

# Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 4th January, 1922.

	Page
Questions: Railways—1. Catering on dining cars	
2. Perth Parcels Delivery	2696
Select Committee: Hospitals Bill, Extension of Time	2696
Loan Estimates, 1921-22	2696
Bills: Workers' Homes Act Amendment, returned	2718
Licensing Act Amendment, referred to Select Committee	2718

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

## QUESTIONS (2)—RAILWAYS.

### *Catering on Dining Cars.*

Hon. P. COLLIER asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Has the catering on the dining cars on the Eastern Goldfields railway and on the Great Southern railway been let by tender? 2, If so, what are the facts relating to the contracts, and what is the reason for the departure from established custom?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, No. 2, The whole question is under consideration.

### *Perth Parcels Delivery.*

Hon. P. COLLIER asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Is it a fact that the Railway Department has let, or contracted out, the work of parcels delivery in Perth? 2, If so, will he state the particulars relating thereto?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Yes. 2, It being evident that considerable economy could be effected in Perth by adopting the same contract system as had been in operation, since 1918 at Fremantle, tenders were invited by advertisements in the Press in September last. The resultant contract may be seen by the hon. member at any time.

## SELECT COMMITTEE, HOSPITALS BILL.

### *Extension of time.*

On motion by Mr. Gibson, time for bringing up the select committee's report extended to 18th January.

## LOAN ESTIMATES, 1921-22.

### *In Committee of Supply.*

Resumed from the previous day. Mr. Stubbs in the Chair.

Vote—Harbours and Rivers, £162,500.

Item, Bunbury Harbour Works, £29,000:

Mr. MONEY: I regret that the Minister, in his reply yesterday, did not give us the information asked for. We should know

how much of the Vote, £30,000, passed last year, has been expended on construction work at the Bunbury harbour. In the next column £3,372 is shown as a liability under the Audit Act. Not having received the information asked for, I am of the impression that a large amount of that sum has gone in overhead charges, and very little in construction work. The scheme adopted by the Public Works Department was a £90,000 scheme, in lieu of a scheme involving £150,000. We ought to be told whether the work under that scheme has been accomplished. For years past, successive Parliaments have promised the South-West full facilities at the port of Bunbury. Yet there are no facilities whatever to be found there, and in consequence goods have to be landed at Fremantle and sent overland, a distance of 125 miles. If facilities had been provided at Bunbury for the proper bunkering of coal, that port would have been the Newcastle of Western Australia. We should know what extra amount it has cost the people of Western Australia to have hundreds of thousands of tons of coal hauled over an extra distance of 125 miles. We had not a word from the Minister in reference to the export of fruit from the Nelson district. All the profits of the fruit-growers are absorbed in the extra freight and the losses they suffer in sending their fruit past the natural port. If nothing is to be done to remedy this state of affairs, the Government should say so. We have had boats come to Bunbury for coal and go away empty because all the railway coal boxes were in use trucking coal to Fremantle. One-third of the coal rolling stock would be sufficient if the coal were shipped through its natural port. If money can be found for non-essential purposes, as it has been, surely it can be found for the improvement of Bunbury harbour. The Minister, by interjection yesterday, suggested that it was the province of the Treasurer. If that be so, if it is the Treasurer who is blocking the provision of these facilities at Bunbury—

The Minister for Works: You know there is no money. Why keep harping on a dead string?

Mr. MONEY: Sufficient money has been wasted to fully equip that harbour. Why should so much money have gone in overhead charges down there?

The Minister for Works: You never asked me about that at all.

Mr. MONEY: I asked you yesterday, and I got nothing but insult.

The Minister for Works: I did not hear it, and in any case one could not insult you.

Mr. MONEY: The Minister is trying to make a personal matter of it.

The Minister for Works: There can be nothing personal between you and me.

Mr. MONEY: I mentioned this yesterday, yet the Minister in his reply made no reference to it. The members for the South-West recognised that the dredgings from the Bunbury harbour, instead of being wasted, should be used for reclamation purposes.

Yet no attempt has been made to so utilise them. It was not mentioned by the Minister, although the question has been put before him many times.

The Minister for Works: That is not true.

Mr. MONEY: One would think we were trying to get for Bunbury something Bunbury should not have.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Bunbury is getting its share.

Mr. MONEY: It is not Bunbury, but Western Australia.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Of course! Bunbury is all of Western Australia.

Mr. MONEY: I am referring to the whole of the South-West and its products—to the export of timber, the export of fruit, the export of wool, of potatoes and of wheat. The fruit supplies for Perth are now coming more from districts close to the city, and the hills are being developed more every year. If we are to compete in the world's markets we must not be too much handicapped, otherwise we shall be unable to develop. We should know what construction work has actually taken place during the last 12 months. What have been the overhead charges, what has been spent, and does the money come out of loan funds or from the funds of the Bunbury harbour? The Bunbury harbour by its wharfage dues has done well in the way of contributions to the interest and sinking fund on this work, but if the money is to be wasted on overhead charges—

The Minister for Works: Are they paying their debts?

Mr. MONEY: They will never pay this debt if the money is to be spent on overhead charges and not upon construction. We should know what the overhead charges have been out of last year's vote, and what amount has been spent in construction. The money that has been spent on this confirming work would cover half the loan moneys that have to be spent on construction.

The Minister for Works: I give that an emphatic denial. The Engineer-in-Chief knows his work, and you do not.

Mr. MONEY: Does the Minister desire to throw the responsibility on the Engineer-in-Chief?

The Minister for Works: Go on.

Mr. MONEY: It would be well to have a statement from the Engineer-in-Chief. First it is that official and then it is the Treasurer, whereas no one is responsible for the department except the Minister.

The Minister for Works: Nothing of the kind.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You have not much to growl about.

Mr. MONEY: Is any attempt going to be made to give these facilities to Bunbury, which this House knows are necessary for the development and progress of the South-West?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member with characteristic effrontery has returned to the charge he made last evening. He is careful to say it is not a personal matter,

but I cannot regard it as anything else but a personal one.

Mr. Money: That is rubbish, if you like.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not know why he should take it in that way. The State has its professional officers, in this case the Engineer-in-Chief and his engineers, who are experienced men in harbour works. These officers listen as gentlemen should—there are some people who are not gentlemen and not even men—to statements made to them.

Hon. P. Collier: Why make it personal?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is not a question of why.

Hon. P. Collier: The hon. member is entitled to speak on behalf of his district upon a public matter.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: He has had his opportunity, and will have it again. He is making the matter a personal one, and I am defending my officers who have been unjustly attacked. These officers listened long before I was Minister for Works to the various statements that were made. No Minister for Works has apparently been able to satisfy the requirements of Bunbury, and I shall be unable to do so, I suppose, so long as the hon. member represents that constituency.

Mr. Money: That is all fudge.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Last night the hon. member said we had not an engineer in the Public Works Department.

Mr. Money: That was in reply to your slur.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: So far as the hon. member's profession in Bunbury is concerned there is not a lawyer there.

Mr. Money: I am here now.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: When the hon. gentleman is in Bunbury the absence of lawyers is more pronounced than ever. He wants to know what money was spent by the Public Works Department at Bunbury. According to the accounts we spent the sum of £36,000. The hon. member says he believes this money was spent in overhead charges.

Mr. Money: Tell us what construction work has been done.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Is it by way of a political dodge that the hon. member is making attacks in this House in order to put himself right in his own electorate?

Hon. P. Collier: You do not seem to be a happy family.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No, we are not. The hon. member spoke about using the dredgings for reclaiming land at Bunbury. He may have mentioned it before; I do not know. The question of dealing with the dredgings has been under consideration by the department for years. For reasons of economy it has been found cheaper to deal with the dredgings in the way that is now being done than in the way the hon. member suggests should be done. He does not know anything about engineering.

Mr. Money: I am speaking for the public on this occasion.

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** And his electors will probably speak for him shortly. The hon. member waxes great on the question as to how the £36,000 was spent. I sent this message to the Public Works Department this afternoon, "For what purpose was the £36,628 spent on the Bunbury harbour works last year?" The reply from the responsible officer attending to this matter was, "The whole amount was spent in extending and widening the jetty." I suppose my officers are lying. Will the hon. member have the effrontery to suggest that, or even hint that? Will he dare to do so?

**Mr. Money:** What have you done since June of last year?

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** I ask the Committee to look at the tactics of the hon. member. He wants to know how the money was spent, and says it was spent on overhead charges.

**Mr. Money:** What are the overhead charges?

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** The hon. member is not now in a police court. I ask this Chamber to take him at his own valuation. He has been waving his arms in his "Moneyesque" peculiar style about this £36,000. Even now that he has his answer from my officers, he has not the effrontery to say they are not telling the truth. He says, "What have you done during the last seven months?" The hon. member has spoken about fruit and coal boxes. He knows that the Public Works Department has nothing to do with supplying coal boxes, and that this has to do with the Minister for Railways and the Commissioner. I believe the hon. member has even had deputations to the Minister for Railways on the subject of coal boxes. What he wants is cold storage, and he wishes to know what has been done. Nothing has been done. Is that definite enough? Nothing can be done until the funds of the State permit. The hon. member simply throws a smoke cloud over the Estimates. It is unworthy of him. He knows that the Premier is the supreme head of the Government, that as Treasurer he cuts down the expenditure, and that as Minister for Works I cannot get the money to spend.

**Hon. P. Collier:** This 3½ million pounds is not shutting down on expenditure.

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** That is apart from the point. If the Treasurer says he has not the money, then we have nothing to spend upon works.

**Mr. Money:** What has the boring cost?

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** I will procure the information for the hon. member. He seems to think I can carry all the details of the work at Bunbury in my head, but nature has not endowed me with sufficient capacity to do that. Last night he said I had told him that I would give him certain information, and that the engineers had refused to give it to him. The Engineer-in-Chief assures me that no one has any knowledge in the Public Works Department of the hon. member being refused any infor-

mation. I challenged him six times last night to tell me the name of the engineer. I even went so far as to say he was not man enough to tell me, but he went red and lost his head.

**Mr. Money:** Oh, no.

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** Is he man enough now to say who the engineer is who refused him the information? Was he making a statement in order to get a denial so that he might get the information?

**Mr. Money:** That is beneath the Minister.

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** I have no further information to give on the subject at present. I absolutely deny both the direct statement and the implied statement of the hon. member that Bunbury has been neglected in the way of harbour works.

**Hon. W. C. Angwin:** It has done very well.

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** I deny that money has been deliberately wasted there. The Engineer-in-Chief tells me his engineer feels he is fully justified in the borings he has made, and that the plans to which I referred last night would be ready for submission to me early next week; and if I think fit the information will be made known to anyone who shows any curiosity in the matter. What return am I getting from the member for Bunbury? I have been complimented in Bunbury time after time, at meetings at which I believe the hon. member was present, for having given the people there more information than they were able to get from any of my predecessors, but I have no desire to claim any credit for that.

**Mr. PICKERING:** I regret that so much heat has been imported into this discussion. I have always assisted the member for Bunbury in his endeavours to get improvements made to the Bunbury harbour, but I am sorry to say that he has not reciprocated so far as the port of Busselton is concerned. The hon. member went so far as to say that timber should be shipped almost entirely from Bunbury. We know, however, that there are other ports in the South-West from which vessels remove timber. I believe that the whole of the plan of Bunbury harbour has been reconsidered, and that the depths which have been discovered will demonstrate that the harbour will be capable of considerable improvement. I hope that the Minister will continue to give the fullest consideration to the work of improving that port, because it is one which is worthy of development. At the same time I hope he will not lose sight of the fact that a port also exists at Busselton.

