

could be enforced and there would be no need for the amendment suggested.

The Premier: The trouble is that people will not enrol.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: In times such as the present when men are scattered all over the State in a search for work, hardship might result from a general attempt to secure convictions for failure to enrol, but in ordinary times it will be different. I know some people who have been off the rolls for two years or more and have made no attempt whatever to be enrolled. I guarantee that if a systematic canvass in some of the metropolitan constituencies were undertaken, it would be found that thousands of people were not enrolled. If it were appreciated that the law was to be administered stringently but sympathetically, the necessity for canvassers would disappear and everyone would be enrolled. On the other hand, should someone assist an elector, who was too lazy to attend to the matter himself, to fill in his claim card and subsequently the card should disappear, I do not see that the former should be penalised. What I desire is the rigid enforcement of the compulsory enrolment provisions of the Act. If that were carried out, the necessity for this amendment would disappear altogether. The Attorney General has outlined the procedure regarding objections to claim cards. As he said, I do not think it will make much difference in actual practice. As the member for South Fremantle said, I prefer that 20 people should be improperly on the roll rather than that one or two who are entitled to be on the roll should be denied the opportunity to record their votes. There is further evidence of a desire to keep people off the rolls instead of encouraging them by every possible means to get on the rolls. A firm in the city sent out to the persons on the electoral roll a circular. If a circular was returned through the Dead Letter Office, immediate objection was lodged at the Electoral Office and the name of the addressee was struck off the roll. I do not think we should be so energetic in striking people off the rolls. There are some individuals in the Government service who have red tape wrapped right round them. If they can take any possible objection to something which they consider is not right, they will do so. Fifty claim cards may be lodged the day before an election and

an energetic, enthusiastic red-tape official of the type I have mentioned may reject them because he considers the people are not entitled to be put on the roll. His action may affect an election. There might be an unscrupulous partisan in some position in the Electoral Department who perhaps would use his position to disfranchise numbers of people. We do not want to give anyone that opportunity. I do not think the Bill should be discussed further at this early hour of the morning. I shall conclude by saying that there is no hope of the measure passing this session. I notice there are already two pages of amendments on the Notice Paper. The proposed alteration of the law does not affect the members of this House so much as it does the members of another place, but they no doubt will also make amendments. In the unlikely event of the Bill being passed this session, then it will become law within five or six weeks of the issue of writs for the elections. It is not right to alter the law at this stage, particularly in view of the nearness of the forthcoming elections. I shall vote against the Bill.

On motion by Mr. Panton, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 1.36 a.m. (Friday).*

## Legislative Council,

*Tuesday, 13th December, 1932.*

	PAGE
Assent to Bill ... ..	2351
Bills : Loan, £2,176,000, 3R. passed ... ..	2351
Wheat Pool, 3R. ... ..	2351
Financial Emergency Act Amendment, report ...	2351
Road Districts Act Amendment, Assembly's request for Conference ... ..	2351
Appropriation, 2R. ... ..	2351
Road Districts Act Amendment, Conference Managers' report ... ..	2365
Mine Workers' Relief, 1R., 2R. ... ..	2366
Naragoin Hospital, 1R. ... ..	2369
Road Districts Act Amendment, Assembly's further Message ... ..	2369
Reserves, Com. ... ..	2369

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

**ASSENT TO BILL.**

Message from the Lieut.-Governor received and read, notifying assent to the Public Service Appeal Board Act Amendment Bill.

**BILL—LOAN, £2,176,000.**

*Third Reading.*

Read a third time and *passed*.

**BILL—WHEAT POOL.**

*As to Third Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 8th December.

**HON. H. SEDDON** (North-East) [4.36]: Since this Bill bears a relation to a Bill at present in another place, and may be considerably affected by the fate of that Bill, I suggest to the Minister that he defer further consideration of the Bill before us until we hear something more of the Bill still in the Assembly.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** (Hon. C. F. Baxter—East) [4.37]: This Bill is in no way connected with the Bill in the Assembly referred to by the hon. member. However, if members would like this Bill deferred, I have no objection to holding it over.

The **PRESIDENT**: I interpret that as a personal explanation. I trust there will not be many more.

**HON. J. M. MACFARLANE** (Metropolitan-Suburban) [4.38]: I am with Mr. Seddon in the desire that the Bill be held over, for I think there is a very distinct connection between this Bill and the legislation in another place.

On motion by Hon. J. Cornell, debate adjourned.

**BILL—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY ACT AMENDMENT.**

Report of Committee adopted.

**BILL—ROAD DISTRICTS ACT AMENDMENT.**

*Assembly's Request for Conference.*

Message from the Assembly requesting a conference on the amendments insisted upon by the Council, now considered:

The **CHIEF SECRETARY**: 1 move—

That the conference requested by the Assembly on the amendments insisted upon by the Council be agreed to, that Hon. J. J. Holmes, Hon. A. Thomson and the mover be appointed managers for the Council, that the President's room be the place of meeting, and the time 7.30 p.m.

Question put and passed.

**BILL—APPROPRIATION.**

*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 8th December.

**HON. J. M. DREW** (Central) [4.40]: Last year in dealing with the unemployment difficulty, I expressed the opinion that even if the prices of our primary products reached profitable figures, it would be some years before it would be possible to get the greater number of the men now out of work re-employed. I pointed out that heavy loan expenditure had created a large labouring population, and that as the ability to borrow money on the old-time scale or anything approaching it had disappeared and was not likely to reappear for a very long time, the necessity for facing the position and dealing with the problem was of urgent importance. One remedy I suggested was the settlement of carefully chosen married men on small blocks with good soil in country easy to clear, with a sufficient rainfall, and where the men could soon produce most of the necessities of life. If that cannot be done with many of those now on the dole, if it cannot be done as it was done in the early days of colonisation in Western Australia, I see no cheering prospects ahead. But I am merely making passing reference to that question in order to lead up to something closely associated with the Bill we have before us. Towards the close of last session Mr. Thomson gave the House, what was news to me, and I think to many other members, the information that the Government had embarked on an extensive irrigation scheme to serve a comparatively small area of land out from the Collie River. The hon. member quite properly complained that the Government had not taken Parliament into their confidence in that matter. But that is not all. After Parliament had adjourned I discovered there was another costly settlement in progress, that the Government were diverting the course of the Harvey River 14 miles to the sea by means

of a deep and wide channel, and that shovels and wheelbarrows were mainly used in the work of excavation. One of the objects was certainly praiseworthy, in that it was to provide work for the unemployed. But a matter of great importance is the question whether these undertakings will prove of benefit to the State, or whether, like others which have preceded them, they will become a burden on the State. If the land is good along the Harvey River and not too highly capitalised, the step is in the right direction. With the resources the Government have at their disposal, there is no excuse for adding to the cost by using shovels and wheelbarrows for the excavation of the channel. The up-to-date machinery in the possession of the Government should have been used, and when the job is finished the men should be employed on other work. Parliament, however, has no information concerning the scheme, but has simply been asked to provide funds with which to carry it out. In the case of the Collie scheme, the land is held by old settlers, who are already using it productively in the growing of fodder plants. Not one settler will be added to the present number unless the holders are able to unload without loss, which is practically impossible if the facts and figures are taken into consideration. It is said that only 11,000 acres will be served by this scheme, and that if the land is rated, it will carry an added capitalisation of £30 per acre. On top of that, the land will have to be graded by the owner, and that will run into a considerable sum. The basis of my statement is a letter which Mr. Thomson received from Mr. Alfred Clifton, who has for many years lived in the district. Mr. Thomson read this letter to the House when he made his comments last year. I have been waiting patiently during the present session for information concerning the Harvey proposition, but it has not been touched upon. The Loan Estimates give some idea of the financial side. The item as it appears on the Estimates is included in several other votes and undertakings. It reads, "Water supply in agricultural and North-West districts, including drainage and irrigation, and loans and grants to local authorities and drainage boards." That is not very enlightening, and it is a very curious mixture to include irrigation in the South-West with works in the North-West. I find that under these headings £257,000

was spent last year, and that the estimated expenditure for this year, including £75,000 recoup to Loan Suspense Account, is a total of £365,000. In reply to the debate on the second reading of the Loan Bill the Chief Secretary said that the estimated cost of the Collie scheme was £330,000. After exhaustive inquiry by experts, the Irrigation Commission said that the works would benefit the State and be re-productive in a broad sense. The reports of experts carry very little weight with me. There are lasting monuments in this State to the mistakes of experts, and the least said about them in these debates the better for those who would be inclined to use their recommendations concerning any scheme that might be proposed. If past experience goes for anything, the Estimates will be vastly exceeded. It would be interesting to know, both in connection with Harvey and Collie, what area will be benefited if these schemes prove a success, and whether the old settlers out from Collie are to be taxed for water for irrigation purposes, despite the fact that a large number of them were opposed to the proposition from its inception. They did not change their minds until an Under Secretary of one of the departments visited them and explained the matter fully. I suppose from the standpoint of the Government. If the old settlers are rated on the basis of the capitalisation—we are told the estimated cost is £330,000—and the area to be benefited is only 11,000 acres, it follows that the land will be loaded with a liability of £30 per acre. On top of that there will be the cost of grading. If the land is rated, there will be a wholesale refusal to pay the rates, and the great bulk of the money, if not all, will be written off. The taxpayers will bear the burden, as they have had to bear many similar burdens before. No increased settlement worth mentioning is likely to result from this fantastic proposition. Neither of these schemes, because of their cost and capitalisation, is suitable for the absorption of unemployed. I agree with Mr. Thomson that the time is ripe for the introduction of a Bill to establish a public works committee. On three occasions, in 1911, 1912 and 1913, I brought down a Bill with that object in view, but on each occasion it was defeated. There was to be a committee of five, two from the Assembly and two from

the Council and the chairman to be a member of Cabinet, thus giving the Government a majority on the Committee. Parliament was suspicious, and on that ground I believe the Bill was defeated.

