

finds no difficulty in doing this work for the board.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Council of Industrial Development, £1,175—agreed to.

Vote—State Labour Bureau, £3,421:

Mr. H. W. MANN: I should like to know from the Minister what steps he intends to take for the re-organisation of the bureau, which is really useless as it is to-day.

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRY: I have lots of intentions but I cannot announce them yet, because if I start re-organising this department I do not know quite where it will end. But certainly I have intentions.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Minister for Police £254,842:

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.29 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 23rd October, 1930.

	PAGE
Assent to Bills	1257
Question: Mining permits	1257
Motion: Traffic Act, to disallow regulation	1258
Bills: Main Roads, 3R.	1260
Vermion Act Amendment, report	1260
Education Act Amendment, report... ..	1260
Parliamentary Allowance Amendment, 2R.	1261

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

ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills:—

1. High School Act Amendment.
2. Supply (No. 2), £970,000.

QUESTION—MINING PERMITS.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS asked the Minister for Country Water Supplies: 1, Under Section 31, Subsection 4, of the Mines Regulation Act, 1906, how many permits have been issued since the 1st January, 1930—(a) originals, (b) renewals? 2, How many such permits, or renewal of permits, have been refused? 3, What permits have been issued under this section since the 12th July, 1930? 4, What are the names of the persons to whom, and the names of the mines on which (a) permits have been issued, (b) renewal of permits has been refused? 5, What were the reasons for such refusals? 6, Have any complaints been lodged regarding the safety of the mining hoists? 7, Have any suggestions been made as to the desirability of amending the Act, and/or do the Mines Department contemplate amending the Act? 8, How many permits are in force?

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES replied: 1, (a) ten; (b) one. 2, Three. 3, Five. 4, (a)—

Permits issued since 1-1-1930, date expired or to expire, and mine.

J. A. Smith, 15-9-30—Horseshoe Mine, Boulder.

Southcombe, W. A., 18-9-30—Lake View South, Fimiston.

Gunn, Richard Trail, 27-9-30—Enterprise G.M., Boulder.

Gunn, Richard John, 27-9-30—Enterprise G.M., Boulder.

McKay, John Howat, 5-11-30—Glencairn Extended, Greenbushes.

De Paoli, Giacomo, 5-11-30—Great Victoria Mine, Burbidge.

Douglas, Keith Dunbar, 13-2-31—Lake View Lease, Fimiston.

Gaynor, William, 21-2-31—Great Boulder G.M., Fimiston.

Smith, James Albert, 16-3-31—Lake View and Star (Horseshoe), Fimiston.

Edwards, George, 3-4-31—Claim 952, Greenbushes.

Rosewarne, Albert Edward, 10-4-31—Lake View G.M., Fimiston.

(b)—

Permits refused.

Gunn, Richard Trail, 1-10-30—Enterprise G.M., Boulder.

Gunn, Richard John, 1-10-30—Enterprise G.M., Boulder.

Greenhill, Thomas William, 1-10-30—Enterprise G.M., Boulder.

5, It is considered that permits should be granted only for a limited depth. The Enterprise shaft is down 400 feet, and in

such cases it is considered advisable to have a certificated driver. 6, I do not know of any. 7, An amendment to Regulation 14 has been suggested by the State Mining Engineer to define clearly the purposes for which hoists may be used. 8, Seven.

MOTION—TRAFFIC ACT.

To Disallow Regulation.

Debate resumed from the previous day on the following motion by Hon. Sir William Lathlain (Metropolitan-Suburban)—

That the amendment to Regulation No. 230 (a) under the Traffic Act, 1919-26, published in the "Government Gazette" on the 26th September, 1930, and laid on the Table of the House on the 1st October, 1930, be and is hereby disallowed.

THE MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES (Hon. C. F. Baxter—East) [4.37]: This subject is one of great importance to the Government and to the State, and I feel sure that when Sir William Lathlain is apprised of all the facts surrounding the amendment of Regulation 230a he will hold a different opinion from that which he holds at present, and before I conclude he will acknowledge that the Government have been very generous in their decision of this morning further to amend the regulation by the addition of a paragraph to meet the wishes of the people concerned. In his speech in support of the amending Traffic Bill Sir William displayed a masterly grip of a very complex question, and saw very vividly the ultimate result if waste and overlapping of services in the transport industry were not eliminated. Never before in the history of the State has the practice of economy been so essential, and I am sure members are fully seized with that necessity. The time has arrived when it becomes the duty of all, irrespective of party, to strain every sinew in an effort to bring the financial position of the State back to a point where complete confidence in our ability to pay our way will be assured. Individual convenience must be subordinated to the common good, and realising that truth, the Government have set themselves the task of stocktaking, which will reveal any leakages likely to defeat the desired end—improved financial conditions.

In coming to decisions on matters revealed in the stocktaking, the Government have been guided solely by a desire to improve the lot of the people of the State as a whole, and will not be a party to any act that will unduly favour one section of the community at the expense of another. Perhaps, in one sense, Sir William's action in tabling the motion will be productive of good. It will afford me, as the Government's representative in this House, an opportunity to present the full facts of the case—an opportunity that otherwise would not have arisen. A complaint of long standing by the Claremont people was that the tramway serving the district was unsatisfactory in its working, owing to the time taken on the journey from Claremont to the city through the trams having to run via Subiaco. To overcome that complaint the late Government were approached on more than one occasion to construct a connecting line from the corner of Perth-Fremantle Road and Nedlands Broadway to Mount's Bay Road.

Owing to lack of funds, the request was not granted at the time. In 1925, however, a committee was appointed to report to the Government on the matter of tramway extensions, and in January, 1926, representatives of the Claremont Council and the Claremont Road Board appeared before that committee and asked for the construction of the connecting link of line. It was pointed out to the representatives of the local governing bodies that the building of the line did not appear to be justified so long as the 'buses were allowed to pick up passengers along the tram line. It was shown that the losses occasioned by the 'buses picking up passengers along the line had turned it from a profit earning investment into a losing proposition. In answer to that, the representatives from each of the bodies concerned made it abundantly clear that if the connecting line were built and an adequate tram service provided, they would do their best to cut out the 'bus service.

