

# Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 7th October, 1930.

	PAGE
Questions: Railways, running expenses ... ..	889
Metropolitan Markets Trust ... ..	889
Taxation, land and income ... ..	889
Farms, abandoned ... ..	889
Bills: Traffic Act Amendment, reports ... ..	889
Local Courts Act Amendment, 2a., Com. report ... ..	889
Stipendiary Magistrates, 2a. ... ..	889
Annual Estimates: General debate concluded ... ..	889
Votes and items discussed ... ..	911
Adjournment, Royal Show ... ..	918

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

## QUESTION—RAILWAYS, RUNNING EXPENSES.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Premier: 1, What new railways or extensions are at present under construction? 2, Of these, what loss, if any, per year in running costs, is expected? 3, Has consideration been given to this and to the running of motor vehicles to serve those districts, and the consequent possible saving, including construction and running expenses?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Kulja Eastward, Lake Grace-Karlgarin, Meekatharra-Wiluna, and Bridgetown-Jarnadup Railway. Extension (Pemberton-Westcliffe). 2, No loss in running costs is anticipated. 3, Yes.

## QUESTION—METROPOLITAN MARKETS TRUST.

Mr. J. MacCALLUM SMITH asked the Minister for Lands: When will the report and balance sheet of the Metropolitan Markets Trust for the year ended 30th June, 1930, be laid on the Table of the House?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: The balance-sheet is now in the hands of the Auditor General, and so soon as it is completed it will be laid on the Table in both Houses.

## QUESTION—TAXATION, LAND AND INCOME.

Mr. J. H. SMITH asked the Premier: With reference to Section 37, Land and Income Tax Assessment Act, 1907-1924, over what calendar years does the present five-year period extend?

The PREMIER replied: Section 37 does not fix a commencing date for a five-year period of valuation common to all land tax assessments, but permits the Commissioner of Taxation to assess the value of land once, and then such value must stand for a five-year period commencing on the date on which the value was determined by him. There are, therefore, various five-year periods in operation. The principle adopted was determined by the State Full Court in the O'Connor-Quinlan case.

## QUESTION—FARMS, ABANDONED.

Mr. J. I. MANN asked the Minister for Lands: What was the number of abandoned farms in the wheat mixed farming areas up to the end of August, 1930?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: The number of blocks previously held and now vacant on the plans of the Lands Department is 334, a number of which have not been made available for selection owing to distance from the existing railway system. In addition to this number, the Agricultural Bank has 225 farms for sale, and these farms, in many cases, embrace more than one block. Such farms are not necessarily considered paying propositions.

## BILL—TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT.

Reports of Committee adopted.

## BILL—LOCAL COURTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 18th September.

MR. WILLCOCK (Geraldton) [4.40]: I have no objection to the Bill. The object of the Attorney General is the simplification of procedure and the minimising of expense to people who desire to engage in litigation. I think the whole object of the Bill is commendable, and therefore it would be useless to waste the time of the House objecting to something that one can agree with. Consequently, I will not oppose the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee.*

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

**BILL—STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATES.***Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 18th September.

**MR. WILLCOCK** (Geraldton) [4.45]: I have had an opportunity since the Attorney General moved the second reading of this Bill to peruse his remarks. The principles of the measure are easily understood. Apparently it is in conformity with the policy of the Government. I am surprised to hear that the Minister only presumed he had the support of other members of the Cabinet in the remarks he made on the second reading. Apart from the merits or demerits of the Bill, it is rather amazing that a measure of this kind should be brought down at this stage. There is no necessity to mention that this is a period of financial stress. During the past few months attempts have been made to cut away time-honoured privileges from different employees, and to cut down emoluments and salaries enjoyed by other people, whilst numerous persons have had their livelihood altogether taken away. Retrenchment has been the order of the day. Notwithstanding this, at the most serious time in our history it is sought to improve the status and the emoluments of a rather highly-paid section of the public service.

The Attorney General: Not the emoluments.

**Mr. WILLCOCK**: Those set out in the Bill are greater than are now being paid to any officer holding a similar position in the service.

The Attorney General: Under the Bill they will still receive what they are getting now.

**Mr. WILLCOCK**: The Bill provides that magistrates may be paid up to £1,200 a year, and there is no magistrate in the service now who is receiving within £50 of that amount.

The Attorney General: That is so.

**Mr. WILLCOCK**: The Government select the present period, when everyone is having his income reduced, privileges are

being taken away, and retrenchment is going on, to bring down a Bill of this kind. This is not the time to make alterations that will cost the country any money. If the wages section of the community, and those on the lower rungs of the ladder, have to put up with considerable losses in the remunerations they get for the work they do towards carrying on the affairs of the country, we should not consider any increase in the benefits, status or emoluments of one section of the public service. The Bill alters the whole procedure of appointing magistrates. At present applications are called for one of these positions. These are received by the Public Service Commissioner, and come from inside as well as outside the service. After the Public Service Commissioner has considered the applications, he submits a recommendation to the Government and an appointment is made. The Bill apparently takes away from the Public Service Commissioner any control over these appointments. During the time the magistrates hold their positions, they are not to come under his jurisdiction. The Bill also makes the Government directly responsible, I presume, even for the transfer of magistrates from one place to another. We shall have the Government, as a matter of high policy, deciding whether a certain magistrate shall be stationed at Perth, Fremantle, Northam, Kalgoorlie or Geraldton. When the Attorney General sat on this side of the House, he stated that magistrates should be altogether outside the control of Governments. The very principle he objects to is now embodied in his Bill. The Government will be able at any time to control the movements of magistrates. I do not know that Governments have ever done these things. I have had six years of Ministerial experience and had about seven years of Parliamentary experience before that. I do not think Governments do interfere in any way with the administration of justice generally. The Attorney General on many occasions implied that certain magistrates were either subjected to influence or pressure, or had been carpeted for something they had done. He suggested that they were not *persona grata* with the permanent head of the department, or, through that officer, with the Minister. The Minister has now had six months in office, and has had an opportunity to see the working of the department and what really occurs in connection with magistrates. He

must know that the opinions he expressed are entirely groundless, and that at no time has any Government or departmental officer interfered with magistrates or the administration of justice. I admit that the position of the magistrates is an important one, but this Bill tends to make it still more important, and to bring it up to a higher standard than it deserves. I am not in any way minimising the importance of the post occupied by anyone, either as an honorary J.P., as a magistrate, or in any other capacity connected with the administration of justice. I have no desire to express any opinion contrary to the fact that the occupants of these positions have at all times endeavoured to lift the administration of justice to a high plane. Of course, occasional mistakes have occurred. They have always, so far as I know, endeavoured to mete out justice with an impartial hand to any that have come before them. For all that, people occupying these positions are not entitled to regard themselves as on the same plane as the judiciary.

The Attorney General: Why not?

Mr. WILLCOCK: A man is not appointed a judge unless he has had a very considerable amount of experience. Almost invariably he has held a high position at the bar, either in this State or elsewhere. He has been known for his general good character and judgment, and these qualities, together with the necessary temperament, have helped to give him the required attributes to become a judge. These factors have been apparent to the people or to the Government for some time. Very seldom has there been any serious criticism concerning the appointment of persons to fill those positions.

The Premier: And that is most important, too.

Mr. WILLCOCK: The several Governments in this State have carried out their responsibilities by appointing to the position of judge men who have almost invariably earned the commendation of everybody, and against whom it has been impossible to cavil. The appointment of magistrates is an entirely different matter. It is not a salary that would attract people who have been at the bar for many years, or who have made a name for themselves there. It does not attract men who have shown sound judgment, extensive legal

knowledge, or who have had great experience in the public life of the State. They, as a rule, have made too much headway themselves to regard with favour such a position as this. Under the Bill solicitors are to be eligible for appointment as magistrates. I cannot imagine a member of the bar who has for many years occupied a high position there, has had many opportunities for making good, and has had all the advantages which come to people who occupy positions at the bar, desiring after 15 or 20 years of successful life to sink back into the position of a magistrate. Whether this Bill is passed or not, we should not set up the principle of appointing young men as magistrates. Litigants have not the same confidence when they appear before almost a mere boy, as they would have in appearing before a seasoned magistrate. I know there is an officer in the Crown Law Department who, at the age of 26, has passed all the necessary examinations to qualify him, from that point of view, for appointment as a magistrate. So far as I know he is an able young man and capable of filling the position. In the future I hope he will occupy a comparatively high and responsible post in the department. At the same time, I think his very youth is rather a bar to his taking a magistracy, and that he should not be younger than 30 years of age before doing so.

The Attorney General: What is there in this Bill to say that we are more likely now than has been the case heretofore to appoint young people.

Mr. WILLCOCK: It is one of the dangers of the Bill.

The Attorney General: Why?

Mr. WILLCOCK: A man may just have passed his examinations qualifying him to be a solicitor. He may then apply for the post of magistrate, and may not be known to have either the experience, capability, temperament, judgment, or any of the qualities entitling him to be regarded as a man who will become a successful magistrate. Nevertheless, he may be appointed to that position.

The Attorney General: But he is qualified under the existing law.

Mr. WILLCOCK: I know that.

The Attorney General: Are we more likely to make an injudicious appointment under this Bill than under the Act?

Hon. P. Collier: Under your Bill he will be there until he is 70, and cannot be removed except at the will of both Houses.

Mr. WILLCOCK: As a rule, a man who has served at the bar for 15 or 20 years is either a comparative failure, or has passed the point when he would accept a position at £600 or £700 a year. Therefore, to obtain a man to fill one of these positions, it would be necessary to get a young man. As I have said, the older man is fixed in his position after a number of years, and would not desire to surrender it for a lower one. The only type of person these positions would attract would be a young man who has not had the necessary experience.

Mr. Kenneally: Either the lawyers are too successful, or they have developed near-sightedness, looking for briefs.

Mr. WILLCOCK: Yes. We are not likely to get very many men who have had much experience at the bar, and who have made good there, to apply for these positions. The member for North-East Fremantle (Mr. Parker) has occupied a position in the public life of the State, and has been closely connected with the administration of the law. He has made a reputation in that walk of life, and I doubt very much if he would consider the advisability of throwing up his practice and becoming a magistrate at £600 a year.

Mr. Parker: If members' salaries are reduced, he might.

Mr. WILLCOCK: I do not like saying anything personal, and I mention that merely as an example. The prospects of the member for North-East Fremantle (Mr. Parker) would not justify him in accepting an appointment as magistrate.

The Premier: What about the member for Kanowna (Hon. T. Walker)?

Mr. WILLCOCK: If the member for Kanowna had thought fit some ten or 15 years ago to seek appointment as a magistrate and had been appointed, no doubt his judicial mind, of which we have had experience in the Speaker's Chair, would have qualified him excellently for the position, and he would speedily have attained to the highest salary payable to a magistrate. However, I do not wish to enter upon a eulogy of the member for Kanowna instead of discussing the Bill.

The Premier: Any member who has been Minister for Justice for three years should

be qualified for appointment as a magistrate.

Mr. WILLCOCK: Probably. I might talk about myself in that connection. Similarly, a member who has held a portfolio for six years would be qualified to form fair and impartial judgments. With regard to lawyers—

The Attorney General: How about letting lawyers alone?

Mr. WILLCOCK: Lawyers occupy a useful position in the life of the community, and undoubtedly do good work. I have had a good deal of experience of lawyers, and can certify that a large proportion of them, instead of advising people to rush into expensive legislation, recommend a compromise or a settlement out of court. Most of them endeavour to save their unfortunate clients—it is unfortunate for any man to be a lawyer's client, since even the winner must lose—by letting them down as lightly as possible. The Attorney General has on many occasions, not very openly but rather obscurely, shown a little bias in favour of lawyers for appointment to the magistracy. I rather think that if the hon. gentleman had the responsibility of recommending appointments to the magisterial bench, few laymen would be appointed. On that account alone, it seems to me, if the Bill passes there will no longer be the opportunity that there has been hitherto for people to qualify for appointment to the magistracy. That will be a bad thing for the State.

The Attorney General: The qualification is not altered by the Bill.

Mr. WILLCOCK: For many years it has been the custom to consider men who graduated on to the bench as wardens eligible for appointment as magistrates.