**Hon. W. C. ANGWIN:** I am surprised to hear the remarks of the member for Bunbury with regard to the Bunbury harbour, and I regret that the Minister for Works has had to submit to so much abuse which, perhaps, ought to have been directed at me. Some years ago arrangements were made with the late member for Bunbury—and a very good man, too, he was—as the result

of which plans were prepared for the carrying out of certain improvements. The then Minister for Works (Mr. Johnson) visited Bunbury and the plans were approved. Everybody was satisfied, and instructions were issued to proceed with the work. Not one word of complaint was heard between that time and the period when I took office with regard to the extension of the Bunbury harbour. If there had been complaints, the work would not have been gone on with. No complaints were made until the work was actually in hand for some time, when one Tipping declared that he found a hole somewhere in the harbour containing a certain depth of water. The matter was then referred to the Engineer-in-Chief and it was found that there was a certain depth in a particular locality, but that the approaches to that depth were shallow and that it would cost a considerable sum of money to dredge the area of approach. Even then it was thought that after the dredging, silting up would occur. Inside the breakwater jetties have been constructed, and there is no doubt that if the breakwater is extended further the result will be the closing up of the harbour. At this juncture complaints as to waste of money at Bunbury should not be levelled against the present Government. It was the Labour Government who took the responsibility of starting the work there. The abuse, therefore, should fall on the shoulders of those who commenced the work. I will take the responsibility myself. The time is not far distant when there will have to be another port opened up further down the coast to deal with the timber trade, so as to prevent the up-grade haulage which is so expensive at the present time. The opening up of that port will not rob Bunbury of its legitimate trade; it will only take from it the trade which belongs to the districts further south.

Mr. Pickering: Which belongs to Busselton.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not know what Bunbury has to complain about, because the Government have spent a large sum of money there and have done fairly and justly by that port.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I have heard a great deal about the South-West and its requirements, but on looking through the Estimates I find that what has been allocated to the North-West consists of £10,000 for the Ashburton jetty and £500 for the Wyndham jetty.

The CHAIRMAN: Let us keep to the item we are discussing, as much as possible—the Bunbury harbour.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I am speaking on harbours and rivers, and on behalf of the people of the North-West I can only say that if you cannot spare any money, well, do not give it to us. I am not like these southerners who want—

Mr. Pickering: The earth.

The Minister for Works: And a bit more.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Exactly. I would say, if the Treasurer and the alleged Minister for the North-West cannot spare the amount that has been put on the Estimates for the North-West, the richest part of this State, then for goodness sake do not let them go short, because we in the North-West can do without it.

Hon. P. Collier: A fair and generous offer.

The CHAIRMAN: I would remind the hon. member that we are dealing with Bunbury harbour. The general discussion has been concluded.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: All I can say is that if you cannot spare anything for us, put it into the Bunbury harbour, because we can do without it.

Mr. SAMPSON: I feel a good deal of sympathy for the subject-matter referred to by the member for Bunbury. The facilities at that port are certainly not adequate, nor are they consistent with the improvements that are going on in that part of the State. Promises have been made that a wharf, or wharves, would be constructed, and undoubtedly they are an urgent necessity. When we were in Bunbury, on the occasion of the South-West tour, I was one of the party taken by the member for Bunbury to view the position. Everyone present was impressed with the necessity for the carrying on of improvements at the harbour. Personally I think it would be good business, and it would be in the interests of the State, if an amount were placed on the Estimates to enable the necessary works there to be carried out. We know in the past that fruit has frequently been carried not only from the South-West but from the Great Southern to Perth, and we have had wheat carried from the Victoria district to Fremantle.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That was owing to the war and there being no ships.

Mr. SAMPSON: The hon. member will agree with me that the various ports of the State are entitled to the trade which is geographically theirs, and if we fail to provide facilities at those ports, we are doing something to retard progress in those parts of the State. I am reminded of the position which exists in Portland, Victoria. There is good fertile land there, but, unfortunately, there is no direct communication with Melbourne. Portland suffered from not having a proper communication with the metropolis and has not had a fair deal. Bunbury is largely in the same position, because the harbour facilities there are not adequate for dealing with the exports that should naturally be handled at that port.

The Minister for Works: How much would you be prepared to spend in Bunbury if you had the money?

Mr. SAMPSON: I have great faith in Bunbury, and I would be prepared to risk all I have.

The Minister for Works: It is not a personal matter, but would you spend a million and a half upon the Bunbury harbour?

Mr. SAMPSON: No, I would not.

The Minister for Works: Would you spend a million?

Mr. SAMPSON: I would not. I suggest that any such amount is unnecessary, but a good harbour and a good wharf or wharves should be constructed at that port. There is a splendid trade being done in connection with timber and a great opportunity exists for the export of fruit, coal, wool, potatoes, and so on. Bunbury should receive the benefit of that export trade, and by having proper export facilities provided, I contend it would be good business. I am convinced, particularly since the recent visit through the South-West and by the experience at Portland, that if the South-West is to be developed, it must have reasonable shipping facilities at its natural port. Regarding Mr. Tipping, I have always looked upon him as a public spirited citizen who has spent his money in developing a scheme which will improve Bunbury. He has worked hard along those lines, and, although I express no opinion regarding his scheme, I say that the man who spends money to improve the lot of his fellows and to advance the interests of the State, is one whom we should all respect.

Mr. Wilson: There is only one scheme for Bunbury, and that is an inner harbour.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is Ballock's scheme.

Mr. SAMPSON: I heartily endorse the recognition appearing in the Estimates as to the need for improvements.

Hon. P. Collier: If you want to get the Estimates increased, you should move for a decrease.

Mr. SAMPSON: I am not acquainted with the procedure, but I will confer with the Leader of the Opposition on another matter, and I hope to get assistance from him on that occasion.

Item—Fremantle Harbour Works, £53,000:

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I will not object to the amount appearing in the Loan Estimates for improvements in connection with the Fremantle Harbour Works, because I suppose the amount allocated is as much as could be spared out of the Estimates themselves. It should be noted, however, that the amount of £53,000 is about £20,000 less than the profits made at Fremantle last year.

Mr. Sampson: Those profits are taken from other ports.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is not so. That talk is all bunkum. Ships do not go to Bunbury yet for wheat and so on. At Fremantle, however, there is not sufficient berthing accommodation at the present time, and last week a number of ships had to stay outside until they could secure berthage at the wharves. It was understood that there was to be further berthing accommodation provided at the north wharf, and the present

wharf on the south side is being eaten out by the teredo. It will take a large amount of money to repair the south wharf. The present amount cannot meet the requirements of the Fremantle harbour. Seeing that there is a rate for the Fremantle harbour improvement funds, which the Government have used in Consolidated Revenue, I think that the least we can expect is that the profits made at the port shall be devoted to the improvement of that port.

Mr. Money: Was that amount paid into the Consolidated Revenue?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: £168,000 was paid in, but there was over £70,000 profit after interest and sinking fund charges had been met. In the circumstances I think Fremantle can justly ask that in order to keep the harbour up to date, the profits made shall be spent on the improvement of the harbour itself. The south wharf is in a very bad condition and one of these days if a ship knocks against the wharf, it will be gone, because some of the piles are nearly eaten through.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The amount of £53,000 is made up as follows: Further dredging to 36 feet low water, £46,000; part cost of new slipway, Arthur's Head, £4,000; replacing beacons and minor works, £3,000. We are working at the dredging in connection with the Fremantle harbour and we keep three shifts going, because we find it more economical to keep going rather than have one or two shifts and then stop. By keeping going, we keep men employed on work that is reproductive, or attached to work which in itself is reproductive. The dredging of the harbour is being carried out to a depth of 36 feet. That policy has been adopted for some years past. I believe the whole of the blasting has been completed, but there is about another two year's dredging to be done unless it is possible to obtain additional dredges. I will look into the other points raised by the member for North-East Fremantle.

Item—Geraldton Harbour Works, £4,000:

Mr. WILLCOCK: I would like the Minister to give the Committee some idea as to the policy of the Government regarding the Geraldton harbour works and what has been the result of the investigations carried out during the last six months. Investigations have been going on for half a year and I should like to know the result achieved.

The Minister for Works: The result has not been very satisfactory.

Mr. WILLCOCK: I know there has been a difficulty in securing a quarry for stone. It was proposed to spend £20,000 last year in connection with the harbour works, but only £1,200 was expended. This year the Vote has been decreased to £4,000. Apparently it was thought that stone could not be located in sufficient quantities to enable much work to be carried out this year, although promises have been made that the work would be proceeded with for years past.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am glad of the opportunity to make a few remarks on this particular matter. The hon. member knows the position regarding the water supply. What was considered by the Geraldton people as backing and filling on the part of the Government, is now understood by those people, and they are perfectly satisfied that the Government's attitude was for the benefit of the people generally and they are satisfied as to the bona fides of the Government and of myself as Minister for Works. I ask the member for the district (Mr. Willecock) to have the same faith regarding the harbour works at Geraldton. He knows that we cannot do the work at Geraldton unless we can get stone of a proper quality, easily gettable, and as cheaply procurable as possible. Many statements have been made regarding the stone quarries at Geraldton. Some time ago it came to my knowledge that a site had been found for a quarry. A considerable area had been probed and it was said by the officer who made his report, that a real good quarry existed with a sufficient quantity of stone cheaply procurable. Having had experience in connection with stone quarries I determined that no expense would be authorised until I had had an opportunity of seeing it for myself. I went up there and found that it would have meant a preliminary expense of from £8,000 to £12,000 to get into the quarry. When the engineer in chief and the other engineers inspected the site, it was realised that there was a difficulty regarding the grade, but that difficulty could be got over by the Commissioner for Railways. I determined to see what the stone was like, and I got the men to sink down in three or four places. By a most peculiar circumstance in every place we bored, we came upon a water ranging up to the size of a man's body. It may have been intuition or it may have been Providence, but in any case, these were the stones the officer had encountered in boring. I determined that the work could not go on unless better provision were made regarding stone. We spent a day in inspecting the outcrop of rock on the other side of the river and three shafts were ordered to be sunk to see whether it was possible to get adequate supplies of stone at that site. Later on the shafts were put down, but the result was not been satisfactory and that proposition was also been abandoned. Since then, capable men have been searching in different parts of the district, but up to this morning the Engineer-in-Chief was unable to inform me what stone had been found which was considered satisfactory. There are a couple of places which they have in their mind's eye, but I do not desire to state where they are. The sum of £4,000 is put on the Estimates to carry on necessary work, but even if we found a proper stone quarry to-day, it would hardly be possible to make a reasonable start before the end of the financial year. I spoke to the Premier regarding this matter and he said that provision would be made so that when we find proper stone and can make a

start with the harbour works, we will be able to get the necessary money. I regret that the hopes and wishes of the hon. member's constituents have not been given effect to, but I know they will acquit me of any blame. When a sum of £250,000 or £300,000 is to be spent, I want to be sure first rather than sorry afterwards. I shall do my best to see that what has been promised is carried out.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Water supply and sewerage, £281,750.

Item, Water supply in agricultural districts (including drainage and irrigation, and loans to local authorities and drainage boards), £30,000:

Mr. HARRISON: What proportion of the £30,000 is likely to be devoted to drainage and irrigation and what proportion to water supplies in the agricultural areas? If the Government are going to carry out any considerable proportion of the work anticipated between Bunbury and Fremantle, this is a very small amount and very little will be available for agricultural water supplies.

The Minister for Works: For agricultural water supplies, £10,000 will be available.

Mr. HARRISON: If we are going to accomplish anything in the South-West, a complete scheme should be drawn up and the work should be commenced from both ends. Near to Fremantle there is a large area of country held as a University endowment which I think would be in the zone affected by the capital to be expended under such a scheme. It would be advisable for the Government to take over that land and give the University authorities a certain sum annually for it rather than that this area should stand in the way of development. Further development in this district would mean much to the State. If the agricultural areas are deficient in water supplies during the summer months, all Government expenditure is placed in jeopardy. Although the capital outlay may in some instances seem heavy, it is a good policy to ensure adequate supplies in the country districts, just as the people of the city demand a good supply for the metropolitan area. The country is even more important than the city.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: What about forming a trust?

