is included in almost every working class party platform throughout the world. I know that the Minister for Lands never had any time for it. I know

that at every congress he has attended he has tried to put it off the platform altogether. After some 20 years of existence as a party, we find that the last congress at Fremantle removed that plank from the general to the fighting platform, and now we find that this Bill proposes not only to continue what this Government was pledged to disallow if it could, but interferes with the methods their predecessors in office carried out. It would have been in accord with the Labour party's platform if the Government reprinted this land on the unimproved value with the right to reprice at certain periods, and then said to the settlers, "We are satisfied; experts have told us that the late Government in carrying out its policy of the alienation of land over-charged you for that, but we as a party have been returned to discontinue that policy. We have revalued your land. We will grant you a lease in perpetuity at our valuation, or you may keep what you got from the other Government." Had that been done, the Government would have kept faith with the Labour party's platform and ideals, but the Government are seeking to reduce the price of land alienated by other Governments and not only has the plank, which many of us hold so dear, been departed from, but it has been flouted, and not only has the policy of our predecessors been perpetuated, but it has been—well, I cannot find a word strong enough to express my opinion. That is the chief reason why I object to this Bill. It is no business of ours as a party to interfere with land which was alienated prior to our party taking office. That should be allowed to remain as it was. It may be said that this is a measure to placate the farmer, but so long as the settler believes in alienation, which I believe is a fallacy, and so long as the Labour party are pledged to non-alienation, their interests must be as wide apart as the poles. When election day comes, so long as that plank stands in our platform it is useless and the results in the past have shown that it would be ridiculous to endeavour to get the votes

of the farmers. Therefore, from the point of view of the Government getting votes, this Bill will be of no utility.

Hon. C. Sommers: You are giving the slow away.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am not, but I am speaking from actual experience. The farmer seems to think he must have the fee simple of his land. It seems to be a part of his religion, and so long as he thinks so I do not see how he can logically vote for me who would take it away from him to-morrow.

Hon. W. Patrick: What would you do with it?

Hon. J. CORNELL: Let the land out on lease in perpetuity to the hon. member. It has been said that, though it is claimed the non-alienation plank of the platform will assure to the people the unearned increment from the land, this can be taken back by way of taxation. I think that phase of the question has not entered the Government's mind. If it has done so, the fact has not been borne out by actual experience. An endeavour has been made by the present Government to alter the incidence of taxation on land, and it failed dismally. So long as this House is constituted as at present and so long as the franchise remains as at present, I am firmly of opinion that the democracy of this country will not have an opportunity to alter the incidence of taxation as applied to the land.

Hon. C. Sommers: How do you account for the workers wanting freehold for workers' homes?

Hon. J. CORNELL: That is easily answered. It may be brutal to say it, but I think it comes about through ignorance. I do not want to discuss the relative merits of non-alienation and alienation of land. If members wish to pursue that branch of the subject I would refer them to Alfred Russel Wallace's work on *Land Nationalisation* or to the man of the hour, Mr. Lloyd George, who for a long time was a land taxer and who has developed into a land nationaliser. It has been said the passing of this Bill will mean a loss of £30,000 per annum to the revenue of the State. The Minister for

Lands in another place said he was not sure whether this loss would extend over the 30 years or not. Every member of this House is entitled to know, when a concession such as this is proposed, what it means in actual cash to the consolidated revenue of the State and what the taxpayers will have to make good. If this loss of £30,000 per annum is to continue for 30 years—

Hon. W. Patrick: Is it not £30,000 for the 30 years?

The PRESIDENT: Order! There have been 13 interruptions during this speech. I must insist on the Standing Orders being observed.

Hon. J. CORNELL: If my reading of the report in the *West Australian* is correct, the hon. member will find that the Minister said the loss would be £30,000 per annum, but he did not know whether it would extend over the full term of 30 years. These are bad times for almost every individual in the community, and more especially for the working classes. The cost of living has increased by 40 per cent. and unemployment has increased almost in the same ratio. For the farmers, however, the seasons are good and everything now looks fairly prosperous. Yet it is proposed to give the farmers rebates to the extent of £30,000 per annum, and that sum must be made good by the general taxpayers. It has been said that the £30,000 per annum could not be considered a loss because the settlers between them would have that much extra capital with which to develop their holdings. If a man has taken up 1,000 acres at £1 per acre, and the price is reduced to 15s. per acre, and his rental is fixed at 9d. per acre per annum, it means an actual difference to the farmer of £12 10s., which represents the extra amount available to him to put into the development of his land. I cannot conceive that £12 10s. is going to mean the difference between keeping settlers on their holdings or of their going off. So far as the rebates will provide increased capital for the farmers to put into the development of their land, this will be a very small mat-

ter indeed. I notice by the map that the agricultural portion of my constituency comes under the proposed repricing scheme, and a very small portion of it is marked A. The effect of the repricing of the Esperance land on the farmers of Esperance, I think, will not mean the difference of a vote for or against me on that score. There is another section of the community to whom very little consideration has been given, but who occasionally take up land; I refer to the mining community. For a mining lease the rent is £1 per year per acre for a 20 years' tenure. No fee simple is given. Also it is necessary to put a certain number of men on the lease and keep them employed. It does not matter whether the lease is at Mount Weld or at Kalgoorlie, the rent is the same. It does not matter whether it is 1,000 miles or five miles from a railway, the rent is the same. It does not matter whether the locality has frequent rains or no rains at all, or whether the lease is rich in gold or otherwise, the rent is fixed hard and fast. No section of the community were more due for recognition in this direction of revising the rents charged for land than were the miners, but we find during the last four years that the Labour Government have been in office, Bill after Bill has been brought down in the interests of the agricultural industry and those engaged in it. The hon. Mr. Baxter has said that the farmers in this State do not get the amount of assistance that those in the other States receive. All I can say is that if they want any more assistance, let them take the whole damned lot. Not only do they get assistance in the way of legislation—

The PRESIDENT: I must ask the hon. member to withdraw that word; it is not Parliamentary.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I bow to your ruling.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member will withdraw the word "damned."

