

## NOES.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh	Hon. C. McKenzie
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. H. Carson	Hon. H. Millington
Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. A. Sanderson
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. G. M. Sewell
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. C. Sommers
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. J. F. Cullen
Hon. J. J. Holmes	(Teller).
Hon. J. W. Kirwan	

Amendment thus negatived.

Schedule put and passed.

Title, Preamble—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

*House adjourned at 10.48 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Tuesday, 1st September, 1914.*

	AGE
Papers presented .. .. .	959
Leave of absence .. .. .	959
Standing Orders Suspension .. .. .	959
Bills: Supply (No. 2), £1,450,000, all stages .. .. .	959
Osborne Park Tramway Purchase, returned .. .. .	980
Foodstuffs Commission, returned .. .. .	980
Bunbury Motor 'Bus Service, returned .. .. .	981
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, returned .. .. .	981
Electoral Act Amendment, returned .. .. .	981
Geraldton Agricultural and Horticultural Society's Land, IR. .. .. .	981
Friendly Societies Act Amendment, all stages .. .. .	981
Leederville Rates Validation, all stages .. .. .	981
Workers' Homes Act Amendment, all stages .. .. .	982
Licensing Act Amendment, all stages .. .. .	983
Road Closure, discharged .. .. .	986
Special Lease Enabling, Com., 3A. .. .. .	986
Adjournment, special .. .. .	987

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

### PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Minister for Mines: Return of exemptions granted during the year ended 30th June, 1914.

By the Premier: 1, Report of administration of endowment trust under the Public Education Endowment Act. 2, Correspondence relating to the recent

political crisis in Tasmania. 3, Report of Public Service Commissioner for the year ended 30th June, 1914.

By the Attorney General: 1, Amendment of Supreme Court rules. 2, New regulations under the Electoral Act, 1907. 3, Annual report of the Department of Land Titles.

By the Minister for Works: 1, By-laws of the Beverley roads board. 2, By-laws of the municipalities of Kalgoorlie, Leederville, North Fremantle, and Guildford.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. LAYMAN leave of absence for two weeks granted to the hon. member for Claremont (Mr. Wisdom) on the ground of urgent private business.

### STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan—Brownhill-Ivanhoe) moved—

*That for the remainder of the session the Standing Orders be suspended to enable messages from the Legislative Council to be taken into consideration on the day on which they are received; also, so far as to admit of the reporting and adopting of the resolutions of the Committees of Supply and Ways and Means on the same day on which they shall have passed those Committees.*

Question passed.

### BILL—SUPPLY (No. 2) £1,450,000.

#### Message.

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriation in connection with the Bill.

#### Committee of Supply.

The House having resolved into Committee of Supply, Mr. Holman in the Chair,

The PREMIER moved—

*That there be granted to His Majesty on account of the service of*

*the year ending 30th June, 1915, a sum not exceeding £1,450,000.*

He said: In submitting the motion, may I take this opportunity of saying that on my consulting the leader of the Opposition, that hon. gentleman concurred in sufficient supply being granted to carry us to the end of December, thereby enabling Parliament to be called together before the close of the present calendar year for the purpose of passing the Annual Estimates. It will be appreciated that the Government could probably have managed on three months' supply, carrying us to the end of November. Personally, however, I consider that if such a thing as a change of Ministry should eventuate the new Ministers should be afforded an opportunity of looking round before being called upon to frame Estimates, particularly under the conditions obtaining at the present time. Again, even from the point of view of the present Administration things are changing from week to week under existing conditions; and it is not desirable to present to Parliament Estimates which cannot be relied upon, if such a course can possibly be avoided. Thus it will probably be found that this year's Estimates will be introduced later than otherwise would be the case. Again, may I say that the amount asked for under this Bill is based on the expenditure for the same period of last year. It will be noted that the amount asked for from General Loan Fund is small. That circumstance is due to the fact that the amount already granted under the previous Supply Bill is not yet exhausted. The balance of that authorisation, with the supplies now asked for, will, it is expected, carry us on to the end of December, under ordinary conditions.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I recognise that a general election is to take place shortly, and I fully acknowledge we must have sufficient time to formulate the Estimates, more especially under the present unfortunate conditions. I should like to ask the Premier now as to whether we will be able to get the balance sheets of the trading concerns before the House rises. Two months have already expired

since the close of the financial year, and we are just about as much in the dark as ever in connection with the operations of these undertakings.

The PREMIER: In regard to the question raised by the leader of the Opposition the hon. member must appreciate the fact that to comply with the Trading Concerns Act it is not only necessary to prepare a balance sheet but to have it audited by the Audit Department.

Hon. Frank Wilson: It should be audited by this time.

The PREMIER: Before the Trading Concerns Act was passed the Audit Department was not called upon to audit these particular accounts, and the Auditor General found it difficult to present his report in time for hon. members to peruse when considering the Estimates about October. Under ordinary circumstances the Audit Department is fully occupied in auditing the general accounts without including the trading accounts. Before these accounts can be touched, balance sheets have to be prepared by the departments concerned, and as the financial year does not close until practically the middle of July, it is impossible to have the balance sheets ready for the Auditor General in the period which has expired so that they may be audited and presented to Parliament. There is really not the urgency to the extent that other work should be set aside so that these balance sheets might be audited in order to have them presented to Parliament immediately after the close of the financial year. I will, however, see that the departments concerned expedite the preparation of the balance sheets in my own interest as much as that of the hon. member.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: We have had promises in regard to these balance sheets since the trading concerns were started, and we have also had promises in regard to the general finances, and we know how far they have been kept. The question is one of having the position put clearly before the country, so that it might be discussed intelligently. Private companies who carry on opera-

tions of the magnitude of our trading concerns are obliged to have their accounts out within a couple of months after the termination of the year.

The Premier: But they have only one trading concern.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I would urge upon the Premier the desirability of having these accounts audited in the proper time, and if the Audit Department are not able to do the work, we should adopt business lines and have special auditors appointed for the purpose. We do not want to wait 12 months for the audit of these accounts. The position must be detrimental to the Government, because the cash returns cannot show the true position of these huge undertakings, and it is necessary that the shareholders, the people who find the money, should know how they stand.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: I should have liked to hear the Premier make a fuller explanation in regard to the finances. Of course, I recognise it is difficult for him to do that just now, but I think it is more important that the trading accounts should be audited than that the general work of the Audit Department should receive first attention. The trading concerns have been going on for two or three years, and the public are beginning to become anxious about the result. I have already pointed out that this vast expenditure of money has not found employment for one additional man. The steamships have not employed one more man on the coast.

The Premier: What about the implement works, and what about the saw-mills?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The sawmills may be temporarily employing men, but if the Premier had not cut the sleepers at the sawmills they would have been cut by hewers. The vast sum of money which has been employed in the State enterprises might have been used in reproductive works. This is the time when the Premier should make a fairly full financial statement. It will be the last opportunity we shall have of discussing the finances in this session of Parliament, and the last occasion the Premier

will have of taking the public into his confidence. We know that the Government have been putting off men.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): That is wrong.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: We know that in the agricultural districts and in the Minister for Lands' own electorate, they have put off men. We know, too, that the Agricultural Bank has only paid 50 per cent. of its obligations, but the Premier declared that he would rectify that as soon as possible. I hope to-day that he will be able to tell us that this has been done. The Premier should take us into his confidence in regard to all these matters. If there is one institution that should meet its obligations it is the Agricultural Bank, and I enter my protest against the manner in which the Premier has dealt with this institution. If the payments had not been curtailed a good deal would have been done to prevent the reduction of employment. The Government must keep men employed as far as possible, and so legislate that work will not be affected in the slightest degree. No man should be out of employment if it is possible to keep him in employment. Long before there was any necessity to do so, the Government put off many men.

The Premier: That is absolutely incorrect.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): I can fancy you telling that yarn in the bush, but I will be hanged if you will be believed here.

The Premier: You are a huge joke.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Premier says it is a huge joke.

The Premier: No, I said you were a huge joke.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Premier will have to answer to the workers for the trouble he has caused them, and to the people of the country for his faulty administration.

Mr. LANDER: I cannot agree with the member for Northam when he has the audacity to tell us that more men have been out of employment since this Government were in power than was the case before. The very opposite is the

fact. The Labour Government gave the farmers last year over £500,000, and how much of it was paid back? The Government of which the member for Northam was a member advanced the farmers £250,000, and he shook them up to see that nearly the whole of it was repaid. It is all very well for the hon. member to make these bald statements, which he knows are quite incorrect. A lot more men have been employed by this Government than was ever the case before. No doubt it is the hon. member's electioneering cry. The hon. member told the people before the last general elections that if the Labour Government were returned to power the homes would be taken from the workers. I may tell the hon. member that we have not taken any homes from them, and if he goes about the country he will find that the Labour party have given assistance in every possible way. I do not think many settlers have been paid on the 50 per cent. basis by the Agricultural Bank. It is ridiculous for the member for Northam to raise such cries.