The connecting line was built at a cost of approximately £5,000 and the time of the journey to Perth was considerably reduced. Further, the Government honoured the obligation to provide an adequate tram service by arranging a time-table giving a 15-minute service during the slack periods of the day, with a 10-minute service at the

busy times. That provision, I consider, was quite ample in view of the population served by the line.

To give effect to the agreement reached between the tramway extension committee and the local governing bodies, the Government published an amendment to Regulation 23C (a) of the Traffic Act debaring the 'buses from picking up passengers along the Claremont line. Four months later, for some reason unknown to the present Government, the amendment was annulled which meant that the 'buses were once more permitted to pick up passengers there. In consequence of the losses experienced in working the tramway, it was found necessary to reduce the service to its present proportions. That state of affairs continued until the present Government assumed office, when the matter was again represented and action decided upon. The amended regulation now before the House was then approved, and the motion affords an opportunity to disclose the Government's intention in the matter when the amendment under discussion is further revised and approved.

If the proposed further amendment to the regulation be agreed to, the following improvements will be effected in the Claremont tram service:—

(a) The present service of 47 trips per day will be increased to 68 trips.

(b) The average interval between trams will be 14¼ minutes with 10-minute intervals at busy times.

(c) The time occupied on the journey will be reduced.

(d) The present 3d. section from the Weld Club to the University gates will be extended to the corner of Perth-Fremantle-road and Nedlands Broadway.

(e) The two succeeding penny sections will be altered to provide a penny section from Broadway intersection to Loch-street and from Loch-street to the Claremont Council Chambers.

This shows that the Government have gone even further than their original obligation. They propose to provide not only an adequate service for the district, but to make concessions in fares—concessions for which the people have been asking for some time. I do not think the Government could do anything fairer than that. When the Government submit the proposed additions to the regulation, it will be found that the prohibition against the buses taking

Fremantle-bound traffic has been relaxed. Further than that, the Government are not prepared to go.

Subject to the concession to those proceeding to Fremantle and wishing to patronise the buses, there can be no valid reason advanced why the section of line between Loch-street and Broadway should suffer a form of penalty which is not imposed on the remainder of the line from Broadway to the city. Along the latter section buses are prohibited from picking up passengers. Apart from that aspect of the matter, hon. members should consider the economic effect of the duplication of services which now exists along the route. The Claremont Council territory is served by the railway, the tramway and buses. The road board area has a tram and bus service, and it is the latter area which will be affected by the proposed addition to the regulations. Rightly or wrongly, the Tramway Department maintain that the tramway was the medium of the fillip to the settlement of the district; and I feel certain if it were suggested that the tramway service be discontinued, there would be an unprecedented chorus of protest. When submitting the addition to the regulations, the Government will not be asking for anything that cannot be justified. The trams are entitled to the trade, and the Government are going to provide travelling facilities adequate for the residents, who should realise that losses in working cannot be allowed to continue. The local governing bodies are anxious that the greatest facilities possible should be given to their ratepayers, assuming, no doubt, that such facilities will be the means of making the districts more popular and so adding to their development. The fact must not be lost sight of, however, that a multiplicity of transport services is not a guarantee of prosperity. If through the fall in prices of staple commodities, or through wasteful services, the financial position of the State is damaged, a reflex will be found in the finances of every municipal council and road board. The tramway earnings have fallen off to such an extent that work has had to be rationed. Should one of the tram routes, such as the Claremont line, be closed, the position would be aggravated. As intimated earlier in my speech, the position has altered materially since the submission of the motion yesterday. This

morning I discussed the matter with the Minister for Works, and subsequently he heard the views of a representative deputation of those concerned when he decided to amend the regulations so that the amendment to No. 230, as published on the 26th September, 1930, will not apply to (d) the picking up of passengers on the outward journey from Perth on prescribed Route No. 8 between Broadway and Loch-street. In due course that amendment will be made and I believe it to be a reasonable arrangement. In the circumstances I think Sir William Lathlain should withdraw his motion.

On motion by Hon. J. M. Macfarlane debate adjourned.

BILL—MAIN ROADS.

Third Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES (Hon. C. F. Baxter—East) [4.49]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

HON. G. W. MILES (North) [4.50]: I support the third reading. As I missed the opportunity of speaking on the second reading, I desire to offer a few remarks now. In my opinion, expenditure on main roads should be curtailed. Roads now in hand should be completed, and thereafter funds voted for main road construction should, if possible, be diverted to the assistance of the man on the land. That is the problem which the Government have to face. The whole of the money available should be used to help the primary producers. I hope the Minister will make a note of my views. Whether what I suggest can be brought about, I do not know. I trust, however, that there will be no more squandering of money on main roads as there has been in the past, especially main roads running parallel to the railway system. I congratulate the Government on having appointed one Commissioner to control main roads in future.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time, and returned to the Assembly with an amendment.

BILL—VERMIN ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee.

THE MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES (Hon. C. F. Baxter—East) [4.53]: I move—

That the report of the Committee be adopted.

HON. SIR EDWARD WITTENOOM (North) [4.54]: Mr. Deputy President—

The **DEPUTY PRESIDENT**: This is the report of Committee stage. Does the hon. member wish to speak?

Hon. Sir **EDWARD WITTENOOM**: Yes, Sir.

The **DEPUTY PRESIDENT**: It is unusual.

Hon. Sir **EDWARD WITTENOOM**: I am in the habit of doing unusual things.

The **DEPUTY PRESIDENT**: Is it the wish of the House that the hon. member be heard at this stage?

Members: Aye.