Hon. G. W. Miles: I think it was defeated because a Labour Government brought it in.

Hon. J. M. DREW: Under that Bill, any work which was estimated to cost more than £20,000 would have been referred to that committee. In these times, and in the times to follow for some years when we shall have to look at every sixpence before we spend it, the amount could well be reduced to £15,000.

Hon. G. W. Miles: I agree with your statement.

Hon. J. M. DREW: If a conscientious public works committee, consisting of members of Parliament, were formed, I am certain they would do their duty intelligently and well, no matter to which party they might belong. If the present Government are in power next session I hope they will introduce a Bill in accordance with my suggestion.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: The committee would always be supporters of the Government in power.

Hon. J. M. DREW: Not necessarily. I have had experience of conferences when members have thrown aside their political views, and endeavoured to bring about a satisfactory settlement. When the responsibility is cast upon them, they prove equal to it in every respect. I can see no signs of a return to prosperity, and no good can be done by obscuring the fact. The practical failure of the recent loan shows how difficult it is to raise money in Australia. The floating debt of the Commonwealth and the States is approaching £100,000,000, made up of short term loans, bank advances and overdrafts built up since we were able to borrow overseas in 1928-29. The deficit portion must be funded sooner or later, and that must amount to a considerable sum by this time. Under the Financial Agreement a sinking fund of four per cent. must be established. That will considerably harass the States and the Commonwealth when it comes into operation, unless the Act is amended in good time.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Treasurers ought to be compelled to balance their budgets.

Hon. J. M. DREW: The price of gold has gone up and is still going up. Every advance in the value of gold diminishes the value of goods in accordance with economic law. Unless some system is successfully established for facilitating International credit to permit of a better exchange of trade between nations, there will be a big obstacle to the world's progress. We have wheat and wool for sale, and there are other countries which require those commodities that have other articles which we cannot produce, and which it would not pay us to produce; but owing to the failure of the medium of exchange, those different countries cannot be brought together on a trade basis. The whole world is in poverty while it is teeming with wealth of various kinds. The world at present is sullen and unsettled, furnishing all the essential elements for war. Surely the League of Nations realises the danger, and, if so, might it not suggest in the interests of peace an International conference of statesmen to grapple with this important problem?

Hon. G. W. Miles: That is coming within the next six months.

Hon. J. M. DREW: I hope so. The gold mining industry is coming to the rescue of the State once more. It is making great progress everywhere, especially in my Province. I give the Minister for Mines credit for doing his best to assist the industry with the limited funds at his command. There are, however, some complaints in the Murchison district concerning certain failures of administration. One is in reference to the method adopted of charging for the treatment of sands. There has been an alteration. I understand that instead of the former rate of 7s. per ton being charged, 2 dwts. and 8 grains of gold are taken. The department thus gets more than 7s., since it gets also the premium on the gold. This is considered by the prospectors to be grossly unfair.

Hon. G. W. Miles: It is unfair.

Hon. J. M. DREW: There are many protests against it in every portion of the Murchison. Representations made to the department have led to no satisfactory results. The only reply given is that they must make up on the sands what they lose in the crushing. It is urged that to test the position and remove any misunderstanding half-yearly balance sheets should be

issued by the Mines Department showing the cost to the department of crushing, and also the cost of the treatment of the sands, in addition, the gain resulting from the process adopted under the new system. Perhaps the strongest objection on the Murchison to the administration of the department is based on the holding up of large areas of country by way of reservations, thus restricting the prospector in pursuit of his avocation. The original reservations were made pending anticipated flotations, but years have passed by—three or four or more to my knowledge—and no flotations have been accomplished. Nor in many cases have any genuine attempts been made in that direction. It is of that that I complain. I am not referring to cases in which bona fide efforts, with hopes of ultimate success, have been exerted to bring capital into the country, but to those who hold the reservations and are simply sitting down and doing nothing the Government should extend no mercy. Surely it is a mistake at a time like the present, when there are so many men out of work, and so many are anxious to go prospecting, to permit these reservations to continue to exist without good cause. I am told that in one little centre on the Murchison, previously unknown except to those who prospected the country 30 or 40 years ago, there is a reservation in the name of one man extending over an area of 5,000 acres, and prospectors say that they have no idea of the boundaries of the area so reserved. The consequence is that prospectors have to keep miles away from it in order to avoid committing a breach of the law. The general opinion on the fields is that applications for concessions should go through the Warden's Court, so that there would be local knowledge of what was going on, and anyone who desired to object could do so and give reasons why the application should not be granted. In the past the custom has been—not only during the regime of the present Government but with other Governments—for the applications for reservations to be made in Perth where the department has adjudicated on the question. Perhaps that was not a very important matter when there was a slump in the mining industry, but it is certainly of considerable importance now when prospecting is regarded as an alluring occupation, and in many respects a profitable one. I should like to be supplied, during the Parliamentary recess, with a statement showing the different min-

ing reservations that have been granted in the province I represent, the area of each, and the name or names of the person or persons at whose request the reservations were made.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: What were the reservations for; prospecting?

Hon. J. M. DREW: No, holding them in anticipation of companies being formed. That was all right provided a specified time was set out in which to float a company, but that period should not be allowed to run into years. In conclusion, I wish to say that I am glad the Government have not neglected the Geraldton district. The harbour works at Geraldton have been kept going as well as was expected, in view of the financial position. The Wicherina dam which supplies Geraldton with water, has been roofed with the object of preventing evaporation to the extent of something like 4,000,000 gallons of water per annum. That evaporation to a large extent will no longer occur, as the result of the sheds which have been put over the area. Part-time work has also been provided for many men in the district. I trust that any criticism I have offered during the course of these remarks, or on previous occasions, will not be regarded as having been conceived in a carping spirit, but from the standpoint of what I consider to be the best interests of the State.

HON. G. W. MILES (North) [5.7]: I desire to say a few words, first of all, with regard to the financial emergency legislation which was passed last year. I claim that the Government have not carried out the intention of the legislation, nor have the financial institutions done so. When the 22½ per cent. reduction was brought about, it was understood that that would be passed on to the grower so as to bring down the cost of production, and it was claimed further that it would mean increased employment. As far as the financial institutions are concerned the banks have reduced their interest, and I agree with other members who have said that it is due to the way in which the banks have been run in the past that Australia has been saved from total collapse. But while continual borrowing goes on, I do not see how we can get out of our difficulties, nor will the Governments be able to balance their budgets. With regard to the brokering firms, wool buyers have been visiting the Great Southern districts

and have been buying some of the clips there for 10d. a lb. Other farmers in those districts have been sending their wool to Perth for disposal and have realised under 9d. per lb., while it has cost them an extra 1d. for railage and charges. There is something wrong with the whole business that permits that sort of thing to take place. Brokers offer an insult to the growers when they announce that to show their sympathy towards the growers they propose to reduce the handling charges by five per cent. on one farthing per lb. That five per cent. amounts to about 30s. per 100 bales of wool. Under the emergency legislation it was the duty of the brokers to reduce their charges to the growers, but I am told that some of the financial institutions have opened what they call No. 2 accounts. This needs inquiring into and if it is true we should see to it that the emergency legislation is enforced.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: What is the idea of the No. 2 account?

Hon. G. W. MILES: So that clients will pay an extra rate of interest. Disbursements connected with the carrying on of the farm or station are debited to the No. 2 account. I am told on good authority that that has actually happened.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: What rate of interest is paid on the No. 2 account?

Hon. G. W. MILES: I am not in a position to say, though I believe it is six per cent. The clip is credited to the No. 1 account, which is charged the lower rate of interest. Eventually that is wiped out and the expenditure connected with running the station or farm is debited to the No. 2 account. That is how it has been put to me.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: It is a wonder that the people deal with those institutions.

Hon. G. W. MILES: The people are forced to deal with them. Any institution that is carrying on that class of business should be compelled to observe the conditions of the emergency legislation. Another matter to which I desire to refer deals with the transport of cattle. I have here a statement made by the Leader of the House with reference to a proposal for the development of Northern Australia—the other side of the Continent. This is part of a scheme I, with others, had the honour to

put up some 10 or 12 years ago. The Leader of the House is a responsible Minister and when he makes a statement publicly it is assumed that that statement is correct, and that he knows what he is talking about. This is the statement to which I take exception. He said recently, referring to cattle transport—

Such transportation is too costly, both for the cattle industry and the taxpayers. I am of opinion that the laying down of extensive railway lines for the development of the cattle industry is not warranted. Cattle taken over long sections of railway cannot be marketed in a satisfactory condition. More especially does this apply to cattle consigned to treatment works, because they lose condition and also get bruised in transit. The handling of cattle over large areas is best achieved by having holding grounds close to treatment works, or to a port, if shipment is desired. Cattle after transit could remain in those holding grounds for a season, and would then have a chance of being treated and marketed in first-class condition.

