Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I really cannot tell the House that, but I should say that the president would not be a politician. I take it that the Government in appointing a layman as President of the Arbitration Court would realise at least, even if they were actuated by any other reason, what public opinion is and I am sure that the Government will endeavour, to the best of their ability, to get hold of the most impartial man available and a man with a knowledge of industrial matters. I do not say that even a layman would have a knowledge of the whole of the industrial matters of this State, and I say that it is a credit to the past presidents of the Arbitration Court that they have grasped so well all the details of the various industries with which they have had to deal; but I would add that a judge, by the very nature of his profession, cannot possibly give that attention to industrial matters which is necessary in order to effectively carry out the provisions of an Arbitration measure. I have much pleasure in moving—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Hon. D. G. Gawler debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 6.5 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 7th December, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Premier: 1, Indenture under the Fisheries Act between the Government and Henry Barron Rodway; 2, Report of the Inspector General of the Insane for 1910.

QUESTION—LAND ASSESSOR.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS asked the Minister for Works: 1, On what date was Mr. L. A. Woolf appointed assessor to the Government in connection with land resumption? 2, Had Mr. Woolf any special experience as a land or property valuer, or what were his qualifications entitling him to the position? 3, Who was the assessor prior to Mr. Woolf's appointment, how long had he acted, why were his services dispensed with, and in what manner were his services dispensed with?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, On 7th February, 1911, Mr. L. A. Woolf was appointed to act as assessor in any compensation court proceedings resulting from the recent railway resumptions in Perth; but there is not, nor has there ever been, any permanent position of Government assessor. Mr. Woolf's qualifications were his commercial, legal, and actuarial knowledge, his proved ability to weigh evidence (a qualification indispensable in an assessor acting in a judicial capacity), and his firm and irreproachable character. 3, Mr. T. Tate acted as assessor in two cases spread over

eight years. At a conference with the Crown law officers, about a dozen names of the most prominent business men in the city were listed, and after careful elimination it was ultimately decided that Mr. Woolf was the most suitable. Mr. Tate's services were simply not availed of, although his assistance in valuating has since been obtained.

BILLS (3)—THIRD READING.

1, Appellate Jurisdiction, *passed.*
2, Licensing Act Amendment.
3, Collie Rates Validation.
Transmitted to the Legislative Council.

BILL—AGRICULTURAL BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

Recommittal.

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

Clause 3—Amendment of Sections 28 and 29:

The MINISTER FOR LANDS moved an amendment—

That all words after "pursuits" in line 7 down to "industry" in line 13 be struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—"or in any industry that the Governor may by proclamation declare to be a rural industry, for any purpose incidental to or in aid of any such business, pursuit, or industry, including the erection of a dwelling-house for the borrower on or adjacent to any land occupied or used by him in connection with such business, pursuit, or industry: Provided that no advance shall be made to any borrower for the purpose of any proclaimed rural industry to an amount exceeding a sum to be limited by such proclamation.

As originally inserted the clause followed the lines of the corresponding provision in the State Bank Act of South Australia, and in his opinion at the time it fully provided that where any departure was proposed to be made by the trustees of the Agricultural Bank from the lines already laid down in regard to loans for clearing and other farming work it would be necessary to have a proclamation before they embarked on that new departure; but, having promised the leader of the Opposition to make absolutely sure he had since submitted the matter to the Crown Law authorities, who had thereupon drafted this new amendment. The amendment would make it absolutely certain that before the trustees could depart from the existing lines in regard to lending on farmers' securities for ordinary work the new departure must be proclaimed, and therefore approved by the Governor in Council. It also provided a limit to the amounts which might be advanced by proclamation.

Mr. MITCHELL: The amendment was perfectly satisfactory, because it now meant that the Minister would control the policy of the country, and that was what members on the Opposition side had asked for. They had been anxious to make sure that the trustees would not fix the policy of the country, but that the policy would be determined beforehand by the Government. He took it that the works which the Minister had in mind, for which money might be advanced, were more or less small works, as, for instance, when a fruit-grower desired to instal a small cold storage plant on his property.

The Minister for Lands: Yes.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause as amended agreed to.

[*The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.*]

Bill again reported with further amendment.

BILL—WORKERS' HOMES.

In Committee.

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

Clauses 1 to 5—agreed to.

Clause 6—Workers' homes fund:

The PREMIER moved—

That the consideration of the clause be postponed.

The leader of the Opposition, when speaking on the second reading, had made reference to the clause, and since looking into it and conferring with the Parlia-

mentary Draftsman he (the Premier) found that it was not in accordance with his desires. He desired that the funds at the disposal of the Treasurer, such as Savings Bank funds, could be used for the purpose of the workers' homes, and under the clause, as it stood, that could not be done. The clause was being redrafted to allow the Treasurer to use such funds, and also to provide that any moneys repaid to the Treasurer by the board should be applied to the redemption of any loan moneys, or mortgaged bonds used for the purposes of the Act, and should not go into Consolidated Revenue.

Motion put and passed; the clause postponed.

Clauses 7, 8—agreed to.

Clause 9—Expenditure on area for surveying, etcetera:

Mr. BOLTON: Would not this clause be affected by the postponement of Clause 6? This gave the board power to expend money from the fund on draining, road making, subdividing, etcetera, and if the Treasurer desired to operate from another fund it might be necessary to amend the clause to that effect.

The PREMIER: This was merely a provision to expend money after the funds had been provided. His object was to enable the Treasurer to draw, not only on Consolidated Revenue and General Loan Fund, but also to issue mortgage bonds from the Savings Bank, the same as was done in connection with the Agricultural Bank. That would not affect the expenditure from the fund when once created.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 10—Area set apart for parks, etcetera:

Mr. BOLTON: How did the Premier propose to redeem the mortgage bonds if he had power to expend money on recreation grounds and parks?

The PREMIER: The reference to parks and recreation grounds applied to large areas repurchased or waste Crown lands set apart and dedicated to the purpose of workers' homes. When deciding on the rental for the land the board would lump up the total cost, including the cost of providing the land and effecting the improvements. It must be understood that if it were a matter of repurchase, whilst the land was being bought wholesale the board would be retailing it, and thus making a profit, as was being done to-day by land agents, who bought up large estates and subdivided them; the Mount Lawley estate, for instance. Some of these people were making up to 250 per cent. profit, and yet making no provision at all for parks and recreation grounds for the people. This clause provided that the Minister might take some portion of any such large area for the purpose of parks and reserves, and the money would only be expended out of the profits. The provision would not apply where a single block had been resumed and set apart for workers' homes, but to any large estate which the Government might cut up for that purpose.

Mr. BOLTON: The principle of having parks and recreation grounds was to be commended, but it was difficult to see how it would be possible when acquiring a large estate, charging three per cent. ground rent, and then creating parks and reserves, to charge the added cost to the smaller allotments of the subdivision. The added improvements by the creation of parks and reserves could not be charged to the individual allotments until they actually were parks and reserves, and yet the three per cent. ground rent would have to include the cost of such parks and reserves.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: The Treasurer's definition of capital value absolutely precluded any moneys expended on parks and reserves being added to the capital value of the estate. In Clause 10 it was provided that parks and recreation grounds might be created by the expenditure of money from the Fund. Evidently it was supposed to be an expenditure totally apart from the scheme in general. The member for South Fremantle was quite right in asking where these moneys were to come from.

Mr. Bolton: I want to know how it is to be recouped.

Mr. Mitchell: It is to be added to the cost of the ground.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: It was not so.