Hon. J. CORNELL: Yes, I withdraw it. Not only has legislation been introduced and passed for the purpose of keeping them on the land, but every legislative ef-

fort to make the conditions of those they employ a little better has been turned down unceremoniously by this House. Even a slight piece of legislation, which in its final analysis would affect no one—I refer to the Mines Regulation Bill—the Labour members could not get through this House; but now, as a reward for all we have done and suffered, we are asked to require the general taxpayers of this State, including the mine workers, to put their hands in their pockets and find an extra amount of £30,000 per annum in taxation. I have little to add. I believe the time is fast approaching when true Labourites throughout Western Australia will point the finger of scorn at all those who favoured this particular piece of legislation. That is my opinion, and when the time comes I wish to be in a position to say that this Bill did not go through with my support. It would have been much better for me and much more congenial to myself—I do not like to oppose the leader of the House—to sit silent and take no part whatever in the discussion on this measure. But, as a member of the Labour party and as a member of the Legislature, I claim a higher duty than to support Governments or individuals; and that duty is to do the best I can in the interests of those who have sent me here. I move—

That the word "now" be struck out, and "this day six months" added to the motion.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN (South) [3.48]: I second the amendment *pro forma*.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH (East) [3.49]: I am sure we have all listened with a great deal of interest to the candid criticism to which Mr. Cornell has subjected the Government, of which he is usually so ardent a supporter. I can extend to the hon. member at all events this crumb of comfort: if the Government have not pleased or satisfied the members of the Labour party and those who sent them into Parliament, I can assure him that they have not pleased or satisfied anyone else. So that, if we are all of one mind in this important matter—a matter that must be of the

very highest importance when it applies to the Government of a State at a critical time like this—it should not be long before we have a better Administration. The hon. member suggests that this Bill ought to be rejected in the interests of future generations. It is not for me to say how future generations will regard the action of this section of the community or of that. But I have no hesitation in saying that the men who during the past few years lent themselves and who in the immediate future lend themselves to the work of the developing of the wheat areas of Western Australia, and those political parties that seek to aid them in their enterprise, need not fear the accusing eyes of the unborn. With Mr. Baxter I regret very much that a Bill of this importance should be brought down so late in the session. We are told now that the session is to be brought to a close as quickly as possible—next week, I believe, has been mentioned as the latest date on which Parliament is to sit. I cannot help being impressed with the danger that may arise from any attempt to introduce important amendments into this particular Bill. If, through the introduction of such amendments, the Bill should escape consideration in the closing hours of this session, its loss will undoubtedly lead to a great deal of heartburning on the part of those who have something to gain from this very inadequate and very tardily offered act of so-called justice on the part of the present Administration. I am entirely in sympathy with the amendments which have been suggested by Mr. Baxter and Mr. Carson. But before urging members of this House to support those amendments I want to know something fairly definite as to the attitude of those members who at the last general election were returned to Parliament as special and particular representatives of the farmer. So far as the members of the Country party in this Chamber are concerned, I am entirely satisfied with their knowledge of the position, with their absolute sincerity, and with their determination to do the best they can for the farmer and for the

State. But when we come to the members of the same party in another place we encounter a more complex situation. I have endeavoured to obtain some idea as to how this Bill, and the amendments that to me seem necessary, the amendments suggested by Mr. Baxter and one or two other members, are regarded by the special representatives of the farmer who were elected to another place only 12 months ago. I have been at some pains to inform myself on that point, and I find that amendments almost identical with those now suggested by Mr. Baxter were submitted in another place. In all, six divisions were taken on the amendments. On the first of these divisions one Country party member voted for the amendment, three voted with the Government against it, and four refrained altogether from voting. On the second division one Country party member voted for the amendment and seven voted with the Government. On the third, five voted for the amendment and three with the Government. On the fourth also, five voted for the amendment and three with the Government. On the fifth, three voted for the amendment four with the Government, and one did not vote at all. On the sixth division five Country party members voted for the amendment and three abstained altogether from voting. Apparently the aim, and at all events the accomplishment, of these special and direct representatives of the farmer in another place was to completely and absolutely disfranchise the whole of their constituents in order that the Government might not be embarrassed. I have always understood that the one claim put forward by this party was that its formation guaranteed solidarity whenever the interests of the farmer were in question. It has nothing to do with me whether that party has seen fit to abandon the plank of solidarity, but in view of the lateness of the session and of the obvious desire of many members of the Labour party both in this Chamber and in another place—as illustrated by the speech to which we have just listened—to do nothing whatever for the farmer, I feel that it is