The Attorney General: For years there has not been an appointment of a magistrate who either was not a lawyer or had not passed the qualifying examination.

Mr. WILLCOCK: That is so. Some excellent magistrates have graduated to the bench from places entirely outside the legal profession.

The Attorney General: I quite agree with you.

Mr. WILLCOCK: Without decriing the work of any of our magistrates, I consider that many of our best magistrates were men who originally came on to the bench as war-

dens. In fact, there are such magistrates now in various parts of the State. Seeing what has occurred in the past, and that this Bill is going to alter the position to some extent—

The Attorney General: It will not alter the position one jot.

Mr. WILLCOCK: It is going to take away an opportunity of advancement from people occupying positions in the Public Service, where they are closely watched by the Public Service Commissioner. That officer will be deprived even of the right to make a suggestion.

The Attorney General: I do not think so.

Mr. WILLCOCK: When appointments are made directly by the Government, Cabinet takes the responsibility of making them, and only very rarely consults either the Public Service Commissioner or anybody else. In such circumstances the Government recognise that the responsibility is theirs, and they take it. As regards the appointment of judges, for example, no one would ever dream of consulting the Public Service Commissioner. Magistrates are appointed in much the same way as judges are appointed, and consequently I presume that the Public Service Commissioner would not be consulted with regard to the former. Many estimable gentlemen known to the Public Service Commissioner have in the past been appointed as magistrates, and it is probable that the Bill will close an avenue of promotion to which many public servants look forward. It will be closed to them because there will be no one directly to represent their claims to appointment. I agree with the principle of the Bill, whereby the Attorney General desires to cut out acting appointments. In my opinion magistrates should not function in an acting capacity for any length of time. It is not a proper procedure. In connection with last session's measure amending the Public Service Act, hon. members were given to understand that certain gentlemen had acted as magistrates for three or four years, and that no subsequent appointment to the magistracy would be made without the qualification prescribed by the Public Service Act, namely, that the appointee must either be a member of the legal profession or must have passed the legal examination prescribed. On the face of it the Bill will for many years pre-

vent the appointment of a medical man as a magistrate.

The Attorney General: It is not intended to touch that phase.

Mr. WILLCOCK: Under the Bill there will be no possibility of appointing one man to the two positions of resident medical officer and magistrate where the State cannot possibly afford to pay two salaries. The present practice represents an advantage to many outback districts. I presume the difficulty could be got over by exempting such districts from the operation of the measure.

The Attorney General: We shall not extend the operation of the measure beyond the limits of what is practicable.

Mr. WILLCOCK: Exemption by proclamation is likely to give rise to contention. If the inherent principles of the Bill are so very necessary, it should not make much difference what part of the State the measure applies to. If there is something inherently unsound about the practice of appointing one man to the two positions, that practice should not operate in the North-West or in outlying portions of the State any more than it operates in the metropolitan area.

The Attorney General: Half a loaf is better than no bread.

Mr. WILLCOCK: In introducing the Bill, the Attorney General is actuated by motives of high principle. If no very high principle is involved, the present is not the time to bring in such a measure. Unless there are disabilities to be removed or abuses to be remedied, the Bill should not be brought in at the present juncture. The Premier, when Leader of the Opposition, severely criticised the introduction of what he termed unnecessary Bills. At the present stage this measure can be classed in that category, but I do not say it will be so when the population of the State has further increased. However, at this stage of our economic existence such a measure should not be introduced. I do not know that there has been any call for it. During my six years as Minister for Justice I did not hear any complaint on the subject except from the hon. gentleman who has introduced the Bill. I do not say that offensively.

The Attorney General: You could not be offensive.

Mr. WILLCOCK. I am not trying to be. I may say the Bill represents a whim of the Attorney General. Many people are sufficiently interested in the magistracy to have

mentioned this matter before if there was occasion for doing so. The Public Service Commissioner has never made any recommendation on the subject. The magistrates themselves, so far as I know, have never made any representations in the matter, but have always been satisfied with their status. The Law Society, a body closely concerned in the administration of justice from the very nature of its constitution, would presumably have given the subject some thought if that was desirable and could have interviewed the responsible Minister. But no representations on the subject have come from that body. The Barristers' Board have not mentioned the matter. Neither have the Justices' Association nor the Public Service Association. I contend, therefore, that the measure falls into the category of what the present Premier, when Leader of the Opposition, called entirely unnecessary Bills, Bills the discussion of which represents a waste of the time of Parliament. Apparently the Attorney General sees in the present procedure something which does not really exist. The amplification, at any rate, from the fact of his wanting to take away the control of the magistracy from those who have exercised it in the past, is that there is something wrong with the manner in which that control has been exercised. I do not think anyone could say there has been anything wrong indicated so far. I do not think we should select one privileged section of the Public Service and say to them, "You, and you alone of all the Public Service, will be allowed to remain in that service until you are 70 years of age, irrespective of what your capacity may be, unless you like to resign, or unless the Government or some member of Parliament should take the extreme course of moving a motion in this House to remove you from office." The moving of such a motion would be, everyone will admit, a most extreme course to adopt. We can conceive that there may be circumstances in view of which either the Government or the Public Service Commissioner might feel justified in retiring an officer. As a matter of fact, not many mistakes have been made under the present system. We have known of instances of men who have been allowed to continue in office who may not have been altogether satisfactory, but their actions have not included anything officially important enough to justify the moving of a motion in Par-

liament. There may have been men who have been comparatively unsatisfactory and yet, if we agree to the Bill becoming law, those people will be allowed to continue in their positions for some years longer, and a number of years longer than is possible for other gentlemen who cannot occupy their high positions without being called upon to retire at least five years earlier. Under Secretaries have to retire unless in certain instances special permission is obtained through the Executive Council for the retention of their offices after they are 65 or more. The Engineer in Chief and many other officers whose work has a greater effect on the economic life of the State than that of magistrates, have to retire at the age of 65, unless special permission, as I have indicated, is secured to permit their continuing in office. I do not think there is any necessity for magistrates to be specifically exempted in the Bill. The Attorney General gave us the reasons why he selected the age of 70, but I do not think it right that one section of the Public Service should have the right fixed in a statute to enable them to retire at 70 years of age. While I have no great opposition to offer to the Bill, I do not think it is necessary, nor do I think it can do much good. Then again, I do not think the Bill should be placed before Parliament for consideration in times such as these. Rather should we wait until the population of the State increases to such an extent that we shall be able to establish County Courts and appoint officers to preside over them. It is not as though magistrates are called upon to give very learned expositions of the law. Mostly they judge on the facts presented to them in evidence, and give decisions accordingly. That method has given satisfaction for many years—satisfaction to all except, perhaps, the Attorney General. I do not think Parliament should be called upon to deal with a Bill of this description when we are in the economic position confronting us to-day. The measure should not be given the importance attaching to one of the first Bills dealt with in a session that we were told was to be confined almost exclusively to the big problems of finance that had to be dealt with to enable the State to live, let alone attain a satisfactory position on the road to prosperity once more. I do not feel inclined to support the second reading of the Bill.

**HON. W. D. JOHNSON** (Guildford-Midland) [5.19]: I do not like the provisions of the Bill because I do not think it is opportune. This is a time when, as we know, reconstruction is in the air, generally speaking, and in the circumstances I do not think we should agree to a measure that will mean reconstruction on the basis of making more permanent positions that could hardly be as secure as they will be should the measure become law. In this House we have heard criticism regarding security of tenure given to public servants under the provisions of the Public Service Act. That security is indeed limited compared with what is proposed under the provisions of the Bill. I have heard Ministers—I do not say those comprising the present Government—and others criticising the Public Service Act, because they claimed that Ministers and Governments should have the right to reconstruct the Public Service without the limitations imposed by that legislation. I do not subscribe to any such contentions, but I think the Public Service Act gives all the security required or necessary with regard to public offices. At the same time, I would not say there is no necessity to amend the law under which our judges are appointed. That legislation has been in existence for so long that I suppose we have become used to its provisions. At the same time, I can quite imagine that occasions might arise when it should not be desirable to have a motion passed by both Houses of Parliament for the purpose of removing a judge. Mistakes can be made regarding the appointment of judges, and it might be possible that any such mistake might be put right if our judges were not so secure in their positions, once they were appointed, as they are under the existing law. To say that we shall extend the privileges outlined in the Bill to our magistrates, is, in my opinion, quite wrong. Then again, there were many complaints about the protection afforded employees in the Government services who have the right of appeal against decisions that affect their positions in the service. There are quite a number who have claimed that such provisions have hampered administration, and that they do not give the Government, or even the Public Service Commissioner and Minister directly concerned, power to act in the public interests as may be thought desirable. I have always sup-

ported legislation that gave the right to the individual to appeal against a decision if he felt the punishment inflicted upon him was unfair or too exacting. Holding that view, I believe there should be the right of appeal, but to say there shall be no right to review is quite wrong. The other night, the Minister for Education presented a Bill to hon. members. The object of that measure was to remove the rigid provisions of the Education Act. The Minister told us that, because of certain provisions in the Act, he was limited in his desire, as Minister, to institute certain reforms and he asked Parliament to remove the rigid provisions so as to give him scope to act in the interests of the State. Now his colleague, the Attorney General, says that although a certain practice has applied for years, and although it is quite right for the Minister for Education to seek the deletion of certain rigid powers that affect his freedom of action, it is only proper that Parliament shall accord him, as Attorney General, sanction for the Bill that will mean that the same right shall not be exercised in the case of magistrates. In face of the existing circumstances to-day, I do not think we would be right in passing the measure. I agree with the member for Geraldton (Mr. Willecock) that the time is not opportune for the consideration of such a Bill. There is too much retrenchment or alteration in the air to-day, and we do not know what reconstruction is in view, or what will be necessary. That being so, I do not think this is the time for us to limit the power of the Administration with regard to anything necessary for alteration in connection with the Public Service. Rather is it time that the Government should have the opportunity to review, and we can give the magistrates the same protection as is afforded other highly-paid officers who are subject to the provisions of the Public Service Act. That Act contains all that is necessary at the present time, and its provisions are quite sufficient. I do not think it desirable to remove magistrates from the provisions of that Act. It has worked well to date, and, therefore, it is not necessary to pass the Bill. I suggest to the Attorney General that he reconsider the matter and let it stand over until we know more as to what the present agitation for reconstruction will really bring forth. I suggest that

he leave us with the present law rather than secure the authority of Parliament to hamper reconstruction and alter the status of the magistracy. He would be well advised to let the magistrates remain under the Public Service Act.

**THE ATTORNEY GENERAL** (Hon. T. A. L. Davy—West Perth—in reply) [5.25]: I had hoped that the ex-Minister for Justice would have viewed this small measure with a more favourable eye. He has not opposed it with any great vim. I think I can deal with the arguments which he advanced and which one would expect from some crusty conservative rather than from one who sits with a party that prides itself on its liberalism, if not radicalism.

Mr. Willcock: Everyone is democratic in these days.

The **ATTORNEY GENERAL**: I do not know that "democrat" is necessarily synonymous with "conservative." I suggest that, generally speaking, the hon. member's view was that we should not change and that we should be cautious. The member for Geraldton (Mr. Willcock) also rather indicated to the House that his objection to the Bill was that it would involve the expenditure of money. Let me assure him that the passage of the Bill will not involve the Government in the extra expenditure of one penny piece. It is proposed that magistrates shall be removed from the Civil Service, and it will become necessary to make an appropriation out of which the magistrates may be paid. Consequently, the appropriation provision is embodied in the Bill. The appropriation specified represents the minimum rates paid at the present time, and also the maximum salary to which any magistrate can hope to rise, with a tiny scope for swing one way or the other. I think the most expensively paid magistrate at present receives £960; that is the police magistrate who presides at the Local Court, Perth. It is not intended to increase the salaries paid at all, but the necessary appropriation had to be included in the Bill, making provision within the limits of the salaries paid at the present time. As to the suggestion that this is not the time for the Bill to be placed before Parliament, the Bill is just as apt now as at any other time. The member for Guildford-Midland (Hon. W. D.

