

Speaking generally, quite a number of duties devolve on the department, and owing to lack of finance it has not been possible to do all that the department would desire. Some of the amendments in the Bill will give us additional power which experience has shown it is necessary to have. I hope members will agree with me that the amendments are essential and that they will assist to carry them through so that the department may be able to do their work more efficiently in future. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. H. J. Yelland, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.46 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 13th November, 1929.

	PAGE
Questions: Unemployment, Pemberton ...	1529
Migration Agreement, suspension...	1529
Select Committee, Alsatian Dog Bill, report presented	1529
Bills: Reserves (No. 2), 1R. ...	1529
Redistribution of Seats Act Amendment, 2R., etc.	1529
Cremation, returned ...	1535
Public Service Appeal Board Act Amendment, 2R.	1535
Public Service Act Amendment, 2R. ...	1538
State Savings Bank Act Amendment, 2R. ...	1542
Alsatian Dog, Com. report ...	1554

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

QUESTION — UNEMPLOYMENT, PEMBERTON.

Mr. NORTH, for Mr. J. H. Smith, asked the Minister for Works: 1, Is he aware that over 100 men are still out of work at Pemberton? 2, If so, when does he propose to absorb these men on public works in that district? 3, Will he take steps to ensure that these men, who have waited for many weeks, are employed before men are sent down to Pemberton from the State Labour Bureau and other places?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, 2, and 3, I am aware that men are out of work at Pemberton, and they were

advised by me some months ago that there was no likelihood of additional public works being put in hand in the district. Work available in any part of the State will be distributed on a fair basis.

QUESTION — MIGRATION AGREEMENT, SUSPENSION.

MR. THOMSON (without notice) asked the Premier: In view of the reported negotiations between Mr. Scullin and the Imperial Government regarding the suspension of the Migration Agreement, will the Premier state whether he has received information regarding Mr. Scullin's intentions and the direction in which he proposes the agreement should be suspended?

The PREMIER replied: I can only reply that I have not received any communication whatever on the subject from the Commonwealth Prime Minister.

ALSATIAN DOG BILL SELECT COMMITTEE.

Report Presented.

Mr. Clydesdale brought up the report of the select committee.

Report read, and ordered to be printed. Bill ordered to be reprinted in accordance with the report, and the consideration of the Bill in Committee made an Order of the Day for a later stage of the sitting.

BILL—RESERVES (No. 2).

Introduced by the Minister for Lands, and read a first time.

BILL — REDISTRIBUTION OF SEATS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL (Northam) [4.40]: This measure provides for small adjustments of boundaries which, however, are extremely necessary. I have no objection whatever to offer to the Bill, but regret that the matter had to be referred back to the Commissioners. I remember how difficult it was, on a previous occasion,

to approach the Commission a second time. But how different things appear when one sits on the other side of the House! I remember that my friend the Premier, when in Opposition, was highly indignant at my suggestion to refer a Bill to the Commission again.

The Premier: No; other members were.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Premier led the van. As is usual with this side of the House, we propose to do the right thing by the Government.

The Premier: By remaining where you are?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: That would probably be doing the right thing by the Premier and those associated with him, but not the right thing by the country.

The Premier: Do you propose to change sides?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: As early as possible; we almost did it the other day. However, the Bill is necessary, and the alterations are not material. They do not make much difference in the numbers of electors in the various electorates, but they do rectify small troubles that might produce serious consequences. In one or two cases a boundary ran through a building. Thus one person in a room might be in one electorate, and another person in the same room in a different electorate.

The Premier: The dividing line might run through the centre of the room.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, and that would be a serious matter.

The Premier: Especially in these days of twin beds.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It cannot be tolerated. However, it is a pity that more care was not taken in fixing boundaries when the Commission had the Bill before them. I hope the measure will go to the Upper House without delay, so that it can be dealt with there, and so that the Premier can proclaim the Act—a thing he can hardly do until he obtains these adjustments.

MR. LAMBERT (Coolgardie) [4.43]: I do not know that we should agree to the passing of this amending Bill in the manner suggested by the Leader of the Opposition. If it is necessary to bring home anything forcibly in connection with redistribution of seats, the present Bill does bring home forcibly to my mind the slipshod, hap-

hazard way in which the Commission went about their work.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But we have already carried the principal measure.

Mr. LAMBERT: I know that all right, but I am now speaking of the amending Bill. This Bill does not disclose the only anomalies in the principal Act. In point of fact, that Act bristles with anomalies, and possibly with inconsistencies as well. Probably in Committee I shall take the opportunity to strike out all the words in Clause 1 after "cited" with a view to testing the feeling of the Chamber as to whether we should go so hurriedly about the making of important and far-reaching changes. Hon. members opposite, and especially the Opposition Leader, saw no objection to the passing of the parent Act. The reason for the hon. gentleman's view was that he thought the measure a political advantage. He knew his fate on the old boundaries, but he was and is uncertain of his fate on the new.

Hon. G. Taylor: How are you yourself on the new?

Mr. LAMBERT: I think the fate of the Opposition Leader will be similar on the new boundaries to what it would have been on the old. I trust hon. members will recall some words of warning which were uttered when the principal Act was going through this Chamber. Coincidentally with that measure we had one of a similar nature affecting another place, and it is not hard for members to discern the fate of that Bill at present before another place. At all events, I intend to move a motion covering it, and I hope that when it is brought forward members will agree that we must not have the composition of this House dealt with as it has been dealt with and another branch of the Legislature held immune from the correction of the screaming anomalies in the constitution of that place. At all events, I will again content myself by recording my unflinching opposition to this measure and saying we should not grant—

The Premier interjected.

Mr. LAMBERT: Is it? Only in two or three instances, when they are of such a startling nature as apparently to shock the Chief Electoral Officer. I know that some hon. members have recently gone out to look for their original boundaries. I heard of one the other day, and it was asked what was he doing up there? Another said, "He is looking for his old boundaries." I think the

Act is a huge mistake and that this branch of the Legislature will realise it as time goes on. It is regrettable that we cannot take the opportunity to make the parent Act inoperative by passing this Bill out on its second reading. If we cannot do that, then I hope in Committee to fire the final barrel at the discreditable Act by moving that the first clause of the Bill be deleted.

MR. THOMSON (Katanning) [4.47]: I find that one amendment in the Bill alters "east" to "west."

Mr. Lambert: They do not know east from west.

Mr. THOMSON: On turning to the schedule we find that only the seats in the metropolitan area are dealt with.

Mr. Richardson: They are all very important.

Mr. THOMSON: They are, of course, to the member who has interjected. His rolls have already been made available to him, but up to date I cannot give a genuine criticism of the actions of this Commission, because I have not been able to get the rolls for the Katanning electorate. So I am not in a position, as other members are, to say whether or not the boundaries of my electorate have been correctly defined. Here we have an example of the way in which this Commission performed their duties. There must be some howling anomalies in the country electorates. But, as usual, the Commissioners are able to rectify errors in the metropolitan area quite easily and to prepare the rolls so that metropolitan members may know just where they stand. Yet as I say, up to the present the rolls for the Katanning electorate are not available, and I understand it is giving the Electoral Department a lot of trouble to define the area of that huge territory. I believe that millions of acres have been transferred to the Katanning electorate. In my opinion the subdivision of the electorates does not reflect credit on those who performed the work. They simply sat down in an office and drew a few lines and said, "Those are the boundaries." From the point of view of country electorates it was a great pity we should have lost the services of Mr. Cook, who had been associated with the department for so many years, and that the Government, with the best intentions, regarded as the next best man one who had been dealing with the question only from

the Commonwealth point of view. He certainly could not have considered community of interests when shaping the country electorates. At this early stage, before the Act has been proclaimed we have this intimation that already the Commissioners have found they have made mistakes in defining the boundaries, and so it is necessary for the Government to bring down the Bill to rectify what the Premier euphemistically described as purely technical errors. But what is going to be the position of many country members when faced with all this confusion? Every day electors are asking me whether they are now in the Katanning electorate or in the Nelson electorate or in the Wagin electorate. The House will appreciate the difficulties a member is faced with in answering such a question.

The Premier: But that would occur in country electorates, no matter how the boundaries were drawn.

Mr. THOMSON: I recognise that. It might be excusable in country electorates, but it is not excusable in the metropolitan area, where the Commissioners have up-to-date lithos. to work on. If they had done their job properly they would have gone round and inspected the boundaries. The whole of the metropolitan area could be put inside my electorate, and there would still be plenty of country to spare. Whilst not opposing the second reading—for these anomalies must be rectified—I am voicing my protest on principle. In the opinion of Country Party members the position is very unsatisfactory. Although I have made repeated inquiries for the new rolls, up to date I have not been able to get one, and I am not in a position to say where my electorate begins and ends. While I am fairly energetic, I have no desire to set out on an exploring expedition. That should be the job of the Electoral Department—to find out where the boundaries really are.

HON. G. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret) [4.54]: In opposing the parent measure I declared my doubt as to whether the Commissioners had left their office, instead of sitting there and drawing lines across the map to represent the new boundaries. Members who favoured the original Bill because they thought it would give them some political pull, contended that the Commission had done good work, but to the chagrin of

some members I pointed out that the Commission had not done their work in a satisfactory manner when they made the new Kanowna electorate as big as Europe. I said then and I say again that the work of the Commissioners was not done in a manner indicating that they knew anything about the State.

Mr. Thomson: That is correct.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The original Bill reminds one of that scandalous measure brought down by the Wilson Government. It was howled at from one end of the State to the other, and the Labour Party grid-ironed it in the Press, and of course it was the downfall of the Government. That Bill was a tobogganing along the marginal boundaries, and the Bill that is here to-day is an unanswerable confirmation of what I said about the existing Act when it was before us. Even the Commissioners themselves have seen some of their errors. When the Chief Electoral Officer tried to put voters within the boundaries marked out for them he found it was impossible to make electors eligible under the Bill the Commissioners had submitted to this Parliament and this Parliament had accepted. This Bill to-day is evidence of the lack of knowledge and ability in the Commissioners' recommendations.

Mr. Teesdale: There is nothing here about Mount Margaret.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: And nothing about Roebourne. I like those members who are absolutely safe and have held their safe seats in this Parliament for many years, and yet have the audacity to criticise other members who take part in the deliberations on a redistribution of seats. The member for Roebourne is perfectly safe with his 100 electors up there, but we do not know what is going to happen in March, when that safety may disappear.

Mr. Teesdale: Yes, you never can tell.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Then my honourable friend may have something to say about redistribution. There is no more justification for Gascoyne being held free from these boundaries than there is for Murchison or Mount Margaret being put in that category, for Gascoyne is just as accessible as are the other two.

Mr. Teesdale: I should like to lop a bit off my own electorate, if that is any news to you.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: You may have the whole lot lopped off in March. The Government will take credit for passing this very meagre legislation. In a leading article in the "West Australian" this morning we are told in no uncertain voice what another place has to do with another Bill. There is no backing and filling; the leader writer has told them exactly what to do, just as he has repeatedly told us what to do. The Government will take credit for passing this legislation advocated by the "West Australian," but the "Hansard" record of the division shows that those on the Government side furnished 12 votes in support of the legislation whilst 13 were furnished from this side. They it was who carried the last Bill, but the Government will get the credit for it.

The Premier: Will get the consequences, perhaps.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: If there are any anomalies in that Bill it was this side of the House, not the Government side, that carried the Bill. The Government had to depend on the support of 13 members of the Opposition to pass the measure by an absolute majority. Out of the total of 27 who voted for the Bill, the Government could raise only 13 to support their own legislation, and out of 23 members of the Opposition we supplied 13. The measure itself is convincing proof that the original Bill recommended by the Commission was ill-considered and that it was unwise of the House to pass it. The anomalies under the new redistribution of seats will be equally as bad as those they were designed to rectify.

The Premier: Not under this measure.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I am referring to the measure passed by the House that this Bill seeks to amend. It was impossible to work on the recommendations submitted by the Commission, and it became necessary to get the Commission to revise their report. When the present Leader of the Opposition was Premier, and it was suggested that the report of a similar Commission should be referred back, there was a howl that the Commission had completed their duty and fulfilled the obligation imposed upon them and could not function again. The Commission refused to reconsider their recommendation. The remarkable thing is that the present

Commission appointed practically on the same authority—

The Premier: There were two changes.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Yes, but the Commission were appointed on practically the same authority and therefore had no more authority to revise their report than the other Commission had. Still, they have done it. If the member for Northam sits on your right, Mr. Speaker, it seems that commissions cannot review their work, but if he sits on your left, they can review their work. I do not think the Commission could have been too pleased when they went back over their work a second time, and Parliament was certainly very foolish to accept their first report. Some members thought that the redistribution would be advantageous to them as individuals and as a party, and they seized on the Commission's report with both hands. After reflection, and after interviews with the Chief Electoral Officer during the first few months after the passage of the Bill, they have realised that there were troubled waters ahead. We know that these recommendations are largely the outcome of interviews by members with the Chief Electoral Officer, myself amongst the number.

Mr. Teesdale! Ha, ha! Trying to get the Chief Electoral Officer?

The Premier: Trying to use political influence?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: No. I wanted to ascertain how he was going to arrange for the St. John of God Hospital and the Home of the Good Shepherd.

The Premier: Why were you interested in that part?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Because I was in the House when the Bill was passed.

The Premier: But why your interest over there? That is a pointer, is it not?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: No. I pointed out that the recommendations had been based on the boundaries of many years ago that had been since altered—particularly the boundary of Salvado-road—and the Commission did not appear to be aware of the alterations. Consequently the Bill has been brought down to rectify the anomaly.

Mr. Teesdale: Then you are responsible for all these anomalies?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: No; I asked the Chief Electoral Officer how he was going to handle the position.

Mr. Lambert: Then this is your Bill?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: No, it is not.

The Premier: We can say this is the result of your influence?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: No, nothing like that.

The Premier: Using your influence with the Chief Electoral Officer?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Not at all. I know why this Bill has been brought down.

The Premier: I would not have brought it down had I known there was political influence behind it.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I believe that any member of Parliament has a perfect right to discuss with an officer of a Government department anything within reason, provided he does it in a straightforward way. I went there to ascertain how he was going to rectify the anomalies which I had discovered existed in the Act. Three were outstanding and could not be missed, and they are dealt with in this Bill. Others were also spoken of.