Hon. Sir **EDWARD WITTENOOM**: I am doubtful whether I should weary the House with my ideas, which I do not think will be acceptable. My view is that the Education Vote could be reduced by £200,000 and that the annual University grant of £30,000 could be done away with. Under present conditions, there is no need for this expenditure. The State has seven high schools already, and there are also five excellent private high schools. Money spent on the other high schools is absolutely unnecessary. I have here a letter sent round by the Roman Catholics, who want Parliament to grant a special vote for their schools. I asked somebody why this was desired, and why the Roman Catholics wanted a special vote instead of sending their boys to our high schools. In reply I was told that they wanted to teach the boys a foreign religion. I do not know whether that is true or not. However, we cannot afford to spend more money on education. I am glad to have had the opportunity to make these remarks.

Question put and passed.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—PARLIAMENTARY ALLOWANCES AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES (Hon. C. F. Baxter—East) [4.57] in moving the second reading said: In seeking the approval of the House to this Bill for the reduction of Parliamentary allowances by £4,245, I desire to explain that that amount, together with the salaries tax of £100,000—if Parliament agrees to that proposal—will mean reduced expenditure amounting to £104,245, and that, on the other hand, it is proposed, with the concurrence of Parliament, to secure additional revenue totalling £81,000 from betting tickets, sweep tickets, winning bets, the totalisator tax, and the entertainments tax. Therefore, if the Government's proposals are endorsed, and provided the estimates under the various Bills are realised, there should be an improvement under the headings mentioned of £185,245. In meeting their obligations this year the Government are faced with new expenditure under the following heads:—

Deficit	£518,000
Interest on deficit	31,000
Additional interest	200,000
Exchange on interest payments transferred to London ..	100,000
Total	£849,000

That total of £849,000 is to be covered by some means or other. In meeting it the Government are looking to the economies in the departments for a good deal of it, and also hope that improved financial results will be forthcoming from the Railways. The enormous loss last year on the railways has beggared the Treasury for the time being, and in the consideration of that loss sight must not be lost of the fact that it has arisen mainly from the great mileage of yet unprofitable developmental lines and to almost 1,000 miles of now non-paying gold-fields lines which were built when the State was producing £8,500,000 worth of gold.

Briefly, the loss on the railways has brought us to our knees, and in order to regain our feet the Treasurer has been reluctantly compelled to suggest a reduction in Parliamentary allowances as a small contribution in the adjustment of the finances. Because of the serious times through which the State is passing, the revenues to the

Treasury from the trading activities of the community are dwindling, and in that connection the considerable reduction in loan expenditure has accentuated hardships inasmuch as the absence from circulation of that money has thrown out of employment a great number of men whose earnings in the ordinary course of events are the financial cement of industry.

The Treasurer estimates that there will be a decrease of £150,000 in income tax and dividend duty collections and the magnitude of that total is an indication of the bad times suffered by the people. Most of the big firms have been hard hit and have had to dismiss employees and reduce expenditure considerably. The incomes of all classes of workers have diminished, and farmers, in common with all other workers, are losing income almost every day. To meet the unprecedented situation private and public economy to a previously unknown degree is essential. "Economy is of itself a great revenue." Everyone is losing money and making sacrifices in individual ways and it is thought that members of Parliament should experience some sacrifice along with the rest of the people.

The harvest will certainly improve trade, despite the price of wheat. The aggregate amount received will, it is estimated, range between £6,000,000 and £7,000,000, and that amount cannot be circulated without invigorating trade.

It is hardly necessary to say that in troublesome times it is only right that the Parliamentary representatives of the people should share with the people the difficulties of the community. If we acknowledge the righteousness of that view and make our contributions to the common lot, it cannot be urged against us that we were found wanting in the crisis. Members of Parliament are not overpaid at £600 a year. There are many unavoidable expenses in service to constituents and we usually accept them philosophically as all people must in the games of life. However, in so doing it does not lead us away from the need to contribute our share in alleviating the common burden.

Ministerial salaries are not included in the Bill but a similar reduction in respect to those emoluments is being made under the Salaries Tax Bill. The reduction in allowances will be for 12 months and at the rate of 10 per cent. The reduction represents a sum of £60 for 12 months, and it will

stop automatically. A similar reduction has been made in South Australia, Victoria and in the other States, and there is every indication that the Federal Parliament will determine along the same lines. Therefore, if the reduction is not brought about here we shall be the only Parliament in Australia that has not imposed some reduction upon its members.

The submission of the Bill is not a pleasant duty because I am aware that very few members possess means outside of their salaries. Many of our critics on fixed salaries below £600 a year are much better off than we are, but the circumstances warrant sacrifices by those who represent the people and for that reason I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. J. J. HOLMES (North) [5.3]: Instead of the adjournment of the debate being moved, the House should carry the Bill to-day as far as the rules will permit. The Bill is long overdue; it should have been down here within a week of the meeting of Parliament. This House, at all events, will show to the public that its members are not going to hold up either this Bill or any other Bill that will be a step towards putting the finances of the country on a proper basis. If I had my way and could get the necessary support, I would move an amendment that the Bill, instead of taking effect on the 1st October, should take effect as from the 1st July last.

Hon. E. H. Gray: It is all right for wealthy men such as you to talk like that.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If the hon. member were carrying the responsibilities that some of us have, responsibilities such as overdrafts, he would not interject in that way. I was trained in a school that taught us, that when we felt our worst we should look our best. Particularly must that be so in the presence of the bank manager, and others too. I can inform the hon. member that at the present time I am trying to look my best. We are told that when the other Bill comes along the question of Ministerial salaries will be dealt with. I should like to give my views as to what I think should be done when that Bill is before us. In the days when the Forrest Government were in power, and when as a colony the Government controlled Customs, post and telegraphs, the Army and Navy, etc., there were

five Ministers and they were considered sufficient to control the affairs of the State.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Of course the State has not progressed since then!