The Premier: That capital value is for the purpose of arriving at the rental.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: The member for South Fremantle wanted to know where the Treasurer was going to get the money to spend in the creation of parks and reserves, and then how he was going to get repaid that money which he expended. It could not be repaid out of the three per cent. We were going to lose on that transaction, apart from public parks or recreation grounds. There ought to be some other means of recouping the cost of the improvements carried out from the public funds on those recreation grounds.

The PREMIER: The leader of the Opposition had fallen into the same error as other people had done in connection with the Bill. This applied to large estates purchased for the purpose of dedicating land on which to erect workmen's dwellings. It would deal probably with 1,000 acres. The Government had had under offer during the last two months estates within the metropolitan district totalling something like 3,000 or 4,000 acres, and these were from people who were complaining about the policy of the Government.

Mr. Frank Wilson: That is just the reason.

The PREMIER: Two of those estates were in districts which would eventually be served by railways. If the Government repurchased an estate, say, for £5,000, built a railway through it, and made a suburb of it, that estate might some months later, be worth £50,000. After purchase, the land was cut up, surveyed, provision was made for drainage and roads, water was laid on, and perhaps railway communication was provided, then the value of the land was appraised, and the appraisement would include what was set out in Clause 3. All this gave an added value to the estate, with the result that the 3 per cent. on the unimproved value of the land would be about 20 per cent. on the actual outlay. There were men in Perth to-day who had made fortunes in dealing with estates in the same way. The Government were now going to do a little bit on behalf of the State and provide homes for workers at the same time. Take the Mt. Lawley estate as an example. The people who held that to-day bought it for a mere song, and at the present time were disposing of it for from £3 to £8 per foot, simply because they went to a little expense and even paid the Government to connect it with the water supply. It would be on the appraisement that the Government would get 3 per cen. A profit would be shown on the operations, and from the profits there would be provided parks and recreation grounds. That was a fair and a business-like proposition. Having carried out all the improvements, the value of the land was raised, and the Government were asking that there should be paid 3 per cent. on the capital unimproved value, and from that it would be possible to recoup the Treasurer for his outlay, and, in addition, find money with which to beautify the place.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: The Treasurer had missed his vocation; he ought to have been a land agent or an auctioneer, judging by the way he was booming up the land which he proposed to set apart. When the measure was being introduced the cry was that the Government were going to give workers homes at cost price; now the Premier declared he was going to make 20 per cent. profit out of the scheme. Who was going to pay for that? The worker. The man who applied for one of these up-to-date residences would have to pay the 20 per cent. that the Premier forecasted would be the amount which the 3 per cent. rental would swell into by the time he had spent all his money on improvements. If he was going to carry out the scheme as he introduced it, and if he was going to be true to the workers and give them their homes at cost price, then the scheme was going to be a failure; but if the Premier was going to act as auctioneer or commission agent, or land shark, then the poor worker would have to pay 20 per cent. What would become of this 3 per cent. when it had been collected, or the 20 per cent.

which it would swell into? Was it not going back into revenue?

The Premier: No.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: This 20 per cent. would be made out of the expenditure of Loan Funds, which would be spent on the improvements, and then the poor workers were going to be charged until they paid 20 per cent. for the land, and that money was going back into Consolidated Revenue.

The PREMIER: Before the leader of the Opposition put in an appearance in the Chamber, the consideration of Clause 6 was postponed, because it was not desired that the money should go back into Consolidated Revenue. Provision was being made that it should be used for the purpose of redeeming the mortgage bonds or the general revenue, according to where the money came from.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: The Treasurer was repaying his Loan Fund by a sinking fund. He was going to pay it twice over. The point the Committee were dealing with was that of the 3 per cent. which the Premier had declared would swell into 20 per cent. when he had finished manipulating it. Some provision should be made in connection with the clause which would satisfy the member for South Fremantle.

Mr. BOLTON: The leader of the Opposition did not know much about how values were created, and while at first he though he had a champion to assist him, he found that that champion was getting deeper into the mire. He had asked the Premier for an explanation, but had got from him a ten minutes' discourse on unimproved values, and how they were created. Provision was made for parks and recreation grounds, for which purpose moneys from the fund were to be expended. He had asked whether, even if no money were spent on these recreation grounds and parks at the time of the first appraisement they would still be regarded as an added value to the estate and so charged for, although they were represented only by survey pegs. Further, he had wanted to know where the money was to come from for these parks if they were not made a charge from the appraisement. To both these questions the Premier had returned satisfactory replies.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 11—Disposal of dwellings by lease:

Mr. MITCHELL: It was to be hoped the Premier would let the occupiers of the land have it at cost for at any rate 20 years, and at the same time charge a sufficient rate of interest to cover the cost of the moneys to the Crown, which three per cent. would not do. Would the Premier assure the Committee that he was not out to make money by these people who were going to occupy the homes, and that he would face the position in a businesslike manner and charge a fair rate of interest?

The PREMIER: No such assurance as that asked for was needed from a Labour Government. It was unnecessary to ask a Labour Government to deal fairly with the workers. All that was necessary for him to say was that the Government were not desirous of practising the tricks of private persons who bought large estates and looked for a profit of 40 or 50 per cent. on subdivision. The Government would provide homes for the workers at the lowest possible cost, making sure, of course, that the Government did not sustain any loss, for it was to be remembered that the money to be utilised represented the savings of other people.

Mr. MUNSIE: In Subclause (a) provision was made for a reappraisement at every 20 years. The term was too long. There was no question that the unimproved value of an estate dealt with under the Bill would appreciably increase after four or five years.

The PREMIER: It was provided that the owner of a dwelling could not dispose of it except to the board, when he would merely receive a refund of the money he had paid, less depreciation. So, although the value of the land might be increasing, it was not the owner who would get any monetary benefit from it. True, the place might become a better place to live in, and so, perhaps, the owner would be paying too low a rent; but there was no oc-

casion to be nervous about that so long as the State got the unearned increment in the long run. To be reappraising every few years would be to render the system unpopular. It was desired to show that the worker could be in possession of his home more securely under this system than under freehold.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Too much was being made of the idea that the land would increase in value. He hoped that the selling values of the land would considerably decrease. In making the first appraisement consideration should be given to the point that, after all, the house was only valuable as a place to live in. If the scheme prospered, as he hoped it would, it would be found that the selling values of land would not increase, but rather decrease.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: It was to be hoped the Treasurer would put this clause on a proper financial foundation. Nobody, whether the State or a private individual, had a right to fix a rate of interest which was not sufficient to cover the value of the money expended, and then in an indirect way to make up the difference. We ought to set the scheme on a proper financial foundation by seeing that a proper rate of interest was charged, and then, after that, make as many concessions as we could. It had been argued that because some of the Crown lands would be used in this scheme, lands which were already in the possession of the State, that we would be justified in utilising them without considering their value. It did not matter whether it was Crown lands or repurchased estates. The Crown lands represented a certain value and belonged to the people as a whole, and whoever under this Bill got a special advantage from the national estate ought to pay a fair value. The value of money was what the Treasurer had to pay for it. It did not matter whether the estate was Crown estate or repurchased estate, the value of the land was worth 4 per cent., and the people who were going to get the benefit of it under the Bill ought to pay 4 per cent.

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

Ayes	28
Noes	12
Majority for	16

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. McDonald
Mr. Bath	Mr. McDowall
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Collier	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Dooley	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Foley	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Gill	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Green	Mr. Turvey
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Walker
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Heitmann (*Teller*).
Mr. Lander	
Mr. Lewis	

NOES.

Mr. Broun	Mr. A. N. Piesse
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. S. Stubbs
Mr. Male	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Mitchell	Mr. Wisdom
Mr. Monger	Mr. Layman (*Teller*).
Mr. Moore	
Mr. A. E. Piesse	

Clause thus passed.