necessary to proceed cautiously even before endeavouring to introduce into this Bill those amendments without which, I fear, it will be of very little value indeed. Therefore, I want to put a question to Mr. Baxter. I want to put to him a very simple proposition. When he moves his amendments, will he give the Committee—the House will then be in Committee—an assurance that the party of which he is a member means business? That is a very simple proposition. If the members of the Country party in another place desire these amendments and are prepared to fight for them, they can secure a majority on practically every one of them. That is what I shall want to know from Mr. Baxter when he puts forward his amendment, because, so far as I am concerned, I do not intend to be a party to the losing of this Bill simply by attempting to get into it amendments which the people most immediately concerned do not intend to battle for. I know that if the Bill should be lost as the result of attempted amendment here a section of the Country party—a small section, I know, but a section so unscrupulous that there is nothing in the way of lying and slander to which they will not descend—will never tire of going about the country telling the people that they, the settlers, have lost this Bill, and the benefits that might accrue to them under it, because of the action of the Liberal members of the Legislative Council. Therefore I say in all earnestness, and meaning what I say, that whilst I am heart and soul in sympathy with the amendments Mr. Baxter proposes to move, and whilst I realise that without amendments of that kind this Bill is practically of very little value to the community generally, I am not going to risk its rejection—because of those who will benefit by its enactment—unless the hon. member can give me some assurance that the party of which he is a member want this action taken and are prepared to back it up in another place. Now, in introducing the Bill the Minister referred to “those experienced and capable gentlemen” who had constituted the board appointed by

Mr. Bath. The reference was entirely apt and proper. They were experienced and capable gentlemen. But surely we are entitled to ask why the Government, in introducing this Bill, have not only departed from the promise which they made to the farmers, but have also ignored the most important recommendation made by that particular board. This Bill does not carry out the recommendation made by the board of experienced and capable gentlemen. I do not know that it is worth while dwelling to any extent on the map and plan now hanging upon the wall of this Chamber, because I understand that it is not intended they shall form part of the Bill. They are intended, I believe, as a sort of general guide to members as to what the Government propose to do if the Bill is carried into effect. The method of classification is altogether unscientific and in many cases ridiculous. Mr. Baxter referred to the fact that at one point on the Wongan Hills line there was a spot where the four classifications, A, B, C, and D, met. I do not want to repeat what he said, but I want to make this clear, that at that point the land is the same. It is first class land in zones A, B, C and D—all first class land. That is what Mr. Baxter was referring to. The 25s. land in zone A and the 13s. 6d. land in zone D, which zones adjoin each other, are both first class land, and are both classified as first class. So that the position would be that a man in zone A, $4\frac{1}{2}$ miles from a railway, would pay 25s. per acre for his land, while a man in zone D, on the railway, would pay 13s. 6d. for exactly the same quality of land, the two blocks being separated from each other by a distance of only five or six miles. The position is obviously ridiculous, and it can be equalled in almost every feature of the classification, as shown upon the map. For instance, Clause 2 of the Bill provides that regard shall be had to the distance from a port. Absolutely no provision is made to have regard to distance from a port in that classification. Then again, in the matter of extending the periods of payment there is another curious anomaly.

Clause 3 provides that the rent shall be only 6d. per acre per annum so long as that rate will cover the payment in 30 years. The result of this will be, supposing two parties each took up land to the value of £1,000, but one of 10s. land and the other of 20s. land, that in the first case the payments would spread over only 20 years, because 6d. per acre per annum covers the payment in 20 years, while in the second case the payments would spread over 30 years. Now, in the first case the capital value of the payment would be £641 13s. 4d., while in the second case the capital value would be £529 3s. 4d. So, of these two men each taking up £1,000 worth of land, the man taking up the higher price land would gain an advantage of £112 10s. No system appears to have been followed, either in the matter of classification or in the extension of the period. I fail to see how justice can be done in that particular respect by making the 30-year period apply to all land settlement. However, I do not see much use in referring to that. In the map some curious and artistic alterations have been made since it first appeared on the walls of another Chamber. When I first saw that map all the white portion along the Midland railway line was coloured. Now I see it has been very carefully pasted over in white. I do not know why. Possibly the Midland Company have raised what would, in the circumstances, be a reasonable objection to the Government classifying their land and inferentially suggesting that the company ought to reduce the price of their land to their settlers. The map and the A B C D E F chart are just the sort of thing one would see in a country school. I do not know that they are of very much more value to us than they would be to a country school, because we are told they are not binding, either on us or on the Government, and they have not in fact any definite bearing on the procedure under the Bill. The statement made by Ministers here and in another place is that the object of the Bill is to correct the errors of the previous Administration. I do not think any op-

ponent of the present Government has ever said anything so truly critical of the present Administration as that. The Government, in the fifth year of office, have set out to correct an error of their predecessors, an error too which the Government and their supporters dwelt upon and exaggerated from every platform in the election of 1911. What could one say more bitterly hostile to the administration of the Government than that in their fifth year of office they have set out to remedy an error of their predecessors? Mr. Cullen, speaking yesterday, referred to the wave of enthusiasm in the matter of land settlement which had induced numbers of people to go out beyond what was previously considered a safe rainfall area. I do not know whether he intended to praise or to blame those responsible for that wave of enthusiasm, but I would ask hon. members to consider this question: If we had not had that wave of enthusiasm, unless those hundreds and thousands of people had gone out to undertake the difficult task of developing the wheat lands of the State, what would they have been doing during the last three or four years? What other opening would there have been for them in this State? In what other industry would they have found employment? Is it not highly probable that many of them would have had to go from Western Australia and we would have been compelled to make the shameful admission that the State could not carry a population of 300,000 people? And if it had not been for that wave of enthusiasm, what bright spot would there have been on the horizon at the present time? Five years ago the annual value of our cereal products was half a million; because of that wave of enthusiasm, we confidently expect the value of our cereal products this year will reach the fine total of $3\frac{1}{2}$ millions sterling. I know that recently a new class of political economists has sprung up, and the other day we had an irresponsible representative of the Trades Hall telling the Premier that the only way to meet the present difficulty was

