

the Transfer of Land Act. It is introduced for the purpose of economy. The Commissioner of Titles has brought under the notice of the Government the fact that by this simple amendment a good deal of work can be saved and also a considerable amount of expense. Under Section 87 of the present Act when a transfer of land is made of the whole of the land comprised in the certificate, the transfer can be endorsed on the original certificate kept by the Lands Department, a like endorsement made on the duplicate, and the duplicate handed to the transferee. An exception, however, was made when the Act was passed which provided that in the case of a title dealing with tenancy in common, when it was created or cancelled, the original certificate was kept in the department and cancelled, and a fresh certificate was issued. It is the issue of this fresh certificate which causes extra work and additional expense. After experience of the working of the Act for many years, it has been found that there is no necessity for this exception. It is desired to do away with the exception and the effective clause which will achieve this object is Clause 2 of the Bill. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

The PRESIDENT: I have received the following communication from the Auditor General:—

In pursuance of Section 53 of the Audit Act, 1904, I have the honour to transmit, for presentation to the Legislative Council, a copy of the Hon. the Colonial Treasurer's Statement of the Public Accounts of the State of Western Australia for the financial year ended the 30th June, 1920, together with my report thereon.

The paper will lie on the Table.

House adjourned at 11 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Friday, 17th December, 1920.

	PAGE
Questions: Railway rates and mining industry ...	2551
Wheat price and flour stocks ...	2551
Police protection, Minister for Defence ...	2552
Resolution: Returned soldiers and railway passes	2573
Bills: Tax Collection, 2k., etc. ...	2552
Dentists, Com. ...	2578
Land Tax and Income Tax, returned ...	2560
Dividend Duties Act Amendment, returned ...	2560
Mekatharra-Horseshoe Railway, returned ...	2561
Jerdsmann's Lake Drainage, returned ...	2561
Public Service Act Amendment, returned ...	2561
Auditor General's report ...	2581

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

QUESTION—RAILWAY RATES AND MINING INDUSTRY.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN (for Mr. Troy) asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Has his attention been drawn to the injury being done to the primary industries, particularly the mining industry, by the excessive railway freights? 2, Is he aware that the heavy railway charges, if continued, will give a very serious set-back to the development of the mining industry on the Murchison? 3, Did he in September last, at the Murchison prospectors' conference, promise to revise the freights with a view to bringing about a reduction? 4, If so, when does he propose to take action?

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Railways) replied: 1, No. 2, No. The only increases this year on goods freights, apart from timber and coal, are surcharges of from 3d. to 3s. per ton. These increases apply irrespective of distance, and obviously press less heavily on the long distance traffic such as the Murchison trade, than would a percentage increase. 3, At the recent prospectors' conference held at Magnet, the question of freights was touched upon by the delegates, and the Minister in reply pointed out that owing to increased cost of working, the Railway Department was not in a position to justify any reduction in charges. 4, Answered by No. 3.

QUESTION—WHEAT PRICE AND FLOUR STOCKS.

Mr. ANGELO (for Mr. Duff) asked the Premier: Whether the Government, in view of the fixing of the price of wheat at 9s. per bushel as from the 1st January next, are prepared to purchase from the flour millers of the State the whole of their stocks of flour now on hand at the price fixed by the Prices Regulation Commission, and to retail the flour at cost to the baking trade and the public generally?

The PREMIER replied: The stocks of flour in the hands of millers other than the

stocks held on account of the Wheat Marketing Scheme for export, will be sold for local consumption at present rates.

QUESTION—POLICE PROTECTION, MINISTER FOR DEFENCE.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Is he aware that two detectives accompanied the Minister for Defence to Kalgoorlie? 2, Are the State Government paying for the protection of the Minister while in this State? 3, What are the specific duties of Detectives Lambert and Manning while in Kalgoorlie? 4, Does the Minister for Mines, as administering the Police Department, approve of detectives accompanying the Minister for Defence to Gwalia, seeing that his audience of 16 showed no hostility?

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Mines) replied: 1, Yes. 2, Yes. Payment of the police is an obligation of the State Government. 3, The duties imposed by the Police Act, 1892, and its amendments and regulations. 4, Yes. Such arrangements are framed upon possibilities and not results.

BILL—TAX COLLECTION.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [4.38]: The agreement which this Bill seeks to ratify marks an important step as regards the distribution of functions between the respective Governments of this State and of the Commonwealth, and consequently deserves the most weighty consideration. We are just at the close of the first 20 years of Federation, and probably it is safe to say that the great majority of the Australian people now recognise that their original hopes or aspirations or anticipations relative to Federation have not been altogether realised. Wherever there are two Governments set up to govern the same country, there is bound to be disputation as to where the functions of the one begin and those of the other end. In our brief Federal history there have been many of these conflicts of opinion. However, even apart from that aspect, even where the line of division can be clearly drawn either under the Constitution or in the light of Commonwealth or State laws, it is inevitable that a tug-of-war should be continuously in progress, between what after all have become rival Governments, as to which shall take to itself the greater power. Our experience, I think, has been that right throughout the period of Federation, whenever a struggle has taken place on the one hand to obtain power and on the other hand to retain power, the stronger Government, namely, that of the Commonwealth, has won. It is inevitable that in the end the stronger power should prevail. Year by year we have found the Commonwealth making inroads upon what were re-

garded as peculiarly the functions of the State Parliaments and the State Governments. So we have the position that duplications exist in administrative work, duplications which increase from year to year. If we are to return to the condition of things which existed at the outset of Federation, namely, that there shall be only one department administering one public concern, this apparently can be done only by the State (Governments surrendering more or less of their powers and functions to the stronger Government, that of the Commonwealth. This Bill proposes an important step in that direction. People have been complaining, and rightly complaining, that they are overburdened with excessive taxation by reason of the overlapping of State and Federal Governments in the matter of taxation and other governmental functions. My opinion is that the public generally are not much concerned as to whether the Commonwealth Government give way and allow the State to perform the work, or whether the State Government give way and allow the Commonwealth Government to perform the work, so long as they, the public, are relieved of the burden of maintaining rival departments. Nevertheless, it is a fact that all this tends inevitably towards depriving the States of their sovereign powers. The various Commonwealth Governments have been in my opinion entirely responsible for the duplication of departments. They launched out by establishing the Commonwealth Savings Bank to compete with the State Savings Bank. I consider the Commonwealth were not justified in taking that step. It was followed by the establishment of a Federal Electoral Department to perform work which could very well have been continued by the State Electoral Departments. Subsequently a Commonwealth Taxation Department was also established. Still later, upon the completion of the Great Western railway, we found the Commonwealth Government establishing a Railway Department of their own, notwithstanding that there are at both ends of the Commonwealth railway State railway staffs which could easily have performed the services required by the Federal Government. At our end of the system, Kalgoorlie, and no doubt at the other end of the system, Port Augusta, there are staffs of officials amply competent to manage the Great Western Railway—that is, of course, apart from the men required for the actual operation of the line between Kalgoorlie and Port Augusta. Though we have a traffic superintendent, a district engineer, a locomotive inspector and such officials in Kalgoorlie, only a mile or two miles away at the depot of the Trans-Australian Railway there are Commonwealth officials holding similar positions and performing similar duties. All this has resulted in unnecessary expenditure. It is all duplication. Before the opening of the Trans-Australian Railway the Western Australian Government offered to do all the work necessary, but of course the Commonwealth, pursuing the policy which they have

pursued since the inception of Federation, decided to establish a separate railway department of their own. The latest instance we have has been the Commonwealth setting up the machinery for another department in Perth to carry out the erection of soldier homes, notwithstanding that Federal Ministers were shown that the State had a department which administers the workers' homes and could very well have carried out the necessary work, if not more efficiently at least as efficiently and probably more economically than it could be done by the Commonwealth.

Mr. Johnston: We had a splendidly established organisation.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That is so. But notwithstanding this, the Commonwealth appointed officials, and all the machinery of administration was set up to do work which must be of a more or less temporary character. The demand for the erection of soldier homes will last for only a few years at the most, when those who require them will have been accommodated, so there will be no need for the department except for administrative purposes because the homes have been established on the time payment or purchase system. All this work should have been carried out by the State without another department being opened by the Commonwealth. In all these instances the Commonwealth have been responsible. They have established departments where there was no need whatever for them. If we are going to get rid of duplications, apparently the State will have to hand over the work to the Federal authority. It is an important departure to hand over to the Commonwealth Government the right to collect our land and income taxes, our dividend taxes and our totalisator taxes. Four of our taxes are to be handed over to the Commonwealth for collection. Of course it will result in a saving to the State. The work we are told will be performed for one-third of the estimated cost for the present financial year, but I do not know whether we are justified after all in surrendering our work to the Commonwealth, even for a saving of two-thirds of the total cost of collecting these taxes at present. It is all a step forward in the policy of centralisation, and anyone who has had experience of government from Melbourne by the Federal authorities knows perfectly well that it is not advantageous to the people of this State. It may be all right for Victoria and New South Wales, which are close to the seat of government and are in a better position by virtue of the fact that their members are on the spot and that they have so much greater representation in numbers than have we. They do not feel the disabilities to anything like the same degree that the outlying portions of the Commonwealth are feeling them at the present time, and have felt them in the past. It is inevitable that, wherever we have people governed by a Parliament situated remote from the governed, then there will be difficulties and those people will receive very little consideration indeed. Not that the men charged with the responsi-

bility of governing the Commonwealth are any less desirous of doing justice to the people of this State, than would be any member of the Government in this State, but being so far away and having so few opportunities to become acquainted with the actual needs and requirements of the people of a State such as Western Australia, neglect must result. We have had innumerable instances of it. When I was in charge of the Mines Department correspondence was forwarded to Federal Ministers on many occasions on matters of very great importance indeed to large sections of the people of Western Australia, and not only did we fail to get consideration or redress, but very frequently our correspondence failed to even elicit an acknowledgment. As an instance I recall a time when the Federal Government, shortly after the outbreak of war, refused to allow the export of copper or base metals from this State. For years prior to that the copper mines at Whim Creek had been exporting their ore overseas. The Commonwealth Government prohibited export and that mine had to suspend operations for the time being. When the position was represented to the Federal Government by voluminous correspondence extending over nearly eight months—I myself wrote no fewer than four times to the Minister concerned—this correspondence failed to secure acknowledgment, and it was only after I made a statement to the "West Australian" newspaper condemning the apathy and indifference of the Federal Government, and forwarded a copy of it direct to the Minister concerned that any reply was given. This is only one instance. Quite a number of small prospectors who were producing tin, copper, lead, and other base metals were practically ruined, because of the indifference of the Federal Government to their needs and requirements. So it has been right along the line. In so far as we centralise the functions of government in Melbourne and hand over our power to authorities on the eastern side of Australia, so far will our causes for complaint in the direction indicated be multiplied in the future.

Mr. Johnston: But we retain our State Commissioner of Taxation.

Hon. P. COLLIER: We retain the skeleton; they have the substance. The fact remains that we are placed in a subordinate position. They collect our taxes for us. We are standing in the same relationship to the Commonwealth as a road board or municipality stands in relation to this Parliament, and I do not know that there is any hope for it. They control the power of the purse, and as the years drift by, it seems to me the Commonwealth will keep on gathering to itself greater and greater power to the disadvantage of this State more than any of the other States, except perhaps Queensland which, too, is far removed; but Queensland being a larger State and having greater representation and consequently more voice at the seat of government, will not suffer so much as will Western Australia. I do not

know that I would be justified in voting against the Bill, because the people demand a reduction of unnecessary expenditure, but I do say that it would be with a very great deal of hesitation that I would give to the Commonwealth even one ounce of power more than they have at the present time or more than I am forced to concede to them. It is quite natural that Federal Ministers and members should strive for power. There is something I suppose in the make-up of all of us that leads us to strive for power.

Mr. O'Loghlen: And abuse it when they get it.

Mr. Angelo: A desire to become the top dog.

Hon. P. COLLIER: We all do that; I suppose it is human nature. Members of the Federal Parliament will endeavour to add to the dignity, power and importance of their position; they can only do it by taking it away from the States and the State Parliaments, and it will be a bad thing for this country if the people have to go to Melbourne for a redress of grievances, instead of being able to come to the Parliament of their own State. Members who represent outlying constituencies in this State know how they have a difficulty in getting a hearing for those whom they represent.

Mr. O'Loghlen: The Government refused to pay the travelling expenses for outback members.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I do not know about that, but where people are situated 500 or 600 miles from Perth as they are in the outer goldfields or 200 or 300 miles from Perth as are the people in the farther out agricultural areas, we know that a great deal of time elapses before the difficulties under which they labour can be removed, simply because of the fact that they are so far from the seat of government. The same thing applies to government from Melbourne. I am not one of those who believes in unification with Parliaments constituted as they are to-day, and it seems to me that while we will save some money by passing this Bill, it is a surrender of the sovereign powers of this State, a recognition that after all it is only a matter of time when the whole of the government of this State will be in the hands of the Commonwealth. It will not be long before the Commonwealth will be reaching out for the control of our railways. They will be reaching out for the control of all those things from which they will be able to extract taxation or which will produce revenue, but they will not want to take over such things as health or education or departments of that kind. Those will be the very last departments over which the Commonwealth will seek to secure control. However, it is a matter for the House to decide. The Government, after having come to the tentative agreement, could do nothing else than bring it forward for Parliamentary consideration, and it is with a very great deal of hesitation and doubt that I should concede the powers asked for in this Bill.

Mr. PILKINGTON (Perth) [5.0]: I quite agree with the leader of the Opposition that only with the greatest hesitation should we give up powers belonging to the State. I believe there will have to be a change of some sort from the present Federal Constitution. As we are at present, the relation between the States and the Commonwealth are highly unsatisfactory. Some sort of a change will have to be made. What that change will be I do not know, nor can I express an opinion as to what it ought to be. Whatever it may be, it will require very grave discussion both with the States and the Commonwealth. I agree that we should be very slow to take any steps which would hand over our powers to the Commonwealth. What I want to point out in regard to the Bill is that we are not handing over any sovereign powers to the Commonwealth. It is quite a different thing from, say, handing over the railways, which would mean that the railways would be handed to the Commonwealth and held by the Commonwealth for all time, unless the Commonwealth chose to hand them back to the State. In that case, indeed, we would be surrendering certain of our powers; but in this case we are merely entering into an agreement with the Commonwealth under which the Commonwealth will do certain work for the State, and that agreement can be put an end to at six months' notice.

Hon. P. Collier: But will it not strengthen the hands of the Commonwealth in their desire for more power?

Mr. PILKINGTON: I appreciate that view of the case, but I think the extent to which it will strengthen the hands of the Commonwealth in encroaching on the State will be infinitesimal. However, as I say, in this case we are only handing over certain work and can, by cancelling the agreement, take back that work. We are only authorising the Commonwealth to exercise certain of our powers as our agents. I do not think there is any real danger in allowing the Bill to go through and the agreement to be confirmed. I agree with the leader of the Opposition as to the enormous disadvantage of having to go to Melbourne in regard to our affairs. It is a very real disability, and if ever anything takes place in the way of unification, I sincerely trust it will be limited by providing some local authority to act on behalf of the Commonwealth Government. However, in the present case we are not really handing over any powers at all, but simply entering into an agreement which, if it does not work satisfactorily, we can put an end to on giving six months' notice.