Clauses 12 to 14—agreed to.

Clause 15—Worker's dwelling exempt from land tax:

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Would the Premier explain why a holder of these dwellings should be exempted under the Land and Income Tax Assessment Act?

The PREMIER: Charging the worker 3 per cent. on the capital unimproved value was tantamount to levying a land tax on the freehold. Seeing that we would compel the holder to return a percentage of the unearned increment of the land, it would not be fair to double the tax. There would be no exemption from income tax. It was the dwelling that was exempted, and not the worker; and the dwelling was exempted from the land tax.

Mr. A. E. Piesse: Is it exempted from municipal taxes?

The PREMIER: No. The holder must recoup the board for payment of any local taxes or fire insurance, and was merely exempted from the land tax.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: There might be some ground for the Premier's argument in connection with Crown lands, but in connection with repurchased estates, costing 4 per cent., in which the State money was used, the holder was to be charged only 3 per cent., and yet, in addition, was to escape the land tax.

The Minister for Lands: He pays the land tax in the rent.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: That was absurd, because the man would be paying less than the repurchased estate would cost the Government. Again, if the repurchased estate was worth 4 per cent. on the capital value, Crown lands adjoining would surely be worth that, and no distinction should be made between the two; yet hon. members did so and, in addition, sought to relieve the holders of these blocks from land tax.

The Premier: Because the rent is the tax.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: The object of a land tax was to raise revenue, though it might be made too burdensome for people to own land.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: There was a difference in the understanding of terms. We could not speak of this taxation as revenue; it was really restitution of a measure of value imparted by the community to the land, and paid back as an impost. It was not a tax in this case, where the land belonged to the Crown, and provision was made periodically for the Crown to receive the increase of value caused by the population. It would be unjust to tax the owner. Whatever value accrued, accrued to the Crown. We retained the ownership and taxed the land; it was a tax or economic rental. It would be absolutely unjust to place a double impost and say, "You must pay the economic rental and on top of that you must pay a tax."

The PREMIER: So that there should be no misunderstanding as to the application of the clause he moved an amendment—

That in line 1, after "dwelling," the words "under this Part" be inserted.

Then it would apply only to worker's dwellings under this Part.

Amendment passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 16 to 22—agreed to.

Clause 23—Advances for homes:

Mr. BOLTON: Suppose a man had a house mortgaged to a building society, had the board power to release the mortgage and allow the dwelling to become a worker's dwelling.

The Premier: No.

Mr. BOLTON: What was the reason for Subclause 3 then?

The Premier: By reason of the oppressive interest.

Mr. BOLTON: There was the six per cent. provided for under this part; would the amount be six per cent. over an extended term?

The Premier: That would be governed by regulation.

Mr. BOLTON: If a freehold was under mortgage, and the board released the mortgage, would it be a freehold when the amount was paid to the board?

The PREMIER: Clause 28 said that with respect to every mortgage under the Bill the loan should be for a term of years to be agreed between the board and the mortgagor, provided that the buildings were to be of certain material. The term was 30 years, or 20 years, or 15 years. If the Government lifted an existing mortgage the board and the mortgagor would have to agree on the terms of the loan. It might be for 30, 20 or 15 years, but it would have to be provided that the instalments would repay the loan together with the interest. It would not become a worker's dwelling because the owner would retain the freehold.

Mr. GREEN: According to Subclause (a) advances might be made to erect a dwelling-house on a holding. This was the trail of the serpent. This was the proposal of the present Opposition, and as a labourite he protested against the clause being in the Bill. The tendency would be that the average man would seek to get the freehold in order that at the end of 20 years he might traffic in his block. Under the leasehold system, and for which this Bill was mainly issued, it would be impossible for the

money lender and land grabber to get a worker's home from him. We were not desirous of helping on the further exploitation of land, which would be a very great danger if we allowed Subclause (a) to go through. If there were freeholds alongside leaseholds a person would be better able to traffic in freehold than leasehold. He was inclined to think that no very great business would be done in building homes on leasehold land. People should be educated to the fact that leaseholds were good, and if the Government restricted the operation of the Bill in lending money only on leaseholds, people would readily avail themselves of it when they saw that they could live upon it as well as on a freehold. This clause would only play into the hands of the boodler and money lender, and out of the Bill, from which we expected so much, the bankers, the money lenders and traffickers in land would ultimately come into what they considered their own. The whole intention of the Bill would be defeated if the Government advanced money to erect buildings on freehold land. There was a difficulty in overcoming the matter of those who had already freeholds.

The PREMIER: While holding very much in common with the member for Kalgoorlie, and desirous of seeing the national asset remain in the hands of the Crown——

Mr. Green: And the Bill become effective.

The PREMIER: The Bill did not bring the land into the hands of the Government. Personally, he would have no objection to inserting a clause providing that the holder of a freehold piece of land might, by transferring it to the board, continue to lease it under Part III. of the Bill.

Mr. S. Stubbs: Very few would do that.

The PREMIER: This could be done, he thought, and he would confer with the Parliamentary Draftsman with a view to having a clause provided and inserted in this part of the Bill enabling this to be done, and the member for Wagin would then be surprised at the number of persons who would convert their freeholds into leaseholds. After all they were not committing the people indiscriminately to making use of the homes, but to deal with the cases mentioned by the member for Kalgoorlie provision was made in Clause 35 that a holding on which an advance had been made should not be transferred, let, or sublet without the consent of the board, and the clause before the Committee distinctly referred to the erection of a dwelling "as a home for himself and his family."

Mr. Green: But after he has paid for it?

The PREMIER: After the man had paid for the home he might traffic in it. He held that with a provision such as he had indicated, the people would come under the leasehold principle readily in order to get the benefit of the difference in interest charges. The board were absolutely protected by Clause 35. The Government ought, first of all, to show the practicability and advantage of the leasehold system, and when they had done that they could extend the system, because public opinion would have grown to such an extent that people would ask for it and press for the leasehold system as against the freehold.

Mr. Mitchell: As they do in New Zealand.

The PREMIER: The Committee were not to be guided altogether by New Zealand, but even in that country there were more applications for leasehold than for freehold.

Mr. Green: The whole of the Dutch Colonies are held under leasehold, and they are more progressive than any British colony.

The PREMIER: In this measure the Government had gone further than any similar measure in the British Dominions, and the member for Kalgoorlie ought to recognise that they were making some headway, and he ought to be agreeable to going as far as they had gone in other States in advancing money to persons to erect homes on their own holdings, especially as the Government were safeguarded in the limitation of the amount to be loaned to any one individual.

Mr. MITCHELL: It would be a scandal if this clause were eliminated. Why should not a man with a freehold be able to borrow money? The charging of the owner of a freehold 6 per cent. as against 5 per cent. charged to the man with the leasehold was wrong. The proposal to penalise the man with a freehold was a scandal.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member should not refer to anything in this House as a scandal.

Mr. MITCHELL: It was an iniquitous thing that the interest should be at a higher rate on freeholds than on leaseholds. He hoped the clause would be allowed to stand.

Mr. GREEN: To prevent the possibility of money being advanced to a man holding the fee simple he was desirous of striking out portion of either paragraph (a) or paragraph (b). He intended to press that point, and he asked for either the support of the Government or an assurance that they would not loan money to any man with the freehold. It would be a blemish on the measure and would destroy the whole character of the Bill. Members knew how democratic measures in the past had been defeated by parasites of land agents and men of that kidney.