to provide for higher wages and shorter hours. He may be right, but I confess I am unable to shake myself free of the old theory that wealth production is, after all, the only basis of prosperity for a country, or for the individuals living in it; and in view of those figures of wealth production now and five years ago, I feel it is unnecessary for anybody to apologise for the land policy of the late Liberal Administration, or for the land policy of the late Minister for Lands (Hon. J. Mitchell). I am confident that the work Mr. Mitchell did in promoting land settlement and wealth production in this country will be remembered with appreciation and gratitude when the very names of his critics and successors will have been entirely forgotten. At the root of the policy of the late Liberal Administration in the matter of land settlement was this idea: "We cannot get rich men to go in and develop the lands of Western Australia; therefore we are faced with two alternatives, to leave the work undone, or try to do it with men with little or no capital." It was a difficult enterprise to embark upon, and, to my mind, it was unfortunate for this State that those who embarked on that policy—the only possible policy at the time, and as the result of which Western Australia will yet reap great advantage—it is a pity, I say, that those who embarked on it were not permitted to see it through its initial stages. The first Minister for Lands in the present Government made it his first action to destroy the securities of the farmer by a minute written in actual defiance of the provisions of the Land Act, and the present attitude of the Government towards the farmer is illustrated in the Industries Assistance Bill, and the measure we are now discussing, whilst the attitude of the Labour party generally is, I suppose, illustrated by the speech we have just heard from Mr. Cornell. Of course, another great misfortune was this: When this experiment of settling poor men on the land was attempted, there followed at once four of the very worst seasons, from the point of view of rainfall, experienced

in Western Australia in recent years. It was having all these things in mind that the board of capable and experienced gentlemen to which the Colonial Secretary has referred, made its report. And in making its report it did not say that the lands had been too highly priced. It said they had not been. It said that, with the exception of errors bound to be made in any circumstances, and which can be corrected, the land was sold too cheaply rather than too dearly. And these capable and experienced gentlemen also pointed out that, even had the land been too highly priced it could not have affected the situation up to the present, because none of the new settlers had yet been called upon to pay the higher rates. But those gentlemen pointed out that if we try to develop the lands with men of little or no capital we must make exceptionally easy terms for them during the first few years; and the board recommended an exemption from rent for, I think, the first five years. Why did not the Government follow the recommendation submitted to them by those capable and experienced gentlemen of their own appointment? To my mind it is almost the only reform worth fighting for in the interests of the settler, to give him immediate relief, relief during the first few years of his operations on the land. If we are not prepared to give him that relief, then such relief as is offered by the Bill will only be effective in a limited number of cases, and that only to a partial extent. It is all very well to call attention to the parlous condition of the State's finances. How has that condition been brought about? That condition has been set up by reckless extravagance and by indulgence in socialistic experiments, and it is not going to be remedied by doing injustice to the wealth producer. We are told that the loss from this suggestion will be £30,000 for the first year. The Minister does not pretend that it will be £30,000 all along, but only for the first year. That may seem a large amount, but if we are going to compare it with the losses incurred year after year on enterprises that do no good to any-

body, and if we are going to remember that that loss may mean the holding fast to what is now the second most valuable producing industry in the State, and which soon will be the first most valuable, £30,000 becomes an utterly insignificant amount. The Minister for Works only last evening told the members of another place that he had lost £30,000 last year on the State Implement Works. The Government, hopelessly, recklessly, apparently with every possible satisfaction, lost £30,000 in a year on a socialistic enterprise, and now they speak of the loss of £30,000 in revenue, which they have no right to get, as something appalling, something which is going to wreck the finances of the State. Another point which I would emphasise: This relief was promised to the settler three or four years ago. Had the promise been kept, he would have been enjoying the reduced rental for the past three or four years. Is the settler to suffer because the Government have failed to keep their promise in due time? To me it seems a most unjust proposition that, if we have been overcharging a man for the last three or four years, he is not to have his rebate immediately but is to wait for it till the end of his term, some 20 or 25 years hence. I do not think anybody whose term will expire 15, 20, or 25 years hence is very likely then to be in such a position that the return of this money will be of great consideration to him. I do not believe anybody thinking that would remain on the land for a week. It would not be worth his while; because, after all, our settlers are of the cream of the community. They could earn their livelihood in other capacities if they wished to, and they would not be likely to stop on the land unless they could see a definite prospect of making good. Another difficulty under which the settlers are labouring is that they have not been given the facilities promised. The policy of the Liberal Administration of settling people with little money on the land was allied to the further policy that settlement should be followed up quickly with railways and other facilities. The present Administration have not

done that. Instead of building railways as quickly as required—I know I shall be met with the argument that they are building as quickly as their predecessors; but their predecessors had only started this policy, and under their administration railway construction would have increased as fast as settlement has increased. Had the Government devoted to railway construction the money spent on losing socialistic enterprises, there would not be a man who took up his land as long ago as three years, but who to-day would have been within a reasonable distance of a railway. Now I want to give the Government this solemn warning: already not a few settlers have abandoned their holdings. In the near future other abandonments will follow unless the settler is given a chance of making good. Personally, I do not think the Bill gives him a chance. As I have said, I hope the Bill will pass, if we cannot get anything better, because the Bill will give relief in certain instances; but it will not give all of the settlers a chance, and it is going to be a serious matter for Western Australia if anything like abandonment of holdings on a large scale takes place. It will constitute a monstrous crime against the best interests of the State if such a thing is permitted, and the people on whom the blame will rest will not be the past Administration who earnestly endeavoured to make Western Australia a great wheat-producing country; it will rest on those who have failed to recognise the responsibilities of the State towards those who produce the wealth on which alone all the people can live. I intend to support the second reading, and I will support Mr. Baxter in his amendments if he can assure me that the party of which he is a member will back us up.