The PREMIER: The hon. member for Northam will always find me ready to give him information that is available, and is to the point. Naturally one would expect that the hon. gentleman, who was on one occasion Minister for Industries, would know something about the industries and the expenditure of public funds upon them, but the hon. member has paid so much attention to his own affairs of late that he has forgotten, and we know that his statements are absolutely inaccurate. As the hon. member has asked me to give him some information, I will do so. The hon. member may not know, but his leader will know, that it is not usual to appear on the money market for the purposes of raising loan funds if that market is not considered favourable at the moment, or when in the opinion of our advisers in London it is deemed advisable to hold off until the market is better. No one but the hon. member for Northam, not even the Kaiser himself, knew a month before that war would be declared between Britain and Germany, but the hon. mem-

ber is all knowing in these things, and no doubt, although everybody else did not know it, he knew it. Up to the moment when war was declared, naturally we carried on business under normal conditions. We undertook that the Agricultural Bank should be found money. We had committed ourselves to an expenditure of £600,000 for improvements on agricultural lands and we deemed up to that moment that we were in a position to meet that and even further engagements. We have had to depend within recent years, due to various causes, on loan funds to finance the Agricultural Bank. The Agricultural Bank is after all not a bank but a lending institution acting on behalf of the Treasury, and it leaves a wrong impression when people use the term that the Agricultural Bank is not meeting its obligations. It appears to indicate that the bank is not meeting its obligations, but that is not so. Recognising that the Agricultural Bank has not funds of its own to work on, which it will have in a few years time, due to the actions of the Labour Government, we have had to depend on the funds available on loan account. As I say, war was declared very suddenly between Germany and Britain, which closed the money market in London. When the war was declared I was advised by the Agent General to conserve our funds in this State, as none could be made available from that end. Under ordinary circumstances, although our position was not very bright, we had a fair amount of money in London still we were always able to carry on with the assistance of the London and Westminster County Bank, but we were not able to foresee that this crisis would occur, and we did not go on the market as it is not usual to go on the market before it is necessary and thus have a lot of money lying idle and not earning anything. We kept off the market as long as possible, and our funds were not as bright as they might have been. We had a certain amount of funds in cash deposited at the various banks, and yet the member for Northam suggests that, in order to meet the undue demand of

the moment of people running into the Agricultural Bank with their certificates and asking to be paid, to obtain, in many cases, large quantities of stores to hold, we should have parted with all the money which was available. If the hon. member thinks that should have been done, I view it from an entirely different point of view. I recognise fully that in not paying the full amount of the certificate we may cause some hardship, but I gave an assurance that at the earliest possible moment that I would make arrangements to pay the whole amount. These arrangements have been made and completed. Whether the Agricultural Bank has the money available at the moment I am not in a position to say, but I have signed a receipt for the notes I have purchased by having retained a certain amount of money that the member for Northam has said I should have handed over at once to the farmers. In view of the fact that the hon. member for Northam has asked me to state the particulars as to the finances, perhaps this would be the best opportunity to explain our position in connection with the carrying on of public works. The hon. member for Northam says there is no reason why we should not employ every man who is out of employment.

Hon. J. Mitchell : I said nothing of the kind.

The PREMIER : The hon. member said that no one should be out of work if it is possible to find employment for him.

Hon. J. Mitchell : That is a very different thing.

The PREMIER : Of course no one should be out of work if it is possible to find employment for him, and no one will be unemployed if it is possible to employ him. We have kept many men employed up to the present when it has not paid us to do so. We have not taken advantage, as some of the friends of the hon. members opposite have done, of poor helpless girls and reduced their wages when they had been working for employers on Government contracts. I

assert that other than on works that were completed we have not dismissed men. We have kept men on.

Hon. J. Mitchell : Do you say that in all seriousness?

The PREMIER : In all seriousness. Orders were issued by the Minister of every department that no man was to be put off because of slackness of work, and the only men who were put off at all were men on works which were completed, and they would have been put off in ordinary circumstances.

Hon. J. Mitchell : Is that so?

The PREMIER : It is so and that is all that has occurred to-day. Let me point out that so far as the implement works are concerned, the manager two weeks ago pointed out that work was falling off and he suggested means of getting over the difficulty. What he suggested I am not prepared to say just now; it would not be desirable. I got the departmental officers together and discussed the difficulties and possibilities of the future, to see if we could arrive at some method of continuing operations in all departments and also perhaps find the ways and means of absorbing some of the men who had been thrown out of employment, due to other works closing. The first meeting of departmental officers with their Ministerial heads will be held to-morrow morning. We are meeting the position as expeditiously as possible. Hon. members must recognise this fact, that we can only keep men employed so long as we can find the money to pay the wages and the salaries. It has been generally stated and regularly reported that the Commonwealth were finding us, through their note issue, all the money which we require to continue all the public works at their current volume. After the conference of Premiers in Melbourne, which I did not attend, the general discussion and decision in many cases was confidential and secret, but they gave to the Press a statement. That statement was drawn up by the Hon. Mr. Kay, Honorary Minister, Mr. Holman, the Premier of New South Wales, and Mr. Hughes, ex-Attor-

ney General, and in that statement the three following paragraphs occurred:—

After exhaustive discussion arrangements were made which the conference was satisfied will amply cope with the situation.

The States all have large loan obligations in the shape of public works and developmental undertakings, and it was decided to do everything possible to avoid the dislocation of industry that might be involved in the stoppage or curtailment of these expenditures.

The conclusion arrived at by the conference will allow, we believe, with adequate care, the Federal and State public works to be maintained uninterrupted. Arrangements were made which will enable these to be maintained at their full current volume.

If that does mean anything in English it means that the conference arranged with the Federal Treasurer to provide the States with all the funds they required to carry on public works at the full current volume, that is the volume existing at the moment. I never anticipated that such would be the case. I have never believed at any time that such would be the case. I recognise, as the Federal Treasurer recognised, that we have under existing conditions to be careful in the way of expending the public funds, and that we should make every pound go as far as possible, naturally enough, and when I asked the departments, at the request of the Federal Treasurer, to provide me with certain figures in connection with the expenditure of last year, and the like requirements for this year, I told the Under Treasurer to give the Federal Treasurer all the particulars that he required. As a matter of fact, I told the Under Treasurer to open the Treasury to the Federal Treasurer and let him know exactly our position. The Under Treasurer saw the Federal Treasurer and he knew the position as well as I knew it, or as far as he desired. The Federal Treasurer had asked me to submit a full statement of our financial position, the loan expenditure of last

year, and what we proposed for this year. I obtained these figures and sent them over. I asked the departments to recognise the present position and cut down the amount to the lowest possible figure. The requirements submitted by the departments amounted to £197,000 a month. The loan expenditure last year was £240,000 a month. I am speaking from memory, but I think I am correct. Their requirements were certainly £197,000 a month. I concluded in conference with Ministers that we could not be expected to find such an amount in the existing circumstances, and that we ought to cut it down to £130,000 per month. But that did not include the September month because we had so many of the commitments that we could not reduce it below £150,000. I sent over all these figures to the Prime Minister and the Federal Treasurer. When the statement came to me officially signed by the Prime Minister I immediately telegraphed as follows:—

On first page official report of Premiers' conference prepared for Press three paragraphs appear commencing "After exhaustive discussion" and concluding "maintained their full current value."

Those are the three paragraphs I have already read. The telegram continued—

Do we rightly understand from this that you will guarantee sufficient notes on the basis agreed to to enable us to maintain public works developmental undertakings at their full current value. Our wire to you on this matter gives requirements of departments on the basis of considerable reduction on loan expenditure which means consequent reduction of avenues of employment.

The fact is that we have not the money with which to pay the men, and you cannot employ men without money to pay them. I anticipated that when I received an official report of the decisions arrived at by the conference that probably I might have been going to do an injury to the State of Western Australia, that perhaps I had been misinformed regarding the decisions arrived at, and that

the other States would be able, with the help of the Federal Treasurer, to keep the public works going, and I wanted this State to come in on the same basis. I did not want to cut down expenditure upon public works if the other States were not being compelled to do likewise. Why should I consider matters from the point of view of moderation as suggested, unless the other States were put in the same position? To put the matter right I telegraphed to the Prime Minister in the direction I have already indicated, pointing out definitely and distinctly that a reduction of all loan expenditure meant a consequent reduction of avenues of employment. This is the reply I received—

With reference to your telegram of the 26th August consider the basis you name is quite high enough and moderation had better be observed. (Signed)  
Joseph Cook.

Yet we have the spectacle of Federal Treasurer Sir John Forrest sending a wireless telegram from the boat off Albany to the mayor of Albany informing him that he (Sir John Forrest) had made arrangements to finance the harbour improvements at Albany and asking him for his support for himself and the Liberal senators.

Hon. J. Mitchell: They have given you what you asked for.

The PREMIER: No, they have not. We asked for what was suggested in the conference. When the question was discussed with Sir John Forrest he held the same view as we all held, namely, that it was essential that we should curtail our loan expenditure except in the direction of reproducing something which would be of value in the future, that we could not be expected to go on with public works which would be necessary under ordinary conditions where the State was expanding, its population increasing, and its industries developing in every way, because to-day they must for a period at all events remain stationary until such time as we get over the crisis. No one who is a business man would ask us as business men to go on spending money upon public works at

this juncture by which we would get our finances into an even worse condition than they are now. The general impression, however, amongst the public is that the Commonwealth Government have advanced all the notes that we require, but that is not so. Of course if the Federal Treasurer were to guarantee this I could go on with public works uninterruptedly.

Hon. J. Mitchell: You would buy more steamers with the money.

The PREMIER: This is one of the reasons why I opposed at the Premiers' conference the proposal submitted by the Federal Treasurer, that the Federal Government should take over control of State debts and place them in the hands of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Chief Justice of the Federal High Court, and the President of the Senate, namely, three Federal officers. I opposed this because I feared that a Government which was not sympathetic to the State Governments might take control over the manner in which money was to be expended. And here we find is the first proof of this, the first proof of where the Federal Government have definitely told us that we must moderate our expenditure. They say that what I suggested was quite high enough and that moderation had better be observed. As I have said, I can only spend the money that I have, and under existing circumstances I must depend upon the Federal Treasurer if the public works of the State are to be carried out. But do not forget that I have to find 25 per cent. in cash before I get these notes. I have first of all to find 25 per cent. in gold and if I have not the cash available I cannot find the gold. I then have to give Treasury bills upon which I have to pay 4 per cent. What is the position? I do not care what the Government is that is in power in the Federal Parliament, but whilst I am here as Treasurer of the State of Western Australia I am going to demand a fair deal. I am going to tell the people what this means. I anticipated that I would require £132,000 per month for the next 12 months. That, at all events, is the figure to which I have cut

down the expenditure, and that will mean that I will have to give Treasury bills at the rate of £132,000 a month for the next 12 months upon which I have to pay 4 per cent. But it is the people of the State that will have to face this position, and it will mean the provision by them of £60,000 a year to be placed under the control of the Federal Treasurer. And what has the Federal Treasurer done in return? All that he has done for this is to issue a bit of paper. He has to get from this State £60,000 per annum and the Federal Treasurer will not have to return one single penny by way of services rendered. I know perfectly well that hon. members opposite will answer that we would have to pay interest if we got the money anywhere else. I would certainly have to pay interest on any money that we borrowed, but I want the position of the State to be appreciated in this matter. They are only lending us a limited amount. I am told in the first place that what I asked for is quite high enough. In the second place the Commonwealth are merely taking advantage of the Federal Note Act for the purpose of finding money which does not cost anything except the printing of the notes. Against that, however, this State will have to pay £60,000 per annum. In a time of crisis, such as the present, the Commonwealth Treasurer is going to get from Western Australia £60,000 a year. In my opinion the Commonwealth authorities had no right to ask for gold payment before issuing any notes. The Federal Government are placing the people of Australia in their hour of trial on the same footing as financial institutions, banks and so on, that are carrying on operations for the purpose of profit for their shareholders, and are in some cases paying as high as 20 per cent. dividends under normal conditions, and setting aside as much as £600,000 in their own businesses.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Which ones?