Mr. ANGELO (Gascoyne) [5.3]: At one time and another every member of the House has referred to the absurdity of having a duplication of departments. It is very desirable that wherever one department can carry out the functions of both Federal and State departments, as for instance, the tax-

ation, electoral, housing and other departments, the obvious saving should be effected. But I doubt whether the present agreement is advisable. We have had a debate regarding the financial relationship between the State and the Commonwealth, and nearly every speaker stressed the bad treatment which this State had received from the Federal Government. Only this afternoon the leader of the Opposition pointed out that Western Australia had not had a fair deal from the Federal Government. A convention is almost due.

The Premier: It is overdue.

Mr. ANGELO: And we are hoping that a very different agreement will be entered into at that convention. In my opinion it is going to be a fight between the two big States, Victoria and New South Wales, and the four small States as to what functions the Federal Government shall exercise in the future and what departments they are to control. It will be a question of whether or not we are to have unification. It is most necessary that the four small States, or at any rate, Tasmania, Western Australia, and South Australia, should stand united. If we give away certain powers which the other States have retained, I am afraid it will prejudice us in any joint action with the other small States. It would be a splendid plan if, before the convention met, the Premiers of the four small States, who have suffered so much from Federation, could get together and agree on a joint policy to be advocated at the convention. First and foremost they ought to insist upon equal representation among the States.

Mr. O'Loughlen: How would you appoint it.

Mr. ANGELO: That is a matter for consideration. We require equal representation, say, six members from each State. That would give us a chance to secure fair treatment when the convention met. Then we should discuss the advisability of entering into an agreement with the Federal Government for, say, the collection of taxes and in respect of other matters. But I am afraid that if we now give away a certain department, as suggested by the Bill, we cannot go to a conference with the other States and expect to be heard on an equal footing.

The Premier: Queensland has handed over the savings bank, and Tasmania is having her taxes collected in the manner proposed in the Bill.

Mr. ANGELO: Well, so much the better if we are to give this department away.

The Premier: We are not giving anything away.

Mr. ANGELO: If, as the Premier says, the convention is overdue and must be held next year, it might be well for us to stay our hand. Although by passing the Bill we shall save £20,000 per annum, it might prove to be false economy to do it just now. I would prefer to see it held over until we have a con-

ference with the other small States and arrive at a joint policy. Let us hold the convention as soon as possible and let us first go to a conference with the other small States and leave this question until the conference has been held. That being my view, I regret that I cannot support this agreement.

Mr. O'LOUGHLEN (Forrest) [5.9]: I realise the difficulties pointed out by the leader of the Opposition, and I appreciate the fact that the members of the Commonwealth Parliament, ever greedy for more power, will possibly see in this agreement a tendency on the part of the State to give up that which we hold. I realise all that. But above and beyond any abuse we have suffered from, any disabilities imposed upon us, is a pronounced desire on the part of the people for economy in government. They send us into Parliament to do their business. In several of the Parliaments of the Commonwealth are successful business men who, if they were called upon to administer their own business on the lines on which the Commonwealth and State Parliaments are doing the people's business, would soon be in the bankruptcy court. The duplication instanced by the leader of the Opposition has become a political eyesore throughout the Commonwealth. Several Governments representing the same community are piling on the burden of taxation by building up unnecessary duplicate departments. There are the saving banks, the railways, the taxation departments, the electoral departments, the housing departments and others.

Mr. Davies: The Commonwealth can scarcely be held responsible for building up railway departments.

Mr. O'LOUGHLEN: Yet an offer was made by Western Australia and South Australia to administer the trans-Australian railway. Would the hon. member have had those States build the line? Of course, once the line was built there was no valid reason why the States should not administer each a portion of it.

Mr. Davies: You let the man enter the house then.

Mr. O'LOUGHLEN: The hon. member is going to support the Bill, because it will lead to economy. As the leader of the Opposition pointed out, the Commonwealth could have been given credit for the revenue of the railway, but in order to save expense the State staffs should have been used to administer the line.

Mr. Teesdale: A good suggestion, too.

Mr. O'LOUGHLEN: However, the Commonwealth did not see fit to fall in with the suggestion put forward by the State Governments. The member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo) spoke of the coming convention. Personally, I believe the time is rotten ripe for such a convention to redraft the Constitution. I am interested in knowing how that convention will be composed, whether it will be elected on the adult vote of the people of

Western Australia, as I think it should be. That convention will try to economise in governments. Whether it will be a plan of unification, which will receive the endorsement of the people, I do not know. If it is on right lines I shall have no objection to it. The time is coming when provincial councils, vested with certain powers, will be charged with the government of Australia. We cannot go on as we are at present. The cost is reaching colossal figures, and the taxpayers are talking earnestly about the cost of Parliament. About 100 of them told me last week that this Parliament is costing too much, that it has too many members. I believe myself we could do with fewer members.

The Premier: The work we do costs half as much proportionately as the work done by the Federal Government.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: It is costing a lot of money just the same, and members of Parliament are very poorly paid for the services rendered. But the man in the street does not take that view of it. What prompts him to take up a soured attitude—

Hon. T. Walker: Is because he cannot get here.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Oh, no.

Mr. Teesdale: Some of them have not the pluck to try.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: What prompts them to that attitude is that the cost of government is altogether excessive. They blame Parliament for it. They think we are getting the cream, whereas we are getting only the skim milk, and not too much of that. The taxpayers' funds are going in the cost of administration due, not to individual Ministers, but to the system. I regret that the Premiers' annual conference cannot evolve some solution of the difficulty. This is the first tangible indication we have had that there is a move in the right direction. In South Australia the electoral departments have amalgamated, and in Tasmania the savings bank has been absorbed. I agree with the leader of the Opposition that the Commonwealth had no right to come into this State and set up competition with the State Savings Bank. Men with a knowledge of banking business have pointed out to me that it was impossible to avoid it, that the Commonwealth Bank had to take in the whole of the ramifications of banking. Further, while the Western Australian Savings Bank was being administered on good sound lines, and was rendering valuable service to the people, the State banks in two other States were short-sighted in their administration, were not providing the facilities they should have done, were not looking for business, and did not give the people the services that were required.

Mr. Pickering: That is not part of the system of general banking.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: It is a very essential part of the system of national banking such as that inaugurated by the Common-

wealth. Whilst Western Australia did not give any excuse for the Commonwealth to take on the system of banking against them in this State, a couple of the other States of Australia did. The result is that the Commonwealth came in and grabbed the whole lot. Tasmania and Queensland are handing over their savings banks on fairly decent terms, considering the situation they are in.

Mr. Johnston: Tasmania did that two years ago.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Ultimately we shall have to do it in this State. Already there has been an amalgamation of the Electoral Departments in South Australia, and we are now considering the amalgamation of the Taxation Departments in Western Australia, which no doubt will also be effective. If the people have not been singing out against increased taxation, and against the duplication in the various States and Federal Departments, we in this Chamber have certainly done so.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Against the Commonwealth?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Of course we shall not get a fair crack of the whip from the Commonwealth, no matter what we may do. History records that as individuals or groups of people obtain power they seek for more and abuse it when they do get it. That is evidenced right through life. While we have the present system, we shall have this greedy, grasping desire for more power on the part of the dominant body, which is the Commonwealth Parliament. Unfortunately, it is the popular institution to-day.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I question that.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I have thought at times that this was not so.

Mr. Davies: The results of the referendum have been against the Commonwealth Parliament every time.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: There could be hours of debate on the question of the voting on the referendum taken in Australia. I have said that the Commonwealth Parliament is more popular than the State Parliaments. There is a greater element of interest taken in it because the whole of the people can create it. What has been said about members of the Commonwealth Parliament who without any authority raised their salaries to the extent that they did? Every member who voted to increase his salary was returned by a bigger majority than ever.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: So they will be here.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: We are afraid to do the right thing here. I hold the opinion that the Commonwealth Parliament to-day with its wide franchise has a grip upon the people that the State Parliaments cannot get. That will be so while the democratic majority in this House is being gagged and bound by the dominant party in another place.

The Premier: We are not being gagged.

Mr. Pickering: I have never heard of the Senate being popular.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: There is no justification for its existence. The Senate after all is only a sort of gramophone record of the House of Representatives. The whole question revolves around whether we are going to trust the Commonwealth Parliament more than we trust our own, and whether we in this House are delivering the goods to the people who send us here. I say emphatically that if either the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) or the member for Kanowna (Hon. T. Walker) or myself went out to-morrow and appealed to the workers of the State we would not be able to tell them that even if they give us a majority next March we would be able to do much for them under our present Constitution.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I differ from you there.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: We could certainly do something by way of administering in a limited way, but we could not do anything in the way of legislative enactments passing the barrage a few yards away from where I am speaking. It is a hopeless situation.

The Premier: There is no danger.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The time will come when the workers of this country will be perhaps once more the dominant power. If so we cannot say as their representatives that they will get much advantage in the way of legislation whilst the Upper House exists. The same thing does not apply to the Commonwealth Parliament. If there were no labour members in that Parliament it would still have been created by the people of Australia without any property qualification. Therefore whilst we may regret the position we must accept it. Much depends on this Convention and on the proposals that are put forward for consolidating the powers of the State. It is a businesslike arrangement and is something I have been advocating for many years. The sooner we do away with duplication in departments and so effect economies in that direction, the better it will be for the taxpayers as a whole.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You believe in giving something away every time and letting the other fellow take it.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I have no evidence that up to the present we have given anything away. The Commonwealth Parliament have only exercised those powers which under the Constitution they had a right to exercise.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: There is a doubt about that.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: If the State Governments believed there was a doubt about that they could with all their resources have dealt with the question through the courts. There is no doubt about it, the Federal Government did make inroads on the State taxation. We all know that another place would not allow the Government to levy

taxation in order to help a depleted revenue. They, therefore, missed the bus and the Federal Government came in and took away the money that should have come to the State. We may question the right of the Federal Government to impose a land and income tax and to do many other things, but they know the Constitution just as well as we do.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They are doing many things which the people did not intend they should do.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I agree. The people, however, condoned what they did and tolerated it, showing that they accepted the Federal Parliament as the lesser of two evils. I know they have failed to do many things that they were intended to do, and did many things that they were not intended to do. I remember hearing powerful orators advocating federation, pointing out that a rosy future lay before Australia, that there would be one Governor General for the whole of the Commonwealth, that there would be less duplication in administration, and that we would have economy and sanity. Those things have not all come about. The fact that the Federal Government have failed to carry into effect many of these promises and have done many things which the people did not anticipate they would do, has not prevented them from still standing fairly high in the estimation of the bulk of the people.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I do not think so.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The Federal Government have not done these things without having authority to do them. If an arrangement can be made by which the State will be saved £20,000 a year, it will be a good thing. This may be the forerunner of, say, an amalgamation of the Electoral Departments, the housing departments and the Banking departments. These three departments stand as requiring to be amalgamated, in this way: We have separate departments doing exactly the same work for the same set of people.

Mr. Pickering: What about the Geological Department?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I have already mentioned three departments. Even if the Commonwealth is getting an advantage, in justice to the ratepayers we represent let us wipe out this idiotic system which now exists in connection with our banking business. We have a State Savings Bank and a Federal Savings Bank. Rivalry is set up, dissatisfaction and lack of confidence. An amalgamation of these departments could be effected with great advantage. I have no desire to give the Commonwealth that power which its members seek, and I hope there will be a healthy check put upon their avarice. I have seen no evidence of that yet. The Premiers go to the Eastern States and hold conferences. When they come back they do not carry a torch round the country. They say they are satisfied the State will get a fair deal, but in Parliament they talk about the bad deal the State is getting. I

have never heard the Premier ask the people to help him in dealing with any Federal encroachment. I have never yet seen it done. While that is the case we can do nothing else but make the best of a bad job. By making these amalgamations we shall lay the foundation for a more sane administration and greater economy, leading to a lightening of the burdens that are placed upon the shoulders of the people.

Hon. T. WALKER (Kanowna) [5.25]: I am at a loss to know what the real principles of the member for Forrest (Mr. O'Loughlen) are in regard to these matters. One minute it is the Federal Government shaking the whip over the State, and resisting their encroachments, and the next minute it is a quiet yielding to their first offer to take over all our money through the channels of taxation and give them the first handling of it through their own banks.

Mr. O'Loughlen: What difference does it make if they hand it back the next day?

Hon. T. WALKER: The hon. member knows what advantage there is in a bank holding large sums of money for a day or so, or even a few hours. We have been told that this is not giving any power and that we are yielding none of our rights. In one sense that may be true. Let me put the converse to this proposed agreement. Suppose, instead of the Commonwealth offering to do it for us, the State offered to do it for them within our own boundaries. Would the Commonwealth accept such a proposition? They could have representation upon that single function of the collection of taxes. They could have their commissioner, as it is proposed we should have a sort of figure-head commissioner amalgamated with theirs. They could have their eye upon our books and all our transactions. They could participate in them by representation upon any organisation that is got together for taxation through one agency, both for the Commonwealth and State purposes. Is there any imputation upon the honour of the State that the State cannot be trusted to do such work? Is there any suspicion that we should defraud the Commonwealth or encroach upon any of their rights or privileges? There can be none. The State can be just as honourable in the fulfilment of its work and the performance of its duties as the Commonwealth can be. Why then will the Commonwealth not trust us to collect this taxation?

Hon. P. Collier: They know where the power lies.

Hon. T. WALKER: The answer is obvious. The power of the collection of taxes is an enormous one. It takes the Commonwealth unattended into every home in the land, practically to the exclusion of the State. It gives the Commonwealth authority to investigate the private business concerns of every man in the community practically without supervision and unattended. No power can be greater than that of collecting money from the people, and this is the power we are willing to concede.

The Premier: Oh, no!

Hon. T. WALKER: I say it is. The Federal Government constitute the new Taxation Commissioner.

The Premier: Mr. Black is our Taxation Commissioner.

Hon. T. WALKER: We have a new Taxation Commissioner, and the commissioner is the master of the situation. At the present time we have our own difficulties, and our own method of dealing with those difficulties. If there be a grievance we can immediately attend to it on the spot.

The Premier: So you will under this arrangement.

Hon. T. WALKER: No, for an agency—and the Premier knows it as well as every other individual in the country—exercised by the Commonwealth, is almost inaccessible except through an appeal to Melbourne.

Mr. Pickering: That is so.

Hon. T. WALKER: In my limited scope of action, I have known cases continue for 12 months that could be dealt with finally within a fortnight if we had had power to deal with them in this State without reference to Melbourne.

The Premier: We shall have that.

Hon. T. WALKER: In Melbourne there is an indifference to the vital necessities of this distant State.

The Premier: I agree with that.

Hon. T. WALKER: Who are the officers who will be collecting this tax? Our officers? No. Whose servants? The servants of the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth Government are their masters and will carry out the instructions of their masters.

Mr. Johnston: They will collect what we tell them to collect.

Hon. T. WALKER: They will collect, not what we tell them to; they will collect the tax from us, pay it into their own bank, deal with it there in the ordinary rotation of business, with the advantage of handling all the money of this State which comes through the avenues of taxation.

Mr. Pickering: That is the major part of it.