Mr. HARRISON: It is essential that these matters be attended to. The great bulk of the capital already expended by the Government may be seriously affected if people have to leave their holdings on account of a shortage of water at a period of the year when they should be making preparations for the succeeding season. Unless stock is kept to eat back the weed-growth, we shall not derive the advantage which we desire from an increase of mixed farming and stocking. The Minister has complained that the reservoirs and dams handed over to the local governing bodies have been neglected, that fences have

been damaged, and that troughs and appliances have been allowed to fall into disrepair. Settlers should assist the Government to maintain these schemes. I would like an assurance from the Minister that greater attention is being given to these schemes locally than was the case in years past.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** Of the £30,000 provided under this item, £16,000 is for drainage and irrigation and surveys in connection with the same, £10,000 for tanks and wells in agricultural areas, and £4,000 for other works where necessary. The necessity for adopting a complete scheme for dealing with the land between Fremantle and Bunbury has been recognised, and what surveys have been made have been carried out with that object in view. Although a full survey has not been made, sufficient has been done to indicate the lines which a complete survey should follow, so that if any portion of the work be decided upon, it will be done in such a way that it will co-ordinate with other schemes which later may be connected with it. I know nothing about the University endowment land, but wherever land which may be brought into utilisation is lying idle, the question of resuming it will be considered. With regard to water supplies in agricultural areas, we recognise that it is impossible for settlement to succeed unless water is provided. If settlers can provide it for themselves, well and good. If the Government can provide it, well and good, so long as the charge on the finances of the State and on the settlers is not unduly high. The trouble during the last two or three years has been that, as people have settled further and further away from the goldfields water main, we have had to consider carefully the heavy expense entailed in supplying them. We have investigated the matter in relation to the Totadjin and Belka districts, but have been unable to devise a scheme which would supply these districts from the goldfields main at a reasonable rate. It is useless to expend £100,000 or £150,000 on a scheme on which the people benefited would be unable to pay more than 1 per cent. or  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. Mr. O'Brien was sent to these districts before Christmas with a view to devising a better scheme. If he can do so and the Treasurer can supply the funds, the matter will be submitted for Cabinet's consideration. The matter of dams and reservoirs is an unpleasant one. At one time the department had several gangs of maintenance men going around the tanks to keep them in order. Two or three years ago, it was decided that if the Government provided the capital money to establish these dams and reservoirs, it would not be too much to ask the people benefited to keep them in order. The same principle has been applied in the drainage area in the South-West. The people who are not prepared to undertake the maintenance of the scheme will have to be content with the scheme going as it may. The Government have not the funds and will not provide the funds for the

maintenance of drains which the people benefited should undertake in their own interests. In some districts drains were put down on the definite understanding, and subject to a clear agreement, that the residents would form a drainage board and would rate themselves for the proper maintenance of the drainage system. However, the drains were allowed to become silted up, and then the residents came to the Government for funds to remove the silt. The Government have taken a strong stand in that respect, declaring that, the State having met the capital outlay, it is for the people concerned to look after the drains. As regards the dams, they were turned over to the road boards to be cared for. In some instances the road boards have looked after them faithfully and well; in other instances they have not looked after the dams at all, and have not even shown any intention of looking after them. This year's Revenue Estimates enable the Minister for Works to use road board subsidies for upkeep of dams. How that policy will work out I do not know, but I think the Committee will agree that the power is a fitting one for the Minister to have. When the Government were maintaining the dams, telegrams would come from various districts stating that the dams were out of order and asking that a man be sent at once to effect repairs. Thinking that something important was out of order and that there was risk of a considerable loss, the department would send a man accordingly. In one case the repairs needed were the screwing up of a nut, which was lying on the ground, on to a bolt; in another case the repairs took the man who was sent about a quarter of an hour to effect, but the cost involved to the State was £8 to £10. In some cases the fence around the dam had been broken down in order that stock might drink more quickly than they could if the water had to be pumped. Even the pumps have been taken away in some instances. The position of the Government is that those who will not look after property furnished at the expense of the State for their convenience, deserve to suffer for their neglect.

**MR. PICKERING:** This item represents a very small amount for the work which is forecasted, and which is of a very extensive nature.

**The Premier:** I may refer the hon. member to the item "Supply of water for towns generally (including loans to local authorities and water boards), £100,000."

**MR. PIESSE:** I must protest against the smallness of the amount for water supply in agricultural districts. The Premier does not fully appreciate the really serious position in which farmers on the wheat belt find themselves as regards water supply. Last summer tens of thousands of pounds were spent by the farmers in carting water to their holdings. That is not altogether the fault of the farmers, or of the Government either. Unfortunately there has been a great lack of knowledge and of system in the handling

of this very serious water question on the wheat belt. Whilst during various seasons there was sufficient rain to enable the farmers to grow payable yields, there was not sufficient rainfall during the winter months even to half-fill the dams. The Government made a great mistake in handing over the dams to the road boards. Whilst there was some justification for such a course, still it was most unfortunate, for the reason that many of the boards could not give the dams the necessary attention. Further, the Government thought fit to dispense with the services of various engineers concerned in water supply who had, to my own personal knowledge, rendered excellent service in endeavouring to secure supplies of water in the far inland areas. Several of these engineers were removed because they had failed to provide dams holding sufficient water. Upon their removal, new men were put on, and these had to seek afresh the initial information required. In your own district of Wagin, Mr. Chairman, money has been wasted in this connection. The fault was not altogether that of the engineers who were held responsible; in several cases they were really good men: One of them was removed from the Water Supply Department and put in charge of surveys; another water supply engineer, who worked very hard in the wheat belt, upon being removed left for the Eastern States. It is important that the Government should recognise water supply as being the first essential of land settlement. The Government should appoint a staff, even though limited in number, to make full investigation into the subject, and possibly to visit the Eastern States in search of information. The problem is one requiring the best brains available. My own electorate, which represents merely a section of 150 miles by 50 miles of the great wheat belt, would carry tens of thousands of sheep but for the fact that the farmers dare not stock their holdings with sheep because they are not sure of a water supply from day to day. The carting of water has been going on for the past ten years in the wheat belt. The Leader of the Opposition and the member for North-East Fremantle will remember the strain it was on their Government to supply wheat belt settlers with water.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It was a greater strain to get the farmers to pay for the water supplied to them.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: Why not put down dams instead of buying water carts?

[Hon. G. Taylor took the Chair.]

Mr. PIESSE: The interjection shows that the hon. member does not understand the question. Last summer I could have shown the hon. member his own dam empty and his cows running over his neighbour's property and drinking the water there. I find it is no easy matter to speak in this House, but as long as I am here and have breath I shall endeavour to impress upon the Chamber the essential need of water

supply. The carting of water is an impossible proposition. Had it not been for the wonderful fertility of the soil, the farmers in my district could not have survived the water carting of last summer. The Premier and his Ministers, and also some of our friends opposite, are well aware that this water difficulty has existed for ten years; last year's trouble was exactly the same as that of a decade ago. The trouble will continue until an assured water supply is available in the wheat belt. It has often been said that farmers do not sink their dams deep enough, but last summer dams of an area of 10,000 square yards and of a depth of 14 or 15 feet were dry simply because during the winter months there was not sufficient surface flow to fill the dams. The time is ripe for the Government to set to work to obtain the best possible knowledge in order to overcome the water difficulty in the wheat belt.

Mr. MONEY: In this item there presents itself one of the biggest problems Parliament has to deal with. In the South-West the trouble is the opposite of that in the wheat belt. In the South-West the trouble is too much water. Last year's crops in the South-West were deficient to the extent of 50 per cent. by reason of want of drainage. The seriousness of the drainage problem is not adequately realised. The cost of labour and of seed is the same for half a crop as for a full crop. The fact that settlers in the South-West lose half their crops from year to year through want of drainage is sufficient to demonstrate that the drainage problem should receive the closest attention of the Agricultural Department. It is not a problem for any particular drainage board, but one for a man thoroughly understanding the whole subject. Notwithstanding the fact that half the amount of the present Loan Estimates of five millions is for land settlement and the Agricultural Bank, I trust that any future Loan Estimates of such magnitude will disclose a much greater measure of attention to this most difficult problem of drainage. The crops, particularly the oat crop, in the South-West are wasted to the extent of one-half each year. It means a loss of scores of thousands of pounds per annum. Yet the total amount assigned for water supply and drainage and irrigation is only £30,000, which is ridiculously insufficient.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I should like to know from the Minister for Works how this allocation of money for water supply in agricultural districts turns out as a financial proposition.

The Premier: There is no financial proposition about it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: In the past the report of the department did show the financial position. The latest report ignores it. It is all very well to spend £30,000 on this purpose, but we ought to know what the position is.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is difficult to categorically answer the question. In



some places where main drains have been put in, drainage boards have been established, and one or two of them are working satisfactorily. On the other hand, certain schemes have been carried out on the understanding that drainage boards would be formed, notwithstanding which the boards have not been formed. On the Stirling estate certain drainage work was undertaken and a board formed, but during the last 12 months somebody advised the ratepayers that there was no call upon them to pay their rates, and, in consequence, they refused to do so. The case was taken to court and, by a trick, the ratepayers won; consequently the drainage board has no funds with which to carry on its work. Probably a way out of the difficulty will be found, but at present the position is most unsatisfactory.

The PREMIER: I wish to tell the member for Toodyay (Mr. Piesse) that the farmers must supply water on their own holdings. There is no possible chance of getting the Government to put down road dams to supply farmers, as in the past. A lot of those dams, when put down, were not charged against the farmers. Something over £100,000 was spent in that way, together with a large sum in maintenance. The Government have done their part in respect of road dams, and they have not the money with which to send gangs of men around the country effecting small repairs to dams and wells. In one case a bucket fell down a well, and the local authorities sent in to the department a request that the department should send out and recover the bucket. In another case some fencing around a dam fell down, and the local authority wanted the Government to restore it. The Agricultural Bank is prepared to advance money for the putting down of dams and wells on individual holdings.

Mr. Latham: But the bank will not advance £700 for putting down a well on every thousand acres.

The PREMIER: Such a sum is by no means necessary.

Mr. Latham: Your chief engineer for water supply says it is.

The PREMIER: Well, he is wrong. I have known large dams sunk for much less. Of course, certain public dams have cost a good deal more. It would be a simple matter to run water from the goldfields main to the settlers, but no farmer could afford to water his sheep with water carried 20 miles, not at the present cost of labour and material.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Why would it not pay him?

The PREMIER: The people of Fremantle will not pay half as much as the farmer has to pay for his water, even as it is.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The farmer does not pay at all. You simply collect his chits.

The PREMIER: No, you are wrong. I should like to see water from the Kalgoorlie main used freely in agricultural areas, as I think it will be when pipes can be obtained more cheaply.

Mr. LATHAM: On the cost of farmer's tanks and dams, here is a report, dated 30th November, 1921, by Mr. P. V. O'Brien, chief engineer for water supply. I wish to read only two paragraphs, as follows:—

4. I described how individual farm water supplies could be constructed. These, too, consist of lined and roofed tanks with a capacity of 150,000 gallons with in some cases artificial catchments. The cost of each farm is estimated at £700 to £1,000 according to local conditions.

10. Individual farm water supplies, as referred to in paragraph 4, cannot be provided at lower cost than my estimate, namely, £700 to £1,000 each 1,000 acres. The ground is porous, therefore tanks require lining with either reinforced concrete or asphalt. Evaporation may be taken at 7ft. 6ins. and rainfall, although suitable for wheat growing is unsuitable for conservation without very hard, quick catchments, such as granite rocks or a mud surface. My estimate of 150,000 gallons tank per 1,000 acres would be sufficient for one year's requirements only. To provide for a drought year the tank capacity must be doubled, with, say, 70 per cent increased cost. Mundaring water is more reliable and less costly to the settlers, and they see this clearly.

That is the report of the chief engineer for water supply.

The Premier: I do not care.