On motion by Hon. W. Patrick debate adjourned.

BILL—VERMIN BOARDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Message received from the Assembly notifying that the Council's amendment had been agreed to.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

1, Permanent Reserve.

2, Road Closure.

Received from the Assembly.

BILL — LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT CONTINUANCE.

Assembly's Message.

Further consideration, from the previous day, of Message from the Legislative Assembly disagreeing to the amendments made by the Council.

The PRESIDENT: When Mr. Kingsmill was speaking yesterday it was in a general way and he did not conclude with a motion. I shall now allow him to do so.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL (Metropolitan) [4.18]: I have to apologise to members for my lapse of memory in not moving that a Message be sent to the Assembly. I intended to move that a Message be sent embodying the views which I then gave. I thank members for allowing me an opportunity of repairing the error I then made. I move—

That the following Message be sent to the Assembly:—The Legislative Council acquaints the Legislative Assembly that it has considered its Message No. 28 dealing with the Licensing Act Amendment Continuance Bill and that the Legislative Council see no reason to depart from the procedure it has adopted in amending that Bill, as the amendments introduced are in its opinion relevant to the subject matter of the Bill as required by its Standing Order 193 and the title of the Bill has been amended to the extent required under Standing Order 198 and so reported. The Council further so claims that as the case if fully dealt with under its Standing Orders there is no necessity to seek other authorities but would point out in answer to the contention that the procedure on expiring laws continuance Bills is violated by the course adopted by the Council—(1) That there is no analogy between an expiring law continuance Bill as presented to the British Parlia-

ment which re-enacts several expiring Acts set forth in a schedule to the Bill and the Bill now under consideration.

(2) That if such analogy exist precedent is afforded even during the present session for the course adopted as a 'Bill to amend and continue the operation of the Road Act, 1911,' was considered and amended by both Houses without protest or demur. For the above reasons I request the Legislative Assembly to consider its amendments on this Bill on the respective merits of such amendments."

I do not wish to add anything to what I said at the last sitting of the House. I feel it would be somewhat unfair for me to do so except to say that if hon. members wish to make a comparison between Continuance Bills of the sort named and Continuance Bills presented to the British House of Commons as alluded to in Message 28, they will find a Bill of the latter description in a volume of General Public Acts 1914, and they will there find in Chapter 23 an Act for the continuance of various expiring laws. They will find that the Act consists very largely of preamble and two clauses and schedules, of which there are four, containing the Acts which expire extending over four pages. I have not counted the Acts, but there must be at least 30.

The Colonial Secretary: Different Bills?

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: Containing different Bills. It is obvious when that practice was formed, it would be impossible to insert amendments in continuing Bills, but it does not apply in our case and as I have already said in the first place we may neglect this because our Standing Orders set out what we should do explicitly and sufficiently. If that is not so and we take this into consideration the circumstances of Continuance Bills in this State and before the British House of Commons they are so vastly different that the procedure in connection with one cannot possibly relate to the procedure in connection with another.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.23]: My object in moving the adjournment last evening was to give me sufficient time to consider the position which had arisen. After having considered it, I have come to the same conclusion as Mr. Kingsmill that a Message should be sent to the Legislative Assembly requesting a conference. I support the motion.

The PRESIDENT: There is no request for a conference.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: The Message will lead to that.

Question put and passed.

BILL—PERTH MUNICIPAL GAS AND ELECTRIC LIGHTING ACT AMENDMENT.

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and on motion by Hon. A. G. Jenkins read a first time.

SELECT COMMITTEE, RETIREMENT OF C. F. GALE.

To adopt Report.

Debate resumed from the previous day on motion by Hon. J. J. Holmes, "That the report of the select committee be adopted," and on the amendment of Hon. J. Cornell, "That paragraphs 4, 9, and 10 be struck out."

Hon. W. KINGSMILL (Metropolitan) [4.25]: I understand that at present we are debating the amendment which has been proposed by Mr. Cornell to strike out certain paragraphs of the report, the said paragraphs being 4, 9, and 10. I intend, therefore, to confine the remarks I make at this stage of the proceedings entirely to paragraphs 4, 9, and 10, reserving any remarks I have to make on the main question to the time when that main question arises. The principal objection taken by Mr. Cornell and the leader of the House, who is supporting the hon. member in his contention, is that paragraph 4 concludes with the words, "Your committee is therefore of opinion that

Mr. Gale has been illegally retired." I have given this report and the evidence very careful study indeed and it is natural I should do so because it was at my instance that the committee was appointed to consider what I thought was an act of gross injustice, an act of foolish administration and an unfair act to the public and to the civil servants and Mr. Gale himself, and I maintain that the evidence which has been elicited, and elicited in some cases from unwilling witnesses, goes to show that I was perfectly right in all three contentions. I intend now only to deal with the question of the illegality of the retirement of the officer in question. Mr. Gale was retired as what is known as an excess officer under Subsection 7 of Section 9 of the Public Service Act. He was retired under that subsection under Executive Council's minute which explicitly sets it forth. He was not retired under Section 9 as a whole, he was not retired under any other subsection of Section 9. Now Subsection 7 deals with excess officers. Mr. Cornell and the leader of the House both quoted Mr. Sayer as saying that this is an arguable point. Mr. Sayer has never said anything of the sort and if the hon. gentleman had taken the trouble to read the evidence—Mr. Cornell heard it no doubt—apparently the portion that is important in this connection has slipped his memory.