Hon. T. WALKER: That is enormous power. Give up nothing! We are giving up terrific power. It is money power that commands the world. We can resist every other influence. Sentiment we can answer or dispel, but the grip of the power of money is inexorable. We cannot escape it. It is invincible. It crushes nations as well as individuals; States as well as private enterprising companies or corporations, it matters not. Money is the commanding force. Get in the grip of money, so to speak, and all our energies are circumscribed by its coils. We are giving the Commonwealth power to know the whole of the circumstances of every individual citizen of the State, to make the most intimate comparison, and to learn just exactly where the vice can have another turn of the screw upon us, where we can still further be pinched, where they can put in the wedge afresh, where they can grip still harder on the life blood of the community. Yet we give them that power. I am at one with

everyone who has spoken about the abolition of duplication. It is wise, but who in the name of goodness is the proper agent to collect the money for all purposes but the State Government? That is the proper agency. Why bring in a foreigner here to do our work? I do not use "foreigner" in an offensive sense.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Say outsider.

Hon. T. WALKER: That would be the better word. We have this dual capacity thrust upon us. We are citizens of Western Australia and of the Commonwealth as well. We have that duplication upon us, but the Commonwealth is the over-lord and we cannot get away from it. It has become the lord paramount, with the acquisition of all our powers, all our energies and hopes. It is getting a footing in every direction, as has been pointed out, in every channel where money can be grasped or be utilised or be manipulated. It is getting in and strengthening its position. Every device it can devise for handling our money, it is practising. It is invading our activities in every direction. It has done so in the past. It is wiping out our private banks as well as our own State banks. It is seeking to have absolute monetary control throughout the whole of the Commonwealth, and once it gets that, what is the good here of Parliament or government at all? What advantage would a State Parliament or government be to us then? We would be crippled. We would be working in fetters, golden though they be, with limbs shackled and our freedom of movement curbed. Yet, it is said, this is merely for the sake of economy. If we are to proceed along those lines and carry that suggestion to a logical conclusion, we should remember that there is duplication in the Savings and Agricultural Banks. Why should we not get rid of those institutions?

Hon. P. Collier: Parliament costs money; shut it up.

Hon. T. WALKER: Shut these institutions and shut Parliament up altogether. Why have two Treasurers? Why should not the State Treasurer hand in his resignation and say, "Kindly take my duties over for the sake of economy."

Mr. Angelo: He may be pleased to do so in future.

Hon. T. WALKER: If it is for the sake of economy, what is the good of having you in the Chair, Mr. Speaker, when we have another Speaker in Melbourne governing us all over Australia? We could save money, and, though we would regret to lose you, if it were a case of economy, we would have to do without you.

The Premier: I object to that; it would not pay.

Hon. T. WALKER: The Premier sees the point. He can see it now, but not in the other instance. Logically carried out, the arguments in support of this Bill are arguments in support of the abolition of the State Parliament and the cessation of our legislative and administrative dup-

lications. Every argument that can be used in favour of this Bill can be used in the direction I have indicated.

The Premier: Oh, no!

Hon. T. WALKER: Yes, just as easily. It is dangerous to surrender our rights and obligations as citizens of this State. It is more dangerous under the Bill, which means handing the citizens' money over to the Federal Government, than it might be to give other work, such as the compilation of the electoral rolls. There might be no harm in giving them that branch of our activities.

The Premier: I think much greater harm would be achieved by that.

Hon. P. Collier: Oh, no!

Hon. T. WALKER: There is harm in one direction but the Premier sees no harm in the other.

The Premier: We are both in the same boat, then.

Hon. T. WALKER: But there is harm in wiping out ourselves by giving the over-lord more power over us. Both the Premier and I agree that that is a dangerous course to pursue, and we can well come to the conclusion that this proposal follows along wrong lines. It is a wrong course to adopt. Some of us have a great idea that we can get a convention and a new Constitution, and that the new Constitution will give us a kind of unification which might be of advantage to this State. These are dreams, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Pickering: Idle dreams.

Hon. T. WALKER: Those who study Nature's laws and have followed what science has taught us know this: Nature grows and develops more by divisions than by unison. She gives specific operations to the human frame, distinctive work to perform, and while other parts of the frame may sympathetically act in unison with it, the particular work done by each operation of the human frame is peculiar to itself. In the embryonic stage of manhood there is no division. We start simply as undifferentiated cellular forms. It is the work of development in the fetal stage which brings us to divisions. We grow into forms and development takes the shape of heart, brain, nerves, blood vessels, bone, viscera, tissue, and so on. And so it is with the building up of the inhabitants in an organised state on this globe. We require divisions in order to get full capacity and to secure development, so to speak. Mental, modern, and progressive powers incidental to the human race are all grouped into divisions, which is essential. So if we had unification throughout Australia it would be impossible to have spontaneous and local advancement. It has been the divisions in the State which have been responsible for that spirit of emulation, stimulation, and progress which has led us to compete among ourselves. This is no empty statement. It is because of this that I am a Western Australian first, and recognise no over-lord over me. I

recognise that Western Australia is the sister of the States all through the Commonwealth, and I recognise in the Commonwealth nothing more than a creature, not over-lording the States, but created for the convenience of the partnership of Australia, a convenience which, of course, is served by the common-relationships of the States to the rest of the outside world. There are some things which a centralised body can do better than these divided partners acting on their own could achieve. It is in that sphere, and that sphere alone, where the Commonwealth can act in the interests of all the people of Australia, but they cannot assume the position of over-lords of the rest of the community, and that is the true spirit of the Federal Constitution. That was the spirit in which it was conceived. That was the view brought to bear upon it by the ablest statesmen Australia could produce at the time. There was never an idea that the rights called States rights should be exterminated or that there should be a lordship over the rest, but that there should be only powers granted to the Commonwealth, yielded and surrendered for the purposes of convenience where the States had common interests and which could best be expressed by one voice so to speak, acting on behalf, and only on behalf, of all, and not upon its own arrogated authority. Holding that view think you, Mr. Speaker, that I can yield to a method of this kind!

The Premier: Yes.

Hon. T. WALKER: No. It would be absolutely inconsistent with the views I take. Let us make a counter offer. Let us offer to collect the taxes for the Commonwealth and give them representation on our board. Who has a better right to do that than our own people themselves? How can it be that those who are interested in the perturbations of the East can understand the conditions of the taxpayers here? How can they sympathetically administer our affairs? I hope the day has gone by when we have to regard the tax gatherer as he was regarded in the day of Henry VII. and Henry VIII. I hope the day has gone by when we are so utterly regardless of the well-being of our citizens as to consider them only creatures to create wealth for the use or abuse of those who happen to be in a position of power. I hope that day has gone by. We need taxation to carry on the very necessary functions of government for the development of the State of which we are citizens. We require it for no other purpose than the administration of those functions that give justice between men, and equal opportunity to all our citizens. That being so, who can be more sympathetic, who can have a keener insight into the fortunes of the taxpayers than the brother taxpayer in the person of the Treasurer of the State? Who can understand the conditions better? Do you mean to tell me, Mr. Speaker, that there are no

difficulties, and that there are no annoyances, no injustices in the methods of collecting the tax? There is nothing that irritates the public so much, nothing that gets upon their nerves so much as the feeling that they are being unjustly dunned and dogged for the last penny, to meet the gatherer's demand. Should we put a man whose representative head is in Melbourne in a position to exercise these powers? It is a wrong thing to do and I am opposed to it. I shall vote against the second reading of the Bill because I want to see our own State autonomous; I want to see our own State supreme, and I want to recognise no over-lord in the management of our affairs. Even the collection of the totalisator tax is to be put in the hands of the Commonwealth collector. It is ridiculous, and I cannot understand the state of mind that has possessed the people, who on the score of saving a mere few thousand pounds per annum would help to put the chains upon this State which will ultimately crush the life out of it. It is coming by every device. By every channel that is open, the Commonwealth is insidiously usurping our rights, our authority, our sovereignty, crushing us by degrees, and doing it through the agency of money. It means being governed by sentiment instead of by understanding, by feeling instead of brains. A Bill of this kind takes from us all that we prize and will make us veritable slaves, dominated by the crack of the whip, from a bogus throne in Melbourne.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Williams-Narrogin) [5-55]: I heartily welcome this measure and commend the Government for their action in having brought it forward. For many years past we have advocated the amalgamation of various State and Federal departments on terms which would be satisfactory to Western Australia.

Mr. Angelo: Not on these terms.

Mr. JOHNSTON: The amalgamation of the State and Federal Savings Banks has been advocated on terms that would ensure the money being kept in Western Australia. There has also been advocated the amalgamation of the two electoral departments. The measure before the House represents a definite and practical attempt to put that policy into force. For many years the State of Western Australia has been climbing steep paths, increasing taxation, and increasing expenditure, and we therefore welcome this oasis of economy which we have met on our march of extravagance. I hope the measure will be the forerunner of other administrative economies and that those other economies will be carried into immediate effect in the direction I have indicated, namely, as regards the State Savings Bank and the State Electoral Department and wherever departments are duplicated to the disadvantage of the West Australian taxpayer.

Mr. Lambert: Duplicated by whom?

Mr. JOHNSTON: By the Commonwealth, though in many respects against my wishes. Under the powers that we were given by the

people of Australia when we entered into federation—

Hon. P. Collier: You are offering inducements to keep on duplicating because you will hand the departments over as soon as they become duplicated.

Mr. Lambert: Why not hand over the management of our railways?

Mr. JOHNSTON: If that were the only method by which the people of Western Australia could be saved the expense of duplication, I would adopt the course suggested by the hon. member.

Hon. P. Collier: Keep on handing over everything until we reach the state in which we find the Northern Territory.

Mr. JOHNSTON: That can never be under the sovereign rights which the States possess under the Constitution.

Hon. P. Collier: But you are taking away those sovereign rights.

Mr. JOHNSTON: That would meet with my opposition. Under the Bill before the House we shall retain our Commissioner of Taxation and we shall retain absolute control over the taxes that may be levied for our own purposes. We are merely saying that we will permit the existing Federal tax collector who is already collecting in our house to collect for the State as well.

Hon. P. Collier: For the time being.

Mr. JOHNSTON: We say that while the Federal tax gatherer is there, we will let him collect our money rather than harass the taxpayer by sending round a second collector. I have always advocated this amalgamation. Naturally I would prefer to have seen the State do all the work, but that seems impossible, and consequently I welcome this opportunity of confirming the agreement which has been drafted between the Commonwealth and the State authorities. I find that at present our State Taxation Department costs £29,719 a year, and the value of the offices for central purposes has to be added to that amount. Since under the agreement the Commonwealth will do the work for one-third of the present cost, including the value of the offices, it is clear that Western Australia will save £20,000 per annum by the amalgamation.

Hon. P. Collier: You could save another £2,000 a year by getting rid of the Commissioner of Railways and allowing the Federal Commissioner of Railways to take control.

Mr. JOHNSTON: The Commonwealth railways are in a different part of the State, and they are not running parallel with the State railways in the way that one might say the taxes are running. To my mind there is no parallel in the illustration put forward by the leader of the Opposition.

Hon. P. Collier: The man who pays State land tax lives where the man who pays Federal land tax lives.

Mr. JOHNSTON: The Federal land-taxpayer also pays the State land tax.

Hon. W. Angwin: But a lot pay the State land tax who do not pay the Federal land tax.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I am aware of that. The payers of income tax at present have to lodge two returns, one for the State and one for the Commonwealth. The State return is lodged at

the office in Wellington-street, and the Federal return just round the corner in King-street.

Mr. Lambert: That is an easy matter to do. There is no need because of that to amalgamate the departments.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Under the amalgamation it will be possible to prepare the returns for the two departments on the one form. At the present time we all know that many taxpayers have to pay more money to have their returns prepared than they ultimately pay in tax. Throughout Australia I believe a great many people are looking forward to the consummation of this measure which, so far as Western Australia is concerned, will prevent the taxpayers being harassed in the way in which they have been harassed by having to lodge duplicate returns.

Mr. Lambert: God help the farmers of this country.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I have perused the agreement and I find that it safeguards the interests of the State in every direction, particularly by the provision that we retain our own State Taxation Commissioner.

Hon. P. Collier: That does not amount to a snap of the fingers.

Mr. JOHNSTON: That officer will have control of the staff dealing with State taxation matters.

Hon. P. Collier: He will not have control of the staff.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Yes; that is provided in the agreement. The agreement provides for such a measure of control by the State Taxation Commissioner over the staff that they shall carry out his wishes as far as State matters are concerned.

Hon. P. Collier: The hon. member is entirely wrong. The agreement provides that the staff go over to the Federal Government.

Mr. JOHNSTON: The staff are absolutely handed over; but still, if a member of the staff is doubtful as to the interpretation of a certain matter, in case of the State law being different from the Federal law, then the interpretation given by the State Taxation Commissioner has to be followed by that member of the staff.

Hon. P. Collier: But with regard to the staff the agreement states merely that such portions of the staff as the Commonwealth may place under our State Taxation Commissioner shall be subject to his direction. Nevertheless, they go over absolutely to the Federal Taxation Commissioner.

Mr. JOHNSTON: It is true that they become Federal officers.

Hon. P. Collier: The hon. member said a moment ago that the staff are to be under our Commissioner. That is not correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I know that they are to become Federal officers.

Hon. P. Collier: Yes, and to be under the Federal Commissioner.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Notwithstanding that, they are to carry out the instructions of the State Commissioner as regards the interpretation of State laws and the collection of State taxes; and that is all we want. I submit that the Western Australian taxpayer does not care twopence whether the clerks who assess his tax and issue his receipt for taxes paid are Federal officers or State officers, so long as he

has the knowledge that he is only paying for the support of one Taxation Department instead of paying for the upkeep of two separate Taxation Departments both doing exactly similar work.

Hon. W. Angwin: Read Clause 24 of the agreement.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I shall do so when the Bill gets into Committee. I hope that the policy of amalgamating duplicate Federal and State departments will be carried a great deal further. I admit that it would have been to the advantage of the people of this State if the Federal Government had not established a Commonwealth Savings Bank to compete with our State Savings Bank.

Mr. Lambert: Would you hand that over?

Mr. JOHNSTON: We must remember, however, that the Commonwealth Savings Bank was established by the Federal authorities under the provisions of the Commonwealth Constitution.

Mr. Lambert: Would you give the Commonwealth Government control of the Agricultural Bank?

Hon. P. Collier: And of the Industries Assistance Board?

Mr. JOHNSTON: Unfortunately there is no Federal Industries Assistance Board, a circumstance which I very much regret for the sake of the man on the land in Western Australia.

Hon. P. Collier: You have sucked the State Industries Assistance Board dry, and now you want a Federal Industries Assistance Board.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I regret that the Commonwealth Savings Bank was established; but shortly after its establishment, in 1913, the then Prime Minister of Australia, Mr. Fisher, visited this State and discussed with the Western Australian Government of the day the question of amalgamating the State and Federal Savings Banks.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member had better keep to the Bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I respectfully submit, Sir, that the whole of the principle of amalgamating State and Federal departments is involved. Every previous speaker has referred to this aspect of the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: But the hon. member is labouring the question.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I do not wish to labour the question, Sir, but on the second reading of this Bill I desire to offer an explanation of the whole position. Without referring to the effect which this Bill must have on the operations of the State Savings Bank, I may say—

Mr. SPEAKER: This Bill has no effect on the State Savings Bank, and does not propose to interfere with it.

Mr. JOHNSTON: At any rate the member for Forrest (Mr. O'Loughlin), who preceded me, dealt with that aspect of the question.