The PREMIER: I am not going to inform the hon. member. And yet the States, that is, the people of the States, who, after all, are the people of the Commonwealth, and not apart from each

other—you cannot divide them, the people of the States are the people of the Commonwealth—are going to be made by the Federal Government and in a crisis like this to pay something like £60,000 per annum for the accommodation they are providing by way of paper money. They are going to do practically the same thing with the banks who are almost on exactly all fours with the people of the State. Notwithstanding the statement which I made to the Press on Friday last, persons are still asserting that the Commonwealth Treasurer has made arrangements to find us all the money we require by way of notes to carry on the public works necessary in the State. The statement, too, has been made that Sir John Forrest was finding us sufficient notes, not only to carry on public works, but to enable the people who were producing articles for export, and who might be restricted at the present time, to carry on their operations as they did before, and that we would advance a certain percentage of the value of the product. I may say that no such thing has ever happened.

Hon. J. Mitchell: It cannot happen until the Federal Parliament meets.

The PREMIER: But it has happened to a limited extent already. Only on Friday last I had to find £5,000 in gold to get £20,000 worth of notes back for it. The hon. member says that it cannot operate.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Under Fisher's Act.

The PREMIER: The hon. member talked about unemployment. Even if it were the case that the Federal Government supplied all the notes we required the public works that would be carried on might not account for all the men out of work. A number of private firms, for instance, have already discharged a number of their employees. As a matter of fact we have to thank the Federal note issue which was provided by the past Federal Government.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: Which was opposed tooth and nail by the Liberals.

The PREMIER: And the Commonwealth Bank has also rendered great assistance in this crisis, and just as the Labour Government was responsible for the



Federal note issue, so was a Labour Government responsible for the Commonwealth Bank. Both, however, were opposed by the Liberals. There are financial men in this State who have withdrawn their accounts from private banks and placed them in the hands of the Commonwealth Bank during the last fortnight. Many of these are Liberals too, men who had opposed the establishment of the Commonwealth Bank. So much for the financial position. I am of opinion that the position is one that has been fairly and squarely faced. Unless we had known what apparently the hon. member for Northam (Hon. J. Mitchell) knew—that the Kaiser would declare war against England—unless, I say, we had had that great foresight, we could not under ordinary circumstances have adopted any other attitude. I am serious in saying that I warrant the cash available under loans and other accounts to-day is greater than it was three years ago at this particular time of the year.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Why are you sacking men, then?

The PREMIER: I am not sacking men.

Hon. J. Mitchell: You are stopping works.

The PREMIER: Let me point out that the cash available, as I have said, is greater to-day than it was at this time three years ago.

Hon. Frank Wilson: How much have you got to-day?

The PREMIER: I am not going to publicly inform the hon. member. I could, however, inform him if he will call at my office.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I do not think you can have more to-day.

The PREMIER: I have quite sufficient and, as I say, we have more funds than we had three years ago.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Where do you get your deficit from?

The PREMIER: Never mind that for the moment.

Mr. Harper: What about your having given instructions to put men on half time?

The PREMIER: The hon. member would probably put men on full time and

pay nothing for their labour if he had his way. We are determined that the position shall be faced as it ought to be faced in order to spread the burden which has to be carried by the community over as great an area as possible. It is not fair to allow one small section of the community, or a few individuals to carry the whole burden, and be on the verge of starvation, while others are probably flourishing, as under ordinary conditions. Coming to the question of employment, it could not be expected that we could go on finding new avenues of employment until we knew our finances were in a sound position. Until the arrangement was made, we were not warranted in spending all our available cash, because I was able to learn from Sir John Forrest that the most they could do was what they did, and that I would have to have the cash available in order to obtain the notes from the Commonwealth Treasurer. I conserved as much cash as possible to that end, and I shall be able to carry on quite satisfactorily, and have already made provision for the Agricultural Bank. The hon member for Northam said that, notwithstanding the expenditure of loan funds during the last three years, we have not found a single fresh avenue of employment.

Mr. Lander: He knew that was wrong.

The PREMIER: In the three years we have absorbed 21,900, or more, immigrants. That means there must be more avenues of employment. There was more employment on the 1st August, before the declaration of war, than three years ago, notwithstanding that our population had increased to that extent.

Hon. J. Mitchell: What about the trading concerns?

The PREMIER: Foremost among the trading concerns which are finding additional employment is the implement works.

Hon. J. Mitchell: How many men are employed there?

The PREMIER: Between 500 and 600 and the employment in other firms

has not been reduced by one per cent., as a result of the starting of those works.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): No implements were made here previously.

The PREMIER: The hon. member for Northam, rather than subscribe to State socialism, would prefer to send the money to America or Victoria, even though it were proved that the implements could be manufactured here by our own workmen at less cost to the farmer. Rather than subscribe to anything of the kind he would cause the farmer to pay more and allow his own men to stand idle and send the money to Victoria or America. And what have we done in connection with sawmills? The only new mill we have erected, except a little spot mill, has been in our virgin karri forest, which was previously untouched, though unfortunately a great deal of it was cut away when the hon. member for Northam was Minister for Lands; it was ring-barked and killed. A forest ranger told me that one of the most disgraceful acts that any Minister ever perpetrated in Western Australia was that of the hon. member for Northam when he gave this karri away contrary to his recommendation.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Who was that?

The PREMIER: I will not give his name.

Hon. J. Mitchell: It is not true.

The PREMIER: I assure the hon. member it is true. That sawmill has been put in the virgin forest and there will be anything from 500 to 1,000 men employed. Is not that a new avenue of employment?

Hon. J. Mitchell: To supply sleepers that could have been hewn!

The PREMIER: They could not have been hewn. There were more sleeper hewers operating on the 1st August than previously in the history of the State, notwithstanding that we had a saw mill employing 500 men cutting sleepers in the karri forest. Not only is employment thus found for 500 men, but additional employment is found for railway men, lumpers and ship men.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: It established a new town.

The PREMIER: Yes, and the hon. member for Northam heard of it when there was some talk of cancelling the contract. The Liberal organisation in the South-West sent up resolutions to our friends opposite informing them that if this contract was cancelled and a new one entered into by the State Government, it would mean ruination to many Liberal supporters.

Mr. Bolton: Yet the contract was cancelled.

The PREMIER: Yes. The hon. member said State steamers do not make new avenues of employment. I say they do. Perhaps the steamers themselves have not done so, but we have been bringing down cattle from a portion of the North-West which the shipping companies would not touch.

Hon. J. Mitchell: From the Northern Territory, the Bovril Company.

The PREMIER: I am talking of a portion of the North-West of this State whence, prior to State steamers being put on, the total number brought down was about 600 cattle, and this year we have bought down 6,000 head. Is not that a new avenue of employment? The hon. member says that brickworks are not providing extra employment. Prior to the outbreak of the war there was such a demand for bricks that it exceeded the supply. The trade naturally has slackened off at present, but prior to the 1st August some of our public works were actually held up because the brickyards could not supply bricks. Even if they had been able to do so, the price was so high that building was retarded. Therefore, the State brickworks provided new avenues of employment in the building trade generally. Perhaps the one exception of which the hon. member may boast is the milk supply, and that, I say with some degree of pleasure, has found less employment. There has been less need for the undertaker than previously, and this avenue of employment has been lessened. Does the hon. member gloat about that? This is the one exception and I am proud of it. This

is the only State concern which the hon. member can prove has not produced new avenues of employment.

Hon. J. Mitchell : I never mentioned it.

The PREMIER : We do not require the same number of doctors and nurses to attend to the children as we did previously, and we do not need the same number of inspectors to catch milkmen who used to supply impure and adulterated milk to the Children's hospital, where the children had to take whatever milk was provided for them. I regret that it has been necessary to speak in this tone, but the hon. member has taken this opportunity, when I was to some extent disarmed, to draw attention to what he described as the mess we made of the finances, and to carry on the same kind of argument in which he indulges in the country when there are no Press reporters about; for instance, when he goes to that favourite spot of his, Jenna-pullen.

Hon. J. Mitchell : That contains the usual amount of truth of your statements.

The PREMIER : Yes. the correct amount, and I am sorry the hon. member is disappointed that he did not catch me napping, as he thought he would do. I am prepared to carry on public works to their full current volume, in accordance with the decision of the conference. if Sir John Forrest, as Federal Treasurer, is prepared to find all the notes I require, and I will pay four per cent. interest on the paper. He can make the profit; I will transfer to the Commonwealth £60,000 a year and will not complain. It is pretty cheap money but the cost of providing it is nothing; after all it is only notes and I have to provide 25 per cent. in gold before I can get that much.

Mr. Thomas : Do you pay interest on the 25 per cent.?

The PREMIER : Oh no. If there is any cause to complain in regard to the slackening of public works I am not prepared to take the responsibility for it. I say again, that if Sir John Forrest will give me an undertaking that he will

provide all the notes I require to carry on the Albany harbour improvements, as he asserts by his wireless message to catch votes, the Bunbury, Geraldton, and Fremantle harbour improvements, the construction of railways, and other work so essential to the progress of this State, and also the capital for the Agricultural Bank, I will do my part to carry on those works. But I decline to sit down quietly and allow these statements to be made and repeated in all corners of the State, whereby it is sought to shift the responsibility from the shoulders on which it should rest on to mine. If I controlled the note issue, I would accept the responsibility for any action I took, but I will not accept it when someone else controls that issue, and when I am told, as by the Prime Minister, that I must exercise moderation; that the figure I stated was high enough.