Mr. Chesson: Parliament would have made a worse job of defining the boundaries than the Commission have done.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Parliament would have fixed more workable boundaries than the Commission have done, because each member would have been conversant with the boundaries of his own district. The Commission were not conversant with the boundaries. This is the first occasion on which the recommendations of an electoral commission have been accepted by the House. When the previous redistribution of seats took place, the Act was regarded as one of the most iniquitous ever passed, and the recommendations of the recent Commission are equally bad. Let members look at the boundaries and it must be admitted that they are equally bad. Still there has been no noise about it because, on this occasion, the new boundaries suit more members than did the previous proposals. They suit the members who cry out the loudest when anything affects. Consequently no noise has been heard on this occasion. It is proof of what I said when the original Bill was before us. I oppose the second reading, and shall oppose every stage of the Bill, and I hope the Leader of the Opposition will not assist on this occasion to carry the Government's legislation as he did on the last occasion.

MR. RICHARDSON (Subiaco) [5.7] : Those who opposed the original Bill naturally say that the members in sympathy with it had something to gain by it. We might

retaliate by saying that those who opposed it had something to lose by it. It is remarkable that the recommendations of the Commission should be introduced into the discussion on this amending Bill. It is only to be expected, as the member for Katanning said, that in the country there will be some anomalies, but they are not mentioned in this Bill and consequently we are not here to discuss them. It has been pointed out, probably to the Government and to the Commissioners as well, that some anomalies existed in the metropolitan area, and I commend the Government for having introduced this Bill to rectify the anomalies. It is better that that should be done now rather than wait until after the elections and have all kinds of complaints made to the Government and other members as well. Instead of condemning the Government for having introduced these amendments at an early stage, we should commend them. The member for Mt. Margaret told us he was responsible for directing attention to the anomalies.

Hon. G. Taylor: Not responsible.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Well, he gave us to understand that he was responsible for directing the attention of the Chief Electoral Officer to the anomaly regarding the Subiaco and Mt. Hawthorn boundary.

The Premier: I suppose the members concerned being neglectful, someone had to do the work.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Quite a number of members noticed the anomaly, which has existed for some time, regarding the boundary between Subiaco and the old Leederville electorate. The boundary ran through the ground of the St. John of God Hospital so that one portion of the institution was in the Subiaco electorate and the other portion in the Leederville electorate. It is only right that such an anomaly should be rectified in order that we might know exactly where the residents of St. John of God Hospital are to vote.

The Premier: In which electorate will they be included now?

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mt. Hawthorn. I do not know how the Electoral Office arranged matters, but quite a number of those people voted in Subiaco, and the rest in Leederville. I am pleased the Government have brought down this amending Bill at such an early stage, and will support it.

Mr. LAMBERT: I should like to ask whether this amending Bill has been back to the Commission for report.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You cannot do that now.

Mr. SPEAKER: No.

Mr. LAMBERT: It is a very pertinent question, because I understand that if it has not been referred back to the Commission, the Bill is not properly before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is not the stage at which the hon. member can raise that point.

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

Ayes	27
Noes	7
Majority for					20

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Millington
Mr. Barnard	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Chesson	Mr. North
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Collier	Mr. Rowe
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Troy
Mr. Lamond	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Withers
Mr. Mann	Mr. Wilson
Mr. McCallum	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Latham
Mr. Cowan	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Doney	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Lambert	(Teller.)

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is resolved in the affirmative by an absolute majority.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

Third Reading.

THE PREMIER (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [5.18]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

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

Ayes	27
Noes	6
Majority for					21

A TTS.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Millington
Mr. Barnard	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Chesson	Mr. North
Mr. Collier	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Rowe
Mr. Cowan	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Troy
Mr. Lamond	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Withers
Mr. Maun	Mr. Wilson
Mr. McCallum	

(Teller.)

NOSS.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Latham
Mr. Doney	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Taylor

(Teller.)

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is resolved in the affirmative by an absolute majority.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time, and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—CREMATION.

Returned from the Council with amendments.

BILL — PUBLIC SERVICE APPEAL BOARD ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL (Northam) [5.25]: We are dealing with two Bills this afternoon relating to the Civil Service, and I do not propose to say very much about this one. There are, however, one or two proposals that seem to me to be wrong. This Bill provides for compulsory unionism. Generally speaking, an officer will not be able to approach the Appeal Board except through the organisation. That is not right. It should not be imperative that an appeal must be made through the organisation. Under the Industrial Arbitration Act all persons employed by the Government on wages are provided for. In the case of the officers, who are on salaries, most of them have the Public Service Commissioner and the Appeal Board to go to. There are others who have neither the one nor the other to approach. Those people ought to be considered, and should be brought under the

Public Service Act. Whatever may be done, they should have the opportunity to appeal against decisions made in respect to them. I also object to the position with regard to fines. It has been explained that this has been put in to avoid anomalies, slight troubles and irregularities which may lead to serious consequences. If a civil servant desires to appeal against the imposition of a fine, he must do so before a judge of the Supreme Court sitting as chairman of the Appeal Board. This will be costly and inconvenient, and if it happened often we should be setting up an impossible position. Imagine a judge dealing with the fine of £1 imposed upon an officer for some slight irregularity. It may be said there will be very few appeals, and that no one would mind paying a fine of that amount. Sometimes it is not a question of the amount of the fine, but the officer in question may hope to reinstate himself in the eyes of his chief and may desire to appeal for the removal of the punishment. It is wrong that there should be an appeal from Caesar to Caesar. In this case the Commissioner who imposes the fine may appear against the appellant. I do not know that any grave injustice has been done in the past under the present system, but this proposal will lead to a lot of inconvenience. A civil servant is not in the position of the ordinary worker. Upon civil servants depend the continuity of work, such as the work of the wage earner. Officers of the service ought not to go on strike. We have given them, first of all, a Commissioner to fix what he thinks their positions are worth. We then provided an appeal court, presided over by a judge, and consisting also of a representative of the Government and one of the service. There ought to be no reason for a strike on the part of officers. Imagine what would happen if the warders of the gaol went on strike, or the magistrates or the judges did so.

The Premier: Or the police.

Hon Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes. Civil servants ought not to go on strike. I cannot imagine any excuse they would have for going on strike now. They are part of the government of the country. The government of the State is in the hands of Parliament, the Executive and the Public Service. The last mentioned are not referred to in the Constitution, but they are none the less part of government, because government cannot go on without the service. We decided previously that if Government em-

ployees left their employment, they must run the risk of losing their advantages accumulated by past years of service. I realise that the House might probably consider it right to reinstate civil servants after a strike. At the same time, it is realised that men who go on strike run a risk, and that is as it should be. I cannot pretend that I agree for one moment it is proper that these officials should have the right to strike. I cannot understand the action of the Premier in proposing to alter the penalty already provided. If half a dozen men on pick and shovel work went on strike, it would not matter much. The work might be delayed for a few days, but then it would go on. On the other hand the whole work of the country would be inconvenienced if civil servants went on strike. It might mean throwing hundreds of people out of work. Apart from that phase altogether, it is not right that the Government employees should contemplate a strike, nor is it right that we should contemplate it either. The penalty already provided in the Act is that civil servants who leave their positions shall forfeit their existing rights, which include pensions. I think many civil servants were pleased when that penalty was decided upon, because they did not wish to be compelled to strike. We knew that, if they did strike, the civil servants would have to make great sacrifices, and therefore there would be less likelihood of trouble. Members of Parliament in those days were quite right in arguing along those lines. Now it is proposed that we shall change all that, and substitute for the heavier penalty a fine of £100 against an organisation and £10 against each individual. I hope the Premier will realise it is not right to make this change. It is not right that a small section of the service should demand from the Government that such an alteration should be made. It is unthinkable that the Government themselves would make such a suggestion, unless there had been a request for it from the Civil Service Association. These two points that I have stressed must be considered by hon. members. Under the Bill we are asked to provide the first steps towards compulsory unionism in the Government service, and then we are asked to alter the penalty that may be imposed in the event of a strike by officials who are not ordinary men. In lieu of that penalty, we are asked to agree to impose one such as is imposed upon workers, who are in a very

different position. With the ordinary workers, trouble may easily occur in a hundred different ways and lead to a cessation of work. For instance, we can appreciate the possibility of a ganger or foreman treating his men badly or inconveniencing them unduly. In such circumstances, the men might protest against the action of the ganger or foreman, and might strike. But such workers do not occupy positions like those held by civil servants. We do not expect from the workers that keen discrimination between the effect of doing right and wrong that we do expect from civil servants. It was because of that that Parliament originally imposed a heavy penalty. Now we are asked to provide the same penalty for an offence that is a hundred times worse than that committed by ordinary workmen when they go on strike.

MR. THOMSON (Katanning) [5.35]: I am sorry that we are asked to amend the Act along the lines so ably indicated by the Leader of the Opposition. He has had many years' experience in an administrative capacity. I think it is wrong that we should be asked to compel civil servants to submit their appeals through the Civil Service Association, instead of to the appeal board direct. I do not think such a proposal is in the interests of the civil service. I look upon Government employees as engaged in something apart from what I might term the ordinary every-day walk of life. When a man occupies a Government position he generally feels, if he looks after himself and his work, that he has a job for life, and that there are certain avenues open to him for advancement. The Bill provides that instead of such a man being able to place his own case before the appeal board, he must put it through his association. To a great extent, such a man will lose his individuality, and that is wrong.

The Premier: You might say that every man who joins a union loses his individuality.

Mr. THOMSON: That is the reason why I take strong exception to a man losing his individuality, if it can possibly be avoided. I believe this restriction, while apparently effecting good to a certain extent, will in the long run be detrimental to a large section of the community. With the Leader of the Opposition, I agree that to a considerable extent the government of the country

is in the hands of the civil service. Generally speaking we have every reason to be proud of our civil service, which is part and parcel of the system of government adopted throughout the whole of the British Empire. I regret that we are asked to depart from the traditions of that service. The Premier and Ministers generally will admit that when they first took over their Ministerial positions, they were largely in the hands of their departmental officers until such time as they got a grasp of the work of their respective departments. Now we are asked to place in the hands of irresponsible young men in the various departments the right to say when, where, and how their superior officers shall go on strike. I do not agree with such a proposition, and I do not believe it to be in the interests of the good government of Western Australia. Unfortunately on one occasion there was a strike of civil servants in Western Australia, and on that occasion I spoke to several gentlemen with whom I had come in contact in their official positions. I told them I was surprised at their action in going on strike, and the reply I received was to the effect that if all were out, no one could be victimised by either section. I would be sorry to think that any officer was likely to be victimised by anyone, provided he did his duty to the State. I think, therefore, the alteration forecasted in the Bill is most regrettable. We will place our responsible departmental officials in the position of having to go on strike at the dictation of their juniors. I realise it is a matter of opinion, but that is the view I take of the Bill. I shall not criticise the remaining clauses of the Bill, although one might reasonably ask the Premier why he proposes to alter the section that deals with the prohibition upon strikes. It seems to me we are fast drifting to a stage at which, while Parliament is supposed to be in control of the affairs of the State, that control is being handed over to irresponsible outside bodies. I oppose the second reading of the Bill.

HON. G. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret) [5.42]: I do not feel disposed to oppose the second reading of the Bill. I desire to hear some arguments in Committee as to what justification there is for legislating so that an employee in the civil service must be compelled to place any grievance he may have, and which he desires to submit to the appeal board, through the Civil Service Association. I have had a good deal of experi-

ence of such associations. At times an individual may be a member of such an organisation and yet not be persona grata with the executive or with those who regularly attend the meetings and transact the business. An application by such a person would not be viewed with favour. That may not apply to the Civil Service Association, but to other associations of which I have had experience it does apply. Men have been turned down by the few who attended the meeting of the organisation, and therefore they could not have their appeals dealt with. Their cases could not be presented to the court at all. Unless an individual is a member of the organisation, he has no possible chance of being heard. It should not be the function of Parliament to pass legislation to practically compel a man, should he desire to secure benefits provided under the Bill, to join the association. The duty devolves on the association itself to get members and to strengthen its forces. From my own experience, I am perfectly satisfied that men do not require much persuasion to join a combination that is for their mutual benefit. Parliament should not be asked to step in and say that unless a man is a member of an association, he cannot be heard by an appeal board appointed by Parliament. Such a proposal needs explanation when a Bill is being dealt with in Committee. However objectionable the proposal may seem to us, the Premier may be able to explain it at that stage. In a democratic country such as Western Australia, should there be any tribunal appointed to hear grievances of employees in the Government service, any Government employee should have the opportunity to approach that tribunal. If it is a frivolous complaint that is made the tribunal should punish him for submitting it. We know that people have kinks and think they are badly treated, especially in a big concern like the Public Service. The man at the bottom of the ladder often gets it into his head that he is not au fait with his superior officer and it happens that the grievance grows. We also find amongst members of the community people who are obsessed by the belief that they are not treated properly by the Government. That occurs in all large communities as well as in big organisations. We should, however, always give consideration to the liberty of the individual and allow him to have the right of appeal whether he be a member of an association or not. We should not com-

pel him to join an association so as to get a hearing before an appeal board. There is no one more desirous than I of seeing people combining for their own protection, whether it be in industry, or marketing, or even in sport. All must act collectively, but it should not be the function of Parliament to have to deal with these matters. An organisation should be able to point out all the advantages to be derived by becoming a member of it. If we are to have a tribunal to hear these cases, it is wise that it should be a board. I have often thought that when a person is dissatisfied with the decision given by the Public Service Commissioner, and the appeal was heard with the Commissioner presiding as chairman, the aggrieved person would naturally feel that he was not getting an impartial hearing; that he was appealing from Caesar to Caesar. That, I am glad to say, will be removed. I support the second reading of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—PUBLIC SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL (Northam) [5.49]: We have just passed the second reading of a Bill dealing with the Appeal Board in relation to the Public Service and I am glad the Premier has agreed to take the Committee stage at a later hour of this sitting. We realise that the service is excellent, that they are many good men in it. We also realise, as I remarked yesterday, that often it is to the advantage of a lad who is smart when he fails to secure a position in the service. We have men in the service who would have done much better for themselves if they had never been associated with it, if they had got a position outside. But in the early years they were attracted to the service and having secured positions in it, stuck to them. No one can say that the salaries paid to members of the service are high, particularly the salaries paid to those on the automatic range. Years ago salaries were very much lower than they are to-day; but living was much cheaper before the war than it has been since, or is ever likely to be again. When I got into power in 1919 the

maximum of the class which consisted of the greater number of civil servants was £204. When I gave up the reins of office it was £264. Since that time those officers have had an additional £24 only. The female members of the service had their salaries raised to £204 up to the time I left office, and their maximum is still the same. It is not a magnificent salary that is paid, especially to a man who has been nearly all his life in the service. It is one of the weaknesses of the service that there are so few well paid positions.