Mr. SPEAKER: That was only a passing allusion in reply to an interjection.

Mr. JOHNSTON: At any rate, I remember Mr. Fisher visiting Western Australia for the purpose of discussing the question of amalgamation of State and Federal services, including the State and Federal Savings Banks. However, the whole question of the amalgamation of the State and Federal Taxation Departments, and of the State and Federal Savings Banks, and of the two Electoral Departments, was

involved in the policy then suggested by Mr. Fisher. The then Prime Minister made a definite offer to the people of Western Australia that if they were prepared to permit the Commonwealth Savings Bank to take over the State Savings Bank, he would not only allow the Western Australian Government to retain all the money then in the State Savings Bank—

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot allow the hon. member to discuss the whole of the Commonwealth Bank system and Savings Bank system under this Bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON: At any rate, I may say—

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You may as well say straight out that Mr. Fisher did not stick to his promise.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I do not know what were the reasons for the failure of the negotiations, but I know that since the time to which I allude 1½ millions of money have been deposited in the Commonwealth Savings Bank here.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member had better keep to the Bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Tasmania and Queensland have adopted the policy of amalgamating Federal and State departments. In both those States we find the Commonwealth Savings Bank amalgamated with the State Savings Bank. Had the agreement put before the people of this State by Mr. Fisher in 1913 been consummated the Government of Western Australia would have had the use, at a very low rate of interest, of three-quarters of the sum of 1½ million deposited since that date in the Commonwealth Savings Bank by residents of Western Australia.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must keep to the Bill before the House. He is now wholly discussing banking propositions. I cannot allow the hon. member to proceed any further on those lines.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Very well, Mr. Speaker. If you are determined not to give me the right that was extended to previous members, I cannot help it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has not discussed the Bill at all. He has been discussing banking.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I am discussing the policy of amalgamating the State and Federal Taxation Departments, which matter, I take it, is part of the broad policy of amalgamating duplicate Federal and State services.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is unfortunate that the Bill does not provide for that. That is all.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I regret, Sir, that you pull me up in this way. I can only say that under this agreement the Western Australian taxpayer is going to be relieved of a great deal of the cost he now has to bear for the maintenance of duplicate departments. We have the Federal Taxation Department duplicating the work which the State Taxation Department performs. By this measure the Government very properly propose that such duplication of services shall end, at least so far as taxation is concerned. I trust that this Bill marks the beginning of an era of economy in Western Australia, economy which will extend so far as to prevent Federal services being duplicated here in the future as they have been in the past.

Hon. P. Collier: You can economise by amalgamating the Williams-Narrogin and Wagin electorates.

Mr. JOHNSTON: If we had a proper redistribution of seats Act, there would be an extra member for that part of the State.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. JOHNSTON: I am afraid, however, that the Speaker will not allow me to follow up the disorderly interjection obtruded by the leader of the Opposition. I am sorry that I have not been permitted to go fully into the subject matter of the Bill. Whilst the Government have done the right thing in bringing this measure before Parliament, whilst they are taking a proper course in proposing the amalgamation of these two departments, still I believe that the force of circumstances in Western Australia is such that that course of action would have been imposed on the Government in the near future even if Ministers had not taken this step. Wherever I go, throughout the State, I find the one complaint: the people say to me, "We lodged a form of enrolment and thought we were on the roll; but when election time came round we found we were not on the roll because we had lodged a Federal claim card instead of a State claim card." Just as the Federal and State Taxation Departments are being amalgamated, so I claim that the Government, if they do their duty and follow up the policy which they are introducing to the Western Australian people by the measure now under discussion, will endeavour to bring about a similar position with regard to the Federal and State Electoral Departments. The sooner that is done, the better it will be for all the people of this State. The people are groaning under the enormous burdens of taxation piled on them by reason of the duplication of departments, a duplication which, moreover, is actually robbing the Government of Western Australia of a great deal of money which they would otherwise have available for expenditure on development. I refer to the loss in hard cash of the sum of £1,125,000 which would have come into the coffers of this State had the agreement proposed by Mr. Fisher for amalgamation of the Federal and State Savings Banks, away back in the year 1913, been consummated. It was then the desire of many members of this House, including, I believe, yourself, Mr. Speaker, that such an amalgamation should come about, provided of course that the terms were reasonable and fair. However, I have said that I welcome this Bill. I consider it is the duty of the Government of this State to make even a small sacrifice, if necessary, in order to let an officer who is to-day a State officer become a Federal officer, as is proposed by the agreement, provided that by so doing we can relieve the people of some of the burden of extravagance and waste imposed upon them by the duplication of services. I contend that the Government are doing excellent work for the people of Western Australia in making an agreement under which the cost of collecting our taxation will be only one-third of what it is now. The Government are to be commended for having made such an excellent agreement. It seems, however, that there must have been a great deal of waste in our State Taxation Department, and also much extravagance, if the Federal people can come along and do the same service at one-third of the present cost. I hope the Government will not be content to stop with the amal-

gamation of these two departments but will consider the question of amalgamating other departments which are now duplicated. If necessary, they should appoint Mr. Black, who is the State Commissioner of Taxation, to go right through all the duplicated departments for the purpose of ascertaining—

Mr. O'Loughlen: Why not Mr. Owen?

Mr. JOHNSTON: I am dealing with Mr. Black, the officer whom this Bill exempts from transfer to the Federal service. Whilst all the other officers of the State Taxation Department are being transferred to the Commonwealth, Mr. Black, our Commissioner of Taxation, remains a State officer. In my opinion Mr. Black, our Commissioner of Taxation, remains a State officer; and I consider Mr. Black should be appointed to overhaul all the departments now duplicated.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Why Mr. Black?

Mr. JOHNSTON: Mr. Black is an officer whose position I am permitted to discuss in connection with this measure.

Mr. O'Loughlen: There are a hundred other officers concerned too.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Before tea I was urging the acceptance of this measure for the amalgamation of the State and Federal Taxation departments.

Hon. T. Walker: Amalgamation! A submission of this State to the Federal authorities!

Mr. JOHNSTON: A measure to permit the Commonwealth to collect our taxes on lines laid down by this Parliament at a saving of two-thirds of the present cost to the State. That saving is the feature of the measure that particularly appeals to me. I would applaud the Government if anything approaching a similar saving were possible right through the field of our departmental administration. Of course we know that a reduction of two-thirds of the cost is not possible. I hope this measure is part of a broad policy for the amalgamation of State and Federal departments wherever there is a duplication of work and provided that the people's money can be saved in this manner without injuring the public interest. That is what I believe the Government will achieve by the measure now before the House. In this case the Federal Taxation Department will be capable of doing the work for the State in accordance with the wishes of the State Taxation Commissioner, but in other cases where the State has the more efficient organisation, such as the workers' homes board, I would certainly suggest that any amalgamation should leave the whole of the administration in the hands of that efficient board or the existing State department. Mr. Black and Mr. Owen or some other officer approved by the Government should go into the question of the amalgamation of State and Federal Departments where the services are duplicated with a view to introducing further measures on the lines

of the one we are now considering. Particularly does this apply to the Electoral Department.

Hon. T. Walker: Would you give the Police force away? The Commonwealth are duplicating that service.

Mr. JOHNSTON: No; I think that action on the part of the Prime Minister was one of shocking extravagance. I do not wish to get into trouble with the Speaker, or I could deal more thoroughly with the hon. member's interjection. I hope this Bill will be accepted while we have an opportunity to save £20,000 a year, and thus reduce our administration cost. We have an opportunity to get done at a cost of only £10,000 per annum work which is now costing us over £30,000 per annum. I do not wish this opportunity to be missed in the way that we missed an opportunity previously for the amalgamation of State and Federal services. Might I illustrate my remarks by referring to the opportunity this State had in 1913 to amalgamate the State and Federal savings banks.

Hon. P. Collier: You have told us that sixteen times already.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I have not. I only wish to make my illustration clear, because it was cut off in the middle.

Hon. P. Collier: What! Make it clear by repetition!

Hon. T. Walker: Tedious repetition.

Mr. JOHNSTON: It is not repetition; I was not permitted to finish my remarks. I hope the Speaker will permit me as a matter of justice to finish my remarks so that I shall not be thought to advocate the amalgamation of State and Federal savings banks at any cost.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not in this Bill. I have already allowed the hon. member a lot of latitude.

Mr. JOHNSTON: What I wish to point out is that we had an opportunity similar to the one we are considering to-day.

Mr. SPEAKER: That opportunity is not mentioned in this Bill. If it were I would allow the hon. member to discuss it.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I do not wish this opportunity to be lost, in a manner which cost the country the use of a large sum of Federal money which might have been placed at the disposal of the State Government.

Hon. T. Walker: That is the fifteenth time.

Mr. JOHNSTON: It is not; I have not yet had an opportunity to get to the point. That money was to be lent to the State at only one per cent. above the rate of interest paid by the bank to the depositor.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not pursue that line of argument any further.

Mr. JOHNSTON: There is one rule for this corner party and another for other hon. members in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must withdraw that statement.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I withdraw it. Provided that the State gets its taxes collected cheaply I do not mind whether the clerk who collects them is called a Federal officer instead of a State officer. It does not matter at all. What commends this Bill to me is the great economy which will be effected. I believe we are living on the eve of times when the people will demand many similar economies. I believe they will insist on the pruning knife being applied to other departments in a similar way to this proposal whereby the cost of the State Taxation Department is being reduced, though perhaps not to the same extent, but the principle of economy, which is the dominant feature of the policy at the back of this Bill, should pervade other Government departments. I welcome the measure as a first step in these amalgamations.

Hon. P. Collier: I thought you were opposing it.

Mr. JOHNSTON: And when Parliament again meets I hope that whatever Government are in power—and I believe the present Government will be—they will follow up the policy introduced to-night with measures for the amalgamation of the State and Federal Electoral Departments and Savings Banks, provided always that the interests of the people are safeguarded as they are under this Bill by the retention of the services of the State Commissioner of Taxation as a State officer. I support the second reading.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [7.40]: I am not like the member for Williams-Narrogin. I do not welcome the introduction of this Bill, because it is the first step towards unification.

The Premier: You know it is not.

Hon. P. Collier: One of the steps on the road.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The State is not responsible for the duplication of offices. The duplication of offices in this State has been due to the Commonwealth. I have endeavoured so far as possible in my own electorate and in other electorates to show that there was no necessity for duplication of departments. The State Government have several departments for the management of their affairs and they could very well carry out the work required by the Federal Government. I instanced at the same time what was being done in connection with the Public Works Department, but in all probability a branch of the Federal Public Works Department will be started in this State earlier than we expect, as the question has already received consideration. If it is necessary to cheapen the cost of administration by handing over our departments to the Commonwealth, the principle will apply to other departments where duplication exists. It is impossible for the Commonwealth to extend their operations by usurping the functions of the State unless they first obtain the consent of the people under the Constitution, the final decision lies with the people. This being so, and the Commonwealth, realising

that on every occasion a vote has been taken the people have turned down the proposal for an extension of Federal powers, there is a possibility of the Commonwealth offering to undertake State services at a reduced cost. They are offering the State Government to take over our Taxation Department at one-third the present cost, but no one knows what will be the cost to the Commonwealth to collect these taxes. If it costs the Commonwealth considerably more for collecting these taxes than the Commonwealth are claiming from the State Government, the people will have to pay that amount.

The Premier: It cannot cost them more.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Which agreement is for one year only, after which it may be terminated on six calendar months' notice being given. Suppose at the end of the year, after the whole of our Taxation Department had been disbanded and the officers transferred to the Federal Department, the Federal Government found it cost a little more money to collect the State taxes than they had anticipated, they could notify the State Government that they did not intend to collect our taxes in future for the amount set out in the agreement. They could give six months' notice and notify the Government that all the State officers had been taken over because the Federal Department was doing our work. Next year the amount charged to the State would probably be one half of the present cost and then another third would be added later on until within three or four years they would reach the amount we are paying now. After that we could expect to pay more than we are paying now for the collection of our taxes. Members should ask whether the Commonwealth Government would collect the taxes in Western Australia for one-third of the cost unless they were of opinion that they would be getting something by so doing.

The Premier: They can do it for that amount.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not see how they can do it for that amount. The Commonwealth are going to take over all the officers and is it possible for them to do the work at less cost?

The Premier: They will absorb them in the service.

Mr. Pickering: They will get at us another way.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Commonwealth Government only take over the department and the officers connected with it. The Commonwealth service to-day is considerably overmanned. Possibly it is intended to use this, on a 12 months' agreement, for the purpose of gaining additional powers over the State. If this agreement had been for ten years, one could understand it, but it is only for 12 months.

The Premier: I did not know that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: As a matter of fact they could terminate it at six months' notice. There is no guarantee that they will continue doing the work at the agreed-upon price for any length of time. Having regard to the

abnormally high cost of Commonwealth administration, there is a very good chance of the cost to us increasing at an early date. The member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. Johnston) tried to show that the State Commissioner of Taxation would have full powers to act on behalf of the State.

The Premier: So he will have.

Mr. Johnston: It is quite clear.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Nonsense! Clause 23 provides that the State Crown Law shall supply the State Commissioner with free legal advice as to what action is to be taken. But under the very next provision the State Commissioner, before taking action to defend any case, must obtain the advice of the Commonwealth Crown Law.

The Premier: That is merely a safeguard.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Then why should the State Commissioner waste the time of the State Crown Law, since he cannot act except on the advice of the Commonwealth Crown Law in Melbourne? The next clause provides that before any appeal under the State laws is referred to a court, it must be submitted to the Federal Commissioner of Taxation for the advice of the Commonwealth Crown Law as to the correct interpretation of the law, and that the appeal should be allowed or disallowed in accordance with such advice. Yet we are told the State Commissioner will be there to carry out the laws of the State! That is true, but only under the advice of the Commonwealth Crown Law, not under the advice of the man who drafted the State Bill.

The Premier: We do not want two prosecutions for the one offence.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That has nothing whatever to do with the point I am putting forward.

Hon. T. Walker: You cannot have even one without the advice of the Federal authority in Melbourne.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: How can the Commissioner go to the State Crown Law when he can do nothing until he receives the advice of the Commonwealth Crown Law? The State Commissioner will be tied hand and foot.

Hon. T. Walker: Come into my parlour!

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I agree that if we can decrease cost it should be done, but let us do it in a proper manner. The member for Williams-Narrogin knows very little about the position in respect of the State Savings Bank, or he would not have put up the argument which he did. You, Sir, will not allow me to go into that question, but let me tell the hon. member that the final conclusion was prejudicial to the State. I am entirely opposed to the duplication of departments, but I think we should show the people that the State is not responsible for it. Instead of doing that, some of us are inclined to lead the people to believe that the fault lies with the State. I have often heard that put up on the election platform. At the last election a candidate for the West Province declared that if he got into Parliament he would bring about economy

by the wiping out of the duplication of departments. I put a question to him. I asked him whether, every time the Commonwealth Government started a department which would mean the duplication of a State department, he would agree to hand over the State work to the Commonwealth Government? He said, "No, certainly not." Then I said, "Well, how are you going to do away with the duplication of departments?"

Mr. Pickering: And he was clean bowled.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The fault has lain with the Commonwealth in every instance. Our Electoral Department was in existence long before that of the Commonwealth. Then there were the Analytical and the Quarantine Departments. The Commonwealth came along and started corresponding departments, bringing in their own officers. Why should they start a quarantine department?