The latter part applies to where there are no means of transport, but what I wish to deal with is that part relating to rail transport. Some years ago I had the pleasure of meeting Sir Sidney Kidman, who is recognised as the greatest authority on cattle in Australia. He knows more about cattle than does any other man in the Commonwealth, and he said to me that we were right ahead of any other part of the world in respect of the handling of sheep, but we did not know the ABC of the cattle business. In America, he pointed out, they transported their stock 1,000 miles by rail, took them out of the trucks every day to give them a drink and a feed of oil-cake and lucerne. In Australia we knocked the condition off our cattle by droving them to market and this, I wish to point out, is a flat contradiction of the view expressed by the Leader of the House. The Minister, I have no doubt, was referring to the cattle that were railed from Meekatharra to Midland. On that line I know that some of the drivers of the train are allowed to have too much refreshment during the journey, and when stopping or starting the trains suddenly, the cattle are knocked about. If we were able properly to deal with men of that type, the railways could be run more satisfactorily and stock could be moved with perhaps as little injury as is done to them in America. I wish to congratulate Mr. Holmes and Mr. Seddon on their speeches on the Bill, and to endorse

what they said. During the last three years the public debt of the State has increased by £8,000,000, representing an increase of £18 16s. per head of population. The Loan Bill passed last week authorised the raising of another £2,000,000, which represents an additional burden of £5 per head of population. The expenditure in this State works out at £16 per minute day and night. The country cannot afford that, and sooner or later we shall have to call a halt. This eternal borrowing—one member described it as borrow, bellow, boom and bust—is the policy that has been adopted by all Governments in Australia during the last ten or 12 years. They have borrowed at any time, in any place, and at any price. The other night I asked the House to enter a protest against the continual borrowing. It is as much the fault of members of this House as of members of another place or of the Government that this pernicious system of borrowing has been allowed to continue. The Council should have passed a resolution to delete a small amount as an indication to the public that we are opposed to continual borrowing. When in Committee I am going to test the feeling by asking members to reduce an item. I am told we are not permitted to do that, and that my action will create a crisis. If that is so, the sooner the crisis is created, the better. The sooner the public realise the position, the better. We cannot go on borrowing as we have been doing. I reiterate what I have stated previously, that I hope the Loan Council will not find any further money, and that Governments will be forced to balance their budgets. If the Loan Council had not imposed the present embargo, there would have been no attempt to keep the deficit at under a million during the current financial year. When the announcement was made that the Government were budgeting for a deficit of £760,000, I said I did not think the Government would live up to it, and I do not think they will do so. In 1930 Sir Otto Niemeyer told us that if we made a cut of 20 per cent. then we could get around the corner in reasonable time, but that if we postponed it for a year, a cut of 30 per cent. would be necessary, while a delay of yet another year would necessitate a cut of 40 per cent. The Governments of Australia did not play the game: they would not face the situation in 1930. They drifted on until 1931 when

emergency legislation was introduced, and that provided for cuts of only 18 to 22½ per cent. The reductions then made should have equalled at least 33 1/3rd per cent. Before we get out of our troubles, we shall have to make reductions on a graduated scale ranging from 10 to 50 per cent. The question of the duplication of services by Commonwealth and States has not been tackled. The Commonwealth and State Governments have been spending up to £450 per minute day and night. Anyone who reads the Commonwealth Auditor-General's report will find references to overlapping and to the cost of social services. Social services are costing £45,000,000 a year, which is equal to £6 10s. for every man, woman and child. That money is being expended on old age and invalid pensions, war pensions, maternity bonuses, police, health, and education. Economies must be effected in all those departments. I agree with Sir Edward Wittenoom that the Government's contributions to the University should be cut out at once. Bursaries should be provided for smart children, but the parents of other students should pay for their education. I am told that people are coming to this State in order to get free education for their children, and the rest of the taxpayers have to find the money for it. Our taxpayers have to foot the bill for educating their own children, and now have to find money to educate the children of other people who are coming here for the sake of the free University education.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: You do not believe that, surely!

Hon. G. W. MILES: I do. Social services cannot be continued on the present basis. They should not be entirely eliminated, but they will have to be modified.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: Where would you start?

Hon. G. W. MILES: I have already stated many times where I would start. It was the duty of the Government to cut Ministers' salaries by 33 1/3rd per cent. Members of Parliament should have given the public a lead, instead of agreeing to a paltry 10 per cent. reduction at first and then, when forced, agreeing to another 10 per cent. reduction. Members were quite ready to increase their own salaries by 50 per cent. a few years ago. If they had given the public a lead, not one-half of the existing dissatis-

laction would have prevailed. I regret that we did not have a Government game enough to make the necessary cuts. Had they been made, the present position would not have been so bad. The financial emergency tax passed recently should have been introduced in 1930. The rate should have been 6d. in the pound and if the necessary economies had been effected in that year, we would not have been confronted with the present deficit. The only way to restore confidence is for the Government to balance the budget. Until the budget is balanced and interest and sinking fund commitments are met, I am going to vote against any further borrowing. In reply to a statement made by Mr. T. Moore, who referred to bringing down interest rates, I say that they will come down if confidence is restored by Governments balancing their budgets. Interest rates have been reduced to some extent. Over £6,000,000 has been saved in interest by the conversion following on the adoption of the Premiers' Plan. I am not opposed to the Premiers' Plan. All I am complaining of is that Governments did not go further to balance their budgets and create confidence.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: You are not consistent. You have already exploded that hogey.

Hon. G. W. MILES: What hogey?

Hon. W. H. Kitson: About interest rates coming down.

Hon. G. W. MILES: Let me read what the Commonwealth Auditor General has said—

The accounts of the year 1931-32 reflect the savings in interest effected by the great loan conversion, as well as the reductions brought about by the Financial Emergency legislation, designed to reduce expenditure both in the Commonwealth and the States, by about 20 per cent. The savings in interest amounted, in round figures, to £6,500,000. The full saving of 20 per cent. in reducible expenditure under the Premiers' Plan has, owing to a variety of causes, not been fully realised in all States, but taken together, the great and very serious revenue deficiencies of the previous year have very largely disappeared from the transactions of 1931-32. . . . The heavy and uneconomic cost of sustenance to the unemployed is the most serious problem. As taxation has already become unduly heavy, almost the only solution is to make deeper cuts in expenditure, and in this connection the possibilities of savings in the cost of social services are dealt with at the end of this paragraph.

I intend to quote those references presently. State trading concerns are cost-

ing money, and should have been wiped out long ago. Continuing, the Commonwealth Auditor General said—

I have previously referred to possible overlapping in the Commonwealth and States in certain activities, and I am aware that investigations have already been made with the object of curtailing expenditure in that direction.

What has been done effectively to curtail overlapping? We have overlapping in the Electoral Department, Public Works Department, Health Department, Forests Department, and so on. Those questions should have been faced a year or two ago, and not allowed to drag on. They will have to be faced before long.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: Do not you think we should pass those departments over to the Commonwealth?

Hon. G. W. MILES: I do not know, but if something is not done soon, we shall have to have either separation or unification.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Are you a unificationist?

Hon. G. W. MILES: No. I am arguing that Governments have not done their duty, and will force unification upon us.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: Do not blame us for what the Federal Government do.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I am blaming the hon. member for what the Labour Government did, but I am including all Governments. The Commonwealth Auditor General also stated—

The amount being paid out in Australia at the present time for social services is an enormous sum. Figures recently quoted in the Senate show that the cost has risen from £8,769,338 in 1911 to £45,087,916 in 1931. It is not easy to decide in all cases the items of expenditure which come under the head of social services. . . . The amount received by Australian Governments from taxation is about £82,000,000 a year, of which about £63,000,000 is absorbed in interest, sinking fund and exchange, leaving only £19,000,000 towards the cost of social services of, say, £45,000,000. That deficiency of £26,000,000, as well as the ordinary expenses of Government, has to be provided out of the earnings over the working expenses of business undertakings, say £18,000,000, assisted by miscellaneous revenue amounting to about £22,000,000 received from other sources.

That shows how serious the position has become.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: Your last statement is the secret of the whole trouble—taxation £82,000,000.



Hon. G. W. MILES: How are we going to reduce it if we continue to employ numbers of civil servants whose services we could do without?

Hon. W. H. Kitson: How is it disbursed?

Hon. G. W. MILES: Partly by paying members of Parliament more than they are entitled to receive during this crisis.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: More than they are worth?

Hon. G. W. MILES: Probably more than the majority of them are worth. I wish to enter an emphatic protest against the manner in which all Government accounts have been kept for a number of years. The method of Government bookkeeping hoodwinks the taxpayers of the country.

Hon. E. H. Harris: It is on its own.

Hon. G. W. MILES: The Government put up certain figures to hoodwink the taxpayers. I want to see the whole system altered.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: That is a strong statement.

Hon. G. W. MILES: It is not too strong. Let me say that I have done the State Auditor General the honour of reading his report from cover to cover. In case other members have not read the report I wish to quote some extracts—

In compliance with Section 53 of the Audit Act, 1904, the Auditor General submits to Parliament his report upon the public accounts for the year ended 30th June, 1932.

The report is issued for the benefit of members of Parliament so that they may see how the accounts of the State are kept. I appeal to members' consciences to take more interest in the financial affairs of the State than they have in the past. The report continues—

The Treasury was advised of any inaccuracies discovered during the course of checking to permit of desired alterations being made before the returns were finally printed.