The Premier: The great majority of them are underpaid.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, a big majority never get over £300 a year. It would be well if we could adjust this matter in some way so that something more than £280 might be paid. I think that maximum can be reached at the age of 26. It would be advisable, if it were possible, to reorganise the methods within the service, reduce the staffs in certain directions and pay higher salaries to those remaining. It would cost the country no more, but year after year we agree that certain methods should be employed in connection with the administration and nothing is done. We suggest that there should be adopted different methods of book-keeping or of keeping files or records in the hope of bringing about greater efficiency. But we still go on paying salaries to the same number of people, more perhaps than are necessary to do effectively the work of the country. It does not make one feel comfortable to know that such a great number in the service are restricted to a salary of £288. I hope that some day we shall devise means by which it will be possible without making further appointments for a year or two, to carry on as we are doing and add to the salaries of those in the service the money that we might have paid to the additional employees. I am sure that could be done. There is some attraction about the Civil Service. People like it because in addition to the salaries paid there are certain advantages such as annual and long service leave.

The Premier: A big factor is the security of employment.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is the certainty that so long as a man behaves himself his services are retained.

The Premier: Yes, that keeps men in the service and perhaps those men could earn more outside.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is a comfortable business for some so long as they get enough to live on.

The Premier: Their future is secure.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, they get enough to eat, but there is not too much to go and come on. Then the older members of the service were attracted to it by reason of the pension that was attached to the position. At the present time men receive better pay outside than they did years ago and the service is not quite so attractive.

The Premier: Parents too are anxious to secure a permanency for their children.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, and I do not know that there is anything more dreadful in the world than the fear of unemployment.

The Premier: Most men who have experienced it desire to protect their children from it.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Generally speaking the position has been improved for many members of the service. Likewise it has improved for the wages men in the railways who, in my time, received increases amounting to £57 16s. and who since then have received an additional £22. The salaried staff of the railways were advanced £70 in my time and they have received £15 since. At the same time, everybody outside has also advanced similarly, or perhaps to a greater extent. By the way, the men receiving automatic increases are not paid as well as skilled tradesmen. That does not seem to be right. I hope members will pay a little attention to the Bill. The Government propose that we should surrender all control except the right of appeal against the classifications of the Commissioner. To-day when a classification is made by the Commissioner it is submitted to the Government, the Government submit it to the Executive Council and the Governor in Council approves of it, and with the approval the official has the right to appeal to the Appeal Board. We are amending the Act in the direction that will compel civil servants to go to the Appeal Board which is an unthinkable position. The Commissioner will be all-powerful up to the appeal.

The Premier: As a matter of fact he has been so since the passing of the Appeal Board Act. The provisions you refer to about the Governor in Council have not been employed since the passing of the Act. The Commissioner makes the classification and this amendment is nothing new.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The classification must go to the Governor in Council. This House has really no control over salaries because of the methods employed under the Public Service Act and the Appeal Board Act. The Premier knows that if Cabinet objects to an appointment recommended by the Public Service Commissioner, Cabinet has to recommend to the Executive Council that the appointment be not made. One can understand the desirableness of that power remaining with the Executive Council.

The Premier: But that power is not taken away.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I think it is.

The Premier: No; not with regard to appointments.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I hope it is not, but I believe it is. When we get into Committee, we can go into the matter more carefully. There is the Public Service Commissioner, and beyond him there is the Appeal Board. The public servant may make application, but the Government have no say as to whether it shall be accepted or not. Many minor improvements are suggested by the Bill, most of the proposals of which are unobjectionable. In future all increases are to be automatic. In the automatic class, a class with a maximum but no minimum, we have the great bulk of the service. Each year the officials in that class go up £12. Increments to officials in the higher grades have not been nearly so certain. In that respect they have suffered during the bad times. When everybody else was suffering during the war and afterwards, the increments of the higher officials were not granted. The Bill proposes to alter that position, though as regards these officials there will still be minimums and maximums. Further, it is provided that the official must display merit, or he will not get any increment; but that provision will not operate often. The official must be competent and diligent; granted those things, there is nothing standing in the way of an annual increment. If an official has a range of, say, £600 to £800, he wants to reach his maximum within a reasonable time; but under the old system he could get to the maximum of his class quickly if he showed extraordinary ability.

The Premier: By grade increases every year.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: In some cases he got better than grade increases each year. Our Public Service has many capable men who are well worth the salaries they receive. Every section of the Public Service is governed by some tribunal which fixes the rates of pay. The wages section can go to the Arbitration Court. A great many officials can go before the Public Service Appeal Board. I wish the Premier would consider whether we could not allow all officials to go to that board, no matter what their position. Officials of this House, for instance, have no appeal as regards the salaries fixed for them. I am not quite certain that under the Main Roads Board Act officials would be treated as ordinary public servants, with right of classification, and of appeal to the board. If that is not so, the omission should be supplied. Everyone in the Public Service should have the right to go to one tribunal or the other. It would be a simple matter to add a clause making that possible even for unclassified officials. Another provision of the Bill deals with magistrates. Several magistrates have "acted" for long periods. They have not the qualifications demanded by the Act. They are not legal practitioners, and they have not passed the regular examinations in law. Therefore although perfectly good men, they have not been able to get permanent positions. The Premier now proposes that clerks of courts who have been acting magistrates for five years may be appointed as magistrates permanently. A clerk of courts will be jolly lucky if he does act as a magistrate for five years. That can only happen, it has only happened, in a few cases. There were instances at Broome, Bunbury, Cue, and one or two other places. Mr. Geary is a case in point. He and the other magistrates in question are good men. We must remember, however, that if the proposed amendment is made, any one of these gentlemen can aspire to any position in the magistracy, even that of chief magistrate for the metropolitan area. We should pause before making the amendment. It would be better if we altered the law so as to provide that in certain cases the magistrate must have had a legal training. I do not think the present examination in a little law is much good. To fill magisterial positions in the back country, where magistrates are not servants of the laws we make but are a law unto themselves, men of out-

standing character and personality are needed. Practically there is no appeal in such places, and therefore such magistrates as I have described are needed.

Hon. G. Taylor: Legal training will not give a man outstanding character.

The Premier: No. It has to be there.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Legal training makes for a logical mind, though. Common sense is useful everywhere, but it is not enough anywhere. A magistrate must have something more than common sense to administer the laws we make here. There are many stumbling blocks in the way of securing suitable men. In my time applications were called, and I saw the responses. The salary is small, the responsibility fairly considerable, the districts are mighty large, and the magistrate is seldom at home, but travelling all the time—which is wrong. Thus the position, because of the salary, because of the work, and because of the travelling, is not attractive. I do not know whether we could induce men of legal training to take up these jobs and do them for us. We certainly cannot get young men to take them; young men would be very foolish if they did. We have to appoint magistrates for the country districts, of that there can be no doubt. The distances to be covered are tremendous, and the number of people to whom a country magistrate has to mete out justice is indeed large. Probably there are now as many people in the district served by the Northam stipendiary as there were in the whole State when responsible government was obtained. One man has to settle all the differences arising among people as numerous as the entire population of Western Australia in 1890. The number is too large when the people are so widely scattered. In regard to magistrates generally, the position is pretty rotten. Undoubtedly we must be most careful regarding expenditure, but we cannot expect the number of magistrates we have in the various districts to carry on their work much longer. Great care is required in the appointment of honorary magistrates, who are needed to witness documents and that sort of thing. They do their work very well in those respects, and on the bench they do their best, but the judicial work is sometimes a bit beyond them; and it is the poor man who suffers because of that, since he cannot appeal. A poor man is taken up, it may be, for some trivial offence, and is given

six weeks. I have known honorary magistrates to give a decent, quiet, respectable old man three months for being tight. The only trouble with him was that about every race meeting he would make his voice heard in the streets, asking everybody to back his fancy; and so he used to be run in.

The Premier: I have known Southern Cross justices once to give a man three months for being drunk.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: We got this fellow out.

The Premier: I got this fellow out, too.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Those are the men who suffer.

The Premier: It was the second time the man had been drunk within a week. The man was "Bluebush," whom goldfields members will recollect. He was a genius.

Hon. G. Taylor: Yes. I remember him well.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Honorary magistrates believe that Parliament requires them to inflict punishment, and so they inflict it. Far too much is left to honorary magistrates; there are too few stipendiaries.

The Premier: I fully agree with you. I should like to have the whole of that work done by stipendiary magistrates.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It was, in the old days.

The Premier: There is altogether too much of the honorary magistracy now.

The Minister for Works: But all the mistakes do not occur with honorary justices.

Hon. G. Taylor: No; certainly not. Bad advice from counsel is often responsible for bad decisions.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If we select qualified people to do this work, we may expect better results. Recently I mentioned that I thought the Government were not justified in appointing Mr. Horgan to the Children's Court. I still consider they were not justified in making that appointment.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I have very little more to say. We are all pleased to see that the services for so long rendered by the magistrates are to be recognised by the appointment of those gentlemen to permanent positions. I do not know what precisely is meant to be done for the females temporarily employed in the Public Ser-

vice. The permanent employees are paid on a different basis and no doubt the intention is to improve the position of the temporary employees. However, I have no intention of opposing the second reading.

MR. LATHAM (York) [77.32]: I do not propose to offer any objection to the second reading, for the Bill is practically a Committee measure. A principle we are all pleased with is the appointment of those gentlemen who have rendered good services as magistrates acting in a temporary capacity. That is one of the features of the Bill that will commend itself to the House. Another feature is the appointment, without further examination, of boys who have passed their junior public examination. I think we should be prepared to accept such boys as fit and proper persons to be trained in the Public Service of the State. I am sorry to think the service, probably, is being made a little bit political; for, after all, our officers have to carry on very much more important functions than do we in this Chamber. The whole of the work of the State is in their hands and they should be able to feel that they are perfectly free to carry out that important work, and to feel also the responsibility of their position. Temporary appointments tend against that kind of thing, and we do not usually get the best service from a temporary staff. I have no objection to raise to the second reading, and anything further I have to say will be said during the Committee stage.

MR. CHESSON (Cue) [7.35]: I will support the second reading. I am pleased that the Bill should provide for the permanent employment of those magistrates who have rendered such good service in a temporary capacity. Every member representing the goldfields recognises that those men serving in that capacity as mining registrars, acting magistrates and wardens, some of them for a period of 34 years, have done good service for the State. I am very pleased to see that they are to have recognition of those good services by being appointed permanently. Knowing most of those gentlemen and the common-sense they display in all their verdicts as acting magistrates and wardens, I am very pleased at this practical appreciation of their efforts. In very few instances have their verdicts been challenged. Again, from time to time they have been

appointed Royal Commissioners, to act with the authority of Supreme Court judges. In every instance they have performed those onerous duties with credit to themselves and to the State. I am glad that at last recognition is to be given to those gentlemen.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—STATE SAVINGS BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL (Northam) [7.36]: We were not surprised by the introduction by the Premier last night of this Bill for the establishment of a rural bank department of the State Savings Bank. We knew it was coming. I hope the Premier will bear with me whilst I make a suggestion for the establishment of this proposed institution on an altogether different basis. We must remember that if we follow the suggestion of the Premier we shall not increase the money available within the State for industry; because it is proposed that we draw the money from within the State for the work of this bank. It can be done by payment into credit in the ordinary way of banking, or it may be done by the issue of debentures; but by whatever means it may be done, it will not add to the money available within the State. I want to show, too, how much more the ordinary trading banks have done for Western Australia than has been done by the Government banks, by which I mean the Commonwealth Bank and the State Savings Bank. There are in the Commonwealth Bank deposits amounting to £2,321,910, and in the Savings Bank deposits amounting to £3,214,230, or a total in the two banks of £5,536,140. Also there are in the State Savings Bank deposits amounting to £8,394,959. So the total deposits in Government banks aggregate £13,931,099, an enormous sum, far greater than the amount deposited in the ordinary banks. The Commonwealth Bank has advanced to individuals — not to local authorities or other public bodies, but to individuals for trading purposes — £714,236, whilst the State Sav-

ings Bank has advanced on mortgage £32,902, or a total from the two banks of £747,138. If we take the £13,931,099 deposited in the Government banks, and the £747,138 advanced to the public by the Government banks, we see that those banks are not doing very much to further the best interests of the country. That is what has happened up to date, and it is this happening that is causing some of the trouble within the State to-day. Our own State Savings Bank has invested £7,203,589 in Government securities. That is over years, of course. I hope the House will keep in mind the difference between £13,931,099 and £747,138, the respective amounts deposited by individuals and loaned to individuals. The total deposits in the ordinary banks aggregate £10,706,000, or £3,000,000 less than has been deposited in the Government banks. But the total advances from the ordinary banks run into £19,279,000. The whole trade of the country is dependent upon the proper use of one-half the available money, and that half, is represented by the money held on deposit in the Associated Banks. I suppose we can say that the money left with the Associated Banks does 500 times as much for the wage-earner and trade generally as does the nearly 14 millions in the hands of the Government banks. That is what we must keep in view in dealing with this matter. There is, as the Premier stated, some necessity for long-term credit. That, of course, is the only justification for the bringing down of this Bill now. It is a strange proposal to ask that we make ordinary banking a department of the Savings Bank. The Commonwealth have it the opposite way. But one really has no connection with the other. The State Savings Bank was intended to be used only to accommodate the small savings of the people, the really small bank. We cannot blame the Premier for departing from this rule, because it has been departed from for some years past. Years ago we paid interest on the first £300.