The Premier: That is a different matter.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The principle is exactly the same. If we had not our State Quarantine Department we should have disease broadcast throughout Western Australia. As the member for Forrest (Mr. O'Loughlin) said, the same applies to the railways. We have on the Kalgoorlie station Commonwealth porters and State porters, the only difference being that the State pays 1s. a day more than does the Commonwealth.

Mr. Johnston: Then there are the war service homes.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is a different system. I should be sorry to see the Workers' Homes Board put in charge of the people running the war service homes. In reply to an interjection asking him why he did not construct the war service homes for the Commonwealth, the Premier said they would not let him do it.

Hon. P. Collier: They will take everything we have.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Everything that does not cost money. They will not take Health or Education.

Hon. P. Collier: We want them to take over the Observatory, but they will not do it.

The Premier: At all events, I did not vote for Federation.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Never mind that now. We are in it and we have to stay there, but let us make the best of it. If the Commonwealth want to gain possession of the various departments of State let them do it in a proper manner, by the votes of the people of the State. This agreement will save us £20,000 per annum, which is a very great inducement. But I believe that three years hence, instead of it saving us £20,000 per annum, it will be costing us an additional £10,000. The Commonwealth will not continue at that rate for long. They will not do the work at a loss, but will make the State pay for it, whatever it costs. On the other hand, no matter what the State may do for the Commonwealth, the Com-

monwealth will attempt to get out of paying for it.

The Premier: It was different in the old days.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: They were fair in the old days. Of course they did not then have enormous staffs to maintain.

The Premier: The very Constitution makes for high cost.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: When the Constitution was framed it was never intended that the Commonwealth should impose a land tax and an income tax. They were to have only the Customs, the Post, Office, Defence, and matters of that description, which it was thought they could carry out better than could the States. It was never intended to encroach on the State's sovereignty in any way. Suppose the Government enter into this agreement! Will it not be held up, if the convention takes place within the next two years, as proof to the people of Australia that we had collected the taxes of Western Australia at £20,000 a year less than it had cost previously? It would not be that much cheaper or cost that much less to the people of Western Australia, but it would be that much less cost to the Western Australian Government.

Mr. Pickering: That is so.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We will not know what it will cost the Federal Government to collect, but it will be a strong argument before the convention to endeavour to get other matters of State passed over to the Commonwealth. I know the bad financial position the Government are in and that they want all the money they can get, but we have to be careful before we hand over to the Commonwealth any of our departments. We should rather move Heaven and earth to secure control of the departments which they have and which are a duplication of our own departments.

Mr. DURACK (Kimberley) [S.1]: I am prepared to support the measure. In doing so I commend the Government upon their agreement with the Commonwealth authorities. The question has been before the public for a number of years. I take it the Government have not into touch with the officers dealing with this proposition, and that this is the best agreement that can be arrived at. The Bill will receive the fullest approbation, I believe, of the people and will in a measure help to create a better feeling with respect to the Commonwealth. A good deal of stress has been laid upon the manner in which we have suffered at the hands of the Commonwealth. One would think we were dealing with an alien nation. I am prepared to believe that the Commonwealth are only desirous of dealing fairly with Western Australia. Our position in this State is in a measure to be compared with those people who live in the North. We of the north at times feel that we are neglected by the Government in the south, but I feel sure there is no desire on the part of the Government to neglect us, but merely that

they do not realise our position. We cannot get into close touch with them and put before them our wants and requirements. If we have not had the best of treatment from the Commonwealth Government it is probably largely due to the fact that we have not properly represented our case. We have not been able to get into direct communication with them as easily as we might have done. Reference has been made to unification. This is looked upon as a bogey to some extent. I believe that unification is coming, probably sooner than many of us anticipate. This in a measure will be brought about by the means of aerial communication we now have. Who would believe a little while ago that we could have reached the remotest corner of Australia in a few hours by aviation? Some of the machines are now capable of travelling at 200 miles an hour and could fly across Australia in eight or ten hours. This sort of thing will bring the people of Australia together and we shall have a better understanding. I welcome a measure such as this. It will be for the good of the whole of Australia. The member for Kanowna (Hon. T. Walker) asks why the Commonwealth do not allow us to collect the two taxes. Why should the Commonwealth do so? They are the predominating or senior partner in this connection.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We are the senior partner. We were here first.

Mr. DURACK: It would be humiliating to our status as a Commonwealth if the junior partner were allowed to make this collection. Would the member for Kanowna, as senior partner in his firm, allow his junior partner to dictate to him the policy to be pursued in respect to his business?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We were in existence long before, and we are the senior partner.

Mr. DURACK: Whilst we would welcome the saving of £20,000, it is not so much the saving that is of importance as the feeling of content that will gradually come to the people of the State. The period of the agreement is too short. We are not giving anything away. We have allowed for only six months for the termination of this agreement, and I hope in Committee we shall be able to make the term as at the period of each financial year. The member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) said that the Commonwealth would make the State pay what it cost to collect these taxes, and that probably there would be an increase in the cost of collecting them after a few years. If any danger of that sort arises we can always terminate the agreement. I feel that the measure will be welcomed by the residents of this State, and have much pleasure in supporting it.

Mr. LAMBERT (Coolgardie) [S.7] Much as I would welcome economy or anything that would be likely to effect economy either in our Parliament or our administrative system, I say that this is toying with a dangerous principle. Before any good can be done either in our governmental system or otherwise, it is necessary that we should re-

model not only the Federal Constitution but the State Constitution. Until that is done I would not concede to the Commonwealth Government one iota of power in this or in any other direction. There is nothing more regrettable than the indifferent manner in which the Federal Government have endeavoured to face the problems confronting Western Australia. If the war had not occurred and public attention been focussed upon it, it would undoubtedly have been focussed upon the extraordinary extravagance on the part of the Federal Government since the consummation of federation. Of the many acts of the Federal Government I cannot see one that redounds to their credit. The problem arising out of the northern portion of Western Australia, and those bigger problems which are purely Australian should have been tackled by the Australian Parliament but have been ignored. To some extent the powers under the Federal Constitution are being exceeded. It is questionable whether we have any right to barter away the sovereign rights of Western Australia in this manner. This departure is the first serious attempt by this or any other State Parliament to indirectly barter away our sovereign rights.

Mr. Durack: What about the Electoral Department in South Australia?

Mr. LAMBERT: That is not a case on all fours with that of allowing the Federal Government to collect our taxes. At all times the Federal authorities have shown a desire to create new departments.

Mr. Nairn: This is only for the collection of taxes.

Mr. LAMBERT: If the principle is once established, that the Federal Government have the right to garner our taxes, the next thing they will ask for is to veto or agree to the taxes we impose.

Mr. Nairn: They would have to alter the Constitution first.

Mr. LAMBERT: It is an absolute violation of the State's Constitution for Parliament in this indirect manner to barter away our sovereign rights. It is expressly set out in the Federal Constitution the manner in which we should enlarge the powers of the Federal Parliament and the Federal Constitution. If it is thought advisable to give to a central Parliament extended powers, they should be given in a proper constitutional manner, and not in this indirect fashion. I hope hon. members will take a serious view of the position; not that we should be petty or State inclined, but we must have regard to the fact that in our present system of government in Australia we have a big territory to control, and we should be very jealous of our rights and not barter away the slightest power we possess to-day. Let the Federal Government carry out their proper functions as the Government of Australia, before we hand over these important departments of State to their control. I am shocked to think that this measure should receive serious attention at the hands of this

Parliament. I hope the day is near when those responsible for public thought in this State will realise that the sooner we have remodelled our Constitution the better. Before we can give any direct force to the usefulness of the Federal Government, this must be done. We particularly require in the first instance, in giving extended powers to the Federal Government, to see that the big unpeopled portion of the north is peopled. That is of almost greater importance to Australia than any other question. There are also other points which call for attention in regard to the Federal Government. It is bunkum to talk of making a serious departure of this description merely for the saving of £20,000. The member for Kimberley has spoken about the north and the impossibility of getting into close touch with the State Government. It would be worse if we were to centralise our form of government, of which this is apparently the initial step. All the members of the Federal Parliament are obsessed with the belief that the Federal Government should control our railways and everything else. One hon. member spoke about the control of our Savings Bank. It has been the desire of the Federal Government for some time to virtually monopolise the banking in Australia to-day. If there is a proper apportionment of the various powers there might be some central authority and control over this matter, but until we can meet our own financial requirements and find out whether we are justified in bartering away the powers which we possess to-day we should step very carefully before doing anything in this direction. We ought to desire to see one authority controlling such things as banking, the gathering of taxes, electoral matters and other concerns whose peculiar features lend themselves to a unified form of control, but we should hesitate before we make the initial step in this direction, which would only lead us into a most violent form of unification and would do no practical good. The sooner the State generally, as well as the State Parliament, realises the tendency that all this is taking, the more quickly shall we appreciate the danger. If we conceded the principle under the agreement we are now discussing, and if we regard it as a sound one, the Federal Government will simply look around and see which Government departments they can suggest they should take over next. They will endeavour to secure perhaps our Electoral Department and if they succeed in securing that department, the next they will probably look for will be the railways. It should be realised that fully nine-tenths of the members of the Federal Parliament feel that it is an absolute obligation on the part of the Federal Government to control the whole of the railways of Australia. In a desire to see a uniform gauge and a better system of railway management throughout Australia, this problem would have been tackled sooner if they had been able to secure any encouragement from any of the States.

Mr. Hardwick: I think they will want the septic tanks next.

Mr. LAMBERT: I do not think they will desire to secure the septic tanks any more than they would want the septic member.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. member must not be offensive.

Mr. LAMBERT: I did not desire to be offensive. I should have said, "the member for the septic tanks." This is a serious problem and we should have regard to the acts of the Federal Government as we have experienced them in Western Australia. So far as we can see, the Federal Administration have hardly shown themselves capable of managing an empty house, let alone an empty State. We have big spaces which we require to be filled up, and we should expect the Federal Government to exercise their due obligations to Western Australia. It would be detrimental to concede further powers to a central authority. There are very few important departments of the State in which the Federal Government will not desire to secure a footing. They have sought to secure a footing in our financial departments and in our banking, and the next matter which will probably receive their consideration is the subject of State insurance. That is a matter upon which that Government would like to lay violent hands. Members should not treat this as a party question. They should be prepared to show by their votes and speeches that they are not prepared to allow the Federal Government to further invade the functions of the State. I do not think members should show by their votes that they are prepared to give one iota of extra power to the Commonwealth.

Mr. PICKERING (Sussex) [8.19]: In reviewing the question before members we should judge of the probabilities by the actualities. Practically the first vote I cast when I came to this State was that upon Federation. I was full of hope for the future of Australia under a Federal regime. After 20 years' experience of Federation, however, I have come to the conclusion that if I were afforded another opportunity I would not now vote in favour of Federation. There is not one service the Federal Government have carried out in connection with the State that redounds to the credit of the Commonwealth. There is not one department in which the Commonwealth has exercised functions in which the interests of the State have not suffered. I will not deal with all the departments which have been referred to by members. The experience regarding the post office and many of the other matters should be fresh in the minds of members and also our experience regarding the surplus revenue. All these things should make us realise that Western Australia has no good grounds for confidence in handing any of these departments over to the Commonwealth.

Mr. Angelo: They absolutely robbed us of our surplus revenue.

Mr. PICKERING: That question, and the attitude of the Federal Government in that regard, have already been dealt with by members during the course of a lengthy debate. One thing which has caused me more surprise than anything else is that we have had two Western Australian-born members advocating handing over the Taxation Department to the Federal Government. I could understand it if they had been men who had formerly been resident in the Eastern States or had come from some distant part of the world. When I remember the experience of Western Australia since Federation, I cannot but wonder at those members adopting the attitude they took up to-night. Of the Western Australian-born with whom I am acquainted, I do not think that there are more than half a dozen who would vote in favour of Federation to-day, or would concede that they were not right in opposing Federation in years gone by. We are now asked to hand over to the Federal Government very important departments of the State. Why do the Federal Government desire to take over these departments?

Mr. Nairn: Because we want them to.

Mr. PICKERING: Is it reasonable to think that a State department which is in operation in this State could be better controlled by people outside? We have several departments in Western Australia upon which the Federal Government have trespassed. One would have thought that, from a business point of view, the Federal Government would have preferred to accept the services of those in the existing State department who had a knowledge of local conditions, rather than create new departments with officers whose knowledge of this State was deficient.

The Premier: The people should show some resentment.

Mr. PICKERING: Now we are asked to encourage the Federal Government in this direction by handing over to them this department of State.

Mr. Lambert: They have established a new Railway Department costing thousands of pounds a year.

Mr. PICKERING: They have a great many departments in this State which run into very big figures. Those departments are unnecessary. There have been protests by the State Government against these things, but they have been of no avail. Now we are asked to encourage them in their exploitation of various avenues in Western Australia. It is suggested that we should hand over other important departments. I am as anxious as any other member to practice economy. I believe it is possible that practical economy can be bought at too great a price and I believe that the price which we are asked to pay in this case, is too big for the small saving.

The Premier: Do you consider £20,000 too small?

Mr. PICKERING: It is too small to pay for this economy. I am surprised that West-

ern Australian-born members should have adopted such an attitude.

Mr. Johnston: We can still take a broad Australian point of view.

Mr. PICKERING: If the treatment we have to receive from the Federal Government had been taken into consideration by members, I cannot see how they could suggest giving more extended powers to the Federal Government. I hope members will realise the importance of this step.

Mr. Johnston: Would you extend this policy to the banks?

Mr. PICKERING: I would not. I would keep the savings bank for Western Australia and I regard it as a matter of vital importance.

Mr. Lambert: We should be co-partners in the Commonwealth Bank.

Mr. Johnston: We are partners.

Mr. Pickering: I am afraid that we shall have, step by step, our powers whittled away. I do not believe in unification in any shape or form and I do not believe in unification so far as State and Federal departments are concerned.

Mr. TEESDALE (Roebourne) [8.25]: If it were not for the great many calamities forecasted by the member for Coolgardie (Mr. Lambert), I would not have wasted time in discussing this Bill, which has already been worn threadbare by members to-day. I feel certain that there is no justification for the fears which the member for Coolgardie has expressed. I am positive that to-morrow morning, when the "West Australian" is scattered broadcast throughout the country, and the people see that Parliament has taken this wise step, a feeling of satisfaction will extend throughout the community. I feel confident that right through every electorate in the State there will be a rejoicing to think that the Government have carried out the promise which was made to effect economies in these directions.

Mr. O'Loghlen: They will light bonfires.

Mr. TEESDALE: If members vote against a measure like this they will have more pluck than I gave them credit for, when they go before their electors to explain their actions.

The Premier: Every elector is concerned.

Mr. TEESDALE: To listen to the member for Coolgardie and all the troubles he has forecasted, one would think that we would be sold up lock, stock and barrel at a bailiff's sale 10 minutes after the measure becomes law. I cannot understand his contention in view of Clause 13, in which it is set out that the sovereign powers of the State are intact both as regards the laws in existence now or hereafter to come into force. Surely there could be no greater safeguard than that outlined in that clause to guard against the dangers which the member for Coolgardie has dealt with. I feel pleased that we have done something to show the people that we intend to economise. This £20,000 saving may be a small matter but I think the public will see

that it is a step along the right lines and that the Government are carrying out the promises which they made on the hustings. I feel satisfied that the people will be behind the Government in the step they have taken.

