

obtain refreshments, both solid and liquid.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: What is meant by "solid"?

Hon. Sir CHARLES NATHAN: Say, eggs and bacon. For a period of 15 or 16 years one person has held this temporary license. Under the Act as it stands, it has been necessary for him to apply every week for a temporary license. The Act also requires that a temporary license should be held by a person who already holds a general license. As I am informed, the present holder of the temporary license has carried out the work to the satisfaction of everybody concerned; but as he does not hold a general license, it has been necessary for him to use the license of another trading concern. In addition to paying £75 per annum for the temporary license, he pays a yearly rental of £52, and furthermore has to pay for the convenience of using another person's name. The Bill provides for two slight amendments which will enable the temporary license to be granted, at the will of the Minister and subject to proper conditions, for a maximum period of five weeks, thus obviating the necessity for making weekly applications. Sometimes an application was made for Tuesday and Wednesday, and then a special sale was held on Friday, rendering it necessary to make a second application in the same week. Just why a period of five weeks has been chosen I do not know. Probably it has been considered undesirable to extend the period of the temporary license too far. Five weeks may have been selected to cover a full month, so that application need be made only once per month. The license can only be utilised on days upon which sales are held. The accommodation is of great convenience to the men who have to work at the saleyards. Further, it is undesirable that the holder of the temporary license should have to pay a third party for the privilege of using his name. If the Bill becomes law, it will save that added impost, and, in addition, will obviate the necessity for constant applications, perhaps twice a week, and certainly four times a month all the year round. I do not know that there is occasion to make further explanations. The Bill is a simple measure and if my explanation so far has not been sufficient, I may be able to elucidate any doubtful points in Committee.

Hon. G. Fraser: Will the Bill cover temporary licenses at country shows?

Hon. Sir CHARLES NATHAN: No. The Bill specifically applies to Midland Junction alone.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. C. F. Baxter—East) [4.47]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, the 17th inst.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 4.48 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 11th November, 1931.

	PAGE
Questions: Pastoral leases, Kimberley rents ...	5162
Bread contracts, prices ...	5163
Bills: Land Tax and Income Tax (No. 2), Council's amendments ...	5163
Salvation Army (W.A.) Property Trust, returned ...	5164
Land Agents Act Amendment, 2R., Com. ...	5164
Land Act Amendment 2R., Com. ...	5168
Loan Estimates: Message, Committee of Supply ...	5164
Annual Estimates: Votes and Items discussed ...	5167
Child Welfare and Outdoor Relief ...	5167
Aborigines' Native Stations ...	5177
State Trading Concerns ...	5178

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

QUESTION—PASTORAL INDUSTRY, KIMBERLEY RENTS.

Mr. COVERLEY asked the Minister for Lands: 1, What is the total amount collected from pastoral rents in the West Kimberley district annually? 2, What is the total annual amount collected from the East Kimberley pastoral district?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, £11,083 collectable annually. 2, £8,435 collectable annually.

QUESTIONS (3)—BREAD, CONTRACT PRICES.

Hospital for Insane.

Mr. RAPHAEL asked the Minister for Lands: What was the contract price for bread supplied to the institutions under his control for the financial years ended the 30th June, 1929, 1930, and 1931?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1929, 1 5/16d. per lb.; 1930, 1 9/16d. per lb.; 1931, 1 3/16d. per lb. The Claremont Hospital for the Insane is the only institution concerned in the question so far as the Chief Secretary's Department is concerned.

Other Institutions.

Mr. RAPHAEL asked the Minister for Health: What was the contract price for bread supplied to the institutions under his control for the financial years ended the 30th June, 1929, 1930 and 1931?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH replied: Old Men's Home—1929, 1 5/16d. per lb.; 1930, 1 9/16d. per lb.; 1931, 1 3/16d. per lb. Old Women's Home—1929, 2 37/100d. per lb.; 1930, 2 11/50d. per lb.; 1931, 1 38d. per lb. King Edward Memorial Hospital—1929, 1 1/4d. per lb.; 1930, 1 1/4d. per lb.; 1931, 1 5/31d. per lb. If similar information is required concerning Government hospitals, some time will be required to obtain the particulars.

Blackboy and Hovea Camps.

Mr. RAPHAEL asked the Minister for Railways: What was the contract price for bread supplied to Blackboy and Hovea camps for the financial year ended the 30th June, 1931?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1 3/16d. per lb.

BILL—LAND TAX AND INCOME TAX (No. 2).

Council's Requested Amendments.

Schedule of three amendments requested by the Council to the Bill, now considered.

In Committee.

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

No. 1. Clause 2.—Delete the word "the" where it first appears in line 14 of the further proviso, and insert in lieu thereof the word "such."

The PREMIER: I move—

That the amendment be made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 2. Clause 2.—Delete all words after "tax" in line 14 down to and inclusive of the word "Section" in line 16.

The PREMIER: I move—

That the amendment be made.

The effect of the amendment is to strike out words which were suggested in this Chamber to be really superfluous. It will not affect the meaning of the clause at all.

Hon. P. Collier: Then why were they included in the Bill originally?

The PREMIER: As the hon. member knows, such things do creep into Bills.

Hon. A. McCallum: It gives the Council an opportunity to strike out something. That seems to be their habit.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 3. Clause 6.—Delete.

The PREMIER: I move—

That the amendment be made.

When the Bill was before the Committee here, the Leader of the Opposition advanced a similar suggestion.

Hon. P. Collier: I moved a similar amendment but withdrew it on the assurance of the Attorney General that provision would be made in another Bill to meet the position.

The PREMIER: I gave notice this afternoon of my intention to introduce a Bill that will make this clause unnecessary.

Hon. P. Collier: Is that to make provision for spreading payments?

The PREMIER: Yes. The Bill I will introduce will amend the Land and Income Tax Assessment Act in order to make provision for spreading the payments of taxation.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: Would not the members of the Legislative Council accept a similar assurance from the Leader of the House there?

The PREMIER: I do not know.

Hon. P. Collier: We accepted such an assurance from the Government here, and I withdrew my amendment. Apparently the Council will not accept the assurance of the representative of the Government there.

The PREMIER: I do not know what happened there.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: They are more suspicious there.

The PREMIER: I have not read the debate that took place in the Council.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly transmitted to the Council.

BILL—SALVATION ARMY (WESTERN AUSTRALIA) PROPERTY TRUST.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

LOAN ESTIMATES, 1931-32.

Message.

Message from the Administrator received and read, transmitting the Loan Estimates for the year 1931-32 and recommending appropriation.

In Committee of Supply.

The House having resolved into Committee of Supply to consider the Loan Estimates; Mr. Richardson in the Chair,

Vote—Departmental, £79,849:

THE PREMIER AND TREASURER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [4.47]: When introducing the Loan Estimates last year I directed attention to the small amount then proposed to be expended, and stressed the difficulty of raising loan funds. This year the amount is even smaller. The sum asked for last year was £2,438,295, and the amount expended was £1,759,263. The sum covered by these Estimates totals £1,459,840. The difficulty of raising money that existed last year has greatly increased. We have funds in sight at present sufficient

to carry us on until the end of December only. I think the position may ease sufficiently to enable the Loan Council to provide a larger amount of loan money for the remainder of the year. I do not think there will be any difficulty in raising the sum of £1,200,000, which is our proportion of the total loan funds which the Loan Council agreed should be raised. From time to time repayments are made to Loan Reserve Account, which this year will amount to about £200,000. That will be added to the £1,200,000 that we shall borrow, and so I am asking the Committee to agree to a total loan expenditure of £1,459,840. Under the Financial Agreement loan money repaid to the Government must be re-voted for other loan works. Members know that meetings of the Loan Council were frequent during the last financial year, and extended over long periods. Everyone realises also that the question of finance has become increasingly difficult. It is almost impossible to provide sufficient funds to meet the high expenditure on unemployment relief and exchange, and to carry on the services—due to the heavy falling-off of revenue collections—and find a limited amount to cover our loan commitments. I should be very glad if I could say that the outlook for the current year had in any way improved over that of last year. We hope that the increased prices of primary products will brighten the situation, and that the position generally will improve. I think it has already improved owing to the increased prices of wheat and wool, and the increased production of gold as well as the increased price of gold. Notwithstanding that business will have improved and will, I hope, still further improve, that cannot affect our receipts for some time to come. It is certain that traders and other people will revert to easier times long before the Treasury can receive much benefit.

The expenditure for last year was spread over the various divisions as follows:—

	£
Departmental	116,309
Railways, etc.	447,315
Harbours and rivers	117,840
Water supplies	200,138
Development of goldfields	28,515
Development of agriculture	846,292
Roads and bridges, etc.	2,854
Total	<u>£1,759,263</u>

The estimates for this year are as follows:—

	£
Departmental	79,849
Railways, etc.	141,258
Harbours and rivers	66,100
Water supplies, irrigation and drainage	408,616
Development of goldfields	20,000
Development of agriculture	747,717
Roads and bridges, etc.	1,300
Total	£1,459,840

The principal works carried out last year were—

	£
Kulja railway	107,348
Bridgetown-Jarnadup railway	49,985
Lake Grace-Karigarin railway	96,847
Meekatharra-Wiluna railway	34,824
Fremantle harbour works	61,238
Geraldton harbour works	49,348
Water supply and sewerage, Perth and Fremantle	58,191
Water supply in agricultural areas	117,760
Agricultural Bank, Soldier settlement, etc.	595,033
Group settlements	201,326

The expenditure of the Agricultural Bank was much greater than is shown here, an additional £200,000 having been provided by the Commonwealth Bank to assist farmers to extend their operations.

Hon. J. C. Willecock: Under the Finance and Development Board Act?

The PREMIER: Yes. That sum was lent to the board direct by the Commonwealth Bank. Later in the year £400,000 was provided through the medium of the Finance and Development Board to cover the purchase of sacks, fertilisers, etc., and make advances to keep farmers on their holdings. All of that money has not been used, but the greater part of it has been. The money was lent direct to the Finance and Development Board and will be repayable when money is raised. A good deal of this money should come back to the bank, because much of it was in the nature of temporary advances against the growing crop. If it is repaid, I hope it will be available for the same purpose next year.

Hon. J. C. Willecock: I hope it will not be so badly needed.

The PREMIER: I hope the need will not be so great as it was last year, but I am afraid it will be great, because even now the price of wheat is not very high, although it has greatly improved. The total

expenditure of the Agricultural Bank, under its various sections, for the year, was—

	£
Agricultural Bank	398,734
Soldier Settlement scheme	39,369
Industries Assistance Board	256,930
Total	£1,195,033

With the exception of the Agricultural Bank and group settlement activities, this year's proposed expenditure is almost wholly for the relief of unemployment. Members will see that so far as possible works have been chosen on which the greatest percentage of the expenditure would represent wages and the least percentage material. That is absolutely essential until times brighten. We could not possibly spend much money on material when we have to find work for so many people who are unemployed.

Hon. J. C. Willecock: Unless you procured the material locally.

The PREMIER: That would make a difference, but even then the overhead charges included in the price would take something from the amount of wages that we would otherwise be able to pay. Locally-made material is always bought where possible. Now we can obtain local cement and most of the other materials we need. As usual the greatest amount asked for under any one division is for the development of agriculture. There are always heavy commitments for the Agricultural Bank, but they are not so great at present owing to the uncertainty of raising money. In the old days the bank often had more than £1,000,000 and even up to £1,500,000 standing as authorised loans against work to be done. If that were so to-day, the position would be very uncomfortable. However, the amount is now down to a manageable sum. This is unfortunate as it reduces employment, but that cannot be helped because the borrowing of money is so uncertain. This year the activities controlled by the Agricultural Bank account for £600,000, made up as follows:—

	£
Agricultural Bank	450,000
Soldier Settlement scheme	20,000
Industries Assistance Board	100,000
Group settlement	30,000
Total	£600,000

Next in order of importance come water supplies and sewerage, the total of which is £403,616. This amount includes the irrigation schemes in hand and proposed. Provision for metropolitan water supply and sewerage will be found in another amount of £115,000. Of the sum of £403,616, the provision for water supplies, irrigation and drainage in the agricultural districts represents £210,000. Those works will largely be constructed along the railway line between Pinjarra and Collie. Such undertakings appear at the moment to be most promising and most capable of giving an early return, because there is so much in the way of foodstuffs we now import that can be produced locally. I think I told members some time ago that it was hoped the firm of Nestles would establish a factory for condensed milk at Waroona. They have purchased a site, and I understand they have commenced the erection of the works. A small factory is already operating at Harvey. It will produce about £500 worth of tinned milk per week. We now import £4,000 worth. That will be something off the import list. If Nestles go ahead they will be able within a year or two to supply the balance. We import large quantities of cheese and other produce, which can only be processed here when the milk is available at the factories. This will come about when the land is under irrigation. Works undertaken in the metropolitan area will help to relieve the unemployment situation. They are not productive in the same sense as is country work. The payment of interest is represented by a tax upon the people who are served by these conveniences. In the country people are taxed under the Irrigation and Drainage Act, but production is the important thing.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: On the other hand we are sure of getting our money back.

The PREMIER: Yes. Work in the country is very different from other work which returns interest by way of a tax, this being a burden on the people.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Surely it is necessary work.

The PREMIER: Yes, but in these bad times it means additional taxation. It is not quite the same thing as money spent in the country. The sum of £65,000 has been provided for the goldfields water supply. This will be almost wholly expended

on the overhauling and renewal of the pipe track. Year by year, for some years, considerable expenditure has had to be faced to keep the pipe track in order. It is more than 30 years since the original pipes were laid, and the wonder is we have not had more trouble. Soon after I first came to Parliament the Minister for Works of the day declared that the pipes would not last very much longer. That was quite 25 years ago. They have, however, stood up to the strain, though at a considerable annual expenditure, for the whole of the 30 years. They really are now needing an increasing amount spent upon them.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: I would not like the engineer's job of keeping the track going this year for £60,000.

The PREMIER: It will be a difficult job. Most of the original pipes are still on the track. It would be a fearful thing to have a breakdown of any consequence. The Kalgoorlie centre depends upon the daily supply of water, and the agricultural areas are also dependent upon it. Stock would perish in some cases if there was a serious breakdown in the pipe line between Northam and Southern Cross. There have been renewals from time to time.

Hon. P. Collier: Very extensive ones.

The PREMIER: Sections have been relaid.

Hon. P. Collier: Nearly the whole length has been relaid during its life-time.

The PREMIER: Oh no!

Hon. P. Collier: Yes.