The Premier: That amount has been increased over the years.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, from time to time, before your time. It was not quite as bad as it is now, but it was bad enough before. We have each slipped a bit and will keep on slipping when there is need for money. By the way, it is not cheap money. However, the House

has to regard the State Savings Bank as a bank where small people deposit their small savings. No bank can afford to pay interest on its current account with daily credit balances, and no savings bank or trading bank could pay 4 per cent. on its daily credit balances. To-day our Savings Bank and the Commonwealth Savings Bank also will accept up to £500 at 4 per cent., and one man can have 40 trust accounts if he likes. So the amount that may be deposited by one man is virtually unlimited. I hope the Premier is not going to pay for money on current account. If he does he will make the rate of interest so dear that the enterprising will be discouraged and harm will be done. The Commonwealth were given control of banking when we federated, and of course the Commonwealth Bank was the only bank of issue. The State has no banking facilities whatever. We are just equal to John Brown when it comes to banking no better and no worse. Our Savings Bank like any ordinary depositor, has an account with the Commonwealth Bank. We have our money deposited there. Money deposited with the banks is quite safe, and money deposited with the Government is safe. Of that there can be no doubt. One is a little more certain of getting his money if he wants it from the ordinary banks than from a Government bank without the right of issue. The reserves held in Australian notes and gold by the ordinary banks in this State total £3,418,000. If we had to keep that proportion of our Savings Bank money in hand, paying as we do 4 per cent. for the deposits, it would cost us a terrific sum. We have never done it and we never can do it. If we are to do any good in this new venture, we must lend money cheaply. Having regard to the cost of production which must come down, we ought to endeavour to make the rate of interest little more than 5 per cent. The cost of production, of course, is inclusive of interest, and interest is a considerable portion of the whole. I think our money is costing about £4 11s. 3d. per cent., that is, the whole of our borrowings. We are charging up to 7 per cent. for money through the Agricultural Bank, though some of the earlier advances were made at a fixed rate and cannot be varied. We can realise now that it would have been better had we done as other banks do, namely, had a more or less even rate for all advances over the year. It did happen that we were paying 6½ per

cent. and 7 per cent. for money and that money had to be loaned at 7 per cent. That, of course, is far too high, and we are not doing very much good when we charge that rate. The paid-up capital and reserve profits of the banks doing business in this State amount to £72,000,000. Hence they are very rich institutions.

The Premier: Have you the figures to show how much is capital and how much represents reserve profits?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: About £42,000,000 is paid-up capital and £29,000,000 reserve profits, but it is all real capital to the banks. I am speaking of the actual cash, and it is a considerable percentage of their actual assets, far greater than would be the case with many English banks because there, where the advances are very short-dated, they trade on a very small margin of their own capital. It is different with Australian banks. I read of an English bank with £16,000,000 capital having total assets of £320,000,000, so 5 per cent. only was the capital of the institution. Our banks have £72,000,000 with just about the same total amount of assets. Those banks are very rich and are perfectly safe, and one would be much more likely to get his money from them if there was a great demand and he needed it. We have no banking facilities. The Commonwealth Bank started without money. It had the right to issue notes and it did issue notes, depending largely on the gold from the other banks, which took Commonwealth notes in exchange for gold. I am sure that the Commonwealth bank has done a great deal of harm in this State. It has reduced employment and trade, because it has taken money and done so much less with it than has been done with the money that the ordinary banks have had deposited with them. That should be quite clear to everyone. We have put into the banks £10,706,000 and they have lent out £19,279,000 to individuals. Nothing better could be done, and it would be an awful pity if any money were withdrawn from the trading banks, even to be deposited with the rural bank that the Premier proposes to start. It is that point I wish to impress upon the Premier. I am satisfied that long-term credit must be found by some means. The Premier suggests that the Savings Bank be extended to cover the proposed rural bank, and he suggests that money be advanced to individuals on mortgage in the ordinary way. All ordinary banking business would be undertaken, discounts, letters of credit, tra-

ding and things common to banks. Everything that any other bank would do he proposes should be done through the proposed new branch of the Savings Bank. That would necessitate having credit agents all the world over, and would entail not only considerable trouble but great expense. I shall revert to that point again in a few minutes. We have a Savings Bank which I suggest should be restricted to ordinary savings bank work. We have an Agricultural Bank, which is making advances on work to be done and on mortgage. That is right and it must continue. It means money for farm-making on Crown lands or freehold, clearing, fencing, house, buildings, stock, implements and cropping assistance. It is the poor man's bank, especially when he comes under the Industries Assistance Board. It is for the man without capital. Consequently it must not be interfered with. By those means have we attained our present position in agriculture. We waited years for men with money to come to the country, but they came not. We even had to buy bread from the East. We started this Agricultural Bank system 23 years ago. For some time we offered 75 per cent. of the cost of the work without success, but when we advanced the whole of the money, success came immediately, and in the six years, the Premier will remember, we produced eight times as much wheat as we needed to eat. We are producing what the world needs; and because of that I hope we shall continue. I suggest that it would be useful and proper business, if the Premier wishes to proceed with this idea—and I think he should; times have changed even during the last year or two—to make it an ordinary mortgage institution. I do not think it is necessary for the rural bank to engage in general banking. If we advanced as is proposed, two-thirds of the value of freehold or, where the land is unimproved, one-half of the value, and if we gave to the unimproved land holder in addition the assistance we give through the Agricultural Bank, as in the case of Crown land, it would meet the position. Say a man bought a property, unimproved, for £2,000, and paid £1,000 down and was advanced £1,000 under mortgage by the Agricultural Bank. On top of that he could get the money he would now be entitled to from the Agricultural Bank against the clearing of Crown land where the only margin rests on the fact that we do not charge anything for the land. I

think that by those two means, namely, advancing two-thirds of the value of freehold or one-half of the value on unimproved land, plus clearing and improvement advances, we should do more to achieve the object the Premier desires. If associated with the Agricultural Bank, the inspection, care and overlooking of securities would be so much simpler. I should raise the money in London for the Agricultural Bank itself, instead of taking it from the money raised by the Loan Council, and for the proposed new branch of the Agricultural Bank which the Premier calls a rural bank, I would also raise the money at Home.

The Premier: By direct loan?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I should set up a powerful board here and give them power to raise the money in London, of course with the approval of the Government and with the Government's guarantee. If the Government appointed say the London and Westminster Bank in London to do for us the business of raising the money as we required it, it could be done with great ease, because this is the sort of work that the British people are anxious to do. The money would be used for the solid work of increasing production. There would be no question of the interest not being paid on the money out of the asset created by the money.

The Premier: Of course the loan would be guaranteed by the State.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes. Under the Financial Agreement there is power for authorities to borrow money guaranteed by the Government, but I think the money should be raised in London. I cannot see that we could do any good at all by endeavouring to raise the money within the State for the purposes of a rural bank. If the Premier will carry his mind back to the time of the homecoming of the soldiers, he will recall that in a very few years we used about £6,000,000 on the reinstatement of returned soldiers in civil life, and probably no money was ever better spent. It has since produced many times £6,000,000 worth of wealth and we are now existing largely on the production created by the money then expended. It has been responsible for tremendously good work. Again this business, if it is to be undertaken by the Government should be only a mortgage bank. I should leave the ordinary banks to do the ordinary banking business. Ordinary banking is very costly business. Some people think it is highly profitable

business, but it is not. If we give people cheque books and allow them to draw cheques, it is necessary to open accounts, make temporary advances, open branches in different parts and have agents the world over, and it becomes a very expensive business. I do not know what the cost of running the Agricultural Bank is, but it is a very small percentage of the total advances. I do not suppose it would amount to much more than one-half per cent. It is the cheapest-run bank I ever heard of. Then a general bank would be bothered with temporary advances and all sorts of exchange business that really constitutes the business of experts in banking. I should think it would be utterly impossible for the staff of the Savings Bank, good and all as it is, to do ordinary banking business. It would probably be necessary to strengthen the staff by the addition of a number of expert banking officials. Banking is really the work of extraordinarily capable officials, and there is not nearly so much money in it as people are inclined to think. We could not expect our officials, untrained as they are in general banking, to undertake the work. The associated banks have branches all over the State, and world-wide agencies. We all agree that we cannot go on living in Western Australia as we are living on the production of the moment. Of the 100,000,000 acres we have in the South-West, we have sold 35,000,000 acres, cleared or improved 11½ million acres, and the agricultural production is now £22,000,000 per annum. If the wheat price keeps up to 5s. a bushel and we have 10 million acres under wheat, and the yield is 100 million bushels from that area, with sheep and other things that are developed on the farms, we could get at least £40,000,000 in wealth each year. Further south again we have another 10 million acres under clover, and this, together with apples, potatoes, etc., would yield a further £40,000,000 worth of wealth. This would make a total of £80,000,000, and with that we should be doing something of real and profitable value without any cost to the people of the State. The production would pay to London the interest on the money and provide for its return. In the Argentine there are 20 million acres under lucerne. Very great wealth is produced from that area. So great is the wealth, that the local people pay £2,000 for a single beast, a short-

horn, from the Old Country. As the Premier heard the other day, they are buying 1,000 of these beasts at £2,000 a head. That is what they are able to do with the wealth they produce. We can do the same thing here, but it will mean the expenditure of money. There is an unlimited market in the Old Country, from which we draw our money. Great Britain eats about £460,000,000 worth of grass-fed food each year. Our opportunities in that market are therefore extraordinarily good. With the Commonwealth Bank operating at it does, I should say that never again will money be as free or as cheap, certainly not in Western Australia. We are pledged to reduce the cost of production by every means in our power and to increase the amount of production. We cannot do that with dear Australian money, but we can do it with cheap British money. The most capable board possible is essential to manage this business. The idea behind it would be to increase production and give more employment. The Savings Bank money should carry its own load. We should not have to pay interest on the daily credit balance. It cannot be done in general banking. No doubt the Under Treasurer is a very capable man, but he is also a very busy man. The Premier proposes he should be the chairman of the board. That may be all right in the early stages when the banking operations are small. I hope the Premier realises I am merely making suggestions in the hope that they may prove useful.

The Premier: It will be a full time job for the officers after they get going.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes. I hope the ideas I have advanced for the raising of money in the Old Land will be taken into consideration. I want the Rural Bank associated with the Agricultural Bank. It is not necessary that general banking should be done. That is expensive, and the job of experts. I should like to show what the bank deposits per head of the population were at the 30th June, 1928. In New South Wales the amount was £49 14s. 2d., in Victoria it was £52 11s. 1d., and in Western Australia it was £28 7s. 10d., the lowest of all the States. We cannot draw from that source with any degree of safety. We must not disturb the ordinary trade arrangements that have been made. We should not interfere in any way with trade. The provisions of the New South Wales Act are similar to those contained in this Bill. The system,

however, is much bigger though more cumbersome than is proposed here. I doubt whether the Premier's proposals regarding ordinary banking will prove satisfactory. This will not take the place of the Agricultural Bank, and will not do more for the people who need help in the development of the country.

Mr. Griffiths: The system is not satisfactory in either New South Wales or Victoria.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: No. In Victoria very little is done for the agriculturist. The Savings Bank there pays interest at the rate of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., but in South Australia $4\frac{3}{4}$ interest is paid. It is the payment of these high rates to men who do nothing with their money that is causing the present high rates of interest in Australia. We can dismiss the proposition from our minds as being a useful one. It does not provide anything that will prove more useful than the present method of using our available funds. Ours is a single crop country very largely, and single crop countries invariably are borrowing countries. Someone has to make the advances. It was suggested by one banker that a greater discount business could be done on short terms so that the assets would be more liquid. That can only come about gradually. If it did come about it would interfere with the ordinary course of development in our State, and throw a great responsibility upon us. I want to show what the banks have done in the last few years for Western Australia. In 1924 the deposits were £13,122,000 and the advances £11,656,000. Our own money in the banks in excess of the amount advanced was £1,466,000. In September, 1929, the deposits were £10,706,000, and the advances £19,279,000, on £8,573,000, representing capital borrowed from the Eastern States. The deposits were reduced by £2,400,000 and the advances increased by £7,600,000. We are paying £500,000 a year interest at 5 per cent. on the £10,000,000 which now represents the State's banking position. The banks have been particularly liberal in their advances in this State during the last five years. It has been said that they send a lot of money away. That is not so, for they have brought considerable sums in all the time. What we have to consider is how best we can supply money to our own people. No Government can improve on the use to which the money

available is now being put. No Government could take in £10,000,000 and lend £19,000,000. It could not be done, and the banks have only done it because they have had money from the East to draw upon. I hope the Premier realises I agree that we can assist development in addition to our ordinary Agricultural Bank work. It is, however, no use endeavouring to get money from within Australia, and certainly not from the people of this State. We can get cheaper money from the Old Land, and we can use it to greater advantage. I hope the Premier will give serious consideration to the suggestions I have made to see whether it is not better to do as I suggest than as the Bill suggests. We should not enter into a scheme of this sort unless we agree that good can follow.

MR. LATHAM (York) [8.12]: I support the second reading. We should have some kind of system of credit to assist farmers after they have passed the elementary stage, and have been helped by the Agricultural Bank. Difficulties of finance do arise in the farming community from that period onward. The Leader of the Opposition has brought forward a new phase, one dealing with finance. We do not want to use up what money we have in the State to render assistance to the agricultural areas more than to any other interest, certainly not if it will deprive any other industry of financial backing. The legislation in New South Wales has not come up to the expectations of the man on the land. He thought the Government would have been able to provide far more assistance. The limit between the advances made and the security is greater than the farming community thought it ought to be. The Bill proposes a fairly wide margin of security. That is quite right. We could not expect anyone to advance money without reasonable security.

The Premier: That is the same with other lending bodies.

Mr. LATHAM: Yes. I am pleased to see that assistance is provided for those engaged in the South-West. The complaint there is that people cannot get financial backing for fertilising their land, which is useless without such fertilisation. This is one of the main directions in which we can render assistance. The Agricultural Bank Act does not provide for short-dated loans. Those loans would assist materially to provide a better security than would be possible by doing business on

Agricultural Bank lines alone. I am sorry it is not intended to supplement the work of that bank, for I understand from the Premier he does not propose that second mortgages shall be taken. If that is so, we are not likely to have the rural bank buying mortgages that the Agricultural Bank already hold.