Hon. E. H. Harris: Do you know what the revenue was at that time?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I do not know what the revenue was then; I know that we paid our way. I know too, that if the same five men had remained in power, they would not have landed us in the mess we are in to-day.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Why talk nonsense?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I do not mind interjections that have sense in them, but silly interjections will not get us anywhere. I am talking of the days before Federation when we had five Ministers. We hear about what Ministers have to do to-day. If we dispose of the State trading concerns, which must be a source of worry to present day Ministers, seven days a week—that is, if they are taking their jobs seriously, and I believe they are—then five Ministers should be sufficient to control the affairs of the State. Instead of five, we have eight, and in making these remarks I wish it to be understood that I am not introducing the personal element at all, because the Chief Secretary and the Attorney General are friends of mine for whom I have the highest respect. If inquiries are made, I believe it will be found that the services of those two Ministers could be done without. The Crown Law Department could advise Ministers with regard to the legal side of various questions and the heads of the other departments controlled by the Chief Secretary could do likewise and so we should save two Ministerial salaries. The Bill is to have effect until the 31st September, 1931. That part of it should come out because I think the Bill should go on until such time as we are able to balance the ledger. It is not a fair thing for this salary question to be brought in—

Hon. H. Seddon: Would you have payment by results?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: —as it will be brought in every year. There will be the fight between those that are out and those that are in, and the question of Parliamentary salaries will go before the public annually. We should pass the Bill for the reduction and let it go on until Parliament sees the wisdom of bringing in another Bill.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Reduce the salaries by £200 a year right out.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: A reduction has to come about; that is, the first reduction. And it may be that before the expiration of the 12 months, a greater reduction may have to be made. So I think it should be a permanent reduction until the ledger is balanced and we can see our way clear to restore the reduction, and to what extent. I intend to support the second reading.

HON. C. B. WILLIAMS (South) [5.8]: I take it the people of the State are entitled to be represented in this Parliament by men of wealth or men who are without wealth, and there is provision in all the Parliaments of Australia that the people's voice shall be heard in Parliament through the medium of educated and wealthy men or men who may be only partly educated and poor. Hon. members of this Chamber say that they do not belong to a party, but speaking for myself, I say that I do, and it is an unwritten law of that party that once a man becomes a member of Parliament, that is his job and he is not allowed to occupy any outside position that may help to carry him along. The result is that we depend entirely on our Parliamentary salaries. Whilst I admit that the State is in a bad way, we are going to save only £5,000 by this reduction. It looks, too, as if the Bill were going to be carried. All the same I enter my protest against it. I claim that I am just as entitled to be here and to be paid for my services as any other member of the Chamber who has other interests outside and who may even have to carry, as we have been informed, huge overdrafts and which, by the way, I should have no hope of raising. To those gentlemen, the Parliamentary allowance would be comparatively nothing. If the salary were cut out altogether, I should probably have to fend for myself and get a living elsewhere. Only in to-day's paper we find that despite the fact that the Government are hard pressed, it is intended to increase the salary of one of the Mines Department officials from £900 to £960. And we are asked to economise and to vote ourselves a reduction to the extent of £60 per annum. In two or three days time I have no doubt the Appropriation Bill will be before us and we shall be asked to sanction the in-

crease in that salary to which I have just referred.

Member: It is an automatic increase.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I know all about the automatic increases. The Government can vote that increase but they must reduce ours. The mining industry is not a third of what it was a few years ago, and still we find that at its worst time there is being employed a huge staff, and that one member of that staff is to get the substantial increase to which I have referred. It is sheer hypocrisy.

Hon. E. H. Harris: It would pay you to look up the salary of the State Mining Engineer.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: That is the official to whom I am referring. Then look at this: I have in my hand the report of the Mines Department. This is where the money goes. Half the time of the officials is occupied in preparing this huge volume, and no one will ever look at it. More than £5,000 could be saved if the compilation of that were abolished.

Hon. A. Lovekin: It cost £380 to print.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: The Leader of the House, when moving the second reading of the Bill, reminded me by the tone of his voice of a lay preacher. As a matter of fact, at one stage I thought that he was going to cry. In view of the position that necessitates a reduction of expenditure all round, some attention should be given to the Civil Service, which I have on previous occasions stated, is overmanned to the extent of 20 per cent.

Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: We are cutting out road grants and such things, and still at the Mines Department head office expenses remain as they were, and high salaried officers are still in charge. Then on top of all this we find an increase being given to one of the officials. I understand that the Bill will be carried, but all the same I intend to oppose it. The province that I represent covers, in point of size, one-third of the State. It is away from the main railway line, and it is impossible to get to many parts of it unless by motor. As a matter of fact, there are many parts of it which I have not seen since I was elected. I had hoped to go through it in the next two or three years, but since sixty quid is to be cut off my salary,

I shall have to economise somewhere. After the interjection by Mr. Lovekin, I did not send any sympathetic glances towards Mr. Holmes, although he would be a better pal of mine than Mr. Lovekin would be if he got his way. I would ask the House to have some respect for those who represent big constituencies. People who represent districts in and around Perth, or pocket boroughs like Boulder and Kalgoorlie, receive the same salary as people who represent a large area such as I do. Whereas the member representing a constituency in Perth can reach his district every day in the week, absolutely free of charge, a man in my position has to pay out £3 or £4 a week in order to reach Perth and return to his constituency.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Do you think it an advantage for members to meet their constituents every day?