Johnson) says that the time is not opportune because Parliament should give the Government as much scope as possible for reconstruction. It is because there is too much scope for reconstruction at the present time where magistrates are concerned, that I desire the Bill to be passed. There is no analogy between civil servants such as engineers and school teachers on the one hand, and magistrates on the other. Every civilised country in the world has realised that the judiciary, which includes the magistracy, must be placed upon an entirely different plane from that of other public servants. They must be in a completely independent position. It is possible that they may find their self-interest conflicting with their duty. Many different methods have been tried in appointing the judiciary with a view to getting an impartial administration of justice, but until Great Britain invented the present system, the position was not satisfactorily dealt with. It was not until we got our present method that there was an impartial administration of justice with complete confidence in the integrity of the judiciary resting in the mind of the people. In introducing the Bill I instanced the United States, and said it was only in those courts where some tenure of office was given, such as I propose, that the courts had the complete confidence of the public.

Mr. Willcock: There is no lack of confidence in our courts.

The **ATTORNEY GENERAL**: I do not say there is, but there might be, and I want to see the possibility of evil checked as early as possible. I am merely following what has been done in other States of Australia, what has been done in England, and what is gradually being done in America.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: We have been a long time following it.

The **ATTORNEY GENERAL**: That is so. My view is that the time has arrived when all persons occupying judicial positions should, as far as possible, be placed in such an independent position that they are certain to be able to exercise their functions without fear of reward or penalty.

Mr. Willcock: That is when dealing with very important matters.

The **ATTORNEY GENERAL**: Stipendiary magistrates deal with very important matters. It is a very important matter whether a man shall be sent to gaol; it is a



very important matter to the persons concerned whether one shall pay another £100.

Mr. Willcock: But we have that administration by honorary justices.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Honorary justices have no fear of losing anything, because their job means nothing to them. I would not have justice dispensed by amateurs who pop on to the bench at the moment. We have that system in Western Australia only because we cannot afford to place the whole of the administration of justice in the hands of permanent judges. Because this measure will not be all-embracing is no argument against it, so long as it goes some of the way to accord with the views I hold. The member for Geraldton exclaimed that there had been no demand for the measure, that neither the magistrates nor the Law Society nor anybody else had asked for it, except myself, and he suggested, quite good-naturedly, that it was something of a whim on my part. I assure the House that the bulk of the legal profession with whom I come into contact have expressed their appreciation of the measure.

Mr. Willcock: Then they were very inarticulate previously.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I do not know that the profession are in the habit of rushing into print with their views on legislation, but whenever I have made protests in this House against the system of acting magistrates—

Mr. Willcock: That is a different thing.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: No; it is part of the same thing.

Mr. Willcock: The matter of acting magistrates is quite a different thing.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It is not different.

Mr. Willcock: I agree with your contention about acting magistrates. We passed a Bill last year to prevent it.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Last year?

Mr. Willcock: Yes, practically so.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: How can that be when at present there are three acting magistrates, one of whom, in Perth, has been acting at the pleasure of the Government on a 10-minutes tenure for the last five years. Year after year I have raised this question in the House and have been told that it was in the hands of the Public Service Commissioner.

Hon. P. Collier: You know that at the time we could not get suitable applicants.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I was informed that that was so, but I think the difficulty could have been overcome. I do not wish to deal with individuals, but I might say that the gentlemen holding magisterial positions are a thoroughly honourable and excellent lot of public servants, who deserve the praise of the people for the manner in which they carry out their duties. That, however, is beside the point. It is absurd to say that the acting magistracy was abolished by any measure passed by this House. So far from its having been abolished, it still continues. I desire to see it stopped, and I see no means of stopping it except by such as are included in this Bill.

Mr. Willcock: It could be stopped if the emoluments were made sufficiently attractive, but the Public Service Commissioner would not do that.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: There are two things that attract people to jobs, one is the emoluments and the other is the status of the position. Both those factors play an important part in the mind of any person when he is considering whether he will take a job. We cannot make the emoluments as high as we would like to, but we can improve the status. I am asking the House to do one of the two things necessary to improve the position. If we cannot give magistrates as much money as is necessary to attract the most skilful men, let us give them the best possible status. I ask the House to give magistrates the status which we regard as essential for judges, and why not? Judges are appointed for life, and if we are going to carry that principle to the extreme, magistrates, too, should be appointed for life. When dealing with the creation of a new judicial position some time ago, that of President of the Arbitration Court, the Leader of the Opposition and I came to the conclusion that it was a fair thing to provide that his tenure of the position should be till he attained the age of 70. I think that is a reasonable compromise between the whole-life tenure and anything less. That is why I have included the age of 70 in this Bill. But for that precedent, I should have felt inclined to insert no age limit at all, but to make appointments for life.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Sixty-five is the recognised age.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I think that is a wrong age. It might apply to jobs that involve manual fitness, but in jobs involving mental capacity a man may be normal and thoroughly alert until he attains the age of at least 70. In fixing that age, we run no risk whatever, unless a man contracts disease that renders him inefficient.

Mr. Kenneally: The Government are not carrying that out in other departments.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am not concerned about that, because the existing law governing it stands. I am dealing with one section of the community, a most important section, and this is an important reform. I am not going to be persuaded to abandon that reform because, perhaps, another reform is needed in another department of our social organisation.

Mr. Kenneally: The Government, through a Minister, introduced the other system in another department and retired men at 65.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The Government did no such thing. A law passed many years ago provided that a man had to retire at 65 years.

Mr. Willcock: There is no such law.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes, there is.

Mr. Willcock: Not applying to wages men.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: My impression is that there is. However, I am not concerned about that, and I do not propose to abandon this measure because the hon. member thinks that the Government ought to do something like it elsewhere. I suggest that members who believe something like it ought to be done elsewhere should support the Government in their endeavours to accomplish this reform.

The Minister for Railways: It is contrary to the policy of the unions to retain men after they have reached 65.

Mr. Kenneally: The Minister is not in a position to speak of the policy of the unions.

The Minister for Railways: The unions have repeatedly urged that men should retire at 65.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Another point raised by the member for Geraldton was that, if this measure be passed, the Government might be more likely to appoint young men who would be unsuitable. Surely the reverse is the case. The more perman-

ently we appoint people, the more careful the Government would be in making a selection. I am inclined to agree with the member for Geraldton in his suggestion that our choice will be rather cramped under the measure, because it provides that we must select magistrates from qualified legal practitioners, or persons who have passed the prescribed examination. Unless I could be sure that we could always get men of considerable experience as legal practitioners, I would be inclined to give the Government a free hand, because I agree with the hon. member that some of the best magistrates we have had have been men who had not passed the prescribed examination and who were not solicitors. Where our choice is so limited, I should feel inclined to agree to an amendment, if the member for Geraldton sees fit to move it, deleting the proposed qualifications. Personally, I regard the tenure of office of a person occupying a judicial position as very much more important than his qualifications. I have a belief in the inherent sense of justice of all human beings. The trouble is that the sense of justice is so constantly blinded by self-interest. I believe that if a person who had led a dishonest life were appointed to a judicial position and given complete security of tenure, his natural sense of justice would tend to make him exercise his functions in a satisfactory manner.

Mr. Willcock: You know what autocracy of power does to most people. They exercise it in a most extraordinary way.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes, because their self-interest dictates it. But take any normal, healthy-minded man and put him in a judicial position, and remove from him as far as possible any temptation to depart from the strict sense of justice, and I think his reasoning intellect will make him endeavour to do what appears to be justice to the position. I regard the independent position as being more important than the qualifications. Give a man of the greatest attainments a position on the judicial bench and expose him to temptation, and he may go wrong if he is not inherently straight, but place a man of mediocre attainments in the position, a man with no particular sense of honesty, and expose him to temptation and he will go wrong.

Hon. P. Collier: A man with unconscious bias very often departs from justice.

**The ATTORNEY GENERAL:** That is so, though the longer he sits in the judicial position, safe from interference of tenure, the less will be his unconscious bias, and the better he will be able to see all around the questions presented for his decision.

**Mr. Sampson:** Might not an arrogant spirit grow up if permanency is granted?

**The ATTORNEY GENERAL:** I do not think it matters in a judicial person so long as it is exercised with justice. Very often a certain amount of arrogance is good for the persons brought before the court, as well as for some of the lawyers appearing in the court.

**Hon. P. Collier:** A man might be arrogant and have a keen sense of justice.

**The ATTORNEY GENERAL:** That is so.

**The Minister for Railways:** That is why opposition is good for some candidates at election time; otherwise they become arrogant.

**The ATTORNEY GENERAL:** The question of persons in outlying districts who at present combine the positions of medical officer and magistrate will not arise under this measure, because it is not intended that the operation of the Act shall be extended to the whole of the State immediately, but only in the future when funds will be available to appoint whole-time men in these positions. We propose to make a start in the area comparatively close to Perth, and we hope to work out gradually as the finances improve. I should like to see the remuneration made more attractive, the minimum being £1,000 a year ranging to £1,500. However, that is quite impossible at the present time; but we believe that by increasing the emoluments, we shall be able to cover the whole State. For the time being the operations of the Act will be limited to a portion of the State only. I do not suppose that will be in the time of the present Government. It may be that the member for Geraldton, if he allows the Bill to become law, will have the privilege in future years of extending the operations of the measure so that it will cover the whole of the State.

**Mr. Kenneally:** In a couple of years' time.

**The ATTORNEY GENERAL:** I do not think the financial position will be such as to enable that to be done in a couple of

years' time, but perhaps six years hence, when the member for Geraldton may again become Minister for Justice, he will have the privilege of making the extension of the well-recognised principle of the administration of British justice.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

## ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1930-31.

### *In Committee of Supply.*

Debates resumed from the 2nd October on the Treasurer's financial statement and on the Annual Estimates; Mr. Richardson in the Chair.

**MR. NORTH** (Claremont) [5.4]: First of all, I should like to refer to the attacks that have been made on those engaged in public life, and the challenges that have been issued to members. I noticed in this morning's paper another attack on the Federal Parliament and the State authorities generally, and while we know that the Parliaments are not perfect, we can claim that the attacks are not justified because the whole of the troubles of this country to-day cannot be attributed to politicians. After all, the trouble is world-wide. In this State we have depended mainly on the production of gold and wheat. We know that it was Lord Forrest who made it possible for the mining industry to thrive by providing water, and we know also what Sir James Mitchell and others have done to put the agricultural industry on its present footing. Just now our only duty is to get the Estimates through as quickly as we can, time being the essence of the contract. All I wish to urge is that if it should be found after the present session has closed that the Estimates appear to be going astray, the Government should again summon Parliament and submit supplementary Estimates. One is aware that the public as a whole have expressed their confidence in the Budget as it has been brought down, but we should also like to feel that it is the determination of the Government, having put up a set of figures which may not be found to balance, that they are prepared in the months ahead to call Parliament together again and submit a revision of the Budget so as to make

up any leeway that may have presented itself.

Mr. Willcock: You were not here when the House opened to-day; notice was given of seven or eight taxation measures.

Mr. NORTH: Another point is with regard to unemployment. There again the number of those out of work may increase. I believe the cost at the present time is something like £180,000 a year, and if the number of unemployed increases, it will be the duty of the Government to see that those who are suffering are provided for.

Mr. Willcock: Surely you do not think the position will become worse with Sir James Mitchell in power!

Mr. NORTH: It is not a matter of who is in power; it is a matter of world facts. Coming back to local questions, the Minister for Railways the other evening made an important statement in which he pointed out that motor transport had taken a great deal of revenue from the railways. The ex-Minister for Works in the course of his remarks a few evenings ago suggested that if it had not been for my heinous attack on the Government a couple of years back, the roads would have been cleared of most of the traffic and the railways would have got back to their normal state. I fail to realise that my efforts had such a tremendous influence on the then Government. My opinion is that it is more a matter of public opinion which the Government wisely followed at that time. There was a clamour for road transport and I feel now, as I felt then, that the public are entitled to choose their own method of transport. I do not agree with the argument which suggests that we should support one or the other—the railways or the buses. It is a question of efficiency and we should take the means of transport on general points. We have certain conditions imposed upon us and we must balance the budget by every available process. Therefore it may happen that we should have to use the less satisfactory method of transport, even though it imposes certain hardships on the public. At the same time let me take the definite case of the district I represent. By reason of a regulation which does not allow the picking up of passengers by motor vehicles within a prescribed area, it is quite obvious that the public are going to be very much hampered. The trams take 25 minutes to cover a journey that the motor

vehicles do in ten minutes. If we compel the public to use the trams, we shall be putting back the clock. I suggest that a compromise can be arrived at without affecting the trams. My proposal is that the trams should take the bulk of the traffic which occurs at the peak periods, morning and evening, and that we should waive the regulation during the slack hours, say, between 9.30 a.m. and 4.30 p.m.