The Premier: If they did that they would hold the first mortgage.

Mr. LATHAM: I do not think they would be likely to make the money available to buy off the first mortgages. In many instances the associated banks advance money against second mortgages and at times buy off the first mortgages so as to hold the securities themselves. I understood from the Premier that it was not intended to do that, under the provisions of the Bill—

The Premier: So long as the banks hold the first mortgage. In the case you mention, the private bank holds the first mortgage.

Mr. LATHAM: That is so. I wanted to know what the position would be, should the Bill be passed, if the bank already held the first mortgage. Will that deprive the Agricultural Bank clients of securing any further assistance from the Rural Bank? I hope it will not.

Mr. Davy: Do you mean that the bank would advance money on second mortgage?

Mr. LATHAM: Seeing that the Government already hold the first mortgage through the Agricultural Bank, and as the proposal in the Bill is to furnish supplementary finance for the people who were started on the land originally by the Agricultural Bank, I was hopeful we would be able to get second mortgages under the Bill, for the purposes of stocking up and fertilising holdings to bring them into a greater state of productivity. I hope the Premier will look into that phase of the question, and that he will be able to tell us how much money the settlers are likely to get to help them over the period, regarding which they complain so bitterly now. It is admitted that Western Australia has done more for settlers under her Agricultural Bank laws than any other country in the world.

The Premier: You know there is a scarcity of money available.

Mr. LATHAM: That is admitted. Of course, money determines everything and we were hopeful there would be sufficient money to do what I have indicated. There is one point that will probably appeal to a good

many men on the land. Many of them were assisted by the Agricultural Bank and the Industries Assistance Board. We know that there is little assistance rendered by the board now. When some of those assisted settlers progressed and had a small credit in the books, they were forced to take their accounts away from the board, although they did not desire to do so. As those people feel they owe a debt of gratitude to the State for the assistance rendered to them, there may be a fair amount of money available from them during harvesting and other operations, but during the rest of the year money may be scarce, and that is when the Premier will find some difficulty in carrying on. I hope he will accept the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition, which I regarded as very sound. He suggested the Government should borrow the money to provide the necessary finance for the rural bank. It will mean bringing in additional money to Western Australia and will not create a shortage of money available for other purposes within the State. The Government themselves must find difficulty in financing, at times.

The Premier: At times! We are never free from the difficulty.

Mr. LATHAM: In view of some of the legislation now proposed, I am afraid that difficulty will be added to. In that event, the position is likely to be anything but pleasant. I shall support the Bill through all its stages, but will move a few amendments when we deal with it in Committee, with a view to further assisting the men the bank is aimed to help.

MR. ANGELO (Gascoyne) [8.20]: We have a tremendous area of country in Western Australia that has yet to be developed. There are millions of acres of wheat land and tens of millions of acres of pastoral land and we require all the money we can get.

The Premier: The men from the North always speak in millions!

Mr. ANGELO: If I went further North to the Kimberleys, I could talk about hundreds of millions of acres. Being of the opinion that we should get all the money we can, I would be only too pleased if half a dozen new banks were to start business in Western Australia and lend us more money, especially as that money is mainly to assist primary producers. It is the primary producer who requires that assistance more than

the commercial and mercantile interests. We want to be assured of new money. It is no good borrowing from within the family, so to speak; we want to get it from new people altogether. We want to get it at such a cheap rate that it can be loaned at a cheap rate. I welcome the principle of the Bill and the suggestions forthcoming from the Government. I would be pleased if I could think for a single moment that the bank can be made a payable proposition. I am afraid it cannot. I am in accord with the reasons and arguments advanced by the Premier. I believe that the primary producers at times have difficulty in securing the necessary finance, more so than the commercial and mercantile community.

The Premier: They have.

Mr. ANGELO: That is what I say. But to give the primary producer relief in the proper way, we must get money fairly cheaply so as to provide him with loans at a reasonable rate of interest. As a member of Parliament and a representative of the taxpayers of Western Australia, I do not want the Government to start off on another enterprise that will be of a losing description. I am afraid that for the next few years at any rate in Western Australia, which is essentially a borrowing State to-day, such an enterprise as that proposed must lose money. Where is the money to come from that the Premier hopes to get for the purpose of loans to the primary producers of this country? Where is that money to come from so that it can be made available at a reasonable rate of interest, say $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. or 7 per cent.? Let us have a look at the State Savings Bank figures for a start. The savings bank has about $8\frac{1}{2}$ millions of money, but with the exception of a very small amount lent to private people, the whole of the money, with the exception of £1,100,000, is loaned on Government securities. These moneys cannot be disturbed for the purposes of a rural agricultural bank. The bank has on fixed deposit £500,000. I presume that the bank gets 5 per cent. on that. If that is so, it would be impossible to lend that money to the rural bank at less than 5 per cent.; probably the Savings Bank would require another $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. for lending the money to its sister department. Let us take the interest at 5 per cent. The rest of the money available consists of cash at credit of cur-

rent accounts with the Commonwealth Bank, £130,000, and cash in hand at the branches, another £70,000. That money cannot be disturbed and used for the purposes of the rural bank. There must always be a certain amount of money in hand to meet daily withdrawals. All that the Government can get from the State Savings Bank is the £500,000 on fixed deposit, for which they will have to pay at least 5 per cent., the amount now earned by the savings bank. The Commonwealth Bank required £5 17s. 6d. per centum when a suggestion was made for the loan of money to the Agricultural Bank. The Commonwealth loan that is now being floated brings in to the investor, £5 14s. 4d. per centum. With these figures before us, we must take it that the Premier would have to pay at least $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to get the money that the rural bank will loan out to farmers.

The Premier: No, not if we got it from the Savings Bank.

Mr. ANGELO: I have just pointed out the position.

The Premier: We lend it at less than 5 per cent.

Mr. ANGELO: Is that so?

The Premier: You said $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Mr. ANGELO: Perhaps to the Agricultural Bank. The only money I can see available from the Savings Bank for the rural bank is the £500,000 that is on fixed deposit and is earning 5 per cent. I cannot see how, if we are to have regard to good finance, the Savings Bank could lend money to the rural bank at less than 5 per cent., taking into consideration the rate required by the Commonwealth Bank to-day and what the latest loan returns to the investor. In the circumstances I cannot see how the Premier could get money under $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. To give cheap money to the producers, he would have to charge 7 per cent. at the outside.

Mr. Brown: That would be cheap.

Mr. ANGELO: That is so. All the other banks have to charge $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to 8 per cent. However, taking it at the percentage I have indicated, it would mean that $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.—the difference between $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. and 7 per cent.—would be available for administering the bank and making provision for bad debts. Careful as officers may be and as all bank managers throughout the State to-day may be, bad debts will crop up, from reasons not anticipated when advances are made. I do not know whether hon. mem-

bers will agree with this, but I can assure them it is my firm conviction, that, from a profit-making point of view, loans to primary producers are the least profitable form of money-lending. This is not because the farmers are not good men to help or that their securities are not all they should be, but there are no collateral advantages at all in such loans, and without them, banks cannot make a profit. Having had some 20 years' experience in banks before I entered Parliament, and having had a little since, I can assure the House that the profits derived by banks mainly accrue from exchange, commission, and British and foreign bills.

The Premier: And money on current account without interest.

Mr. ANGELO: I admit that.

The Premier: Half the deposits in most of the banks are on current account.

Mr. ANGELO: Exactly.

The Premier: You get that money for nothing and lend it out at 7 per cent.; that is a very good profit.

Mr. ANGELO: But that is not what the Premier proposes to do. He will pay interest on the daily balances.

The Premier: Yes, but the hon. member talked about the profit the private banks make.

Mr. ANGELO: That is so, but if the Premier delved into the matter and secured information from experienced bankers, he would find that instead of a margin of 1½ per cent. being sufficient to administer the affairs of the bank and make proper provision for doubtful debts, he will require nearer 5 per cent. It is very expensive to-day to run banks. Another thing, too; to give a rural bank money necessary to carry on, it will probably be necessary to draw on some of the deposits on the other banks, and I think that will be hardly correct in this State, where the other banks have done so much for Western Australia. The Leader of the Opposition has already touched on the figures of the Associated Banks, but I would also like to refer to them. Right back to 1920 there has always been in Western Australia an excess of advances against deposits.

Mr. Thomson: With the exception of the Commonwealth Savings Bank.

Mr. ANGELO: I am taking the Associated Banks. I am glad the Leader of the Opposition pointed out the unfair treat-

ment Western Australia is getting from the Commonwealth Bank. He showed what a huge sum of money they held belonging to the people of Western Australia, and what a small amount they lent us. As far back as 1920 the advances by the Associated Banks in Western Australia were well ahead of the deposits. In 1920 they were £1,285,000 and they have increased this year to £8,504,000. We must admit that these banks are doing very good work indeed. Are they giving us decent service? Let us examine the position. The Bank of New South Wales has 110 branches in Western Australia. I do not suppose more than 15 of those branches are established in the metropolitan area, which means that about 95 branches are spread over the State assisting the primary producer. The National Bank has something like 70 odd branches in this State and with the exception of about 10 they are all out in the country.

The Premier: Of course it is a business, like any other, and it is expected to be a paying proposition.

Mr. ANGELO: I have not the reports of the other banks but I can quote from the National Bank's latest annual report. Of the 486 offices they have throughout Australia, 113, or 23 per cent. are in the city or suburban areas, whilst 373, or 77 per cent., are branches scattered throughout the country.

The Premier: Where business is to be had, of course.

Mr. ANGELO: Then 48.7 of their total advances in Australia are in the city and suburbs and 57.3 per cent. in the country.

The Premier: There is one bank that has no branches in the city.

Mr. ANGELO: I suppose the Premier is referring to the Primary Producers Bank. In Perth, however, it has a well-established branch in Forrest-place.

The Premier: The only one in Perth.

Mr. ANGELO: Yes, but I am referring to branches throughout Australia.

The Premier: You do not do any city business.

Mr. ANGELO: All the Premier's reasons for the establishment of the rural bank are those that we adopted in the starting of the Primary Producers Bank. I do not mind telling the House that we have found, without city business, it is hard to make profits. Our business is confined to advances entirely and there is practically no exchange,

commission or bills business. That is why I am able to give the Premier a tip, which is that I am afraid that advances to the primary producer without collateral advantages will not prove very profitable. If I might say it, we have not had to pay very much for the money we have had. Probably 2 per cent. would cover what we have had to pay, and still we can only make a few thousand pounds profit each year. Of course, we are increasing our business every year. What will the position be if the Premier has to pay 5 or 5½ per cent. for his money? That is where I am anticipating trouble.

The Premier: Where do you get money at 5 per cent.?

Mr. ANGELO: We have our capital, in addition to deposits.

The Premier: Do you pay interest on the capital?

Mr. ANGELO: We are making liberal provision for bad debts, but we are only getting a few thousands ahead of it so far.

Mr. Doney: You have not paid a dividend?

Mr. ANGELO: Not yet, but we are working the bank in a most efficient way. "Safety first," is our motto. I must admit that lending money to primary producers solely is not going to be very profitable. There must be bill business, exchange business and commission business to make good profits. Another thing that must be remembered is that the associated banks are giving Western Australia remarkably good service and the proposed bank will enter into competition against them. What chance is there of a bank starting without capital and competing with the associated banks? I should say, have a go at them, if they were not giving us a fair deal. But they are giving us a fair deal. What chance has the suggested bank of competing against, say, the Bank of New South Wales which has a paid up capital of 7½ millions, a reserve fund of six millions and deposits amounting to 64 millions. They can afford to give cheap money. As the Premier has pointed out, probably half the deposits would cost nothing, that is, 32 millions, and that amount together with the paid up capital and the reserve fund make 45 millions. They must be giving us a fair share of their advances business. The National Bank advances in Western Australia are far ahead of their deposits. It is the same thing with the Union Bank and others as well. As I

said before, if these banks were not giving us a fair deal, if they were giving all their available loan moneys to the city, commercial, and mercantile interests, we should be justified in doing something to rectify the position. But from my experience extending over the last five or six years, I find that the banks are very fair indeed and any reasonable proposition to help the producer is accepted. We often hear people grumbling and saying they cannot get assistance from the banks. Such people have interviewed me and said, "I have a farm worth £8,000; I owe the Agricultural Bank £1,500, and I want £500 to put in a crop and cannot get it." As soon as you investigate the position, it is found that in addition to the £1,500 they owe the Agricultural Bank, they are in arrears to that bank to the extent of £600 for instalments and interest. You find also that they owe a good deal of money outside, including perhaps £400 for a motor car and £500 for a tractor. Then you find, when you get a proper valuation of the property, it is not what they made it out to be. If a man puts his position clearly before a banker who sees that the applicant is doing hard work and improving his property in the hope of making a farm out of it, I guarantee he will never be turned down by an associated bank operating in Western Australia. I am sorry my little institution cannot lend more. It has already lent three times the amount of deposits received in Western Australia, and has come to the end of its tether as far as this State is concerned, that is, for the time being. I hope, however, that it will be possible to rectify the position a little later on. The Premier told us it was not the intention of the rural bank to lend on second mortgage, even when the Agricultural Bank is the first mortgagee. We know the Agricultural Bank only lends money on improvements actually carried out. They require to have a certificate before anything is done, but I am sure the Premier is in accord with every member of this Assembly in the viewpoint that we should go in for mixed farming wherever possible and have two strings to our bow. To enable stock to be purchased, money has to be obtained. Whilst there is plenty of security and a good equity, why prevent a man getting a second mortgage, even though the Agricultural Bank is the first mortgagor? I may say that several of the other banks lend on second mortgage provided they are satisfied with the equity.

Anyhow, that is a matter that can be gone into when the Bill is in Committee. To compete with the associated banks the rural bank would have to open branches throughout the country. It is not likely that the farmer, when he can bank at an institution established in his own town, is going to rush to Perth every time he wants to see his bank manager. Thus the rural bank will have to establish itself in the country districts. Has the Premier any idea what it costs to open a branch in the country? It costs about £1,000 to open it and it takes between £1,000 and £1,200 to run it, and there is also the cost of office premises.

The Minister for Works: What about the Agricultural Bank?