Mr. NAIRN (Swan) [8.28]: At the risk of exhausting the patience of the House I would like to take this opportunity of tendering my congratulations to the Government on bringing forward this measure. It is a significant realisation of the negotiations which have been carried on between the Commonwealth and the State Governments for many years. I will not contend that there may not be something in the measure which will require adjustment or review as circumstances arise. The principle underlying the Bill is good and entirely, in my opinion, against the statements and fears expressed by members of the opposition, as well as some members sitting on this side of the House. Never since I have been a member have I listened to more un-Federal and less Australian utterances than I heard from members sitting on the other side of the House to-day. It is unaccountable to me. There is no more ground for fears arising from such a sane and common sense agreement as that under discussion, than we have of being hypnotised here to-night. The member for Coolgardie referred to the possibilities of the railways being taken over by the Federal Government. It would require an alteration of the Constitution before such a matter could be permitted.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: No; we could hand over the railways in the same way.

Mr. NAIRN: Not as suggested by the member for Coolgardie. If the people as a whole decided to hand over the railways they could do so. This agreement is not for the purpose of imposing taxation but for the collecting of taxation, and is in accord with the principles laid down by the sovereign rights of the State. There is nothing in the belief that we are going to be controlled from Melbourne, because the Federal Crown Law authorities will have to be consulted when a matter is in dispute. It is laid down in the agreement that we shall have the right as a State to appear before any competent court to interpret the agreement.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Of course you will have the right, but not without the consent of the Federal law authorities. Read Clause 24.

Mr. NAIRN: The agreement bears out what I say. When an honourable agreement is entered into I can only wonder at the reason for hon. member's, who are looked upon with confidence to express reasonable views, attacking the Federal Government in a most unfederal, unfair, and illogical manner.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Have you read the Bill.

Mr. NAIRN: Yes.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: There is no agreement entered into.

Mr. NAIRN: It is proposed; it is all proposed. I cannot for the life of me understand why, at our very first attempt to bring about a better understanding between the Commonwealth and the State, members sitting opposite should so vigorously oppose what is desired by a great majority of the people of the State.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Mitchell—Norham—in reply) [8.35]: I hope hon. members will vote for the measure. I repeat that the Federal Government will collect this tax at a third of the cost less than we have been able to do it. Generally, it will be much more convenient for everyone concerned. There will be only one return to prepare, one cost of checking will be saved, and one set of notices will be sufficient to send out to taxpayers.

Mr. Angelo: Could we not have done the same thing for them?

The PREMIER: We might have done so if they paid us.

Mr. Angelo: They were not taking it on.

The PREMIER: We shall be saving £10,000 per annum, by having this work done for us.

Hon. T. Walker: Do you mean that they are doing this without a quid pro quo?

The PREMIER: I would like hon. members who are opposing this motion to tell the electors when they appear before them that they opposed the Bill preferring to compel each one of the people to make out two separate taxation returns. That will be a fair thing for hon. members to do. Not only will the State be saved £20,000, but what is proposed will save the taxpayer a great deal of work and a considerable sum of money as well. I wish to make it clear also that the Commonwealth Government will be merely an agent for the State Government in the collection of the tax which the State Government has determined upon. Our will in this matter cannot be questioned. We shall still determine what the legislation shall be. We shall have the right to vary legislation and impose any tax we like, and when the tax is collected we can determine what shall be done with it. These things will be within our control for all time.

Mr. Lambert: Does not the Premier realise that the people of Australia will declare that we are incompetent to run our Taxation Department?

The PREMIER: Let them say what they like. Hon. members have talked about handing over the railways. We cannot do that.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They will get them.

The PREMIER: We cannot give anyone the right to interfere with our public conveniences. The Federal Government will not have an opportunity of doing anything that will interfere in any way with the State or the individual. This measure merely provides for certain services to be

rendered to the State by the Commonwealth in regard to the collection of the taxes. Surely the matter is very easily understood. Hon. members are aware that to-day we are rendering the Commonwealth Government services, for instance, in collecting fares at the railway stations, and in regard to public works. For this work we are paid a commission. I would agree with hon. members in their opposition to the Bill, if the employment of the Federal Government for the collection of these taxes meant giving away anything at all, or if it meant a single step towards unification.

Mr. Lambert: Does the Premier recognise that if it is sound in connection with one department, it is sound in all departments?

The PREMIER: Does the hon. member place the collection of taxes by the Federal Government as our agent on all fours with the handling over of the Lands Department to the control of the Federal Government? I am absolutely against unification and I am also against a great deal of what the Federal Government have done. They have treated us with scant consideration in many directions and I have had some experience during the past 18 months of that scant consideration.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: And yet they are going to do this work for £20,000 less!

The PREMIER: I know they are vastly superior to the State Government.

Mr. Lambert: We want to tell them that they are not.

The PREMIER: I agree that we should resist in every way any step that is taken towards bringing about unification. We know that the people of New South Wales and Queensland are inclined that way, and that there is some danger of it, but I am not afraid to employ the Federal Government to collect the taxes for us. It would be a scandal if the Bill were defeated. I have nothing more to say except that the opposition which has been voiced to this measure is based upon a misunderstanding. I hope hon. members will vote for the Bill in order that the State may be saved £20,000 a year, and in order also that the taxpayers of Western Australia may be saved a considerable amount of trouble and cost.

Hon. T. Walker: What about saving the State from dishonour?

The PREMIER: It is nonsense to say that.

Hon. T. Walker: This is a wrong thing to do.

The PREMIER: It is the right thing to do and it is being done in the right way.

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

Ayes	18
Noes	5

Majority for .. 13

AYES.

Mr. Broun	Mr. Nairn
Mr. Brown	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Davies	Mr. Piessie
Mr. Draper	Mr. Pilkington
Mr. Durack	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Willmott
Mr. Mitchell	Mr. Hardwick

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Walker
Mr. Angwin	Mr. Lambert
Mr. Pickering	

(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Authority to enter into agreement:

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: When the Premier introduced the Bill he gave me an assurance, in response to an interjection, that the temporary employees in the State Taxation Department would be protected. There is, however, a certain ambiguity about the matter. In the conduct of our public service there are far too many temporary men.

The Premier: I said that some of the temporary men had been in the State Taxation Department for some time and had the right to be put on the permanent staff.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: That is where the ambiguity arises, no definite length of service being set down. The men I refer to are temporary employees who have been in the department for some considerable time, and are thoroughly efficient in their work. I refer especially to those in the land taxation branch. I understand there are only about three men employed in the land taxation branch of the Federal Taxation Department. Consequently the great volume of the work of land taxation in this State will, if this measure is enacted, have to be done by the officers to be transferred from the land tax branch of the State department.

The Premier: They have made no representations to me, as I imagine they would do if they had any doubts.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I accept the Premier's assurance that he will watch their interests.

The Premier: I will.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: If all that is predicted by the Bill happens, there must be a reduction in staff. No one can object to such a reduction, because the object is economy. But there is a fear that if our experienced officers are transferred they will be kept on by the Federal Taxation Department only for the short period necessary to train others, whereupon our men will be cast aside. The Premier knows that to-day the public policy is prefer-

ence to returned soldiers, to which this Parliament has agreed. But if a returned soldier is an applicant for a position in the Federal Taxation Department and receives an appointment in that department and thereupon is trained by a man who, under ordinary circumstances, would have another four or five years' employment there, it will be very hard on that man if he is put out, as soon as the training has been effected, merely because he is a temporary employee. Although a temporary employee, he may have every right to be on the permanent staff. If there is work for these men in the Federal department they should be kept on there, assuming that any representations from the Premier can achieve that end.

The PREMIER: I will certainly watch the interests of the employees mentioned by the member for Forrest. I thought the hon. member was referring yesterday to a number of temporary employees who have been in the State Taxation Department for a considerable time. If they are not taken over—probably they will be—then of course they will have their rights in our own public service. They can now ask to be made permanent. I shall watch their interests, of course. They have served this State well. But a temporary officer who has been employed only a few months knows what his position is. I am sorry that the officers on whose behalf the member for Forrest has spoken did not, at a time like this, let me know of any doubts that they felt. Had they represented to me that they considered themselves to be in a difficulty, I would have given them protection. Those of them who are not taken over but can become permanent will naturally come back to the State public service.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I have no doubt that the Premier will carry out his undertaking to do the best he can for the temporary employees in question. But it is just as well to face the facts. We know that there are numerous temporary employees in the Federal Taxation Department.

The PREMIER: I do not know anything about it.

Hon. P. COLLIER: One of the contemplated methods of economy is that when the two departments are amalgamated our permanent employees, on being taken over, will supplant, and put out of work, a number of the present temporary staff of the Federal Taxation Department. Does the Premier think that the Commonwealth will agree to take over temporary employees of this State and guarantee them permanent employment whilst dismissing or getting rid of Commonwealth temporary hands?

The PREMIER: I thought the Commonwealth service here had got rid of its temporary hands.

Hon. P. COLLIER: There are numbers of them employed in the Federal Taxation Department.

The PREMIER: There should not be.

Hon. P. COLLIER: So long as they are there and are going to be replaced by per-

manent men from the State Taxation Department, there will not be very much hope for the temporary hands in the State Taxation Department. Nearly all the talk we have heard to-day about economy and saving is purely mythical. There will be no such results whatever. Under this agreement the Commonwealth are to take over the whole of the staff of the State Taxation Department.

The PREMIER: But not necessarily to employ them in the Federal Taxation Department.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Where is the Commonwealth going to employ them?

The PREMIER: Wherever the Commonwealth wants them.

Hon. P. COLLIER: If the Commonwealth Government are going to find employment for the temporary hands of our State Taxation Department, the Commonwealth public service must now be understaffed in many directions.

The PREMIER: It may be.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It may be! The arrangement merely means taking the debit out of one pocket and putting it into another. In a very little time the £20,000 annual saving promised in connection with this measure will have disappeared, and we shall probably have to pay £40,000 annually by way of additional Commonwealth taxation. After all, it does not matter much to the taxpayer whether he is taxed per medium of the State Government or per medium of the Commonwealth Government. The effect of passing this Bill and consummating the agreement under it will be to relieve the Western Australian taxpayer as a taxpayer to his State and to add to his burden as a taxpayer to the Commonwealth. That will be the net result. Nothing else will happen. Would anyone expect to get more economical administration from the Commonwealth when we have it on evidence that during the past six years, since the war started, but apart altogether from expenditure occasioned by the war or arising out of the war, the Commonwealth have doubled their expenditure, have piled up expenditure to the extent of a great many million pounds more than the expenditure of six years ago, apart altogether, I repeat, from expenditure occasioned by the war, either directly or indirectly? The Commonwealth Government are multiplying their staffs in all directions, raising salaries as high as £1,200 and £1,500 a year. Just compare the salaries of the Commonwealth officials in Melbourne, especially those who, like flies around the honey pot, move and have their being in the immediate environment of Federal Ministers, with the salaries of State employees! Unless I am a very bad judge indeed, hon. members are victims of an utter delusion if they imagine that in the intimate issue the passing of this Bill will effect any real saving. To say that we are going to get better results from the Commonwealth is to fly in the face of all our experience of Commonwealth administration, and more especially our experience of it during the past six or eight years.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I gather from the Premier that the officers who are entitled under the Appeal Board Act to become permanent officers will be made permanent officers.

The Premier: They must be.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If we are going to take them over there will be no saving at all.

The Premier: Officers are dropping out every day.

Hon. P. Collier: Between the two departments you will not reduce the staff at all.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The question raised by the member for Forrest is one regarding which some of the officers are considerably concerned.

The Premier: They have said nothing to me about it and the agreement was tabled here a week ago.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I read the agreement, but I did not expect that a Bill would be introduced this session. In fact, the agreement has not reached the stage when the Minister could embody it in the Bill for ratification. The Minister should take into consideration the question of the Commonwealth finding positions elsewhere for these officers.

Mr. DAVIES: The State has to pay and fix the salary of the taxation Commissioner. What is the office staff surrounding the Commissioner likely to cost the State?

The Premier: Nothing at all.

Hon. P. Collier: They take over the whole of the staff with the exception of the Commissioner.

Mr. DAVIES: Then no officers would be employed?

Hon. P. Collier: He will not employ any officer.

Mr. HARRISON: We are retaining the officer who knows the conditions here but loss is likely to be incurred by reason of the fact that we are so far from administrative headquarters. There must be a saving in administration. Every taxpayer now has to fill in two forms.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: And will still have to fill in two forms.

Mr. HARRISON: I cannot see any reason for that. There will be a saving in stationery, postages, etc., and the taxpayer will save time and trouble by having to fill up only one form. I guarantee that it is worth 20s. to fill up one form.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: What, when you can copy one from the other?

Mr. HARRISON: There must be a saving right through.

Clause put and passed.

Schedule, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

RESOLUTION—RETURNED SOLDIERS AND RAILWAY PASSES.

Council's Message.

Message from the Council now considered requesting the Assembly's concurrence in the following resolution:—

That in the opinion of this House the Government should (1) grant free transit over the State tramways to ex-members of the A.I.F. who are blinded or totally and permanently incapacitated, or eligible for full membership in the Maimed and Limbless Men's Association; (2) and in the event of the request made by the Federal Executive of the Returned Soldiers' League to the Federal Government being definitely refused, grant to ex-members of the A.I.F. free railway transit provided that they are (a) blinded or totally and permanently incapacitated; (b) inmates of or attending for treatment at military hospitals, sanatoria, convalescent homes, and hostels; (c) eligible for full membership in the Maimed and Limbless Men's Association.

Mr. WILSON (Collie) [9.10]: In speaking to the resolution received from another place I do so with a certain amount of regret and pleasure, regret that the condition of these wounded soldiers creates the necessity for giving such a concession, and pleasure that I and other members of this House might be of assistance in getting something for these deserving soldiers. It also gives me an opportunity to carry out a promise I gave to the Maimed and Limbless Soldiers' Association. In September of this year the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin), the Hon. Mr. Cornell, M.L.C., and I attended a meeting of the association. May I say that if there are any soldiers in the Commonwealth who are the real dinkums, they are these men, sturdy men who went and did their best and came back mutilated, minus a leg or an arm or otherwise disabled. At that meeting there were about 60 men present and a lady. The lady is a member of this body, she having lost her hand in an explosion in a munition factory while engaged on war work in the old country. The qualification for membership for the association is as follows:—

Any soldier or sailor who has served in His Majesty's Service either ashore or afloat, in any part of the world whatsoever during the late war or any other war, and whose disabilities are a direct result of injuries sustained while on such service, shall be eligible to become a member of this association, provided that (a) such soldier or sailor has suffered the loss of a limb or limbs by amputation or otherwise—(b) has a limb or limbs rendered permanently and totally useless as a result of injuries received while on such service.

While the war was on, wounded soldiers received from the Railway Department and from the Tramway Department concessions in the shape of cheap fares and sometimes

free travelling. Soon after the Armistice was signed these concessions were practically cut out except in isolated cases. An application was then made to the Prime Minister from the various State Premiers, the effect of which can best be conveyed by quoting the remarks made by the Minister for Education in another place. He said—

In October of last year the Premier notified the Prime Minister that after the 30th June all the railway concessions to returned soldiers would cease, so far as the State Government were concerned, and invited the Federal authorities to put up a proposal under which the State would extend, at the expense of the Commonwealth, such concessions as the responsible authority, namely, the Commonwealth Government, considered the soldiers were entitled to. Every State in the Commonwealth endorsed that action.