Hon. A. Lovekin: I guarantee you get more out of yours than I do out of mine.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: The hon. member has other standbys. If he was as hard held as I am, he would be just as much inclined to dodge around the corners when he saw people coming; whereas he is now in a position to meet them, and to his credit he does so. I realise the State is in a bad way. I am not anti-Government in what I am going to say, but I do hold that, before curtailing the privileges and salaries of members, the Government should economise in the departments they control. They transfer a policeman, say, from Perth, to relieve another in the country for three or four months. Each may receive the same salary, but the relieving policeman gets an allowance which works out at 6s. a day. Is that economy? One man does the job for £1 a day, but when he is relieved for a time the man who relieves him gets 26s. a day. That is not business administration. If one man can do the job for £1 a day, the other who in relieving him should receive no more. There are men in high positions in the service receiving as much pay as the Minister who controls them, and who have as many perquisites as, if not more than, members of Parliament, and they spend nothing when they travel. They draw from the State anything between £700 and £1,100 a year, and enjoy more perquisites than a member of Parliament receives. They should pay for their tram rides, and their motor-car rides. They are in a good enough position to contribute something towards the revenue

of the country by paying for their own travelling facilities when going from their homes to their offices and back again. None of these things is suggested.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Would you move a motion embodying that idea?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: If necessary. On the Address-in-reply I pointed out a case showing that the Mines Department had taken an inspector from Southern Cross to Coolgardie, Carbine, and Kunanalling, where there are three inspectors who could have done the job in a day, but who himself had to travel 140 miles and had all his out-of-pocket expenses paid. This sort of thing makes one think it is almost a game of hide and seek.

Hon. J. Nicholson: If you bring down this motion it will help the tramways and the railways.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: The Minister for Country Water Supplies said the position of the State was so bad that we had to economise. He declared that if we reduced our own salaries we should set a good example to the people, and he wants us to cut ourselves down by 10 per cent. for 12 months. My view is that there are other economies which would bring in more than the £5,000 covered by this Bill, and which would not hurt anyone.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: They will come in due course.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: The hon. member has been a Minister, and he knows they will not come. They have to come from those who are advising Ministers.

Hon. E. H. Harris: You should outline for the benefit of the Government what these things are.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I am in receipt of only £600 a year. It is true I have a seat almost next to the Minister, but I do not intend to act as Honorary Minister and advise the Government any further. It is absurd that the Mines Department should be increasing the salary of the State Mining Engineer by £60 a year when there is not 25 per cent. of the mining industry going on now that existed five years ago. The department is also increasing its staff. Can any member who has read the annual report of the department see why the State is paying £900 a year to the State Mining Engineer, to compile it?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Do you know what it costs?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I presume it costs more than the Government intend to save by reducing the salaries of members of Parliament.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I do not think you are far out.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: It would amount to more if we took the salaries of all the officials responsible for the compilation of this rubbish.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: How many people read it?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I do not know.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Do you think it fair to class it as rubbish?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: There may be portions which are of interest to some people.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I think it is a very valuable compilation.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Very little of it is valuable to me, and I am interested in the mining industry. I ask anyone to read that report and say if an ordinary inspector could not have compiled the same thing by reporting on different shows in different districts. I am opposed to any reduction in wages. I believe in a man receiving value for his work. I do not think members are being overpaid for what they do. It appears, however, we have reached a state of alarm in this country, and are going to reduce wages all round. The Leader of the House states that all Parliaments have reduced their members salaries, but I would point out that the Federal Parliament have not done so.

The Minister for Country Water Supplies: I did not say that all Parliaments had done so.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I apologise to the Minister. I do not think after Saturday the Federal Parliament will reduce the salaries of members. They realise that it will have an effect upon the financial position of the country to reduce salaries all round. Despite the fact that Governments may have reduced salaries in the various departments and thereby saved £100,000 or £200,000, that will be of little avail; what they will have to do is to increase taxation. That must come.

The Minister for Country Water Supplies: On wages?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: On everything. Government's must be able to get in money in order to be able to provide work and balance the ledger. It is no good getting in a certain sum and paying out that sum. In this State there are between 7,000 and 10,000 persons out of work. It is not a question of saving a few pounds, but of getting in sufficient money to find work for the unemployed. The Government must get in money in order to pay it out, and restore prosperity to the State. A saving of £5,000 will not make work for anyone. It will still be necessary to tax those people who have got overdrafts. They have only secured overdrafts because they had sufficient security, which means wealth production, to induce the banks to give them such overdrafts. No bank will lend money on any business that does not pay interest on overdrafts, sinking funds and the like.

Hon. A. Lovekin: In some cases people have no security for their overdrafts.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: The hon. member is one of those who is in the happy position of being able to lend a few pounds, and he is entitled to be treated with great respect. That is what has to be done. The sooner the Government realise that it is cash we want in order to provide work, the better will it be for all. We do not want to be worrying about crimping a man to the extent of 10s. a week. That will lead to less money being put into circulation and to less being spent in the different avenues where people look for employment.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Are you speaking to the motion for the second reading of this Bill?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I do not intend to go on any further. I know it is a lost cause. Although Mr. Holmes said that the Government should do this, he will live to see the day during this session when he will vote against a Bill that the Government will be obliged to bring down to tax his own overdraft more than they do now.

HON. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [5.27]: I agree with Mr. Holmes that this Bill embodies an important principle, but I think it would be a good thing for the House to show that we are not really offering any opposition to it, in the circumstances, by passing it quickly. Mr. Williams has done his best to make the Bill more palatable

than it would otherwise be by the humorous speech he has delivered.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: He is trying to make us happy in adverse circumstances.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: He is trying to make us happy before we take the dose. I have much sympathy for him. There is a great deal in what he says. This is not the time to raise the salary of any officer from £900 to £960, no matter whether it is an automatic increase or not. All automatic increases should cease just now. Nor do I think it is right for the Mines Department to spend the best part of 12 months in preparing its annual report, which must have cost many hundreds of pounds. It cost £385 alone to print the 720 copies, some of which have been distributed amongst members and most of which will be of little concern to the rest of the community.

