

control is there; I am interested only in the proposed markets in Western Australia. I hope that the building here will be convenient not only for the producers but for the consumers. It is not necessary that the markets should be built adjoining a railway or close to a siding. In these days of motor transport the markets can be built in any convenient locality. When the members of the trust are selected I hope they will prove to be men of experience. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading and hope that the Government will stick to their guns and insist on control by a trust.

On motion by Hon. V. Hamersley, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [9.22]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, the 23rd November.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 9.22 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 17th November, 1926.

	PAGE
Auditor General's Report	2263
Question: Railway project, Kondinin eastward ...	2263
Annual Estimates, Report	2263
Bills: Legitimation Act Amendment, 2a., Com. Report	2264
Legal Practitioners Act Amendment, 2a., Com.	2264
Adoption of Children Act Amendment, 2a.	2263
Public Education Acts Amendment, 2a., Com....	2263
State Trading Concerns, Annual Estimates ...	2269
Adjournment, special	2300

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

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received from the Auditor General, in pursuance of Section 53 of the Audit Act of 1904, the 36th

report for the financial year ended the 30th June, 1926, which I now lay on the Table of the House.

QUESTION—RAILWAY PROJECT, KONDININ EASTWARD.

Mr. BROWN asked the Premier: 1, Is the Railway Advisory Board's report on the Kondinin Eastward project available? 2, If so, will he lay it on the Table?

The **PREMIER** replied: 1, Not yet. 2, Yes.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1926-27.

Report of Committee of Supply.

THE PREMIER (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder): I move—

That the report of the Committee of Supply be adopted.

HON. G. TAYLOR: It is unfortunate that we should be adopting the report of Committee of Supply, which clears the way for the passage of the whole of the Estimates, immediately after receiving the Auditor General's report. It is a pity that we had not the report before passing the whole of the Estimates.

The Premier: I should like to make it clear that I have no responsibility whatever in regard to the Auditor General's report.

HON. G. TAYLOR: That is quite right. The matter has nothing to do with the Government.

The Premier: The Auditor General is responsible to Parliament, and I have no knowledge as to why his report has been delayed.

Question put and passed.

In Committee of Ways and Means.

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

The **PREMIER:** I move—

That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, a sum not exceeding £5,967,519 be granted from the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Western Australia, and a sum not exceeding £109,878 from the Sale of Government Property Trust Account.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported.

BILL—LEGITIMATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Debate resumed from the 3rd November.

MR. LATHAM (York) [4.38]: I do not propose to object to the passage of the measure, which seems to be a necessary piece of legislation. The member for Coolgardie (Mr. Lambert) in moving the second reading pointed out that the Bill is intended to remedy a defect in the Legitimation Act of 1909. At present a child born out of wedlock may be legitimised by a declaration of the father; but if the father happens to die, or if he neglects to make the declaration, even though in his lifetime he may have admitted parentage, the child is still prevented from becoming a beneficiary in the event of the father not leaving a will. It seems only fair to give power to the mother to satisfy a court as to the child's parentage, as she would have to do if the child were admitted by the father to have been his child. The provision that the mother must satisfy the court as to the father having acknowledged the child to be his affords sufficient protection to any remaining children. I see no reason why the Bill should not pass. It is necessary in order to protect children born out of wedlock.

HON. G. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret) [4.40]: I have not read the Bill carefully, but the last clause says that if the father has not recognised the child, the mother can obtain recognition for it if she satisfies the court. That is not quite what the previous speaker stated. I thought the measure was very simple, and therefore did not study it. I have no desire to oppose the Bill, but I should like to know whether, in the event of a man not having recognised a child, the mother can bring that about after his death.

The Minister for Justice: No. It has to be proved to the satisfaction of the court.

In Committee, etc.