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

Mr. LATHAM: I draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that there are many townships anxiously waiting for a water supply. They are not asking the Government to put up the money without undertaking to provide the interest and sinking fund.

Hon. P. Collier: They all say that, but do not pay up afterwards.

Mr. LATHAM: I commend to the Minister the scheme put forward by the Bruce Rock people. That town is badly in need of water. It does not matter how the people try to help themselves they are unable to get an adequate water supply. Whilst the settlers may not have paid directly for the water they have had, the State has had a big return from the outlay upon these facilities.

Mr. Marshall: The same thing applies to the mining industry.

Mr. LATHAM: I know it does.

Hon. P. Collier: Does not your party specially represent the mining industry?

Mr. LATHAM: We ought to do so.

Mr. Marshall: You hold the balance of power. Why do you not force the Government?

Mr. LATHAM: Unfortunately, we are not running the Mint and are not coining the money.

Mr. Marshall: You have got all the Treasury had, and you are still squealing.

Mr. LATHAM: I hope that on next year's estimates a sum of money will be set aside for the provision of an agricultural water supply.

Mr. HICKMOTT: Many farmers in the wheat belt have great difficulty in finding proper catchment for their water. There were similar troubles in the Eastern portion of Victoria years ago. The ground was too porous to hold water. When such land is fenced and stocked a good deal of that difficulty vanishes, because the stock consolidates the ground, and makes it possible for the dams to hold water. Originally, in this State many of the dams were made too shallow and the batters were too flat. The result was that the evaporation was very great, and the dams often went dry before the people really required to use the water. In Victoria we had to sledge the dams in order to make the water run into them. That ought to be done here. Sometimes when the dams are sunk too deep the water becomes salt in this State. The difficulty of conserving water in the Eastern wheat belt will take a lot of solving. There is a magnificent railway dam at Kondinin with a rock catchment of 11 or 12 acres from which the water drains into the dam. Unfortunately, the dam has been sunk only to the height of the rock, and it is leaking. After all the rain we have had I understand the dam will be dry in a few weeks. A good deal of money has been spent on it, but a little more should be spent to put it into working order. In Victoria the custom is to form trusts in connection with water conservation. There was one dam in my district of 7,000 yards capacity which was sunk by the Shire council out of loan funds. A trust was formed and the money borrowed from the Government, the shire accepting the responsibility for the repayment. This particular dam was filled with flood water from the adjoining creek, but in a fortnight it went dry because it leaked. The top portion of the surrounding clay ground was then scooped into the dam, and about 2,000 sheep were placed within the fence of the dam, and it never leaked again. That sort of thing could be done here. The surface of the ground in our dry areas contains a sufficient amount of clay to enable the dams to be puddled so that the leaks might be stopped. The difficulty at the railway dam could be overcome by means of concrete or cement. Mr. O'Brien, the engineer, told me that this sort of thing was done on the goldfields. I believe in people helping themselves and making their own dams. Once the land becomes suitable for stock and the surface becomes consolidated by means of stock, I believe that the catchment difficulty will be overcome.

Mr. PICKERING: I agree with the Minister for Works when he says that if we want to conserve water in the country districts it is necessary that we should have drainage boards. The Stirling drainage board tried to exercise its powers of collecting rates by going to court, but the verdict went against them and they could not

collect the rates. Unless something is done to adjust the position the board will be unable to collect any rates. The firm of solicitors engaged to advise those who protested against the rates attempted to bring about a conference between the ratepayers and the board in order to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion.

The Minister for Works: If they had come together and left out the lawyers they would have been all right.

Mr. PICKERING: Another lawyer came into the matter and did his best to create trouble between the ratepayers and the board. The result was that litigation ensued and the board were unable to collect the rates. I have brought the matter under the notice of the Minister, and I trust something will be done to enable the board to carry out their duties. At present the board are powerless.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I asked the Minister a question just now but got no reply. I wanted to know the financial position so far as agricultural water supplies are concerned.

The Premier: What about the Fremantle water supply?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We have particulars about that published. In this case we only get the revenue and not the expenditure, which is charged up to goldfields water supply. We used to get the information until the Minister gave the farming community double the quantity of water for the same rate. Since then we have not had the published accounts of the expenditure. I commend the suggestion of the member for Pingelly to the Minister. He pointed out that in Victoria they formed trusts, borrowed the money from the Government, and undertook the responsibility of repaying it. The hon. member put up some strong arguments in favour of this system, which might well be adopted here. He showed that when a dam became faulty it was put in order by the trust at their own cost. They did not wait for the Government to do the work for them. I hope the Minister will take a note of the remarks of the hon. member.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I must have misunderstood the hon. member. I had no intention of refusing him any information I had. I am surprised to find that the statement he referred to is not in the report. It will be found in the next report. Indeed, there is no reason why it should not be laid on the table to-morrow.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Development of goldfields and mineral resources, £57,000.

Item, development of mining (including boring for minerals and miscellaneous):

Mr. BOYLAND: I wish to refer to water supplies so far as the development of mining is concerned. The vote for mining is not large considering that it embraces

the whole State and applies to all minerals. I should like to have seen the amount set down for the development of mining larger than it is. Something should be done to give prospectors and others a better water supply so that they may win gold and bring added wealth to the country. A councillor in Kalgoorlie claims that if some of the low grade shows could get water at 2s. 6d. per thousand gallons around Kalgoorlie they could be worked. I hope the Minister will see what can be done to improve the conditions in Kalgoorlie so that more gold may be produced from these low grade propositions. In speaking on the metropolitan water supply on the Revenue Estimates, the Minister for Works stated that the Mundaring water was to be used for the farming districts and, therefore, was not available for the metropolitan area. If that be the case, surely it could be supplied at a cheaper rate to the goldfields for the purpose I have stated. The possibilities of the goldfields are such that every encouragement should be given to them. The pessimism which has existed is not in any way justified. We had a report the other day that the Golden Horseshoe Company were negotiating for the purchase of the old Chaffers mine. To my mind there are big possibilities here also. It is assumed that the lode is dipping away from the Horseshoe so rapidly, and is going into the Chaffers ground, that the Horseshoe people can see the benefit of acquiring the Chaffers property so as to work at a greater depth and continue the production of gold. Then we have the example of the Perseverance mine which went into liquidation some time ago but which lately has been worked by tributaries with immensely satisfactory results. The Great Boulder has similar possibilities. In 1914 the report of that company set out that boring operations had been carried on through the Perseverance into the Great Boulder mine, but that it was found that the lodes were too narrow. But, I ask, how can anyone look through the ground to determine the width of the lodes? It is only by developing that it is possible to tell what the lodes are going to be like. Then with regard to railway freights—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot discuss railway freights under this vote.

Mr. BOYLAND: I am out to help the mining industry and the development of mining. Could I not refer to the railway freights by way of illustration?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member had that opportunity when the Mines Estimates were before the House.

Mr. BOYLAND: I was only going to allude to the fact that the increased railway freights were greatly hampering the development of mining. The policy of the Government is to encourage the mining industry and if they are earnest about that they must do everything in their power to assist it sympathetically, and I urge the Minister to

do all that he can in that direction, so as to keep the industry going.

Mr. CHESSON: I, too, enter a protest against the small amount which has been placed on these Estimates for the development of the mineral resources. We must take into consideration that the amount is intended to be applied not only to gold, but to all minerals. As a matter of fact the whole of the vote could be spent on boring, and even then it would not be too much. In connection with the State batteries system, I would like the Minister to make a definite announcement regarding the policy of the Government. The administration of the batteries at the present time is giving general satisfaction, but I understand that the Government intend to lease a portion or the whole of the system. There has been a hue and cry in consequence amongst the prospectors. Their experience leads them to believe that if the batteries are leased the same satisfaction which they have had in the past will not result. Another matter on which I would like some information is the gold premium. Has the department claimed the gold premium in connection with the gold crushed at State batteries? I understand that the department is paying the premium, but I would like to know definitely whether that is so. I repeat my regret at the amount on the Estimates not being larger, remembering the fact that no less a sum than two millions sterling is being allocated to the development of agriculture.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I am delighted to hear the member for Cue suggest that the amount provided for the development of mining is small. I was rather fearful that there would be some serious criticism, that in view of the present difficulties in regard to financing and the cost of money, we were providing too much. I had this in mind when I was framing the Estimates, and I tried to keep the vote down to what I considered would be sufficient to see us through a trying period. I realise that if every request made in connection with the mining industry were granted there would not be enough money on the whole of the Estimates. We have to consider the matter from the standpoint of expenditure, which is likely to return some wealth to the State. It is well that we should understand that in assisting mining development we set out with the object of developing mining propositions that have at least a sporting chance of returning to the State the money advanced. As the member for Yilgarn said the other evening, some members are of opinion that the whole of the vote shown on the Loan Estimates is in the nature of a subsidy to the mining industry, whereas a fair proportion is returned to the Treasury.

Mr. Corboy: That was my protest.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member should rather say it is evidence of the fact that care is taken to see that the money advanced does give some chance

of being of value to the State. There is other expenditure under the mining vote which does not appear as assistance to the development of mining but which is essentially such. We run our State batteries system at a heavy loss. That is unquestionably in the nature of a subsidy. In regard to this particular vote it is well to understand that the money is voted for the purpose of making advances to those who have a fair chance of returning it to the State. It is there for the purpose of assisting mines over what may be a trying period. Out of this vote last year, we found the sum of £3,000 to enable the mines at Westonia to deal with a serious problem which arose out of the water difficulty. That money was definitely advanced with no possibility of its being returned to the State, but it had the effect of keeping the district working and thus producing a great amount of wealth that would otherwise have been permanently lost. Frequently we hear criticism in regard to a fair percentage of money being expended in one particular district.

Mr. Corboy: Ravensthorpe was specially favoured prior to my advent.

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES:** As a matter of fact everybody knows that we have for a long time been spoon-feeding the Ravensthorpe district. We had to do it. It was due to the policy that was enunciated by my friend the Leader of the Opposition for the purpose of trying to establish that district on a more permanent basis. We took over the smelter and we tried to encourage what appeared to be a good policy of small holdings, and getting the men there, instead of working for wages, to engage in their own propositions and take their ore to the State smelter. That policy worked satisfactorily until war broke out and we were not able to get out of the position by merely saying we refused to go further. We carry on these people and that is done without considering the electorate in which the shows are situated. The member for Yilgarn (Mr. Corboy) will admit that notwithstanding the fact that there has been a change in the political representation, there has been no alteration regarding the attitude of myself as Minister or the departmental officers in giving proper consideration to requests received from his electorate.

Mr. Corboy: That is so.

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES:** After all, the question depends upon the man putting up the proposition. It would not be expected that I, as Minister, would go around the mining districts and say to this person or that person: "You come along and ask for £2,000 and put it into this piece of ground, for you might get something out of it." No such thing would be expected from the State Mining Engineer or any other of the departmental officers. If, however, a proposition is submitted to us, we never decline to have an inspection made and if there is any possibility of developing a new mine

or if there is any prospect of assisting a show which has become practically moribund we always give the necessary attention to the matter. I do not know of any single case in which the departmental officials have not dealt sympathetically with requests for assistance even, perhaps, to the extent of sometimes slightly overstepping the mark in their sympathies. I know of no instance, where a departmental officer has made out a good case, that has been turned down by the Government, unless it be where companies desire to obtain from the Government money which should be available from other sources. I did not know anything about the statements made—I think by the member for Mt. Magnet (Mr. Troy)—regarding the distribution of these moneys until I read "Hansard" the other day. Take the case of the member for Leonora (Mr. Heron) and his district. There was trouble there through the fire at the Gwalia mine. Is it to be supposed that I would not take up that case because of the political colour of the member for Leonora? That aspect does not weigh with me or with the department, but it is a question of the people in the district who have their homes there and who, with the aid of the Government for a brief period, may be able to carry on operations again successfully. I approved of the advance of more than £3,000 from the Mines Development Vote in order to enable them to carry on and give them a chance of operating their mines again. Hon. members can see at any time in the mining reports how the money from the Vote is expended. There has never been any such thing as regard for the political colouring of the representation of an electorate in connection with assistance under the Mines Development Act. As to the question of State batteries, the member for Cue (Mr. Chesson) wanted to know whether it was the Government policy to lease the State batteries. That is not the Government's policy and never has been. We have arrived at a decision in connection with State batteries, however. In the past, it has been the policy that if a district went down to any great extent and the State battery there had no customers, when another district was producing a fair quantity of ore and demanding a State battery, the plant at the centre which was moribund was dismantled and shifted to the more active district. It often happened, however, that subsequently prospectors working at the former place struck a quantity of ore which they desired to be treated. The battery having been dismantled and re-erected elsewhere there was no provision for crushing facilities. The Government have now decided that where we have a State battery which is not operating, should there be prospectors in the district, we will give them the opportunity to take over the battery, requiring them to pay a rent sufficient only to give them the right to own it and then they can operate the battery to suit their own conveniences.