The PREMIER: No such assurance as the member for Kalgoorlie asked for could be given. Whilst the freehold system existed in the State, he was not going to say that no man holding a freehold could get any benefits that a labour Administration gave. He did not believe that it should be provided that these benefits should be restricted to those who believed in the policy of the Government The member for Kalgoorlie was going too far. There was no justification for making any distinction between the leaseholder and the freeholder, except that they charged the leaseholder, as one who was continually contributing to the revenue of the country, a lower rate of interest. The man with the freehold had a long way to go before he could make use of his purchase, and it would be a very unwise step to do as the member for Kalgoorlie suggested, for the House would then have to abolish the whole of the Bill except Part 3, which dealt with advances under the leasehold system. The danger was not so great as the hon. member imagined. There was a possibility of a man paying off the whole mortgage and then trafficking in the property, but as the Government were already relieving him from a position that he could not get out of at present, owing to the exorbitant interest charged by private people, he would not be likely to make any further arrangements which would put him in the same ditch as the Government had helped him out of. The public would have to be educated up to the advantages of the leasehold system, but if they were going to do things in the face of public opinion ultimately they would have public opinion against them; besides it was clearly provided that such a dwelling was to be "a home for himself and his family."

Mr. THOMAS: There was no very serious danger in this clause because it was provided that the board "may, with the approval of the Minister," make advances, and if the Minister discovered that there was any undue trafficking in these properties he could easily put a stop to it, and, if necessary, suitable legislation could be introduced. It would be unfair to exclude from the benefits of the Bill all sections of the community who did not believe in the leasehold system.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: It would be desirable to see the object of the member for Kalgoorlie realised, but in this reform we must crawl before we could walk. The leasehold system must first of all be instituted so that its superiority over freehold could be proved to the people. He had no objection to freehold existing alongside of leasehold, but ultimately he would like to see the tax on freehold land and the rent of leasehold land made precisely the same; then there would be no difficulty. By the time these homes became the property of the persons for whom they were built the incidence of land taxation would be greatly increased. The leasehold system would become popular as soon as it was brought into existence and administered in a sympathetic manner. So far as the point made by the member for Bun-

bury was concerned, there could be no trafficking in these properties until they were out of the hands of the Minister, and immediately the home was paid for the Minister had no power over the individual. However, there would be very few of the homes paid for inside 10 years, and in that time we were going to make enormous progress in the system of land taxation.

Mr. DOOLEY: Whilst not opposed to advancing money for improvements on freeholds in existence, still the objection of the member for Kalgoorlie was to be found in paragraph (b), which contained the words "to purchase a dwelling-house and the land enclosed or occupied therewith." That portion of the clause could be struck out without interfering with the usefulness of the Bill. If a man owned freehold, by all means assist him in the same way as the individual who was applying for a leasehold. But individuals should not be encouraged to go to the Government and borrow money for the purpose of acquiring freehold land. That was the essence of the objection raised by the member for Kalgoorlie.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This was a matter over which the board had absolute control under the guidance of the Minister. To-day the worker was paying for the purchase of a home, and may be paying a high rate of interest, and there was no reason why the worker should not be able to go to the board, and after making out a genuine case the board would have power to release him. We could imagine in Perth a man owning a large number of buildings, and immediately influencing the workers to get the board to purchase those buildings, to relieve him. In this case it was not anticipated that every proposition submitted to the board would meet with its approval. There were workers who deserved some consideration, which could only be granted under the provision in Subclause (b).

Mr. GREEN moved an amendment—

That in paragraph (a) of Subclause 2 the words "to erect a dwelling house on his holding as a home for himself and his family, if any, or" be struck out.

Perhaps the Premier would give him some idea how what he desired could best be accomplished.

The Premier: Vote against the whole paragraph.

Mr. GREEN: There was no objection to the man who was already in the hands of the money lender going to the Government to obtain relief.

Mr. McDOWALL: The clause was a reasonable one in every direction, and the amendment should not be carried. A person might have a struggle to get a bit of land and build two or three rooms on it, and if he could obtain money from the Government on better terms than he had got it from the money lender, it was reasonable and proper that that should be done. The clause should certainly be left in the Bill, especially as the Premier had already stated that he would consult the Parliamentary Draftsman with the idea of inserting a clause in this part of the Bill to enable persons, if they chose, to convert their freehold land into leasehold, so that it might come under the reduced interest. The incentive was the reduction of the interest, and thereby that person would be placed in the position that anyone else might be in. We would be going too far if we struck out a clause of this kind. He hoped that the change would be gradual.

Mr. Green: What about the Labour platform?

Mr. McDOWALL: That was not at stake in connection with this particular matter. The non-alienation of Crown lands was totally different from this question. The ultimate nationalisation was perfectly consistent with this proposal. We did not expect ultimate nationalisation to come about at once. The statement that we heard was tantamount to the misrepresentation which took place during the elections and which practically said that we were going to call in all title deeds. We were reasonable members of the community and would not be violating the platform of the Labour party in proposing a reasonable measure of this kind.

Mr. DWYER: If the Committee were to strike out any portion of the clause it would inflict a great hardship on a large

number of people whom the Bill was meant primarily to relieve and assist. There was not a single section of the clause that could be omitted without harming the Bill and the people for whom it was intended. We might, of course, desire that people should take the land under Part III., but the two were entirely distinct while they seemed to run on parallel lines. Under Part III. a leaseholder got certain obvious advantages, and probably amongst these were the freedom from the land tax and the reduced rate of interest. Under Part IV., a person who had the fee simple was, if he might use the expression, penalised to the extent of one per cent. in the shape of interest, while he still had to pay his land tax and other burdens. If we were to bring relief to these persons who were already oppressed by usurious money lenders, or if we were to assist the man who had a holding, the only way to do it was by passing this clause in its entirety. Since the suggestion had been made that he might have freedom of action to alter the tenure of his land to that of leasehold, he failed to see how anyone could take exception to that relief being given by the clause as it stood.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 24 and 25—agreed to.

Clause 26—Advance to be secured by mortgage:

Mr. S. STUBBS: Subclause 2 provided that the provisions of the Bills of Sale Act should not apply to any mortgage or other security executed under the provisions of the Bill, or affect the validity of any such mortgage or security in respect to any chattels comprised therein. Did he understand from the clause that if a man with his family resided in one of the houses erected under this Bill and, for the sake of argument, that man found himself out of work, and for some time could not get employment, he might be compelled to go to Kalgoorlie or somewhere else in search of work, and in the meantime if his wife and family had not the means left to them to pay cash for their goods from the tradespeople, and the tradespeople gave them the necessary credit, believing that the head of the family was an honourable man, and if the amounts increased to £10 or £20, would the tradesman be able to get a bill of sale over the goods and chattels in the house?

Mr. Dwyer: Not if the Government had a mortgage over them.

Mr. S. STUBBS: Then there would be serious difficulty for the people who found themselves unable to obtain employment. If we could bring in a Bill which, while keeping up the high wages now being earned, would prevent people spending their money in hotels, it would be very much better. He had seen a good deal of this sort of thing lately, of men earning good wages and spending them in the public houses.

The PREMIER: The hon. member would find that if the first mortgage comprised the chattels in the building, any subsequent bill of sale could not apply to these chattels. This was a universal practice.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 27—agreed to.

Clause 28—Provisions relating to mortgages:

Mr. MITCHELL moved an amendment—

That in line one of paragraph (c) the word "six" be struck out and "five" inserted in lieu.

In his opinion 5 per cent. would be ample to pay for the advances made in respect to freehold.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The same advantages were not given in the Bill to those borrowing under leasehold as to those who borrowed under freehold. In the first place those who borrowed under leasehold could not at any time sell their property to any person but the board, but those who borrowed under freehold, once they had repaid the amount of the loan, could sell to whom they pleased. Because of this advantage a man ought to be very ready to pay 5½ per cent. for his accommodation, because, after all, it meant 5½ per cent. and not 6 per cent., seeing that prompt payments secured a rebate of one-half per cent.