Mr. ANGELO: That bank has not many branches in the country districts. The other banks have about 300 branches spread all over Western Australia and give banking facilities to the producers. I suppose what has appealed to a good number of people who have suggested the establishment of a rural bank is the wonderful progress of the Commonwealth Bank and also the remarkable position of the associated banks in Australia. I would like members to recognise that the Commonwealth Bank came in and collared the whole of the note issue. To that, largely, is due the wonderful position of the Commonwealth Bank.

The Premier: The bank has also a wonderful staff.

Mr. ANGELO: Yes; and if the Premier could in some way secure the right to issue £100,000,000 worth of notes as legal tender throughout Australia, he would get my heartiest support for the Bill. Then there are the huge exchanges with London. Next, the Commonwealth took the Savings Bank and collared all the post office facilities. Lastly, the institution has all the Government accounts. Thus it has become a huge success, and I am glad of that, because now it is growing to be what it should be, a bank for bankers. The success of the Commonwealth Bank was due to factors which never will operate in the case of this proposed rural bank or any Associated Bank. It may safely be said that the progress and stability of the Associated Banks in recent years are features due to the accumulated profits of the past. For decades these banks have been well managed, and have been steadily increasing their reserves, and also their secret reserves. I know one bank operating throughout Aus-

tralia whose bank premises account stands at about £18,000. I would not mind betting that if the bank sold its Sydney office, it would realise over half a million sterling for it, and this without difficulty. Yet the whole of that bank's offices throughout Australia are valued at only £18,000. That fact helps the bank in its business.

The Premier: It covers up profits.

Mr. ANGELO: Yes; but it also helps the bank to lend money at reasonable rates of interest.

The Premier: The Western Australian Bank for years paid dividends of 16 per cent., and in addition carried large sums to reserve.

Mr. Thomson: But that is 16 per cent. on the original capital.

The Premier: Not on the watered capital.

Mr. ANGELO: A bank with a paid-up capital of £5,000,000, reserves of £5,000,000 and deposits of £30,000,000 has a total of £40,000,000 earning dividends to be paid on only £5,000,000. It need earn only a small percentage on its capital, reserves and deposits in order to pay large dividends on the paid-up capital. That is why big dividends become available. The profits of banks to-day are not made on capital only, but also on accumulated profits. We ought to be delighted that the Associated Banks are in such a wonderful position. It is due to sound finance. These well-managed institutions are the envy of the whole world. Recently we learned that in America last year there were 470 bank smashes. Do we ever hear of bank smashes in Australia? No; and I hope we never shall. We should be proud of our banking system, and should do nothing to annoy or hamper it—I do not say this Bill will do so in any way. Another matter which the Premier may not realise is the difficulty of obtaining an adequate staff. To secure qualified bankers is most difficult. Each bank is now educating its own staff, taking boys who have shown ability at school and training them to become clerks and managers. It has been found unwise to induce outsiders to come in. That is one of the difficulties to be encountered if the rural bank is established. The board of directors, I note, is to consist of the Under Treasurer and two others. If the rural bank is to do the good which the Premier anticipates, the Under Treasurer will have to devote a great deal of time to it; and yet I suppose he is already one of the

busiest men in the Public Service. The board will be kept pretty busy if the members are to look after the operations of such a bank throughout Western Australia.

The Premier: On an average, how often does the board of a private bank meet? Once a week?

Mr. ANGELO: Yes.

The Premier: Of course they are old-established institutions, and the management machinery is in smooth operation.

Mr. ANGELO: Not only that, but the head men in Western Australia have long experience and excellent qualifications. I doubt whether the Government will secure such men when starting out. In introducing the Bill the Premier said that the rural bank's operations would be restricted short of general banking, and pointed out that under Clause 8 money would be lent only to primary producers and others associated with them. In case I should not be here during the Committee stage, I wish to point out now that under the preceding clause the bank may discount bills, and that there is no qualification as to the kind of bills to be discounted. As much harm can result from discounting bills as from making loans. The Premier also said that sometimes our primary producers were hard put to it because a bad season in the East meant that assistance to western producers was restricted. I think that cuts both ways. Western Australia might have a bad season, and then our primary producers would have the assistance of the banks' surplus funds from the Eastern States. That is borne out to some extent by figures which I shall quote. During 1926, 1927, 1928 and 1929 there were bad seasons in some parts of the East. South Australia, I fancy, has had bad seasons throughout the four years. Queensland has had a bad season. Parts of New South Wales had drought conditions during those four years. Those facts, however, did not prevent the excess of advances made by the associated banks jumping from £2,795,000 in 1925 to £4,535,000 in 1926, to £5,380,000 in 1927, and to £8,504,000 last year. Even when there are bad seasons in the East, the banks are still able to find money to assist our primary producers. The Leader of the Opposition has put up a proposal with which I am in accord. The Premier will find it far easier to get money for the carrying out of that proposal than for establishing a rural bank. We have heard from the Leader

of the Opposition how much the Commonwealth Savings Bank got out of Western Australia and how little it lent here. It is the duty of that bank to assist our Treasurer in finding money if it is to be lent under the scheme suggested by the Opposition Leader. Therefore, I hope that hon. gentleman's suggestion will be adopted by the Premier. If so, I shall certainly support the Bill. I fear, however, that I am only doing my duty as a member of Parliament and a custodian for the taxpayers of Western Australia when I oppose the Premier's suggestions as embodied in the measure. From my experience of the past five or six years, I fail to see how anything but heavy loss to the State can result from the enactment of the Bill.

MR. THOMSON (Katanning) [8.56]: When the Governor's Speech forecasted the establishment of a rural bank, all members of the Country Party felt that something long overdue was about to be accomplished. For some considerable time the need of cheap money has been felt by our primary industries. I do not contend for even a moment that the Associated Banks have not in the past done, and are not to-day doing, their part in the opening up and development of this great State. Provided a man has sufficient security, he invariably receives favourable consideration from those banks. I had hoped that the measure forecasted in the Governor's Speech would be an amendment of the Agricultural Bank Act enabling that institution to make such advances as the Bill proposes the rural bank should make. The Agricultural Bank has played a most important part in the development of Western Australia. The institution has carried on the settler to a position when he was practically forced to go to a private bank, notwithstanding that he did not wish to leave the Agricultural Bank. The reason is that the Agricultural Bank can only advance the value of improvements to be made. Therefore, while regretting that the Government have not seen fit to give greater powers to the Agricultural Bank, I shall support the second reading of the Bill. In my opinion the State Savings Bank can perform a highly useful function in assisting our primary producers. While one clause, it is true, provides that only two-thirds of the value of land is to be allowed for loan purposes, another clause authorises loans to be made on the security not only

of land, but also of crops, wool, stock, plant, and machinery. I hope I am not reading into the Bill something that is not intended. Through the Industries Assistance Board the Agricultural Bank make advances to settlers enabling them to secure stock, purchase super, and obtain seed and other requirements. When this rural bank is established, even if the Agricultural Bank has the first mortgage, a man should be in a position to go to the rural bank and obtain his requirements from year to year. That, of course, would mean that it would be payable on demand. It is going to be beneficial to the primary producers. Early this year quite a number of farmers were not in a position to purchase their superphosphate. It was only when the Government, after consultation with the Associated Banks, made certain arrangements that the banks were able to supply super, to those farmers who required it. Not being a banker, I cannot speak with the same authority as the member for Guscoyne can. He stated that advances to primary producers without collateral security were not profitable, did not pay.

Mr. Angelo: Not when you have to pay heavily for your money.

Mr. THOMSON: While the Bill provides that there shall be two sections, I am hoping that by an appeal to the public of Western Australia, provided the necessary facilities in country districts are supplied, we shall obtain a much greater proportion of the people's savings than we get to-day.

Mr. Angelo: You will have to pay four per cent. for them.

Mr. THOMSON: Even that is very much cheaper than if, as the Leader of the Opposition suggests, we were to borrow the money from the Old Country. In their interim report, the British Economic Commission said they had interviewed leading representatives of trading banks and of the Commonwealth Bank, some of the principal branch managers and officials of the State Savings Bank, the Government banks, and rural and agricultural banks. Then the Commissioners went on to say this—

The high rate of interest paid by the Savings Bank, and the investment of a large proportion of their funds in Government funds and similar long term securities, tend to restrict the money available for ordinary trading purposes.

And they say further—

On the whole the farmer is a desirable and safe client for the bank, and little, if any,

losses have been made on advances on the security of broad acres.

Mr. Angelo: That is quite right if the collateral security is there.

Mr. THOMSON: I am not speaking as a banker. I am more concerned with the Bill. If the rural bank will assist farmers to put in their crops and purchase stock, I think the Government, through the Bill, will have accomplished something that many of us for some considerable time have desired to see brought into effect. When sitting on that side of the House a number of years ago, I advocated the improvement of the Agricultural Bank to enable the bank to carry on those clients who were quite satisfied with the assistance they had received and so had no desire to leave the Agricultural Bank. However, the Government then in power did not see fit to accept my suggestion. Provided we can give the assistance of cheap money, as indicated in the Bill, it is possible that the establishment of the rural bank will do considerable good. I am glad it is intended to put the Savings Bank under a board of directors, and I hope that board will be free from political control. A policy should be laid down for their guidance, after which the matter should be left entirely in their own hands. In country districts, unfortunately, the facilities offered by the State Savings Bank are not as good as those provided by the Commonwealth Savings Bank. It will be necessary to do here as has been done in the Eastern States, namely erect our bank building so that we shall have something attractive to show, in order that the people may know there is a State Savings Bank. I do not altogether favour the issue of debentures. If the money can be obtained more cheaply, I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that as far as possible we should endeavour to obtain at a cheap rate from overseas any money necessary to carry on the functions of the proposed rural bank. Still, if we have in the State people willing to invest in debentures, there is no reason why we should not adopt that expedient. Those debentures can be sold or transferred without registration or any other difficulty, and so when we issue a £10 debenture, virtually we are issuing a £10 note which should always be worth its face value. Moreover, the debenture will be carrying interest. I hope the Premier will accept any amendment

submitted in the interests of that section of the people which the Bill proposes to assist. Of course there is a possibility of overlapping between the Agricultural Bank and the proposed rural bank. I had hoped the Bill would be an amendment of the Agricultural Bank Act. It still seems to me possible to merge the work of the Agricultural Bank, the Savings Bank and the proposed rural bank under one board of directors. That would obviate a great deal of overlapping, would mean economy in administration, and generally would be very effective. I will support the second reading.

On motion by Mr. Sampson, debate adjourned.

BILL—ALSATIAN DOG.

In Committee.

Mr. Angelo in the Chair; Mr. Lindsay in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4—Agreed to.

Clause 5—Evidence:

Mr. DAVY: To me this clause is very objectionable. If a man is to be charged with committing an offence, the offence ought to be proved against him. But increasingly in this House we find attempts made to lighten the burden on those bringing a charge, by departing from the foundation of our criminal law, which is that a man is innocent until proved guilty. The clause provides that the burden of proving that a dog has been sterilised shall be on the owner of the dog. Why?

Mr. Latham: He would be the only one who could say.

Mr. DAVY: That is the way! Whenever this sort of thing comes up we are told "Oh, this is an exceptional case." It is time we took the stand that there can be no exception to so important a principle, and that whenever an offence is alleged it must be proved by those alleging it. I will vote against the clause.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I agree with the hon. member that in almost every Bill that comes down we find a clause of this sort and hear argument trotted out in support of it. Nothing can warrant us in departing from the foundation of British justice referred to by the hon. member. Although I

was a member of the select committee to which this Bill was referred, I am beyond reproach in respect of this clause because I have made it clear to the other members of the select committee that I would not agree to its going through. I hope the Committee will defeat the clause and will throw upon those bringing a charge the onus of proving it.

Mr. CHESSON: I also am opposed to placing the onus of proof on the accused person. Every person should be deemed innocent until he has been proved guilty. I also object to Subclause 2 requiring the accused to produce a certificate of a registered veterinary surgeon setting out that the dog has been sterilised. That might be possible in the city, but what chance would there be in the back blocks of getting such a certificate? Many men can treat dogs of either sex so that they will not reproduce their species. It is not beyond the ability of men dealing with stock. I object to people being put to unnecessary bother and expense.

Mr. LINDSAY: Members have agreed to the principle and they should at least assist to make the measure effective. One can tell when a male dog has been sterilised, but with a female the only possible proof would be the certificate of a veterinary surgeon. This year we passed the Agricultural Products Bill which contained a more drastic clause than this.

The Premier: I think you voted against somewhat similar clauses in other Bills of mine.

Mr. LINDSAY: The clause is necessary in this measure if it is to be effective.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: No doubt the select committee thrashed the matter out thoroughly.

The Premier: It does not follow that a select committee is always right.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Quite so. I should like to know how far the committee considered the clause. If sterilisation reveals no outward indications, only the man who performed the operation could prove that the dog had been sterilised. If sterilisation took the form of emasculation it would be easy, but it is possible to sterilise without performing the more serious operation.

Mr. Lindsay: Not in the female.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I do not know that there would be any outward evidence of an Alsatian bitch having been sterilised. The only proof possible would be that of the

person who had performed the operation. If money were paid for the operation there would be a receipt and the receipt could be produced.

Mr. Withers: What if a man owned a second dog?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The dog would have to be registered, and if the owner tried to ring the changes, he could be punished. If an Alsatian at a few weeks old is worth 12 guineas or 15 guineas, it is idle to argue that the owner could not afford to have it sterilised by a competent person.

Mr. Chesson: It would cost more than 12 guineas to bring a dog from the back-blocks to a veterinary surgeon in Perth.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: If sterilisation is necessary, and the Bill says it is, the only proof of the operation having been performed would be the certificate of the person who had performed it.

Mr. Chesson: It does not require a veterinary surgeon to perform it.

Mr. Latham: A veterinary surgeon would be required to sterilise a slut.

Mr. Sleeman: You believe in the clause?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: If a person claims that his dog had been sterilised, it would be simple to prove the fact by producing the certificate. If a man is summoned for a debt and he produces his receipt, the case falls to the ground.

Mr. Davy: But the creditor has to produce evidence of the debt. The receipt is only a defence. Under this clause, there would be no need for proof of any sort.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The proof would be contained in the certificate and it would be no hardship to produce it. I cannot see how the measure could be administered without this provision.