Hon. J. Mitchell : It was good advice.

The PREMIER : I have no doubt the matter will be adjusted all right after Saturday next. We have met the position fairly and squarely and done the right thing by conserving the cash we had until this matter was adjusted, and I am prepared to carry on public works and find new avenues of employment if the Commonwealth will do their duty by providing us with the necessary notes.

Hon. FRANK WILSON : A remark was made that the German Kaiser had gone off pop. I think the Premier has gone off pop this afternoon and I do not think he had as much justification as the Kaiser for going off pop. I regret that the Premier thought it necessary to indulge in a tirade of abuse because the hon. member for Northam has dared to emphasise the position in regard to the Agricultural Bank, and in listening to the Premier I have been alarmed at the numbers of instances in which he has twisted and turned the hon. member's observations to suit his own arguments. Under present conditions we ought to be able to depend somewhat upon our own resources in Western Australia, and should not find it necessary always to lean up against the other fellow. The one idea seems to be to lean on the Fed-

eral Government; that everything we require in Western Australia, because of this unfortunate war, should be done by the Federal Government.

Mr. Harper: They always blame the other fellow.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I do not agree with that policy, and I take exception to the statements which have been made in regard to the provision which has been meted out to Western Australia, together with the other States, as being something in the shape of robbery, whereas, after all is said and done, it is something in the shape of ordinary finance. The Premier seems to be highly indignant and has opened the vials of his wrath and condemned all and sundry; and Sir John Forrest, if he hears of this, ought to feel very small. But why? Because the Federal Government, in conference with the State Treasurers and Premiers, including Labour representatives, devised a scheme to assist the different States.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): How many were there?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The report quoted by the Premier bore the signatures of Mr. Hughes and Mr. Holman.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): That was adopted at the old conference.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Will the Honorary Minister keep quiet?

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): I was just putting you right.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Well, please keep quiet. Here is a report acquiesced in by members of the Government, and two leading Labour politicians of Australia. They have rendered it to the newspapers as a satisfactory solution of the difficulty, yet it is now trotted out as an injury to Western Australia. Of course the Federal Government have to receive some security for their loans to the State. Under the Notes Act they are bound to have at least 25 per cent. of gold reserve, and that is the very least they can demand from anyone they are assisting. They must have 25 per cent. gold reserve.

The Premier: No, you are wrong. They must have 100 per cent.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: No, 25 per cent. up to a certain figure, and par above that.

The Premier: Well, they have got above that.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Yet it is an injustice because we are asked to provide any gold whatever, and if the Federal Treasurer will guarantee to issue notes *ad lib.* we are prepared to carry on and spend those notes. The member for Bunbury emphasises the point which the Premier complained about this afternoon, namely, that they are getting four per cent. for the balance of Treasury bills that are issued in exchange for the notes, less the pound that has been paid in gold.

Mr. Thomas: It is the nearest thing to Shylock I have ever met. They are charging interest for nothing.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: And the notes can be presented at the bank tomorrow and be paid. It is pay on demand.

Mr. Thomas: They cannot pay on demand.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: They take the responsibility of paying on demand every note they issue, and so far as we are concerned we get something we can use, which is legal tender, and must be accepted by the people.

The Premier: They protect themselves by demanding a Treasury bill from me at 12 months' currency, which I must meet.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Of course. All the trend of the hon. member's argument is that he must be loaned as much money as he wants, and that without security. The thing is insufferable.

The Premier: What I assert is that we are finding 25 per cent. in gold and 75 per cent. in Treasury bills, which the people of the State are pledged to meet. That is the position.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Of course, and the Federal Government have to pay gold for that 75 per cent. in notes directly they are presented, on demand.

Mr. Bolton: Then they destroy the Treasury bills.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Is that any reason why we should get off? If so, what a beautiful scheme of finance! We can pay for all our public works in notes, and pay no interest at all. That is the Premier's scheme. It would be a happy position for any Treasurer. We cannot get away from our responsibilities.

Mr. Thomas: They are getting interest on money which they have never supplied.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: They are getting interest on a promise to pay on demand, which they must supply; and the Premier is getting a negotiable document, which is as good as gold to him. Let us finish these childish complaints about the attitude of the Federal authorities.

Mr. Dwyer: The Federal Treasurer is on a good wicket.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Nothing of the sort. He will be on a very poor wicket when the notes come in. We have an attack made on the notes, and one cannot rise to discuss this without being told that Mr. Fisher's Note Bill was opposed by the Liberals. The Liberals never opposed it. They opposed a reduction in the gold reserve, and it has been a God-send to Australia and Western Australia in particular that we have Sir John Forrest as Treasurer.

The Premier: He made me send £500,000 to Melbourne.

The CHAIRMAN. I must ask hon. members to cease these interjections which have been so persistently indulged in during the hon. member's remarks.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The whole question is in a nut-shell. It is a question of finance. The Premier is being financed, the same as the other State Premiers, and yet we have a round of complaints. I do not think it is fair at all. We get helped over a hard time, and we ought gratefully to acknowledge it without casting any blame on the people who are lending us the assistance. The Premier has been complaining that he would not get sufficient to carry out his public works to the fullest extent. He complains of the report drawn up partially by Mr. Hughes and Mr. Holman, and given to the Press, in which they state that the conference

had agreed to some scheme which would enable the States to carry on to the full current volume. The Premier has admitted that the request he made to the Federal Government was for £130,000 per month. He took the very obvious and proper course of any Treasurer in times of stress to make his estimate as small as he could. He cut it down, and I think it is a good thing he has taken such steps. We cannot expect to go on at full top speed in troublous times like these, and I venture to think that if we had the figures of the Eastern States and their demands on the Federal Treasurer we would find that not only have they taken the same steps to reduce the amounts for which they were asking, but that also they were not getting anything like up to the full limits they required.

Mr. Foley: Then why does your leader use it as an election cry?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: They are carrying on everything that has been asked for. The Premier got all he asked for.

Mr. Foley: What is the meaning of the word "normal"?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Used in connection with expenditure I should say it meant ordinary expenditure.

The Premier: What is the meaning of the wires to the Mayor of Albany?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I understand the Premier wired to the Mayor of Albany and said the money would be found for the Albany harbour works. I presume the harbour works were in the schedule which he put before the Federal Treasurer, and therefore he concluded those works would be carried on. Has not the Federal Treasurer the right to say he has arranged to finance Western Australia's demands as presented by the State Premier, seeing that he has done so? What is all the carping criticism about? It is absurd, it is childish, and moreover it is unfair, to blame those who are trying to assist us to the fullest extent.

Mr. Dwyer: Why should he praise his own generosity?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: He has not done so. He has taken credit for being able to look after Western Australia, and

if the hon. member lives to the same ripe old age as Sir John Forrest and can then point to having done for Western Australia one-tenth of what Sir John Forrest has done, I will give him all the credit which I am attempting to give Sir John Forrest to-day.

The Premier: No, you would not.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Such a denial carries no weight. Now, we have the Premier's lame explanation in regard to the Agricultural Bank. Of course he has large commitments, some £600,000, which have to be met as the work is carried out and completed. He puts the blame on the money market having failed. No doubt it has to carry a lot of blame. If one cannot borrow money one cannot pay, but I do not think it was a wise action to stop 50 per cent. after undertaking to pay, especially when the Treasurer had the money in his hands at the time; and now £5,000 has been put up in golden sovereigns, making a total of £20,000. And we must remember that it does not matter whether it is in the Agricultural Bank or a loan office. The name of the institution does not matter. If we approach repudiation it matters very much indeed. If I give a man my cheque for £100 and the money is lying at my bankers, and I instruct my bankers to pay only £50 I am repudiating. If the bankers on their own behalf when the cheque is presented say, "We can only pay £50 of that £100" it is repudiation, and something worse. We require to keep our engagements. Let us not incur fresh liabilities, or if we do, let them be on such terms that we can finance them; but for goodness' sake, when we have once made an engagement that we will pay under certain conditions, when those conditions are fulfilled let us see that the money is paid, and take all the risk of being short, which apparently is the excuse of the Premier.

The Premier: What would you do with the institution that did not keep its bargains?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I would take very strict measures against a banker who dishonoured my cheque and

said he would only pay £50 when he had £100 lying there. The Premier says it was an undue demand made by a rush of certificate holders. I cannot imagine such a position. If the certificates were due they would be granted; if the work had not been completed the certificates would not be due, and therefore not granted. And once they are issued they are just like cheques. The man who has a certificate on the Agricultural Bank considers it as good as a cheque on any financial institution. But if such a man on presenting his certificate is met with the calm reply that he is only to be permitted to receive 50 per cent. of the amount, it is unfortunate in the extreme. I refrained from commenting on this because I did not wish to create anything in the nature of a scare in Western Australia on the subject. The other night I asked the Premier to make a statement in this connection, and I am glad he did make it, that the balance of these certificates would be paid as soon as possible. I am happier still to have heard him state to-night that he will be able to pay the balance very soon. A base charge has been made that the champions of the member for Northam (Hon. J. Mitchell) were reducing the wages of girl employees. Let me state at once that we on this side have no champions of that description, and that such people do not get any sympathy from us. Employers who will treat any employee—man or woman, boy or girl—unfairly receive no sympathy from us whatever. There is no reason for casting such offensive remarks across the Chamber. We on this side are not any more responsible for such people than the Premier is.

Mr. Foley: Did not the hon. member the other night blame members on the Government side for the Younni trouble?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I blamed the unions.

Mr. Foley: Well, we blame your union.

The Premier: Hear, hear!

Hon. FRANK WILSON: We have not any union. Does not the hon. mem-

ber interjecting support the Youami action, and has he not supported it all along in this Chamber? When he hears me supporting such action as the Premier has described this afternoon, then the hon. member can attack me for it.

Mr. Foley: You did support such action last year, and you were lucky that it did not get into print.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier enters into a somewhat detailed account of his trading concerns. He makes wild statements that the State Implement Works, which are employing some 400 or 500 hands, have opened up a new avenue of employment. I want to say, however, that I do not think those works have opened up any new avenue of employment. The Government have transferred to that undertaking, or so I understand, all the repairs of the Harbour Works. They have transferred to the Rocky Bay establishment work which was formerly given to private concerns, such as Metters' works. I may point to the huge works which the firm of Metters erected at Subiaco, and which are standing idle to-day in consequence of the starting of the State Implement Works. In this connection I may also remark that the Government absorbed a small establishment at Victoria Park which had already entered on the manufacture of agricultural implements.