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

BILL—LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

MR. DAVY (West Perth) [4.45] in moving the second reading said: I am extremely pleased to have the privilege of

moving the motion. In the first place, because in a way it is the fulfilment of a promise I made to the House, and in the second place because I think it is a step towards the realisation of what, to my mind, is the true ideal of a democratic community, namely, that as far as possible every citizen should have the opportunity to find that place in the community for which his brains and character fit him, irrespective of the wealth or poverty of his parents. It will be remembered that, during the session before last, the member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes) introduced a Bill to amend the Legal Practitioners Act. I strongly disapproved of that Bill, and was pleased when it was defeated. It passed this House on the casting vote of the Speaker, given in accordance with custom, but was rejected in another place. My hostility to that Bill was based on the fact that, although it did purport in a certain measure to make the profession of legal practitioners easier to enter, at the same time it very seriously affected those safeguards that the laws of every country provide for the onerous duties the legal practitioner has, and so opened the door to the great power for harm he may have if people are carelessly admitted to the profession. But undoubtedly there was in the important remarks of the member for East Perth what I am not prepared to admit was more than a grain of truth: He did point out that it was difficult if not impossible for a boy poor to get into the profession. My answer to that was that the proper way to achieve the object contained in that grain of truth was to establish a Chair of Law at our University. I do not think any university can be termed a complete university, or one that is fulfilling its complete function in the life of the community, unless it has a school of law; not so much a school of lawyers, as a school of law. After all, we in this House are engaged in passing laws. The community has to live under those laws. Unless we have in the community a large number of persons trained in the knowledge of laws that are and laws that have been, and trained in the knowledge of the basis and origin of those laws, we cannot expect the community to have that respect for and thorough understanding of the laws that are so essential to the welfare of any society of mankind. I therefore am pleased to be able to bring down this Bill, which is termed "An Act to amend the Legal Practitioners Act," but

which in effect is a Bill to assist the establishment of a chair of law at the University of Western Australia. After that Bill brought in by the member for East Perth was defeated, I arranged a meeting of members of the profession. The whole of its members were circularised, consisting of approximately 139, spread all over the State, but the bulk of them in Perth. We had a large attendance, and a number of apologies expressing sympathy with our object were received. Unanimously the meeting carried the following resolution:—

That this meeting is in favour of the establishment of a chair of law at the University. It is also in favour of making a contribution towards the expense of the establishment and maintenance thereof, and is in favour of the Barristers' Board being given power by legislation to raise funds from the profession for this purpose. That a sub-committee be appointed of five members to take steps to obtain the objects approved of, with power to act.

Mr. Villeneuve Smith, K.C., Mr. Walter Dwyer, now President of the Arbitration Court, Mr. J. P. Dwyer, Mr. MacDonald and I were appointed the sub-committee. We went into the matter and came to certain conclusions that are now embodied in the Bill. After we had come to those conclusions, I introduced a deputation of that sub-committee to the Minister for Justice, and received from him a sympathetic hearing. But at that time the Treasurer did not feel himself to be in a position to commit the Treasury to the Government's share of the expense of establishing this chair of law, and so the matter had to drop. This year I again approached the Premier, when he lent a sympathetic ear. Whilst explaining that no arrangements had been made for amending the special Act dealing with the University, nevertheless he gave what I feel, in a man in his responsible position, ought to be equivalent to a promise, namely a half-promise.

Hon. G. Taylor: Like a half-truth, a half-promise is a very dangerous thing.

Mr. DAVY: I do not agree with that. A half-truth is always the same, whoever utters it, but a half-promise depends on the utterer. The half-promise of some people is very much better than the full promise of others, and in this instance I think the Premier's half-promise equal to a bond signed, sealed and delivered by another man.

The Premier: Go straight ahead.

Mr. DAVY: The cost of establishing the chair of law will be, in the first year, from

£1,300 to £1,400. After the first year it will be slightly less. Members of the profession have agreed to allow themselves to be taxed to the tune of £500 per annum, which I think is a fair share for them to pay. I may point out that the members of the profession who will do this paying can gain no personal benefit whatever from the project.

Mr. Corboy: Except increased competition.