Mr. Willcock: You want to have the two methods of transport where only one is necessary.

Mr. NORTH: Both are being operated at the present time. Taxi cars are running from Fremantle to Perth and vice versa, and they carry the traffic for a good deal of the way. But we must not lose sight of the fact that many people have bought houses within ten minutes' drive of the city by taxi, and we propose that they shall patronise the trams which take 25 minutes to cover the journey. That may be justified from the point of view of balancing the budget, but not from any other aspect. Therefore the suggestion I have to make, so that the Government shall not be harassed, is that the regulation regarding the taxi vehicles shall be waived during certain hours. The taxis will then be able to carry some of the traffic, and the trams will have it during the busier periods. Like other members, I have received communications setting out all sorts of theories for the existing world conditions from which we are suffering. I have no intention of referring to them at the present juncture because the present Parliament has quite enough to do in attempting to balance the budget. If there are world-wide reasons for the present state of affairs, which we cannot control, it is no use our attempting to solve them from this end. We have all we can do to look after our own finances, and we can safely leave the bigger difficulties to those elsewhere whose province it is to solve them. A great many complaints have been levelled by the public against the State Parliament. These should have been more properly laid at the door of the Federal Parliament. Requests have been made by farmers for a moratorium and for an increase of the note issue, as well as other suggestions for curing our troubles. All these are exclusively Federal matters, though I do not think the Federal Parliament can cure them. The

fact remains that they come within the Federal sphere; we as a State Parliament have not the power nor the opportunity, legally or otherwise, to solve the various questions we have been asked to deal with.

**MR. SAMPSON** (Swan) [5.57]: In a statement made earlier in the session there was a reference to a reduction of Parliamentary allowances. We are looking forward with interest to the introduction of that measure. I feel that in view of the very difficult times through which the State is passing that reduction to be set out in the Bill will readily be approved. In respect to State trading the time is opportune to offer a few remarks on the subject of the extension of electric current. There is urgent need for something to be done in that respect.

Hon. P. Collier: Is not that State trading?

**Mr. SAMPSON**: I regard electricity supply as a utility which should be extended to every part of the outer suburban districts where it is likely to have a beneficial effect on production. I regret that many centres within a radius of 120 miles from Perth are not supplied from one generating station, as was done in South Australia many years ago with the result that the production and distribution of current was much more economically handled. Unfortunately for those in our outer suburban areas who desire current, the position usually is that the generating capacity of the East Perth station is said to be at its peak. That condition is brought about because of a specially good agreement made some years ago with the Perth City Council.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Did you say specially good?

**Mr. SAMPSON**: Yes. Good for those who have the opportunity to use that current. That current is supplied to the Perth City Council at a rate below the cost of production. That is very much to be regretted. The position is that while there is always plenty of current for picture shows and other forms of illumination, those who require the current for primary production are unable to get it because the generating capacity of the plant is insufficient to meet all that is necessary. That, of course, is to be regretted, particularly in view of the pious hopes and statements frequently voiced

by members on both sides that we should look after those on the land.

The Minister for Railways: Would you support a Bill to take compulsorily 50 per cent. of the profits accruing to the Perth City Council from electricity?

**Mr. SAMPSON**: I would be prepared to support a request to the Minister that the legal position of the agreement between the Government and the Perth City Council should be looked into.

Hon. P. Collier: There is no need to look into it.

The Minister for Railways: No, it does not require illuminating.

**Mr. SAMPSON**: I am not sure. In view of the illuminating advice sometimes given in this Chamber, it may be that a defect will be found in that agreement. I question whether it is quite equitable that the State should be levied upon to the extent it is levied upon under this agreement.

The Minister for Railways: It was £70,000 last year.

**Mr. SAMPSON**: We have the Attorney General, the Chief Secretary, the member for North-East Fremantle, the member for Kanowna, and the member for Geraldton, all boasting acquaintance with legal intricacies. Through them we might be able to put up a case proving that this agreement is neither equitable nor legal.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: To begin with, I think the Council have more area than they should have.

**Mr. SAMPSON**: I recall that in 1925 the then Deputy Premier, fired with the enthusiasm of youthful optimism, did me the kindness to visit Mundaring. The hon. member himself will recall the very earnest desire then expressed by the people of Mundaring that electric current should be extended to that centre. This is an indication of what is happening all through the outer suburban areas. Electric current for power purposes is everywhere required. It is required at Parkerville so that it might be used in the quarries, and for a similar purpose it is required at Middle Swan. Current cannot be procured to carry on necessary work. If the current were available for those quarries, there would be cheaper road-making material for a number of local authorities, and there would be less unemployment than we have to-day. I do not know that there is

any use in complaining of what was done in the past; the past has gone, and the future is not too hopeful in respect of electric current.

The Minister for Railways: We must get that new unit.

Mr. SAMPSON: I do hope that in spite of manifold difficulties the Premier will make provision for a new generating unit at the East Perth station. Hope deferred maketh the heart sick. As I observed a few moments ago, it was hoped that with the enthusiasm of the Deputy Premier in 1925 we should have an extension of the electric current to Mundaring. I am sure that gentleman used his best endeavours to secure that extension, but evidently the necessary money could not be found. I do not wish to labour this proposed extension of the electric current, but I hope every consideration will be given to it. As for State trading, I trust it will not be long before the Government give their undivided attention to governmental matters, and that the State trading concerns will no longer exist as such.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Would you include in that the Government Printing Office?

Mr. SAMPSON: Yes; I am prepared to sacrifice the Government Printing Office, which has rather exceeded the purposes for which it was established, and is in the habit of encroaching upon private enterprise. However, it may be considered that I am personally interested in that subject, and so I do not desire to speak on it at any length. As for the State hotels, I think I will have general support when I say the time has long since passed when they should have been disposed of. It is a most undignified position for any Government to depend on the sale of liquor—larding out wallop, it has been described by some members—as a means whereby Consolidated Revenue is to be improved. It is gratifying to know that the present Government stand for private enterprise as against State trading. This is what State trading does in point of hotels. This is seriously reported in the local newspaper—

The Premier: Local where?

Hon. P. Collier: But these papers are very unreliable.

Mr. SAMPSON: In this instance the report is quite correct. This is referring to

the Wongan Hills State Hotel, regarding which the "Ballidu-Wongan Budget" says—

The additions to the hotel building at Wongan Hills are now nearly completed, including extra bath accommodation. A corridor effect has been added to the southern building, in which are two neat enclosures fitted with showers.

Imagine that! The fact that the Wongan Hills State Hotel has put in two showers is held to be a matter for congratulation. Because, although for many years the people of the district have urged that the hotel should be treated the same as other hotels, successive Governments, and even the Licenses Reduction Board, have refused to follow that course.

Hon. P. Collier: But these are additional showers, of course.

Mr. SAMPSON: Yes; additional showers. Also in recognition of the needs of this single-storeyed hotel at Wongan Hills there are two new porcelain hand basins. Now the only thing necessary is to put back the clock a year or two and send along an Honorary Minister officially to declare them open.

Mr. Munsie: Is its single storey a detriment to the hotel?

Mr. SAMPSON: Yes; it is recognised by the Licenses Reduction Board that an hotel must be at least two-storeyed. At all events, the hotel at Wongan Hills is utterly inadequate for the needs of that prosperous, growing district. I do not know for what purpose the building in which this business is carried on was originally built, but I should say it was an antediluvian type of country store, with unexpected steps here and there to catch the unwary. Such steps in an hotel, of course, are absolutely out of place. As for the conduct of that hotel, I have nothing but praise. The meals are good, the liquors are good, the house is perfectly clean, and everything is in order. But the time has arrived when these State hotels should be disposed of. Still referring to the improvements at the Wongan Hills State hotel, the local newspaper says—

These conditions will add greatly to the comfort of the hotel's guests.

If many guests come along they have to sleep on the verandah, or go round the town and try to find friends who will put them up for the night. At one time I

wanted to remain at Wongan Hills overnight. I went along to the hotel with a friend, but found there was room for only one of us.

Hon. P. Collier: That was a tragedy!

Mr. SAMPSON: I should not be surprised if the Leader of the Opposition has found himself in equally embarrassing circumstances, for he moves about those districts a good deal. The local newspaper, still referring to the hotel additions, continues—

It is to be regretted that they have been added to a building which in itself is totally inadequate and unsuitable.

Nobody can criticise the accuracy of the writer of that paragraph, for he has described the position exactly as it is.

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

Mr. SAMPSON: Two or three years ago the then Minister for Railways, by invitation, visited Mundaring and attended a meeting at which the railway service was discussed. The need for a train that would reach Perth in time for the early workers was stressed, and it was understood that the Minister would make an endeavour to run that train. The meeting assured the Minister that a large number of workers would settle in Mundaring, Glen Forrest, Darlington, and Greenmount if it was possible for them to reach Perth in time to attend their duties. I suggest to the present Minister that an early morning train should be provided if possible. I believe it would pay, but at any rate a trial might be made. If it is not run I feel it will not be long before a taxi or charabanc service is operating along the York Road. That road is now nearly reconstructed as far as Mundaring. If provision for a train is not made by the Government, there can surely be no objection if, in view of the great need that exists for such, a service from Mundaring to Perth is supplied by some bus owner. I suggest also it is time that the power used at pumping stations Nos. 1 and 2 be looked into. Steam power is obsolete, and if a close calculation were made I think it would be found that electric power would make for a very considerable reduction in cost. No other power is nearly as cheap as electric power, and I believe a change-over from steam to electricity would make for a good deal of economy. The matter is not one that I am

advancing as a definite proposition, but I do ask that the Government should look into the matter and see whether this change-over could not be made. At the present time, in order to cart wood to the pumping station, a road of about 18 miles in length has to be maintained, and, because of the stiff gradients, this is fairly costly work. The sympathy of every member will be with the Premier in the very difficult position he has to face. Everyone here, both on the Government and Opposition sides of the Chamber, earnestly hopes he will be able to live up to the figures he presented in his Budget a few days ago. We wish to assure him that anything we can do towards that end will be done gladly. I feel sure too, that members will readily welcome the suggested legislation for the reduction of Parliamentary salaries. The position calls for general treatment. It is an obligation on members to take the initiative, and gratifying to know that the Premier proposes to bring down this Bill.

Mr. Marshall: I wish you had to represent my electorate and keep five children.

Mr. SAMPSON: The hon. member must not blame me for his five children. I feel that he thinks as I do in this matter.

Mr. Marshall: I do not think as you do, and do not want you to speak for me.

Mr. SAMPSON: The hon. member has generally no difficulty in speaking for himself, and usually does so out of place.

Mr. Marshall: But I use better arguments than you do.

Mr. SAMPSON: Members generally will welcome the introduction of this measure, and will be glad both now and at any other time, and in any way, to assist the Government in the difficult times through which we are passing.

Mr. Marshall: If you would have a go at some of the newspaper dividends, I might agree with you.

MR. J. H. SMITH (Nelson) [7.35]: I would not be doing my duty if I did not bring under the notice of the Government certain anomalies I know to exist. I would first of all refer to land taxation. I sympathise with the Premier in his difficult task of trying to make both ends meet. In my opinion, however, a portion of the revenue for which he budgeted cannot be expected to come from land taxation. As is well known, at the last general election, candidates from this side of the House told the

people on the land that if a change in Government occurred, one of the first things we would do would be to provide for an exemption of £250 on the unimproved value of land, and reduce the land tax from 2d. to 1d. The main trouble, however, is in regard to the assessments. I propose to read a letter I have received from the Primary Producers' Association, Boyup Brook branch, and from this members will know what the position really is. The letter is as follows:—

A well-attended meeting convened by the local branch of the Primary Producers' Association was held at Boyup Brook on September 13th to discuss and protest against the very high assessments rendered by the State Taxation Department on unimproved land, more especially in this district (Upper Blackwood).