I am quoting this not against the Mitchell Government, the Collier Government, or any particular Government; it is against all Governments. The system has been in operation for years. I wish to show how the public were hoodwinked when the Government revealed a deficit of 1½ millions last year. There is the following paragraph—

Under the Audit Act the Auditor General is obliged to publish particulars of expenditure which might by law have been charged against the Revenue Fund during the year, but was not so charged. The only practicable method of obtaining this information is through returns from departments. These were ob-

tained, and a summary of the result appears in Appendix 3 of this report, the total amount being £161,582 0s. 3d.

The meaning of that paragraph is that items representing a total of £161,582 would have been taken into account in the deficit had proper books of account been kept by the Government departments. I repeat what I have said before: If private individuals ran their businesses in the way Government departments keep their accounts, there would not be sufficient gaols in Australia to hold them. If members turn to Appendix 3, they will find particulars of expenditure claims against the Consolidated Revenue Fund as at the 30th June, 1932, which might by law have been charged but were not so charged. These amounts represent items that are not taken into account at the end of a financial year, and are held over so that the position may appear so much better. The items in the appendix include some like the following:—

	£	s.	d.
Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Dept. . .	1,458	11	1
Goldfields Water Supply . .	6,006	5	9
Railways—Salaries and Wages	67,813	10	7
Railways—Creditors' Accounts	16,411	13	5
Electricity Supply—Creditors' Accounts . . . . .	9,381	9	10
Unemployment Relief . . . .	31,597	12	8

There are many other items and the total, as I have pointed out before, represents £161,582. Will this House tolerate that sort of thing any longer? Are we to be treated like school children by Governments that adopt this procedure year after year? Should we not enter an emphatic protest and tell the Government that the State's accounts must be kept on proper lines? Are we to continue this practice for generation after generation? The sooner we adopt a strong attitude on this question and tell the Government that it must stop, the better it will be. For my part, I say it has to stop. Here is another paragraph from the Auditor-General's report—

The "Loan Suspense" expenditure for the year 1931-32 applied to one heading only, namely, "Water Supply in Agricultural Areas, £75,751 14s. 3d." The method of treating such expenditure as a loan fund drawing pending Parliamentary authorisation is incorrect, as, under the Appropriation Act, it should remain as an outstanding under the Public Account under the "Advance to Treasurer" until Parliament deals with the matter. This matter has been commented upon in previous reports.

Still it goes on. Comments are made by the Auditor General year after year, but Parliament takes no notice of the position. It does not matter if we bring about a crisis. Now is the time, when a Nationalist Government is in power, for us to take strong action.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Is it not the duty of the Legislative Assembly to do that?

Hon. G. W. MILES: Yes, but the fact that the Legislative Assembly fail to do their duty is no reason why we should neglect to carry out ours. Sooner or later a Labour Government will be in power. I am sorry to say that, in my opinion, in this House greater opposition is shown to a Labour Government than to a National Government. Should a Labour Government take office, and we take a definite stand on this question, we will be accused of acting along party lines. This is not a party House, and, therefore, I claim that this is the time that we should take action against the present Government. Before the Bill is passed, we shall see whether the House will assist me by entering an emphatic protest. The next paragraph I will quote deals with the Sale of Government Property Trust Account. This is what the Auditor General has to say—

Under the provisions of the Financial Agreement Act, 1928, the Government Property Sales Fund ceased as regards further credits. The amount to the credit of the fund is being absorbed by Votes on the Estimates, and new items created by the Governor. A sum of £81,925 17s. 2d. was expended during the year (for details, see Treasury Return No. 30), and the balance available for further appropriation was £60,874 7s. 4d.

The method of dealing with the Sale of Government Property Trust Account should be altered. Parliament agrees to a loan being floated and certain work is carried out in consequence. Should the Government sell any of the assets secured by the expenditure of that loan, the money so obtained is paid into the Sale of Government Property Trust Account and from time to time the Government ask Parliament to appropriate amounts from the account to Consolidated Revenue. That money should be utilised towards the redemption of the liability.

Hon. J. M. Drew: The procedure adopted is strictly in accordance with the Financial Agreement.

Hon. G. W. MILES: Yes, and would be all right if the Government were balancing their Budget and providing the necessary sinking fund. The Financial Agreement set out distinctly that in the event of a Government experiencing a deficit, a 4 per cent. sinking fund had to be set aside to meet it. If the provisions of the Financial Agreement were really being carried out, and the 4 per cent. fund were being created to meet deficits, we would be in a worse position than the figures show to-day. The only points of real advantage, in my opinion, that are embodied in the Financial Agreement refer to the provision of the sinking fund and the prevention of Government borrowing. The object was to force Treasurers to balance their Budgets. If we are to balance the Budget, and pay the necessary interest and sinking fund charges, the position will be satisfactory. But here we have been going for the last three years with deficit after deficit.

Hon. H. Seddon: For 15 years.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: The last 30 years.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I do not know exactly how long it is.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Since the Seaddan Government were in power.

Hon. G. W. MILES: The fact remains that the system must be altered. Unless Governments balance their Budgets, the system will continue and we shall be worse off than ever. Money is borrowed for the purpose of constructing railways that will benefit in helping to develop areas. The land is sold on conditional purchase terms, and the money from that source is paid into Consolidated Revenue. That is wrong, and I regret that the House did not agree to Mr. Thomson's motion to have an inquiry into such matters. If we had adopted that course, the committee of inquiry could have placed proposals before the Government. The money derived from that source should go towards the liquidation of our liabilities. If that had been done in the past, the capitalisation of the railways would not stand at such a high figure to-day, and the railways would now be able to carry produce at more reasonable rates. Instead of that, the present system has operated, and what the position of future generations will be when no land will be available for sale, I fail to appreciate.

Recently we celebrated the centenary of the Legislative Council, and we can pay a tribute of respect to the way in which the men of those days handled the affairs of the country. What will the next generation say about this Parliament for selling their birthright? The course we are pursuing will absolutely ruin them. We are not giving the boys and girls a chance, and sooner or later—well, I would not like to say what I think will happen. You, Mr. President, might say that my language was unparliamentary. Reverting to the Auditor General's report, I find the following under the heading of "Advance to Treasurer"—

Omitting interest charges for the year 1931-32 on the advances to the old company and the liquidator—

Hon. W. H. Kitson: What company does that refer to?

Hon. G. W. MILES: It refers to the Calyx Porcelain Co. Ltd.—

—the amount to be recovered by the State at the 30th June, 1932, was—

	£	s.	d.
Advances to the company prior to liquidation (including interest calculated to 30th June, 1931) .. .. .	19,808	2	10
Advances to the liquidator (including interest calculated to 30th June, 1931) .. .. .	14,059	15	8
Advances under the heading "Advance to Treasurer" not recouped .. .. .	647	11	10
Advances to the option holder (Mr. F. N. Vincent) subsequent to 12th November, 1931 .. .. .	900	0	0
Interest on bank overdraft calculated to 31st March, 1932, paid by the State .. .. .	124	5	0
Total .. .. .	£35,539	15	4

The State was also liable for the bank overdraft (set down by the liquidator at £3,925) guaranteed by the Treasurer.

This kind of thing must be cut out. The State cannot continue making advances of this description and losing thousands of pounds a year. The Auditor-General continues—

According to the opinion of the Assistant Crown Solicitor (see No. 301, Appendix 5), the liquidator and receiver, also the option holder, are not "public accountants" under the Audit Act, and therefore there is no authority for the Auditor General to audit the accounts. The Treasury is evidently taking action as regards the option holder, and it has

been suggested that the accounts of the Receiver should also be audited.

This sort of thing has been going on for a number of years, and it is impossible for the country to continue such a system.

Hon. H. Seddon: What about the Mangane Co.?

Hon. W. H. Kitson: Does the Auditor-General say anything about the Carnarvon Meat Company?

Hon. G. W. MILES: The position regarding that company may be just as bad. I have not noticed anything about that, or I would quote it too. I am not speaking as a parish-pump politician; I am trying to speak in a statesmanlike way. Whether the hon. member can follow me or not, I cannot say. Here is another paragraph which has reference to the transfer of the State Savings Bank—

No specific reference appeared in the Transfer Agreement or the ratifying Act to the Depositors' Unclaimed Fund shown in the books of the bank with a credit balance, at the date of the transfer, of approximately £28,000. Under the State Savings Bank Act, 1906, any individual balances remaining in this fund for a period of 10 years were payable to the State Revenue Fund. The Crown Solicitor was approached in regard to the matter, and he expressed the opinion (see No. 298, Appendix 5) that the "moneys having been transferred to the Commonwealth Bank will remain the property of such bank and the State cannot claim the same."

There is another £28,000, which through an oversight and arising out of rush legislation, was handed over to the Commonwealth Government. How can we expect Budgets to balance when that sort of thing goes on? Here is another item with reference to the inspection of the Lands Department accounts—

The proceeds of sales of cream at the depot have been credited to the Revenue Fund. So long as the operating expenses are charged against the Loan Fund, that fund should be credited with proceeds of this nature.

That kind of thing is pointed out by the Auditor-General right through his report. The existing method of keeping accounts is wrong. Money is spent from Loan funds, and then proceeds are devoted to bolstering up Consolidated Revenue.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: To what does your last quotation refer?