Mr. DAVY: Precisely. But it cannot be suggested that any personal benefit will accrue individually. So I can claim on behalf of the profession that in this instance—perhaps such instances are but infrequent—they are acting from altruistic motives. In the minds of the public the legal profession is not a very popular one. I understand that when revolutions take place, the first people to be strung up to the nearest lamp post are the lawyers. Sometimes they are followed by the politicians. The doctors, as a rule, seem to escape.

The Minister for Railways: You will not have much chance to escape.

Mr. DAVY: I realise that. That is why I am strongly against revolution. As I say, the cost of establishing the chair of law will be £1,300 or £1,400 in the first year. So if the profession find £500, it will leave the Government to provide the very small sum of £800 or £900 to confer what will undoubtedly be a great benefit on the whole of the community.

Hon. G. Taylor: Will more lawyers be of benefit to the country?

Mr. DAVY: No, but better-trained ones will be.

Mr. Stubbs: How many students will be able to avail themselves of the privilege?

Mr. DAVY: Once the chair is established, all the students that come along will have to be taken. There is no provision, subject to lack of building accommodation, whereby the University may refuse students. It may be thought by some who do not understand the position that, seeing the munificent bequest that came along the other day, the University authorities ought to be able to do this themselves. It is true that a very large sum of money has come by way of endowment to the University. We are extremely grateful for it. I do not suppose that such a small community as that of Western Australia has ever before received such a munificent endowment. But it is

all earmarked, and indeed will serve to embarrass the University authorities in financing the ordinary University cost. Not one penny of it is available for the payment of the salary of a professor of law or any other professor, but a very large portion of it is earmarked for the payment of scholarships to enable boys to live during the time they are engaged on a University course. The University authorities are at present engaged in apportioning these scholarships, and if we do not get our chair of law established almost immediately, the law faculty will not get a scholarship. That is an added reason for urgency in this matter. I should like to explain the Bill. No man may carry out work which is deemed to be work for a lawyer unless he be a practitioner duly admitted—that is the present law—or unless he is doing it for nothing, as the agent for a friend. I do not propose to enter into the merits or demerits of that law. It is most necessary that the public should be protected by our seeing to it that only properly trained persons carry out these duties. What is proposed is that, instead of merely forbidding anybody except a legal practitioner to do this work, we propose to forbid anybody to do the work except a certified practitioner. He will be a man who has in the year in question taken out his annual practice certificate. There is nothing novel about that, for in London and in South Australia lawyers have to take out annually practice certificates for which they have to pay each a fee. Those fees go into Consolidated Revenue.

Mr. Panton: Who issues the certificates?

Mr. DAVY: In this case it will be the Barristers' Board. In London, I think, the Incorporated Law Society issues the certificates, and probably a similar body does so in South Australia. It will not be a discretionary issue. It is merely a ticket—

Mr. Corboy: A union ticket.

Mr. DAVY: If you like to put it that way, I will not quibble.

Mr. Panton: An association ticket.

Mr. DAVY: No, there is no association of lawyers in Western Australia. There is in many other parts of the world, but not in Western Australia. Here we have legal restrictions laid down by Parliament forbidding any person who is not qualified to practise law, and the Barristers' Board is a statutory body which performs certain functions that have no relation to the preservation of the interests of the people in the pro-

fession. However, the hon. member may call it a union if he likes.

Mr. Lutey: An honourable understanding.

Mr. Panton: You never find one lawyer scabbing on another.

Mr. DAVY: If the hon. member will get himself involved in six assault cases during the next six weeks and employ a different lawyer in each case, I will guarantee that he will be charged at least four different fees by the six lawyers.

Mr. Corboy: Do you think that, after having consulted the first lawyer, he would have anything left for the other five?