I now come to the point concerning which I asked a question on Thursday afternoon. The letter continues—

Several land owners gave details of their 1929/1930 assessments, comparing them with those of the previous year. In all the cases brought before the meeting, the Taxation Department had increased the valuations by not less than 100 per cent., and in one case the Department had made demands for tax on a valuation of over five times that for the 1928/29 period. In this case the Commissioner thought fit to assess the unimproved value of the holding at a figure in excess of the amount paid for the holding (with all improvements) less than two years ago, and this in spite of the fact that the property changed hands at the peak of the boom period.

This speaks for itself. The land assessments were adopted by the Federal assessors some years ago for taxation purposes. I expected something would be brought down this session to provide for the re-valuation of agricultural land in this State. At the time these assessments were made everything was at its peak in values. Wheat was worth between 6s. and 7s. 6d. a bushel, and wool was round about 3s. a lb. All that was being produced from the land was at peak prices, and the assessments were based on those prices. The local authorities adopted these values with a reduction of 33½ per cent. They were, however, too high, with the result that rates are to-day not being paid. Just now our primary products are at their lowest ebb. How can any Government expect to collect land taxation when the problem is to keep people on the land? Something must be done to protect these taxpayers. It appears to me a farce that such a

large amount should be collected from our timber industry for reforestation. When I spoke on the Address-in-Reply I said that the royalty per foot on timber had gone up over 200 per cent. Actually the royalty on a 60ft. pile, such as is being used to-day for the building of the railway bridge over the Swan, is £6 15s. This was taken from one department to give to the other. The inspection fees are one-third of the royalty. The Forests Department, and the man who is supplying the piles is getting £16, and of this the Forests Department are taking £10 for reforestation purposes. Whilst that is going on, the railways are being strangled and are losing many thousands a year. This should be inquired into. Members may say we have to be loyal, and do so and so and something else. Many things require to be looked into. One matter is in regard to the throwing open of Crown land. I have in my bag to-night 100 applications for such land. The Government should throw open Crown lands instead of going miles and miles away as they are doing to-day from railways, schools and other facilities. At least 5,000 people could be supplied with land if it could be released from the Forests Department, south of Pinjarra and within close proximity to existing railways, roads, schools and other facilities. The Government propose to bring in a Bill to reduce the allowances of members and public servants' salaries. The Premier indicated the reduction as on the basis of 10 per cent. We are to have a hospitals tax of 1½d. in the pound. I plead for an unemployment tax; before the Government have gone much further they will find such a tax indispensable. The 10 per cent. reduction is a flat rate, not applying to Ministers who draw double what private members draw. The Government should begin taxing at 1½d. in the pound the people who are untouched to-day. Thus there would be a total collection of £600,000. On the basis of the hospitals tax, rising gradually, the return would be over a million of money. The Treasurer could deduct the amount of the hospitals tax, and still have £600,000 left to give employment to people who are workless to-day. I entered this Chamber as an independent responsible only to my electors. I have linked up with the present Government, and said that I will give them faithful service. I will not vote them out of office unless my



electorate, absolutely losing faith in the Government, compels me to do so. I want Ministers to realise that I shall be an earnest critic, and shall always voice my opinions. To a great extent I shall please myself as to the manner in which I record my vote.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: So long as it is not dangerous.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: On matters vital to the country I shall record my vote as my conscience dictates.

Mr. McCallum: Only on those questions?

Mr. J. H. SMITH: Only on those questions.

Mr. McCallum: As regards the rest you will do as you are told?

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I am not caucus-ridden like the hon. member interjecting. I am responsible only to my electors. That is the advantage of sitting on this side of the Chamber. There are no pledges to be signed. We are not responsible to persons sitting in conclave. We are not liable to be hauled over the coals and refused a selection ballot if we do not do exactly as those persons tell us.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: You were refused an endorsement.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: Never in my life. I was one of the endorsed candidates. However, I went out on the principle that no outside body had authority to refuse an endorsement. I shall discuss the various items as they arise. There will be opportunities for discussion later, as the Leader of the Opposition said. Bills will be brought down, and they will be treated according to their worth.

MR. MUNSIE (Hannans) [7.50]: A good deal has been said in this Chamber, and certainly a good deal has been printed in the newspapers, during the last month or six weeks as to the various Australian Governments being compelled to live within their means. It is said that each Australian Parliament—there are seven of them in all—must square the ledger. My belief is that during the current year each State Government and the Federal Government will bring down a Budget that on paper will square the ledger, but that when the 30th June of next year arrives neither the Commonwealth nor any State will have squared the ledger. The talk of squaring the ledger

is purely talk. Anyone who realises the facts must know that the various Governments cannot do it, and will not do it. They will budget for such a result, but at the end of the year they will fall short of it. I wish to deal with only two items in the Premier's Budget. I notice that the total of the reductions in this year's Estimates is £156,597. The principal cuts are in two departments—Medical £114,930 and Mines £10,862.

The Minister for Lands: There is also a cut in the Agricultural Department.

Mr. MUNSIE: I am taking only the two departments I have administered, and they represent the greater part of the reduction, £125,792. The Premier appealed to me as a former Minister for Health who introduced a Bill, the session before last, providing a tax on income for hospital purposes. In his Budget speech the Premier has forecasted a hospitals tax. The figures given by him prove conclusively what his intentions are. He is budgeting to raise by the hospitals tax, whatever it may prove to be, a sum of £156,000. Then he proposes to take into Consolidated Revenue the amount received from the entertainments tax, which he forecasts at £36,000. Really it is not £36,000, but more. It has been more for the last three years. To offset that £36,000 the hon. gentleman says he will allow the hospital fund, which will be created by the proposed Bill, to retain the amount of collections during the year. These, it is estimated, will amount to £36,000. I do not know how the Premier arrives at that estimate. The Budget figures show last year's collections as £40,572. However, included in that amount are the collections from the Repatriation Board by the Perth Hospital, and also collections from the Federal Government for treatment of venereal disease in seaport towns.

The Minister for Lands: That money will not be available.

Mr. MUNSIE: Yes, it will. Thus the total amount is £40,572. For argument's sake we will say that last year £36,000 was collected from Government hospitals throughout the State—there are 12 of them. The Premier has no possible hope of collecting £36,000 this year. Everybody must recognise that collections from public hospitals will certainly go down. The money is not here; the people are not as well off

as they were last year. Therefore, the Premier will not receive £36,000 from that source. Thus the hospitals will be worse off on that line. On the other hand, receipts from entertainments tax will undoubtedly increase. I know there is a depression, but the reason for the increase is that three of the largest picture shows in the city of Perth have during the last two months reduced their admission fee from 2s. 7½d.—which amount returned nothing to the State—to 2s. 2d., from which the State will collect. Therefore, the amount received by the State will be greater and the amount received by the Commonwealth less. The Commonwealth have been collecting on the 2s. 7½d. and 3s. 3d. admission fees, the State getting nothing from them. The State will henceforth collect on the 2s. 2d. admission fee, and the taxation will, according to the Premier, go into Consolidated Revenue. When introducing the hospital tax measure of the session before last I estimated a surplus of £58,000 after providing for payment of 6s. per bed in respect of every bed occupied in a hospital in this State. At that time the present Premier, then Leader of the Opposition, asked whether the Treasurer was going to pay interest on the £58,000 while the amount was in the Treasury. I naturally answered in the negative. The Treasury was collecting the money, but would not be asked to pay interest on the £58,000, which amount in any case would not be in the Treasury long enough to return any appreciable interest. Last year, according to these Estimates, it cost £141,431 from Consolidated Revenue to run the Medical Department. This year the Premier proposes to raise £156,000 by taxation. He intends to allow collections from the hospitals tax, estimated at £36,000, to bring the total revenue from hospitals up to £192,000. Then he is going to pay into Consolidated Revenue £104,539 from the hospitals tax. That will be getting money under false pretences. If the Government cannot square the ledger without imposing taxation, let them be honest about the matter and impose direct taxes. The taxation should not be put forward under the guise of a hospitals tax if the hospitals are not going to get the proceeds. The Premier will not get my support for a Bill of that description. Nor do I believe hon. members will allow

him to pass a hospitals tax and put into Consolidated Revenue £104,539 out of the proceeds.

The Minister for Lands: He does not put it in. You mean he does not take it out.

Mr. MUNSIE: Revenue will benefit to that extent.

The Minister for Lands: That is better.

Mr. MUNSIE: Revenue will benefit to the extent of £105,000. If a hospitals tax is to be raised in Western Australia, the proceeds should be, as under the Collier Government's Bill, set aside solely for the maintenance and extension of hospitals.

The Minister for Lands: So they will be.

Mr. MUNSIE: Yes, £192,000 will be set aside! It is absolutely unfair. Two or three years ago I was severely criticised, particularly by the member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) when I claimed that the entertainments tax had not benefited the revenue during the regime of the Collier Government. I still maintain that the only benefit the general revenue derived from the entertainments tax, which represented £38,000 a year, was the revenue we collected from Government hospitals and from patients in those hospitals. To that extent the revenue benefited directly, and that was all. Not a penny of the entertainments tax went into Consolidated Revenue. The position is set out in the Government's Estimates. They show the amount received from the tax for 1929-30 was £38,595, less the cost of collections and refunds, £931; making a total of £37,664. The amount brought forward from 1928-29 was £890, making the amount available for allocation £38,554. The amount allocated was £37,137. That was all that was spent from the entertainments tax last year. The amount held in the Treasury this year was £1,417. At the bottom of that is the estimated expenditure for 1929-30 charged to Consolidated Revenue, £104,294. The expenditure last year charged to the entertainments tax fund was £37,137, making a total of £141,431. Now this is what we find when we turn to the Estimates for this year. Estimated receipts for 1930-31 in connection with the hospital fund show that the estimated amount to be received from the hospitals tax will be £156,000. Hospital collections, estimated to be received, previously treated as revenue, £36,000, thus giving a total of £192,000. The Premier

has disclosed in those figures the fact that the imposition of the hospitals tax will mean that instead of the hospitals benefiting to the extent of £156,000, Consolidated Revenue will benefit to the tune of £105,000 and the hospitals to the extent of £52,000 only.

The Minister for Works: Then where do you say the false representation comes in?

Mr. MUNSIE: The false representation is in introducing a hospitals tax Bill, seeing that the hospitals will not get the money. I candidly believe that 25 per cent. of the people of Western Australia were in favour of the imposition of a tax for the maintenance of our hospitals when the Labour Government introduced the Bill. Knowing that, the present Government intend introducing a Bill for a similar purpose, but the hospitals will not receive any corresponding benefit.

The Minister for Works: They will get the whole of the tax.

Mr. MUNSIE: And the money will be paid into Consolidated Revenue. That is frenzied finance.

Mr. Sleeman: And hospitals will not be any better off.

Mr. MUNSIE: Not a penny piece better off. If the Premier intends to persist in his budgeting along those lines, I hope the House will not agree to his hospitals tax Bill. Should the measure pass this House, I hope the Legislative Council will see that he does not get that legislation through. If that should happen, then the Premier will be down in his estimate by £156,000. The attitude adopted by the Government is not fair to Parliament, nor yet to the public. It is not fair to introduce a hospitals tax, which will really benefit Consolidated Revenue. I cannot see how the Government will square the ledger in these circumstances, and certainly it will not be done with my support for the hospitals tax Bill. The other item respecting which I desire to speak, is the reduction of £10,862 in the Estimates for the Mines Department, which was another department I administered when a member of the Collier Government. I have gone through the whole of the Estimates for that department and I find that the greater proportion of that reduction is to be saved under the one heading—compensation under the Miners' Phthisis Act, £7,213. When we reach that item on the Estimates, I shall ask how the present Min-

ister for Mines expects to save that amount on last year's figures. I know that for the period I was in office, and up to the date of the elections, the present year's examination of the men working in the mines gave the worst results recorded in the history of those examinations in Western Australia. A bigger percentage of men had been turned down under the provisions of the Miners' Phthisis Act than was ever previously recorded. I shall want an explanation of the expected saving in view of the fact that I know at least 100 extra men will have to be provided for. I do not know how the Minister will be able to do it. He may have a method that the Estimates do not disclose. I can find no set-off although I have searched for some provision elsewhere from which payment of some portion of the money will be made. I cannot find a single penny for that purpose, and yet 100 extra men will have to be dealt with! I am satisfied that, regarding the two departments I had experience in administering, the Government will be at least £200,000 short in their Estimates.