Mr. Corboy: Do you intend to restrict that privilege to genuine prospectors?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes, that is the intention.

Mr. Corboy: I hope you will make sure that only genuine prospectors get in.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: We always consult the prospectors in the district regarding the leasing of the battery, and we always take their advice. It is not, however, always possible to get what is termed the genuine prospector, the man who goes out with the pick and shovel, to take over the responsibility of a State battery.

Mr. Chesson: We had one instance where a man roasted the plates twice in two months.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It is only when we find that a battery is not fully required in a district and when it does not pay us to have a staff to treat only 50 or 100 tons of ore in a year, that we give the prospectors the opportunity of leasing the State battery in order that they may operate in the interests of those remaining on the spot. It is infinitely better to adopt such a practice than to dismantle and shift the battery elsewhere in the circumstances I have outlined. I do not know that there is anything further to say on this vote except to mention that if we placed on the Estimates the whole of the moneys which could be taken up under this Vote, it would be a matter of some £70,000. As we never actually expend the total amount applied for in the year, I have provided the amount which, on past experience, I think is sufficient to meet requirements for the period covered. I have not asked for more than I think we shall expend. I contend that the Government are justified in assisting prospectors wherever that help can be afforded. To-day the people at Westonia are experiencing difficulties in getting down to the bottom levels in some of the mines. As in other small communities, we generally find that in the small mining centres they are at loggerheads. There are two or three mines there which might be operated economically under a joint arrangement, but the different companies will hardly speak to each other over the fence. When I was asked for assistance, I told them very plainly that I was not concerned about their disputes but about their district. I informed them that unless they forgot their difficulties and came back to me with an intimation that such a result had been achieved, they could not expect the Government to assist them.

Mr. Corboy: You would want to be a Lloyd George to negotiate with those companies.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I received a telegram saying that the companies had met and that they anticipated by to-morrow they would come to an agreement.

Mr. Marshall: If you got Claude de Bernales out of the district, you could get all the leases working together pretty quickly.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member is welcome to de Bernales in his own district.

Mr. Corboy: These companies must be very hard up against it if they have come to terms.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: In any case that is the position as I understand it at present. Then again we had a request from Youanmi for a large sum of money. It was shown that they had a magnificent security and in such cases, where the security is of the best, I consider the proper financial institutions should go to the assistance of the mining industry the same as in the case of any other industry. In those circumstances, I did not feel disposed to go to the assistance of that particular company.

Mr. Lambert: But are they not paying dividends?

Mr. Marshall: No.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: This company has not paid dividends. I may be told, however, by the member for the district that in adopting such an attitude I am doing something that is detrimental to the State. On the other hand, I contend that the Government are not entitled to become money lenders. That is to say, they are not entitled to become a banking institution to assist the mining industry in the development of a proposition which can advance such securities as this particular mine.

Hon. P. Collier: At the same time, that is what we have become regarding the agricultural industry.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: To some extent, that is so.

Hon. P. Collier: The Western Australian Bank was the only bank which lent assistance to mining propositions, but even that institution has closed down on them now.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The practice we have followed is not to actually advance to the company, but to guarantee their overdrafts at the bank. The result has been that when these companies require assistance, the banks or other institutions have instructed them to go to the Government to secure a guarantee.

Hon. P. Collier: They will not touch mining ventures.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: In the particular instance I refer to, there is unquestionable evidence that the security is all that could be desired and in this instance, too, assistance has been received from the bank. The bank as a matter of fact has made advances for years past because the company has been guaranteed by a trust. That guarantee has been withdrawn and notwithstanding that the security available is all that could be desired, the company has been asked to come to the Government to secure the guarantee in place of the trust. This is because it has become an institution with the Government to give such guarantees. I do not know that that position should be encouraged too much. The Government are

entitled to encourage the development of the mining industry, but that encouragement should rather be in the direction of assisting those who go out to find new fields or to assist in the revivifying of somewhat moribund fields. Once a mining proposition becomes well established or when ore bodies are proved to exist I think the Government should not be called upon for assistance.

Mr. Harrison: In some cases, the withholding of assistance is detrimental to the towns.

• The MINISTER FOR MINES: I have already mentioned that aspect and referred particularly to the water difficulty at Westonia. Had that difficulty not been dealt with quickly, there was a possibility of the mines being permanently lost. In that case, however, it is an entirely different proposition from the one I am discussing. The State battery system has been encouraged as far as possible. I am glad to inform the member for Cue that we are returning to the people whose ore we treat in the State batteries, the whole of the premium received from the Gold Producers' Association.

Mr. Chesson: That is good.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It will be admitted that we are giving the prospectors a better deal than is the case at the private batteries.

Hon. P. Collier: You are dealing honestly and the private batteries are not. That is the difference. Any private battery that retains part of the gold premium is not acting honestly.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I am delighted to hear the Leader of the Opposition say that, because the department has often been charged with not dealing honestly with the prospectors.

Hon. P. Collier: Not regarding the Government.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes, that charge has been made. We have been said to be acting dishonestly towards the prospectors. There have been several cases in which that charge has been made.

Hon. P. Collier: Then I take it that generally you are honest, but individually dishonest.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Evidently that must be the position. We have been accused of levying higher charges than private batteries and thus acting unfairly towards the prospectors. It must be remembered, however, that many of the State batteries are only working spasmodically. When a battery is allowed to stand for eight or ten months without being used, it is apt to get into a state of disrepair. We have to send out a gang of men in order to put the battery in order, and the cost of those operations is a charge against the State battery. Those charges have a bearing on the cost of running the battery, but this does not apply where privately owned batteries are kept running throughout the year, in consequence of which they are able to treat ore at a

cheaper rate. This aspect is not taken into account when the State battery system is criticised. Again, critics do not take into account the fact that the Government subsidise some of the private batteries by paying up to 2s. per ton for ore treated, on the understanding that the batteries do not charge more than we charge at the State batteries. There are two private batteries at Leonora, and I undertook months since to subsidise those batteries to the extent of 2s. per ton so long as the charges to the prospectors did not exceed those of the State batteries. Notwithstanding this fact, they have not come to any arrangement, but they asked us to establish a State battery in a district where they have two private batteries. This shows that our State battery system is evidently not so bad as it has been painted.

Mr. Heron: The private batteries do not get the same treatment from the sands.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I have heard complaints against the department regarding the treatment meted out to the prospector, and yet to-night I am hearing a story which is quite the reverse. Now I feel satisfied that the State battery system is assisting the development of mining and is treating the prospectors fairly.

Mr. Corboy: The prospectors would sooner have a State battery any time.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It is not desirable to spend a large sum of money to establish a State battery where private batteries are in existence, provided we can arrange with them to treat the ore at State battery costs.

Mr. MUNSIE: The assistance granted to small leaseholders or prospectors under the mines development vote would be of much greater advantage if administered in a different way. In one case at Kalgoorlie, the mining engineer and the inspectors reported favourably on an application for an advance on a certain property. But the advance provided for under the mines development vote was one of pound for pound. The unfortunate part was that the individual concerned had not the pound.

The Minister for Mines: He would have his labour.

Mr. MUNSIE: But he wanted machinery before he could put the labour in. He supplied the Mines Department with a full estimate. He interviewed machinery agents with a view to obtaining the requisite machinery. I believe the price was £613, and the cost for erecting it and for everything complete was £1,000. He asked for an advance of £1,000 and was prepared to give as security, not only the machinery but the mine itself, and to put in the labour of five other men. The reports of the inspector who sampled the mine were favourable, but owing to the pound for pound system being in vogue, no advance could be obtained. Thus, the possibility of getting a decent mine went by the board. I do not think the Government would have lost a penny

if they had advanced the £1,000. In less than a month the mine could have produced gold, and the Government could have taken all except bare wages until the advance was repaid. I hope the Minister will make provision to give generous assistance in such cases in future.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Development of Agriculture, etc., £1,977,450.

Item, Agricultural Immigration, £6,000:

Mr. HARRISON: The Leader of the Opposition has pointed out that we cannot expect to continue our loan expenditure unless we receive agricultural immigration somewhat in proportion to it. Serious steps should be taken with regard to agricultural immigration. This capital expenditure should be a national matter. As a result of the Washington conference, it is proposed to reduce armaments, and the present should be an opportune time to send a man to England to tell the people there of the development made in Western Australia, the facilities provided and the land available.

Mr. Wilson: We have an Agent General and others there already.

Mr. HARRISON: We should send another man. I hope the Premier will consider this matter seriously and see whether this would not be a good proposition for Western Australia. We have a vast territory and have spent enormous sums of money to provide facilities such as transport and harbours. I think the time is now ripe for the Premier to go to the Old Country and negotiate with the British Government for a per capita grant with respect to British people settling in Western Australia.

The PREMIER: This item is merely to make provision for some nominated passengers. I agree that the British Government should assist in the settlement of British people on the lands of Western Australia. We have communicated with the British Government through the Agent General, and I hope we shall have their sympathy as well as that of the Federal Government.

Hon. P. Collier: This is one of the matters which you will discuss at the Premiers' Conference.

The PREMIER: Probably so. I am much obliged to the hon. member for his suggestion that I should go to London and, of course, I should very much like to go.

Item, Assistance to settlers, industries, etc., £50,000:

Hon. P. COLLIER: Under this item comes the subsidy to the Western Australian Meat Export Company Ltd., otherwise known as the Fremantle co-operative freezers. I should like to know what amount has already been advanced to the company, how much it is expected will be advanced during this year, and whether interest on the money already advanced has been paid.

Mr. McCallum: And when they will start work.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That would not come within the province of the Minister. No doubt the Leader, or one of the members, of the Country Party would be able to supply that information, because I understand the boss of the party is one of the directors of the company. From certain quarters comes very severe and trenchant criticism of the fact that the Wyndham Meat Works were unable to work last year and perhaps will not be able to operate this year, but never a word is mentioned of the fact that this co-operative concern, launched with the aid of pound for pound assistance by the Government and supposed to be in existence last year, has so far failed to materialise.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: And the works at Carnarvon, too.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Quite so. Both works failed to start at the appointed time but nothing is said of that. But for the Government backing, the so-called co-operative works launched at Fremantle would not have got so far as they have done. There is another aspect of the matter, an aspect which I am not permitted to discuss at the stage; and that is that the Fremantle company is not a truly co-operative concern as we were led to believe when the Government assistance was authorised. How much has already been advanced to the company? How much is to be advanced to the company this year? Has the company met its interest charges up to date?

The PREMIER: About £60,000 has been advanced up to date, and probably another £35,000 will be advanced. I cannot inform the hon. member whether interest has been paid up to date, but I have no doubt it has.

Hon. P. Collier: I do not know why you should be so confident about it.

The PREMIER: The work of the company is of the utmost importance to this country.

Hon. P. Collier: So is the work at Wyndham; but that is not the question.