The PREMIER: Many of the old pipes are still there. Bad patches have had to be relaid, and lately we have been lining pipes, which has added to their life. A good many miles of the old pipes are still on the line. These are now being uncovered, inspected, and attended to. In work of this kind one has to be guided by the advice of the engineer in charge. No one else knows very much about the work or what is required. Repairs and renewals are becoming more expensive. When work of any sort is undertaken, whether it be harbours, railways, water supplies, sewerage works or anything else, it has to be kept up. In times of tightness the upkeep becomes a serious burden.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: When it becomes a great burden the question arises as to whether it can be borne.

The PREMIER: The thing is to get the money with which to carry on these works. We shall have to face very considerable expenditure. Although £132,000 has been set down for railways and tramways, only £10,000 is for a new work, namely, the Boyup Brook-Cranbrook line. Of the remainder, £20,000 is to carry on the Bridgetown-Jarnadup extension, which has been in hand for some time. For ballasting the Lake Grace-Kalgarrin line £20,000 is provided, and £28,000 for the Meekatharra-Wiluna line. A small amount, £4,000, has been allowed for rolling stock this year, and the usual provision has been made for rails and fastenings, water supplies, etc. A tremendous amount of money was spent on rolling stock during the term of the previous Government, and we are fairly well supplied for some time to come. I should like to say a word or two about the East Perth power house. Only a small amount has been set aside for minor works. Before the depression set in the demand for current was rapidly approaching the full capacity of the station.

Mr. Kenneally: And it will do so again when things brighten up.

The PREMIER: I hope so. For the moment that is not the case. It was thought that further extensions would have to be put in hand some time ago. Each unit, however, costs a large sum of money, which has not been available. A great proportion of the money spent in this direction goes overseas, for we must buy the plant there. It is impossible to face such expenditure at the moment. Meanwhile, the demand for current has fallen off very considerably owing to the depression. As suggested by the member for East Perth, I hope the demand for current will ultimately be restored, and that an increasing number of factories will take it.

Mr. Kenneally: I hope that will be so.

The PREMIER: Of course it will.

Mr. Kenneally: The question is how we shall cope with the demand when it occurs.

The PREMIER: The question is how to get the money for the extensions. When we do these things they always require an annual expenditure for repairs and maintenance. In the case of the power station, from time to time an additional unit has had to be added.

Mr. Kenneally: Our advocacy of buying home products will be useless if we are not able to supply the current.

The PREMIER: That is not the only power that can be used in secondary industries, but it is a convenient form of power.

Mr. Kenneally: And cheaper than others.

The PREMIER: It is fairly cheap. It is not much cheaper than producer gas. All the mills and factories outside the metropolitan area run on power other than electricity. That will have to be the case with some of the factories which I hope will be established fairly soon. There has been a remarkable development on the goldfields, and an increase in gold production. Last year we spent £28,000 only from loans, and this year £20,000 has been set aside for the development of mining, including State batteries.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: There is £5,000 for State batteries.

The PREMIER: Yes, but £20,000 is the amount set aside. When we had a larger vote we were paying £45,000 to the Water Supply Department in reduction of the cost of water to the Kalgoorlie goldfields. We are now unable to provide that money, and there is therefore a reduction in the vote. I hope we shall be able to raise the money covering these Estimates in order that we may carry out these works, but it is by no means certain we shall be able to do so. I hope the Estimates will be passed.

Progress reported.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1931-32.

In Committee of Supply.

Resumed from the previous day; Mr. Richardson in the Chair.

Vote—Child Welfare and Outdoor Relief, £607,000?

MR. SLEEMAN (Fremantle) [5.14]: The sum of £480,000 is provided for unemployment relief. Large as this is, it is not large enough to cover what should be done to face the position in which we find ourselves. There are many large families which seem not to be getting enough to keep body and soul together. Whilst small families may be getting just enough to keep them from absolute starvation, there are

large families in my district which are experiencing a very serious time. I have one case in mind, a family of ten that is getting £2 9s. per week. There is the hard and fast rule that the maximum number of children to be allowed for shall not exceed five, no matter how many there may be in the family, although occasionally relief can be obtained for one child over 14 years of age.

Mr. H. W. Mann: It is more liberal than the systems in the other States.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Well, even if they are allowed to starve in the other States—which I do not say they are—that is no reason why they should be allowed to starve here. Some of them are getting plenty of work, but unfortunately they are not getting very much money for the work they are doing. I appeal to the Minister not to make it a hard and fast rule that the ordinary maximum shall be five children with the possibility that one child over 14 years of age may be added. The Minister for Lands knows the family to which I am referring, because they have been to see him on various occasions and are still hoping to be repatriated to the Old Country. The family are practically starving at present because the meagre amount allowed to them by the department is not sufficient to keep them in food alone, and gives them no chance whatever of getting clothes and boots. It seems to me the Government are not trying to employ men on a living wage, but that there is a movement afoot to keep the man who was in a semi-permanent job down to the level of the sustenance worker. Apparently there is no chance of building a worker up, for all are trying to drag him down to the level of the sustenance people. Take the instance of the harbour works in Fremantle. Before the new system of employing a man for £1 a week plus sustenance was adopted, the men there were employed two weeks on and one week off. For the three weeks a man's earnings averaged £2 7s. 6d. a week. That was a very small sum for a man to exist upon, but now the same man who was averaging £2 7s. 6d. a week under the old system, is reduced to £1 14s. per week, while a man with one child has been reduced from £2 7s. 6d. per week to £2 1s. per week. In addition, those men are charged 2d. per day or 1s. per week for the ferry, many of them have to pay a couple of shillings per week in tram

fares, and while they are supposed to pay hospital tax at the rate of 1½d. in the pound, the Harbour Works at times charges them 2d. in the pound. For instance, a man working for the Harbour Trust and earning, say, 15s., is charged 1½d. hospital tax, but if he be employed on the harbour works he is charged 2d. So with these large weekly earnings of £1 14s. and £2 1s. respectively, ferry fares and hospital tax account for 3s. 3d. straight away. Then there is the house rent to be provided. For immediately it is known that a man is working, the landlord is on the doorstep demanding his rent, and to prevent his wife and family being turned into the street the worker has to pay up. In the majority of instances, the rent is 15s. per week at the very lowest. Notwithstanding all that the Arbitration Court has decreed owing to the cost of living in Fremantle, I can see very little difference in rent in that district. When we take 3s. 3d. from a man's pay and then deduct 15s. rent, we find that the man and his wife have only about 15s. per week left to live upon. That is not enough to keep a man and his wife in food alone, to say nothing of the fact that when a man is working his clothes are wearing out and have to be replaced. It seems to me that in the near future we shall find everybody down to the level of the new scheme of £1 per week plus sustenance. And while it is bad enough in the metropolitan area, we have to consider those who are constrained to leave the metropolis and find work in the country, and so undertake the responsibility of maintaining two homes on the £1 14s. per week or the £2 1s. per week, as the case may be. How they are going to do it, I do not know. The amount provided is not enough for the man in the metropolitan area, and when that man has to go away into the country and keep two homes, he is attempting the impossible. Then there are those families whose bread-winners are disabled through sickness. The department say they cannot assist the bread-winner, that all that can be done is to assist his wife and children. Only a few weeks ago I had before me the case of a man who had been operated on for hydroitis. The department declared there was no chance of providing any relief for him, that they were giving the wife and children the usual sustenance, but the husband would have to scratch for himself. While strong healthy

men may be able to exist on the ordinary sustenance, here we have a man thrown out of action and unable to do anything. He is debarred from getting any sustenance when, actually, he should be receiving extra sustenance to allow him to get back to normal health. Then there are those men who are able to earn a few pounds. Notwithstanding the arguments we have had about it, the department are still going on in the same old way, penalising a man for being truthful and honest. A man may secure a job for a couple of weeks. He goes to the department and reports accordingly. The department reckon up the money he has earned, and practically say to him, "You have to stand off until that sum has been cut out from what you would receive if on sustenance." A little while ago a man on £2 2s. per week had the good fortune to earn £11. He reported it to the department, and they compelled him to stand off sustenance until the £11 had been cut out. Seeing that he had been out of work for some twelve months, it was necessary that he should get a few clothes, but he was debarred from doing that because the money had to be cut out at the rate of £2 18s. per week, and so he could get nothing beyond the bare necessities of life. It is only fair that those endeavouring to help themselves and who are honest in coming forward to report their success in securing a couple of weeks' work should be shown some consideration in order that they might get together what is necessary. I find also there is a system under which the picking-up is done by the local authorities. While some of those bodies act quite fairly, nevertheless it leaves a loophole for other local authorities to victimise a man who, perhaps, has said more than the secretary of the board approves. A little while ago several men were to be sent to the country. One man who had just been evicted by his landlord and had spoken his mind freely, was picked to go. Three others refused to go, and so they were reinstated on sustenance, but the offending man was told he had to go. In my opinion it was to assist the landlord that this man was to be sent to the country, the idea being that if he were out of the road the landlord would be able to squeeze a little more rent out of the wife. However, I am pleased to say, he did not go, but stayed back and stood by his family. Still, it shows how some of the local authorities

will victimise a man. The picking-up should be done by Government officials, and should not be left to local authorities, who may wish to take advantage of a man. In the Fremantle district there is a large number of people who in my opinion have very little chance of finding work in the State for a considerable time to come. They are migrants anxious to get back to the Old Country, and their maintenance here is costing the State a great deal of money. They were brought out here, but they have no chance of getting profitable employment for a long time to come. Having heard the Premier introducing the Loan Estimates just now, I am more than ever convinced that there are going to be very few public works in this State for some time to come. Consequently, primary production offers the only avenue for men looking for work. But a lot of these migrants, having come from the large industrial centres of Great Britain, are not suitable for work at primary production. They desire to return to England rather than be a burden on the State any longer. It would be cheaper in the long run to send those people back to the Old Country, for it would save the Government a great deal of money in sustenance. I have spoken about this matter several times, and I hope that even now something will be done so that those people will be able to return to the Homeland instead of being kept here, where they are a burden on the State and a charge against the people generally. There is no desire on my part to send away people who wish to remain in the State, but there are hundreds whose anxiety is to return to England, where they would be amongst their friends. The Minister agrees that it would be a cheaper proposition to send those people Home, and I am sure it would be a more humane way to treat them than to keep them here in the manner in which they are being maintained at the present time.

MR. RAPHAEL (Victoria Park) [5.32]: I cannot allow the vote to go through without raising my voice in protest against the inadequate amount that has been provided for this specific purpose. When one considers the way in which the money voted for unemployment relief has been spent in the past eighteen months, it will not be difficult to believe that another couple of hundred thousand pounds could be distri-

buted in the same happy way to assist the unemployed. The Government have made a considerable sum of money available to local governing bodies and to the Perth City Council to assist in the provision of work for those who are in need of it. But we find that a body like the Perth City Council can boast at the present time of being able to show a surplus of no less than £20,000 on the year's operations. That, to my mind, is a disgraceful state of affairs, and it is even more disgraceful that the Government should stand behind such a body. The Lord Mayor has taken a delight in announcing to the ratepayers the fact that he has been able to save this amount of money.

The Minister for Railways: Did he save it out of the 3 per cents?

Mr. RAPHAEL: It is a disgrace to the Government, and an even bigger disgrace to the City Council that that body should have been able to set aside such a large sum of money. The Lord Mayor had the audacity to make public this announcement, but he did not say in what way the saving was effected.

The Minister for Lands: Are you not one of the city councillors?

Mr. RAPHAEL: Yes, but thank God I do not agree with the methods they adopt.

The CHAIRMAN: It would be better if the hon. member discussed the vote.

Mr. RAPHAEL: My sympathies are with those unfortunate bush workers who have been sent out into the country and whose wives and families have been compelled to remain behind, and who are expected to pay rent for the houses they live in out of the pittance earned by the husbands, as well as to feed and clothe the children. Seeing that the finances of the Perth City Council are so buoyant, the Minister for Unemployment should insist that a certain sum above the sustenance rate should be paid by that body when employing men on relief work.

The Minister for Railways: Some of them prefer to get cash instead of ration orders.

Mr. RAPHAEL: Those men should be told that if they did not accept jobs their sustenance would be stopped. That threat has been made at Victoria Park, and in other places as well. I have a good deal of respect for the Minister in his capacity a Minister for Unemployment, that is to say, outside the Chamber, but I am sorry to say I have not the same respect for him

in the Chamber. The wonderful scheme of providing work in the country is what we might have expected from the present Government, who have mismanaged the State's affairs for the past eighteen months. We could not expect anything better from them. They send men away to the country and give them a measly pittance, and on that those men are expected to pay the rents of the homes in which their wives and children are living in the suburbs of the city, and to clothe and feed them as well. I have taken the trouble to look at some of the works that the Government are carrying out in the country, and I know that there is no possibility of the women and children accompanying their husbands to those places. They cannot be expected to go there and live under the filthy conditions that exist. The women and children are forced to remain behind until the landlords turn them out of their homes when they are no longer able to pay rent. This process is simplified when the husbands are out of the way. The member for Swan smiles, but what can we expect from one with the mentality that he possesses? It would be impossible to send the wives and children into the country where their husbands are working, because there would be no provision for schooling, and we know it is the boast of the present Government that they see to it that the workers' children are always educated. Thus the women and children are compelled to remain behind, and in many cases are ordered out of their homes by the landlords. They are given a certain time to get out, and if they do not move, their goods and chattels are sold over their heads, and no one is there to protect them. When the member for Fremantle (Mr. Sleeman) introduced his Bill to the House, we had great hopes that the Government would meet him in respect to providing accommodation for the homeless.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not discuss, under this vote, legislation that is before the House.

Mr. RAPHAEL: I am not discussing the Bill, but I am merely pointing out the extremely harsh conditions under which the workers are suffering because the Government have not made provision for them in respect of housing. The Government should place a further amount on the Estimates to carry all these unfortunate people over the

period of their distress. The Government should provide housing facilities or set aside a sum of money for rent that a man is not able to find. A case came under my notice this morning of a woman whose husband is away. She has five children and is occupying a house of two rooms. The family sleep in one and eat in the other. Such things as this bring the housing conditions to a worse position than those existing in the slum areas in the big cities of the world. The husband of this woman is amongst those who have gone away on the definite understanding that work will be provided for two days a week. Even when the men arrive at their jobs they discover that they have to work under the contract system, and some having worked for three or four days find that deductions are made from their earnings. Generally speaking, the unemployed difficulty is bigger than the Government realise. The Minister has done his best to cope with it, but there is work enough for a full-time Minister. I will not say that the present Minister is the most suitable member of the Government for the job, but I do say that the Government, even at this late hour, should realise their responsibilities and appoint a Minister to do nothing else but attend to this very important question.