Mr. Withers: There is nothing unusual in that.

Mr. MUNSIE: Perhaps not, but it shows the fallacy of the statements published in the Press daily that all Governments are out to balance the budget. In my opinion not one of them will be able to do so when the financial year closes. There are a hundred and one things I could discuss in connection with the Budget, but I do not think it would do much good. Before concluding what I wish to say on the general discussion, I would point out that prior to the elections the chief cry of the Premier, who was then Leader of the Opposition, was that if returned to power it was not his intention to increase but to reduce taxation.

The Minister for Lands: Of course, you know that circumstances have altered.

Mr. MUNSIE: Yes, the position altered in 24 hours. They altered on the night of the election when you discovered you were in office.

The Minister for Lands: We are not getting the loan funds that we were promised.

Mr. Sleeman: That has nothing to do with the Revenue Estimates.

The Minister for Lands: But they helped revenue.

Mr. MUNSIE: When we deal with the Loan Estimates we can discuss that phase, but at present we are considering the Revenue Estimates. The chief cry of the Premier was that there would be no increased taxation, but that taxation would be reduced. In his policy speech, he mentioned four Bills that would increase taxation. To-day he has introduced five or six such Bills.

The Minister for Works: They are all small ones.

Mr. MUNSIE: But all mount up. The Premier introduced five or six, and then the Minister for Lands introduced a measure that will result in the collection of the largest amount. He gave notice of his intention to introduce a hospitals tax Bill, although it is really not a Bill to provide taxation revenue for hospitals at all. The promise that the Premier made to reduce taxation has gone by the board.

Mr. Willcock: Like the rest of the promises.

Mr. MUNSIE: We will have an opportunity to discuss that measure when the second reading is moved, but I am puzzled as to how it will operate. There is one point that I wish to make clear to my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition. I want to advise him that I am not the expert he appears to think I am in winning at the races. I would have liked to make the Leader of the Opposition prove his words when he told the Committee that I was a consistently successful bettor. As a matter of fact, if I had not had my Parliamentary pass, I would have had to walk home from the races on many occasions. By no means am I a regular winner when I attend the races. I shall be delighted to see the Bill it is intended to introduce to impose a tax on winning bets. I want to have a look at the measure and ascertain how it is proposed to collect the tax.

Mr. Withers: It will be a Chinese puzzle.

Mr. MUNSIE: I do not know what method the Government can adopt. I know something about races and racecourses, and I claim the Government can introduce any Bill they like with that object in view, and I will undertake to go to a race meeting and back every winner on the day, and yet the Government will not collect one shilling from me.

Mr. Willcock: Perhaps you will not collect.

Mr. MUNSIE: It will be interesting to discover how the Government intend to collect.

Mr. Sampson: Surely you will help them to amend the Bill and make it effective.

Mr. MUNSIE: Yes, I will help them to make it reasonably effective, but I will not assist them to impose a tax on winning bets that will mean that if a man goes to the races and loses £100 and then wins £10 on the last race, he will have to pay  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. on the £10, although he will be a loser of £90 on the day. If that could be considered just, I have yet to learn what is fair and equitable. I do not intend to discuss the Estimates any further, but I shall have a good deal to say when we discuss the Health Vote. I congratulate the Minister for Health upon having induced the Premier to increase the Health Vote by £1,000. I am sorry he was not able to get a little more. I honestly believe that if Western Australia were to spend more money on preventing sickness than it spends on curing ailments once contracted, our people would be more healthy. While I am pleased to see the Health Vote slightly increased, I am sorry to see the Medical Vote decreased, particularly regarding the hospital provisions, with which I have already dealt.

**MR. GRIFFITHS** (Avon) [8.14]: The Estimates provide private members with an opportunity to ventilate what they consider matters of importance from a national standpoint as well as from their own parochial point of view. I spoke at length on the Address-in-reply, and I shall not detain the Committee for long on the Estimates. I would not like to let the opportunity pass without bringing under the notice of hon. members that phase of our national activities that is referred to in the newspapers almost daily under the heading of "Farmers' Finance." That question has been occupying the attention of the Government, the commercial community, and the banks for many weeks past. There have been meetings all over the country. At Wyalcatchem a scheme was put forward for financing the wheat crop by issuing Australian notes against the taxable value reserved to the Commonwealth. At Merredin a 4s. guarantee was asked for, or a bonus of 6d. per bushel. At Lake Grace the farmers asked for a moratorium. All sorts of resolutions have been

passed, most of them diverse and conflicting. They will not help in a solution of the present impasse that the farming industry has reached. I should like to stress the point that the general clamour all over the country indicates a very serious position, and one that we should consider, not only from the standpoint of trying to solve the difficulties confronting the agricultural calling, but from the standpoint of the future of the industry. An appeal was made by the Prime Minister to the farmers to grow more wheat. That appeal has been responded to in magnificent fashion. The record wheat production of the Commonwealth occurred in 1915 when something like 179,000,000 bushels were harvested. This year it is estimated that from 200,000,000 to 225,000,000 bushels will be produced. That shows how gallantly the farmers have responded to the appeal. We understand that steps are being taken to relieve the immediate position with which the farmers are confronted. Now is the time when the whole structure of both our primary and secondary industries should be investigated. Speaking to many farmers recently, men who have been on the land for years, I was informed that they are very little better off than they were 20 years ago. In fact, some of them are worse off. If this sort of thing is going to continue, there will be a wholesale exodus from the land. Unless farming can be made less of a gamble and more of a business proposition, the state of affairs now prevailing, bad as it is, will grow worse. I understand that steps are being taken to tide the farmer over the present stage until the harvest is garnered, and that provision is being made to finance his requirements for the coming season.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Who is doing that?

Mr. GRIFFITHS: The hon. member has seen the reports in the Press.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Surely you do not think the merchants are serious!

Mr. GRIFFITHS: That is a point I wish to mention. The farmer has endeavoured to save the financial stability of the Commonwealth. The call in war time was as it is now for the farmer to do his bit. He has done his bit as well as he knows how. What about the banker, the merchant and others doing a little to help to save not only the farmers but themselves? If a wholesale exodus from the land once starts, it means that the banker, the merchant, the bag man and the machinery man, as well as the farmer, will suffer heavy losses. I cannot

believe that those people will be so lacking in common sense that they will not meet the Government and the farmers in a spirit of good will and make a mutual sacrifice to enable the industry to be saved. I have a letter from a farmer in the country who gives an idea of the outlook. He writes on behalf of a number of farmers, and from his letter I have taken the essential points. After referring to the Chamber of Commerce and the move to finance the farmers, he goes on to say—

The farmers are up against the toughest proposition of their lives. No doubt business people are preparing for the big grab which will take place on the realisation of the proceeds of the wheat. The farmers are in a desperate plight. They have no money with which to buy tucker. Their credit has gone to the pack. They have good farms, many of them highly developed, and excellent crops, and yet they have no credit with which to buy household goods. The move of the merchants to protect themselves may be all right, but provision will have to be made to finance next year's farming operations. Is this to be done? It will be worse next year for our farming operations. I am tipping a big exodus from the farms if wheat prices remain as they are at present, or if they fall lower, if something is not done to keep families on their holdings. Under the extraordinary conditions now prevailing, the Government should see that the farmers' interests are protected, and that no man is pushed off the land through stress of circumstances over which he has no control. The whole thing is a national and burning question. Mr. Glasheen spoke of continuing the I.A.B. in an emergency such as the present. This experience will be infinitely worse than that of the drought year. Why not use the machinery of the I.A.B. and the valuable experience gained. It should be used at a time like this. Do you think that would be preferable to the present move by the Chamber of Commerce? What about a big meeting at, say, Kellerrin, to discuss these queries of the farmers' present difficulties and the future if wheat values do not rise? We can all anticipate a financial catastrophe if wheat values remain at the present low level or fall lower. I have been asked by the farmers of Doodlakine to write you. We take it that the Country Party members and the Primary Producers' Association Executive will watch our interests and evolve a scheme to help the farmers over this difficult period. We also believe that Sir James Mitchell and his country members will be just as keen to help.

I believe the present impasse will be overcome. If a spirit of good will can be brought to bear, the chances are that we shall manage to struggle through to next year. As regards the outlook for the coming year, we know there is much talk

in Great Britain about reciprocal trade. That involves the question of the tariff, and as we are vitally concerned in the question of the tariff, it appears that the time is opportune to endeavour to get a fuller and broader outlook taken of the primary industries, especially by the Commonwealth authorities who appear to rule in the interests of Melbourne and Sydney rather than of the primary producing States. The sooner we tackle this problem and bring the position under the notice of the Federal Government, of bankers, merchants and others connected with the industry, the better it will be. Since pre-war days production costs have doubled. The interest charged to settlers before the war was from 4 per cent. to 5 per cent., whereas it is now  $6\frac{1}{2}$  per cent to 7 per cent. Pre-war farming was conducted mainly with a 4d. to  $4\frac{1}{2}$ d. per bushel railage freight. Now it extends to a 6d. or even higher freight. The Commonwealth Government have imposed a primage duty on wheat sacks of 9d. per dozen. Yet they ask the farmers to grow more wheat. The farmers are getting it in the neck from all sides. One farmer informed me that he had received a communication stating that he must sign a lien over his machinery, or he would not be allowed to use the harvester to take his crop off. Others are getting orders from the Agricultural Bank for signature giving the bank liens to cover interest. When we tell these farmers that we are doing our best for them, they point out that the Government evidently intend to join in the rush for their share of the proceeds. They want to know whether the Government intend to press their claims, or whether they propose to extend the same good will that farmers expect the merchants to exhibit. So the merry game goes on. Merchants, bankers, super manufacturers, and in fact the community as a whole must get into their heads that if wheat growing and sheep raising fail, everyone will suffer just as much as the farmers are suffering at present. I hope the opportunity will be seized to bring home to the Federal Government the evils of the present tariff, and if they will not realise the national catastrophe facing Australia, we should go bald-headed for secession.

[Mr. J. H. Smith took the Chair.]

**MR. SLEEMAN** (Fremantle) [8.27]: I am rather surprised at these Estimates after all the talk we have heard about the economy and wage reduction, and about all from the highest to the lowest sharing the sacrifice.

Mr. Marshall: The Government said everybody should do so.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Yes, everyone had to stand his share, but unfortunately the Government have started with the lowest and have forgotten the highest. I notice that provision still remains on the Estimates for the Governor's establishment. Lest I might be misunderstood, let me say I consider His Excellency the Governor is one of the best we have had to carry out those important duties. Those duties are important in normal times, but I do not regard them as important in such a time as the present when we are seeking to effect economies. This is an office which could be dispensed with during the next year or two. His Excellency will be leaving us shortly, and I think the Government would be well advised not to appoint a successor, so that the amount at present expended on the Governor's establishment could be saved. The money could be better spent for the relief of starving families in Western Australia. There are plenty of people starving in the country, and the money should be spent on them rather than on maintaining the Governor's establishment.

Mr. Sampson: There is no one in Western Australia more industrious than His Excellency.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I have nothing to say against the present occupant of the office. I have already tried to explain that he is a fine gentleman who has carried out his duties very well indeed. No Governor of this State has ever travelled amongst the people more than he has done.

Mr. Sampson: His office is certainly not a sinecure.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The position could be dispensed with for a time, especially after all the talk we have heard about the necessity for economy from the highest to the lowest. Let us start at the highest, and we might get down to the lowest. I hope the Committee will agree to reduce this expenditure as a protest against continuing the office of Governor for the next year or two until we get back to normal times. There

is also another way of economising and I referred to it on the Address-in-reply. It is that we could well do without some members of Parliament.

The Premier: I agree with you.

Mr. SLEEMAN: In fact we could do without the member for Northam.