Hon. J. Cornell: I wish to make a personal explanation. I intended to infer that in the dismissal of Mr. Gale, Mr. Sayer held that he could not be retired under the section Mr. Kingsmill says it was purported to retire him, but under another subsection of the same section, and I think hon. members will find that is the only question I asked Mr. Sayer. I asked Mr. Sayer, was Mr. Gale illegally retired and he said it was arguable. He said Mr. Gale had a remedy and that remedy was to claim his salary and a court of law would then decide his legality or otherwise. I would just like to read question and answer 765 which is the only question I asked Mr. Sayer. It is as follows:—

You say the only section of the Public Service Act under which Mr. Gale could have been retired is Subsection 2 of Section 9?—Yes. You say it is arguable, and that being the case, evidently there is a doubt in your mind?—It is not so clear as I should wish it to be. Although you hold it is arguable, the fact remains Mr. Gale has been retired?—Yes. I would like to know is there any provision of any Act which gives Mr. Gale the right to have an interpretation of this arguable section, if not he may be a victim?—If Mr. Gale considers or is advised that it was not within the power of the Executive to retire him, he can claim to be still filling the office. That is his position; claim his salary. That is the only question I asked Mr. Sayer.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: I have to thank Mr. Cornell for helping me so much in my argument. He will insist upon referring to the arguability of retiring Mr. Gale under Subsection 2 of Section 9. As a matter of fact, Mr. Gale was never retired under that subsection. He was specifically and explicitly retired under Subsection 7 as an excess officer. Let us see what Mr. Sayer says with regard to Mr. Gale being an excess officer, and with regard to the legality and propriety of his being retired under Subsection 7 under which, as a matter of fact, he was retired. Question 714 sheds an altogether different light upon this question than that which has been shed upon it by the leader of the House and Mr. Cornell. The chairman of the select committee said to Mr. Sayer—

My question a little while ago, which you have not yet answered, was whether in your opinion Mr. Gale had been illegally retired?

We must remember that in asking the witness this question, the chairman of the committee was asking the principal legal adviser of the Government who had retired the gentleman in question, and who would, if any trouble arose out of this matter, have been entrusted with the task of framing the defence, if indeed there was a defence, on behalf of the

Government. The chairman of the committee was a bold man to ask such a question, but Mr. Sayer, with that adroitness to which the chairman alludes as having been demonstrated previously, said—

I have to give you a reason for my opinion. I could not say in my opinion he had been unlawfully or legally retired, all I can say is this: That while Mr. Gale is within the Public Service Act, and so long as the office that he fills continues, he cannot be removed from that office without cause personal to himself, that is incompetence or misconduct, unless there is a reason in the Public Service Act to justify it. Then, is there anything in the Public Service Act to justify it? From all I can find I do not think he would be an excess officer within the meaning of Subsection 7; I do not think that applies.

And yet that is the subsection which had been applied.

Hon. J. Cornell: If the hon. member wishes to be fair to Mr. Sayer he will read on.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: Of course I wish to be fair to the Solicitor General. He says—

They purported to retire him.

What is the meaning of the words, "they purported to retire him?" Mr. Gale ceased to be Chief Protector of Aborigines under the subsection which, Mr. Sayer, says, did not apply to him. Then Mr. Sayer says, "They purported to retire him." As a matter of fact, they did retire him under this very subsection which, Mr. Sayer says, does not apply to him. If that is not illegally retiring Mr. Gale, I do not know what is. It is open for the Government, if they wish to take up the course which Mr. Sayer says is arguable—it is not a strong position, and I presume that the position they are in now, as a direct inference upon what Mr. Sayer says is not arguable, is so bad that there can be no argument about it at all—if, as I say, they wish to take up that position it will be taken up from the point of view of their principal legal adviser, and the only thing for them to do is to have a special Executive Council

meeting in order to retire Mr. Gale over again under Subsection 2 of the Act. Mr. Gale does not wish to make trouble. He has not told me so, and I have not spoken very much to him on the subject, but from what I know of him, as the result of a long acquaintance with him, I think he is a man who has always treated other people fairly and expects fair treatment from other people in return. I ask hon. members through you. Sir, if they consider that Mr. Gale has received fair treatment in this instance? It was one of the most grave pieces of injustice which has ever been perpetrated towards three parties—the public, because they lost the services of a man who is a capable and efficient officer and who has served the State for 22 years faithfully and well, and who holds a record in the service of which anyone might be proud; the civil service, because they have had introduced into their minds an element of unrest which has affected the entire service as a result of the methods employed in the retirement of Mr. Gale; and, lastly, Mr. Gale himself, the unfortunate victim of, what is called, the policy of the Government. The policy! In the word "policy" there is an underlying idea of something about which there is some continuity, some fixed scheme upon which to work, but what evidence of any continuity or fixed scheme is there in this so-called policy which brought about the retirement of Mr. Gale? Mr. Gale was retired over six months ago. The pretext put forth for this retirement was the amalgamation of the two sub-departments, the Aborigines Department and the Immigration Department. Any other pretext would have done. The pretext which was put forward before for such a thing failed on account of the head of one of the sub-departments not being qualified to take on the position of Chief Protector of Aborigines. This was on the occasion of the proposed amalgamation between the Charities Department and the Aborigines Department. It is all too obvious. What the Government wanted, apparently, was to get rid of Mr. Gale at any price, but why, I do not

know. Mr. Gale comes into the category of Mr. Roe, Captain Hare, and some other well-known public servants. What he did I do not know. I cannot imagine his having done anything which would arouse the animosity of any fair-minded employer. Apparently, however, he has done so at some time or another, and must suffer the consequences. I do not think it is necessary to go very much further into the question of the illegality of the retirement as outlined in the report. The leader of the House quoted, I think, from Question 770 with regard to that subject and with regard to Mr. Sayer's remarks as to its not being material under what subsection Mr. Gale was retired. That was in the second part of Mr. Sayer's evidence. I can imagine Mr. Sayer, who is a quiet man and a seeker of peace, coming back to the committee in a terrified condition when it was pointed out to him what an error he had made in the evidence he had given, and I can imagine his feelings when he realised that perhaps he had given the show away on the part of the Government, whose legal adviser he was and is, and can also imagine him saying, "It does not matter. If there is any trouble about this I will say it did not matter a bit what subsection Mr. Gale was retired under. That does not matter a scrap." That is the only defence he has put up. In answer to Mr. Cornell, in regard to Mr. Sayer's attitude on this subsection, I need only refer to Question 720. Mr. Sayer crystallises his opinion as to the arguability of the retirement of Mr. Gale under Subsection 2 as follows—