The PREMIER: Undoubtedly it would be much better for everyone in this State if the Fremantle company could start operations, but the company cannot start unless the farmer is able to get a remunerative price for his sheep, and that is impossible in the present condition of the world's markets.

Mr. McCallum: But many people seem to think the world's markets affect only Wyndham.

The PREMIER: Freights are falling now, and that should make a very considerable difference. The Fremantle works are capable of handling practically all the stock that our South-West will be able to export.

Mr. Lambert: What has been advanced in the case of Carnarvon?

The PREMIER: About £50,000.

Mr. Lambert: Is that pound for pound?

The PREMIER: Rather more than pound for pound. The Committee surely must realise that co-operative meat works of the kind established at Fremantle are of the utmost importance to the producers of Western Australia.

Hon. P. Collier: But this is not a co-operative concern at all.

The PREMIER: I am being asked half a dozen questions at once. As regards storage of fruit in the Fremantle works, one can hardly expect to store fruit and meat at the same time.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I thought £60,000 was the limit of the advance to this Fremantle company?

The PREMIER: That was the limit, but hon. members know that every work undertaken by the Government has cost about double the amount estimated beforehand.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: This is not a Government work at Fremantle.

The PREMIER: No; but the fact is as I state. In the case of the Fremantle works the increase in the cost of materials alone represents an enormous sum.

Hon. P. Collier: There is a wonderful stillness about this Fremantle job.

The PREMIER: There is no wonderful stillness.

Hon. P. Collier: In making that remark I am not referring to the Premier. But there is a wonderful silence in those quarters which are most vociferous about Wyndham.

The PREMIER: Practically all the meat works of Australia are closed down to-day. The Wyndham works, in common with the Queensland works, are closed, but owing to no fault of the managements. If one cannot sell one's product, one cannot operate one's works. I hope the market will change within the next few months, enabling us possibly to operate Wyndham this year. Everyone wants to see the three or four hundred thousand pounds' worth of meat still on the hooks at Wyndham shipped to London and converted into money. The Government would be very glad to operate at Wyndham if they could, and a corresponding remark applies to the owners of the meat works at Fremantle.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We could very well reduce the amount of this item by £20,000.

The Premier: This only represents advances through the Industries Assistance Board.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I know what the item represents. It represents, amongst other things, £35,000 for these meat works at Fremantle.

The Premier: No, it does not.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: An undertaking was entered into whereby the Government were to advance £60,000 towards the cost of constructing meat works at Fremantle. It is not long since the member for Sussex asked some questions, very keen questions, too, questions perhaps framed by some person outside—

Mr. Pickering: No; they were framed by myself.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: They were questions referring to the Wyndham Meat Works.

Mr. Pickering: Those questions needed no framing.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It was stated that the Government had wasted money on the Wyndham Meat Works, which, it was alleged, had cost considerably more than private enterprise would have needed to expend on their construction.

Mr. Pickering: That is true.

Hon. P. Collier: It is not true.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Now we find a private company—not the Minister for Works, who by some people is regarded as devoid of business acumen—very much out in an estimate of the cost of meat works. I do not think the actual and real Leader of the Country Party would give the Minister for Works credit for much business acumen. Now that real and actual Leader of the Country Party who is chairman of directors of the company that constructed these Fremantle meat works, is proved conclusively to be calling upon the Government for another £35,000 as a subsidy, because of his underestimation of the cost of these works. The application for a further £35,000 shows that the works have cost £70,000 more than the estimate of that keen business man. On the aspect of cost of materials, let me point out that there was a better opportunity of forecasting that cost when the Fremantle works were started than when the Wyndham works were started. Members on the cross benches have severely criticised a past Government on the score of the cost of the Wyndham Meat Works, but they have sat tongue-tied on the question of the cost of these Fremantle meat works. In the circumstances, the Committee would be quite justified in cutting down this item, with a view to affording the Fremantle company an opportunity of making good the assertion of its directors that they can do work so much more cheaply than the Government. I admit that the Fremantle works have not yet commenced to operate, but they ought to have done so, because these gentlemen contend that the Wyndham Meat Works ought to have been operating during the past two years. Not a bullock has yet been killed at Fremantle. I wonder will the Fremantle company advance the farmers so much on their sheep pending the re-opening of the London market; I wonder will the company extend corresponding treatment to the pastoralists. No such proposal has been made by the company; no such action has been demanded of the company by the Country Party. But demands of that kind are put up to the Government, because the Government are the milk cow all the time; and the Government are kicked in the ribs when they are unable to yield any more milk. Now the Fremantle company come along to the Government for another £35,000. Would the Committee be justified in granting this additional money? I do not think so. Let



me point out, too, that there is just a footnote at the back of these Estimates to indicate that £35,000 of this item is for the Fremantle company. I would not mind the position if these people had been honest, if they had frankly admitted that their works are in exactly the same position as the Government works at Wyndham by reason of the lack of a market for meat.

The Premier: I will admit it for the company.

Mr. Mann: The company have admitted it through the Press.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: But the company have also asserted through the Press that the Government ought to be running the Wyndham Meat Works. No apology was ever put up by the company for the stoppage of the Wyndham Meat Works. It has been proved conclusively that these people cannot construct works any more cheaply than can the Government, and I am quite sure that their works are not better than those at Wyndham; yet we are continually hearing sneers at State trading concerns. Presently these people will want the Government to take over their works. The works are in the wrong place. For convenience of operation, they should have been built in Fremantle. The member for Coolgardie, with his policy of boom and bust, ought to take a lesson from this vote, and realise the difficulty in which the country is placed when the people's money is used for the purpose of assisting private enterprise. The Government agreed to advance £60,000, and now they have to advance another £35,000, and God only knows if that will be the end of it!

Mr. Mann: But you favour the starting of industries!

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes, by the State, or by private enterprise if standing on its own foundation; but I do not believe in giving private enterprise State money to play with.

Mr. Pickering: But this is co-operative.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Co-operative be blowed! When we find money for these people to build up industries, is it any wonder that they should be against State enterprise? Very few of these companies ever pay back what they borrow from the Government.

Mr. LAMBERT: I am not prepared to sanction the departure made in the assistance of these two companies. Preferential treatment is shown. One company can go to the Government and get pound for pound for the starting of an industry, while another, after spending thousands of pounds, has difficulty in getting any Government assistance at all. I am seized of the necessity for starting freezing works. If private enterprise will not do it, the Government ought to. This is not the only direction in which this vote should extend. Many industries with natural resources in Western Australia ought to be assisted, but we have the Chamber of Commerce decrying any industry in Western Aus-

tralia, particularly those assisted or established by the Government.

The Minister for Works: Then they must be importers.

Mr. LAMBERT: Yes, and it is well known that the men who stand behind all those who wish to crush local industry are members who preach the rotten policy advocated by the Chamber of Commerce, Perth. No decent manufacturer would be found dead near them. Until such time as we can eradicate the influence of the Chamber of Commerce, we shall make no progress in industry. Instead of this vote being £50,000 it should be £150,000, and there should be no differential treatment. It is impossible to establish an industry in Western Australia, because the distributing agents are all foreign importers, and it is against their interests to see local industries grow up. The Premier, who is desirous of seeing local industries flourishing, knows that to establish an industry in Western Australia one has to pay toll to the distributing agencies. We import millions of pounds worth of stuff every year, whereas by a bold policy we could, in a couple of years, reduce these imports by 50 per cent. It is our duty to do it. I hope the Premier will give this matter personal consideration, and will appoint a board on lines similar to that established for the assistance of farmers, a board that will look into all commercial undertakings.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We have one now.

Mr. LAMBERT: Yes, and it is a pretty sort of board! It is wrongly conceived, and wrongly established. There are dozens of industries which could be successfully established in this State. With the wealth of tanning material available, a tanning industry in Western Australia would be worth half a million per annum. It is essential that we should establish secondary industries. Those which private enterprise will not take up should be, in part at least, established by the Government. Before the close of the session I intend to move for a report showing the amount advanced to all industries in Western Australia, together with the securities held. We have a right to know whether there is differential treatment as between the various industries. I believe the freezing works industry is necessary and could probably be extended. It was welcome news to me to hear the member for North-East Fremantle remind Monger & Co. that they were not such wonderful men or possessed of such business acumen when, while they were railing day in and day out at the achievements of the Wyndham Meat Works, they had to come to the Government for another £35,000 with which to build their own works at Fremantle, which are easier to establish than were the works at Wyndham.

Mr. J. Thomson: You know that the money was required to provide extra facilities.

Mr. LAMBERT: The details are not before the Committee. We were led to understand that the concern running on a co-operative basis was expecting assistance from

the Government to the extent of pound for pound. The Premier interjected that the Carnarvon Freezing Works had received more than pound for pound in the way of monetary assistance.

The Premier: They do not come under this item.

Mr. LAMBERT: The Government may be giving them another £25,000, but that is a matter for them. I would welcome the establishment of a board on similar lines to that established for the assistance of agriculture, so that all industries that apply for assistance may be thoroughly looked into with respect to their value and their relationship to this State. We know that Western Australia possesses the natural products to support those industries, and that there is the possibility of their becoming a commercial success. I would not advocate the boom-and-bust policy of the member for North-East Fremantle. He is courageous, but is not of that conservative type which can give a clear and concise commercial judgment upon affairs of this description. He is altogether too rash in matters of this kind. Most members know his rash and venturesome spirit at all times and upon all questions. The Government would be well advised to give equal treatment to other industries and assist in their development, for this should do a considerable amount of good for the State.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The discussion has justified my inquisitiveness in regard to this item. It has opened up some rather important questions. Had one not been rather vigilant in looking through the items, one would not have found hidden away in two lines of small print the fact that this vote—

The Premier: It is the usual note.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes. I notice there was no keen desire in the House amongst members to ask for any information concerning it. The public would not have known that this company, which set out to erect these works with the aid of £60,000 of Government funds, had been obliged to come back to the Government and had succeeded in obtaining an additional £35,000. I hope that those active spirits who spend so much time and money in compiling the articles which appear periodically in the "Bunbury Herald," the "Narrogin Times" and the "Carnarvon Advertiser" and which in the form of reprint bring so much grist to the printing mill of the member for Swan, will also make a feature of this fact.

The Premier: Does he print them?

Hon. P. COLLIER: Most of them.

The Minister for Works: Most of them are libels.

Mr. Johnston: But the print is good.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes, but the rest is all lies. I hope the vigilant party responsible for them will also deal with this particular question. I wish the hon. member would give away trade secrets and let us know where these articles come from that keep his printing machines going so regularly

as they have been going during the past few months.

Mr. Sampson: Do you appreciate them?

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes. Only yesterday I received my last copy, but to-day I did not get any. These interesting and veracious pamphlets have been scattered broadcast throughout the State during the last few months. I hope the party responsible for their distribution will get out a pamphlet embodying the discussion which has taken place this evening. The latest pamphlet I have seen contains reprints from "Hansard." They even considered that some of the remarks I made a month or two ago were worthy of reproduction, and they have lifted them from "Hansard." Thousands of people will now be the wiser for having read these remarks.

The Premier: We shall have to copyright "Hansard."

Hon. P. COLLIER: I hope they will let those people who are so interested in the cost of construction and operation of trading concerns know that the directorate of this trading concern have had the benefit of the wisdom of the President of the Primary Producers' Association, and have had to come back to the Government for an additional £35,000. If pound for pound is given for this amount, it will mean that the work will cost £70,000 more than was anticipated.

The Premier: The works are bigger.

Mr. McCallum: Is there any limit to the amount that they will ask for?

Hon. P. COLLIER: No, and apparently there is no limit to the amount that they can obtain owing to the pressure they can exercise upon the Government. If it is found that this £35,000 is insufficient, all that will be required is another turn of the screw from the cross benches. They will then be able to grind out another £30,000 if it is wanted. The Chairman of Directors, who is also Chairman of the Primary Producers' Party, may find that he wants this sum. He will send a communication to the party, and, probably without the formality of a party meeting to approve of it, the party will pass it on to the Treasury and obtain the money. I guarantee that there will be no delay in the process. The response will be prompt to the call. It is the silent worker who is the most effective.