Mr. S. STUBBS: According to the member for Subiaco the time was not far distant when the incidence of the land tax would be so great that owners would be glad to sell to the Government. In the meantime, however, most men perferred freehold to leasehold. He would support the amendment.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: The per centum charged on freehold land should be made equal to the difference between the land tax and the ground rent which was to be charged for leasehold. The land tax was one halfpenny in the pound, while the ground rent for leaeshold was to be 3 per cent. He would like to see the amount chargeable on freehold made 7½ per cent., which would make up precisely the difference as between the land tax and the ground rent. He would oppose the amendment.

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

Ayes	.. .. ..	12
Noes	.. .. ..	29
Majority against	..	17

AYES.

Mr. Broun	Mr. A. E. Piesse
Mr. Harper	Mr. S. Stubbs
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Male	Mr. Wisdom
Mr. Mitchell	Mr. Layman
Mr. Monger	(*Teller*).
Mr. Moore	

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. McDowall
Mr. Bath	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Collier	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Dooley	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Dwyer	Mr. Swan
Mr. Foley	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Gill	Mr. Turvey
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Walker
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Heitmann
Mr. Lander	(*Teller*).
Mr. Lewis	
Mr. McDonald	

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 29 to 37—agreed to.

Clause 38—Extension of time for repayment:

The PREMIER moved an amendment:—

That in line 3 "six" be struck out and "five" inserted in lieu.

The clause provided that in cases of hardship the board might extend the terms of payment, and that the interest on the deferred payment should be six per cent. The object of the amendment was to reduce the interest to five per cent. There was no desire that in cases of hardship higher interest should be charged.

Amendment passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 39 to 50—agreed to.

Progress reported.

BILL—TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Second Reading.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan) in moving the second reading said: I have great pleasure in introducing the Bill to enable the Commonwealth of Australia to construct, within our State, a portion of the Transcontinental railway from Port Augusta to Kalgoorlie, and in doing so it gives me great pleasure, not only on behalf of the people of Western Australia, but on behalf of the people of Australia, to congratulate the Federal Government for having, at last, passed through both Chambers a Bill enabling them to construct this railway. May I say it is a credit to the present Government as against past Governments, who have at every election preached the desirability of constructing this railway, but immediately afterwards forgot the pledges and promises they gave to the people of this State. I want also to say that it is as well we should remember that the whole of the members representing this State in the Federal Parliament have certainly sunk any differences they might have had on other questions in order to combine in assisting the passage of the Bill, and I had great pleasure one day last week in telegraphing to each of those members congratulating them on the assistance they had rendered the present Federal Gov-

ernment. However, I must pay a special tribute to some of the members representing this State, particularly Senators Pearce, DeLargie, Needham, and Lynch, and Representative Fraser, for the manner in which they have at different time in the other States appeared on public platforms to show the people how unfair it was to Western Australia that it should continue without this link between it and the people of the Eastern States. I think it is largely due to their efforts in this direction that the people of Australia have at last authorised the Federal Government to construct the railway. Recognising that the State as a whole is almost unanimously in favour of the construction of this railway, it devolved on us as the Government of the State to render every possible assistance to the Federal Government in their work ; and, while we may disagree in some details in connection with the necessary land which should be granted for the purpose, we will place no obstacle in the way of the Federal Government obtaining all the land they require for the construction, maintenance and working of the railway. There may be a difference of opinion with regard to just what quantity of land is required for the purpose, but that is a matter that can be arranged to the satisfaction both of the Federal Government and the State Government, who represent the people most affected. I am pleased also to say that yesterday I received a telegram from the Premier of South Australia informing me that his Government had decided to grant all the land necessary for the construction, maintenance and working of the railway from Port Augusta to Kalgoorlie.

Mr. Frank Wilson: Then they have dropped the gauge question over there ?

The PREMIER: I do not know that the gauge question is standing in the way at present. I understand the Premier of South Australia recognises that the Federal Government, who are responsible for the construction of the railway, have decided on a 4ft. 8½in. gauge, and that being the case, the South Australian Government are raising no further objection on the score, though they are retaining to themselves the right to call on the Federal Government to assist them in altering their gauge from 5ft. 3in. to 4ft. 8½in., to comply with the wish of the Federal Government to have a uniform gauge throughout Australia. But that is really apart from the Bill we are discussing. The Federal Government first applied to the State Government for a strip of land half a mile in width on both sides of the railway. For the life of me I cannot understand to what possible use they would want to put half a mile on each side of the railway.

Mr. Frank Wilson : They wanted 25 miles on one side.

The PREMIER: I happen to know that on one occasion a statement appeared in the Press from a correspondent in London that the Western Australian Government had promised the Federal Government 25 miles on either side, to be used by the Federal Government for the purpose of paying any loss on the working of the railway. It appeared in the *West Australian*, and was never denied by the then Government. Sir Newton Moore was Premier of the State at the time. I have the newspaper cutting at home and can produce it if necessary.

Mr. Frank Wilson: It does not make any difference.

The PREMIER: But it is giving the Federal Government the opportunity for pressing the claim.

Mr. Frank Wilson : The hon. member surely remembers the stand we took against the 25-miles request.

The PREMIER: That was later.

Mr. Frank Wilson: It was emphatic enough.

The PREMIER: It may have been, but at the same time this report was in the *West Australian* coming from a correspondent in London, and it was not contradicted by the then Government. If I am not greatly mistaken it was Sir Newton Moore himself who made the statement. However, that does not affect the present position. I hold it is not desirable under existing conditions where the State is responsible for the administration of towns and has control of the land

generally within its borders, that the Commonwealth should, within our borders, also establish townsites along their railway line. It must be remembered this is not merely a railway constructed by the Commonwealth Government to comply with the wishes of the people of Western Australia. It is also to comply with the advice they have obtained from their military experts that for the purpose of the proper defence of Australia we must have an iron railroad between the Eastern States and the Western Australian State, which advice has been the lever that has assisted the present Government to pass the Bill through both Chambers with such magnificent majorities. In my opinion it has been a breach of contract between the Eastern States and Western Australia that a Bill for the construction of the railway has not long since been passed through the Federal Parliament. It was generally understood, though we had nothing in writing to the effect, that it was part of the agreement under which Western Australia entered into the Federal bond, and I am certain that a few years after the line is constructed and running the people of Western Australia will then feel that they are a part of the Federal bond which to-day many of them do not feel. The Bill is a very short one. We are not mentioning any particular area of land, but are stating that the Governor may grant to the Commonwealth, for an estate in fee simple, the surface and the land below the surface to a depth not exceeding 200ft. of all such waste lands of the Crown in Western Australia, as, in the opinion of the Minister of State for the Commonwealth for the time being administering any Act of the Parliament of the Commonwealth authorising any such railway as aforesaid, are necessary for the construction, maintenance, and working of the railway intended to be constructed under the powers conferred by such Act. Members will notice I particularly mention in the Bill that we grant the land which, in the opinion of the Minister of State for the Commonwealth, is necessary for the purpose. I do that because there shall be no disagreements or heart burnings with regard to this State concerning the necessary land being held for the purpose.

Mr. Frank Wilson: If he says that half a mile is required you will have to give it to him.