Mr. DAVY: If he followed my advice, he would not deserve to have anything left. We propose that the Barristers' Board shall issue annually a practice certificate, the holding of which shall be necessary to enable a man to practise under the Act. The issue of the certificate will be merely a receipt for money received. The fee will be prescribed by the Barristers' Board, and may be not less than £5 or more than £10 per year. The revenue thus derived will go into the fund into which all the revenue of the Barristers' Board is paid and will be spent, firstly, to provide for ordinary administration and, secondly, for the payment of £500 each year to the University of Western Australia as a contribution towards establishing and maintaining a chair of law. If any balance remains it will be devoted to keeping up to date the Law Library which, incidentally, is the library of members of Parliament, just as much as it is the library of the legal practitioners. Each legal practitioner who desires to avail himself of the privilege of using the library has to pay an annual fee, which members of Parliament do not pay.

The Minister for Justice: The Government subsidise the Law Library to the extent of £700 a year.

Mr. DAVY: Yes. That is the scheme and that is all the Bill provides, with two little exceptions. It has been thought that if a man has the scientific training that he receives from a proper university course, there is no reason why he should have to serve a very long period of articles in the practice of the profession. However, it is deemed essential that before a man begins to practise as a legal practitioner, he shall have served a certain period of articles. We have to remember in this connection that there is a very marked distinction between

a barrister and a solicitor. In England legal practitioners are either barristers or solicitors. If they are barristers they do not need to have had any training at all; all they have to do is to keep terms, which they do by eating an excellent dinner on 12 or so nights in the year, and to pass their examinations. Having done that, they are admitted to practise. That does not matter at all because a barrister is employed by a solicitor, and a barrister would not be employed unless he knew his work. On the other hand, the solicitor, who deals directly with the public, has to serve a lengthy period of articles. At present a man has to serve five years' articles to become qualified. We propose that if a chair of law is established and a student obtains a degree, he need serve only two years' articles. It is proposed to give the Barristers' Board power to prescribe what part, if any, of the two years may be served by the student during the currency of his university course. I think the opinion of the committee appointed was that if one year was served during the university course and one year afterwards, it would meet the case. That would mean a four-years' course for the whole term. If a student had the brains to become a lawyer in four years, it would be one year less than under existing conditions. Personally, I wavered towards stipulating only one year, but I was, well, not howled down but unanimously opposed, and I dare say the other members of the committee were right. We dare not allow people in this State, who are both barristers and solicitors, to hang out their shingle unless they possess the proper training. That training they can obtain in two years and possibly in one year. The member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes) pointed out an anomaly in the Act. Although the barrister in England need have no training at all, but can become qualified by eating his dinners and passing his examinations, he can come to Western Australia, put in the six months' residence qualification and be turned loose on the public. I admit that is an anomaly. I can readily understand how it occurred. In the early days, when there was no training, people did not quibble whether a barrister came here or not.

Hon. G. Taylor: There was no reciprocity between the States.

Mr. DAVY: No. This Bill proposes that a barrister of the United Kingdom may come here and practise if he has two years' stand-

ing. That will bring him into line with our own boys. An amendment that I think should be made in Committee is to prevent any hardship in respect of boys who may already have embarked upon the study of law at the Inns of Court in London. It may be that there are Rhodes scholars in England who have already made their plans, and cut them pretty fine, too, knowing the amount of money available to them. If we added to them the two years' burden, they might find that, after having got through their three-years' course, they would be hung up for another two years with disastrous results. Once a student knows what is before him, there will be no difficulty. We should make an amendment exempting from the two-years' course the boys who already shall have embarked on a course of law when the measure reaches the statute-book. I commend the Bill heartily to hon. members. It shows that in this community there are people capable of doing something at their own expense from motives that are not selfish. If the good intentions of the lawyers of the community, expressed in concrete form in this Bill, are given full expression, I see no reason why other sections of the community should not do similar things. I may inform members that there is a move on behalf of the merchants in the town to finance a chair or diploma of commerce. That would be of great value to the State; it would be more or less ancillary to a chair of law. If we establish a chair of law with the revenue found partly by one body, there is a reasonable prospect of getting a diploma of commerce financed by another body. Once we start in this way and make it popular, I see no reason why every section of the community that has any organisation should not regard it as its duty to come to the aid of the University and make that institution as complete an instrument for the improvement of education as it possibly can be. I hope members will sympathise with the objects of the Bill and pass it into law. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Lutey in the Chair; Mr. Davy in charge of the Bill.