Hon. G. W. MILES: The Sabina Vale Stock Depot. I am sorry I have to mention that, because it has reference to the

South-West, and I may be accused of speaking against that part of the State. I am merely quoting these extracts to make my point regarding the method of Government finance. There is a paragraph dealing with group settlement, and on that subject I find the Auditor General has this to say—

The losses and unrecoverable expenditure were—

	£	s.	d.
Ascertained losses on holdings transferred to the Agricultural Bank and land available for selection ..	4,925,590	4	11
Livestock, plant, buildings, land purchased, debtors and unrecoverable sundry expenses .. .. .	104,104	16	6
Administration costs not recoverable .. .. .	359,124	17	8
	£5,288,819	19	1
Less—			
Deductions from the losses and unrecoverable expenditure for interest charges spread over holdings, etc., in excess of the interest payments from the Loan Fund .. .. .	607,340	1	4
Net Losses ..	£4,681,479	17	9

I do not know what has been done in regard to that. I think we are still to a certain extent advancing money to people who should not be on the land. The whole thing wants cleaning up. If we could, as suggested by Mr. Thomson and Mr. Drew, appoint a public works committee to investigate all expenditure before Parliament is called upon to pass it, we would be in a far better position. Mr. Drew put up a case in 1911 and also in 1912 and 1913 for such a committee, but I suppose the proposal was turned down because it was brought forward by a Labour Government. Then Mr. Thomson suggested the appointment of a committee and it was turned down because he happened to represent the Great Southern, or Katanning.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Why Katanning?

Hon. G. W. MILES: Why anywhere? No matter what is said, no notice is taken. I know it is only waste of time for me to stand up here, but I am doing what I consider to be my duty, and I am pointing out to members what I consider to be their duty. Whether they are prepared to go on in the future as they have done in the past is their outlook. I will record my vote, even if I

have only one or two to support me. The report continued—

Interest met from capital: Under the Bank Act, administration expenses are payable out of income, but repayments of principal by mortgagors may be used to meet sinking fund and interest if the balance of the income is insufficient for these purposes. After providing for administration expenses and sinking fund the income and principal repayments for the year 1931-32 were insufficient to meet the full amount of interest payable, and capital moneys supplied to the bank were used to make up the shortage.

Bless my soul! Are we going to allow this to continue? It has been going on for years. Is it not time we had a clean up and brought about a crisis? The report continued—

Properties repossessed: Returns prepared departmentally show:—576 properties with debts totalling £688,219 8s. 10d. came into the Bank's possession during the year. 342 properties were sold, or partly sold, during the year for £329,315 10s., the losses written off on sale totalling £48,858 2s. 5d. 869 properties were on the hands of the Bank at the 30th June, 1932, with debts totalling £1,052,846 14s. 2d.

How long is this to continue? Yet the Government bring in a measure to increase the capital of the Agricultural Bank! It must go through, because the Government have brought it in, and the House will not have another Government.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: Why not change the Government?

Hon. G. W. MILES: The previous Government were worse. I am not picking out one Government more than another. The previous Government spent £4,000,000 a year. I want the House to enter a protest before another Government gets into power, so that we shall not be accused of being a party House. There is another statement in reference to the indebtedness of settlers which I need not quote. The report continued—

The capital upon which interest was charged against the board by the Treasury was reduced by—

	£	s.	d.
Sinking fund accumulations from 30th June, 1927, to 30th June, 1931 .. .. .	25,794	4	2
Accumulated loss as shown by the board's account at 31st March, 1931 .. .. .	748,472	0	0

No further sinking fund has been paid by the Board subsequent to 30th June, 1931.

Section 25 (2) of the Industries Assistance Act, 1915, reads:—"All moneys received in repayment of advances shall be placed to the

credit of a Suspense Account to be kept at the Treasury, and the moneys for the time being to the credit of such account may be applied in payment of interest and contributions to the Sinking Fund in respect of Loan Funds appropriated to the purposes of this Act, and the expenses of administering this Act, and the surplus for the time being to the credit of such account may be applied by the Colonial Treasurer in making further advances under this Act." As the collections credited to the Trust Account were less than the amount paid to the Treasury for interest, it follows that the foregoing provision has not been observed, and moneys transferred to the Board from the Loan Fund have been partially used towards paying interest and administration expenses.

Do members realise what all this means? The whole business of the country is being covered up. If there were a true stocktaking of the State we would find we are millions more behind than we appear to be to-day. The farmers are worse off than the farmers in Russia. The Government have socialised farming; they will socialise everything if we let things go on in this way. The Government are just as much in favour of the socialisation of industry as the previous Government were. With regard to the Auditor General's remarks upon the Department of Agriculture, Vermin Trust Account, a credit balance is shown. I marked that, because I want the Government to do something to help to destroy the vermin in the country. That credit balance was provided by the pastoralists and the farmers. The vermin rate was lowered, with the result that there has been an increase of dingoes, foxes, and rabbits throughout the country. The rate should be increased and the Government should provide money to keep Crown lands free from vermin, instead of expecting people on alienated Crown lands to do the work for them. I now come to an interesting item. It is only small, but members have all heard of the wonderful nugget recently found on the goldfields. This is the statement in regard to it—

The following statement shows the effect on the Loan Fund and the Revenue Fund in regard to the purchase, exhibition, and sale of the nugget:—Loan Fund, debited with purchase price, £5,438 4s. 2d.; Revenue Fund, credited with sale proceeds, £6,647 13s. 1d. (including Gold Bounty, £127 2s. 11d.), and debited with £586 7s. 2d., loss on exhibitions, and £36 11s. 4d., transport expenses of the nugget from the Fields to Perth. The net amount credited to the Fund was £6,024 14s. 7d. The reason for crediting the Revenue Fund with the sale proceeds of the nugget, when the pur-

chase money had been charged to the Loan Fund, was stated to be to comply with Section 4 (3) of the Financial Agreement Act, 1928, which reads:—" . . . . All proceeds of sale of Government property . . . . shall be paid to a special account of the Consolidated Revenue." It is reasonable to doubt that such a course was anticipated in a case of this nature. If, at the time the purchase money was charged to the Loan Fund, it was the intention to sell the nugget the Fund could have been debited.

There is another case in point. These things are happening all the time. Is it right to allow them to continue?

Hon. J. M. Drew: No.

Hon. G. W. MILES: Of course not. I hope the conscience of members will prick them and that they will look into these matters themselves and not go on as they have done in the past. Governments say that it is the duty of this House to agree to certain measures because they are money bills. I think the members of this House have not done their duty to the country. Even the minor protests that we made against the Loan Bill the other night were not mentioned in the Press. We said we objected to the Government borrowing further money. My desire is to see publicity given to this question and if the Press will not publish our remarks I will take means to have them published myself. I will divide the House and let the public know what the opinions of members of Parliament are, and so ascertain whether they will allow this state of affairs to continue.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Intimidation!

Hon. G. W. MILES: You can take it which way you like. With regard to the Metropolitan Traffic Trust Account, the Auditor General says—

In regard to payments from the Traffic Trust Account for interest and sinking fund on half the amount appropriated by Parliament for certain roads, Section 13 (3) of the Traffic Act fixes a maximum of nine per cent. The maximum has been applied, of which three per cent. represents sinking fund. No sinking fund is in existence, as contributions are used by the National Debt Sinking Fund Commission to repurchase and cancel stocks. The sinking fund contributions by the State (5s. per cent.) and the Commonwealth (2s. 6d. or 5s. per cent.) would not equal the amount transferred from the Traffic Trust to the Revenue Fund. The latter should not receive more than it provides.

I now come to a matter which affects metropolitan members. I may be accused of

taking an interest in metropolitan matters, as I have heard other members accused of taking an interest in the goldfields. I am not a goldfields member, but a member for Western Australia, and I shall refer to the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Department. This is the position, and this is where the Government, as I stated at the beginning of my speech, have not carried out the intention of the Financial Emergency legislation. There is a credit balance in connection with this item that should have been passed on to the ratepayers of the metropolitan area in order to reduce their sewerage and water rates. But the Government come along, as they come along in connection with lighting and gas. I think gas is a Government business.

Hon. J. M. Drew: No; electric light is.

Hon. G. W. MILES: The Auditor General said—

The position at 30th June, 1932, according to the books, in regard to the revenue accounts of the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Department, was as under:—

Water Supply Section:	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Excess of income over expenditure for the year, excluding interest and sinking fund, etc. ...				211,596	17	11
Interest for the year ...	153,605	4	8			
Sinking fund for the year ...	22,859	14	7	178,464	18	3
Profit for the year ...				£33,131	19	8

Water supply is a monopoly and the people of the metropolitan area should have been relieved of payment of rates to the extent of that profit. There should not be any book profit shown. Instead, that amount will be taken into Consolidated Revenue and the ratepayers will have to foot the bill. They do not know they are doing it. The same remark applies to the people who use the Fremantle Harbour Trust. Of the revenue of the Trust, £80,000 or £90,000 per annum goes into general revenue; it was £120,000 recently. The Harbour Trust is a taxing machine. Under the Loan Bill which the House passed last week, it is proposed to borrow money for the extension of the Fremantle harbour. Then, in regard to the Forests Department, year after year we stated that excess revenue was to be paid into a Trust Account for reforestation, because if that were not done the Government would take the amount into revenue. We fought Governments time after time and when Labour members were returned a few years ago we

could not get the necessary majority, with the result that the Government appropriated that money for other purposes. They did exactly what members said they would do. The House, by a majority of 16 to four, gave the Government £100,000 for reforestation.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: Why not spend it on the North-West?