The Minister for Railways: I will lead you as a deputation to the Premier, and you can ask for a full-time Minister.

Mr. RAPHAEL: The Government have not lived up to their job in the direction of providing food in the country at the prices they stipulated, and while the men who are at work on those country jobs are eking out a miserable existence we find that in the city on every Monday morning the landlords are on the doorstep of the homes that are occupied by their families waiting to collect the rent. In many cases the woman in her weakness will see that the landlord gets his money and the result is the children will have to suffer from want of food. At least the Government should see to it that while the husbands are away at work in the country the women and children are protected in their homes. Another matter to which I desire to draw attention is the amount of money that an unemployed man is allowed to earn and to retain in conjunction with sustenance. I have accompanied several deputations to the Minister, and he gave the assur-

ance—which he has denied since—that an unemployed man could earn up to his rent, and that he was entitled to retain that money instead of receiving rations. It has been found on every occasion when adjustments have been made that if a man has earned 10s. the sum of 5s. has been deducted. The Government should stipulate a definite figure so that a man will know where he stands. Nearly every week we hear of men being prosecuted for earning money and not reporting the fact. I blame the department more than I do the men, because the men are in desperate straits, and do not know whether they are to spend that money or retain it and report to the department. Another matter that the Government can afford to give attention to—

The Minister for Railways: I wish you meant that.

Mr. RAPHAEL: Well, the Minister has just made a profit by selling the Golden Eagle nugget, and that, by the way, is about the only profit he has ever made. What I was going to refer to is the matter of continuing sustenance for children after they reach the age of 14 years. When a child is 14 he has as much right to assistance as he had before he reached that age, that is, if he is entitled to it. He requires the same amount of food as he did before he arrived at that age. I hope the Government will see that all kiddies under 14 years of age whose parents are unemployed are provided for. The Minister for Works has uttered a threat that if these men do not accept the jobs offered to them, but are game to stand up to the Government, victimisation will occur later. Perhaps, however, another Government will take over meantime and see that there is no victimisation. The actual words used by the Minister were that the sustenance would be stopped, but not yet. I hope that "not yet" means some distant period. In the event of victimisation it is not the men who will suffer, but the women and children. I do not know exactly what was in the Minister's mind. Does he intend to deprive the women and children, as well as the men, of food? Working conditions in Western Australia are being thrown back 20 years by the Government's attitude. Twenty years ago men were earning as much as they are earning to-day. The Minister in charge of unemployment relief, who has been a

member of this party, knows that wages and working conditions have been thrown back 20 years. In a speech I made here 17 months ago I said that the Acting Premier was following in the footsteps of Mr. A. Thomson, the ex-member for Katanning, in bringing down our workers to the level of nigger countries. We have had the spectacle of the Premier wasting millions on works in the country and on group settlement. He is muddling along now in the same way, when numerous works could be carried out in the metropolitan area, and the services of the unemployed utilised better. However, no such provision has been made for those men. The late Labour Government did attempt to carry out metropolitan works, so that the unemployed would be able to stay at home with their wives and families, as they have a right to do. The present Government, I repeat, are muddling away tens of thousands of pounds on group settlement. I congratulate the Country Party on their success in defeating all attempts of the Government to carry out works in the metropolitan area. I hope, however, that metropolitan members on the other side of the Chamber will stand up to their responsibilities and try to get a little work done in the metropolitan area. It is a lamentable thing that those members are not prepared to fight for their constituents. I hope especially that the member for Canning (Mr. Wells) will stand to his guns and get a little improvement effected in that sorry spectacle, the Causeway.

The Minister for Works: What about reproductive works?

Mr. RAPHAEL: The work I suggest might be reproductive in the sense of saving a few lives. Now as regards persons on relief of whom the Government could be relieved. There are many English people here in such a condition that they will never be able to work. They are complete invalids. The Minister should make some endeavour to repatriate those people to the Old Country. To Western Australia they are a mere source of expense. In my district there are several cases of that kind, the whole family being unable to work. I unsuccessfully endeavoured to obtain for them a small proportion of the passage money for their return in place of the 35s. per week they were drawing from the Government. I trust that my remarks will sink into the Minister's mind, and that he will

make some endeavour to provide better conditions for the unemployed.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison) [5.52]: This vote is rapidly growing to proportions which are alarming. The Government, and the Minister in particular, appear to be fully alive to the growth of the expenditure, but indifferent as regards solving the problem of unemployment. It is that problem which gives me concern more than the increase in the expenditure. Most members expected the vote to grow, especially having regard to the nature of the attempts, if attempts they can be called, made by the Government to overcome the difficulty. Several members have said that no one on either the Opposition or the Government side has offered any solution of the difficulty, or appears desirous of solving it. However, when suggestions of a character worthy of consideration were made, particularly to the Premier, they were treated with scorn. Upon the Premier's shoulders rests, to a large extent, the responsibility for the existing position. When concrete proposals were made at the Premier's Conference for a reform of the monetary system and a fiduciary loan to relieve the position, when Mr. Lang submitted his proposals, the only response on the part of our Premier was a blunt refusal. To his mind nothing that interferes with private enterprise is a solution. His only suggestion is that we sit down on the kerb of the road of time and wait for something to turn up. Indeed, that seems to be the attitude of all members of the Ministry. There is no collective effort on the part of Ministers to solve the problem. Like a school of copyists, they sit waiting for something to turn up, for some other Government or some other State to do something that is to their taste. Probably they would copy that. I contend, however, that it is up to the Government to do something. The position is acute, and Ministers should be active. To sit down is not to solve the problem. Admittedly, finance is a world-wide difficulty; but surely the Government can offer some solution. After the lapse of another 12 months Western Australia will be spending a million pounds annually to give the unemployed bare sustenance. The solution offered a few months ago, namely, the financial emergency legislation, has made the position more acute instead of remedying it;

and that process is likely to continue. There is a tendency to create unemployment. Everywhere private enterprise is dismissing employees. The Government themselves are doing so, notwithstanding all the alleged virtues of the financial emergency legislation. Something must be done, and it is up to the Government to move. To maintain that it is sufficient to ill-feed, ill-house, and ill-clothe the unemployed is utterly wrong. The Government have the responsibility for the solution of the problem. While Ministers hold office they should endeavour to find a solution. Nothing has been done beyond what was done decades ago, when unemployment was merely a passing phase. So many meal tickets and so many bed tickets are given to tide the unemployed over until they find work. However, they are not likely to find work now. There is no money coming to the State to provide them with employment. The Government's inaction is reflected in private enterprise, which cannot now employ the same numbers as formerly. More remarkable still, the Government and their mouthpieces agree that there is no possibility of employing many of our workless people, and yet they look with scorn upon those migrants who are willing or anxious to return to their own land. Even that cannot be done. They are to stay here and starve, and we are to see them starve. Surely it is more economical to assist the hundreds of migrants desirous of returning home to do so. The Governments of Western Australia and of other Australian States have broken their contract with those people. They cannot provide them with work. The position would be relieved if the Government repatriated those people to the country whence they came. If only from the aspect of economy, those people should long since have been returned to the land from which the Australian Governments were instrumental in bringing them. They were practically decoyed out here under false pretences.

Mr. Sleeman: Too right.

Mr. MARSHALL: It has been admitted by the Premier, the Deputy Premier, and the Minister for Works, and by all the spokesmen of the Government that these migrants cannot be employed. The Government attitude is, "We cannot employ these people, but we are feeding them." On what sort of rations? Even supposing these peo-

ple are well fed, the time is rapidly approaching when they will have to be clothed.

Mr. Sleeman: That time has arrived already.

Mr. MARSHALL: Perhaps it has. Beyond a shadow of doubt, every unemployed migrant will have to be clothed by the State next winter. Already there are many homes in need of clothing. Numbers of our people have for years been out of permanent employment, doing mere odd jobs which cannot be described as employment in the true sense. The reward for their services was not sufficient to enable them to provide more than bare sustenance. When suggestions are made to the Government, they do little more than give passing attention to them—and let them go by the board. I cannot understand the Government continuing to feed people who desire to return to their native country. The State possesses ships, and if a ship-load were repatriated, the local position would be relieved to that extent and it would certainly prove economical. Many of the migrants will have to be fed for years to come because the Government cannot find employment for them, and certainly private enterprise will not be able to absorb them. Probably the Government desire to do what they consider right in administering the vote, but, in my opinion, they have adopted an altogether wrong policy. The Government take individuals who are in receipt of sustenance and, in order to relieve the Treasury of the necessity to pay that sustenance, provide the men with employment under conditions that are certainly objectionable to anyone desirous of maintaining a reasonable standard of living. Men accustomed to engaging in work controlled by the Government are now passed over that counter jumpers, clerks and shop assistants may be given the work those experienced men formerly undertook, but who are now given opportunities to work at other tasks with which they are absolutely unfamiliar. Under such methods, the cost of work undertaken by the Government must be enormously increased. The inexperienced individuals I have referred to cannot deliver the goods and, notwithstanding the reduced payments being made for the work undertaken, the cost of the operations must be enormously increased. Then again, merely because some individuals have been thrifty and have looked after their families

in past years, they are not allowed to be given work by the Government because they have a few pounds beside them. Recently I referred one individual's position to the Minister. It is a positive, crying shame that a man who has been battling round the goldfields for years after having had to leave the mines because of the condition of his lungs, cannot secure any suitable work in the metropolitan area, merely because he has been thrifty in the past. While practical miners, such as he is, have to stand by, inexperienced individuals are able to secure jobs on deep sewerage works. Those inexperienced individuals have no more idea of carrying out the work than a pig has knowledge of the virtues of paradise. I cannot understand the attitude of the Government. It would be more economical to keep those inexperienced individuals on sustenance than to provide them with that class of work, thereby displacing experienced men. The Minister knows it is wrong. Some of those individuals are afraid when they look down a little gap in the ground, let alone when they have to go down a hole. There is a lack of organisation apparent. Surely it would be possible to set aside some officers who could find out the class of work in which individuals have had experience, and place them accordingly.

The Minister for Agriculture: The work is not hard to learn.

Mr. MARSHALL: But it is hard to take when one is not used to it.

The Minister for Agriculture: The men soon get used to it.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Minister must not imagine that deep sewerage work is unskilled.

Mr. Kenneally: He would bury himself.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Minister would not be on such work for long before someone else would be looking round for the pieces. I know that some of the work undertaken does not require much skill but in other directions much of it requires a lot of experience. A ganger cannot be watching the men all the time. In much of the sewerage work it is necessary to hold up the country several feet ahead; it has to be timbered up. On sewerage works in the past, men have lost their lives through inexperience. They have been buried alive. Notwithstanding that fact, the Government are employing inexperienced men on that class of work and the ganger

has to accept the added responsibility. That is not an economical system, seeing that there are experienced men available. I know that the Minister appreciates the position, but he is one Minister only in the full Cabinet.

The Minister for Railways: The work is provided by the Minister for Works.

Mr. MARSHALL: But the allocation of the work is under your department. That is where the lack of organisation comes in.

The Minister for Works: The public engineers pick up the men.

Mr. MARSHALL: I know differently. If the engineers were able to pick up the men they required, they would pick up experienced workers.

The Minister for Railways: That is what they are permitted to do.

The Minister for Works: Wherever possible, they get experienced men.

Mr. MARSHALL: I know of one experienced man I have been trying to get placed, but without success. Because that individual has been a good type of citizen and thrifty in the past, he is now being penalised. He can get neither sustenance nor work.

The Minister for Works: That is a different phase altogether.

Mr. MARSHALL: Perhaps that man has been foolish in the past; he should have spent all he earned. Because he looked after his wife and family and put by a little capital, he cannot get work now. Surely the Minister does not approve of that policy. I know the Minister for Railways does not; he has had too much experience.

The Minister for Railways: I have not heard of any solution of the problem.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Government should utilise the services of experienced men when they are available.

The Minister for Railways: You are speaking of an isolated instance.

Mr. MARSHALL: But it has a general application.

The Minister for Lands: That is not so.

Mr. MARSHALL: Each time I have spoken to an officer of the department the first question asked is, "Are they receiving sustenance?"

Hon. J. C. Willcock: There is a considerable number of men who cannot get work because they are not in receipt of sustenance.

The Minister for Railways: That applies in every part of Australia. Unfortunately we cannot solve that difficulty.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Minister knows it is not fair, and merely because that is the position elsewhere, he should not be influenced in allowing the same conditions to apply locally.

The Minister for Railways: We do not prevent those individuals from getting work elsewhere.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am aware of that.

The Minister for Railways: You want the Government to find work for everyone.

Mr. MARSHALL: No. What I want is that the Government, when employing men for work under their control, shall engage men experienced on that particular class of work, irrespective of whether they are in receipt of sustenance. It is quite true, as the Minister stated, that I have referred to an isolated instance.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: But I have not referred to an isolated instance.

Mr. MARSHALL: I have approached the officials on a number of occasions and the first question as to whether the individual is in receipt of sustenance, has ended the whole thing.

The Minister for Railways: We cannot find work for everyone in the community.

Mr. MARSHALL: I agree. The individual I have in mind is well known to the engineers and to the gangers as a capable worker. He has been able to keep going for twelve or fourteen months although out of work, but I suppose he is at the end of his tether now, and will have to go on sustenance.

Mr. Sleeman: He will not be able to get sustenance if one of his children has a coin in his moneybox.

The Minister for Lands: It is a question of how much we have to spend.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Government are quite prepared to keep the spendthrifts.

The Minister for Lands: If we did not, they would starve.

Mr. MARSHALL: Why not allow men of the type I have mentioned to get work?

The Minister for Lands: We do.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Government do not. If they allowed the men to get work, the engineers or the gangers would employ men of the type I refer to. People who formerly would scorn to look at this class of work, now get preference.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: And they cannot do half as much work as the men you have in mind.

Mr. MARSHALL: Of course not. It would be impossible for any unskilled men to do half as much as the experienced miners. If the Government pursue such a policy over any lengthy period, there will be loss of life in connection with the sewerage operations. Some of the unfortunates will bury themselves. Although there are experienced men available for that class of work, they are not allowed to take it, and it is certainly not an economical policy to adopt.

Mr. J. MacCallum Smith: Quite right; I know of several such instances.