Mr. McLeod: At what price?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I am arguing about the question of employment. If the implement works at Rocky Bay had not commenced operations, Metters' works at Subiaco would be in full swing, and so probably would be the works at Victoria Park. The demand would have been met.

Mr. McLeod: Yes; from the Eastern States and America.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The State is still getting agricultural implements from the Eastern States and America, just as fast as before. Then we have the saw mills trotted out by the Premier as a great avenue of employment. It is a great avenue of employment, but one transferred from private hands to the Govern-

ment. The Premier knows very well that the Government were approached by Millars' Company with an application for a tract of karri land, so that that company might tender for the Federal sleeper contract. Undoubtedly Millars' could have been successful in obtaining a portion of the contract. However, the policy of the Government was to do the work themselves. Rightly or wrongly, that was their policy, and they have carried it out. In a few years, I think, it will be found that the expenditure at the State karri mills, especially in connection with the powellising plant, will not be satisfactory, and that the proposition will not be a payable one. That is my impression. Still, on the argument of avenues of employment, as long as the demand is there and the State has citizens prepared to meet the demand it makes no difference from the point of view of employment whether the Government be the employer or private capitalists go in and invest their money.

Mr. McLeod: But it makes a good deal of difference to the employee.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It does not. Otherwise, how is it we find the sleeper hewers leaving the employ of the Government? Again, we have the strange argument that the State steamers have opened up a fresh avenue of employment indirectly, because they are bringing down cattle from ports not previously tapped by cattle steamers. But does it not appeal to hon. members that the number of cattle brought down is controlled by the demands of the market, by the law of supply and demand? Plainly, it is no use bringing down more cattle than the people can consume.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: The supply is never curtailed to raise the price, is it?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The price of meat has never been higher in the history of Western Australia than it has been since the Government have been running cattle steamers. The effect of the action of the Government in going into the market as a buyer has been to increase the price rather than to decrease it. In making these remarks I am simply answering the argument of the Premier,

because he went on to this aspect of the matter and the other side of it wants looking into.

The Premier: Be fair.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I am trying to be fair. The history of the brickworks has been sad in the extreme. We have been trying to construct brickworks for the last two years, and I do not think that a private order has been executed by those works up to this day. Two years is time enough to build half a dozen brick works. Had I been constructing those brickworks, I would have sacked the manager and a good many others if the works had not been in operation twelve months ago. Then there is the milk supply. What is the good of talking about the Government milk supply? The milk of the Government is not guaranteed to be any better than that provided by private suppliers properly looked after by the Government inspectors, and it must not be forgotten that just the other day diseased cows were found at the State dairy farm.

Mr. McLeod: But they were destroyed.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Yes; and they would have been destroyed if found on private dairies.

Mr. Elliott: The Government milk supply had a bad effect on the Children's Hospital.

The Premier: You ought to be ashamed of yourself, to sit there and say that.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I think the whole debate is regrettable. When a little mild criticism is indulged in from this side, the Premier takes the first opportunity of flaring up like a torch. He hits out right and left regardless of the measure we are discussing and regardless, I am sorry to think, to a large extent of the responsibility of his high office. I hope the Premier will devote his magnificent talents to controlling the finances of the State, to working in with those who are assisting us over a very parlous time indeed, to giving them a little consideration, as he is always first and foremost to demand consideration at their hands.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: There is one point which wants clearing up. This State has borrowed before from the funds

obtained through note issue. That was done in the previous Government's time. We paid interest on the money borrowed then, and the Premier knows that. Sir John Forrest is not making any new departure in charging interest on the money which is being borrowed now.

The Premier: That money was paid in gold.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: It was not paid in gold. It was placed to the credit of the Premier at the banks.

The Premier: It was gold. They could only lend gold.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: It was paid into the banks to the credit of the Premier.

The Premier: Yes; of course it was.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: And that is just what will happen now.

The Premier: This is an entirely different proposition.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The gold was placed to the credit of the Premier, just as the notes will now be placed to his credit. Sir John Forrest is doing just what Mr. Fisher did. Sir John Forrest is treating us in exactly the same way. We are to pay for the money we borrow. What I want the people to realise is that we are paying no more than before, that we are paying just the same, and that the money is coming from exactly the same source, and also that we are only paying on 75 per cent. of the amount of the notes. My friend the member for Bunbury (Mr. Thomas) said we are paying 4 per cent. on the full amount of the notes received.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): I do not think so.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: I think he did. However, we are paying only on 75 per cent. Now, the Premier says the money costs nothing; but it costs something. To issue notes costs from 1 per cent. to 1½ per cent., and there is some responsibility in connection with them. In asking 4 per cent. Sir John Forrest is doing what Mr. Fisher did.

The Premier: He is doing what Mr. Fisher made it possible for him to do.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Mr. Fisher, of course, determined to have a Commonwealth note issue. By that he did an



immense amount of harm at the time, because the effect was to draw an immense amount of money out of circulation.

The Premier: That is why you opposed it.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: I had no opportunity of opposing it.

The Premier: I heard you oppose it in this Chamber.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: I am extremely pleased that Sir John Forrest had sufficient foresight to build up a decent reserve of gold, a thing Mr. Fisher did not think necessary.

The Premier: How does that affect the position? Sir John Forrest is not leaving us the gold he has stored up.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: If the Premier does not understand that one cannot have a paper currency without a stock of gold, it is no use my attempting to explain the matter to him. I am pleased to have heard the manner in which my leader dealt with the question of employment. As regards the implement works, let me tell the Premier that within four months of this year Western Australia imported £46,000 worth of machinery from the Eastern States. During the whole of last year Western Australia imported only £170,000 worth of agricultural implements from the Eastern States. Further, the import from the old country will not be stayed.

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

Hon. J. MITCHELL: We were discussing the number of men employed at the implement works and I was pointing out that, notwithstanding the establishment of those works we had imported £46,000 worth of machinery from the Eastern States last year in addition to what was imported from oversea. I believe those works will find employment for men not otherwise employed in Western Australia, but it is absurd to say that these 500 men are employed on the manufacture of implements. This establishment is engaged on other works. It is comforting to know, however, that in this one venture of all the trading concerns, there is a chance of employing

men who are not otherwise provided for. Notwithstanding the remarks of the Premier the banks of Australia were never in a stronger position than they are today. Last year they improved their position by something like 10 millions, and in addition, the position of the accounts improved by something like 10 millions, and the gold reserve increased by six millions, a record for Australia. If we can export timber, wheat, and wool and the product of the men engaged in primary production, we shall be in a good position, but unfortunately wool is not worth anything like what it was. Its value this year will probably be 10 millions less than we would have got for the same quantity last year.

The Premier: It is not likely to remain at the present price.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Instead of getting 28 millions as we did last year, we shall probably get 15 millions, and that will be a serious blow to the people. There is no need to fear if the Premier can get money to pay wages to men employed in building railways and other useful works so easily. If Sir John Forrest can find the money for the works the Premier would carry out, this country is fortunate in having Sir John Forrest as the Federal Treasurer. It is fortunate that the Federal Government have been able to give the Premier what he asked for.

The Premier: I have not had a reply yet.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Premier has had a reply, for he said he put up £5,000 and got £20,000 for it. However, it is no use prolonging the discussion. I thought that this would be the last opportunity of sounding a note of warning. This was necessary. It is useless for the Premier to say that the payment of 50 per cent. by the Agricultural Bank has not worked some hardship.

The Premier: I did not say that; I said it would.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The finances of the country will need to be very seriously watched, and if that is done there need be no trouble. When men are em-

ployed they must be paid, and it is possible to employ them here and to pay them. When it is a matter of finances, it is just a question of merely capable handling. In good times you can build up a deficit and take it out of loan money, and when you have not loan moneys to dip into, the position becomes serious. Month after month, before the war was thought of, we went to the bad and the Premier dipped into the loan resources.

The Premier : Who is responsible for that?

Hon. J. MITCHELL : The Premier is. He has more and is doing less with it. It is just a matter of management; good management on the part of the leader of the Opposition when he was in power, and bad management from my friends opposite. The leader of the Opposition does not want the Premier found fault with, and he does not want the Premier's Administration unduly criticised just now. I promise the Treasurer in connection with the matter of finance that whenever the opportunity offers about the country I shall refer to it. Too often the Premier has taken an unfair advantage of his position to attack the Government that went before. He is always at it.

The Premier : I am entitled to use all points available just as you do.

Hon. J. MITCHELL : Senator Pearce said "Government is finance." The people of the country say Government is finance, and we want the country to be financed wisely and well.

The PREMIER : I regret the tone of the debate this evening. The hon. member for Northam must be held responsible because he can hardly expect me to sit here and allow him to make the statements we have heard and to repeat them. I do not take much notice of his remarks in remote places like Jennapullen, etc.

Hon. J. Mitchell : Jennapullen is a very important place.

The PREMIER : It is true from a political point of view for the hon. member, I will admit, but when the hon. member comes into this House and makes statements as he has made about financial

bungling, I am entitled to put my point of view forward, and if necessary make comparisons between the financing of the present Government and that of the previous Government. I agree that Government is finance. That is how we have been operating for the last three years. We could have accomplished nothing if we had financed on the same lines as our friends opposite. I knew well that our friends opposite, with the aid of another place, would prevent us financing in the direction we wanted to do, that is in the direction of introducing reform.

Hon. J. Mitchell : Taxation.

The PREMIER : I was able to foresee at the outset what was going to happen with the finances. We had not been in office more than two months before we recognised that less than 9s. was not a living wage for a man with a family. When our friends opposite controlled the finances they controlled them in such a way that they could always show a slight margin, either a deficit or a surplus, so as to be able to reply to the artisans when a request was made for a living wage, that the finances would not allow it to be given. We admit having deliberately paid men a living wage and we would do the same again to-morrow, and if I cannot get the assistance of our friends opposite to obtain the money with which to pay a living wage, I will not worry.