Mr. SAMPSON: In some instances a similar clause is essential to make the measure effective, but there is no need for it in this Bill, since Clause 6 prohibits the registration of any Alsatian unless it has been proved to the satisfaction of the registering officer, by the production of the certificate of a registered veterinary surgeon, that the dog has been effectively sterilised. There is no need for the clause, and its deletion will not impair the usefulness of the Bill.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I object to the principle embodied in this clause and regret that it has crept into so many of our Bills. In the drafting of these measures this appears to be a precaution taken

by those in charge to obviate a lot of work on their part. When the gold-stealing provisions came in, the Government of the day pleaded that exceptional circumstances existed making it difficult to prove that a person was rightfully in possession of gold, and so the onus of proof was thrown upon the individual. When it came to the question of lumpers being found in possession of goods, again the onus of proof was thrown upon them. We are breaking down the old principle, that a man is deemed to be innocent until he is adjudged guilty. It is a bad principle to cast the onus of proof upon the person charged. This has crept into too many of our Bills.

Mr. Latham: And into some introduced by your side.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I regret that very much. It happened even this session, but will not occur again if I can help it. We should stand by the principle that a man is innocent until he is proved guilty.

Hon. G. Taylor: There are difficulties in this case.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is always being pleaded that difficulties exist to warrant the breaking down of this principle.

Mr. DAVY: I suggest that this clause might be struck out, and Clause 6 strengthened to take its place. In the Dog Act the penalty for failure to register is a fine of not more than 40s., and when the fine is paid the dog is considered to be registered for the rest of the year. We could recommit Clause 2 and provide there not only for keeping a dog that is not sterilised, but for keeping one that is not registered. A dog could not then be kept unless it were both registered and sterilised.

Mr. Lindsay: I will agree to that.

Mr. COVERLEY: I hope the clause will be passed. It is the most essential part of the Bill, and will not inflict any hardship upon Alsatian owners. A man will only have to produce a receipt from the veterinary surgeon who performs the operation. If the clause is not passed, the owner may decline to produce any certificate to a local authority. Despite what the member for Cue says, I maintain that the operation is a painful one when performed by amateurs; should be performed by a competent person. In the North thousands of dogs are unregistered. The crossbred Alsatian is a worse

menace than the pure-bred animal. We should therefore try to prevent the spread of the crossbred.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The owner of an Alsatian has just as much right to get British justice as anyone else. That principle will go by the board if this clause is passed. I am not going to vote for it. I am pleased to say I crossed the floor of the House in connection with the Agricultural Products Bill, because it contained the same objectionable principle that we find in this clause.

Mr. CHESSON: I disagree with the remarks of the member for Kimberley. The operation is not a serious one. If stock can be dealt with by other than veterinary surgeons, dogs can also be dealt with in the same way. I have seen hundreds of female calves treated by stockmen. I am just as much concerned about the pastoral industry as the hon. member, and when I have opinions I will express them irrespective of whether I offend him or not. There is an effective way, and I do not want to place the burden of unnecessary expense upon those people.

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

Ayes	17
Noes	15

Majority for 2

Ayes.

Mr. Barnard	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Rowe	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Cowan	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Doney	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Latham	Mr. Lambert
Mr. Lindsay	(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Chesson	Mr. Rowe
Mr. Collier	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Troy
Mr. Davy	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Lamond	Mr. Withers
Mr. McCallum	Mr. North
Mr. Millington	(Teller.)

Clause thus passed.

Clause 6—agreed to.

Clause 7—Powers and duties of local authorities and inspectors.

The PREMIER: The clause imposes serious duties upon local governing bodies and

may entail considerable expense. Frequently we have heard of the difficulties of local authorities owing to the insufficiency of funds. Here we propose to direct the local authorities to carry out certain duties and to appoint inspectors to enforce the provisions of the Act. What have the local authorities to say to that?

Mr. Teesdale: The same officials who look after the dogs now will do the work.

The PREMIER: I do not know that they will! Have the local authorities been consulted?

Mr. Lindsay: Yes. I have a letter from the executive of the Road Boards Association approving of the Bill.

The PREMIER: The hon. member has not always accepted the decision of that body as expressing the opinions of the road boards.

Mr. Lindsay: I do so in this instance.

The PREMIER: In connection with the Main Roads Act, the decision of the executive was repudiated.

Mr. Thomson: That mistake was admitted.

The PREMIER: Perhaps the executive has not expressed a more representative opinion in this instance.

Mr. Latham: Yes, the executive is right this time, although it was wrong last time.

Mr. Lindsay: I also have a letter from one of the road boards.

The PREMIER: I raise the point because I want to know who will pay for the work that we direct the local authorities to carry out.

Mr. Lindsay: The ratepayers.

The PREMIER: And later on, is it to be expected that they will approach the Government with a request for a subsidy on account of these additional duties?

Mr. Lindsay: Nothing of the sort! They are only too glad to carry out the duties.

The PREMIER: I am not quite sure whether I would be in order in discussing the recommendation of the select committee with regard to compensation. Perhaps they would view with antagonism the proposal that they should pay compensation.

Mr. Teesdale: You have got a big balance in the vermin fund that could be used.

The PREMIER: The recommendation of the select committee does not say who will pay the compensation.

Mr. Clydesdale: There are only three recognised breeders in the State.

The PREMIER: I do not think it would be a fair thing to ask the Government to pay

that compensation, irrespective of whether the amount involved was large or small.

Mr. Davy: It is a community matter.

The PREMIER: But where will the money come from?

Hon. G. Taylor: From the taxpayers.

Mr. Davy: The vermin fund would be a sound source.

The PREMIER: Perhaps in the agricultural districts the duties imposed by the Bill might be carried on by the branches of the Primary Producers' Association!

Mr. LINDSAY: The Premier knows perfectly well it would be useless to introduce such a Bill unless it could be administered. The road boards have asked for such legislation and I have a letter from the executive of the Road Board Association of Western Australia.

The Minister for Works: You did not take much notice of the letter approving of my Bill!

Mr. LINDSAY: This is a different matter. The letter is as follows:—

I acknowledge the receipt of a copy of "Hansard" relative to your introduction of the Alsatian Dog Bill, and I thank you for same. I express the gratitude of the Executive Committee to you for so exhaustively opening up the subject, and submitting facts of an undeniable character in support of the Bill. I trust the Bill will be enacted in the form you have introduced it, and appreciate your efforts in the matter.

The Bill is in the form that I introduced it. At the last August conference of the road boards, a motion was carried unanimously urging the introduction of such a Bill. The local authorities administer the Dog Act and the Vermin Act, and little extra expense will be incurred. In fact, it will be practically nothing at all.

Hon. G. Taylor: Does the Pastoralists' Association approve of the Bill?

Mr. LINDSAY: Whole-heartedly! In reply to the Premier I can say that the local authorities are prepared to do their part.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: What about the municipal councils?

Mr. LINDSAY: I cannot say whether they approve. I sent a copy of the Bill to the Quairading Road Board and I have received the following letter from them this evening:—

A resolution was carried at a meeting of the board held on the 9th inst., that this board support you in your action regarding the Alsatian dog and also for your work in connection with the amendment to the Dog Act. For

months your actions have been followed with interest, as you have put up a long fight to stop the importation of the Alsatian dog.

Mr. Sleeman: And they had a copy of the Bill?

Mr. LINDSAY: Yes. The hon. member is in favour of the Bill; he was a member of the select committee.

Mr. Sleeman: I am not in favour of two points.

Mr. LINDSAY: I knew the hon. member intended to move an amendment. I knew the hon. member was going to oppose it, but he did not oppose this clause. If we cut out this clause the Bill will become a dead letter. I hope hon. members will agree to retain the clause.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The select committee agreed that dog owners should get compensation. They are not getting it under Clause 5. That is another reason why the Bill should be tossed out *holus bolus*. I will oppose every clause until I can get Clause 5 struck out, and the assurance given that the owners of the dogs will get compensation.

Mr. Teesdale: Why did you not tell us that before?

Mr. CHESSON: I have no intention of opposing this clause. The work must be carried out by the local authorities or the police, and I think the police can do the job better than anybody.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Subclause 3 is most extraordinary. It sets out that an inspector may take action without authority. That may involve the local body in considerable expense.

Mr. Lindsay: I do not mind if that subclause is struck out; I do not like it myself.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move an amendment—

That Subclause 3 be struck out.

Amendment put and passed.

The PREMIER: Subclause 4 says that "local authority" means a municipal council or road board. I have no doubt that road boards in country districts will endeavour to enforce the Act, but I want to advise the hon. member in charge of the Bill that I have no faith in the municipal council in the city.

Mr. Lindsay: I have not much faith in it myself.

The PREMIER: It is in the city where the dogs are bred and where the greater number are to be found. The Dog Act to-day is a dead letter in the city. The City

Council's dog inspector, if there is such a person, does not carry out his duties. I have had dogs for years and I have never registered them.

Mr. Teesdale: You will hear all about it to-morrow morning.

The PREMIER: I do not think any person in the city registers his dogs.

Hon. G. Taylor: There is a man to deal with dogs.

The PREMIER: Well, he is a very lazy man. If there is such an individual he must be employed on a weekly wage; he cannot be receiving so much for each dog registered.

Mr. Chesson: How many have you?

The PREMIER: I have never had less than two. In the course of 20 years I have never been without two dogs and I have registered only one on one occasion.

Mr. Sleeman: When they get you they will make the registrations retrospective.

Mr. Chesson: Have you an Alsatian?

The PREMIER: I had one, but I was afraid of what was likely to take place and I sold it. I knew I would get no compensation if I kept it.

Hon. G. Taylor: Was he savage?

The PREMIER: No, he was intelligent enough to discriminate between those he ought to attack and those he should not attack. I can only express the hope that the sterilisation will not lessen the intelligence of these dogs, because the dog world would be very much the poorer without the intelligent Alsatian. I want to know whether the member for Toodyay is satisfied—because now that the Bill is going through I want to help him—that the municipal councils will enforce the provisions of the Bill? We must not let the Bill go through if it is likely to be more or less a failure.

Member: I suggest we strike out "municipal councils."

The PREMIER: The trouble is that most of the dogs are in the city, and although the country municipalities may carry out the provisions of the Bill, I have no faith whatever in the City Council.

Mr. Lindsay: What about giving it to the Stock Department?

The PREMIER: If we strike out "municipal council" we must substitute some other body. We must remember too that the Alsatian would be able to discern at once the object of the visit of an individual who was going to prosecute the owner for not taking certain action in respect of the dog.

Then that would be the end of the individual, and no more would be appointed as dog inspectors. I am merely warning the member for Toodyay.

Mr. LINDSAY: I realise all the difficulties the Premier has mentioned and I thank him for the warning. This clause was added to the Bill to overcome the difficulties that were foreseen.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 8—Proceedings.

Mr. DAVY: Under this clause any person can prosecute for an offence.

Mr. Lindsay: That is what I was told and when discussing the matter with people who are interested in the Bill it was decided to include the clause.

Mr. DAVY: You cut down the authority by the proviso.

Mr. Lindsay: I see no other way by which we can get the Act administered.

Mr. DAVY: The clause gives a power that already exists, but unfortunately the proviso limits the right of a citizen. Every citizen has the right to prosecute a person for any breach of the law, and if a municipal council is not doing its job the anti-Alsatian League can take steps to see that people are prosecuted. I move an amendment—

That the proviso be struck out.

Mr. LINDSAY: We did not have the legal knowledge possessed by the hon. member when the proviso was inserted. The members of the select committee were under the impression that we were giving rights that never existed previously. If the hon. member gives me an assurance that this is common law, I will agree to the proviso being struck out.

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

Clause 9—Interpretation:

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: What is the meaning of this clause? It says, "A dog shall be deemed to be of the Alsatian wolf hound species if such dog, or either parent of such dog, is or was wholly or partly of the species or kind commonly known as Alsatian wolf hounds." I would like some explanation of the clause.

Mr. Coverley: They have changed the name of the dog several times.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Who is to say what the breed is? If one changes

the name and another still holds that it is of the same type, who is to decide? Recently I was shown an Alsatian which struck me as not being an Alsatian at all. Still, the owner holds it to be an Alsatian. If neighbours took action, that dog would have to be sterilised.

Mr. Lindsay: Not necessarily.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Who is to decide the question whether that dog is an Alsatian or not? Should any person be entitled to step in and drag the owner to the police court, where the onus of proof would lie on the owner?

Mr. Davy: No; the onus of proof now is on the prosecution.

Mr. Lindsay: It is only as regards sterilisation that the onus of proof is on the owner.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: On whom will rest the onus of proving the dog to be an Alsatian?

Mr. Davy: The onus will be on the plaintiff.

The Premier: The clause is likely to be fruitful of litigation.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: An owner might be dragged to court merely out of spite. Why should all these restrictions and penalties be placed on him?

Mr. Teesdale: Because the select committee have decided that the Alsatian is likely to become a menace to the pastoral industry.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If the law is intended to apply to a special breed of dog the measure should not be made applicable to numerous other breeds. Let us have justice and fairness.

Mr. Teesdale: As regards compensation, there are only three breeders.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The number of breeders affords no guide to the amount of compensation payable; the number and the value of the dogs would tell. However, this clause is altogether too sweeping.

Mr. LINDSAY: The clause deals with the Alsatian wolfhound species. It is easy to decide whether a dog is a pure-bred Alsatian or a half-bred Alsatian. The clause was drafted in its present form because in many places these dogs are not called Alsations, or Alsatian wolfhounds, but German shepherd dogs, and so forth. Therefore the clause should cover every Alsatian breed. The Tasmanian Act deals with "the Alsatian wolfhound," and leaves it at that. The clause may be cumbersome, but the Bill is not of my drafting.

Mr. DAVY: The Minister for Works takes a wrong view of the clause. The onus of proof being entirely on the complainant, he will have a considerable task in supporting that the dog is an Alsatian. That task becomes increasingly difficult as the dog is less wholly and more partly Alsatian. I take it the Act will never be brought into operation except against pure-bred Alsations. If the parents are wholly or partly of the species, it is certain that the offspring must be. From the wording of the clause it would appear that there was a possibility of the old dog being wholly or partly Alsatian while the younger dog was not. I move an amendment—

That in Subclause 1 the words "or either parent of such dog," lines 2 and 3, be struck out.