The PREMIER: Not at all. There is a clause in the Commonwealth Bill, Clause 3, which provides that before the construction of the railway can be commenced an Act must be passed by the West Australian Parliament consenting and agreeing to grant such Crown lands as in the opinion of the Minister are necessary for the purposes of the construction, maintenance, and working of the railway. The opinion of the Minister may be that the Commonwealth require all the land from Eucla in the south to Wyndham in the north, but that will not compel the Governor representing this State to give him that land. It is a matter, after all, of conferring between the State and the Commonwealth as to what is sufficient land for the construction, maintenance, and working of the railway. The only point is this, that until such time as we do grant the land and satisfy the Minister of State for the Commonwealth, they cannot proceed with the construction of the Kalgoorlie-Port Augusta railway. It will be an unreasonable attitude for the Minister to demand more land than is reasonably necessary. He has to answer to the people of Australia, and the people of Western Australia included, for not having commenced the railway. We are absolutely protected there. I have no misgivings in being able to confer with the Minister when am in the East later in agreeing as to what is the necessary land. I think the Commonwealth Government will see the advisability of agreeing that town sites springing up alongside the railway shall remain the property and vest in the Government of Western Australia. If that is the case I am prepared to give them all the land they require, even to the half-mile on each side of the line, with the undertaking by the Commonwealth Government that we can resume the fee simple when any town sites are proclaimed. If they want half a mile of land for getting the necessary ballast,

or for getting the necessary timber, then I shall have no objection to giving it.

Mr. Frank Wilson: Do not give the fee simple, but let them take the timber and the ballast.

The PREMIER: I am not prepared, as representing the State of Western Australia, to grant land to the Commonwealth Government to allow them to have the town sites along the railway that may spring up, and I do not think the Commonwealth Government desire that. I have pleasure in presenting the Bill, and moving the second reading, because I believe all members desire that it shall pass immediately.

Mr. Frank Wilson: What about the 200 feet depth?

The PREMIER: That is usually granted except in goldfields areas.

Mr. Frank Wilson: What about the minerals?

The PREMIER: I am not concerned whether it is 40 feet or 200 feet. If members consider it is desirable to strike out 200 feet and insert 40 feet, in the event of minerals being discovered, so that we retain the minerals to the State, at a greater depth than 40 feet from the surface, then I am prepared to do that. I beg to move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Frank Wilson, debate adjourned.

BILL—TOTALISATOR REGULATION.

Second Reading.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan) in moving the second reading said: The Bill that is now before the House is a measure to further regulate the use of the totalisator, and it has been prompted by the fact that we have had a number of people requesting that they should have an opportunity of using the totalisator in connection with various sports that they are responsible for. I may explain that the Bill is principally prompted by the fact that the West Australian Trotting Association, who conduct meetings on a course registered by the Western Australian Turf Club, where the totalisator machines are in use, or buildings necessary for the use of betting by means of the totalisator are erected, but who, under the provisions of the present Act, are precluded from making use of that machine. I see no reason why trotting, as well as galloping, should not be placed exactly on the same footing. Personally I feel inclined to give more encouragement to trotting, because trotting horses are a class of horses of more actual benefit to the community than galloping horses, and I happen to know at the present time that a great number of those who have horses taking part in trotting events are men who are the owners of the horses, the trainers, and even the drivers of the horses themselves, and it is more for the sport than anything else that they take part in these races. There is practically no professionalism in this sport. The horses that take part in galloping events must be stabled under professional care, they are professionally trained and professionally ridden. Trotting horses may be used for the daily work of life, and I may point out the Bill does not interfere with the existing rights so far as it affects the Western Australian Turf Club and the clubs registered by them, but they are in the position of not being able under their rules, to register the West Australian Trotting Association or clubs running trotting races. While they have so far assisted the West Australian Trotting Association by permitting them to hold trotting races on one of the registered racecourses, they point out that, under their rules, they cannot permit them to make use of the totalisator, because only clubs registered by the Western Australian Turf Club can make use of the totalisator machine, that is under their Act. Viewed from another standpoint, to-day we are making use of the totalisator as a means for obtaining revenue, and while we exclude the totalisator from some sports gatherings we do not exclude the bookmaker. If we are going to allow betting at sports gatherings it is better to encourage people to bet through the totalisator, which cannot be up to the

tricks of the bookmaker, and thus benefit the State. In the last financial year the State obtained £7,153 from the use of the totalisator machine. I said that the totalisator was only used on courses registered by the Western Australian Turf Club. I have an advance copy of the report of the Commissioner of Taxation for last year, and I discover he has made some reference to the use of the totalisator. He says—

> The law of the land has since 1883 legalised the use of the totalisator by clubs or companies established for the purpose of promoting horse-racing, and registered by the Western Australian Turf Club (Totalisator Act, 1883 and 1899, and Criminal Code, sec. 209), and since 23rd December, 1905, has imposed a tax on totalisator takings. The Criminal Code, sec. 209, prohibits betting in any house, room or place other than by means of a totalisator conducted on the racecourse of a club, etc., registered by the Western Australian Turf Club. If business of this nature (betting) were confined to the totalisator, it is reasonable to predict that the returns from totalisator duty would be trebled.

It is worth consideration whether it is advisable to abolish the bookmaker and thus give an opportunity of extending the system of the totalisator and thereby adding to the revenue, while removing a lot of the evils that exist by the presence of the bookmaker. But I do not propose to do that on this occasion. Our object is to extend the operations of the totalisator machine to the West Australian Trotting Association, and clubs registered under the Western Australian Turf Club. It may be found necessary later on to extend the Bill still further.

Mr. Monger: What about Bicton and Kensington?

The PREMIER: We have had no application from them and I have given no consideration to extending the use of the machine to other clubs than the West Australian Trotting Asosciation, and other than those using it. Any applications from other sources will be dealt with absolutely on their merits. I am not prepared to say whether we shall do anything in the matter but it shall receive consideration. It will be noticed in the definition that we provide that "horse racing includes trotting racing," and we provide that the Colonial Treasurer may, on payment of the prescribed fees, issue clubs' totalisator licenses under the Bill, and a totalisator license shall, whilst in force, authorise the club holding the same to have, use, and play with one totalisator, or the number of totalisators mentioned in the license on a racecourse specified in the license during, and for the purpose of any and every race meeting held by the club on such course. The fee will undoubtedly be smaller than that now charged, and at the same time we provide in the Bill that the granting of the license shall not be deemed to be a right, but shall be in the uncontrolled discretion of the Colonial Treasurer. No one can claim to have a license and to say it is their's by right; we can exclude anyone except those permitted under the Act of Parliament to do so. They cannot be interfered with, but in the future when an application is made a club cannot claim that they have a right to obtain a license. The Colonial Treasurer is responsible as a Minister to Parliament, and through Parliament to the people, in seeing that the use of the machine is not abused. Under those circumstances I think we are really on safe ground in extending the operations of the totalisator. The other clauses are really machinery clauses in order to enable us to make regulations, and also to provide fresh licenses in cases where the licenses granted in the first instance have been lost. Clause 14 provides that—

> The Western Australian Turf Club and every club or company, incorporated or otherwise, registered by the Western Australian Turf Club, and authorised to have, use, or play with the totalisator shall, in the month of January in every year, pay to the Colonial Treasurer, for the use of His Majesty, a sum equal to the fee payable for a license for a totalisator for such year under this Act.

It was necessary to put it in that way because we did not really issue a license to the West Australian Turf Club. They use the totalisator by powers conferred upon them by Act of Parliament, but as it would be unfair to compel others to pay a license fee unless the Turf Club were made to pay the fee as well, we provide here that they shall pay to the Treasurer an amount equal to the fee payable for a license. I beg to move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Frank Wilson, debate adjourned.