The Premier: You have already tried that.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Then if at first we don't succeed, we can try and try again. The reduction in the number of members may be one way of getting rid of the hon. member. I realise that if we reduced the number of members in this Chamber from 50 to 40, some of us would not come back. But there would be the economy by reason of the State having perhaps 40 members less in both Houses. That brings me to the fact that when I spoke on the Address-in-reply, the "West Australian" took me to task for bringing up a contentious party matter and disguising it in the garb of economy. I did not know that the abolition of the Legislation Council was a contentious party matter. Evidently the "West Australian" knew more about our platform than I did, but whether it was a contentious party matter or not, I still claim that it would be a good thing if we could abolish the Legislative Council and by reducing the number of members of the Assembly to 40, so do away with a similar number—thirty in one and ten in the other.

Mr. Sampson: There would be some innocents abroad then.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Yes, and the hon. member might be one of them if what I suggest came about. I agree with the remarks of the ex-Minister for Health when he criticised the attitude of the Government towards the medical vote. The Government have cut down that vote by £114,000 and we have the spectacle of the Fremantle hospital being obliged to close up two of the wards instead of the Government doing something to assist to keep them open. So far as I can see the position will remain the same after the Government's proposals have been carried out, and the Treasurer will get the benefit of the extra money that he proposes to raise. The existing position in which the hospitals find themselves at the present time is a disgrace to the Government. The hospitals are not able to finance themselves. Several propositions have been put up for financing the

Fremantle hospital, but up to date it has not been possible to get the sanction of the Government to any of them. I can tell the Premier that the Estimates of the Medical Department will not go through without a lot of criticism owing to the fact that he is cutting out £114,000 and relieving his revenue by bringing in legislation which the Government claim will be a hospitals tax. In my opinion it will be a misnomer; it will not relieve the hospitals, but it will relieve the Treasurer by letting him get away with £114,000 of revenue. I do not propose to say anything further at the present stage because we shall have plenty of opportunities when the divisions are being considered.

This concluded the general debate.

Votes and items were discussed as follows:

*Vote—Legislative Council, £1,812—agreed to.*

*Vote—Legislative Assembly, £2,946:*

Mr. MARSHALL: I should like to have something to say about the abolition of this vote.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. member desire to deal with the Legislative Council vote? That vote has already been disposed of. We are now dealing with the Legislative Assembly vote.

Mr. MARSHALL: Then I have missed my opportunity. Anyway, I should like to have something to say on the Legislative Assembly vote.

The CHAIRMAN: On which item?

Mr. MARSHALL: Clerk Assistant. I wish to enter a protest against the procedure that has been adopted, spontaneously apparently. In any remarks that I may have to offer I wish it to be understood that I have no ill-will towards the individual who is temporarily occupying the position of Clerk Assistant. I understand that the Clerk Assistant has been taken ill and has gone away on a holiday. In his place we find a stranger to the Chamber. The stranger may be ever so competent, sincere and genuine. I am not casting any reflection on him; I am criticising the procedure that has been adopted in bringing in an outsider to temporarily fill the post of assisting to control the business of this Chamber, while others who have served us faithfully for 15 and 18 years respectively

have been overlooked. It is a little difficult to understand what has really caused this particular change. One is speaking more or less in the dark, but when one finds that young men who have faithfully discharged their duties and who have practically grown up in the service of this Chamber, are cast aside when an office with higher emoluments becomes vacant, and an officer from some other department, foreign to us, is brought in to fill the vacancy, it is time that we were told the reason, if there be one. I had no knowledge of the change until the Assembly met this evening and it came as a great surprise to me, as I am sure it did to most hon. members. We have two officers in this Chamber who have been with us for a number of years, and who have rendered faithful service. Why have they been overlooked and a stranger brought in and put immediately over their heads? I do not know how we can expect to get faithful service rendered if we bring in strangers and give them precedence over men whom we have been accustomed to trust. The efficiency of the work to be performed in this Chamber must certainly deteriorate by actions of this description. I shall not say much more, but I will take every opportunity, as a member of this Chamber, to protest against such action. During the course of my experience extending over 10 years in this Chamber, I have learnt to appreciate the value of the services given to us by our junior officers. How can we expect a stranger to come in and discharge the duties as well as those who, by their experience, have a thorough knowledge of what is required? I enter an emphatic protest against the procedure which I fear will lead to inefficiency. May I also add that if the gentleman who is temporarily occupying the position lives to find himself displaced at some time or other in a similar way, he will appreciate the protest I am making. I have nothing to say against the gentleman himself; all I wish to declare is that the procedure is absolutely wrong and should be protested against by at least a majority of the members of this House. If there is anything against the officers who have been overlooked, their services should have been dispensed with long ago. But they have been allowed to graduate during their services of from 15 to 18 years, and then, when there is a pos-

sibility of their securing promotion, a stranger is brought in and put over their heads. I apologise in the sense that probably I have said things that the officer may be led to believe I have something against him personally. I assure him I have not. I am arguing that a wrong procedure has been adopted. It is not a fair thing to ask anyone to work for 15 years or more and qualify for a certain position, and then, when the opportunity arrives for the position to be filled, to be immediately turned down and a person entirely a stranger to this Chamber brought in. No member of this House will tolerate such a procedure, and that is why I have entered my protest. I have nothing to say against the officer who has been brought in; it is merely the procedure that has been followed to which I object.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I feel that an injustice has been done to those who have served this Assembly faithfully and well, no doubt in the expectation of promotion. I do not think we can let this matter pass without an explanation. We have officers attached to this Chamber who, in my opinion, are quite capable of filling a higher position when it becomes vacant. It may be argued that what has been done is purely a temporary expedient, but even the temporary filling of a position by an outsider is a reflection upon those that are servants of this Chamber. I have always stood for promotion within the department. It is quite wrong for us to educate officers in a given department and then go outside to fill a vacancy that may occur, unless, of course, there are very strong reasons for doing so. We members are in the position that we are able to judge service; it is not a question where any one member can judge. The servants of this Chamber are the servants of many, and every member is qualified to determine whether the officers are sufficiently educated and experienced to fill higher positions. I have no hesitation in saying that the officers of this Chamber are quite capable of filling the position that has become temporarily vacant and therefore we should be given an explanation of the course that has been followed. I am not prepared to let the matter stand with the mere entering of a protest.

The Premier: What are you going to do about it?



Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I want an explanation. We have a responsibility, and it is to protect the officers of this House. The Clerk Assistant, who is unfortunately away ill, was himself promoted from within the service. He was a messenger in this House and he qualified as others are now qualifying, and who have proved equally faithful up to the stage he reached when he was appointed Clerk-Assistant. Mr. Steere is a capable officer, but he was an officer of this House in a subordinate position before he was elevated to his present post. He improved considerably after his promotion. Responsibility and promotion always bring more diligent service; they always assist a man to improve. But if we deny promotion to one to whom it is owing, we are not encouraging him to improve himself and so do greater service to the State. Mr. Brown, the Usher of the Black Rod, was formerly a messenger in the Legislative Council. He was promoted from the ranks and improved his position step by step till he reached his present office. So we have made no mistakes in the past in keeping promotion within the service and elevating our own officers from subordinate positions to higher posts. That has been the practice in the past, but here to-day we have a complete departure from that practice. This is no time for such an innovation. I do not know whether the Speaker is responsible for it, but I do not think it is too much to ask the Speaker to explain it, rather than that we should let it go. I am sure the feeling of members is quite against what has been done, and I think we are justified in asking an assurance that it will be reconsidered or, alternatively, a satisfactory explanation given as to why we should permit it to continue. While it is within the right of the Speaker to make this innovation, still we as members have a responsibility. We cannot leave solely to the Speaker the handling of officers of the House and say we have no responsibility for it. The officers of the House are servants of ours, and so we have a right either to an explanation from the Speaker or an assurance that this innovation will be reconsidered. It is so wrong, so unjust, that I hope the House will not allow it to continue.

The PREMIER: Of course the appointment was not made by the Government, as the hon. member ought to know.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: I only said that if you condoned it, you ought to explain it.

The PREMIER: Unfortunately the Clerk Assistant is away ill, as is also the Sergeant-at-Arms. Had it not been that both are away, we might not have had to get someone from outside to fill this position. As it is, the work is being done in the manner that you see. Of course it is only a temporary job. I hope it will indeed be a very temporary job, and that the Clerk Assistant will soon be restored to us in robust health to take up his former duties. Since this subject has been well ventilated by those members who have spoken, I think they might now let the matter drop, feeling assured that there is no intention to treat any officer of the House with other than the utmost consideration.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am not at all satisfied with the Premier's reply and defence. The appointment is an unfortunate slight on the officers and servants of this Chamber. If it is only a temporary vacancy, that is all the more reason why those officers should have been given a chance to prove themselves. It would be far more fitting that one who knew the procedure of the Chamber should be temporarily entrusted with the task. Instead of that, we get a stranger who will not know the procedure of the Chamber until he has had experience.

The Premier: Well, we are all so well behaved.

Mr. MARSHALL: The hon. member, like Abraham, might be well behaved, but I don't know that all members are. But, even if we were to misbehave, it would not be for the newcomer to show any aggressiveness. Undoubtedly those officers who have been working in the Chamber for the last 15 years should have had the advantage of this temporary appointment. As it is, we are to educate a stranger up to this position, and as soon as he becomes proficient he will be vacating the office again. I am disposed to move a reduction in the item, just as a protest against this innovation. If anything of the sort happens again while I am a member of the Chamber, I will keep the House particularly busy for a long time. I do not say that any officer, if inefficient, should be retained; certainly such a man should not be allowed to continue here for 18 years, and then, when a temporary position is available, be slighted by the appointment to that post of an utter stranger, a stranger both to the work and to the procedure.

Mr. RAPHAEL: We have had the same sort of thing crop up in the City Council a number of times.

The Premier: But you cannot discuss that.

Mr. RAPHAEL: We have found, when such things happen as have taken place here in the matter of the appointment of this officer, dissension is caused amongst other servants and officers. I am going to appeal to members not to try to make this a party matter, but to vote for the appointment of a returned soldier to the position. Already the Government have said that, all things being equal, a returned soldier should have preference.

The Minister for Lands: The Government were not responsible for this appointment.

Mr. RAPHAEL: But the Speaker is part of the Government, or at all events he is on the Government side and would vote as the Government voted. Members should stick to their guns and, when all things are equal, give the position to a returned soldier. I do not speak with any disfavour of the officer at present holding the position, but it seems to me that perhaps some small degree of political bias has been used.

The Premier: I think that ought to be withdrawn.

Mr. RAPHAEL: I will withdraw it, but still that is the thought in my mind. I hope members will vote to give a returned soldier the preference. And it must be remembered there are other young men waiting to move up in the service of Parliament. It is not one man alone who is deprived of this advancement, for we must consider also those behind him in the service.

Vote put and passed.

*Vote—Joint House Committee, £4,893:*

Item—Secretary, £50:

Mr. MARSHALL: I want to raise the point that in every room set aside for writing there is to be found ink splashed about the walls. It reflects discredit on members of this Chamber. Not very long ago we had given us an extra room in which tables and writing material were provided, but some members with gold-mounted fountain pens, whenever they wish to know if their pens are full, try them out on the plaster walls. One observing the ink splashed about everywhere would

think he was in a school lavatory. Members might well keep their fountain pens in their pockets except when they desire to apply them to paper.

Vote put and passed.

*Vote—Joint Printing Committee, £4,851—agreed to.*

*Vote—Joint Library Committee, £142:*

Item—Library Assistance, £72:

Mr. CORBOY: Is it intended to add this amount to the salary already drawn by an officer of this House, or is it intended to appoint a new officer?

The PREMIER: It is intended that someone shall be employed to assist the librarian in the care of the very valuable books that we have. It is hardly a full-time job, but it is very necessary that our books should be well looked after.

Mr. CORBOY: I regret that only £72 is being provided.

The Minister for Lands: You are lucky to get that.

Mr. CORBOY: Yes, I suppose we are lucky. Indeed, it is strange that this year of all years the Treasurer should be able to provide something for the purpose. Someone should be appointed to look after the valuable library we have got together in this building. Many of our most useful books, because of their value, have to be kept under secure conditions, so that at least 90 per cent. of the members do not know of their existence on the premises. Most of our best books are not available to us in the ordinary way. They can only be made available through the constant attendance of an officer who will see to their proper custody. The sum set down here would hardly be sufficient for the purpose, and I hope next year it may be increased so that the library may be more fully useful to members than it is to-day.