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not know of several instances, but I know of the specific instance I have referred to, and I have spoken to the Minister about the position.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. MARSHALL: There are only a couple more points to which I would draw attention. One appertains to the lack of organisation in the administration of the Vote. We have not had any assistance for the unemployed on the goldfields. At places such as Wiluna and Meekatharra quite a number of unemployed are being maintained by local effort. Negotiations were entered into with the department on one or two occasions, but no finality was reached. It is not quite fair to give all the assistance in one portion of the State to the exclusion of other parts. If the principle of assistance is good for the city unemployed, it is good also for those unemployed in outback districts. On one occasion the Treasury granted a sum of money to the Meekatharra Road Board for the purpose of absorbing some of the unemployed, but it was only a small amount and has long since been disbursed. Again, I think the Minister should review his treatment of destitute prospectors. He knows that until recently the prospector who found himself without cash and without work could not receive sustenance unless he came down to Perth and was registered as being unemployed, in order to receive sustenance. Then, if it suited him, he could get his payments transferred to his goldfields address. But that is scarcely fair. The Minister, as an ex-resident of the gold-

fields, knows the type of man the prospector is, how well-deserving of help he is. But the Minister, although usually of long vision, was very short-sighted in respect of the position of the prospector. Destitute prospectors have to go without sustenance while all other sections of the community can enjoy it. It is a gross miscarriage of justice, and I am sure the Minister must appreciate it. He was reared on the goldfields, and so he knows the prospector as a type pretty well. There is not much the prospector requires of the State, but at times he does need a little food and I cannot understand how it is the Minister has overlooked his requirements. The Minister should set up some sort of an organisation under which the prospector's needs would be attended to. There are on the goldfields persons who have never been prospecting, yet are in receipt of the dole because they had themselves registered in the city as being unemployed, and were then able to get their payments transferred to the goldfields. That is scarcely fair to the bona fide prospectors who cannot get relief. I am sure the Minister has sufficient influence in Cabinet to secure better treatment for the prospector. Now let me say that since the Premier turned down all proposals put forward by other members of the Premiers' Conference for the relief of the unemployed, the onus is on him to do something to alleviate the existing position. Since the proposed fiduciary issue of £18,000,000 was objected to by the Premier, it is strange that the Commonwealth Bank should have issued recently a million pounds' worth of extra notes without evoking a protest from anybody. Yet the Premier strongly objected to the proposed fiduciary issue of £18,000,000.

Mr. Sampson: The notes issued by the Commonwealth Bank were issued to replace worn notes.

Mr. MARSHALL: Not at all. It was an issue of a million pounds' worth of extra notes.

Mr. Angelo: There is some difference between £1,000,000 and £18,000,000.

Mr. MARSHALL: That is so, but the principle is the same and nobody has objected to the new issue.

The Minister for Railways: That has been the trouble with inflation all over the world: once it is introduced, it is found necessary to carry it further.

Mr. MARSHALL: At all events the Commonwealth Bank has issued a million pounds' worth since the Premiers' Conference.

Mr. Sampson: Not a million.

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes, a million.

Mr. Sampson: Well, it was to replace old notes.

Mr. MARSHALL: It was not. The Premier opposed the principle at the Premiers' Conference; it was a crime in his eyes.

The Minister for Railways: No, that was a proposal for a definite inflation of £18,000,000.

Mr. MARSHALL: Well, what does the amount matter? The principle is the same. In England they have £400,000,000 of that class of currency, and a further £200,000,000 to be issued. Yet nobody objects. If there were a declaration of war to-morrow, the currency in England would be inflated by many hundreds of millions.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We cannot have this discussion.

Mr. MARSHALL: At the Premiers' Conference the Premier was opposed to all inflation to relieve unemployment, and so it is now on the Premier and his Government to find other means of relief.

The Minister for Railways: The Premier was not the whole of the Premiers' Conference; there were six other Premiers there.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am not trying to make out that the Premier was solely responsible, but since he opposed the proposal—

The Attorney General: What proposal?

Mr. MARSHALL: The proposed fiduciary note issue.

The Attorney General: It was never mentioned at the Premiers' Conference.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Premier could not agree to anything that was proposed at the Premiers' Conference. All he wanted was to let things go from bad to worse.

The Attorney General: Why, he agreed to everything.

Mr. MARSHALL: Finally, perhaps. However, the Attorney General will admit that the policy adopted at that conference is doing no good for the country.

The Attorney General: I will admit no such thing.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I cannot permit this discussion.

Mr. MARSHALL: It is up to the Government to do something for the relief of

the unemployed, not to sit down and say, "This is what is being done in the other States, and this will do us also." It is up to the Government to relieve the position even if they cannot conclusively solve it. But no, they say, "At all events we are doing better than are the other States." Then there is the proposal to return certain migrants to their Home land. It would be much more economical than to keep on feeding them here for the next two years.

The Attorney General: Is that your suggestion?

Mr. MARSHALL: The Government have broken their contract with those people, for they cannot provide them with work. Those migrants are almost without clothes; many of them are without homes, and they desire to return to the Old Country. With the exception of the Attorney General, all the Ministers that have spoken have said that in future they will be unable to find work for those who have been accustomed to work for the Government, and will not be able to do so for many years to come. So what is going to happen to those migrants? Are they to be hunted up to Blackboy or other unemployment camps for the next four or five years? Would it not be more economical to send them back to the Old Country, even if we have to use our own State vessels for the purpose? We have broken our contract with them, there is no chance of employment for them and so it seems they are to hang on here in the hope of something turning up. What the devil do the Government think is going to happen? Do they think some miracle will be performed by which work will be provided for all?

The Minister for Railways: It is a question for the Federal Government.

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not think the State Government have pressed the Federal Government in the matter. I do not even think the resolution passed by this Chamber has been forwarded to the Federal Government.

The Minister for Lands: That resolution was sent on to the Prime Minister.

Mr. MARSHALL: The position is desperate, and desperate ills need desperate remedies. Irrespective of the attitude of the Commonwealth, the State Government should adopt the course that is most economical and in the best interests of the State. If the Commonwealth will not do anything,

the State Government should do the next best thing.

The Minister for Railways: We cannot move without the Commonwealth.

Mr. MARSHALL: It is wonderful what the Government could do if they had the determination; it is wonderful how little they need do if they have not a mind to do anything.

Vote put and passed.

Postponed Vote—Aborigines' Native Stations, £4,756:

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: In my absence the member for Kimberley desired information about the tannery at the aborigines native station, Moola Bulla. The reason why the tannery was closed was because it was impossible to place the leather manufactured there. The tannery had never paid its way, and it was considered more profitable to ship the roughly-tanned hides to England rather than manufacture the finished leather here. Only one white man was employed at the tannery, and as the tannery was a losing proposition and we were compelled to economise, it was thought that this was one way to do it. A stage had been reached when it would have been necessary to increase the plant considerably.

Mr. COVERLEY: I know that the Minister for Lands is not in charge of the department, and therefore is giving information supplied by the department.

The Minister for Lands: That is so.

Mr. COVERLEY: I do not hold him responsible for the information, but the tannery should have been profitable had it been run on sound lines. The leather tanned there originally was not a complete success, but after considerable experiment the tanner turned out a very good article—one that was sought in the Kimberleys. In that part of the State there is a rather large sale for leather, particularly on the cattle and sheep stations, where it is used for harness and saddlery. A departmental officer insisted that the leather should be sold at 30s. per side, whereas a saddler buys leather by the pound, not by the side. To stipulate 30s. per side was unfair. A purchaser might get a small side, a medium side or a large side, and yet he would have to pay the 30s. for any one of them. When

the leather was sent to the city the firm of Arundel offered to buy it at 2s. per lb. That did not appeal to the official, and he sent the lot to England. I asked some questions in the House regarding the matter, and the reply I received was that out of the 500 sides sent overseas, only six sample sides had been sold. The return to the department was about 1s. 11d. per lb., showing that had the business been conducted on proper lines and the artisan given control of the selling, he would have found a ready sale in the metropolitan area for the bulk of the leather. The loss incurred on the 500 sides sent to England, which had to bear freight, commission, etc., is tacked on to the department to make it show a loss. Seeing that the State incurred considerable expense to build the tannery, the Minister should investigate the question. There is still a big demand for the leather in the district. Actually the cost of controlling the tannery is very small. It is only a matter of the wages of the tanner, which would be less than £300 a year. There is a big demand for Moola Bulla leather, but a revision of the price is necessary. The tanner had no say in the disposal of the leather. That was controlled from Perth by someone who knew nothing about it. I hope the Minister will inquire whether steps cannot be taken to operate the tannery again. The natives are there to provide the labour, and have to be fed whether they work or not. The only cost over and above the wages paid to the tanner would be a few shillings for dyes, etc. Saddlers who travel from station to station attending to the harness have informed me that the Moola Bulla leather recently bought by them was quite as good as they could get from Perth, and that they were quite prepared to continue using it.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I will bring the remarks of the hon. member under the notice of the Chief Secretary, and if it is possible to do something in the way of producing a useful article at Moola Bulla, I am sure he will accept the hon. member's advice.

Vote put and passed.

This concluded the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the year.

Resolutions reported.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES—STATE TRADING CONCERNS.

In Committee.

Mr. Richardson in the Chair.

Division—State Brickworks, £15,462:

Mr. SAMPSON: I do not know whether the Minister intends to make any statement about State trading, but the circumstances justify some reference to this Governmental activity. Unfortunately trading concerns must be a source of great anxiety to the Government. The figures before us show a tremendous loss. According to the report of the Auditor General, the net loss made by trading concerns since their inception has been £1,384,000.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: How much is due to the State brickworks now under discussion?

Mr. SAMPSON: That is one of the concerns which has made a profit.

Hon. P. Collier: It is usual to allow the Minister to make a statement.

Mr. SAMPSON: I rather gathered that he did not intend to speak.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been the custom, and I think the correct one, to discuss the particular division before the Chair. Members are now discussing the State Brickworks.

Mr. SAMPSON: Following the submission of a Bill to Parliament some months ago, I hoped that a definite offer would have been received by the Government for the purchase of the State trading concerns.

Hon. P. Collier: The brickworks?

Hon. W. D. Johnson: No, the Government Printing Office.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the State Brickworks.

Mr. SAMPSON: I realise that the State Brickworks have shown a profit, but that is not the point. The question that is exercising the minds of the people is whether or not State trading should be continued.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member to obey the Chair. On two occasions I have directed attention to the fact that he cannot discuss all the State trading concerns.

Mr. SAMPSON: That was not my intention. It is not a question whether the State Brickworks have shown a profit or loss, but

it is a matter of whether or not the State should enter into the realms of private enterprise. It is expected that the State Brickworks this year will show a deficit of £5,462. If the undertaking had in the past been compelled to meet income tax, rent, and various other overhead charges, the chances are that a loss and not a profit would have been made over the period of the operation of the works. The intrusion of the State into the industry has discouraged others from taking part in it. I regret the Government have not taken steps definitely to offer the State Brickworks for sale.

Hon. P. Collier: Surely you know there are no purchasers in the market to-day.

The Minister for Lands: We could not give them away.

Hon. P. Collier: You cannot sell at sacrifice prices.

Mr. SAMPSON: I know it is a bad time for a sale, but only one buyer, the right one, is necessary to effect a deal.

Hon. P. Collier: But there is no sale for the commodity.

Mr. SAMPSON: It may be that a sale could be effected.

Hon. P. Collier: At a price, of course.

The Minister for Railways: Yes.

Mr. SAMPSON: A sale might be effected at a reasonable price. We are perhaps on the verge of a revival of the building industry. If the Government made it known in the leading newspapers of each of the other States that the works were for sale, some buyer at a satisfactory price might be discovered.

Hon. P. Collier: How about an advertisement in the "Mullewa Mail"?

Mr. SAMPSON: It is possible a buyer might be found in Mullewa. No one can say until the Government disclose their intentions to dispose of this State trading concern.

Hon. P. Collier: To give it away.

Mr. SAMPSON: Who can say that a buyer will not be found? I hope the Minister for Works will recall the sentiments expressed in Parliament a little while ago, and that every endeavour will be made to dispose of this undertaking.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is not the policy of the Government to continue State trading concerns; neither is it their policy to give them away. If conditions were such that buyers were available,

the situation would be entirely different. The matter was gone into exhaustively some months ago by the Minister in charge of these works. I assure the hon. member that, if he is prepared to make a reasonable offer for them, it will receive most sympathetic consideration.

Division put and passed.

Divisions—State Hotels, £38,900. State Implement and Engineering Works, £39,104—agreed to.

Division—State Quarries—£12,915:

Mr. SAMPSON: I see that in the case of this vote there is an anticipated loss of £3,415. I should be glad of an explanation from the Minister on the question whether the quarries are likely to be operated to a normal extent.

Hon. P. Collier: Is anything normal to-day?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The question is one which, I think, should not have been asked.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: What is going to win the Perth Cup?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No business of this nature, dealing as it does with the building trade and road construction, is operating normally, because people do not require stone. This is rather hard upon the State quarries. There is very little demand for stone. Certain capital has been invested in the enterprise, and unless the demand for stone is fairly considerable, so that the interest and sinking fund are spread over a large tonnage, the quarry cannot be operated at a profit.

Hon. J. Cunningham: The municipal quarry has been closed down.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Every other quarry in the State is making a loss. This year we hope to pay working expenses because we have a certain amount of stone on hand. We are using this up and keeping the works in operation in a small way. Last year we sold 60,000 tons of stone. When, however, we are operating only on 10,000 tons, a loss is inevitable. Two or three days ago a gentleman came to my office to object to certain stone being sent from the State Quarries to the Fremantle harbour. As it was a matter of payment by cash, a very important item to the Treasury, the stone was taken from the quarry.

I told him that any reasonable offer that might be made for the State Quarries would be carefully considered by the Government.

Mr. SAMPSON: I should like to say, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. P. Collier: You cannot speak a second time on the general discussion.

The CHAIRMAN: I would point out to the Leader of the Opposition that we are now in Committee, and that there is no general discussion.

Hon. P. Collier: You cannot speak twice in a general way.

Mr. SAMPSON: Then I will take Item No. 1, that of the manager, £500.

Hon. P. Collier: You are now in order.

Mr. SAMPSON: The statement of the Minister is evidence of the injury that State trading concerns do to private enterprise. The Minister for Works evidently insisted on the supply of stone from the State Quarries when some private enterprise was prepared to supply the material.

The Minister for Railways: For what purpose?