The Minister for Agriculture: He has spent a good deal of his own money on the works.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I have no doubt he has, but for every pound of his own money he has obtained more than £1 of Government money. Had things gone right and had the market for the product which is supposed to be turned out been good, and had the business been a success, no doubt the company would have gone ahead. As they have not been able to make a success of it up to date and as there is no market for the products, the future is uncertain. If it

should appear to the directorate that the business is likely to fail, I have no doubt they will come along to the Government and ask them to take it over. They will say—"Let the Government nurse the baby." Before this vote is passed I want to know whether the Government will be likely to purchase these works without the authority of Parliament, and if we are to have a repetition of the Waroona-Lake Clifton railway affair. Who knows but that in a month's time, immediately after Parliament rises—for in the other case the famous agreement was signed in January after Parliament had gone into recess—an agreement will be put up by some wise member of Cabinet who will deceive the unsophisticated members into passing that agreement. That is not a flight of imagination. It is even within the bounds of possibilities. If the Premier were not going to the Premiers' Conference I should not feel so uneasy. If he were taking with him the Minister for Education and leaving the Minister for Works in charge I should not be so uneasy. The Minister for Works, however, slept slightly on the other occasions that I have mentioned. If the Premier leaves behind the Minister for Education, who is bound to be busy looking after all the departments, who knows but he may sign an agreement without authority for the purchase of these works? Will the Minister for Works on behalf of the Government give me an assurance that these works will not be purchased without Parliamentary authority?

The Minister for Works: In the absence of the Premier.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is quite possible. I should not fear at all if the works were a profitable and going concern. Knowing, however, that they have not paid I fear an attempt will be made to pass them over to the Government. We have two Ministers of the late Lefroy Cabinet still in office. The Minister for Works was tricked and deceived in the matter, and there is also the Minister for Education. The Minister for Agriculture is new to Cabinet rank, but he is a member of the party from which the pressure will come. Even though he may be more alert than some of his colleagues who comprised the former Lefroy Government, it may be that the pressure will be too strong for him. It may be, too, that he would not communicate his knowledge if he did discover that a joke was being put up on the other members of Cabinet.

Mr. Johnston: He may be going, too.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I beseech the Premier to leave behind at least one reliable Minister, even if he is forced at the last moment to appoint an honorary Minister.

Mr. Johnston: Or an Attorney General.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I suggest that a reliable member like the member for Kimberley should be asked to watch events in the interests of the State while the Premier is away. It is during the absence of the

Premier that these directors are likely to become active.

The Minister for Works: They will not worry me.

Hon. P. COLLIER: We ought to have some assurance of this kind.

The Premier: I will give you an assurance that we will not purchase these works or any others.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I am satisfied that the Premier will stick to that assurance, but can we rely upon his colleagues and can we be sure that he will not be dragged into this during his absence? Can the Premier give me a further assurance that he will leave some reliable Minister behind him?

The Premier: I will leave four.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I do not think there is one of his four colleagues in whom we could have absolute confidence. I trust the Premier will adopt my suggestion and bring in even an Honorary Minister who has not failed us in the past, and in whom, therefore, we could place trust. Having done my duty in warning the House and the country of the possibilities, I leave the subject, relying upon the Premier's promise to do his best with the material at his disposal. Now, the total amount of the item is only £50,000, of which £35,000 is to go to the Fremantle company.

The Premier: Hardly that amount this year.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I understood the Premier to say that.

The Premier: Yes, I did say that.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It means that the Government are going to assist in the establishment of industries, chiefly secondary industries, only to the extent of £15,000 during the remainder of this year.

The Premier: A good deal of money has been expended in that direction already. The Industries Assistance Board have paid out over £100,000.

Hon. P. COLLIER: But this item has nothing to do with the Industries Assistance Board.

The Premier: Yes, it has.

Hon. P. COLLIER: No; the Premier is wrong. This item is concerned only with the establishment of secondary industries. Knowing that only £15,000 is to be devoted to that purpose during the remainder of the year, I wonder how long it will be before we shall see the realisation of the industrial future forecasted by the member for Coolgarlie yesterday and to-day for Western Australia. The Council of Industrial Development was established, I believe, by Mr. Robinson, when Minister for Industries a few years ago. The establishment has grown, and for the first time we have on this year's Revenue Estimates what is practically an industrial department, with a total vote of £2,720, the portion set aside in administrative cost being £1,810. The latter amount will represent the cost of distributing the £15,000 to which I previously referred. There is a secretary and the usual office clerk and typist.

We know how these departments are apt to grow.

Mr. Pickering: This new department is doing effective work.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I make no complaint about the work done by the Council of Industrial Development. I know the members of that council have devoted much time gratuitously to the service of the country with a view to the establishment of secondary industries here. But the Government started in the wrong way. The council were the creation of an administrative act. We ought to have a Council of Industrial Development; but that council ought to be erected by Parliament, and have statutory powers, and be controlled by Parliament, and report to Parliament. Such a council should not be the creation of any individual Minister. The members of it should not be chosen by any Minister personally, though in saying this I desire to cast no reflection whatever on the present membership of the council. The members of that council should, if necessary, be paid, and certainly they ought to be representative of every section of the community. I hope that next year the Premier will bring down a Bill to establish the council on a proper footing and with definite powers. The council can exercise considerable influence on the expenditure of public funds, because any strong recommendation made by the council to the Minister would have great weight with him. The council might recommend that assistance to the amount of, say, £100,000 be granted towards the establishment of an industry here; and such a council should not be appointed by a Minister, and should not be responsible only to a Minister. The council should be treated by Parliament with statutory powers, and be responsible to Parliament. I believe the council have so far been somewhat of a failure, or have not accomplished as much as it was thought, when they were established, that they would accomplish. That comparative failure has been due largely to the fact that they have had no statutory powers, and that they have experienced several changes of Ministers. They have never known from month to month when a new Minister would be appointed who would completely reverse the policy of his predecessor. In such circumstances, no body of this kind could do effective work. I do not wish to weary the Committee by citing once more the frequently quoted figures of the imports into Western Australia of goods and commodities in which this State ought to be meeting its own requirements, and of which it should, moreover, be producing large quantities for export. Time might well be devoted by Parliament to the matter of the adequate establishment of a Council of Industrial Development, in view of the numbers of bright young boys and girls of school age who at present have no opportunity of learning trades here. Many of them are turned out with a first-class primary education to become, so to speak, hewers of wood and draw-

ers of water. As things are at present, the probabilities point to our having to import operatives from other parts of the world when we do establish secondary industries here, while our young Western Australians will have become unskilled labourers. To my knowledge, hundreds of parents have left this State during recent years for the East with children at the age when it was necessary for them to look out for employment. The parents were anxious to secure for their children opportunities of learning trades, and those opportunities were and are offering only in the great manufacturing cities of the Eastern States. In this way we have lost very many valuable citizens. Therefore I consider that public time and public money devoted to the establishment of an effective Council of Industrial Development would be time and money well spent.

Mr. PICKERING: I congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on his speech, but I must give an unqualified denial to his statement that the Country Party got funds for a private company from the Government. I give the Committee an emphatic assurance that the Country Party have never been approached by the directors of the company in question to obtain any assistance from the Government. Neither can the Government say that they have been approached by any member of this party in that connection.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Roads and Bridges, Public Buildings, etc., £72,000.

Item, New roads and bridges in country and goldfields districts (including feeders for railways and grants to local authorities), £35,000:

Hon. P. COLLIER: Can the Minister for Works inform me how much has already been expended from this item on the Rockingham-Mandurah-road and on the Collie-Brunswick-road?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I have not the figures with me, but I believe that on the Rockingham-Mandurah-road something like £9,000 has been spent.

Hon. P. Collier: Is the road completed?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It will be completed in three or four weeks, so far as the Government are concerned. I believe something like the same amount has been spent on the Collie-Brunswick-road.

Hon. P. Collier: Is that road completed?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No. The gang of men have been shifted to Hamilton Hill, near Worsley, where it has been found that by a deviation a better road can be obtained, though it will be a few chains longer. The road from Collie to Brunswick was started at the instance of the Collie traders, and of people at Harvey who wanted to get through to Bunbury, this road reducing the distance for them from 70 or 80 miles to 35 or 38 miles.

Hon. P. Collier: Will the Government have to construct this road right through?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No. The road cannot be constructed as a first-class road, because we cannot metal it. Our greatest difficulty has been on the road out from Brunswick and we had to put in a large number of small bridges to get through. We made use of one of Millars' old timber lines which had been abandoned. We went under a bridge of the railway and used a mile and a half of the company's formation. They did not like it but that did not matter. The work will be found to be of great convenience in the future.

Item, Public buildings (including sewerage, and equipment new buildings), £32,000:

Mr. MUNSIE: On page 27 of the Loan Estimates details appear showing the work proposed to be carried out during the current financial year. Strange to say nearly all the schools included under that heading appear to be high schools or secondary schools. It is most remarkable that requests can be made for months on end for a school in an outback centre without any satisfaction being obtained. Now when the Loan Estimates come forward again, I find that no provision has been made for the school I have in mind. The details show that there is provision for the Bunbury High School, the Northam High School, including equipment, fittings, and furniture, and also head master's quarters. Then there is provision for the Perth Modern School and the Pinjarra school. I do not know whether that is a secondary school or a high school.

The Minister for Works: That is a common sense school.

Mr. MUNSIE: Then it is an ordinary school. There is reference at the end of the details which I have mentioned to provision for "public buildings and additions generally as may be authorised." I take it from that that a certain amount is available for the building of smaller schools elsewhere. That being so, I want to again voice my protest regarding the delay in providing the only school I have asked for in ten years. Nine months ago I asked for a school at Celebration, where we have 30 children at present without any means of securing education. The married men have to live at Celebration and leave their children at Kalgoorlie or Boulder in order that they may receive their schooling. I would be lacking in my duty if I did not raise my protest against the delay in providing the school facilities that are necessary at Celebration.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Provision may have been made on the general Estimates.

Mr. MUNSIE: No, there was no provision there, nor is there any provision on the Loan Estimates. I mentioned the matter to the Minister for Works and I received a letter a day or two ago, pointing out that the people at Celebration had undertaken to provide a room for school purposes on the understanding that the Government provided

the teacher and the necessary fittings. I have ascertained that the room which the people had in mind has now been burnt down so that, as a matter of fact, there is no room available at Celebration. I was told that if sufficient money was available, a school would be removed from Bulong and re-erected at Celebration. Now, I understand, that the Bulong school has been re-erected elsewhere.

The Minister for Works: That is correct.

Mr. MUNSIE: Then that is over the odds. If I do not get a definite promise from the Government before the session closes, I will make a noise regarding this matter.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The member for Hannans desires to know what was to be done with the balance. Of that amount, £4,300 has been expended in connection with the electric lighting at the Claremont Hospital for the Insane and £1,200 for the water service at the Old Men's Home. I freely admit that there is cause for complaint regarding the school at Celebration. I promise to see what can be done when the Treasurer liberates funds to enable me to proceed with works appearing on the Estimates. The hon. member has just cause for complaint regarding the way his application has been dealt with.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Other undertakings, £214,650.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I want to draw the attention of hon. members to this particular Vote, on account of a statement which appeared in the Press recently commenting on the financial statement of the Treasurer for the six months ended December 31st. The "West Australian" published a leading-article which contained these words—

The net debit on the trading concerns for December was £35,703. This was an addition to working capital, the money being provided from loan or trust funds. As money, including the charges for raising it, is now costing the State about 3 13s. per cent., the frightful drain upon our resources created by the necessity of finding endless capital for the trading concerns will be apparent. The Premier has frequently evidenced his knowledge that the public utilities—vast works with too few productive people to keep them in profitable occupation—are at the root of our troubles.