Hon. E. H. Harris: It is very valuable for record purposes.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Is it right that, whilst on the one hand we are trying to reduce expenditure, a geological report costing £600 or £700 should be put up, when it is of no interest to anyone except to the department, where it ought to remain until it is wanted. One sees these inconsistencies all round. No wonder members like Mr. Williams complain. They have some justification for doing so. We have before us the Anatomy Bill. If that is put into operation, it must cost at least £1,000 a year for the inspector who is provided for. It is impossible to put an office boy into such a position. We also have the Stipendiary Magistrates Bill. These officials are to be lifted this time by £100 or £200 a year. Despite this we are asked to reduce our own salaries. We should be consistent. The Government should shut down on all increases of any kind to anyone. Let us do our best to get together and secure economy if we can. If we reduce on the merry-go-round and add to the cost on the swing, we will never square the ledger. That is what we are doing at the moment. I interjected a little while ago, when one hon. member was speaking, that we might make one dose of the medicine and cut salaries down to £200. Perhaps I was not quite serious when I proffered that suggestion. Although I am opposed to the payment of members altogether, we have to recognise that not everyone can come to Parliament to represent the people in his province without receiving some

remuneration for his task. Since I have been in Parliament, my experience has been that the £600 paid to private members does not go very far in paying expenditure members are called upon to face in all sorts of directions, to say nothing about the money required to enable them to live. Those who live in the outlying portions of the State have to incur expense in travelling and keeping two homes together. In addition, they have to face expenditure that others in more favoured positions do not incur. If salaries are to be paid to members of Parliament, £600 a year is not too much. Although that is so, if we are to get out of our financial difficulties, we must realise that if we have a loaf of bread to-day, we will have to be content with half a loaf of bread to-morrow, and until such times as we arrive at the position of being able to earn £1 and spend 19s., instead of 21s. as heretofore. I have every sympathy with hon. members who are opposing the Bill, but I suggest that they follow the course pursued by Mr. Williams and treat the matter philosophically. Let them realise that the pill has to be swallowed, and swallow it with as good grace as possible.

Hon. C. B. Williams: I intend to come to you for an overdraft.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Let us agree to the Bill and put it through as soon as possible.

HON. SIR EDWARD WITTENOOM (North) [5.33]: I rise to contribute to the debate with some diffidence seeing that Mr. Holmes has said I ought to be in gaol because I was connected with one of the Colliery coal companies.

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

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. J. J. Holmes: On a point of order, I ask for a withdrawal. I said nothing of the sort.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

The hon. member will resume his seat. I fail to see that any remarks Mr. Holmes may have made yesterday have anything to do with the Bill now under discussion.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: If I were in gaol, I could not speak in the House.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I ask the hon. member not to proceed along those lines.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I did not make that statement.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: I have it in writing that I am a gaol bird.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I must ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the Bill.

Hon. A. Lovekin interjected.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: I understand Mr. Lovekin says that I ought to be there.

Hon. A. Lovekin: No, I did not.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: All I desire to say is that I shall support the Bill and at a later stage will move an amendment setting out that it shall not apply to any member who lives more than 300 miles from Perth. I intend to do that because there are many members who live a long way from Perth and, in order to undertake their parliamentary duties, have to leave their constituencies, which may be at great distances from the metropolis. Take my own position as against that in which such members are placed. It is no disadvantage to me whatever, seeing that I live where I do. On the other hand, let hon. members consider the position of those who come from Kalgoorlie, Albany, or from the far North-West. We should extend some consideration to them, particularly if they happen to have established businesses in their home towns.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: Why confine your amendment to 300 miles?

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: There is nothing to stop the hon. member from amending my suggestion. I shall simply put that proposition forward. Those members who have to leave their businesses, find it necessary to employ others to look after their interests. Some of them have to travel for seven or eight days to reach Perth, and a corresponding period on the return journey. Is it fair to place such hon. members on the same plane as myself? Of course it is not. For that reason, I intend to move the amendment I have indicated. I do not mind how hon. members may amend it, so long as some consideration is given to that phase.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Why not pass the Bill but reduce the salaries paid to town members a little more?

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: I would be agreeable to that, and I will follow the hon. member. We have given the franchise to every adult person in the State. Having done that, we must have

someone to represent those electors in the various parts of the State. Many of those young adult electors would not accept Mr. Lovekin as their member, nor would they accept Sir Edward Wittenoom. They want members who have some ideas of their own.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Do you infer that Mr. Lovekin has no ideas of his own?

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: The hon. member is always saying something much more clever than I myself can say. I said that those young people would not like Mr. Lovekin—or Mr. Holmes, I could add—to represent them. I know very well that hon. members appreciate what I meant. I do not know whether we were wise or foolish in extending the franchise to these young people of 21 years of age and over. To my mind, I think we were foolish, but having adopted that course, those young people will want someone who represents their own views. They would not be content with men like myself, or Mr. Lovekin, to represent them. The result is that we must provide some remuneration for their representatives and the question arises as to what we can afford to pay them. I am agreeable to the 10 per cent. reduction, but we ought to make some reservation in connection with those members who live thousands of miles away, and who have to shoulder additional expense in order that they may attend to their parliamentary duties here.

HON. SIR WILLIAM LATHLAIN (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.40]: I support the second reading of the Bill and hope it will be passed quickly and without being amended. Sir Edward Wittenoom has intimated his intention to move an amendment because certain members of Parliament have to engage someone else to look after their businesses. Although I am a town member, I have to engage someone to look after my business in order that I may devote my time to my parliamentary duties. Thus, town members suffer disadvantages equally with the country members. During the debates in the Legislative Assembly as well as in this House, and in the course of discussions in the Federal Parliament with regard to contemplated reductions in the salaries of members of Parliament and of civil servants, capital has been made of the penalty to be imposed upon certain sections

of the people only. Speaking with some considerable knowledge of the subject, I can inform hon. members that the commercial world to-day is bearing a heavier burden than that shouldered by members of civil services, governments, or Parliaments, in any part of Australia. I happen to be the proprietor of a large business and I do not mind telling the House that during the half year that has just closed, I finished up with a severe loss of capital. When I faced the position and took out my expenses for the present season, I found, notwithstanding the reductions I had made, and all I had done to effect economies in every possible way, the fact still remained that my working expenses proved 4 per cent. higher than they were in that part of the year in which I lost money.