Clause; 1, 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Amendment of Section 6:

Mr. NORTH: Is it clear that if a legal practitioner went away for a year he could, on his return, obtain a practice certificate without difficulty?

Mr. DAVY: I do not think there is the slightest doubt about it. If a man chose, I think he could refrain from paying his fee for a number of years and then secure a certificate again. The details have been left to the Barristers' Board to prescribe by way of regulation, which would be laid on the Table in the ordinary way.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—Amendment of Section 14:

Mr. DAVY: I did intend to move for the addition of the words I indicated on the second reading but members are in such a good mood that I feel inclined to let the Bill go through. I have not drafted the amendment and, if members will pass the clause, I will promise to see that an amendment is moved in another place.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I would rather the member for West Perth moved the amendment here than have it inserted in another place and then sent back to us for approval.

Mr. DAVY: In accordance with the hon. member's desire, I shall draft an amendment.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I think a clerical error has crept in. The words contained in the clause should be inserted before the word "or" in Section 14 instead of at the end of the paragraph. I move an amendment—

That at the commencement of paragraph 1 the words "Before the word 'or,'" be inserted.

Mr. Davy: It is a very necessary amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. DAVY: I move an amendment—

That the following be added to paragraph 1:—"Provided that the words so added shall not apply to Western Australian residents, who at the time of the coming into operation of this Act shall have already entered themselves as students at any of the Inns of Court in England."

The Premier: What is the effect of the amendment?

Mr. DAVY: If any Western Australian resident is, at the date when the Bill becomes law, already a student at an Inn of Court in London he should not have to wait, upon his return to Western Australia, two

years before becoming a barrister. But for this amendment some hardship might be created in the case of young men who at present are at different Inns of Court.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: We should be very careful with regard to the interpretation of the words "Western Australian," and should make allowances for all possible contingencies. It would be advisable to report progress and have the matter further investigated.

Mr. Davy: I will promise to look into the matter and see that it is correctly stated.

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

Clause 6—agreed to.

Clause 7—Provision for appeal from decision of Barristers' Board:

Mr. DAVY: This clause provides for an appeal to the Full Court in Western Australia by any person who has been refused a certificate of admission. If, for instance, the board refused such a certificate in the case of a managing clerk, their decision would be final. That seems to be wrong.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—ADOPTION OF CHILDREN ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

MR. SLEEMAN (Fremantle) [5.28] in moving the second reading said: This Bill speaks for itself. It deals with the question of adopting parents having a special entry made in the register of births, giving particulars concerning the adopted child, and the surname of the adopting parent to the child. It is quite competent at present for any child, even if he is grown up, on applying for a certificate of birth, or for an extract from the register of birth, suddenly to be apprised of the fact that he is illegitimate. Any outsider who wishes to be inquisitive on the point can do the same thing, and find out exactly what the position is. I have discussed this Bill with officers of the State Children Department and the Registrar General's Department, and they have agreed that such an amendment to the Act is necessary. Members will find from the last report of the State

Children Department that there are 822 adoptions in this State. Any children, on applying for certificates of birth, may suddenly wake up to the fact that they are not the children of those who have adopted them, and whom they have always regarded as their parents. I do not intend to waste any time in placing the Bill before hon. members, because I believe all realise that the step is necessary. I would point out in addition that provision is made so that the original registry of birth cannot be open to inspection except with the approval of the Registrar General. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. S. W. Munsie, debate adjourned.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES—STATE TRADING CONCERNS.

In Committee.

Mr. Lutey in the Chair.

Division—State Brickworks, £32,844:

HON. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford) [5.32]: I have been present when the discussion on the State Trading Concerns has proceeded on previous occasions. Formerly I did not seize the opportunity that I regarded as necessary to make a few observations concerning the enterprises with which I had had some definite connection. The State trading concerns have been subjected to a great deal of continuous misrepresentation. This will continue, on the part of interested parties, so long as State trading exists. An agitation is maintained so that public opinion may be so directed as to ultimately reach a stage when the Government—

Point of Order.