Mr. SAMPSON: For the purpose referred to by the Minister.

The Minister for Railways: That is for Government purposes.

Mr. SAMPSON: Yes.

The Minister for Railways: It is a matter of using Government material for Government business.

Mr. SAMPSON: I understood that the price for the other material was better than that at which it was estimated the State Quarries could supply.

Mr. Kenneally: The Minister said no such thing.

Mr. SAMPSON: There was some justification for the representatives of private enterprise to wait upon the Minister to ask that this matter should be considered, especially when it was a question of a lower price being offered than that submitted by the State Quarries.

Mr. Kenneally: The hon. member is romancing.

Hon. P. Collier: To what item are you referring?

Mr. SAMPSON: To item No. 1.

Hon. P. Collier: Then connect it up.

Mr. SAMPSON: This is the sort of thing that prompts strong opposition to a continuation by the State of these trading concerns, which are in direct conflict with private enterprise. When the cost of quarry-

ing by the State is in excess of the quotes submitted by private enterprise, an injury is being done to the latter if the work is given to the State. I would be wanting in my duty if I sat quietly when this matter came on.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Does it affect your pocket?

Mr. SAMPSON: It affects the pocket of every citizen in the State. No State undertaking should be allowed to enter into competition with private enterprise.

The Minister for Railways: It does not enter into competition with private enterprise.

Mr. SAMPSON: It does, because the State is a big buyer. When tenders are called, the lowest tender should be accepted.

Hon. A. McCallum: You kicked up a row because the Government Printing Office beat you for that school reader!

Hon. P. Collier: You wanted the job although your tender was higher.

Hon. A. McCallum: You are never satisfied unless you can fleece the public.

Mr. SAMPSON: I ask for the withdrawal of that remark.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member takes exception to the remark of the member for South Fremantle.

Hon. A. McCallum: I withdraw it.

Mr. SAMPSON: I hope it will not be long before all State enterprises are disposed of.

Mr. HEGNEY: The hon. member contradicts himself. He wants the State quarries, in which capital is invested, to remain idle and not supply stone for works at Fremantle. Meantime the taxpayers would have to foot the bill. Yet the hon. member claims to be speaking in the interests of the taxpayers. Many private quarries having gone into liquidation, the State was obliged to start a quarry in order to obtain supplies of stone. The hon. member speaks of the coming revival. As soon as road construction begins, the quarries will become active, and thus give employment to many men. It would be unwise to sell the State quarries. In that event they would not be able to supply the stone which private enterprise in the past has failed to supply.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: The member for Swan takes exception to State trading concerns because they interfere with his private pocket.

Mr. Sampson: I take exception as a citizen.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: The hon. member quite recently was associated with a protest made to the Government against a contract being let to a Government institution, the reason for the protest being that the Government refused to pay his company a profit which would have affected the pocket of every parent of a school child in this country.

Mr. Sampson: That is not true.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: The Government institution beat the hon. member's company in fair competition, and he objected to that. He wanted to delve into the pockets of the school children of this country in order that he might make a higher profit. When the Government institution secured the contract, he objected to 20 per cent. commission being allowed to booksellers.

Mr. Sampson: That is not true. None of it is true.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: One would think the hon. member would be ashamed to raise his head in this House to protest. He serves his own pocket. His care for the public purse! We know which pocket he is looking after. He comes here with hypocritical protests, but he cannot deny these facts.

Mr. Sampson: All that is absolutely untrue.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I was waiting for the hon. member on the Estimates. He threatened to someone else that he would bring this matter up on the Estimates, but he was not game to do it. I had all the facts and figures here. I want the hon. member to be seen in his true colours, so that he may not mislead the Chamber by stating that he is entirely disinterested. His anxiety over this vote makes one wonder how many shares he holds in private quarries. My interjection, which the hon. member wanted withdrawn and which was withdrawn, stated the facts.

Mr. SAMPSON: I have never threatened to bring forward a matter relating to the Government Printing Office. The statement of the member for South Fremantle relating to a commission of 20 per cent. is entirely wrong. Nothing of the sort was ever said. I am prepared to resign my seat in Parliament if what the hon. member said is true, provided he on his part will give the corresponding undertaking.

As regards the deputation to the ex-Minister for Education, I took part in it at the request of the master printers. The hon. member has become confused regarding a deputation of booksellers, which waited on the Minister.

Hon. A. McCallum: I know all about that. I spoke about your printing the book.

Mr. SAMPSON: The 20 per cent. to which the hon. member has referred relates to the sale of books by booksellers, and has nothing to do with local printers. I have made my challenge, and am prepared to stand by it.

Hon. A. McCallum: I challenged you about the printing of the book.

Mr. SAMPSON: There is no ambiguity about my challenge.

Hon. P. Collier: It is a fact that you are now talking about your private business.

Mr. SAMPSON: I am not.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee are dealing with State Quarries.

Hon. P. Collier: The member for Swan is talking about a matter that affects his own private business.

Mr. SAMPSON: Not at all. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition introduced a matter as to which he was absolutely wrong. I took part in a deputation from the master printers to the ex-Minister for Education. That deputation asked that the printers be permitted to submit prices for the production of a school book. However, a later deputation—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We cannot go into all those deputations.

Mr. SAMPSON: I am on my defence. By implication I am accused of having shares in a quarry.

Hon. A. McCallum: I asked whether you had any.

Mr. SAMPSON: The hon. member should not do that. I do not ask him whether—

Hon. A. McCallum: I know what you did about the school book.

Mr. SAMPSON: The hon. member has no right to impugn my honour by implying that I have spoken about the State quarries because I had shares in private quarries.

Hon. P. Collier: It is owing to the energy with which you argue these questions that one asks whether you are interested.

Mr. SAMPSON: I will make the Leader of the Opposition the same offer as I made to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. A. McCallum: Will you deny that you are a shareholder in the concern that tendered for the school book?

Mr. SAMPSON: Of course I am. I am a printer, a very honourable avocation.

Hon. A. McCallum: And then you protested against the Government Printing Office getting the work.

Mr. SAMPSON: No. We merely asked that all printers should have the right to tender. I hope the time is not far distant when State quarries will be a thing of the past, and when the Boya quarry will be operated by private enterprise. I am sure it will be quite as well worked then as it is now.

Division put and passed.

Division — State Shipping Service, £188,000:

Mr. SLEEMAN: The division "State Shipping Service" is somewhat puzzling. Is this a State trading concern, or a public utility? It would be interesting to know whether the Committee desire that the State Shipping Service should be disposed of. Some time ago a move was made affecting all State trading concerns. On that memorable morning an unfortunate event debarred us from getting a true expression of opinion as to the disposal of the State Shipping Service. If an expression of opinion were taken it would be found that a fair majority of the House would be opposed to the disposal of the State Shipping Service. I understand that the Government have been nibbling for offers for the disposal of the service. I cannot say whether that is true.

The Minister for Lands: It is not true.

Mr. SLEEMAN: That is what has been reported to me.

The Minister for Lands: I do not know where you got your information.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I welcome the statement of the Minister for Lands that the report is not true.

Hon. P. Collier: What about the member for Gascoyne?

Mr. SLEEMAN: The time has arrived when the interests of the State Shipping Service can be further advanced. It will be realised by hon. members that the State ships are manned by white crews and that we employ our own people. The money paid to the crews is circulated in our midst.

During the last few days an announcement was made that the s.s. "Gascoyne" was to be taken off the coastal run. When the latest of the privately-owned steamers took up her running on the coast, the company had to secure a permit from the Commonwealth Government for that purpose, and it was only on the strength of strong representations by the Premier that the permit was granted.

The Minister for Railways: That is not right.

Mr. SLEEMAN: It is right. We had it in black and white from the then Minister—I think it was Mr. Rodgers—that it was only on the strength of the representation by the Premier that the permit was granted.

The Minister for Lands: The question was referred to us and we raised no objection. That is all there was to it.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I remember the letter from the Federal Minister, and I believe we can produce it. He said that it was only on the strong recommendation of Sir James Mitchell that the permit was granted. As the s.s. "Gascoyne" is to be taken off the coastal run, I hope that no additional permits will be granted to privately-owned overseas steamers to trade along the coast. If any further permit were granted, it would be on the recommendation of the State Government only.

The Minister for Railways: That is not so.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The Commonwealth Government would not grant such a permit without getting the opinion of the State Government.

The Minister for Railways: They might get our opinion, but it is a Commonwealth obligation, and we have no say in the granting or disapproving of such permits.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I think the Commonwealth Government would not grant such a permit without the recommendation of the State Government.

The Minister for Lands: Nothing of the sort.

The Minister for Railways: They were on the coast for six years when there was no Nationalist Government in office.

Hon. J. C. Willecock: Such a question was never referred to us.

Mr. SLEEMAN: At any rate, I hope that no additional permits will be granted. I am sure that no representative of the Northern constituencies would vote in fav-

our of the disposal of the shipping service. If the steamers were sold, it would be regretted by every resident of the North-West. A lot of money is circulated in connection with the victualling, reconditioning and repairing of the State steamers. Unfortunately we have not the plant nor the facilities to cope with all the repair work required, but even so, the expenditure is largely money that circulates among our own people. The families of the crews reside within the State, and I certainly welcome the statement of the Minister for Lands that there is no proposal to sell the State ships, nor is it the desire of the Government to dispose of them.

Mr. H. W. Mann: The Minister did not say it was not the desire of the Government.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Government regard the State steamers as a public utility just as much as are the railways.

Mr. Coverley: Why do you not deal with them as you do with the railways?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It is just as essential to have ships for the North-West as it is to have railways to the agricultural areas. I do not know where the member for Fremantle got his information regarding the supposed action by the Government, but it was not true. We have not been asked to dispose of the ships. There is no chance of disposing of them, and it is our intention to maintain the shipping service to the North-West ports.

Mr. ANGELO: I would like to tell the member for Fremantle that when the Bill for the sale of the State Trading Concerns was under discussion last year—

Mr. Sleeman: It was a pity you took the Chair.

Mr. ANGELO: —I had intended to move an amendment to strike the State Shipping Service and the State Ferries out of the schedule. The effect of that would have been to take those two activities away from the State Trading Concerns altogether. The Premier gave me a definite promise that there would be no question of selling the State ships, and I was perfectly satisfied to accept his word. I have never heard of any suggestion made by a member of the Government since then, that the State ships should be sold.

Hon. P. Collier: Why should we not dispose of them any more than any other trading concern?

Mr. ANGELO: Because the State ships are on a par with the railways.

Hon. P. Collier: There are no rival railway companies, whereas there are private shipping companies.

Mr. ANGELO: But those ships have declined to trade in parts necessary to link up the ports along the coast. They will not go to Shark Bay or Wyndham and they seldom go to Balla Balla.

The Minister for Railways: And they will not quote freights in opposition to the ships to the other side.

Hon. P. Collier: You have opposition ships on the coast, but there are no rival railway companies.

The Minister for Railways: But those ships are not competing with us. They are only there to prevent reasonable shipping facilities being provided. I will give you proof of that if you want it.

Mr. ANGELO: I am sorry we have not another up to date ship like the "Koolinda." If the financial results of the shipping service were analysed, I think it would be found that the loss has been due almost entirely to the "Kangaroo," which is out of date, slow, and costly to run. There is but little freight available for her at present, and I am glad to note that she is being used in an endeavour to open up trade with the Far East. I believe there are great possibilities of benefit accruing to the State with the opening up of that trade. I compliment the Minister on using that vessel for the purpose I have indicated, even though it be at a slight loss. I assure the Committee that the "Koolinda" is an up to date vessel that is rendering splendid service to the North, and, furthermore, that she is paying. While she is paying, I do not think there will be any question of her being sold.

Item—m.v. "Koolinda," £78,148:

Mr. SLEEMAN: It is pleasing to know that the "Koolinda" is paying. The member for Gascoyne said that as the vessel was paying, there was no chance of the Government disposing of it. That argument could be used with regard to other trading concerns, but even so, surely the fact that a specific trading concern is not paying, should not warrant the Government in selling it.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: That did not apply to the sawmills some years ago.

Mr. SLEEMAN: There is a principle at stake, and whether a trading concern is paying or is losing, it is wrong to attempt to dispose of it. If a steamer trading on the South-West coast is a losing proposition, and he is willing to sell it, will the member for Gascoyne say that the "Koolinda" is to be retained merely because it is showing a profit?

Division put and passed.

Divisions — State Sawmills, £484,894; Wyndham Freezing, Canning and Meat Export Works, £345,709—agreed to.

This concluded the Estimates of the Trading Concerns for the year.

Resolutions reported.

BILL—LAND AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 4th November.

HON. J. C. WILLCOCK (Geraldton) [8.42]: I do not take exception to the provisions of the Bill to any extent. We have had eight or nine years' experience of the operations of the Act, and it has not been until the last 12 or 18 months that the necessity to amend it has occurred to the Government. If the Bill that a previous Government introduced had been given effect to, with consequent severe restrictions upon land agents, the present Bill would not have been necessary. I agree with the Attorney General that the bond required from land agents should be raised to £500. He will be a poor sort of land agent who does not deal with business representing £300 or £400 a month. On that amount, 5 per cent. would represent about £15 a month. In all probability a reputable land agent would have a monthly turnover of considerably more than I have indicated.

Mr. H. W. Mann: If this Bill does not suit a member of another place, it will probably go by the board, like the last Bill.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: That is quite possible. There is a tendency on the part of some members there to consider business interests and to talk about things that concern themselves privately—as was indicated even in this Chamber just now during the

course of the debate—rather than to view questions from the standpoint of the welfare of the State. The Land Agents Bill that I refer to would have obviated the necessity for the measure now before us. It was probably due to considerations of private individuals that the last Bill was rejected in another place, although its provisions would have protected the interests of the public. It would be wrong to allow unscrupulous persons freedom to rent an office in the city, instal a table and a few chairs, hang out a sign, and then proceed to take down the public. Unless we require a bond or a substantial license fee covered by a bond, from land agents who set up in business, the unsuspecting public will be defrauded. During the last 12 or 18 months we have had some experience of what can be done—I shall not say in a dishonourable way, because that has yet to be proved—by slim and sly practices in effecting land sales. The Bill proposes, in connection with the bond of £500 that land agents will have to find, that at the expiration of six months after the Bill has been assented to, the money will be distributed amongst those persons who have any claim against an agent who has absconded or robbed or defrauded persons who have done business with him, in respect of which notice has been given, and the balance will be returned to the insurance company that issued the bond.