In my opinion, if Subsection 2 of Section 9 applies, he was lawfully retired, and if it does not apply I think he was not lawfully retired.

As a matter of fact, the Government never endeavoured to apply this subsection at all. It was Subsection 7 under which Mr. Gale was retired. It is much the same as the case of a man, who was brought up before the police court and charged with drunkenness, being given 14 days' imprisonment by the magistrate

without his defence being heard, on a charge of having stolen chickens, a charge upon which he was not accused at all. Mr. Gale is accused of being an excess officer. Mr. Sayer says he was not an excess officer, but still the Government retired him, and yet the leader of the House and Mr. Cornell have the temerity to assert that the opinion voiced by the select committee, that he was illegally retired, is not justified. I venture to say that everybody, even those versed in the niceties of the law, will agree that the legal aspect of the case is that Mr. Gale was illegally retired. With regard to the equity of the case, I am prepared to leave that in the hands of hon. members.

Hon. J. Cornell: I suppose some hon. member will take up a brief for Mr. Gale against the Government.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: That is very likely to be the attitude which the Government might be expected to take up. It is not a creditable attitude for the Government to take up, to stand within what are possibly their legal rights. I shall be pleased to learn from the Colonial Secretary, when he rises to speak on this question, what the intentions of the Government are in regard to this officer, not on account of Mr. Gale himself, but in order that the public may be satisfied that their servants are going to be well treated, that the public service itself may have some little feeling of confidence in their employers, without which feeling the service would be no good at all, and in order that justice may be done to an admirable officer, who has been unfairly picked out for this adverse treatment. I reserve any other remarks I may have to make for the debate upon the general question. I desire to say, however, that I do not see that the committee could do anything else but hold the opinion, which the majority did, that Mr. Gale had been illegally retired, that, although he was walking about Perth without doing anything, he was still legally the Chief Protector of Aborigines. I do not think they could have closed their labours without putting in the recommendation they did in Clause 10 of the report, which reads—

Your committee therefore is of the opinion that Mr. Gale should be requested to resume his duties.

It is obvious to hon. members that I intend to oppose the amendment which has been moved by the hon. Mr. Cornell.

On motion by Hon. A. Sanderson debate adjourned.

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE — HORSE-RACING CONTROL.

To adopt Report.

Debate resumed from the 26th October.

Hon. J. F. ALLEN (West) [4.44] : I do not desire to speak very fully upon the report which has been brought forward by the committee appointed for the purpose of inquiring into this question. I desire to say, however, that when Mr. Colebatch stated that members of the committee had all made up their minds before they were appointed, he made a statement with which I do not agree. It is true we all held certain opinions in regard to certain phases of the question, but I believe we all had an open mind on the immediate question of the best methods to be employed for dealing with the evil which was generally admitted to exist. Speaking for myself I was a novice in regard to matters relating to horse-racing, but the information which was elicited from the various witnesses enabled me to arrive at certain conclusions which are embodied in the report. Members of this House will realise that when 10 men selected from the two Houses of Parliament meet to discuss a question of this nature, a great difference of opinion must exist on many points, and it was my attitude there, and it will be my attitude here, to deal with any measure brought forward as the outcome of the report in such a way that the views of the majority might prevail. The report of the committee represents the results of the matured judgment of the members of that committee, based on their own personal observations and the evidence adduced. I do not agree with the

whole of the report but, as a member of the committee, I am prepared to support the adoption of the report by this Chamber. There is only one clause in the report to which I take the most emphatic exception and it is that which deals with the question of national sweeps. I opposed this clause being included in the report and I wish to take every possible opportunity of opposing any attempt to place any such provision on the statute-book of this State. I believe that no nation can progress, no people can develop, when they depend upon the elements of chance for success. The vital characteristic which is to be fostered in any community is that of endeavouring to produce something by their own energies and efforts, rather than Micawber-like they should sit down and wait for something to turn up, something which they have done nothing to produce and in which the element of chance is emphasised. We know that those who take part in sweepstakes have no control over the results. They simply cast their bread upon the waters and trust that a munificent power will bring them back something manifold more than they have cast on the waters. This principle is diametrically opposed to the development of national and individual life, and therefore I oppose the recommendation of sweeps being included in the report. I shall oppose any attempt to make this any portion of the legislation which might be produced as the outcome of the report. I disagree with Mr. Colebatch when he said that all we require to do is to enforce the law as it stands in regard to the suppression of illegal acts on racecourses, and that that will bring about the cure which we desire. If we are to stand still and say that the law as it exists is sufficient we shall make no progress. It is necessary that some legislation should be introduced to curtail these evils. If the law of to-day is sufficiently definite to enable the evils to be dealt with, there is something wrong in connection with the administration. I would be prepared to enforce the law but it seems to me to be necessary that some other body should

be charged with the work of seeing that it is administered, and that abuses which have grown up amongst us should be removed. I have not anything further to say except to repeat my emphasis in regard to my opposition to the establishment of national sweeps, and to state again that it is necessary that further legislation should be introduced for the control of this great national evil.