We are providing £214,000 from loan moneys and I want to know from the Government whether they are providing loan moneys for transference to consolidated revenue to bolster up the financial statement.

The Minister for Works: No.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: In the financial statement published a few days ago, there was transferred the balance from the State trading concerns accounts amounting to £43,000 and recoups for departmental charges, interest, etc., £32,611, or a total of £75,611. The position is that £32,611 is a recoup for

charges in connection with officers' work in the Departments.

The Premier: No.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The interest is the amount due to the Government for interest on undertakings and money advanced. The Minister for Works: We have paid that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I know, and the total is £75,611. There has been a further amount transferred. What is that for?

The Premier: Profits, I suppose.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The "West Australian" was perfectly correct in its statement, and later on in the article attention is drawn to the banking account of the State trading concerns, and it is shown that the banking account is overdrawn to the extent of £33,703.

The Premier: It is more than that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: How can it be, seeing that this is a statement by the Treasury? To enable the State trading concerns banking account at the Treasury to be overdrawn to that extent, the Government transferred £43,000 odd to consolidated revenue, or £7,297 more than the amount I have referred to, namely, £35,703.

The Premier: We did not get enough to cover the interest on all these concerns.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Why was that?

The Premier: How can we charge it and then charge against it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Treasury has drawn the interest.

The Premier: Yes, but not sufficient to cover the loss.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is for the month. There may be interest on previous months.

The Premier: No.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: At any rate, for this period it was £32,611, and the Premier says that that represented profits. To enable the Government to show that amount of profit, they drew from the trading concerns account, to show the profit in consolidated revenue. Had that money been left in the trading concerns account for the time being, they would have shown a credit balance of £7,000 instead of an overdraft of £75,000.

Mr. Munsie: On which they had to pay interest.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is how the finances are bolstered up.

The Premier: That is not so.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is in accordance with the published statement.

The Premier: I know, but we did not get enough interest to pay on all the State trading concerns.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I can only go on the figures which have been published and they show the recoup for departmental charges, interest, etc., at £32,611.

Mr. Mann: That is the statement in the Press.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: But the figures are supplied by the Treasury. Then there is another amount of £43,000 transferred from the State Trading Concerns Estimates. This, the Premier says, is profit. If this profit had not been transferred, then instead of the bank account showing a debit of £35,703, there would have

been a credit of £7,297. To enable our finances to show a surplus of £93,000 on the month's transactions, £43,000 was taken from State Trading Concerns, leaving a debit.

Mr. Mann: Is that good finance?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No. I am showing that the State Trading Concerns have assisted Consolidated Revenue to their disadvantage.

Mr. Mann: You do not object to that?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do, because it gives the Press an opportunity to put things in a wrong light.

The Minister for Works: You do not take notice of newspaper articles, do you?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I think the Minister for Works takes more notice of them than does anybody else. To-morrow or the next day, probably, we shall have sent to us another circular letter pointing out the position of the State Trading Concerns on the 31st December. Even the writer of this newspaper article knew well that the Treasurer had drawn £43,000 from the State Trading Concerns to increase Consolidated Revenue. That is the position. Had the State Trading Concerns not been in existence, the surplus last month would have been £50,000 instead of £93,000.

The Minister for Mines: You are treating the State Trading Concerns as a whole, whereas they are not treated in that way by the Treasury.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: They must be taken all together.

The Minister for Works: No. Under the Act they have to be kept separate.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That has been a mistake right through.

Mr. Munsie: That is where the Act is unfair.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I want the Premier to tell those who urge him to sell the State Trading Concerns that he cannot do it, because they help to build up Consolidated Revenue; and to advise them to establish private concerns to provide the local markets, instead of importing from the other States. Some of those people are displeased with the Minister for Works because he is trading in agricultural implements; yet during November of last year £33,375 worth of agricultural implements were imported, together with £16,672 worth of other machinery, and £22,177 worth of other metal manufactures. Apart altogether from the State Implement Works, there is ample room for private persons to open up similar industries.

The Minister for Works: They could get all the engineering trade if they bestirred themselves, but they are too damned lazy.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: They prefer to do, as the member for Coolgardie would say, stick up a brass plate, get the goods manufactured in Victoria, and so keep up the population there, while keeping down our population here.

Mr. Mann: They do not all want that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: A large proportion of them do. However, I have brought this matter before members to show that during the last six months Consolidated Revenue has benefited through the State Trading Concerns to the tune of £43,000.

The PREMIER: Each of the State Trading Concerns stands alone. That is prescribed by the Act. We got £43,000 from different undertakings, but it was not sufficient to pay interest

on them all. Whilst we secured a profit from one or two concerns, we got no profit at all from others, notwithstanding which we had to pay interest on them, although we could not get a recoup. On the Wyndham Meat Works alone we paid £37,000 interest. Under the Act we have to keep the trading concerns separately.

Mr. MUNSIE: That is where the Act is unfair. I agree that the Premier is entitled to transfer £43,000 from the State Trading Concerns to Consolidated Revenue. But no private firm could carry on under the conditions of the State Trading Act. The Premier has admitted that some of the concerns showed a profit of £43,000 or more. But would any private firm, running that business, put away the £43,000 and, next month, borrow £35,000 from another institution and pay interest on the borrowed money? That is what the Act compels the Treasurer to do. In the year in which the State Trading Concerns returned a profit of £90,000, that £90,000 was transferred to Consolidated Revenue in June, and in July the Treasury advanced to the State Trading Concerns £50,000, on which the trading concerns had to pay interest, although they had paid £90,000 into Consolidated Revenue in the previous month. No private firm could or would carry on under those conditions. The Act requires amendment.

Item, Steamships £121,622:

Mr. LATHAM: This seems a large amount. I should like to know if the Minister proposes to build some ferry boats to run across to South Perth.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Lands Improvement Loan Fund, £34,580—agreed to.

Resolutions reported and the report adopted.

#### BILL—WORKERS' HOMES ACT AMENDMENT.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

#### BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT.

Referred to Select Committee.

(Order of the day read for the consideration of the Bill in Committee.)

Mr. MANN (Perth) [10-0]: I move—

That the Bill be referred to a select committee.

In doing so, I am influenced by the fact that notice has been given of just on 60 amendments which members propose to move to the Bill, and there are still other amendments to be put on the Notice Paper. There are so many conflicting interests—

The Minister for Works: And so much bad beer.

Mr. MANN: I do not know about that. There are so many interests that desire to be heard that the only way to get the true opinion of the people is by means of inquiry by select committee.

The Minister for Works: A committee of the whole House.

Mr. MANN: I doubt whether it could be obtained in that way, and that is the reason why I am moving for the appointment of a select committee. If we attempted to consider all the amendments of which notice has been given, we would be here for probably a month or six weeks debating the matter, and even then we would probably not obtain what Parliament or the people desired. I have been interviewed by, and have received pamphlets and circulars, from various societies in my electorate in which a large number of interests are represented, and I am satisfied that the best way to deal with the measure will be by inquiry by select committee.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [10-2]: The member for Perth has tried to explain himself, but he will now realise that the people of this State are not in accord with most of the Bills which have been introduced.

Mr. Mann: I did not say that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not know why the hon. member did not have the courage to vote against the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. Mann: It would have caused the Bill to be thrown out, and I was not in favour of that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The very action which the hon. member has taken to-night will result in the Bill being thrown out; select committees cannot sit after the end of the session.

Mr. Mann: But the select committee can be converted into a Royal Commission.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Government should be responsible for such legislation as this. There would be plenty of time during the recess for the Government to reconsider the Bill and introduce another measure next session. The member for Perth did not have the pluck to vote against the second reading.

Mr. Mann: That is your opinion.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Since a bit of pressure has been brought to bear on the hon. member from outside, he realises that he must block the Bill at all costs.

Mr. Mann: You can get that out of your mind.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The fact of the hon. member having moved that the Bill be referred to a select committee shows clearly what his intention is. He says in effect that he wants to kill the Bill.

Mr. Mann: I want to amend the Bill.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I repeat what I said on the second reading that the Bill is not worth the paper it is printed on, but I had the courage to vote according to my conviction.

The Premier: Why did you say that?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Because I realised that the Bill represented a backward step, but the member for Perth supported the second reading. There was no talk then of referring the Bill to a select committee. Now, in the last stages, the hon. member asks the Premier to assist him to defeat the Bill in an indirect manner, instead of acting straightforwardly and openly so that every member could discuss the Bill. The hon. member should be aware that Bills, after being referred to a select committee, are rarely altered by Parliament. The majority of members generally take the view that a select committee gives a Bill the fullest consideration, and in nine cases out of ten the recommendations of the select committee are adopted and the Bill goes through with very slight alteration.

The Minister for Mines: I warrant that a licensing Bill would not; send it where you like.

Hon. W. C. ANGLWIN: As a general rule that is the experience. No better committee than the whole of the members of this House could consider this Bill. We do not want any inquiry behind closed doors. I hope that the next time the hon. member wishes to shelve a Bill, he will do so in a straightforward way by opposing the second reading.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell - Northam) [10-5]: I think this Bill is perfectly simple and one easily understood. It is a non-party measure, but apparently it is not approved by the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin). I think it is a very good Bill.

Mr. Munsie: It is a revenue Bill instead of a licensing Bill.

The PREMIER: It is a revenue Bill; we are entitled to some revenue from the trade, and it is also a licensing Bill.

Mr. Munsie: Not it.

The PREMIER: It has not met with the approval of some of my friends of the temperance organisations, and it has not met with the full approval of my friends who would be compelled to pay the tax. I do not know why my temperance friends have not approved of it, because it goes a very long way to introduce temperance reform. I suppose no liquor Bill would ever be approved by the temperance people, or even by the people who want a drink or by those who sell liquor. This is a non-party Bill, entirely in the control of the House. I do not know quite what the select committee will be able to find, but if members think a select committee can obtain information which they do not possess now, I have no objection to its appointment. We want the Bill; we ought to be getting more revenue from the trade. Every member will realise that the cost of this trade to the State is very considerable, and the State has to be recouped so some extent in that regard. If further inquiry were necessary, I could make it during the recess and bring down a Bill next session, but I think I have made all the inquiry that is necessary. If a select committee be appointed and can get further information, the House can then consider the Bill, fortified by that knowledge. I do not know that it will mean much.

Mr. Munsie: I do not think it will stop discussion when the Bill comes down again.

The PREMIER: I do not think it will. The whole position is simple. I have endeavoured to put up a Bill which will give effective control of the liquor traffic and, so far as I can judge, the Bill will achieve that. If members wish the Bill to go to a select committee, however, I have no strong objection to the adoption of that course.

Question put and passed.

Ballot taken and a select committee appointed as follows:—Mr. McCallum, Mr. O'Loughlen, Mr. Pickering, Mr. Richardson, and the mover Mr. Mann.

Mr. Mann: I move—

That the committee have power to call for persons and papers to sit on days over which the House stands adjourned, and to report that day two weeks.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I do not feel inclined to remain here until this day two weeks, and I do not think any other member does. I move an amendment—

That the words "two weeks" be struck out and "this day six months" inserted in lieu.

The Premier: I would accept this day week.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I am ashamed to think that this House is not capable of taking the responsibility of dealing with the Bill to-night instead of referring it to a select committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member should have discussed that on the motion for the appointment of a select committee.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I am opposed to the motion and hope my amendment will be carried.

Mr. SPEAKER: The amendment lapses for want of a seconder.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: This is only an indirect way of killing the Bill.

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

Ayes ...	...	...	29
Noes ...	...	...	7

Majority for ... 22

#### AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. H. K. Maley
Mr. Broun	Mr. Mann
Mr. Carter	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Chesson	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Money
Mr. Collier	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Davies	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Denton	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Jurack	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. George	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. J. Thomson
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Latham	Mr. Mullany
Mr. C. C. Maley	(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Heron	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Corboy
Mr. Munsie	(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

*House adjourned at 10-30 p.m.*