The Attorney General: Or to the surety, whichever it may be.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: It would not be a bad idea if the balance were to become the property of the Crown. If a land agent absconded, the State might be put to considerable expense in tracing the absconder and bringing him back to justice. Heavy expenditure might be incurred by the State in the steps taken in the interests of justice, and any money so estreated from dishonourable persons should become the property of the Crown. It should not go to the insurance company. It is not very much punishment for the wrongdoer if there is to be taken from the bond only so much as people have been robbed of, whereas if the whole amount is estreated the people who put up the surety will be very careful about the character of the individual they insure. The loading of the policy might possibly keep undesirable people out of the trade or profession, which offers so many oppor-

tunities for defrauding people. The insurance company certifies that the land agent is of good character and worthy of trust, and if he should prove to be unworthy of trust the full amount of the insurance should become the property of the Crown to offset the expense of trying to bring the wrongdoer to justice. I hope, therefore, the full amount of the bond will remain the property of the Crown. I agree with the proposal to increase the amount of the bond, and I do not raise any objection to the Bill.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [8.47]: The general public will be grateful that the amendment to the Act has been brought down. I agree with the previous speaker that increasing the bond from £200 to £500 is in the best interests of the community, but I disagree with the proposal that the whole of the bond should be retained by the Government. It is only reasonable that the expense of bringing the defaulter to justice should be met out of the bond, but the real reason for the provision of the bond is the setting up of a guarantee that those who do business with the land agents shall be protected. The parent Act has done a great deal of good, for it has laid on the land agents an obligation to see that all outstanding rates are paid up to the day of the sale. To a large extent the Act passed in 1922 became a taxing measure, but nobody could cavil at it because it conferred great benefits on the public. I am told the Act is not administered very strictly, and that it is possible for an unauthorised person to operate as a land agent for some time without any notice being taken of it. The Minister might give us some information about this when he replies. The increased fidelity bond will be welcomed by the public, although at present the land agents are having a very bad time, since little property is changing hands. However, there is evidence that we are on the threshold of a big forward move, and the whole of Australia is predicting that by the end of December we shall have recovered to a great extent, if not entirely, from the economic depression through which we are passing.

MR. SPEAKER: That question is not now under discussion.

MR. SAMPSON: The outlook is so good that by the end of the year our land agents probably will be doing considerably more

business than they are doing to-day. So the fact that they will have to find a fidelity bond of £500 will not press heavily upon them. I should like to know from the Minister whether, if a land agent were to deposit a Commonwealth bond or the title of a property valued at not less than £500, it would be accepted in lieu of the fidelity bond provided by an insurance company or some other approved surety.

MR. H. W. MANN (Perth) [8.53]: It seems to me that if a person enters into a bond to conduct his business on proper lines and fails to do that, the bond should be forfeited to the Crown. I do not know why it should be merely a matter of collecting from the bond the amount of money representing the extent of the default. It was suggested by the member for Swan that the bond was merely a guarantee of good faith. But the liabilities of a land agent operating on a large scale would far exceed £500. If such a man is going to default, a £500 bond would scarcely cover his defalcations. Unless the Attorney General has some good reason with which to support that provision in the Bill, it seems to me that when a land agent defaults, the whole of the bond should go to the Crown. There have been numerous instances of bonds being forfeited to the Crown.

Hon. J. C. Willecock: If you enter into a bond that some person will appear at the court, and he does not appear the whole of your bond is forfeited.

MR. H. W. MANN: That is so. If it becomes a matter of having to extradite an absconding defaulter, the cost has to be paid by the Crown, and in my view there is no reason why the balance of the bond should not go to the Crown.

MR. WELLS (Canning) [8.55]: I do not suppose there is in any country a business in respect of which the general public requires more protection than the land agent's business. It is a business that almost anybody can embark upon, because it requires very little capital, the land agent working on other people's money. So every effort should be made to protect the public against a person launching out on such a business without having a sound reputation. I do not think £500 is too much as a fidelity bond, and I am of opinion the Government should take the

whole of the amount estreated, and that no return should be made to the insurance company. If the land agent proves dishonest the Crown might well compensate those who have been defrauded, but any balance remaining over from the bond should become the property of the Crown. I do not think reputable land agents would object to paying a fair amount for a fidelity bond, because it would serve to prevent disreputable people from entering the business. In the auctioneering business we have to insert in the newspapers an advertisement giving 14 days' notice of application for a license. If within seven days anybody raises an objection to the granting of the application, and if that objection should be upheld by the licensing magistrate, the license does not issue. It is only a wise precaution, because it is very easy for an unscrupulous person to set up in any commission agency business. As the member for Geraldton said, all that such a man requires is a table and a chair, and a sign over the door. Not only in the sale of land, but in the sale of businesses, there have been in this city numerous instances of roguery and unscrupulous dealing. Therefore the House should take every precaution to protect the public against unscrupulous people.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. T. A. L. Davy—West Perth—in reply) [8.58]: The object of the Bill is two-fold. In the first place it is to increase the guarantee to the general public, and in the second place to make the cost of that guarantee as low as possible from the point of view of the land agent. We do not broadly imagine that land agents have a monopoly of dishonesty.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: They have very good opportunities for dishonesty.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: As a matter of fact the calibre of the average land agent in Perth is very high. I do not think we could go to any other capital city in Australia and find, on the average, a better lot of men conducting land agencies than are to be found in Perth. Certainly these times we do not want to make the overhead expenses of the business any higher than is necessary. As I explained to the House in moving the second reading, the Bill was precipitated by an action which was brought in the court when the Crown insisted upon the entire forfeiture of a £200 bond. The surety in

that case, which happened to be an insurance company, was surprised to find that, however small the default made by the land agent was, the whole of the amount of the bond was immediately and for ever paid to the Crown. They thereupon took a new view of things and desired to revise the premiums they had been charging land agents for the cover given under the Act. In addition, what was to be done with the money whenever a bond was forfeited had been left to the imagination of the Treasurer, the Minister for Justice or the Attorney General for the time being. It seems to me that we should define the position. In framing the measure we have followed the precedent of New Zealand, South Australia and several other States of the Commonwealth, and have provided that the Crown may, after paying all the people who have been robbed, hand back to the surety any surplus.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: That would become an obligation, would it not?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: No, it is entirely discretionary.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: Why amend the Act if it is to be discretionary?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Once a bond is forfeited and the money paid into Consolidated Revenue, the Crown have no right to pay the money back. Theoretically, the Government would have to ask Parliament for an appropriation, or include it in the Estimates. The proposal in the Bill is a reasonable and sensible one.

Mr. Sampson: Ordinarily, the whole of the bond is not forfeited.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: If it is in the form of a fidelity bond and the condition of the bond is not fulfilled, the money is forfeited. I think the hon. member is confusing a bond with a fidelity guarantee policy such as is taken out in respect of employees of road boards.

Mr. Sampson: That is what I was referring to.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: That is an entirely different contract. This particular guarantee might have been put in that form, but it was not. The draftsman happened to draw it in this particular form. I ask members to allow me to amend the law in the way expressed in this Bill. We have increased the actual amount—the protection the public get—by 250 per cent., which is something. By doing that, I do not want to increase the load imposed upon legitimate

land agents in the overhead of their business. After all, a majority of people are allowed to carry on business without paying substantial sums to the Government annually. The doctor pays nothing; the grocer pays nothing by way of a license fee.

Mr. Marshall: What about the lawyer?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The lawyer does something that is self-imposed—he contributes to a Chair of Law at the University.

Mr. Sleeman: Not very much good, is it?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The member for Fremantle is a great authority on that subject, but I could mention a number of people who have found it of very great advantage.

Mr. Sleeman: After passing through that course, does a lawyer have to pass another examination with the Barristers' Board?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I was pointing out that unless there is some good reason, people are allowed to follow any vocation they choose without paying a fee to the Government. The land agent has to pay £5 a year.

Mr. Wells: A poor old auctioneer has to pay £25.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: But the poor old auctioneer has special opportunities, apparently, for making a handsome income.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: There are honourable men in that profession, too.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes, though I understand that they often see a lot of imaginary things around a room when they are selling. The object of the Bill is to increase the protection to the general public and certainly not to increase the amount a land agent has to pay for overhead from year to year. The member for Geraldton knows I am thoroughly in sympathy with the idea of tightening up legislation to include the business of land agents and subdivisional land agents. I think I was of some assistance to him in making the Bill he introduced more efficient.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: Yes.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Or moulding it more to my ideas.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: But another place amended it.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Members there evidently had their ideas.

Mr. Kenneally: If the whole of the money reverted to the Crown, would not the dishonest man only be affected?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: No; whenever any breach was committed, however small it might be, the whole of the money would be forfeited for ever, and the insurance companies who, in the main, do this insurance work, would increase their premiums.

Mr. Kenneally: They would certainly charge an increased rate.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: They would fix their rates on their experience in the business.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: If, every time a sum of money was stolen, say £30, it meant that the sureties had to lose £500, the insurance companies would charge a very much higher premium than they would if their loss was only the actual amount stolen.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: It would depend on their experience how the premiums worked out.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes. If the law remains as it is, or if we increase the £200 to £500 and leave the law as it stands, as the member for Geraldton suggests, undoubtedly the premiums will be increased to four or five times what they are now.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: That is only supposition.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: At present the risk is £200 and the premiums that have been paid in the past have been very small. I think they have been £1 per £100, which would mean a charge of £2 a year for a risk of £200. That premium, however, was fixed on the basis that the surety had to pay only the amount of the actual defalcation up to £200. On the court's deciding that the slightest error on the part of a land agent meant the forfeiting of the whole £200, the companies indicated that they could not give the cover for the same premium.

Mr. Kenneally: Did they alter it to any fixed amount?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: No; because this has happened only during the currency of the present year, and the matter is still under consideration. If we increase the £200 to £500 and also allow the decision of the court to stand, I fear the premiums the companies will seek to charge

will be three or four times as much as they are now. It is no exaggeration to say that.

Mr. H. W. Mann: It is optional with the Crown now.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes.

Mr. H. W. Mann: Then will not the companies base their premiums on that?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: No, because they know that, as a general rule with the Crown, the money will be paid back. I have followed the exact wording of the New Zealand Act, which has apparently given complete satisfaction over many years, and I ask members to pass the second reading of the Bill. I shall seek to make one or two amendments in Committee, but I will place them on the Notice Paper before I ask members to consider the Bill in Committee. The object of the measure is to increase the protection to the general public. It has been contended that it is the duty of a surety to make inquiries regarding the character of a person, but in practice people do not do that. It is left to the court to do so. There is the safeguard. The court has to make ample inquiries. Each year a land agent has to apply for his license, and his character is and should be carefully scrutinised from year to year.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: Those who have been in the business for years are not likely to cause any difficulty. It is the "blow-in."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: But the "blow-in" has to satisfy the court that he is a fit and proper person to hold a license. With that safeguard, the surety treats it as a commercial proposition.

Mr. Wells: In the last 12 months one agent was refused a license.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: From time to time people are refused licenses. I hope members will pass the Bill. It is a matter of some urgency, because licenses have to be renewed next month and land agents find themselves in a quandary as to whether they will be able to get the necessary sureties for their bonds to enable them to carry on their business.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: What is the proposed increase in premiums?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Nothing has yet been decided upon pending the passing of this legislation. When the difficulty arose, land agents waited on me and stated the problem. They are not concerned except that they must get their bonds. But

I do not want them to have to pay too much. This is not the time to increase the overhead expenses in any vocation if that can possibly be avoided. I do not want to find agents landed with an increase. They already have to pay a license fee of £5 a year.

Mr. Withers: And you do not want to make it prohibitive for anyone else desiring to start in the business.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: No; we have more than the so-called reputable land agents to consider. They could probably pay the £500 in cash, but there are many small men, highly reputable and honourable, who may have very little or no capital, and I do not want to block them from starting, and I do not want to make it more expensive than necessary for them to carry on.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Richardson in the Chair; the Attorney General in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Progress reported.

BILL—LAND ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

To refer to Select Committee.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. C. G. Latham—York) [9.13]: I move—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill.

HON. M. F. TROY (Mount Magnet) [9.14]: This is the opportunity to move to refer the Bill to a select committee. I do not propose to traverse the remarks made by members on this side of the House last night, in which they indicated the desirableness of referring the Bill to a select committee. I move an amendment—

That the Bill be referred to a select committee.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. C. G. Latham—York) [9.15]: I thought I had made out a strong enough case last night to warrant the House putting this Bill through as quickly as possible. I do not know that any great benefit would accrue to

members if the measure were submitted to a select committee.

Mr. Marshall: I do.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I am only expressing my own opinion. The subject matter of the Bill has already been referred to a committee, and the report was presented to the House last night. I do not think the member for Mt. Magnet has given any good reason why the amendment should be carried. It will only mean delay, for which there is no justification. I hope the House may be able to adjourn early.

Mr. Marshall: The Bill would not take effect until the 1st January.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: A select committee could not finish its work in a fortnight, and the Bill would still have to go before another place. If the Bill is to become law, to cover the period we desire to be covered, we cannot afford to delay too long with it. I oppose the motion.

HON. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford-Midland) [9.16]: I strongly support the appeal made by the member for Mt. Magnet that the Bill be referred to a select committee. There is no reason why we should close down in a fortnight.

The Minister for Lands: I did not suggest that.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: There is no reason to hasten the prorogation of Parliament if justice remains to be done. If we sat for three weeks we could still do a large measure of justice to those who are appealing to Parliament to review their special circumstances.

The Minister for Lands: We generally close before Christmas.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Yes. It is essential that the Bill should receive further consideration. I know of no measure which has met with a more complete endorsement from members generally than this one. The House does desire to extend consideration to this important industry, but whether we are doing it in the right way and doing it effectively is another question. I have perused the report of the committee which was appointed to assist the Minister in the preparation of data. I am dissatisfied with the investigation. It was neither conclusive nor comprehensive. Certain interests have expressed their views, but the evidence given

certainly does not provide the data that we require in order to come to a satisfactory decision upon this measure. It was confined almost wholly to an extension of tenure of the leases. Right through their report the committee stressed the question of extending the leases beyond 1942. The Government have ignored that, but have gone into the matter of giving immediate relief owing to the fall in commodity prices. The Minister says he wants to encourage pastoralists to produce more. The Bill will not do that. If we want the pastoralists to go in for a better class of stock, and improve the carrying capacity of their holdings, it must be done in some other way. I agree that the main consideration is the improvement of the leases. If we can do anything to bring this about it is our duty to do it as speedily as possible. Under this proposal we are not going to encourage those who are already slovenly in the development of their leases; rather are we going, by reducing the rental, to induce the man who is doing very little to do still less. The reduction in the rental will constitute a discouragement of activity.