Hon. J. Mitchell : It is the expenditure on motor cars that we object to.

The PREMIER : The hon. member talks about motor cars; that is about as paltry a thing as could be expected from the hon. member.

Hon. Frank Wilson : Cannot you dry up; you have had a cut already.

The PREMIER : I am going to reply to the criticism of the member for Northam.

Hon. Frank Wilson : Then I will reply again.

The PREMIER : I am not going to gag the leader of the Opposition; I am only replying simply because the member for Northam is not under the control of the leader of the Opposition. If the leader of the Opposition likes to

allow the member for Northam to get out of his control, it is no use looking to me for assistance.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You ought to learn to control yourself; never mind about him.

The PREMIER: Am I supposed to sit here and allow the member for Northam to act as spokesman for the leader of the Opposition in order to cover up his tracks and be able to say that the leader of the Opposition did not unfairly criticise the Government and then try to make the people believe that they did not know exactly what the Government were doing? I have repeated that I can close up any financial year with a magnificent surplus by financing as our friends opposite have done, that is by refusing to give a living wage, or by declining or reducing subsidies to local authorities or transferring revenue expenditure to loan.

Hon. Frank Wilson: We never did that; we always paid a living wage.

The PREMIER: The leader of the Opposition cut down subsidies to hospitals.

Hon. Frank Wilson: The hospitals were better catered for than they are now.

The PREMIER: Or by making the helpless in the community less helpful. The position is easy enough. Finance is Government, it is true, but that is the difference between the operations of the two parties.

Hon. Frank Wilson: It is absolutely impossible for the Premier to finance.

The PREMIER: The hon. member says so: not on the lines he suggests or expects us to. I cannot show a surplus with the present means of obtaining revenue and the present demand upon the Treasury. I cannot meet the demands that are made even now.

The Attorney General: Members opposite even wanted a motor car for a magistrate.

The PREMIER: It was only suggested this week that I might arrive at a place earlier in the morning in order to see the improvements made in connection with the river. If I had declined

to give the money the member for Northam would have been the first to complain that we had not kept faith with the promise that had been made.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): It is a waste of money at this juncture.

The PREMIER: I am told all over the country that there are further avenues for expenditure, and that I am not complying with the wants of the people. I cannot comply with them until we obtain the revenue necessary in the first instance. Our desire was to obtain revenue from those who could afford to pay it.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Tax the other fellow.

The PREMIER: The methods adopted in the past have been to tax men without their being able to know it, that is, by indirect taxation. Who is paying the customs duties from which we obtain a fair amount of our revenue at the present time? It is the working man. The customs duties are largely paid by the working man with a family of ten, who is paying his quota as well as the man with £5,000 a year and no family and living in luxury at Claremont. This is the same old cry. Hide up your methods of taxation in order that a man, the wage earner, will not appreciate the amount that he is paying. I regret that this long debate should be necessary. Here we are asking for supplies, and yet after the tea adjournment have not got through the first Committee. Three years ago, before the general elections, hon. members opposite did not even have to approach Parliament for supplies. They were able to carry on for four months without any reference to Parliament. Here, however, it takes a whole sitting to obtain supplies which are to carry on the Government through the general elections. Place this side by side with the action of the Opposition in the Federal Parliament, when supplies were asked for notwithstanding the fact that there was a forced double dissolution. Here we find there is a general election brought about by effluxion of time, an election which is of course necessary. We must go to the

country and must have supplies to carry on during the period over which the general elections are taking place. Let me put two or three things right. The hon. member for Northam says in the first instance that we ought to be thankful that we have Sir John Forrest as Federal Treasurer to enable us to do these things. That may be perfectly true, but may I, in order to allow the position to be correctly understood, explain that this matter was fixed and agreed to at the Premier's conference before Sir John Forrest reached Melbourne.

Mr. Bolton. He had nothing whatever to do with it.

The PREMIER: When the facts are made known there are of course all sorts of reasons given, but I am merely stating what transpired.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Your complaint then is against Mr. Holman?

The PREMIER: I am not complaining at all, except from this point of view: that the Federal Treasurer, together with his supporters, even State members including the hon. member for Northam, must have been going about the country trying to pour ridicule upon the Government, holding them up to contempt because they say that men are not employed to the same extent as previously, and using the argument that the Federal Treasurer, Sir John Forrest, is finding the money for us.

Hon. J. Mitchell: I said nothing of the sort.

The PREMIER: It seems to me that all that the Federal Government are required to do, so far as Western Australia is concerned—and I am doubtful about Victoria, because being far removed from the seat of Government we are in a different position from that State—all that they are expected to do, at all events, is to raise revenue and expend it. When a crisis such as this arrives we do not hear of people going to the Federal Government and telling them that they must find means of employment for the people.

Hon. J. Mitchell: They are employing them.

The PREMIER: I would like to know where? One of the first acts of the Liberal Federal Government was to practically close up the works in Cockburn Sound.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Why?

The PREMIER: That is what I want to know. Notwithstanding that Admiral Henderson was brought out to report on the question of the naval bases, and did report upon the question of the naval base in Western Australia, in Victoria and New South Wales, as soon as this last Federal Government came into power they stopped all work here, but it is noticeable that they did not stop the work at the other bases in the Eastern States. I claim that the Federal Government is just as much concerned, and responsible for the employment of people as the State Government and that it is their duty to find the money at such times as these, and that they should be responsible for seeing that there is no unemployment in any of the States, and that responsibility should not rest upon the States. I telegraphed to the Prime Minister pointing out that there was unemployment upon the goldfields, and asking him to employ as many men as possible in connection with the construction of the Trans-Australian railway. The reply which I got from him was that they appreciated their position in this matter, and that all the men who could be economically employed on the trans-Australian railway would not be dismissed.

Mr. Bolton: They dismissed 260 men from the naval base.

The PREMIER: Evidently all that they are responsible for is the keeping in employment of the men at present working there. Our responsibility is said to be to absorb all the unemployment due to the fact that firms are dispensing with the services of their employees. Our hon. friends opposite applauded the Federal Government for doing something which was their absolute duty to do, and which was not a favour at all. In my opinion the

Federal Government are not extending any favour towards us, and I decline to accept it as such. I regard it as a matter of their duty, whether they be a Liberal or a Labour Government, to do just what they are intending to do at the present time. It is a fair proposition whilst applauding the Federal Treasurer, Sir John Forrest, for his action that it should not be held up as anything but a duty devolving upon him to absorb any unemployment which exists. It certainly is one of the ways in which the Federal Government should spend their money at the present time. They have told us that our figure for our expenditure is quite high enough, and that we must exercise moderation. That is tantamount to saying that if we go higher they will not give us the money. I gave them our requirements for 12 months, and all the particulars that I could obtain were sent to the Prime Minister, and Sir John Forrest. We told them what we had already expended during the previous 12 months, and also the minimum departmental requirements that under the circumstances would be required to be provided by the Federal Treasurer.

Hon. J. Mitchell: They are giving you that.

The PREMIER: I have not heard so yet. I have no assurance from the Prime Minister that they are treating us as the other States are being treated. I am told by the Premier's conference that they are going to provide all the money necessary for public works to their full current volume. I have told them what we required last year, and what our requirements would be for this year, and what under the circumstances would be sufficient to enable us to carry on. The leader of the Opposition has said that I have held up the payments of the Agricultural Bank, notwithstanding that it was only a matter of £20,000. He must have known when he made the statement that it was not correct.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I did not say it.

The PREMIER. You said it was only a matter of £20,000.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You said that you could commence the repayment of the

money you had stopped now that you had £20,000. You paid £5,000 in gold and had £20,000 in notes for it. Therefore you were going to pay the 50 per cent. which you had stopped from the £20,000 to enable you to carry on.

The PREMIER: I do not think the leader of the Opposition appreciates the position. At the time when I had to reduce the payments from the Agricultural Bank by 50 per cent. I was unaware how far the Federal authorities were going to assist us. We approached the Federal Treasurer and had him in Cabinet, but he was not able to tell us.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You knew they would assist you as far as they could.

The PREMIER: I did not even know that or whether they would assist us at all. The action I took was merely to conserve as much as possible without bringing about any undue hardship, the cash which we had available. As soon as a decision was arrived at I decided to get into touch with the Federal Prime Minister, as Sir John Forrest had left Melbourne, asking what he could immediately make available. This was not under the arrangement made at the Premier's conference because that had not been decided. I made application in accordance with that arrangement some time ago, before the Federal Treasurer arrived in Melbourne, but I have had no reply. I decided, instead of waiting, that in accordance with the promise that I made to Parliament, I would endeavour to get a certain amount to carry on immediately. I asked whether they would make £20,000 in notes available, if I made available £5,000 and this I did. As soon as that is absorbed I will make a further claim upon that basis. It does not mean that £20,000 is the full extent of the difference we had to meet. Supposing it was £20,000 and I had found that £20,000 under the conditions prevailing at the commencement of last month, what would have been the position? It would have meant a loss to the extent of something like £80,000, because that £20,000 could now be turned into £100,000 in notes. There is the position. Instead of being able to find £20,000 worth of notes for

£5,000 in gold that £20,000 would have been gone, while to-day I could turn it into £100,000.

Hon. J. Mitchell: You can turn that into gold if you want to.

The PREMIER: But I cannot turn gold into notes on the same basis. I am pointing out what would have happened at the time I reduced the 50 per cent. in the Agricultural Bank. If I had paid out the money I could not have turned it into notes to-day. To-day I could get £100,000 for it.

Hon. J. Mitchell: If you will get me the notes I will get you £20,000 in sovereigns. The Premier has not the notes in his pocket.

The Attorney General: The hon. member must be a miracle worker.