I believe that the Government at present are doing something for these soldiers, but it is the desire of members of the association that something permanent should be placed on record and that they should be put on the same footing as their brother members in the other States of the Commonwealth. At the conference it was thought advisable that a deputation should wait on the Premier. It was also decided that if the Premier failed to give some satisfaction, a motion to this effect should be tabled in this and in another place. I understand that Mr. Cornell introduced the deputation to the Premier and that the Premier was very sympathetic. At the time the member for North-East Fremantle and I were in the Eastern States. I may say that the Premier is always sympathetic to the soldier. He has good reason to be, and I am sure that to-night we shall have no trouble in making some atonement to these men.

Mr. Davies: Does the motion embrace nurses?

Mr. WILSON: Yes and men suffering from tuberculosis as a result of active service. The Premier expressed warm sympathy with the deputation and said that although the matter was really one for the Commonwealth he would see what could be done and, if possible, would meet their requests. It is a Commonwealth affair, but if the Commonwealth will not stand up to their promises made to the men, that is no reason why we, as a State, should not see that they get justice. The concession asked for would be some recognition by the State of the services of the soldiers. Following that interview with the Premier, and the conference of soldiers, Mr. Panton moved a motion in the Council which, at the instance of Mr. Cornell, was amended. As amended, it is the subject of the message from the Council we are now considering. Let me quote an excerpt from an article in Stead's "Review" of the 10th October, 1920, in which Mr. J. J. Thomas says—

The analogy of the war still holds good. If men are totally incapacitated by fighting to save the life of their country, it is

recognised to be the country's duty to provide for them; if they are incapacitated only for the particular work in which they are skilled, it is recognised to be the country's duty to train them for such work as they can best perform.

He goes on to say that surely the same principle should apply to those who have been incapacitated while serving their country in industry. That would bring in this nurse who lost her hand at munition work. The article continues—

If by losing a limb a man can no longer follow his calling, the State must train him for another calling which he can follow; if a man's health is threatened, say by unsuitable indoor work, and he has not the ability to perform any other work, the State must help him to get the necessary ability. Not only fairness to the worker, but the good of the State demands this.

Mr. Thomas also put in a word for the man whose health has been threatened by the war, for the man suffering from tuberculosis. We have at Wooroloo men who left the country, big upstanding young fellows and who came back with tuberculosis accentuated by gas. I have here a letter from the secretary of the T.B. Sailors' and Soldiers' Association of Australia, who wrote to Mr. Cornell as follows—

We also note you have been good enough to endeavour to secure a travelling concession on the railways for inmates of or attending military hospitals, sanatoriums, etc., and although my association are thankful to you for the benefits which will be given to ex-soldiers receiving treatment in sanatoriums, we consider the full benefits to be given to members of the Maimed and Limbless Men's Association should also be extended to members of the above association, and we feel this matter is deserving of the most sympathetic consideration, hence the reason for bringing same under your notice. There is a deep and general prejudice existing against employing the consumptive soldier, although he may be declared by a doctor as his disease being arrested and in consequence of this, he finds it difficult to procure work, and at times the consumptive soldier has often to cease all work for periods of days or even weeks at a time. Regular work and employment that returns a living wage is impossible to obtain. It is only the T.B. soldier himself who realises the disabilities and deprivations under which he suffers, and any T.B. soldier although striving to live under the very best conditions, his life is considerably shortened, and would sooner have lost his limbs than suffer as he does.

He puts in a plea that the same concession should be given to men in the sanatorium, men who are practically dying on their legs. I want to bring under notice what has been done in other States. I have here an excerpt from the "West Australian" of the 12th December. Referring to the New South Wales Government, the paragraph is as follows—

It has been decided by the Cabinet that any returned soldier who has lost a leg, arm, or eye, shall be given a free pass on the trams for 12 months, and those of them who live in suburban areas which are served by trains will receive passes to travel between their homes and their places of employment. A letter from the Premier's office to the Returned Soldiers' Association making known this decision says that the Cabinet considers that the matter of such passes is entirely a Federal and not a State question, and that it is intended to make strong representations on the subject to the Federal Government. In the meantime, however, the State Government will issue such passes as a matter of grace and not of obligation. We are asking for that for these men. I have here an excerpt from the "Worker" of last week as follows—

The New South Wales Labour Government agreed to allow blind soldiers a free pass, for life, when travelling by train or tram in New South Wales. The pass is of gold, and, in addition to the blind soldier in possession of it, it entitles a guide, who may accompany the blind soldier for that specific purpose, to also travel free. On the obverse side of the pass is stamped "New South Wales Government Railways and Tramways Life Pass," and on the reverse side is inscribed the name of the blind soldier to whom it has been issued with the added words "and guide."

Which is a most humane proposal. Let me refer to what is being done in South Australia. I have here a cutting from "The Digger," the official paper of the soldiers of South Australia. It reads as follows—

Limbless soldiers have at last received justice. Free, first-class travelling facilities for life, upon tramways and railways, will be granted to those who have lost a leg or a foot in the war. In addition, all those incapacitated and blinded soldiers who were recently granted second-class passes will be allowed to travel first-class. Now I have a copy of a letter from an old friend of mine who was in France, a brother of the member for Forrest (Mr. O'Loughlen), who lost a leg in France. Writing from South Australia he says—

I have a free pass on trains and trams now. Has your State granted a similar concession? If not it is time you did. This State gives to all men who have lost a leg or foot, or others who are totally disabled, a free first-class pass on all lines within 25 miles of G.P.O., and if we want to go further we have only to apply at Commissioner's office (without giving a reason for the journey) and we get a free pass. I think the reason for a special pass for each country journey is to prevent us all becoming commercial travellers.

I do not think it is necessary to labour the question. Nearly every member has more than a full meed of sympathy for the returned soldiers, especially those who have lost their limbs in service for the country.

If the Federal Government will not give these requested facilities, it is up to us to do something. I am sure the Premier and his Government are sympathetic. The granting of the concession would be very much appreciated. I have pleasure in moving the motion.

Mr. HARRISON (Avon) [9.26]: I have but little to say. I merely wish to support the hon. member. I feel it is the duty of the State to grant these concessions in regard to tram and train journeys.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Mitchell—Norham) [9.27]: My views are that the Federal Government ought to do a good deal of this work. We have written, asking them to do it. We are carrying the blind men free to-day and they will continue to be carried free, whether the Federal Government undertake the responsibility or not. I do not know quite what has been done in regard to the incapacitated men. For some time they were carried free. A great many of those cases ought to be carried free. As for the men attending military hospitals, convalescent homes and hospitals, it is clearly the duty of the Federal Government to see that they shall get to those places. I do not understand why the Federal Government have not met this obligation. We have asked them to do it, have written to them about the matter, and have submitted the requests made by deputations.

Mr. Wilson: They are full of promise, but they are doing nothing.

The PREMIER: I can get no satisfaction at all. It is clearly their responsibility.

Mr. Wilson: Undoubtedly.

The PREMIER: Some of our maimed soldiers are very badly maimed and have considerable difficulty in getting about. They can earn very little, some of them nothing. Of course we are giving preference about the departments to injured soldiers, men minus an arm or even a leg.

Mr. Wilson: This country which did so much during the war ought not to be outdone now by New South Wales.

The PREMIER: That is true, but we ought to ask the Federal Government to do their duty. I am perfectly willing to do all that is possible to make the lives of these men as comfortable as may be. In New South Wales they have given them a pass which will last for a year and will then be over, and will have to be renewed or they will not get anything more. In South Australia they have given a pass to injured men who live near the city. If they want a pass into the country they have to apply for it. I did not know that this was being done. I have no objection to blind or permanently incapacitated men being treated with the utmost consideration. If the Federal Government will not do it for them I think we should. We should continue to make representations to the Federal Government in re-

gard to men receiving hospital treatment. Federal members should do this.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They do not represent the State. They have been away too long.

The PREMIER: It would be just as right to say to us that we must look after them at the hospital, too.

Mr. Wilson: They are too lazy to do anything.

The PREMIER: I do not know about that.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You may think a lot though you do not say much.

The PREMIER: I do think a lot about this. Men have come to me and asked me to refer the matter on their behalf to the Federal Government. We owe these men a great deal. They have fought for us, bled for us and suffered for us, and will continue to suffer for us so long as they live. They are deserving of the utmost consideration. I do not know that we can do more with the Federal Government, but we ought to make it clear to them that this is part of their duty.

Mr. Lambert: We ought to clear them all out.

The PREMIER: I would not mind doing that with some of them.

Mr. Lambert: I am referring to the Federal Government.

The PREMIER: I thought the hon. member was referring to Federal members. They leave these men here and apparently that is their way of dealing with the matter.

Mr. Lambert: And yet you are going to allow them to take over the collection of the State taxation.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They have not got it yet.

The PREMIER: The hon. member is a pessimist.

Mr. Wilson: You are agreeable to issuing passes to these men.

The PREMIER: I am willing to issue passes to blind and permanently incapacitated men. I do not think the House ought to agree to the issue of permanent passes to any other than to these two classes of men. We might follow the example of New South Wales and continue to bring pressure to bear upon the Federal Government in the meantime. It is an infernal shame that we are left to bear this cost when the Federal Government collect additional revenue in order that they may meet war costs.

Hon. P. Collier: They raise loan funds to meet war expenditure, and they raise taxation in order to meet war expenditure, and they ought to meet their obligations, too.

The PREMIER: Yes. They got the money to do it and they then propose that we should do the work. It is wrong that they should not carry those men who need medical attention at the hospitals.

Mr. Lambert: Barbarians would treat the soldiers better. Talk about German treatment! They would allow these men to hobble to hospital.

The PREMIER: I suggest that so far as these two classes of men are concerned we should agree that they must have passes. There are not many of them. So far as the others are concerned, whilst I might give consideration to them for a time we ought to see that every effort is made to induce the Federal Government to face their responsibilities. I am willing to go that far on the distinct understanding that representations will be made on the part of members of these organisations to bring the position before the Federal Government. I have a profound sympathy for these men and a feeling of eternal gratitude for all they have done for Australia. I would not hesitate for a moment to do all that is essential for them if I thought it was our duty to do it. If the Commonwealth Government will not do their duty by them we must do it for them.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [9.35]: The Premier almost made a definite promise that if the Federal Government refused to carry out their promises and their duties they would be met by the State.

The Premier: I did say that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is a fairly definite promise. In Fremantle ever since the war, limbless and incapacitated men have received free tram rides in the district. There are 25 or 30 of them. We cannot make this permanent but have made it for two years and the concession is renewed. It is against the law, but no one would dare to bring us to court for doing it. In the case of men attending hospitals, immediately the medical officer finds out that it is necessary for a man to attend he sends instructions to the tramway office and a pass is supplied at once. The people in Fremantle are contributing their share on behalf of the limbless and incapacitated men as well as for the sick men, and would have no objection to paying an additional share to the State at large. If hon. members only had an opportunity of meeting members of these associations they would not hesitate to grant this request. Whilst these men feel that they have not been served fairly in the requests that have been made and that if they were in a position to avoid making the request they would not continue to press it, they point out that in the hot weather they often have great difficulty in getting about. A man who has to use two crutches finds it very hard to get to and from his employment. I hope the Premier will issue instructions at once, pending further representations to the Commonwealth, that these men are immediately attended to. All the time there is delay these unfortunate men are suffering. They are in need of immediate relief. There is no doubt, however, that the work is a Commonwealth duty. I am sure all concerned will assist the Premier in endeavouring to force the Government to do their

duty. We as a State after the promises we have made to our men must regard it as our duty to see that they are fulfilled at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. LAMBERT (Coolgardie) [9.40]: I am in accord with the sentiments expressed in the motion. Until such time as the Federal Government can be awakened to a full sense of their obligations in these deserving cases, we as a State should afford the necessary relief. It is a monstrous thing that although the Minister for Defence (Senator Pearce) is at present in the State, engaged in the comparatively trumpery matter of an election in Kalgoorlie, he should be so callous as to neglect his duty towards these men. I am pleased to hear the undertaking given by the Premier, and it is also pleasing to note what is being done for these men on the Fremantle trams. I hope the Premier will endeavour to bring home to the Federal authorities what their obligations are in these matters. The claims of these men would appeal even to barbarians, let alone to Federal members, who during the war almost at the point of the revolver drove men away to fight for the country. I have a brother who came down the other day to have his leg off. What do Federal members care about these men? Unless we can show them their obligations they will remain callous to the claims of these people. For decency's sake this State should continue to help these men at any cost until such time as the Federal authorities take them in hand. Even if it means a small loss to the State railways or the tramways I am sure every member will vote for this motion. Apparently the Federal Government will go on ignoring their obligations until they are forced to do something. It is certainly an act of grace on the part of the State Government to carry these soldiers free, and that must be plainly pointed out to the proper authorities. I am sure no one will have any hesitation in voting that these men shall have any facility that is within the gift of this State.

Mr. GRIFFITHS (York) [9.45]: I heartily approve of the motion. My mind has been carried back to the period during 1917 when things were critical with the Allies and when the conscription issue was before the people.

Mr. Lambert: Some of those blatherskites would have given them the railways some time ago.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Quite so.

Mr. Lambert: The blatherskiting scoundrels!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I feel the utmost sympathy should be extended to these men. It should not be regarded as an obligation but as a duty to look after them. Looking back over the past six years we must agree that the consideration which is suggested in the motion is very little to concede these men.

The other day I saw a man who was half blind leading a totally blind man. My thoughts reverted to this motion, and I thought it would be passed with but little discussion. I am in entire sympathy with those who brought this matter forward, and I congratulate the Government on having indicated that if the Federal Government do not take this matter up, the State will extend this consideration to the men until such time as the Federal Government recognise their obvious duty.

Mr. ANGELO (Gascoyne) [9.47]: I am quite in accord with what other speakers, including the Premier, have stated. I would suggest, however, that we should ask the Government to grant these facilities for nine months. During that time pressure might be brought to bear upon the Federal Government, and by the time Parliament meets again, we will know what the intentions of the Federal Government are. The new State Parliament will then be in a position to reconsider the question.

Mr. DAVIES (Guildford) [9.49]: The motion has my entire sympathy. I think, however, that it might well be extended to include a free pass for the attendants. The other day I encountered a returned man on the railway station and his attendant had not put in an appearance. If the attendant were granted a free pass, it would get rid of this difficulty. I speak not only as a member of Parliament, but as a taxpayer, and I have no hesitation in agreeing that this concession should be given to the men.