The Minister for Lands: Will you assist us to put a Bill through to increase the term of the leases?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: That is not the question.

The Minister for Lands: I was wondering whether you would do so.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The committee devoted considerable attention to that.

The Minister for Lands: Only some attention.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The evidence that came along caused the committee to devote their time and activity to an endeavour to convince the Government that a further extension of these leases was desirable. I hope Parliament will not consider that until serious thought has been given to it. Parliament extended the leases before, and made a mess of the matter. This Bill will not bring about the better development of pastoral leases. We want to encourage those who are already doing what the State desires, namely, utilising the land of which they have the lease. We are not going to encourage a man who has developed his lease in a proper way, and we are not going to discourage the man who at present is doing nothing. I claim that this Bill is an encouragement to the man who holds a lease

with the minimum amount of development and production, and is really a discouragement to the man who has done considerably more. It is reasonable that we should give those in the industry an opportunity to express their views. I do not mean a limited examination, such as was made by the committee appointed by the Government, but an investigation into the whole question, the condition of the industry, and the best way to relieve it. No definite evidence was given to the committee that the best way to give relief was by reducing rents. The matter is referred to, but it is not the main point submitted. The Government have brought down the Bill as a short cut, as it were, to relieve the pastoralists. I am going to place the responsibility upon members of the cross benches. They are the producers' representatives. This Bill is supposed to help the producers, but will not do so. It is very difficult to get a vote against the second reading of any Bill that proposes to afford a measure of relief. It is good Government tactics to bring down a Bill to give relief to somebody. If it is opposed, members can then be charged with being in opposition to the relief. The House, during the debate, has agreed upon the need for relief being given to this industry. The most deplorable thing about the debate is that those who are supposed to represent the producers have not said a word. The principle of the Bill has been endorsed by both sides. It is the application of that principle to the required relief that we say is wrong. It is extraordinary that those who should know most about the matter, and should be able to assist the House in arriving at a conclusion, have remained silent. I admit the member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo) spoke, but he only supported the Bill with modifications.

Mr. Angelo: All I wanted was to date the Bill back six months.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: May we take it that the hon. member's electors desire the relief limited to the proposals contained in the Bill? If they got that relief would they be satisfied that the Government had done all that was necessary to tide them over their difficulties?

Mr. Angelo: In the present circumstances they could not do more.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Although it is the most the Government can do, it is not what the pastoralists want.

Mr. Angelo: The Government have not gone into the question of tenure, and that is what we want.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The Bill does not deal with that, but it is a matter which can be considered.

The Minister for Lands: The Bill does not deal with it.

Mr. Angelo: I regret that.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Outside of the Minister's speech we have not been assisted to make a careful scrutiny of the Bill.

Mr. Angelo: Silence gives consent.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: No. I want to give the producers an opportunity to assist Parliament to render that relief which will be of maximum benefit both to them and the State. There is no definite evidence that one shilling per lb. of wool is the correct basis to work on, or that the six per cent. up or down is the correct percentage to allow for a rise and fall, or that the 30 per cent. limit is justified. There is nothing to guide this House on the question whether 20 per cent. in West Kimberley is just compared with 40 per cent. in East Kimberley. We do not know whether the percentage of relief to the cattle industry is comparable to that given in the sheep-raising portions of the pastoral districts. No detailed information is given in the Minister's speech.

The Minister for Lands: And there is none in yours.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: We do not know from him what amount of relief will be given to individual pastoralists. The only information we got was from the member for Kimberley (Mr. Coverley), that in his electorate, of which he could speak with special knowledge, the amount of relief to some pastoralists will be £50 per annum. I do not want to limit my consideration for pastoralists of £50 a year. That is not worth giving. If their disabilities are limited to £1 per week, they are not worth the while of Parliament to bother about. They can overcome those disabilities themselves. It is because I know their disabilities to be beyond £1 per week that I want a select committee to inquire what really are the needs of the industry. Then assistance can be rendered where it will be of most benefit. There is no evidence to help hon. members in coming to a conclusion as to whether the Bill is right. On the question of time we have to recognise the activity of another place. With all the limitations of

representation there, the pastoral industry is specially well represented in that place. A large proportion of the members of another place are either directly concerned or have a substantial interest in the pastoral industry. Are we justified in assuming that they will take the casual view of this Bill that has characterised the attitude of the Government side here? The only investigation made has been made by members who have indicated that they do not oppose the principle of the Bill but that they wish to apply it in the best way, and that they desire to be satisfied by evidence that in the pastoralists' opinion the Bill will meet their needs. Those who have spoken here with the greatest amount of knowledge and thought, members representing the pastoral industry of the North, have criticised the Bill not on the ground that their constituents are undeserving of relief, but on the ground that the Government's method of rendering relief is not what their constituents desire. I wish the Minister to appreciate that another place will not be casual in regard to the Bill. He may think that by pushing it through here, he will expedite its passage. However, the necessary inquiry, instead of taking place here, will take place where vested interests are represented—in another place.

The Minister for Lands: Inquiry will take place whether there is a select committee or not.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: We are not justified in assuming that. If this House makes the inquiry, the scope of that inquiry will be convincing not only to members here, but to another place and to the people generally. For special reasons, I suppose, another place will delay special legislation as much as possible. Whether or not that has been so in the past, I do not know. But another place will not duplicate the inquiry by this Chamber if that inquiry is as comprehensive as another place considers essential. A select committee can make all necessary inquiries within a fortnight. Fortunately it is not necessary to go to the North to obtain evidence. Members of this Chamber can assist with evidence.

The Minister for Lands: They can give that evidence in Committee.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: One cannot in Committee satisfactorily amend a Bill that has been wrongly based.

The Minister for Lands: Of course one can.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: What knowledge have we?

The Minister for Lands: You just suggested that you had the knowledge.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: No. If we had the knowledge, why should we want a select committee? We on this side say we that we want to render assistance to the industry, but that we have not the knowledge how to go about it in the most practical way. We go further and say that the Government have not that knowledge, and that the Government's Bill does not display any special knowledge as regards granting assistance in the most practical manner. Therefore we on this side cannot help the pastoral industry in Committee. We have not the knowledge to do it. But we do say on behalf of this important industry, one of the most valuable industries the State has, that this House should consult those engaged in the industry as to their needs and give them every opportunity to express their views. Further, there is the fact that when the agricultural industry was in need of relief, the Government appointed a Royal Commission so that the agriculturists could come along and point out how relief could be rendered most effectively. But when it comes to this huge pastoral industry, the Government are content with the work of a committee, work not comprehensive, work not of the scope required to enable the State to do what is most beneficial. A grave injustice will be done if a select committee is not appointed. The representatives of the producers, sitting on the cross benches, will have to carry the responsibility of denying the pastoralists the right to express their views as to how relief should be granted. It amounts to making fish of one and flesh of another. Equal consideration will not be given to the relative merits of the two industries, and to the means by which relief can be afforded, unless the select committee is appointed. I say most emphatically that such an investigation is necessary. I trust the House will carry the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the discussion proceeds, I wish to inform hon. members that under Standing Order 271 it is quite competent for any member of the House to move that a Bill be referred to a select committee. I have now a motion and also an amendment before the Chair. Under Standing Order 271 I rule that Mr. Troy's motion supersedes the Minister's motion that I do

now leave the Chair. The question now before the House is that the Bill be referred to a select committee.

MR. ANGELO (Gascayne) [9.40]: I feel certain that if this Bill and the whole question of relief to the pastoral industry were referred to a select committee, that industry would secure more relief than the Bill proposes to give. But the trouble is that time is the essence of the contract.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: That is wrong.

Mr. ANGELO: No.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Another place has to deal with the Bill.

Mr. ANGELO: I hope that when speaking on the Bill yesterday I satisfied members of this Chamber that not only is relief necessary, but that the relief must be immediate. We know that this session cannot continue for more than another fortnight.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Why not?

Mr. ANGELO: Because with the exception of this question we shall have run out of work. That is the opinion which I have formed from reading the Notice Paper. Moreover, we all know that as soon as the Estimates have been got through, a good many innocents are slaughtered.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: There is no reason why we should slaughter the pastoralists.

Mr. ANGELO: I do not intend to slaughter the pastoralists. What I suggest is that we get the Bill through, so as to give the pastoralists the immediate relief they require. Then what is to prevent the hon. member from giving notice of motion to-morrow for the appointment of a select committee to inquire into the whole question? I want to get the Bill through.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: So do I.

Mr. ANGELO: And I want to get it through speedily. Otherwise the industry will go to the wall. We all know what select committees come to. Some time ago the hon. member moved for a select committee on a certain matter. He asked for a fortnight in which to complete the investigation, and I think he obtained three extensions before he brought up the report. That is always the way with select committees. There are many pastoralists of the Kimberleys and the North-West who do not reside in the city. They are the real hard workers, the real sufferers, and the people

who ought to be heard. I do not want a select committee to rush through in a haphazard manner. I want a select committee of independent people to go into the whole question of the industry.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: When are you going to get it?

Mr. ANGELO: The agriculturists obtained a comprehensive Royal Commission, as the hon. member himself has pointed out. All that is necessary in this case is to move for a select committee, which I am sure will readily be granted. When the session closes, the Government will create the select committee an honorary Royal Commission. That Royal Commission could go right on, and the report could be tabled when Parliament re-assembles next year. I agree with much of what the hon. member has said as to our not having the full information we need. As the hon. member has stated, all sides agree that some relief is necessary. I ask hon. members to let the Bill go through to-night, and then if they want a select committee to inquire comprehensively, I will help them. So far as the select committee is concerned, it does not matter if the Bill passes. As soon as the honorary Royal Commission have delivered their report, the Government will consider it; and what is to stop them from bringing in next year a measure perhaps repealing this Bill, which I hope will pass to-night, and substituting a measure which will give the necessary relief?

Mr. Withers: Why not get the whole thing fixed up at once?

Mr. ANGELO: Because the pastoralists want this relief immediately. The Bill gives a certain amount of relief, and the industry must have it. I am afraid that if we let the measure go to a select committee, the prospect of immediate relief will disappear. I do hope that the motion will not be carried, but that the Bill will be passed. Then steps can be taken to appoint a select committee to be converted into an honorary Royal Commission after the House adjourns.

MR. COVERLEY (Kimberley) [9.44]: I support the amendment because I consider that an immense amount of good will result if the Bill is referred to a select committee. The Minister has placed before us the report of the departmental committee who inquired into the Bill, and I have perused that report. My perusal has

only served to confirm the view I held when speaking on the second reading, that the inquiry was held on a bad foundation. The members of the original appraisalment board, who travelled through the Kimberleys and the rest of the pastoral areas for the purpose of reappraising the country, were in duty bound to work in accordance with the Act. Their inquiry was unsatisfactory because the necessary knowledge was not furnished to members of this Chamber to enable the question to be properly dealt with. Some hon. members were over-anxious to secure an extension of the pastoral leases, and were prepared to accept anything. As a result they agreed to the minimum charge of 10s. per 1000 acres as a reasonable rental for the pastoral leases. That was the start of the whole mess-up. Then there was a change of Government, and amending legislation was introduced to abolish the minimum rental to be charged. Unfortunately the committee appointed in Perth to inquire into the reappraisalment of pastoral leases could work only on reports forwarded to the department by the original appraisers who had travelled through the country. Thus the special reappraisalment board started on an unsatisfactory basis, and their subsequent recommendations could hardly be regarded as logical. Now the latest committee set up to report on this question have also had to base their findings on unsatisfactory premises. In the first place the evidence taken was one-sided and partisan. The evidence the committee were asked to take was from the original pastoral reappraisalment board, from the associated banks, fencing and financing firms, the Agricultural Bank, the Pastoralists' Association, and from others associated with the cattle industry. My complaint is that the Government have not taken a broad view of the position.

The Minister for Lands: The committee had the report of the Royal Commission to deal with, and that Royal Commission was appointed by your Government.

Mr. COVERLEY: The fact that the Royal Commission was appointed by a Labour Government, did not make it a satisfactory commission. I had no say in it.

The Minister for Lands: The commission took evidence on oath.

Mr. COVERLEY: The Bill is based on a narrow view of the situation.

The Minister for Lands: It is pretty wide in its application.

Mr. COVERLEY: It is confined to particular interests only.

The Minister for Lands: It is not. The committee had all the reports that were available.

Mr. COVERLEY: I would raise no objection if the Government were to reduce the rents altogether, so long as they imposed the condition that whatever profits were made, or whatever the Government were prepared to refund to those engaged in the industry, the money was to be spent in the development of the holdings in the interests of the State and of the pastoralists themselves. The Minister said the Government wished to assist the cattle industry by the introduction of additional stud bulls. He held a different view when I suggested that the Government could assist the pastoral industry by enabling further water conservation to be undertaken. I disagree with the attitude adopted by the Minister. In my opinion, the improvement of the cattle herds is merely a common-sense business policy. If the pastoralists themselves were interested enough, they would attend to that phase without the necessity of any advice from the Government. If they had decided to take steps in that direction, they could have availed themselves of the stud cattle already imported under the supervision of the management of the Wyndham Meat Works. The Minister seemed to be under the impression that it would be an altogether wrong policy to go in for water conservation, but it would be quite right to seek to improve the standard of the herds by means of stud cattle. If the policy were right in one direction, it should be right in the other. I shall not prolong the agony; I have said all I desire to say. I believe the Bill, if referred to a select committee, could be improved in the interests of the State as well as of the industry.

The Premier: You do not think the select committee could do the work required in a few days?

Mr. COVERLEY: I do. The member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo) talked about immediate relief. He knows that is a myth. The pastoral rents will not be collected until June.

Mr. Angelo: I think the Premier would regard that as a myth.

Mr. COVERLEY: It is not. The land rents are due in June.

The Minister for Lands: You know nothing about it. They are due at the end of March, and if not paid, there is provision for a fine.

Mr. COVERLEY: The pastoralist will receive the same consideration as fruitgrowers and others who cannot pay their rents. It does not further the position to say that the Bill is necessary to grant the pastoralists immediate relief. They have suffered under this hardship for many years, and does the hon. member suggest that a question of three weeks will save them from the bankruptcy court?

Mr. Angelo: The hon. member should realise that it is the banks that are insisting upon the payment of rents, because they want to see their securities made good.