Hon. F. CONNOR (North—on amendment) [4.52]: As Mr. Allen has stated, it is fairly well known that a number of men dealing with a question of this kind would not see it through the same spectacles. If the amendment is carried, the whole usefulness of the report will be destroyed. It would then be a report without a beginning and without an end. My friend Mr. Cullen, who moved the amendment, invariably rushes into all these things, whether he knows anything at all about them or not. He is always anxious to teach hon. members their duty and he does his best to dictate to us as to the value of what we propose to do or what we have done. I am sorry he is not in his seat to hear my remarks. I was almost going to say that his action in this case was impertinent, but as that would be unparliamentary I will not say it. A good deal of evidence was collected by the committee and the two points which are of the greatest value are those which declare that there is too much horse-racing and too much gambling. To the best of their ability the members of the committee dealt with those two phases of the question and recommended the course that should be adopted. One recommendation is that horse-racing should be reduced, and it was left to the Government to determine to what extent the reduction should take place. The committee also say that there is too much gambling, and the evidence of the authorities in that respect is that they have not the machinery whereby they can suppress it. I sincerely hope the House will agree to the report as it is.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. J. CORNELL (South) [4.56]: I intend to support the adoption of the report, but I intend to reserve to myself

the right to adopt whatever course I may think advisable when the recommendations appear before us in the form of legislation.

Hon. F. CONNOR (North—in reply) [4.57]: There is not much more to be said in regard to the report of the select committee. The work of the committee has been useful. It has brought prominently forward the fact that the evil of over-gambling exists, and it has also been proved by the evidence that the authorities have not the necessary power to stop gambling, and particularly street and shop betting. So far as the question of legalising bookmakers is concerned, there is a recommendation in the report which the Government can take to themselves if they like. They may either abolish the bookmakers or license or control them in some way. Opinions were expressed by responsible witnesses with reference to the totalisator and the action of the Government in granting licenses. A few weeks ago the Government actually granted totalisator licenses to two new classes of clubs, namely the Trotting Association and the unregistered; and, even worse than that, they reduced it to a 5s. totalisator. If the Government were in earnest in connection with this matter they would not have done such a thing. It is the most wicked action the Government have yet taken. On the 12th December, 1911, the Premier in another place said—

There is no intention on my part to extend the operations of the totalisator to other than the Trotting Association and I gave the assurance when I was moving the second reading of this Bill that until such time as Parliament has been given an opportunity to deal with the control of racing the operations would not be extended. As to the Western Australian Turf Club, it has many champions here, and I think it has more influence and control over members of Parliament than I anticipated, or I would not have dreamed of introducing this measure.

That is clear evidence that the Government did not then intend to grant the totalisator to the unregistered clubs. Of

course I must admit that some of the men concerned in the unregistered clubs are really decent fellows; but there is no getting away from the fact that the unregistered is an irresponsible body, to which the concession should not have been granted. Their proposition is of no use in respect to the breeding of horses, is in fact nothing but a gambling machine. I have nothing more to say. I thank hon. members for having exhibited so much patience towards me.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 5.4 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 28th October, 1915.

	PAGE
Papers presented...	2100
Questions: Aborigine children in missions	2100
Oil fuel and Collie coal	2101
Industries Assistance Board and crop sales	2101
Railway officers' increments	2101
Railway Wongon Hills-Mullewa and carriage of mails	2102
Collie coal, danger from sparks	2102
Joint Select Committee, Money Bills Procedure	2102
Bills: Permanent Reserve, all stages	2102
Vermia Boards Act Amendment, Council's Amendments	2103
Road Closure, 2a., Com., 3a.	2104
Perth Municipal Gas and Electric Lighting Act Amendment, 2a., Com., 3a.	2106
Mines Regulation Act Amendment, message	2107
Industries Assistance Act Amendment, Council's message	2107
Loan Estimates, general debate	2108

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 p.m., and read prayers.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Minister for Works: Midland Junction Abattoirs and Sale Yards, audited accounts to 30th June, 1915.

By the Minister for Mines: Regulation under the Coal Mines Regulation Act.

QUESTION—ABORIGINE CHILDREN IN MISSIONS.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY asked the Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): 1, How many children were cared for by each of the following Aborigines Missions for the financial year 1913-14, and the amount paid by the Aborigines Department to each of these missions for the support and education of the children for the same year:—Australian Aborigines, Beagle Bay, Ellensbrook Home, New Norcia, Presbyterian Church, Salvation Army (Girls' Home), Sunday Island, Swan Native and Half-caste, Drysdale River Aborigines Mission? 2, How many children are now cared for in each of the said missions? 3, What amount does the Government intend granting to each of the said missions for the current financial year for the support and education of their children? 4, Will the Government resume the former practice in regard to the report of the Aborigines Department, namely, to have the report laid on the Table of the House and printed, as all other departmental reports, for the information of the public? 5, If not, why not?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister) replied: 1,—

Name of Mission.	No. of Children, 1913-14.	Expenditure, 1913-14.
		£ s. d.
Australian Aborigines	35	470 8 2
Beagle Bay	143	800 0 0
Ellensbrook	4	34 19 6
New Norcia	43	350 0 0
Presbyterian Church	Unknown	144 9 1
Salvation Army ..	18	218 1 8
Sunday Island ..	62	200 0 0
Swan Native and Half-caste	43	509 12 6
Drysdale River ..	Nil	Not subsidised.