Mr. TEESDALE: It would be interesting to know whether the drafting of this clause has been done carelessly because it is not a Government measure. It is absolutely rotten that the select committee should have to take a clause three times to the drafting officer and still have it in such a shape that it is fired at by this Committee.

The Premier: Because the select committee were not capable of explaining what they wanted.

Mr. TEESDALE: The select committee made three attempts to explain it to the drafting officer, and in the end we thought we had occasion to hope that officer was fully seized of what we wanted. This is just the sort of thing the Minister for Works shoots at with great glee.

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

New clause:

---The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move—

That the following new clause be added:—
"This Act shall not operate within the metropolitan district as defined in the Traffic Act of 1919."

That district extends from Midland Junction to Fremantle, and approximately as far as Armadale. There is no pastoral industry there, so dogs in that area could not be a menace to the pastoral industry, for the protection of which, we are told, the Bill has been introduced. If the Bill will do that, it is all its sponsors should aim at. These dogs may prove to be a menace to the pastoral industry, in which case the industry

must be protected. I regret that we should be called upon to deal with the Bill without having before us the evidence taken by the select committee. The only case that has been made out against the Alsatian is that he may possibly prove a menace to the pastoral industry.

Mr. Teesdale: You have these printed sheets, representing the views of the expert authorities.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: There is not in those sheets one word saying that the dog is a danger at all. The only case put up against the dog is that it may prove to be a danger. But even if the Committee agrees with that, why go the whole hog and say the Act is to apply all over the State, and that a person who wants an Alsatian shall not be permitted to have him, even when there is no danger of the dog ever coming into contact with sheep? If I have one of those dogs in my home at Fremantle, what danger can it be to the pastoral industry?

Mr. Clydesdale: What is wrong with sterilising your dog?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If I want to breed from the dog, I should be permitted to do so. It does not mean any danger to the pastoral industry, so why should there be any such restriction in the metropolitan area? The Alsatian dogs are the most intelligent in the world, and if a man in the city wants one there is no reason why he should not be allowed to have him, and even breed from him. To prevent people of the metropolis from keeping those highly intelligent dogs is going too far altogether. I am interested in a few sheep, but it is a long way from my home to my farm, and even if I thought it might be dangerous to have an Alsatian on my farm, that is no reason why I should not have one at my home in Fremantle.

Mr. Clydesdale: How would you prevent him from getting out into the country?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Easily enough: I would not take him into the country.

Mr. Clydesdale: You could not control him to that extent.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If the dog were to get away into the country, he would then have to be sterilised.

Mr. SAMPSON: The passing of the proposed new clause would render the measure futile, utterly useless. If the Government do not desire the Bill—

The Minister for Works: I was speaking, not for the Government, but for the residents of South Fremantle.

The Premier: This is not a Government Bill at all.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Minister for Works is a member of the Ministry.

The Premier: He was speaking for himself.

Mr. SAMPSON: If the Bill is not desirable, it ought to be defeated. To say that the pastoral industry is not in evidence within the limits mentioned by the Minister, is to say something that is not quite correct. Sheep have been killed by kangaroo dogs at Churchman's Brook, which is not outside the area referred to by the Minister, and we know that sheep are running out on the southern branch of the Wongong Brook. The carrying of this proposed new clause would render the Bill abortive.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I fail to see the justice of the argument used by the Minister. I understand that none of the breeders of Alsations are more than five miles away from Perth.

Mr. Sleeman: There is one breeder in Narrogin.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Two or three times to-night have I heard the chairman of the select committee, by way of interjection, say there are only about three recognised breeders of Alsations. Of what use is it to appoint a select committee of this House to exhaustively inquire into a subject, if other members, without any inquiry, are to make bald statements? The Alsatian dogs are bred in the metropolitan area and sent out into the country, where they are sold. If the new clause be carried, it will render the Bill abortive. I was amazed that the member for Fremantle, who was a member of the select committee and had an opportunity to examine the witnesses, should come here and oppose the select committee in the way he has done.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The hon. member need not be amazed at anything I do. If he looks at himself he will find enough to be amazed at and ashamed of. I am surprised that he should call himself British, when he can get up and support an amendment in the way he did. The members of the select committee knew my opinions on Clause 5. It is unthinkable that the breeders of Alsations should have their dogs destroyed without compensation. If it is proposed that

they are not to be compensated, I hold myself at liberty to do anything I can to wreck the Bill.

Hon. G. Taylor: This is not compensation.

Mr. SLEEMAN: There is compensation provided for in the Bill.

Hon. G. Taylor: There is not a word about compensation.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I will stand by all I have done. In the select committee I opposed Clause 5, and I reserved the right to oppose it here.

Hon. G. Taylor: I hope you will have the same success here as you had in the select committee.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I know you do, but I hope the Committee will be British enough to refuse to commit an injustice. How would the hon. member like somebody to come along and take some of his property without giving him compensation? He would be the first to squeal, and would never stop squealing. I hope the Bill will be wrecked if Clause 5 is retained or if breeders are not to be compensated for their loss.

Mr. DAVY: It would be a pity to pass the new clause. The doubt we had was whether the charge against the Alsatian was a just one. The select committee have found that it was a just charge, and that the dog should be prohibited.

The Minister for Works: So far as the pastoral industry is concerned.

Mr. DAVY: No.

The Minister for Works: That is the only case made out against the dog.

Mr. DAVY: In effect the select committee have found that the dog is so dangerous to the pastoral industry that it ought not to be allowed to breed in the State. The Premier has given a convincing illustration that the Dog Act is a dead letter. I think he said that not one person in eighty had his dog registered.

The Premier: I think that is so in the city.

Mr. DAVY: Then it is reasonable to suppose that some of the owners of Alsations will not register and will be able to breed from their dogs without any proper check being kept. I cannot see what is to prevent the dogs from being shifted into the proximity of sheep. If the dog is dangerous, it should not be allowed to increase. If the new clause be passed it will be possible to breed Alsations ad lib in the city.

Mr. Mann: But not take them to the country.

Mr. DAVY: What is to prevent it? If they are not registered, all the stray dogs wandering round the streets of the metropolitan area will pick up some of the blood of the Alsatian. We shall be acting illogically if we end by imposing this serious restriction on the scope of the Bill. I shall vote against the new clause. I agree with the member for Fremantle that compensation should be paid, but unless the Government take the matter up, it is extremely difficult for a private member to get justice done. I do not suppose the compensation would amount to more than £100 or £200.

The Premier: Wouldn't it?

The Minister for Works: I know of one dog in Western Australia that cost 100 guineas in England.

Mr. DAVY: Suppose compensation cost £500 or £600, if we are going to destroy people's property, compensation should be paid.

Mr. MANN: On the second reading it was generally admitted that the Alsatian was an intelligent animal, but should not be trusted to run loose in the country. The pastoral industry would not be affected by dogs kept in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Clydesdale: How could you keep them here?

Mr. Lindsay: Put a wire netting fence around the city!

Mr. MANN: If an Alsatian were found outside the metropolitan area, it would come within the scope of the measure. Recently a gentleman who had returned from a trip to Germany told me that the blind soldiers of that country had received no compensation, but each had been given a trained Alsatian dog to guide him in his daily work. He said the intelligence displayed by the dogs was amazing.

The Premier: I saw such men in the Berlin railway station taken down through subways on to the right platform and into the right train.

Mr. MANN: My friend mentioned that. He also told me that a blind soldier whom he had known as a boy had said it was necessary to take the dog to a place only once and it would always be able to find its way there afterwards. Alsations in the metropolitan area would be under strict control. The member for Canning asked how they could be controlled.

Mr. Clydesdale: Inside 12 months there would be none left except sterilised dogs.

Mr. MANN: The new clause is reasonable. If a dog is kept in the city, it cannot be a menace to stock.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No case has been made out against the new clause. If it is likely to wreck the Bill on the ground that it will be impossible to trace a dog taken from the city to the country, the Bill as it stands must prove impossible. It will be necessary to ascertain where all the Alsations in the country are located to ensure that they are sterilised. If a dog goes from the metropolis into the country, a certificate has to be produced. The owner is challenged, the inspection is made, and the whole thing is as simple to follow as the Bill itself, if there is any simplicity in that. Is it to be said that we in the metropolis are to be denied the service, companionship and pleasure of having these dogs around us, when no argument has been advanced against it? Are we to be denied everything in the metropolis to suit people in the country? Members on the cross-benches are going to extremes, and inflicting an injustice on the people of the metropolitan area. If this provision is inserted now, and subsequently the Act is found impossible to administer, the hon. member next session can bring down an amendment. All he has to do is to prove that the Act has become unworkable and that a danger is menacing the pastoralists. These dogs are to be seen in all the big cities in the world. The only argument against them in Australia is our big open spaces. We cannot compare the sheep runs of Europe with the sheep runs of Australia. If Alsations can be controlled on the sheep runs of Europe, surely they can be controlled in the backyards of the metropolis. Is it suggested that we cannot effectively control Alsations in our backyards? These dogs have been proved for over 300 years to be the best shepherd dogs in Europe. They have been useful also in countless other directions. Are we to be denied the right to train and keep them in our own homes in the metropolitan district? No possible danger to the pastoral areas could arise by our keeping them in our own homes. To suggest that every one of these dogs in the State should be destroyed merely because people outback will be affected is most unfair. Members of the cross-benches are never tired of arguing that the country should be treated differently from the city. They are always asking for special consideration, and to be relieved of some burden which should be borne by the

city. We, however, are to be denied any consideration. We in the metropolis have done nothing else but extend privileges and grant favours to the country. We have done more for the country than members of the Country Party have, and, indeed, have initiated most of the big movements on behalf of the country. None of the other States except Tasmania has attempted to bring down a Bill this session. If these dogs are a danger to Western Australia, they are a danger throughout Australia. There are ten times more dogs in the other States than there are here. The case is not so urgent that it has to be decided now. The Eastern States are not looking at it in that light. Why should we in the metropolis be forced into this position? If next session the hon. member can show that the pastoral industry has been endangered by the keeping of dogs in the metropolitan area, he will find me in his corner supporting him. It is the training of the dog that counts, not the breed. When an Alsation is properly looked after it can be taught to do almost anything for its master. It is not too much to ask that the metropolitan area should be exempt for the time being.

Hon. G. Taylor: What is the value of the dog in the metropolitan area?

The Premier: What is the value of any dog in the metropolitan area except the love that a man has for a good faithful dog.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The member for Mt. Margaret loves a good horse. I love a good dog, and animals of any kind. Am I to be denied the right of having a dog if I want to?

Hon. G. Taylor: My affection is better directed than yours.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is a question of taste and judgment. I am not asking for anything unworkable or unreasonable.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: "What a wonderfully docile animal the Alsation is," must be the thought occurring to one after hearing the Minister for Works. Mr. McCabe and other witnesses testified that after sterilisation the Alsation becomes a better animal. The carrying of the Minister's amendment means the wrecking of the Bill. The metropolitan area would become a breeding ground for Alsations, and they would be distributed throughout the State. The Alsation is intelligent—too intelligent to be allowed to get out into the back country. The benefit of any doubt should be given to the pastoral

industry, and not to the dog. Western Australia already has too many pests.

Mr. TEESDALE: The Minister for Works complained of absence of proof. The inquiry closed about 1 p.m. to-day. Does the Minister think the select committee can now produce here a hundred odd letters to prove the case? The inquiry was directed towards the probable effect of Alsations on the pastoral industry of Western Australia, and not to what Alsations do on the Continent or in Britain. The weight of opinion was against the dogs. The letters support the select committee's finding.

New clause put and negatived.

Title—agreed to.

Mr. Sleeman: When shall we know whether the select committee's recommendation will be carried into effect?

The CHAIRMAN: That question cannot be gone into now.

Mr. Sleeman: It will be gone into.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member may be able to do so on the third reading.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

House adjourned at 11.11 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Thursday, 14th November, 1929.

	PAGE
Bills: Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, 2r.	1563
Reserves, 2r.	1563
Sandalwood, 2r.	1563
Electoral Provinces, 2r.	1566
Alsatian Dog, 1r.	1573
Reserves (No. 2), 1r.	1573
Cremation, Assembly's Message	1573
Main Roads Act Amendment, Com.	1573
Mental Deficiency, 2r.	1576
Aborigines Act Amendment, 2r.	1579
Criminal Code Amendment, 2r.	1580
Appropriation, 2r.	1583
Licensing Act Amendment, 2r., Com., etc.	1585
Loan, £2,250,000, 2r.	1585
Road Districts Act Amendment, 2r.	1589

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

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

1, Agricultural Bank Act Amendment.

2, Reserves.

Returned to the Assembly with amendments.

BILL—SANDALWOOD.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.37] in moving the second reading said: For many years, Western Australia has exported considerable quantities of sandalwood to China, but until 1924 the State received very little direct benefit from the trade which fluctuated from year to year. Prior to the introduction of regulations, in November, 1923, to control the pulling of sandalwood on Crown lands, the annual export of wood ranged from 3,000 to 14,000 tons per annum, and was characterised by a series of short boom periods and long slumps. During a boom period the puller received high wages, but during the slumps he was forced to sell at a very low figure, which gave him a poor return for his labour. Up to 1920 the royalty was 5s. per ton. From 1920 to 1922 it was £2 per ton. Under the regulations of 1923, a system of licensing merchants handling Crown land wood was introduced and the maximum output from Crown lands was fixed at 6,000 tons. The licenses provide that the getter shall receive prompt payment for his wood at the rate of £16 per ton (f.a.q.) on rails at Fremantle, and the Government receives £9 per ton royalty, or an annual revenue of from £40,000 to £50,000. During the years 1924-25-26 large quantities were obtained from nominally private property in this State. A quantity, however, was pilfered from Crown land. That was proved satisfactorily. By 1926 the control of these private property operations had been tightened up, and supplies reduced to such an extent that the business was no longer so attractive. About this time, the attention of certain pullers was turned to South Australia, and licenses were secured in that State on the basis of 10s. a ton royalty. Representations were immediately made to the South Australian Government, and as a result they undertook to restrict the quantity to be obtained from Crown land in that State, and to increase the royalty. Since 1927, the basis of the arrangement between the two