The PREMIER: I regret that it is necessary for me to make all these explanations at this stage. I think everyone appreciates the fact that the time is a trying one from the point of view of the Treasurer. I certainly think that the public appreciates the fact and that the leader of the Opposition appreciates it too. I think that while it may be granted that the Opposition are entitled to fairly criticise the Government, even in such circumstances as these, they are not entitled to keep up that carping criticism which has come from the hon. member for Northam, and make wild statements which are not in accordance with the facts at all and expect one to sit down and give no reply. I do not propose to do it. I will give the Opposition all their rights so far as criticism is concerned, but I can fairly ask in the circumstances now existing that they should regard themselves responsible to some extent for assisting to find means to relieve the distress instead of all the time criticising us and not assisting. The leader of the Opposition in an interview with the Press took up the correct attitude in stating that he is not called upon to accept responsibility for any of the Government's actions, although he may be consulted and may agree to any course they adopt. We have consulted him in conformity with an arrangement made on matters connected with the work of Parliament. I am prepared to carry the responsibility for the

whole of our acts. Naturally the Government must do so, but in the special circumstances which have arisen I ask the Opposition to give me assistance to carry on and relieve distress and avoid further distress.

Hon. Frank Wilson: We will give that.

The PREMIER: That is all I am asking, but if the Opposition are going to criticise the action of the Government they should criticise fairly and in accordance with facts, and not endeavour to bring the Government into ridicule and make their position more difficult than it otherwise would be.

Question put and passed.

[The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.]

Resolution reported, and the report adopted.

#### *Committee of Ways and Means.*

The House having resolved into Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Price in the Chair,

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan) moved—

*That towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty for the service of the year ending 30th June, 1915, a sum not exceeding £1,250,000 be granted from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and from the General Loan Fund £200,000.*

Question passed.

[The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.]

Resolution reported, and the report adopted.

#### *Supply Bill introduced, etcetera.*

In accordance with the foregoing resolutions, Supply Bill introduced, passed through all its stages, and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

#### BILLS (5)—RETURNED FROM THE COUNCIL.

1. Osborne Park Tramways Purchase.
2. Foodstuffs Commission.

3. Bunbury Motor 'Bus Service.
4. Agricultural Bank Act Amendment.  
Without amendment.
5. Electoral Act Amendment.  
With amendments.

# BILL — GERALDTON AGRICULTURAL AND HORTICULTURAL SOCIETY'S LAND.

Received from the Council and read a first time

# BILL—FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT.

*All Stages.*

Received from the Council and read a first time.

*Second Reading.*

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister—North-East Fremantle) [S.12] in moving the second reading said: Members will see from a mere glance at the measure that it is for the purpose of assisting friendly societies during the present crisis. A number of members of friendly societies have joined the expeditionary force which will be leaving this State, and other members will in all probability be unable, through lack of employment, to continue to pay the full amount of their contributions. This Bill is introduced with the consent of the registrar to allow the friendly societies, if they so desire, by resolution of their members to grant relief from payment of the whole or part of the contributions which are due, at the same time reserving to the members who will be leaving the State and to those unable to pay owing to the crisis, their full benefits and rights as if they had continued to contribute to their respective societies. A deputation recently waited on the registrar asking that relief should be given, as is provided for in this Bill, to enable the societies to allow the members under such conditions to continue as members. If they lose a considerable number of members through the non-payment of dues, it will be serious for the societies. At the same time, every provision necessary to protect the sta-

bility of the societies has been introduced into the measure. Every action must be approved by the registrar before the reduction can be made. Other powers are given whereby the registrar may, if he thinks necessary, approve of a levy to be placed on members who are in a position to pay the contribution, and a provision is made whereby the societies can at a later date claim the payment of back dues either in whole or in portion, as decided by a general meeting of members. I do not know that I need say any more on the matter. It is a Bill purely for the purpose of meeting a contingency, if it is necessary to do so, and it will only come into operation by proclamation. I move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Hon. FRANK WILSON (Sussex) [S.16]: I think it is a very proper Bill to pass. It requires very little debate. The provisions have been explained by the Honorary Minister and the only position we need to concern ourselves with is in connection with the stability of the societies. In this regard everything depends upon the Registrar, who can at any time direct a levy to be made on the members in order to preserve the stability of the society. I think that a Bill which tends to allow members of a friendly society to go to the war to fight for the Empire or which relieves any who unfortunately may be thrown out of employment either directly or indirectly as a result of the crisis we are passing through, should be supported by hon. members.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc.*

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

Read a third time and *passed*.

# BILL—LEEDERVILLE RATES VALUATION.

*All Stages.*

Introduced by the Minister for Works and read a first time.

*Second Reading.*

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. D. Johnson—Guildford) [8.20] in moving the second reading said: The Bill has been rendered necessary through the introduction of the validating Bill for the municipality of Cottesloe. It appears that when that Bill was passed to validate the rates of Cottesloe which were invalid owing to the neglect of the mayor in not signing the rate-book, some of the big land agents busied themselves going round inspecting the rate-books of other municipalities with a view to seeing if they could legally refuse to pay the rates. They discovered that the Leederville municipality was in somewhat the same position as that of Cottesloe, where the mayor had neglected to initial the pages of the rate-book, although the rate had been struck according to the Act. Another section of the Act prescribes that a copy of the memorandum which appears in the rate-book shall be published in the Press. In this case some notification was given to the Press, but the memorandum was not published in full. This was discovered by some of the land agents, and they refused to pay their rates. The Leederville council appealed to the Government to have a validating Bill put through. I sent an officer out to inspect the books to see whether everything else was in order or whether anything further was necessary to put the municipality on a sound footing from the rate-collecting point of view. That officer pointed out certain informalities in previous ratings, an evidence of carelessness, and consequently the Bill is not only to validate the rate struck last year, but also rates previously struck. The Government had no alternative to responding to the request of the municipality, and the Bill is introduced as a result. However, I would like to point out to the municipalities that Parliament cannot go on continually considering Bills of this description. I wish to draw the attention of the municipalities to the fact that under the Act if certain prescribed things are not done a penalty is entailed, and it will become necessary for the Government to enforce some penalty if the

mayors of municipalities neglect to carry out the duties they have pledged themselves to perform. I understand that in this present case the mayor was not aware that this was necessary and, the neglect having taken place in previous years, it was allowed to become general. I make these remarks in order to appeal to the municipalities to study the Act, and to appeal to the administrative officers, namely, the town clerks of the various municipalities, to draw attention to the fact that the mayors have these duties to perform, and that they should be performed in order to avoid the necessity for the introduction of these Bills which mean expense and an amount of unnecessary trouble to Parliament.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Can you not fine the town clerk?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No. The Act says it is the mayor who is liable. We must of course blame the town clerk, for he is the man who should attend to these matters. However, the Act prescribes that in cases of neglect of this description a penalty can be enforced. No one would like to enforce a penalty against any mayor, but it is worth while drawing attention to the fact that if it goes on much further Parliament will see that something is done to avoid repetition. I move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Question passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etcetera.*

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

Read a third time and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

## BILL—WORKERS' HOMES ACT AMENDMENT.

*All Stages.*

Introduced by the Premier and read a first time.

*Second Reading.*

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan—Brown Hill-Ivanhoe) [8.27] in moving



the second reading said: This is a small measure to enable the Workers' Homes Board to extend the due date of payment of any moneys payable by a lessee or mortgagor to the board in the case of hardship. Each case under this measure will have to be dealt with on its merits, and the terms and conditions must be subject to the approval of the Minister. A number of successful applicants for workers' homes have made application in a general way for the suspension of their payments to the board, but I was not prepared to approve of such applications because it would enable those—who were perhaps not justified in obtaining this consideration—having the powers that would be given to them under this to refuse to pay anything further to the board until we had passed through the present crisis. I recognised at the same time that there was quite a number who perhaps through unemployment or reduction in salary or wages would not be able to keep up their present payments. The existing Act provides heavy penalties for getting into arrears. Power is given to the board to forego those penalties, and after consultation with the board we agreed that it would be better to give the board power to extend the payments under such terms and conditions as the board think fit, subject to the approval of the Minister. The only way of doing this in a proper legal form is by a Bill of this nature. I move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Hon. FRANK WILSON (Sussex) [S.29]: The Premier has been good enough to consult me in connection with this measure, and it seems to me the provision really ought to have been included in the original Act. I think the House can safely pass the Bill, for the power given can only be exercised after the approval of the Minister, which is a sufficient safeguard.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etcetera.*

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

Read a third time and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

## BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

*All stages.*

Introduced by the Attorney General, and read a first time.

### *Second Reading.*

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. T. Walker—Kanowna) [S.34]: In moving the second reading of this Bill a few words only, I trust, of explanation will be necessary. It is a measure produced by the times we are in, and may perhaps be necessary. My hope is that we shall not have to put this Bill into operation. The Bill provides that there shall be power, by proclamation, to restrict or prohibit the sale, offer for sale, supply or gift of liquor, within any licensing district, or any defined portion of any licensing district. It further provides that, if it should be deemed necessary, by proclamation there can be a limitation of the hours in which on licensed premises liquor may be sold. Then it provides that we shall have the use of, that we shall keep intact, the powers conferred by the Licensing Act, 1911, and by that measure which was passed for the prevention of sly groggeries. But this Bill goes further still. As regards remote parts of the State where sly drinking and groggeries exist, it provides that a police constable, without warrant, shall have the power to search premises, and also to search vehicles which may be suspected of conveying intoxicants to a camp of any kind, or to a township, or to any place where the consumption of liquor may ensue. The Bill gives power, moreover, for the seizure of alcohol so suspected of being intended to be used for sly grogery purposes, and for the retention of that alcohol until the embargo shall have been removed by proclamation, or this measure shall have ceased to have force. I would rather have seen the Bill provide for the continuance of these powers until the ene-

nies of His Majesty had ceased to be enemies, until the war had ended, as has been the case with the other emergency measures which have been introduced. However it is provided in the Bill that this measure shall operate only until March, 1915. In the interim, of course, another Parliament will have been elected to take charge of affairs; and if it should be found necessary to continue this measure, or to re-enact it, that course will devolve on the ensuing Parliament. In the meantime we do not know when it may be necessary to use the drastic powers provided by this Bill. There are some parts of the State, as we know, where excitement between those who are loyal to the British Empire and those who may feel that their patriotism leads them to be otherwise, to be patriots of alien countries, may lead to all kinds of riot and disorder. We cannot tell where, under drunken excitement, danger may crop up, and to what it may lead. I do not want to enlarge upon the disabilities that may come from drink in time of great public excitement. The measure is one which has been found necessary in belligerent countries, and in the Home country itself. It may be, I hope it will not be, an absolute necessity to put this measure into force here by proclamation. However, until the measure is given vitality by means of a proclamation, it has no weight. Its value lies in giving certain powers, should the exercise of those powers ever become necessary. That is the essential feature of the measure, which I do not think requires any lengthy speech in order to commend its principle to the Chamber. I therefore move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Hon. FRANK WILSON (Sussex) [8.38]: I must confess that I viewed this measure with some concern when I first read it through. The powers it contains are so drastic, covering as they do absolute prohibition by proclamation in any portion of the State, and also absolute control over the hours of opening and closing. Therefore, one hesitates some little time before making up one's