Hon. G. W. MILES: No. Run the country on decent lines. The Auditor General's report, in connection with the Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Department, continues:—

Sewerage Section:	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Excess of income over expenditure for the year, excluding interest and sinking fund ...				65,323	5	11
Interest for the year ...	52,117	1	10			
Sinking fund for the year ...	2,614	7	10	54,731	9	8
Profit for the year ...				£10,591	16	3

The accumulated profit under the three divisions (water supply, sewerage, and drainage) at 30th June, 1932, was £286,857 18s. 7d. A contributing factor to this total was the application of the provisions of the Financial Agreement Act, 1928, resulting in—(a) A decrease in the rates of sinking fund. (b) A reduction in the capital (based upon the accumulated sinking fund at 30-6-27) upon which interest was charged.

This is covering up the tracks. The Auditor General has pointed out that that should not go into revenue.

Hon. G. W. MILES: People in the metropolitan area have had their wages reduced, but there has been no marked reduction in sewerage rates or water rates. Here is another item, State Trading Concerns. The Auditor General says—

The following particulars abstracted from the departmental statements, show the profit or loss for each of the State trading concerns for the year 1931-32:—

	Profit.	Loss.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Sawmills ...	...	619,801 11 5
Shipping Service ...	...	50,829 9 8
Implement and Engineering Works ...	...	25,306 3 3
Wyndham Meat Works ...	...	667,616 1 7
Brickworks ...	...	3,659 17 6
Boya Quarry ...	...	2,980 18 9
Hotels ...	3,450 0 10	
Ferries ...	194 8 10	
	26,064 9 8	£169,663 2 2

(a) Debit balance on profit and loss account after utilisation of £478 12s. 5d. of unappropriated profits, and £24,540 17s. 6d. transferred from reserves.

(b) For the year ended 31st December, 1931.

The hotels do not show half the profit that they should. The Government would do better to lease them to business men. And if the Government were to get out of the other

trading concerns, it would save the country a great deal of money. It is of no use Ministers saying they cannot sacrifice these trading concerns, for business people have to make sacrifices, and so will the Government. Are we to allow this kind of thing to go on? Men get into Parliament and cast their votes quite against what they know to be business principles.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: Would you dispose of the State steamers?

Hon. G. W. MILES: Yes, on certain conditions. We should have a subsidised line of steamers and we should fix the fares and freights, as we did before. We would then get a much better service than we have today. Then we get this interesting table from the Auditor General's report—

Interest which had not been earned was transferred to the revenue fund from the banking accounts of five of the State trading concerns, as follows:—

	£	s.	d.
Implement and Engineering Works .. ..	13,772	6	8
Shipping Service .. ..	36,888	16	5
Brickworks .. ..	2,761	10	10
Quarries .. ..	2,116	2	4
Sawmills .. ..	19,801	11	5
Total .. ..	£75,340	7	8

Now I think I have quoted sufficiently from that report to appeal to members to study it for themselves and assist me to enter a protest against the way in which the accounts of the country have been kept for a number of years past. Mr. Drew referred to the Collie irrigation and drainage scheme, and I want to enter my protest against that work having been proceeded with. The Government could have employed far more men if they had continued to carry out the scheme previously in hand, namely, the paying of 10s. per week to farmers for employing men. It provided the men with employment and with decent homes, and it created work for the railways and the wharf lumpers by producing an exportable commodity. But that was cut out in November of last year. Why, I cannot understand. It has been said it was because one or two farmers abused the scheme and paid off some of their men previously employed. For that they should have been prosecuted. Mr. Seddon and Mr. Drew referred to the loan recently floated, showing that the public of Australia have not yet the confidence they would have if budgets were balanced. The

other day the Premier made a statement regarding the banks. It has been said the banks have not played the game. Actually, the position is that the banks in this State have loaned out three or four millions in excess of the deposits they have received. Moreover, it is well known that the banks saved Australia from total collapse. The affairs of the world are now rapidly coming to a head. There will be an International Conference within the next six months, when, I feel confident, debts will be adjusted and tariffs reduced in order to promote a recovery of international trade. The only way that recovery can be brought about is by the price of gold falling and commodity prices rising. But here in Australia we have not yet brought down the cost of production as far as it should have been brought. Unless the recovery takes place pretty quickly, there will have to be further economies made before we are round the corner. During the decade 1920-1930 Australians were spending £40,000,000 per annum more than they earned. Although not to the same extent, they are still going on in the same way. There were published some time ago, when Australia was borrowing from America, some lines which give the position exactly. Let me quote them—

Ye bankers of Old England who sit at home at ease,

List to the cry for help that comes from far-off southern seas:

“Advance Australia money so that we don't have to sow,

But merely reap the benefit of the money that we owe.

And we'll pay you what you lend us with the money that we owe.”

Australia has a motto, 'tis known throughout the world—

“Advance Australia money” on our banner is unfurled.

What is a thousand millions on which to come and go?

Just put another “1” in front, and add another “0,”

And we'll pay you what you lend us with the money that we owe.

Australia needs no bulwarks, no towers along the steep,

What Australians need is money so we can eat and sleep,

And journey out to Randwick and see the Easter Show

And buy a Yankee motor car, to Yankee pictures go.

And we'll pay you what you lend us with the money that we owe.

Advance Australia money; if you decline with thanks,  
 Don't think that it will make us save, we've  
 always got the Yanks.  
 Advance Australia money, advance Australia  
 fair,  
 You can't advance too much, my lads, Aus-  
 tralia will be there.  
 And don't be scared, my bonny boys, of  
 course you always know  
 We can pay you what you lend us with the  
 money that we owe.

On motion by Hon. E. H. H. Hall, debate  
 adjourned.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 8.55 p.m.*

## BILL—ROAD DISTRICTS ACT AMENDMENT.

### *Conference Manager's Report.*

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I desire to  
 report that the Managers of this House  
 met the Managers of another place and  
 agreed as follows:—

Amendment No. 11. Clause 39.—That the  
 words "and from time to time" previously  
 struck out, be re-inserted; and that the words  
 "deemed to be," previously struck out, be re-  
 inserted.

Amendment No. 14. Clause 63, page 27,  
 paragraph (b).—Re-insert and amend the  
 clause by inserting after the word "Act," in  
 line 5, the words "provided that no board shall  
 appoint or dismiss an auditor without first ob-  
 taining the consent of the Minister."

Amendment No. 15. Clause 64—Previously  
 deleted, that this be re-inserted.

I move—

That the report be adopted.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I understand that  
 when the Bill was originally in Committee,  
 Clause 39 was struck out. Subsequently a  
 new clause was inserted at the instigation  
 of the Chief Secretary, and the words  
 "from time to time" and "or by the Min-  
 ister are deemed to be," were not con-  
 tained in that new clause. The new clause  
 went to another place which disagreed  
 with it, and asked for the reinstatement  
 of the original clause. It appears that the  
 conference did not consider the original  
 clause, but the new clause submitted by  
 the Chief Secretary, and agreed to reinsert  
 in the alternative clause the words that  
 had been struck out of the original clause.

The PRESIDENT: It would be better if  
 the matter were discussed in Committee.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move—

That the President leave the Chair, and the  
 House resolve into Committee.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I do not know for  
 what purpose the Chief Secretary desires  
 to go into Committee. The amendments  
 must be made, so it is immaterial whether  
 they are made in the full Council or in  
 Committee.

The PRESIDENT: It will facilitate ex-  
 planations if we go into Committee.

Hon. J. M. DREW: In the whole of my  
 experience, I have never known such a  
 course to be proposed. The conference  
 report must either be accepted or rejected.  
 If we go into committee, the Bill will be  
 lost, since we cannot amend it. The Bill  
 cannot live if we amend it. An agreement  
 has been arrived at by the conference, and  
 we must either accept or reject the Con-  
 ference report. Personally I am in favour  
 of accepting the report.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: With the  
 permission of the House, I would like to  
 withdraw my motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I am sorry a mis-  
 take has been made. The intention was  
 that the original clause should be reinserted.  
 We agreed to the reinsertion of that clause  
 subject to the words "are deemed by the  
 Minister to be" be struck out.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I am not respon-  
 sible for the manner in which the confer-  
 ence report has been put up. We rein-  
 serted the clause with the deletion of the  
 words "or by the Minister are deemed to  
 be," which were moved in this House by  
 Mr. Nicholson.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The original Com-  
 mittee deleted Clause 39 on the motion by  
 Mr. Thomson. The Committee divided, and  
 the voting was 16 to 6. The clause read—

The Governor may at any time and from  
 time to time by proclamation declare that in  
 any district or any portion of a district it  
 shall be lawful to use wood in the construction  
 of the external and internal walls of any build-  
 ing intended for use as a dwelling-house . . .  
 and until such provision is revoked . . . and  
 of any by-laws made thereunder which are, or  
 by the Minister are deemed to be, inconsistent  
 with or repugnant to the authority . . .