Hon. G. Taylor: On a point of order I would ask for your ruling, Mr. Chairman, as to whether we are permitted to have a general discussion on the principle of State trading or whether we are confined to the division before the Chair? I raise the point as to whether there is any obligation further than to lay the Estimates for the State trading concerns on the Table.

The Chairman: We are in Committee, but we cannot amend these Estimates. As to whether there should be a discussion on each division or a general discussion—

Hon. G. Taylor: I want to know whether we are confined to this particular division, or whether we can discuss the general principle governing State trading?

The Chairman: We are not in Committee of Supply. Personally I think it would be better to deal with each division as it is called.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: I propose to exercise my right of discussion to deal with all phases of State trading. I do not, of course, propose to discuss each one of them in detail.

The Chairman: I called the division dealing with the State Brickworks, and that is before the Chair.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: We know that a vote is called and a general discussion follows. I submit that the Committee have no opportunity to discuss State trading other than on the introduction of these Estimates. We have no right to discuss balance sheets that are laid on the Table, and if members are to be deprived of their right to discuss State trading concerns generally now, we will have no opportunity to do so.

The Chairman: At any rate we are dealing with the division now before the Chair.

Hon. G. Taylor: While I admit that I could not arrive at any conclusion when I was Speaker, I desire, if possible, to ascertain if there is any obligation under the State Trading Concerns Act to do other than lay the Estimates on the Table, and, secondly, whether the Estimates can be discussed like the general Estimates. If they are to be regarded merely as balance sheets that have to be tabled, the next step, should any member desire to discuss what he considers to be an irregularity or a wrongful action in connection with the trading concerns, should be to move a special motion.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: It cannot be questioned that the Estimates for the State trading concerns are before the Committee. When the Railway Estimates were discussed last night, we were dealing with a public utility. The vote was called and a general discussion ensued. If we are to depart from that practice, an injustice will be done to members seeing that they will have no other opportunity to discuss State trading concerns.

The Chairman: These concerns are provided for by a special Act and the Committee may not amend the Estimates. In effect, the Estimates are balance sheets. It

has been the custom to discuss the different divisions as they have been called. It will be better for the hon. member to confine himself to the State Brickworks.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: That would be an undue limitation. The Estimates have been submitted and they show the receipts, expenditure, surplus or deficiency. There are items just as there are items included in the Railway Estimates.

Hon. G. Taylor: That is a different matter. The Estimates before us relate to concerns governed by a special Act of Parliament.

The Chairman: That is so. The two sets of Estimates are by no means in the same category.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: I am not dealing with special Acts of Parliament. I cannot discuss such Acts unless they come before us in the form of amending legislation. The Estimates before us are headed: "State Trading Concerns. Details of the Estimates of the Revenue and Expenditure for the year ending 30th June, 1927." If I am denied the right of a general discussion on the Estimates, an injustice will be done because, as hon. members will realise, no other opportunity will present itself for a general discussion. I do not propose to limit myself to the State Brickworks unless I am directed by the Chairman to do so. I desire to avail myself of the same opportunity that we had respecting the Estimates of Government departments and public utilities.

Mr. Latham: We are not asked to pass the payment of any money.

Hon. G. Taylor: Then it will be necessary to discuss each division as it is called on, because the various concerns are controlled by different Ministers.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: That makes no difference. The Estimates are submitted by the Government and Ministers may be in charge of different sections. It has always been the custom for the Estimates to be submitted and discussed. I propose to speak regarding State trading concerns generally.

The Chairman: These Estimates are in a different category from the general Estimates. This is a question of a balance sheet put before members for their information. They cannot amend these Estimates, and the different divisions will be dealt with as they are put from the Chair. I rule that the member for Guildford must confine himself to the division before the Chair.