mind to agree to such a measure. The powers conveyed by the Bill are, in our existing legislation, referred to the people. We have recognised the right of the people in the various districts to settle these questions; but, of course, the times make all the difference in the measures that we have to pass. At the present juncture I recognise we may deem it necessary, for instance, to declare martial law. The Federal Government may declare martial law, and if they do they will have all the powers contained in this measure. Having proclaimed martial law they could do anything they thought necessary in the interests of peace and good government. Therefore I think it would be wise to give the Government the power that they seek, in case such power has to be exercised in the interests of the community as a whole. I think so more especially as our Parliament is dying, is pretty well dead, and we will have an interregnum of perhaps two or three months before we can possibly call the new Parliament together, to pass legislation of this description, should it be necessary. Therefore, after consultation with the Premier, I have consented to pass legislation of this description, as I realise that, notwithstanding the powers under the Bill are so extensive, they will be put into operation only if the occasion and the necessities of the time should require that course. It appears to me, however, in connection with this Bill that if the Government have to exercise, for example, the power of total prohibition in any given district for any lengthened period, it would be a hardship on the licensees. Their trade for the time being would be absolutely closed down; and it is a question whether, under such circumstances, we should not impose some of the burden on the landlords, the owners of the licensed properties. I throw this out as a suggestion for consideration, whether we should not include in this measure a clause to the effect that if licensed houses have to be closed in the interests of the public in any given district, then during such closure the licensees shall not, at any rate, be liable to pay the whole rental of the pre-

mises. I think it would be equitable if the licensees were exempt from paying the full rentals during such periods. The rentals of these establishments are fairly high, as hon. members know.

The Premier: I do not think licensed premises would be closed absolutely. They would only be prevented from supplying drink.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It comes to the same thing.

The Premier: No. Hotels provide accommodation for travellers. The State hotels do, anyhow.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier must realise that the rentals, or the ingoings, which are enormous, are fixed upon the business that can be done in the sale of intoxicating liquor. Otherwise these premises would not require any license, except a boarding house license. It is from the sale of liquor that the profit comes. Therefore it seems to me that we might take that fact into consideration. A very short clause would meet the position, giving power to suspend the payment of rent during such time as licensed houses are debarred from selling liquor. If that were done, I do not think there could be any exception taken to the measure. Together with the Attorney General, I believe, or at any rate I hope, that we shall never need to put the measure into operation. I trust that the fears expressed by some sections of the community as to trouble arising, which would necessitate the putting of this measure into operation, will prove to be false. At any rate, we must clothe the Government with sufficient powers to preserve the peace and good order of the community during the present crisis. Therefore I am taking no exception to the Bill. I am merely pointing out that such a clause as I have suggested, and which possibly some legal gentleman opposite would frame, might be acceptable to the Government. Perhaps the Attorney General will consider the matter. I think that such a clause should be included; and, if it were, the measure would be assured of readier acceptance at the hands of the public generally. The amendment might be made here, and the

Bill could be sent to the Legislative Council on Thursday. I presume that although the Attorney General did not mention it, he has been in consultation with the police, and he has acted after due consideration.

The Attorney General: Absolutely.

Mr. DWYER (Perth) [8.46]: As the Attorney General has pointed out there is need for a measure such as this in the present crisis, but I think in a case of this kind the owner should bear his proportion of any loss incurred. There is no doubt that in normal circumstances the rent of an hotel is fixed on the understanding that it shall remain open during certain hours and the lessee agrees to pay rent in consideration of being allowed to keep open during those hours; therefore if any restriction of hours takes place it is only equitable that the lessor of the premises should bear his proportion of the loss. If the hotelkeeper suffers through being obliged to close for a certain time, not only he, but the landlord should bear his proportion of the loss. Of course the rent is only one consideration. There are also the rates and the same principle applies, because what is equitable for the landlord as regards the rates and license fees should also be good and equitable as against the persons to whom the license fees and rates are payable. Therefore I submit that the Bill should be made to apply equally to all parties concerned. When there is a loss on one side, it must be counterbalanced by a corresponding diminution on the other side. If the licensee of the hotel loses his trade to the extent of the time he is forced to close, the landlord to whom he pays the rent, and the persons who collect rates and taxes and license fees, should also bear their proportion. I think that another clause is absolutely necessary to provide for what I have suggested in the event of a proclamation being made under Clause 2 or Clause 3.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Kannana) in reply [8.50]: The suggested amendment commends itself to me. There is only one difficulty about it, however, and it is the possibility of delaying the

passage of the Bill. The suggestion that the amendment might be made in another Chamber, however, gets over the difficulty. I will accept the suggestion, more particularly as it emphasises one particular phase of the question which apart from this Bill I am interested in. It shows that the real value paid for by the publican is the license.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Undoubtedly.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The license is the sole thing that has rental value, and adds a rental value to the premises; and the point that goes further with me is that if that be the value, it is the State's property. The State only charges a nominal fee for the license, and yet the moment that license is granted enormous rentals follow, and that really should be the property of the State. I am not sure whether we could get that inserted; we should not forego what is really the State's property.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Unfortunately you are not reaping profits out of your State hotels.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: We are, undoubtedly, whereas private individuals get the profits under the existing state of affairs. However, I am not anxious to inflict any injury upon those conducting trades of this kind, and as my object is to protect the general public in case of emergency I see no objection to the introduction of the amendment. I will have it drafted and forwarded to another place.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etcetera.*

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

Read a third time, and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

#### BILL—ROAD CLOSURE.

*Order discharged.*

Order of the Day read for consideration in Committee of the Road Closure Bill.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. T. H. Bath): In view of the fact that I

require further investigations to be made in regard to two of the closures included in this Bill, I move—

*That the Order of the Day be discharged.*

Question passed, the Order discharged.

#### BILL—SPECIAL LEASE ENABLING.

*In Committee.*

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

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Ratification of Agreement:

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: When considering this Bill on the second reading, members were desirous of securing further information in regard to the exact locality of this area. I made the maps available on the Table of the House for the information of members, and if they have not seen them, I may say that this area is in Hanover Bay, running from Halfway Bay to St. George's Basin, and along the coast, between Derby and Wyndham; what might be termed the extreme northern part of Western Australia. It is in the electorate represented by the member for Kimberley. I do not know whether that hon. member has ever visited his constituents in that part of the State; if he has he will be able to supply further information in regard to the locality. In discussing this matter with Mr. Cole, that gentleman stated that he had visited the locality and had satisfied himself that it was suitable for his requirements. Personally I am of the opinion that any settlement in this particular area will not be carried out without those who are undertaking the enterprise meeting with considerable difficulties. In the first place all the information we have leads us to believe that in this area the aborigines are perhaps the most difficult to deal with that there are in the whole length and breadth of Western Australia; and the fact that there are several missions along this coast, north and south of this locality, where different denominations are seeking to win the aborigines over to a more peaceful life, indicates that the intending settlers may

encounter some trouble. However, this is the area selected for settlement, and in view of the fact that the conditions require that the land shall be used for the purposes set forth, it is a matter for the lessee's own responsibility in regard to the area.

Mr. MALE: I must thank the Minister for making available the plan showing the locality. I have no objection whatever to the Bill as introduced. It does not of course altogether appeal to me as being the most suitable place in which to start tropical agriculture, for it is, I suppose, as far isolated from a port as it can possibly be. There are no ports in the vicinity but there are the makings of fine ports, and it will be necessary for any company to provide itself with shipping facilities. Unless they take a fair number of white men with them it seems to me that they will be courting great danger. In view of past happenings in that part of the State it would be advisable for any company to see that it was properly protected and in a position to look after itself. I have pleasure in supporting the measure.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 2—agreed to.

Schedule, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

#### ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan—Brown Hill-Ivanhoe) [9.3]: I move—

*That the House at its rising adjourn until 4.30 p.m. on Thursday next.*

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 9.4 p.m.*

## Legislative Council.

Wednesday, 2nd September, 1914.

	PAGE
Personal Explanation: Hon. J. J. Holmes and the Civil Service .. ..	987
Motion: Agricultural Bank Advances .. ..	990
Bills: Bills of Sale Act Amendment, report, 3a. Kingla Grass Tree Concession Confirmation, 3R. .. ..	996
Supply (No. 2), £1,450,000, 2R., Com., 3R. Workers' Homes Act Amendment, 2R., Com., 3R. .. ..	996
Leederville Rates Validation, 2R., Com., 3R. Licensing Act Amendment, 2R., Com., 3R. ..	998
Special Lease Enabling, 2R., Com., 3R. ..	1008
Rights in Water and Irrigation, Com., 3R. ..	1009
	1012
	1020

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

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

*Hon. J. J. Holmes and the Civil Service.*

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [4.33]: Mr. President, last evening the leader of the House thought fit to make an attack on me, and say things in connection with myself that, if they were true, would practically forbid me to be entitled to remain a member of this House. The worst feature of the whole thing is that the hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that what he says is not true. He said that I made use of language of the ale house and the racecourse spieler. He said, further, that I had pushed one officer out of the service whilst I was Minister for Railways, that this officer was replaced by a man who had been dismissed from the railway service for manipulating cash, and who had been guilty of disgraceful conduct; and further, that I, knowing it to be so, appointed this man as confidential secretary, and that the man was no better than a low pimp and a cash manipulator, and that the new confidential secretary to the Minister was kicked out of the service. The hon. gentleman knows all the facts in connection with the matter, for he was in the House at the time. Further, he was one of a number of gentlemen who complimented me upon the stand I took on that occasion. True, I did appoint, and the hon. gentleman knows it, a man to a position in the service, and he was practically one of the smartest railway men in the State. I ap-