Subsequently the Chief Secretary moved  
 that Clause 39, which was struck out, be re-  
 inserted in an altered form. On amendment  
 by Mr. Nicholson the words "and from time  
 to time" were struck out. Later on the



words "or by the Minister are deemed to be" were struck out. That clause, as amended, was sent to the Assembly, and the Assembly disagreed and asked for the reinstatement of the original Clause 39. This House insisted on the Minister's amendment as amended. Which clause is to remain in the Bill, the original Clause 39, or the alternative clause moved by the Minister with the amendments of Mr. Nicholson disallowed?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Conference overlooked the amendment made by this House. We dealt with Clause 39 of the Bill as it came to this House. Conference agreed to accept the clause in that form, retaining the words "from time to time" and "are deemed to be," but striking out the words "by the Minister are."

Hon. G. W. MILES: As there has evidently been a misunderstanding, I suggest that progress be reported or that the sitting be suspended.

The Chief Secretary: There is no misunderstanding.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Are we asked to agree to the reinsertion of the original clause with the deletion of the words, "or by the Minister are"?

The PRESIDENT: The question is that the report be adopted. If any member is in doubt, I am sure the Minister will read the report again.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I should like that point cleared up.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The conference agreed to give the power to the Governor to control boards.

Hon. J. Cornell: Then the report is for the reinstatement of the original Clause 39 with the alteration I mentioned.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes.

Question put and passed.

## **BILL—MINE WORKERS' RELIEF.**

### *First Reading.*

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

### *Second Reading.*

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** (Hon. C. F. Baxter—East) [9.10] in moving the second reading said: The purpose of the Bill is to provide a fund for the relief of mine workers suffering from T.B. or any disease or mal-

ady directly attributable to their occupation as mine workers. It will repeal the Miners' Phthisis Act of 1922, which provides for compensation being paid to mine workers and their dependants when they are prohibited from employment in the industry, if upon examination by the Commonwealth laboratory officials they are found to be suffering from tuberculosis. Provision is made in the Bill for all benefits under the Miners' Phthisis Act to continue as if the Act were still in existence, and the provisions of this Bill will apply as from the date of its commencement upon proclamation. Under the Miners' Phthisis Act a worker was not prohibited from working until he had contracted tuberculosis. He was then prohibited and became entitled to compensation. This had the effect of compelling men to remain in the industry long after they should have left it, and it is for the purpose of improving the position in this direction that the Bill is now introduced.

If a miner suffering from silicosis in any stage ceases work without being prohibited, and claims compensation under the Workers' Compensation Act he has to prove that he is totally incapacitated and has contracted an industrial disease before he can receive the compensation provided under the Third Schedule of that Act. The result is that he almost invariably continues working until his health is very seriously and permanently impaired, and eventually contracts tuberculosis and obtains compensation under the Miners' Phthisis Act. On an average, such a mine worker, once he has contracted T.B., is not likely to live for more than three or four years longer. Under the provisions of the Workers' Compensation Act, he may receive a weekly payment, including payment for his dependants, which must not exceed £3 10s. per week, until he has received the amount of £750, which is the maximum under the Act. Under the Miners' Phthisis Act he may receive weekly payments for himself and his dependants, not exceeding the basic wage, and payment is continued to his dependants after his death, without limitation of time.

The Bill now provides that when a miner reaches the stage known as "silicosis advanced" or of "silicosis plus T.B." he shall be entitled to compensation under the Workers' Compensation Act and the labora-

tory certificate stating that he is so suffering shall be proof that he is entitled to compensation under the Act.

It is proposed that the difference between £3 10s per week allowed under Workers' Compensation Act, and the basic wage allowed under the Miners' Phthisis Act, will be made up, if he is entitled to it, by contribution from the Mine Workers' Relief Fund, to which of course he will have been contributing, and after he has exhausted the amount of £750 under the Workers' Compensation Act, he and his dependants will then be entitled to payment under the Mine Workers' Relief Act, only, according to a prescribed schedule. If a mine worker is found to be suffering from silicosis early, which is not a contagious disease, he will be notified and may if he chooses, continue to work in the mine, but if he elects to leave the industry, he may register within three months with the Mines Department, and may thereafter, provided he keeps up his subscriptions to the Mine Workers' Relief Fund, be eligible to receive the benefits prescribed under that fund if he should at any future date, be found, upon examination at the laboratory, to be suffering from T.B. and silicosis, or from silicosis in an advanced stage. If his disease reaches such a stage within 12 months after his leaving the industry he will be entitled to compensation under the Workers' Compensation Act: if more than 12 months have elapsed, he will be entitled to benefits under the prescribed scale of the Mine Workers' Relief Fund. If a mine worker were found to be suffering from tuberculosis only, which is not an industrial disease, he would not be entitled to compensation under the Workers' Compensation Act. In order to obtain the benefits under the Mine Workers' Relief Fund, he must have been employed in the mining industry of Western Australia, for a period of not less than two years, unless he had been previously examined by the laboratory. The reason for this provision is that it is not always convenient for a man applying for admission to the industry, to proceed to Kalgoorlie to be examined, and therefore the Bill provides that he may be examined by a medical practitioner, who may fail to discover that the applicant is suffering from T.B. and if, on a subsequent examination at the laboratory within two years

of his being employed in the industry, he is found to be suffering from T.B. only, it is assumed that he was so suffering when he joined the industry. But if at any examination, the laboratory was unable to discover any trace of T.B., then, although he may not have worked in the industry for two years and was subsequently found to be suffering from T.B., it would be considered that he had contracted it in the industry. The compensation to such a person suffering from T.B. which is not an industrial disease, would come from the Mine Workers' Relief Fund, and such benefits will be prescribed by regulations that will enable him and his dependants to receive up to the basic wage, if so entitled, until a total payment of £750 had been made, and thereafter in the same manner as others under the Mine Workers' Relief Fund.

It is also intended to bring prospectors under the provisions of the Bill. There are between 2,000 and 3,000 men working in this industry who are classed as prospectors. The great majority of them are owners of mining tenements, known as prospecting areas or gold mining leases, and are, in fact, small mine owners. Some of them work their own shows without assistance, whilst others have miners working for them. These men are, therefore, not employees and are not entitled to benefits under the Miners' Phthisis Act, although working in the industry to the same extent as mine employees. Special provision has therefore been made to enable such men to qualify for benefits under this measure. Any such person, who is free from the diseases which would disqualify him from employment as a mine worker under the Mines Regulation Act and its regulations, or who is suffering from silicosis in the early stages only but is entirely free from T.B., may register with the Mine Workers' Relief Board. If he is suffering from silicosis in the early stages, he must produce evidence to prove that he has been engaged in the industry in Western Australia for a period aggregating five years. If he is able to obtain the initial certificate showing that he is free from disease and from silicosis, no period of engagement in the industry will be necessary. If he registers he may subscribe to the fund and the Treasurer will subscribe an equal amount, and if at a later

period, he is found, on examination at the laboratory, to be suffering from T.B. or T.B. with silicosis or from silicosis in the advanced stage, and has regularly subscribed to the fund, then he shall be entitled to receive out of the fund, the same benefits as a mine worker found to be suffering from T.B. only. A further provision is made to enable the board to grant benefits, which will be prescribed by regulation, to any mine worker, who, after two years' employment in the industry, may become incapacitated, or whose earning power may be materially prejudiced by reason of any disease or malady, which may be legitimately attributed to the nature of his employment as a mine worker in the mining industry in Western Australia, subject to restrictions regarding his rights under the Workers' Compensation Act and other divisions of this Bill.

Those are the main principles of the Bill as applying to benefits to be derived by sufferers from diseases peculiar to the mining industry. Whilst it is no part of this Bill to say who shall or shall not be engaged in the industry, it is necessary, for the purposes of the measure, to restrict entrants to the industry through the Mines Regulations Act and its regulations. However, men suffering from T.B. or from silicosis advanced, will not be permitted to enter the industry, both for their own sake and for the protection of other workers. A certain amount of hardship has been inflicted on a number of men who had been for many years engaged in the mining industry in Western Australia. These men had been affected with dust lodgment and in some cases had reached the early silicosis stages, and for this reason had left the industry and found work in some other occupation. Now, however, owing to unemployment, they have found themselves stranded and wish to go back to the mining industry. Under existing conditions, they have to be re-examined as entrants for the first time and must be free from all diseases, including silicosis early, and are therefore debarred from employment in the industry. The mining industry requires such trained and experienced men, so provision has been made by which they may now be taken back into the industry, subject to certain restrictions. They will not be allowed to work underground—this has a very wide meaning as members can see by the interpretation clause—except in certain specified mines, and then only on the certificate of the inspector of mines or a medical prac-

titioner, stating that such work is neither detrimental to the man or to his fellow workers. This certificate may be withdrawn at any time. These workers will be granted what is known as a readmission certificate, and as they had previously worked for a lengthy period and had in many cases contributed to the Mine Workers' Relief Fund, and will, on readmission, again contribute, they will be subject to the provisions of this Bill. Others may be admitted under special certificates to work in certain places, but will not be entitled to any benefits as they had probably progressed too far in the way of contracting diseases.

Provision is also made to permit a person who may accept some position which is directly or indirectly connected with the mining industry, but who would not be actually a mine worker, to obtain the approval of the Governor to be included under the term "mine worker," so that he may again be employed as such, subject to him having kept up his contributions to the fund, and to entitle him to the benefits of this measure.