Hon. Sir Charles Nathan: Because your turnover had shrunk to such an extent.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: Yes. Although I do not desire that information to be broadcast, I mention that in order to show members that the position in the commercial world is serious, and we must realise our duty to the country.

Hon. C. B. Williams: You will go broke if you make further reductions of wages. That is what is breaking you.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: One of the greatest difficulties we have in regard to the Arbitration Court is that while some people are suffering severe losses, others escape scot free. I could point out how widely that operates, but the point I want to get at is that the Federal Government should be the first to set the example not only to the other State Governments but to the people generally as to what is necessary to meet the present abnormal circumstances. It may not be a palatable remedy, but it is essential. The Federal Government should have been the first to fix its contribution so as to set an example to the States to show them what can be done. It is all very well to wait until the New South Wales elections have been contested to find out what they will do. Fortunately, we in Western Australia, and the business people generally, cannot wait until elections are fought; we have to face the position as it is. I am certain members of the Legislative Council will face the position cheerfully and accord the Government the support that is necessary. Mr. Wil-

liams made a statement pointing out how economies could be effected. We realise that the Government are doing everything possible to effect economies in Government departments. While the Government may be committed to the payment of certain increases in salaries, I agree that the present is not an opportune time for that to be done. I am convinced, however, that the Government are doing the best they can in the circumstances, because theirs is the responsibility. I hope the Bill will be passed in as short a time as possible.

HON. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [5.45]: I will support the second reading for the reason that it is highly desirable and in the best interests of the community that we should assist the Government in their effort to effect those economies which will help them to tide over the difficult position in which they find themselves. It has been suggested that those economies will have the inevitable effect of reducing the spending powers of the community and so probably will create more difficulty. With that view I cannot agree, because if one finds it necessary to economise by effecting savings in one direction, there is only one method whereby those savings can be effected, and that is by giving an indication, as the Government are seeking to do, of the intention to reduce the emoluments received by members of Parliament. There is no other way then, if the Government are to be assisted as far as possible in the efforts they are making, and the suggestion put forward by Sir Edward Wittenoom to move an amendment would, I think, scarcely be wise in the existing conditions. The Government have budgeted on a certain reduction, relying partly on that to assist them in squaring the ledger, and if we were to make alterations in the manner indicated, the adjustments that would be required to be made would be difficult to arrange, and probably even more difficult to get the members of another place to agree to. It would raise discussion on the inequality of the remuneration to be paid to one member or another, placing as it were a premium on the more distant centres as against those within the metropolis. I share the view that the expenses which members representing districts outside the metropolitan area have to suffer are much greater than those which

fall upon a member resident in the metropolitan area, and I as a metropolitan member would be quite prepared to contribute my share of the burden in that respect. But I do not think it would be wise to amend this Bill and so defeat the Government, as such a course undoubtedly would, in the effort they are making to achieve the indicated result. If any proposal is going to be made regarding a re-adjustment of the allowances to be paid to members, it should be done by a separate measure, and no attempt should be made to effect it by an amendment in this Bill. I hope, therefore, members will accord this measure their support. I certainly will give it my fullest support, and I will also be prepared to seriously consider any other measures brought forward, such as indicated by Mr. Williams, in regard to the question of those perquisites of office held by members of Parliament. If the hon. member desires to bring in any motion which would have the effect of limiting those perquisites, I will certainly give it my consideration; because it is the duty of every man to do what he can in a time of difficulty such as we are passing through so as to effect savings and economies.

HON. H. SEDDON (North-East) [5.49]: I have but very few words to say on the Bill, but I wish to speak because I, like Mr. Williams, am one of those who could not be here without the Parliamentary allowance. At the same time, I fully realise that we are facing a national crisis. The Government have brought down this, amongst other measures, as a means of balancing the State ledger, and the whole credit of the State depends on the balancing of that ledger. Every step in that direction should be taken because, after all, if we are not going to balance the ledger we are going to be one of the first British communities to fail to meet our obligations. In regard to this legislation, I can only say it should have been brought down six months ago. There can be no doubt we were facing a crisis then and could realise what was ahead of us. Had the Government taken this step then, they would have been interpreting rightly the voice of the people, and the ideas of the people and would, furthermore, have set that example to the public which we as members of Parliament should set by offering ourselves as a sacrifice to the

State's good. After all, the individual is part of the State, and so is responsible for its good name, and the integrity of the State must come first. From that standpoint, this legislation is justified. We have to recognise that our national income has been reduced, and we must realise that the way in which the national income is distributed is by means of salaries and wages. So if the income is reduced, it follows that every individual part of the distribution of the national income must bear its fair share. There is no doubt that out in the commercial world many men already have had to take a reduction in their salaries. Many of the big houses have found it necessary to call upon their staffs to accept reductions, and the staffs have done so because they realised that it was inevitable. At the same time there is a great deal in what Mr. Williams said about the reduction in the purchasing power in consequence of cutting wages, but I think the hon. member puts an undue value on that effect of the reduction. What really happens is that there is a change in the direction of the spending. When a man is faced with a reduction of salary he reconsiders the items of his expenditure and cuts out those which are least necessary. There is another effect which arises as the result of a reduction in wages and salaries generally, which is that the money is saved to provide future employment. That is an aspect of the question which has not yet been thoroughly gone into. We have to realise that through the employment of capital the necessities of life to-day have been saved for us. We are living on last year's wheat. That wheat had to be grown and had to be harvested and kept and milled until it was available for use. It is this aspect of the use of capital in the carrying out of those services which is not fully stressed, and it is the want of capital which has to do with the slowing down of production and the consequent privation of the general community. So from that point of view compulsory saving by way of reduction in salary has something to commend it. I agree with Mr. Williams also that it will be necessary to increase taxation in one way or another if we are going to do our duty by those men who are out of employment. After all, we have a very serious responsibility there. We have to recognise that many of those men who have been employed directly or indirectly by the spending of loan money have been

thrown out of work because loan money is no longer available. The only thing we can do is to ask those in more fortunate circumstances, those in receipt of regular salaries, to make a contribution to help their unfortunate fellows who are out of a job. I am prepared to support to the best of my ability any steps taken by the Government to meet that obligation to the men out of work. If we can find money to provide those men with work—not at Blackboy, for that I regard as being only a temporary expedient—but in developing the resources of the country, we should be prepared to make up the loss of loan money as far as we can out of our individual incomes. From that standpoint I am prepared to support all Government legislation in that direction. I will support the Bill before us because, as I say, we should have set an example some time ago, and shown that we were prepared to make our sacrifice on behalf of the good name of the State.