BILL—PERMANENT RESERVE RE-DEDICATION.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. T. H. Bath), in moving the second reading, said: This is a small measure, although it will make a very important change in the reserve which we have in Swan Location in the Darling Ranges, to the east of Perth. The proposal is that the purpose of first class reserve A7537, which has been dedicated as a national park, shall be altered and shall henceforth be dedicated to the purposes of a hospital and sanitorium for consumptives. I might state that the Commissioner of Public Health has been investigating the question of securing a suitable site for the purpose of providing a sanitorium for consumptives, where up-to-date methods might be carried out in order to effect a cure in cases where the complaint has not gone too far; and after personal inspection, in company with officers who have a knowledge of the district, of a number of sites that had been suggested, he has recommended that this would be the most suitable place, and asked that the purpose of the reserve should be changed. The matter has been considered by the Government, and in view of the Commissioner's recommendation they think it desirable to make the alteration.

Mr. Frank Wilson: Have you got the Commissioner's report?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I might inform the House that I have not the plans here this afternoon or the report of the Commissioner of Public Health, so that I will have no objection to the leader of the Opposition, or any other member, adjourning the debate; and I will provide that on Tuesday next a plan showing the reserve and also the report urging that this should be made available for the purposes of a sanitorium, shall be laid on the Table of the House. I beg to move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON (Williams-Narrogin): This National Park is very close to the City, and I should like to ask the Minister for Lands whether arrangements could be made for those hon. members who desire to do so, to inspect the reserve before Tuesday next. It is almost a lung of the City, and I think it would be very desirable that arrangements should be made for such members as may care to do so to see the park in the meantime.

Mr. FRANK WILSON moved—

That the debate be adjourned.

The Minister for Lands: May I be allowed to answer the question of the hon. member for Williams-Narrogin?

Mr. SPEAKER: A motion for the adjournment of the debate having been made, I must put it to the House.

Motion put and passed; the debate adjourned.

BILL—VETERINARY.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

BILL—LOCAL COURTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

BILL—SHEARERS' ACCOMMODATION.

In Committee.

Resumed from the previous day.

Mr. Holman in the Chair; Mr. McDonald in charge of the Bill.

Clause 7—Buildings other than shearing sheds to be kept clean by shearers:

Mr. FRANK WILSON moved an amendment—

That in line 4, Subclause 1, the words "in the opinion of an inspector," be struck out.

If this amendment were carried there would be a subsequent amendment to strike out other words lower down. This amendment related to the keeping of the quarters clean. It was argued that it would be quite impossible, if the shearers had allowed the premises to get into a filthy condition, for the manager to get an inspector on to the station to examine the premises; at any rate, before the inspector could reach the station, the shearing would be over. In Victoria, where there were railways throughout the State, there was provision in the Act giving the manager power to personally inspect the premises, and if they were not clean to either order them to be cleaned out, or have the cleaning carried out and the cost charged up to the shearers. If such provision had been considered necessary in Victoria, how much more was it necessary to have such a provision in this State, where the distances of the stations from the settlements were so great?

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. FRANK WILSON moved an amendment—

That in line 6 of Subclause 1, the following be struck out:—"the inspector shall give to the employer a notice in writing to that effect and such."

Mr. McDONALD: The Bill gave power to the Governor in Council to appoint inspectors for certain districts. The first amendment of the leader of the Opposition having been carried, the clause now compelled the shearers to keep the hut clean, but assuming that in the first instance the hut was clean and fit to be occupied, there was no necessity for inspection to see that the hut was kept clean. Seeing that the first amendment had been carried, it would be just as well to leave in the words now proposed to be struck out, and allow the inspector to give notice to the employer that the hut was not being kept in a clean condition.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: The first amendment having been carried, to leave in the words now proposed to be struck out would make the clause contradictory, and would destroy the object of the first amendment. Some men allowed their rooms to get into a dirty condition, then the employer or the manager could take the initiative and say that the rooms would have to be cleaned, and if that was not done he could have them cleaned up and charge it against the men, otherwise he would have to send miles perhaps for an inspector, and when the inspector arrived the shearing might be over.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The owner of the station was the boss of that station, and if a man was not keeping the place clean the owner could dismiss him. The clause provided that in the event of the manager of a station not keeping the place clean the inspector could order him to do so.

Mr. Frank Wilson: The manager is not going to dismiss a man if he cannot replace him.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: So far as his experience went, if the manager did not want a man he dismissed him. The object of the clause was that if the manager did not look after the place the inspector could order him to do so.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: The clause first placed the responsibility on the shearer of keeping the building clean. All the Committee were concerned about was how to enforce the clause. He had pointed out what appeared to be a great difficulty about enforcing the cleanliness of the quarters, if it was necessary to wait until an inspector appeared on the scene from a great distance away.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: The amendment was not consequential as had been suggested, and as the clause had been amended the manager of the station was given full power to order shearers to clean up the building if it was in a dirty condition, but above that it was also provided that where there might be neglectful shearers and also a neglectful manager, if an inspector happened along and found that the place was in an undesirable condition, that inspector could take the matter in hand.

Mr. Male: Suppose the inspector is a hundred miles away.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: The clause would not prevent the manager taking steps to compel the man to keep the place clean. In the event of the shearers and the manager both being careless the inspector when he came along could take steps to compel the manager to see that the huts were cleaned up.

Mr. LANDER: The omission of these few words would not make very much difference to the Bill, especially when it was remembered that the Government could appoint the owner or the manager of an adjoining station an inspector. Provision was also made for police constables to be appointed as inspectors; therefore there should not be any very serious objection to these words remaining in the clause.

Mr. MALE: It would be very necessary to strike out these few words. He failed to see how the clause would stand unless the words were taken out. Take stations at Kimberley which were 60 and 70 miles apart; it was not possible to appoint a constable at every station an inspector, and it would not be wise to appoint the managers of the stations inspectors, or even one of the head shearers. There was a provision in Clause 8 that an inspector should make an annual inspection of all sheds and report. He would have the opportunity at any time of the year of seeing that the places were clean, and unless the words complained of were struck out the clause could not be made effective.

Mr. NANSON: The discretion of the inspector would be in no wise interfered with if the words were struck out because it was provided in Clause 10 if an inspector after making an inspection had reason to believe that any of the requirements of the Act had not been complied with he could notify the employer and direct him to comply with such requirements. One of these requirements was keeping the sheds clean. The objection raised by the member for Fremantle was fully met by that clause.

Mr. McDONALD: The usual means of procedure during shearing season was that the men kept the sheds clean themselves. If there were many men engaged they appointed what they called a common sergeant who was responsible for keeping the camps clean. There was no doubt about the fact that men would keep their huts clean if they were given to them in the first place in a clean condition, and if they were not in a clean condition they would refuse to go into them. If they became filthy afterwards it would be the duty of the manager to see that they were made fit for the accommodation of the men. This clause was taken from the Victorian Act, which was quite untried, as it had only been law since last October.

Mr. Frank Wilson: The same disabilities of long distances do not apply in Victoria.

Mr. McDONALD: But to meet that disability more inspectors might be appointed. Instead of the matter being left to the will of the manager, a responsible Government officer should be appointed.

Mr. Frank Wilson: Clause 10 gives you all that power.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY: If the hon. member would not agree to strike out the words proposed to be struck out, we might just as well have left in the words "in the opinion of the inspector." In most cases the officer in charge would be made an inspector by the Government. We required an independent man as inspector, and for that reason it would probably be a police officer who would be appointed in all cases. The onus of keeping the shed clean was placed on the shearers, but to make that operative under the clause it would be necessary to get an inspector. The onus having been placed on the shearers, it was necessary for the inspector to give notice to the employer before the shed was cleaned up. But the employer might have to go hundreds of miles in search of an inspector, and it might be a month before he could get hold of a police officer. Clearly the provision that an inspector should be called in for his opinion was absurd. The South Australian Act had had a good trial, and it was there provided that the shed should be handed over to the shearers in a clean condition and maintained in that condition, failing which

the owner might have it cleaned up, and deduct the cost from the money due to the shearers. That was all it was proposed to do under the amendment, merely to bring the clause into line with the corresponding section in the South Australian Act.