Vote put and passed.

*Vote—Premier's Department, £11,595:*

Item, Governor's Establishment:

Mr. SLEEMAN: Something ought to be done to economise at the top of the tree. The expense in connection with the Governor's establishment is considerable.

Mr. Sampson: On a point of order! There is no item connected with the Governor before the Committee.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I am speaking generally. Apparently £4,000 is given to the Governor as his salary, and a large sum of money is spent on the upkeep of the Governor's establishment in Perth and Albany.

The Minister for Lands: There is no salary mentioned here.

Mr. SLEEMAN: But he receives a salary of £4,000 a year.

The Minister for Lands: Under Special Acts.

Mr. Sampson: I understand that Division No. 7, which is the first portion of the Premier's Department, has been passed.

Mr. Marshall: It has not.

Mr. Sampson: There is no item before the Committee.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I am speaking under the heading of the Premier's Department. A large expenditure is incurred annually on the Governor's establishments. In addition, a large sum is expended in connection with His Excellency's travels all over the State. As a protest against the Government's disinclination to start economies at the top of the tree, and to test the feeling of the Committee, and in an endeavour to keep the Government up to their statement that everyone should share in the economies, I move an amendment—

That the vote be reduced by £1.

The CHAIRMAN: Under the Standing Orders the general discussion on the whole of the Estimates takes place on the first vote, and the general discussion on the various votes takes place when that vote is called on. The first vote under this division is the Premier's Department, £11,595.

The PREMIER: The hon. member has moved his amendment in the wrong place. His Excellency the Governor is provided for under Special Acts, and there is no vote for his salary here. I was not going to say so, but I am authorised to say that the Governor is perfectly willing to make some contribution towards the present difficult financial position. It will, therefore, not be necessary for the member for Fremantle to move for this reduction as a protest. We know how the Governor holds his appointment and what his position is. I think the hon. member will be satisfied with the reduction that will voluntarily be made by His Excellency because of the unfortunate financial position.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I am satisfied that His Excellency will do as much as any other member of the community. I am not referring to him personally, and am casting no reflection upon him. He does the job he was brought out to do quite well. I think the position ought to be abolished for the next year or two. We know things are bad, and we are told they will get worse. If that is so, the place to start economies is at the top of the tree. Let us start with the position of Governor and his establishment. If it is necessary to have a Governor, I do not know anyone who can do the job better than the present occupant of the position, but the post should be done away with for the time being. The Chief Justice could carry out all necessary official duties, and the State would have to do without the periodical visits to different parts of it by His Excellency. The social side of the position could remain in abeyance for the next year or two.

The Premier: If the hon. member wishes to make a protest against this expenditure, I do not know why he does so on this particular vote.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I am quite prepared to move the amendment in the right place so long as I can move it.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is in order in moving to reduce this vote by £1 if he so desires, but if he withdraws the amendment he can move it when we reach the vote, Governor's establishment.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I will withdraw the amendment in the meantime.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Item, State Gardens Board, £2,100:

Mr. CORBOY: Is any of this money being spent at National Park in connection with the work that is being done by the men at Blackboy? We should know what is being spent on these recreation reserves. What is this money being spent on?

The PREMIER: The money is being spent in many excellent ways by the Gardens Board. It is always unanimous in coming to a decision.

Mr. Corboy: How many members are on the board?

The PREMIER: There are two, Messrs. Shapcott and Morris. They are doing excellent work at small cost. The people are

well served and catered for in connection with our parks and reserves.

Mr. RAPHAEL: The men who are working in these gardens are being paid from the Mc Ness fund, and their rations have been stopped. Is this fund going into Consolidated Revenue, or is it being used for the relief of distress?

The PREMIER: That fund is not going into revenue. As the hon. member knows better than anyone else, the money is being used for the purpose for which it was intended. No one is more interested in that fund than he is.

Vote put and passed.

*Vote—Governor's Establishment, £2,457:*

Mr. MARSHALL: I notice that this Vote includes an item "Allowance to the Governor in lieu of staff, £251." In view of recent propaganda it might have been expected that the Government, who are constantly calling upon the people to be prepared to make sacrifices, would not introduce such an item.

The Premier: It is an item put on by agreement with the Imperial Government.

Mr. MARSHALL: My argument is that there is no reason whatever for the existence of the institution to-day. Governors are not required. Their function is nil. Apart from touring the State, performing opening ceremonies, and attending afternoon tea parties, there is nothing to show for the expenditure of this enormous sum. The office is merely social.

The Minister for Lands: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, is the hon. member in order in discussing the Governor on this item?

Mr. MARSHALL: I argue that the Governor should not be here, and that therefore the item should not be here. The unsophisticated yokel from York makes a bigger fool of himself standing up than sitting down.

The Minister for Lands: I ask your ruling Mr. Chairman, on the point of order I have raised.

The Premier: We might also ask it on the hon. member's language.

The CHAIRMAN: On the Estimates no matter can be discussed which requires legislation, that is, the abolition of the office of Governor. However, the hon. member was in order, as he was not raising the question

of the abolition of the office of Governor on the item.

Mr. MARSHALL: This item proves that the Government are not sincere in proclaiming that everyone should make sacrifices. What service do we get from the expenditure on the office of Governor?

Mr. Parker: The Governor receives the £251 and makes up the difference himself.

Mr. MARSHALL: The office became useless years ago, except for the purpose of providing social butterflies with afternoon tea, and allowing snivellers who like to stoop and crawl—

The CHAIRMAN: I call the hon. member to order.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am disgusted to think that this expenditure goes on.

The Attorney General: You say that now in Opposition; you never said a word about it during the past six years.

Mr. MARSHALL: As a protest, I move an amendment—

That the Vote be reduced by £251.

Mr. HEGNEY: I support the reduction of the Vote. We are told that economy is the order of the day. In this country to-night many men are unable to secure sufficient food to keep their children adequately nourished; moreover, the children have not sufficient clothing and are ill shod. In view of the depression, this office might have been suspended for the next 12 months. The real reason for the Governor's existence is that he shall be a link between the State and the Crown. There are seven Governors in Australia. Surely the Governor General would amply suffice to discharge all the functions. During this period of distress the office of State Governor might well be suspended, especially as many workers have had to sacrifice their jobs. A reduction in the amount of the Vote will be an intimation to the Government not to make another appointment when the present term expires.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	9
Noes	..	..	..	20

Majority against .. .. 11

AYES.	
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Lamond	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Lutey	Mr. Withers
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Munroe
Mr. McCallum	

(Teller.)

## NOES.

Mr. Barnard	Mr. J. I. Mann
Mr. Brown	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Collier	Mr. Parker
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Doney	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Latham	Mr. Wells
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. North

(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Vote put and passed.

[Mr. Richardson resumed the Chair.]

*Votes—Executive Council, £5; London Agency, £11,674; Public Service Commissioner, £1,506; Government Motor Car Service, £761—agreed to.*

*Vote—Printing, £69,028:*

Mr. SAMPSON: I want to deal with the printing of departmental reports.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot continue the general discussion. To which item does he wish to refer?

Item, Foremen, Compositors, etc., £44,000:

Mr. SAMPSON: I will deal with the point I wish to raise under the item relating to the various workers and will draw attention to the decrease in the total vote of £6,963. I am glad to see a substantial decrease, but I think the Government could go further. The printing of the report of the Mines Department cost about £308. During the session a number of other large reports will be presented, and I question whether they are really essential.

Mr. Munsie: If there is one report that is essential, it is the report issued by the Mines Department.

Mr. SAMPSON: I thought the money could be better spent in sending prospecting parties out to look for gold.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must confine his remarks to the item.

Mr. SAMPSON: I ask the Premier to consider whether a further saving could not be made in connection with the printing of these reports.

The Minister for Lands: You know that this item deals with salaries only.

Vote put and passed.

*Vote—Tourist Bureau, £2,043—agreed to.*

*Vote—Literary and Scientific Grants, etc., £11,117:*

Item, Public Library, Museum and Art Gallery of Western Australia, and Travelling Library, £7,700:

Mr. CORBOY: The item shows a decrease of £100. A footnote at the bottom of the division indicates that the item includes £100 for the schools travelling library. I trust the Government do not intend to effect the saving of £100 at the expense of the travelling library for the schools.

The Premier: There is no intention to cut out that amount.

Mr. CORBOY: Then it is just a coincidence that the amounts are the same?

The Premier: Yes.

Vote put and passed.

*Votes—Treasury, £20,239; Audit, £14,695; Compassionate Allowances, etc., £1,047; State Savings Bank, £56,441; Government Stores, £15,494—agreed to.*

*Vote—Taxation, £30,000:*

Item, Commissioner of Taxation, £900:

Mr. CORBOY: I understood there was some arrangement with the Federal Government, who are responsible for the payment of this officer's salary.

The PREMIER: The Vote of £30,000 is paid by the Federal Government, which covers the whole of the amounts referred to in the Vote. It is really the concern of the Federal Government as to the payment of this officer.

Vote put and passed.

*Vote—Workers' Homes Board, £15,088—agreed to.*

*Vote—Miscellaneous Services, £253,679:*

Item—Workers' Compensation Act Fund, £4,000:

Mr. McCALLUM: The item shows a decrease of £2,535. Will the Premier give us an explanation of the reduction?

The PREMIER: We shall have to contribute whatever is necessary during the year. The item is a bulk one and shows a Vote of £4,000 this year as against £6,000 last year. If it is necessary to pay more than is provided, we shall have to do so.

Mr. Willcock: This represents one of the pious hopes for reduced expenditure.

The PREMIER: The only pious thing I know of in the Committee is the hon. member who made that interjection.

Mr. Willcock: And that was a silly remark, too.

The PREMIER: Perhaps so.

Mr. McCALLUM: The law places the obligation upon the Government to provide certain expenditure and I presume that will be provided irrespective of what vote may be set against the item.

The Premier: Yes, whatever the amount may be.

Mr. McCALLUM: I cannot understand why the Vote is so substantially reduced under this heading, unless it be that the Government will not be carrying on so much work, which means there will not be so much employment and therefore a correspondingly decreased risk. I want to know that the decreased Vote does not indicate the Government's intention to reduce the benefits payable to the workers under the provisions of the Workers' Compensation Act.

The Premier: No, it has nothing to do with that. The hon. member knows that certain payments have to be made.

Mr. McCALLUM: That is so, but we can take it that the item does not indicate the intention of the Government to reduce the benefits payable to the workers. The railways have to be run; the harvest has to be garnered; public utilities have to be carried on. There will be a substantial number of men employed.

The Premier: This item does not cover the railway employees, but only those in smaller activities. The railways item would be bigger than this in itself.

Mr. McCALLUM: At any rate, it is not the intention of the Government to reduce the benefits under the Workers' Compensation Act.

The Premier: The item does not refer to that.

Item, Unemployment, Wheat Belt Investigation, £119:

Mr. SLEEMAN: Does the item indicate that unemployment was so bad in the wheat belt that it was necessary for the Government to send someone up to deal with it?

The PREMIER: The amount was spent in travelling to induce farmers to make use

of loans authorised by the Agricultural Bank but not availed of promptly.

Vote put and passed.

Votes—Group Settlement, £2,539; State Accident Insurance Office, £3,700; Agricultural Bank, Industries Assistance Board, Soldiers' Land Settlement, £5; Agriculture, £64,698; College of Agriculture, £10,342—agreed to.

Progress reported.

## ADJOURNMENT—ROYAL SHOW.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [9.50]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till Thursday, 9th October, at 4.30 p.m.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 9.51 p.m.

## Legislative Council,

Thursday, 9th October, 1930.

	PAGE
Leave of absence	918
Bills: State Trading Concerns Act Amendment, 3R.	918
Inspection of Scaffolding Act Amendment, 2R.,	
Com.	919
Traffic Act Amendment, 1R.	924
Local Courts Act Amendment, 1R.	924
Vermis Act Amendment, 2R.	924

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

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. H. Stewart, leave of absence for six consecutive sittings granted to Hon. W. T. Glasheen (South-East) on the ground of urgent private business.

## BILL—STATE TRADING CONCERNS ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time, and transmitted to the Assembly.