Mr. PICKERING (Sussex) [9.50]: I was one of those who during some of the most critical periods of the war spoke in favour of conscription. At that time we were prepared to offer anything in order to secure a majority in favour of conscription. This is a very small thing to give the men who have fought during the war, and I endorse what has been said by other members.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. F. T. Brown-Beverley) [9.51]: I move an amendment—

That after "incapacitated" in Clause 2, the words: "(3) Grant to ex members of the A.I.F. free railway transit for one year, provided that they are" be inserted. The effect of the amendment will be that Clause 1 will stand as in the resolution. Clause 2 will stand for free transit for life for ex members of the A.I.F. provided they are totally blinded or totally and permanently incapacitated, and Clause 3 will read—

Grant to ex members of the A.I.F. free railway transit for one year, provided that they are (a) inmates of or attending for treatment at military hospitals, sanatoria, convalescent homes, and hostels; (b) eligible for full membership in the Maimed and Limbless Men's Association.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [9.52]: I understand that negotiations with the Federal Government covering the whole of those dealt with in the resolution have been going on for some considerable time, and the motion means that for the next 12 months the men included under Clause 3 will be granted free transit. I have not objection to that. Judging from the attitude of the Federal Government, however, so long as the State Government are prepared to grant the passes, so long will the Federal Government refuse to shoulder their responsibility. The resolution has my whole-hearted endorsement; in fact, no member could fail to recognise the obligations due to these men who have been seriously injured for life. I am sorry that the Federal Government have not realised it. It is strange to me that some member has not brought this matter up before the Federal Parliament.

Mr. Davies: There are several returned soldiers there.

Hon. P. COLLIER: During the 12 months, the question can be further fought out with the Federal Government. It is essentially a matter which can better be dealt with by the Federal Government than by the several States, who will probably deal with matters on a more or less different scale.

Mr. Angelo: The Federal Government will not agree to part with the money.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That may be so, but surely it is not a matter of money that should weigh with the Federal authorities. I am surprised that some returned soldier in the Federal House has not drawn attention to this matter before now. While we can continue wrangling with the Federal Government if necessary, the State can in the meantime assist these men in the direction suggested. The State Government would be quite prepared, doubtless, to offer the Federal authorities a special rate in order to assist these men. It is not too much to ask the Federal Government to do something in this direction, seeing that only a few thousand pounds are involved.

Mr. TRESDALE (Roebourne) [9.56]: While I take second place to no one in this State in the sympathy and consideration which I extend to blind, maimed and limbless soldiers, I think it is just as well we should realise that it is quite possible some of these men may be used by business firms in some form of employment or other, and we should see that this pass, which is worth from £150 to £200 a year, is not exploited by any firm. It would be perfectly fair if we limited this to men who are not employed by any firm. It would give undue preference to an employer if we enabled him to employ a soldier with the advantage of this free pass and permitted him to do business throughout the State. We should see that there is no possibility of these soldiers being exploited for business purposes.

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

BILL—DENTISTS.

In Committee.

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

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: In order to get the Bill through not only this House, but another place before the session closes, I propose to reduce it to about four clauses—the clauses contained in Part IV. The clauses I propose to abandon are too contentious and would take up a considerable time of the House.

Clause 1—Short title:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move an amendment—

That all the words after “Dentists Act” be struck out and the following inserted in lieu: “Amendment Act, 1923”, and shall be read as one with the Dentists Act, 1894, hereinafter referred to as the principal Act.”

The amendment will make the Bill merely an amending Bill instead of a consolidating Bill.

Mr. LAMBERT: The proposal of the Attorney General will be welcomed by hon. members. Most of the clauses in the Bill are of a contentious nature, and would take some time to discuss. I trust hon. members will support what the Attorney General proposes to do in order to secure the passage of the Bill through both Houses.

Amendment put and passed.

On motion by Attorney General, Clauses 2 to 19 struck out.

Clause 20—Persons registered under repealed Act:

On motion by Attorney General, Subclause 2 amended by striking out “this” and inserting “the principal” before “Act” in the second line, to provide that every person, qualified to be registered, shall be entitled to be registered as a dentist under the principal Act.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I move an amendment—

That in paragraph (c) the words “provided that an apprentice who has been once articulated and has failed to pass his examinations within three years from the completion of his article shall not be again articulated as an apprentice” be struck out.

This is an unheard-of proposal and it is out of all reason. It is designed to discourage anyone from going in for the practice of dentistry. Many of the most successful of our dental practitioners have taken a much longer time than that arranged for, to qualify. The time limit should be cut out altogether.

The Attorney General: Do you say that there must be no time limit at all?

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I have known students to be “plucked” repeatedly at the university, and who have ultimately got through. Why

should not an apprentice go on trying until he eventually succeeds? Several dental practitioners and companies have apprentices, in respect of whom they have received substantial premiums. The number of apprentices does not exceed 25 or 30, as against 50 stated by the board. The board contend that local facilities for obtaining the instruction necessary for passing the examination are on a par with facilities in the Eastern States. But we have no dental clinics or dental colleges in Western Australia; and the actual facilities here may be described as non-existent, in comparison with those available in the East. Moreover, the handbooks prescribed by the board for apprentices to study are out of print and unprocureable. I ask the House to carry the amendment.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: The question is whether people ought to be allowed to practise dentistry who are not qualified, or who, to judge from their past work in learning the profession, are never likely to qualify. From notes I have here I learn that there are four students registered under articles who were registered in 1895 and 1899 and have not yet passed the final examination.

Mr. Lambert: They may not be going on.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Are they practising, or working?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: I understand so. If a man intends to qualify for a profession and does not get through his examination within a reasonable time, it is pretty good evidence that he is not fit to be admitted to the profession. The Committee may think a period of three years beyond the period of articles too short, and I am prepared to consider a reasonable extension; but to suggest that there shall be no time limit is going too far.

Mr. BROWN: I hope the proviso will be struck out. When a boy is apprenticed to any profession or trade for a fixed time and fails to qualify within that time, he is given a further opportunity. It is apparently being assumed that every dentist to whom a boy may be apprenticed will be a good teacher; but very few masters in any trade or profession are, in fact, good teachers. To throw a boy, after three years, right out of the chance of going up for examination again, is unreasonable. Perhaps a period of six years may be regarded as a fair thing.

Mr. LAMBERT: At present, if one is registered as a dentist in Western Australia, one can only practise in Western Australia. Our dental legislation in this respect differs from all other dental legislation. In other parts of the world one cannot practise dentistry unless one is either a registered dentist or an articulated pupil to a registered dentist. In this State one can practise dentistry under the nominal supervision of a registered dentist. If a registered dentist is on premises containing five or six surgeries,

four or five other persons can practise dentistry there. I hope the Attorney General will not press for the insertion of these dangerous words. One registered dentist in this State took years to go through, and most of the dentists now practising here would probably fail if called upon to pass a theoretical examination at very short notice. I wish to stress the point that anyone can practise dentistry in Western Australia; the Attorney General could do so if he wished. If the hon. gentleman puts up a bar, as suggested, against apprentices to dentists, he will be doing something absolutely wrong. The principal Act lays down that the moment a man has passed a certain preliminary examination—the junior University examination—he shall be, to all intents and purposes, admitted to practise as a dentist. A man so admitted can operate, using either a local or a general anaesthetic. After passing that preliminary examination, the man can walk into a dentistry and go ahead when the registered dentist says to him, "Pull those teeth!" Those who desire to practise must start somewhere. One dentist who is practising in Kalgoorlie makes no secret of the fact that when he started he used to give someone a couple of shillings to get a gin and a blackfellow and practise on them.

Hon. P. Collier: When the trans line was being built the men were a great field for some people to work on.

The Attorney General: The Minister for Works would be a good subject.

Mr. LAMBERT: One would need a good pair of forceps to draw his fangs. I hope the amendment will be accepted.

Mr. PICKERING: We might extend the period from three years to six years. This should be adequate. I suggest that the member for York withdraw his amendment to enable us to insert this period.

Mr. NAIRN: I am in doubt as to the extent to which the Bill will apply after having suffered practically decapitation. Whether we retain this period or not does not make much difference if under the law as it exists, any person just commencing will be permitted to draw teeth on the first day of his apprenticeship. If we alter the law we should do something which will be of benefit to the public as well as to the dentists.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Apprentices after having served their time and spent money on preparation might, through anxiety, fail at the examination. The period suggested by the member for Sussex would be a reasonable one and should meet the desires of all concerned. I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Leave refused.

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

Clause 21—Registration of practitioner subject to examination:

On motions by Attorney General clause amended by striking out of line 2 the word "dentist" and inserting "principal," and by striking out of line 4 of paragraph (c) the word "second."

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I move an amendment—

That the following paragraph be added—
 —“(d) Provided also that the following persons shall be entitled forthwith to be registered by the board of dentists, that is to say—(1) Every person who for seven years prior to the 1st day of August, 1920, has been engaged in the work of a dental assistant, and who was on the 1st day of August, 1920, alone or with co-partners an employer of or in partnership with any dentist.”

Quite a number have been engaged for seven years and over and my object is to provide protection for them. The dental profession is the closest of close corporations, and the spirit which actuates the board is manifested in the measure which was put forward at their suggestion and which contains the iniquitous proposal I have been combating regarding the apprenticeship limitation. The board recently sent out a circular which stated that we were endeavouring to create a new type of dentist. No such thing is intended. There are certain men who have practised dentistry without infringing the law and have been allowed to continue for a number of years, and when we are passing additional legislation, it is only fair to protect them. In Victoria they have one dentist for every 1,462 persons. In New South Wales one for every 1,234 persons, and in Western Australia one for every 5,062 persons. The disproportion in these figures is evident. In regard to assistants, this State is not in line with the Eastern States. Mr. Joskey, registrar and barrister for the Victorian Dental Board, has said—

Hon. P. Collier: Oh, why stonewall your own amendment?

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I have no desire to do so, but he said it would not be fair to deprive these people of earning their livelihood in this way. The Government were supporting this view, and so, too, were both Houses of Parliament. In the profession of the law, he said, men had been admitted in somewhat the same way. He went on to say it was considered essential by the authorities that the concession should be made. He said the same applied to lawyers, and that to-day there were lawyers practising who had never been through the prescribed forms. When additional legislation is brought about, existing interests should be protected. Repeatedly in this State has the dental board acted in a way anything but impartial. Those people who have established businesses here should be protected from the vagaries of that board.

Mr. PICKERING: I will oppose the amendment. This is not new legislation; it is an amendment of the existing Act. The hon. member originally intended to move a very

different amendment, in which he proposed that any person who had been practising for eight years should be registered as a dentist.

Hon. P. Collier: The hon. member cannot debate an amendment simply because it is on the Notice Paper, although it has not been moved. He must confine himself to the amendment which has been moved.

The CHAIRMAN: Quite right.

Mr. PICKERING: As soon as the hon. member realised that there was no sympathy with his proposed amendment—

Hon. P. Collier: The hon. member must not discuss that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: That is so. The question before the Chair is the amendment moved by the member for York.

Mr. PICKERING: But the hon. member for York, in submitting his amendment, put in additional words which we were not able to catch.

The CHAIRMAN: He merely altered seven to eight.

Mr. PICKERING: Dental surgery might mean just extracting a tooth. There are other branches of the dental profession which are very important, such as the provision of artificial teeth. This amendment will admit practically anybody who has been practising for seven years as a dental surgery assistant. I am opposed to admitting to a profession those not properly qualified.

Mr. Lambert: It was done in the parent Act.

Mr. PICKERING: Yes, by obligation, because that was the first Act. I will not give my vote to perpetuating that. What is to be the end of this? Why should we not have a further amendment next session limiting the period to six years?

Hon. P. Collier: Or to the architects' level of one year; your level.

Mr. PICKERING: Under the Dental Act passed in 1894 everybody was admitted. If we are to have an amending Bill year after year there will be no finality. We will have fresh amendments at every available opportunity.

Mr. Griffiths: No, this shuts the door.

Mr. PICKERING: The door was supposed to be shut in 1894. Every opportunity has been afforded to anybody desirous of entering the dental profession by legitimate means. I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

Progress reported.

BILL—LAND TAX AND INCOME TAX.

Bill returned from the Council, with an amendment, in which the Council requested the concurrence of the Assembly.

BILL—DIVIDEND DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill returned from the Council, with an amendment, in which the Council requested the concurrence of the Assembly.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received the report of the Auditor General for the year ended the 30th June, 1920, under the Audit Act, 1904. The report will lie on the Table of the House.

BILLS (3)—RETURNED FROM THE COUNCIL.

- 1, Meekatharra-Horseshoe Railway.
With amendments.
- 2, Herdsman's Lake Drainage.
- 3, Public Service Act Amendment.
Without amendment.

House adjourned at 11 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Monday, 20th December, 1920.

Questions: Kalgoorlie Deputations	Page
Finances and Legislation	2581
Motion: Water Supply, to disallow by-law	2581
Bills: Permanent Reserves, 3a.	2586
Narrogin Recreation Reserve, 3a.	2586
Navigation Act Amendment, 3a.	2586
Justices Act Amendment, 3a.	2586
Bayswater Drainage Works, 3a.	2586
Transfer of Land Act Amendment, 3a.	2586
Sale of Mangarine, Discharged	2586
Workers' Compensation Act Amendment, Report	2586
Divorce Act Amendment, Report	2586
Stamp Act Amendment, Com.	2587
Wheat Marketing, 2a., Com.	2587
Resolution: Returned Soldiers and Railway Passes, Assembly's Modification	2586

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 3 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTION—KALGOORLIE DEPORTATIONS.

Hon. T. MOORE (for Hon. A. H. Pantton), asked the Minister for Education: 1, Is the Minister aware that men have been threatened with deportation by returned soldiers in Kalgoorlie? 2, Is he aware that two railway employees were ordered out of the town? 3, Is it a fact that those two railway employees, having left the town under compulsion, have been dismissed from the service? 4, Has any report been received from the Police Department? 5, If so, what is the nature of the report? 6, Has any complaint been received by the Government from the trades

unionists in Kalgoorlie on this matter? 7, If so, is it the intention of the Government to take steps to maintain law and order in Kalgoorlie? 8, In view of the circumstances of the dismissal of the two men will the Government consider their re-instatement?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, No. The only advice the Government have received is contained in a letter from the secretary of the A.W.U. at Boulder and a report from the Inspector of Police at Kalgoorlie. 2, No. 3, No. Two railway employees have been dismissed for being absent from duty without leave. 4, Yes. 5, The Inspector of Police, Kalgoorlie, reports that a rumour was current that members of the Returned Soldiers' League intended to forcibly deport certain supposed leaders of the O.B.U. As a result of action taken by the Inspector nothing of the kind took place. 6, Yes. A letter from the secretary of the A.W.U., Boulder. 7, The Government will maintain law and order at all times. In this instance the law was not broken. 8, The decision in this case rests with the Railway Appeal Board, to whom one of the above-mentioned employees has already appealed.

QUESTION—FINANCES AND LEGISLATION.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN asked the Minister for Education: 1, Are the Stamp Act Amendment Bill, the Dividend Duties Act Amendment Bill, the Land and Income Tax Assessment Bills the only measures which the Government propose to submit to this House during this session, for the purpose of restoring the equilibrium between the expenditure of the State and the revenue of the State? 2, If not, what other measures are to be submitted?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: (1, and 2), Yes. Unless something unforeseen happens the deficit at the end of the financial year will be as estimated, £399,000, as against the deficit of £668,000 for last year. Under the circumstances additional taxation is not considered essential.

MOTION—WATER SUPPLY.

To disallow by-law.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [3.3]: I move—

That the amendment to By-law No. 112, made by the Minister for Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage, under the provisions of "The Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Act, 1909," and laid upon the Table of this House on the 15th of December instant be disallowed.

This is a small matter, but important. I regret having to bring it forward during the closing hours of the session, but unless I do so, the by-law, to which I wish to draw atten-