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

Ayes	.. .. ..	13
Noes	.. .. ..	27
Majority against	..	14

AYES.

Mr. Broun	Mr. A. E. Piesse
Mr. Harper	Mr. A. N. Piesse
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. S. Stubbs
Mr. Male	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Monger	Mr. Wisdom
Mr. Moore	Mr. Layman
Mr. Nanson	*(Teller).*

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Bath	Mr. McDonald
Mr. Bolton	Mr. McDowall
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Collier	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Dooley	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Dwyer	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Foley	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Gill	Mr. Turvey
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Walker
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Heitmann
Mr. Lander	*(Teller).*

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, put and passed.

Clauses 8 to 10—agreed to.

Clause 11: Order on such complaint:

Mr. FRANK WILSON: The penalty for failure to carry out such order was rather high. Both in Victoria and South Australia it was £10. He moved an amendment—

That the words "twenty-five pounds" in line 3 of Subclause 2 be struck out, and "ten pounds" inserted in lieu.

Mr. McDonald: No objection would be offered to the amendment.

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

Clauses 12 to 15—agreed to.

New clause:

Mr. FRANK WILSON moved—

That the following be added to stand as Clause 16:—"Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act, in the case of the owner or other person having the control of a portable shearing plant and employing not more than fifteen shearers, exclusive of labourers, the Governor in Council may prescribe the nature and extent of the temporary accommodation to be supplied by such owner or person to such shearers and labourers, so that in all respects the health and well-being of such shearers and labourers may be safeguarded."

It was to be hoped the hon. member would see his way clear to accept the new clause. It did not exempt those in control of portable plants from the Act, for the Governor in Council had to prescribe the temporary accommodation. It was understood that there was already one portable plant at work in the State.

Mr. McDONALD: The new clause represented something closely akin to throwing dust. In the first place it provided for 15 shearers, exclusive of labourers, while an earlier clause in the Bill provided that accommodation was necessary in the case of eight shearers and shed hands inclusive. There were very few of these portable plants in Western Australia. There were one or two portable plants in this State but not in any way carrying 15 shearers around to the exclusion of labourers. With the new electric motors any station owner could have a portable machine which he could keep at his homestead and move to the wool shed as required. That would be taken to mean a portable plant, and thus the owner would evade the provisions of the Act.

Mr. Male: How about obtaining the Order-in-Council?

Mr. McDONALD: A letter was referred to in the previous discussion on tent accommodation, and it was claimed that a station owner had asked for tents in preference to accommodation. As a matter of fact, the overseer for the shearing company that shore the sheep on that particular station had given assurance that only one man applied for outside accommoda-

tion, and that was the cook, and it was before the shearing started. As for the proposed clause, one of the leading managers had plans drawn up for hut accommodation, and was waiting for the clause to be passed in order to evade the provisions of the Bill, so as to avoid going to any expenditure.

Mr. MALE: When this clause was introduced into the Victorian House there was no opposition to it, and the provision certainly had a good effect in Queensland. It was not introduced now with any intention to evade the Act, but simply for the purpose of allowing portable plants to be used where required. In a time of drought it might be necessary to take a portable plant out to shear sheep that could not be brought to the shed. In any case, it was amply provided that the Governor-in-Council must approve of any temporary accommodation that was to be provided.

Mr. TAYLOR: If the clause were to apply to portable engines that travelled from one station to another shearing for different squatters, why should not the station owners be compelled to provide proper accommodation for the shearers following the plant as well as for those employed on stationary plants? If the clause were passed the station owners would provide portable plants, and the real object of the Bill would be evaded.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The men working on portable plants ought to have good accommodation provided just as much as men working on stationary plants.

Mr. Male: How about the case of a drought, when they cannot shift the sheep to the shed?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: When sheep could not be shifted they could not be sheared; they could not be mustered. As a matter of fact, certain contractors had motor-engine-driven machine shearing plants, and took contracts at various sheds. The only thing they shifted was the machine, and the owner of the station should still be responsible for providing accommodation for those working for him.

New clause put and negatived.

New clause—Date of commencement:

Mr. FRANK WILSON moved—

That the following be added to stand as a clause:—"This Act shall come into operation on the 15th day of June, 1912."

Mr. McDONALD: The new clause would be accepted.

New clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY, LAND GRANT.

Mr. FRANK WILSON (Sussex): The Premier, in speaking in connection with the Transcontinental Railway Bill, stated that a report was in the Western Australian Press that Sir Newton Moore had said in London that he, or the Government of which he was the head, had promised 25 miles on each side of the Transcontinental railway should be handed over to the Commonwealth. Is that correct?

The Premier: Something of the kind.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Then I would ask the Premier if he would be good enough to cable to Sir Newton Moore.

The Premier: I will not do anything of the sort. I will produce the statement in the *West Australian*.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I say there is no truth in it. I am certain there is no truth in it, but I would ask the Premier to have it contradicted, because it might go forth as being a statement by the then Premier. I never noticed this paragraph in the Press, and I have asked my colleague, the late Attorney General, and he states he knew nothing about it. I think it is only right that the Premier should cable to Sir Newton Moore and get his denial of it. I am satisfied he would get the denial.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan): I do not feel disposed to cable to Sir Newton Moore to ask him whether the statement I made here this afternoon is right or not. I will prove the statement I made by producing the article, and if the hon. member thinks it is fair to Sir Newton Moore that the statement should go uncorrected for another 12 months, then I will cable for him. At present I may

say that the *West Australian* had a letter from their correspondent in London stating that the State Government had agreed, through the head of the Government, that 25 miles along the route of the railway should be given to the Federal Government, as they anticipated that the Federal Government by that could make sufficient to pay for any loss on the railway.

Mr. Frank Wilson: Was Sir Newton Moore in London at the time?

The PREMIER: I am not absolutely certain on that point. However, I will produce the article, and that ought to be sufficient for the hon. member.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Seeing that I never saw the statement in the Press, and that Sir Newton Moore was in London at the time, surely it is a very moderate request to make that the Premier should cable to Sir Newton Moore to get a repudiation of the statement. It is a serious matter, though the Premier seems to think little of it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think this discussion is in order.

The Premier: I will produce the paragraph.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Does the Premier want me to pay for the cable out of my own pocket?

The Premier: No; but I will produce the paragraph first.

House adjourned at 6.15 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 12th December, 1911.

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

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: Annual report of the Observatory.

SAVINGS BANK AND COMMONWEALTH DEPARTMENTS—RAILWAY ADVISORY BOARD INSTRUCTIONS.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew): I wish to make a statement with regard to questions asked by Mr. Kingsmill and Mr. Moss last week. Mr. Moss asked a question on the 30th November: "Is it the intention of the Government to take immediate steps to remove the Savings Bank business now transacted for it by the Commonwealth Government to some State department"? At the last sitting of the House Mr. Moss asked me a further question on the matter without notice, but I was not in a position to give a definite reply. I am advised that the Premier will make a public announcement on this matter within a few days. As to the question asked by Mr. Kingsmill, I have done all in my power to secure the instructions, but unfortunately the chairman of the advisory board, the Surveyor General, is ill in hospital and that considerably interferes with the result of my efforts, besides I am informed by the secretary to the Premier that in many instances the instructions were given verbally. When Mr. Johnston is well we shall be able no doubt to supply the instructions without delay. The various de-