HON. F. W. ALLSOP (North-East) [5.55]: I will support the second reading, for we must all make sacrifices during this crisis. I agree with a lot Mr. Williams has said, particularly in regard to country members. I can assure metropolitan members, that country members, if they had city seats, would be £200 better off. The city member can remain in his office until 4 o'clock in the afternoon, whereas country members are here all the week, and practically the whole of their week-end is spent in getting up to their constituencies and back again to the city. If we have our wives in Kalgoorlie or in other outlying provinces, we have to maintain two homes, one in Perth and one in Kalgoorlie, and in many other ways we have to make sacrifices. I will not support Sir Edward Wittenoom's projected amendment. I am prepared to do my best, as Mr. Seddon said he would do, to pay a contribution from my earnings towards the assistance of the unemployed. We cannot allow men and women to go hungry, and those fortunate enough to have a little more money than others should not only bear this reduction, but do their best to help those less successful than they are themselves. When I stood for Kalgoorlie, I stood with my eyes open. I knew something of the expense it would cost me. Many successful business men in Kalgoorlie and

other districts far removed from Perth make a considerable financial sacrifice when they stand for Parliament. For five years I was continuously mayor of Kalgoorlie, and during that period I was several times approached with the request that I should stand for Parliament. But I was then paying out £700 per annum to keep my boys at the University and my daughter at college, and rather than let them down I made the sacrifice of battling along at Kalgoorlie that I might give my youngsters the best education. Many of our successful business men cannot afford to make the sacrifice involved in standing as members of Parliament. I do not think the pay we are getting is at all too great, but while we are passing through this financial crisis I will gladly sacrifice the £60, and indeed any other amount in proportion to my income which may be necessary to help those requiring assistance.

HON. J. M. MACFARLANE (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.58]: I will support the second reading because I desire, that the Government shall be given every opportunity to square their ledger. But we hear so much about sacrifice that I am just wondering what sacrifice members are making by foregoing £60 per annum, when we consider that the producing community of the country have already made sacrifices which will more than compensate members for the loss of 10 per cent. of their salary. I have toured around the country a good deal during the past few weeks and have had it borne in upon me what the general community are already suffering, and how slow we have been to respond to the spirit of sacrifice. We should show the people that we are in sympathy with them and prepared to carry our burden, if burden it can be called. Last week the farmers of Pingelly were told by people seeking to purchase produce that they could not pay more than 1½d. or 2d. per lb. for lamb's wool and 7d. per lb. for fleece.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: What has that to do with members' salaries?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: If the hon. member has patience, he will hear all that I have in mind. Wool growers have had to make a sacrifice. We know what wool was worth a little time ago. The wheat grower has had to make a sacrifice. He

will have to submit to a reduction equivalent to what we are asked to surrender. Eggs that brought 1s. 6d. a dozen at this time last year are now bringing only 5½d. to 6d. per dozen wholesale. At the Harvey show yesterday, I was told by some potato growers that they had wonderful crops, some as heavy at ten tons to the acre, but that it would probably be cheaper to let the potatoes remain in the ground than to dig them out. At the Midland Junction sales yesterday, good wethers in the wool were 11s. 3d. apiece. Surely to goodness, in agreeing to a reduction of 10 per cent., we are only falling into line with the primary producers!

Hon. G. W. Miles: We are not even doing that.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: At any rate, it is an acknowledgment that the cost of living has been reduced equal to the percentage we are asked to forego. I was in the House when Parliamentary allowances were increased by £200 a year. The reason given for increasing them was the high cost of living. By the same token we should now reduce our allowances. I admit that members like Mr. Williams, who have to live on their Parliamentary allowances and who have to yield up portion to meet the demands of constituents who indulge in leg-pulling, are at a disadvantage.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Leg-pulling by whom, their lady constituents?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: As we granted ourselves increased allowances on the score of the higher cost of living, we should submit to a reduction now that the cost of living is declining. I support the second reading.

On motion by Hon. W. H. Kitson, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 6.3 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 23rd October, 1930.

	PAGE
Assent to Bills	1306
Questions: Mining, prospectors' sustenance	1271
State Ferry Service	1271
Bills: Salaries Tax, 2a.	1272
Main Roads, returned	1206
Annual Estimates: Votes and Items discussed	1279
Police	1279
Forests	1306

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

QUESTION—MINING, PROSPECTORS' SUSTENANCE.

Hon. M. F. TROY asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Is he aware that a large number of prospectors have applied to the Mines Department for sustenance to carry on prospecting operations, and that the Central Mining Board are unable to deal with the applications owing to lack of funds? 2, When will the necessary funds be provided?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, Yes. 2, I hope to make a definite announcement in a few days.

QUESTION—STATE FERRY SERVICE.

Mr. WELLS asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Have the Government imported the engines for use in a new South Perth ferry boat, and what was their landed cost? 2, Have tenders been called for the construction of a new ferry boat? 3, If not, when do the Government intend to call tenders for its construction? 4, What amount has been paid by the Government during the last 12 months for the hire of boats in the maintenance of the Mends Street-Barrack Street service?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Yes. Approximate cost £4,800. 2, No. 3, Owing to heavy cost of construction it is not proposed to call tenders for the time being. 4, £267 15s. for the year ended 30th June, 1930.