The remaining provisions of the Bill provide for the establishment of a Mine Workers' Relief Fund Board, which will be on practically the same basis as the present Mine Workers' Relief Fund Board which is operating voluntarily. This board will control the fund to which it shall be compulsory for all employers in the mining industry, all employees, and the Government, to contribute in equal part. Special provision has been made to enable the board to provide an insurance or indemnity in respect to the amounts of any benefit under this measure. This provision is made in case it may be desirable to insure some of those benefits that are now provided under the Workers' Compensation Act. I feel sure members will agree that this legislation should have been passed many years ago. There is no doubt that it will do much to decrease the ravages of T.B. amongst miners, and will encourage able-bodied men to join the industry, knowing that efficient steps are being taken to protect their health, and in the event of their contracting diseases peculiar to this industry, that they will receive adequate compensation. I move:—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. H. Seddon, debate adjourned.

**BILL—NARROGIN HOSPITAL.**

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

**BILL—ROAD DISTRICTS ACT AMENDMENT.***Assembly's Further Message.*

Message from the Assembly received and read, notifying that it had adopted the report of the conference managers.

**BILL—RESERVES.***In Committee.*

Resumed from the 8th December. Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 7—A1720 (King's Park), exclusion of Perth sub. lot 490 at Crawley (partly considered).

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Since the Bill was previously before the Committee, I have seen a member of the King's Park board and the secretary of the board. They assured me that the board approved of the re-opening of the road at the south end of King's Park, but that the board had not been requested to exclude from King's Park the three acres of land outside the park fence at the south end.

Hon. A. Thomson: Did not the Government know that the board controlled the park?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Yes. I was told how the board came to acquire that particular piece of land. It was given to them in exchange for a piece of land further away.

Hon. A. Thomson: Then they would not miss it.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: They would. As a matter of courtesy, the board should have been asked whether they objected to this land being taken from them. I oppose the amendment. The Committee should be told what is proposed to be done with the land.

Hon. J. M. DREW: I am surprised to hear what Mr. Holmes has told the Committee. I certainly thought, when I spoke previously, that the King's Park board had been approached, but whether they were approached or not is immaterial, because I intend on every occasion to oppose any

attempt to whittle away any part of King's Park. I have always taken up that attitude, and hope I shall continue to do so. Now we are informed that the King's Park board have not been consulted. The secretary of the board has no knowledge of the matter. Mr. Nicholson, a member of the board, also knows nothing about the proposal. Yet a Bill of this kind is submitted to the House without its having first been referred to the authorities who control the park. No matter how the King's Park board acquired the land, it was subsequently included in Reserve 1720. For what purpose is it proposed to transfer the land to the Government? I did not ask that question before, because the point does not concern me, but other members may want to know the object of the proposed annexation. If the clause is passed by the Committee, I shall be in a position to say in the future that it was not passed with my support.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: All I know is that so far as the road is concerned, the King's Park board agreed to that.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: That is so.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: The piece of land in question is, between the main King's Park and the Fremantle-road, right outside the park fence altogether. What use is it to the park?

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Quite a lot. It could be fenced and included in the park.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: All the board can do for years to come is to develop the park itself.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Are there any other pieces of land belonging to the park outside the fence?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not know. The land is cut off from the park by a road.

Hon. W. U. Kitson: What is intended to be done with the land?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: It will be used for recreation purposes. It will not be commercialised in any way.

Hon. G. FRASER: The Minister states the land will be used for recreation purposes, and he will give a guarantee to that effect. I would like to know the particular kind of recreation. I take the stand Mr. Drew takes. I am not prepared to agree to the giving away of the park lands at all. I oppose the amendment.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I also oppose the amendment. Notwithstanding that the piece of land is outside King's Park, it will be very valuable to the park.

The Chief Secretary: What value would you place on it?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: There are several ways in which it could be used. It is better to leave it in a state of nature than to agree to its being excised from King's Park.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Two or three sessions ago we had a long debate with regard to other portions of King's Park which were not exactly excised from the park, but which were then used and are used to-day for recreation purposes. The general public are excluded from those particular portions, unless they care to assert their right to object to the charges made for admission and insist upon going on to those portions of the park, irrespective of any rules or regulations of a tennis club or any other association. If the piece of land in question is excised from King's Park, it is quite possible it may become the exclusive property, for a period, at any rate, of some other organisation similar to the King's Park Tennis Club. The Committee should be given information as to what is intended to be done with the land. It is quite possible for the land to be utilised for recreation purposes and not be commercialised.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Members have spoken as though I had more information to give them. I can assure the Committee I have not.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Committee is entitled to more information on the matter. In the absence of that information, we ought to strike out the clause. In spite of what the Minister says, the land could be disposed of, if it were excised from King's Park, under part III. of the Land Act, 1898.

Hon. J. M. DREW: I am aware of the Minister's good intentions, but in this instance his guarantees are quite valueless, for another Government coming into office may take a different view altogether. There is in the community a feeling that this area of land is to be devoted to quite a different object. On Sunday morning I was rung up by a leading lady citizen of Perth, who told me the object was to get land for the erection of a hospital in King's Park, the idea being to get this three acres of land in the first place, proceed with the erection of the

hospital, and subsequently make further demands. That is being repeated amongst people outside. If the present Government do not avail themselves of the land for this purpose, probably some other Government will do so with the authority of Parliament, for Parliament could not well refuse if there was a fine building erected on the three acres and a further area was required for gardens and grounds. The University is agitating for the erection of a hospital within close reach of its buildings. Within the next five or ten years the University will be taking medical students, and so this would be a very suitable site for a hospital where those students could pursue their studies. I am strongly opposed to any further areas of King's Park being annexed for any purpose whatever.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am astounded at Mr. Drew. In the first place the area is altogether too small for the purpose of a hospital. Nor is a cross-road a suitable place for a hospital, especially when there is heavy traffic on one of those roads. I am now informed by the responsible Minister that the block is to be used for educational purposes.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I have turned up Part III. of the Land Act referred to in this clause, and I find that under that Part this land may be used for the benefit of aborigines, or for a cemetery or church or chapel, or for a town hall, mechanics' institute, or a number of other purposes, including a resting place for travelling stock. Now we are told it is to be used for educational purposes. And it is suggested that a hospital on this site will be very useful to University medical students desiring to cut up corpses.

Hon. G. FRASER: First of all we were told the land was to be used for commercial purposes, and now we are told it is to be reserved for educational purposes. That means definitely that the general public will be cut off from the use of that land, and so I will vote against the clause.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Already there have been several excisions from the park. The late Hon. A. Lovekin combatted even the placing of a bore in the park, for which only about 12 perches of land was required. Then there are within the park a tennis club, a bowling club, a croquet club, the Hale School playground, and the reservoirs, all making it very easy for a future

Government to resume land there for a hospital. Already a Minister of the Crown has said it would be quite a good place for a hospital, and I know it is in the minds of other people to have further excisions made from the park.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Macfarlane is quite wrong, for the accommodation of tennis and bowling clubs within the King's Park was the responsibility, not of any Government, but of the King's Park Board. Nor have any excisions been made on account of those clubs, for the land on which their respective properties stand still belongs to the park. The piece of land dealt with in the clause is outside the park and cannot be used for any park purpose.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I cannot help thinking we are not getting all the information to which we are entitled. We are now told it is proposed to use this land for educational purposes. I cannot understand the Government bringing down such a clause unless some concrete proposition had been previously put to the Government.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Put up by Shapcott, the chairman of the Gardens Board.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Originally we were told it was to be for recreation purposes. Then it was declared it was not intended to commercialise the land, and now we are told it is to be used for educational purposes. Clearly we should have further information about it.

Hon. G. W. MILES: It is the duty of the Committee to delete the clause. We do not want Government interference with Class "A" reserves.

The Chief Secretary: This is not a Class "A" reserve.

Hon. G. W. MILES: It is included in King's Park, which is a Class "A" reserve. We should not permit this or any other Government to interfere with Class "A" reserves. I hope the clause will be deleted.

Postponed clause put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes	..	..	..	2
Noes	..	..	..	17

Majority against .. .. 15

AYES.  
Hon. C. F. Baxter | Hon. E. H. H. Hall  
(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. R. G. Moore
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. Sir C. Nathan
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. H. V. Pirrie
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. W. H. Kitson	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. E. H. Harris
Hon. G. W. Miles	(Teller.)

Clause thus negatived.

Postponed Clause 8, First schedule, Second schedule, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

*House adjourned at 10.7 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly.

*Tuesday, 13th December, 1932.*

	PAGE
Assent to Bill	2371
Question: Migrants, repatriation	2371
Bills: Mine Workers' Relief, report, Standing Orders suspension, 3r.	2372
Narrogin Hospital, 2R., etc.	2376
Bills of Sale Act Amendment, 2R.	2378
Secession Referendum, Com.	2383
Loan £2,176,000, returned	2382
Road Districts Act Amendment, Assembly's request for Conference	2382
Road Districts Act Amendment, Conference Manager's report	2383
Road Districts Act Amendment, Council's further Message	2383
Bulk Handling, Com.	2388

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

### ASSENT TO BILL.

Message from the Lieutenant-Governor received and read notifying assent to the Public Service Appeal Board Act Amendment Bill.

### QUESTION—MIGRANTS, REPATRIATION.

Mr. SLEEMAN (without notice) asked the Premier: Is he aware that Australians are being repatriated from Canada owing to their being a charge on that country? If