Mr. COVERLEY: If the member for Gascoyne will read the report that has been tabled, he will realise what the attitude of the banks has been. They are not interested in the improvement of the industry, but they want to see that their security is made good. That is apparent in three or four places in the course of the report.

Mr. Angelo: There are the financial firms as well as the banks.

Mr. COVERLEY: I do not object to those institutions having their security made good, provided something is done to improve the industry. In Perth we have the Agricultural Department that costs the State hundreds of thousands of pounds a year. What is the department doing?

The Minister for Agriculture: Assisting the pastoral industry.

Mr. COVERLEY: In what way? The Minister will assist the industry if he helps to refer the Bill to a select committee. Hundreds of thousands of pounds have been spent by the department upon the improvement of varieties of wheat, wool, apples and other primary products. Apart from sending a few veterinary officers to the North occasionally, what has the department done for the North?

The Minister for Agriculture: A lot of money has been spent on the Wyndham Meat Works.

Mr. COVERLEY: The Government, not the Agricultural Department, did that.

Mr. Angelo: Well, pass the Bill and then have a select committee.

Mr. COVERLEY: The select committee should be appointed at this stage to deal with the Bill.

The Minister for Lands: You want to hold up the Bill for another month so that the poor, unfortunate pastoralists shall not get any benefit.

Mr. COVERLEY: That is no argument. The Bill can be referred to the select committee. We can deal with it subsequently in the light of the committee's report, and it can be passed by both Houses of Parliament before the end of the session.

The Minister for Lands: When will that be?

Mr. COVERLEY: According to the Minister's statement, about three weeks or so hence.

The Minister for Lands: I did not say anything of the sort.

Mr. COVERLEY: We have enough legislation on the Notice Paper already to occupy our attention while the select committee make the inquiries and submit their recommendations.

The Minister for Lands: The select committee will do more than the Royal Commission!

Mr. Angelo: How could the committee get evidence from the North-West?

Mr. COVERLEY: It would not be necessary to get evidence from the North-West. We can secure sufficient down here. Already we have one Royal Commissioner roaming about the North in an aeroplane. I do not know what he will learn of the North by going through the air. The Bill has been based on a wrong foundation, and we should rectify it by referring it to a select committee.

Question (to refer to select committee) put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	18
Noes	22
Majority against				4

AYES.

Mr. Collier	Mr. Millington
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Munro
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Toner
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Lamond	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Withers
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Corboy

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. McLarty
Mr. Barnard	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Brown	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Davy	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Doney	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Latham	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Thorn
Mr. H. W. Mann	Mr. Wells
Mr. J. I. Mann	Mr. North

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Lutey	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Wainbrough	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Pantou	Mr. Parker
Miss Holman	Mr. Keenan

Question thus negatived.

In Committee.

Mr. Richardson in the Chair; the Minister for Lands in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Adjustment and appraisalment of rentals of pastoral leases:

Mr. ANGELO: I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of paragraph (b) of Sub-clause 1 "January" be struck out and "July" inserted in lieu.

This will have the effect of dating the relief back to July. On the second reading I tried to impress on members that the pastoral industry is in a very parlous state, and that any relief required should be given at once. The Premier, when introducing the Revenue Estimates, admitted that the pastoralists were having a bad time. The Minister for Lands, when moving the second reading of the Bill, made the same admission, and when replying to the debate last night said the position of the industry demanded relief. The Leader of the Opposition acknowledged that relief was required, and so, too, did every member that spoke on the second reading. That being so, I ask why the relief should be deferred. However, the Premier, probably, is wondering where the money is to come from. Already some of the land rents have been paid, and he does not want to make a refund. But if he agrees to the amendment, he can add a proviso that no rebate need be made, that the amount can be deducted from the next payment. The Premier had made his estimate and told us what the relief is going to mean, but surely, since we have agreed that relief is necessary, we shall not take him to task if,

through his agreeing to the amendment, his estimate proves to be inaccurate. I appeal to members not to delay the giving of this relief. The Premier is sympathetic to the pastoralists who have contributed so much to the revenue of the State and helped to create credit for us in the Old Country, and I ask him to accept this amendment.

Mr. COVERLEY: I am sorry I allowed the hon. member to speak on his proposed amendment, for I have an earlier one to move in paragraph (a). The Bill as it stands provides for a reduction of 20 per cent. in West Kimberley and 40 per cent. in East Kimberley, and I propose to move an amendment to make it 40 per cent. in both Kimberleys.

Mr. Angelo: I will withdraw my amendment in order that the hon. member might first proceed with his.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Mr. COVERLEY: I move an amendment:

That in line 10 of paragraph (a) of Sub-clause 1 "twenty" be struck out and "forty" inserted in lieu.

This will put the two Kimberley districts on a par. I have gone through the land committee's report and have come to the conclusion there is really little or no difference in the two districts.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: There is no difference, except that arising from the pleuro line, and the conditions there have now been changed.

Mr. COVERLEY: The average price obtained for West Kimberley cattle is £4 10s. 1d. per head, while for East Kimberley it is £4 8s. 6d., so there is very little difference in the average returns of the two districts.

The Minister for Lands: Take it over a period of three years and see what the difference is.

Mr. COVERLEY: That is exactly what I have done, and those are the averages given. For 12 months past the pleuro restrictions have applied to both districts, and so far as I can see they will apply for many years to come.

The Minister for Agriculture: East Kimberley has the advantage in point of freight.

Mr. COVERLEY: That is not what I have to reply to. What I have to reply to

is the land committee's report, on which the Bill is based. Just now we had a motion to send the Bill to a select committee, but the Minister for Agriculture opposed it. He should have supported that motion for a select committee. If there is any advantage, it is with the East Kimberley growers, and the Minister for Agriculture ought to know it. The restriction imposed upon West Kimberley pastoralists is that they must ship their stock for immediate slaughter. This means that nothing but the primeest cattle can be shipped. Old or inferior cattle must be left to die on the runs. There is no sale for them. East Kimberley growers have a market for every class of cattle at the Wyndham Meat Works and some return can be obtained for them. I have tried to do my best for the industry by supporting the proposal to refer the Bill to a select committee so that anomalies could be considered and rectified. Now the Government must take the responsibility for the measure.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I cannot accept the amendment. Paragraph (a) does not apply to the same extent as does the rest of the Bill. It will apply only for 15 months when a reappraisal of the whole of the Kimberleys will be made. Some of the beef growers have had a very lean time. For quite a number of years the price has been as low as £3 2s. and in no year until 1929 did it reach anywhere near £5. Before the reappraisal is made the Government will have the report of the Royal Commissioner on pleuro, and the report should show what restrictions are fair and reasonable. Much consideration has been given to the Bill and it represents the views of the Government.

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

Ayes	18
Noes	20
					—
Majority against	2
					—

AYES.				
Mr. Collier
Mr. Corboy
Mr. Coverley
Mr. Cunningham
Mr. Hegney
Mr. Johnson
Mr. Kenneally
Mr. Lamond
Mr. Marshall

Mr. McCallum
Mr. Millington
Mr. Munsie
Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Troy
Mr. Willcock
Mr. Wilson
Mr. Withers
Mr. Raphael

(Teller.)

Mr. Angelo
Mr. Barnard
Mr. Brown
Mr. Davy
Mr. Doney
Mr. Ferguson
Mr. Latham
Mr. Lindsay
Mr. H. W. Mann
Mr. J. I. Mann

NOES.

Mr. McLarty
Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Patrick
Mr. Piesse
Mr. Sampson
Mr. Scaddan
Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Thern
Mr. Wells
Mr. North

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.
Mr. Lutey
Mr. Fenton
Mr. Wansbrough
Miss Holman

NOES.
Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Parker
Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Keenan

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. ANGELO: I now move the amendment which I temporarily withdrew—

That in line 1 of paragraph (b) "January" be struck out and the word "July" inserted in lieu.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I cannot agree to the amendment. Members would not approve if I brought down retrospective legislation, and particularly would they disapprove of the amendment seeing that it affects land rents because it could be asked why the Bill was not introduced previous to the 1st July. A second reason is that the amendment would be unfair to the Treasurer. It would mean a loss of £17,000 which he could ill-afford. Application might be made for a refund of some of the land rents paid and I do not think the Treasurer could object to returning them.

Mr. Angelo: According to your figures the loss would be £13,860.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The total is £33,310.

Mr. Angelo: Divide that by two and leave out the Kimberleys.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member is referring to the South-West portion. The Treasurer has not the money with which to make refunds.

Hon. P. Collier: What has he been doing with the money?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: There is little money with which to do anything, and it would be shockingly unfair to make the measure retrospective. It is easy to make oneself popular at the expense of another. I could make myself popular with the member for Gascoyne, but at the expense of the Treasurer. I cannot do that. It is not fair to make the Bill retrospective, particularly as the rentals have already been paid.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I support the amendment. I am sure the Treasurer will not be called upon to refund much money, simply because the pastoralists themselves have not paid much.

The Minister for Lands: They have.

Mr. Angelo: They have had the rents paid for them.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I know of many who have not paid. If we are going to give this relief, it must be given immediately.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Minister's argument is ridiculous. We all remember another Bill, which was made retrospective and compelled employees to make retrospective payments.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must not discuss a Bill which has already been dealt with this session.

Mr. MARSHALL: I demand the right to compare the Minister's attitude on this amendment with his attitude on another Bill dealt with a few months ago. In the first place, he opposed this amendment because he would not agree to the Bill being made retrospective. He also said that the amendment would be unjust to the Treasurer. If the Treasurer can find money to relieve other industries, I cannot see why he should deny similar relief to another industry.

The Minister for Lands: What other industry?

Mr. MARSHALL: Millions have been written-off group settlement accounts, and hundreds of thousands of pounds have been found for farmers and for soldier settlement, but a matter of £13,000 to assist pastoralists in the North cannot be considered. I protest against this discrimination between industries. This is the first occasion on which pastoralists have ever had anything in the way of relief meted out to them by the Treasury.

The Attorney General: The whole Bill is designed to relieve them.

Mr. MARSHALL: And the amendment is designed to give them a little more relief.

The Attorney General: Don't be greedy.

Mr. MARSHALL: One is said to have an appetite when he asks for £13,000 more for pastoralists, but Government supporters can get millions for group settlers, and hundreds of thousands of pounds for wheat-growers, without being termed greedy or being thought to have an appetite of any kind. Members on the cross

benches can never ask for too much, but when we of the North ask that the pastoral industry should be favourably considered, we are told not to be greedy. I do not know what support the member for Gascoyne expects to receive from members around him, but judging from their countenances I do not think he will get much. Allegedly those members are here to represent the primary producers. When the division is taken presently, we shall see their loyalty disclosed. I expect the hon. member will find himself standing alone.

Mr. KENNEALLY: Some time ago I appealed to members not to legislate retrospectively regarding the amount of money that was sought to be taken from certain people. The member for Gascoyne was adamant in his desire that this money should be taken retrospectively from the workers. This evening, however, he wants to turn the position around, and desires that pastoralists should take money retrospectively from the Government. I shall not support that attitude. What was good enough for the workers is good enough for the pastoralists. Other legislation which came before this Chamber proposed to protect tenants who, by reason of unemployment, could not pay rent. Did the member for Gascoyne support the contention that relief from rent should be made retrospective in that instance? No. Again, did the hon. member support us in our endeavour to prevent contracting outside that legislation? He did not. The Committee would do well to turn down this amendment. This class legislation is not to the credit of the Chamber. Certainly, Bills to protect the workless do not commend themselves to hon. members opposite.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I move an amendment—

That in paragraph (b) of Subclause 1, after "North-West," in line 7, there be inserted "South-West."

I gave the reasons for this amendment last night. Numerous pastoral properties in the South-West Division will not come under this Bill. They are properties which cannot be called good station properties. They are situated in thick country, which has not much carrying capacity. One station of 100,000 acres recently sold carried only

5,000 sheep, and cannot carry more than 7,000. Friends of mine who inspected that property would not bid for it because of its poor carrying capacity.

The Minister for Lands: We will agree to the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I move an amendment—

That in paragraph (b) of Subclause 1, after "wool," in line 10, there be inserted "produced in Western Australia."

There is some doubt as to where the Government Statistician should get his information from; hence this amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I move an amendment—

That in paragraph (b) of Subclause 1, after "wool," appearing in lines 20 and 22, there be inserted "aforesaid."

This is consequential.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I move an amendment—

That in the proviso to Subclause 1, paragraph (d), after "North-West," line 3, there be inserted "South-West."

This is consequential on my previous amendment.

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

Clause 3—Preference to agricultural students:

Hon. M. F. TROY: This clause should be struck out. I gave reasons yesterday.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I shall not object to the deletion of the clause.

Clause put and negatived.

Clause 4, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

House adjourned at 10.40 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 12th November, 1931.

	PAGE
Questions: Agricultural Products Act ...	5198
Railways, Collië coal supplies ...	5198
Butler's Swamp, drainage ...	5199
Rent reduction, country appeals ...	5199
Assent to Bills ...	5199
Annual Estimates, Report, Com. of Ways and Means	5199
Bills: Land and Income Tax Assessment Act Amend-	
ment (No. 3), 1R. ...	5199
Electric Lighting Act Amendment, 1R. ...	5199
Companies Act Amendment, 1R. ...	5199
Land Act Amendment (No. 2), Recom., Standing	
Orders suspension, Report, 3R. ...	5199
Swanbourne Reserve, 2R., etc. ...	5200
Licensing Act Amendment (No. 5), 2R., defeated	5200
Land Agents Act Amendment, Com. ...	5207
Tenants Protection, 2R., defeated	5208
Licensing Act Amendment (No. 2), 2R., Com.,	
defeated ...	5214
Electoral Act Amendment, 2R., Com. ...	5222

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

QUESTION—AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS ACT.

Sale of Immature Fruit

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Are the provisions of the Agricultural Products Act being administered? 2, Is he aware that immature stone fruit is being offered for sale at the metropolitan markets? 3, In view of the injury thereby done to the sale of fruit suitable for consumption, will he take steps to protect the public and the more careful growers?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, Yes. 2, Yes. As is usual, at the beginning of the season, a small quantity has been marketed. 3, The Act is administered by the Department with the object of protecting the public and growers, but it also provides that the purchaser himself may proceed against the seller for any offence under the Act.

QUESTION—RAILWAYS, COLLIE COAL SUPPLIES.

Mr. WILSON asked the Minister for Railways: 1, What was the total of the coal orders given by the Railway Department to the several coal companies operating in Collië for the weeks ended the 31st October and