Hon. G. Taylor: Standing Order 386 sets out how the discussion on the General Estimates must be conducted.

Mr. Panton: But these are not the General Estimates.

The Chairman: Nor are we in Committee of Supply.

Hon. G. Taylor: The member for Guildford desires to apply that Standing Order and, therefore, he is quite out of order.

Debate resumed.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Though I do not like your ruling, Mr. Chairman, I will accept it. Dealing with the establishment of the State brickworks, it has often been contended by the critics of State enterprise that the Government of the day responsible for the establishment of those concerns, were simply influenced by Government policy, and that the concerns were inaugurated regardless of special circumstances. It has always been suggested that such Governments desired to establish State enterprises willy-nilly, whether they were in the public interests or not. That is a totally wrong impression for anyone to gain. There was no connection between the establishment of the State brickworks and the establishment of State sawmills. The circumstances that governed the establishment of the one were not the same as influenced the Government in inaugurating the other. There has been no connection between one State trading concern and another, other than, possibly, the advancement of some public utility. That might be done by the extension of activities from the sphere of a Government utility to that of State enterprise on the ground that the establishment of a particular State enterprise might result in more economical and better administrative working, together with better results. I am prepared to admit that brickworks should not be established by the State and that it is not a function of government to make bricks unless there are special circumstances that necessitate that course being pursued, such as a combination that is operating to the detriment of the public. State enterprise is something like a revolution in the commercial world, and can be compared to the use of the strike as a weapon by industrial organisations or trade unions. A strike is justified only in very special circumstances. So, too, the establishment of a State trading concern, such as brickworks, is justified only by special cir-

circumstances. Just as a strike represents extreme action by a trade union, so the establishment of a trading concern is an extreme action by a Government in defence of public rights. The State brickworks were not established with the idea of creating a Government monopoly in the manufacture of bricks, but because of special circumstances at the time. At that particular period the Government were proposing to erect many public buildings, principally in the metropolitan area, and they found that the price of bricks to the Government was in many cases higher, certainly not lower, than the price charged to small purchasers of bricks. It was the desire of the Government to buy on a wholesale basis and to have the advantage generally obtained by purchasing in that way. However, no opportunity was given to the Government to buy in that manner. It was found that the brickworks in the metropolitan area were controlled by an association and that that association regulated the price of bricks. It was impossible for the Government to purchase on a basis that was equitable as compared to the price at which others could buy.

Mr. Thomson: Do you mean to say that the brick makers would not sell to the Government at the price they were selling to others?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: They wanted to sell to the Government, just as they would sell to a small consumer. The Government of the day intended becoming a purchaser on a very large scale, and moreover, the Government were cash purchasers. Consequently there should have been some special consideration extended, just as there is in any commercial enterprise where purchases are made on a wholesale scale.

Mr. Mann: Was it a combine?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: It was a combine of brick producers and they were operating for the purpose of exacting a maximum result from the public irrespective of quality and everything else.

Mr. MANN: And the department joined up with the combine.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Again, there was a scarcity of bricks at the time.

Hon. G. Taylor: There is a scarcity now.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The Government were not able to obtain the quantity of bricks that they desired and work was delayed to such an extent that it was considered some action should be taken. The dual position existed of an excessive price

compared with the quality of the bricks, and the fact that that price was the price charged to buyers of small quantities. The Government had trouble in getting the number of bricks they needed, and it was, therefore, decided, in view of the fact that a workers' home scheme was being initiated, that brickworks should be started. The question was not rushed into; it had grave consideration. Expert officers of the department were consulted and certain difficulties that were constantly arising were submitted to them for an expression of opinion as to how best to overcome them. The result was that in the public interest it was deemed essential to start the manufacture of bricks. There was no desire to attempt to produce all the bricks that were required by the community. Other people were manufacturing and are still manufacturing bricks. It is a strange position that private enterprise will not try to meet the public demand for this commodity.

Mr. Thomson: That is because there is so much competition from the Government.

Mr. Lindsay: The cost comes out of the pockets of the taxpayers.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The hon. member will misrepresent the position. The taxpayer has never contributed one penny towards these works; they have all along been conducted at a profit.

Mr. Lindsay: Do they pay income tax or land tax, or any kind of taxation?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: They contribute to the general revenue considerably more than do the private manufacturers of bricks.

Mr. Mann: Nonsense.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask members not to enter upon a general discussion on State trading.

Mr. Thomson: That is what we are getting.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: All I ask is that members should be fair. If they will take an ordinary commercial balance sheet and apply to it a financial investigation, then obtain the balance sheet from the State Brickworks and deal with it similarly, they will find that the State is fulfilling conditions identical with those imposed upon private manufacturers, and that the State works are showing advantageously in comparison.

Mr. Mann: Are they selling any cheaper than private enterprise?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: That is not a consideration in regard to the manufacture of bricks. The responsibility of the Government is to supply bricks to the general

public at a minimum of cost commensurate with a proper return to the Treasury for the capital invested. They have no right to operate a trading concern at a loss, but at the same time when a trading concern is established for the protection of the public, we should not impose upon the public a charge beyond what is necessary to work that concern at a profit. There has been so much misrepresentation about the matter by members and by the Press that what I desire to do at this stage, as one who was connected with the introduction of the brickworks, is to point out that the brickworks were not established with the desire merely to create a socialistic concern; the brickworks were decided upon for the purpose of protecting the public against exploitation. Since their establishment they have been a wonderful protector in that respect. They regulate what is a reasonable price to charge for bricks and because of the superior management they are producing bricks at a price with which private enterprise cannot compete. It has been said that, because of some State subsidy, the works are not attempting to fulfil the public requirements in regard to bricks. That is not true. The State has contributed nothing towards this business concern. What the State has done has been to lead the way in regard to economical manufacture. The equipment and the management alone make it impossible for private enterprise to compete.

Mr. Stubbs: If your argument is sound, why not socialise every industry from one end of the State to the other?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I am dealing with brickworks only; I will not be drawn away to deal with socialisation generally. Moreover, I do not think it necessary to go into that phase of the question. All I want members to realise is that to-day we have a trading concern that was established to fulfil a definite function and that it has done so. It has regulated the price of bricks and has materially increased the production of bricks. This cannot be disputed, that events confirmed the decision of the time, that it was essential in the public interest to bring these works into existence. I want members to appreciate the fact that State enterprises are not part of the Government policy beyond the fact that they are established as a means of protecting the public against exploitation. State enterprises are a commercial revolution.

Mr. Mann: That is why they charge the same price as the other traders.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I do not know what price is being charged; all I do know is that they are supplying a public need and that it is appreciated is shown by the fact that State bricks are always in greater demand than the supply available. Therefore, instead of the Government being influenced by members to limit this part of State trading, they should be encouraged to increase it, because the quality of the manufactured article compares more than favourably with the article produced by private enterprise. The equipment enables the bricks to be turned out at a lower price, and the general management is so economical that it has enabled the works to do a public service. Whatever members may think, and there has been a lot of reckless talk in regard to a Government subsidy and all that kind of thing, the works were established for the purpose of protecting the public and they have fulfilled the task for which they were brought into existence.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [6.0]: I am sorry the member for Guildford (Hon W. D. Johnson) has not given us some more information, since he started on this subject. I do not know that there is so very much in the feeling of harmony existing in the State Brickworks. I heard last year that there was a good deal of trouble, or at least a good deal of dissatisfaction, prevailing there. I had no intention of referring to that matter, but in view of the circumstances the statement that everything is going on smoothly and swimmingly should not be allowed to pass.

Mr. Panton: The brickworks employees have a smoke social once a month.

Mr. SAMPSON: That may help. Disputes arise in various industries, and I understand that the State Brickworks have not been altogether exempt from them. Those works have a big pull over other brickworks. It has frequently been stated here that State bricks are specified for certain jobs.

Mr. Thomson: For all Government jobs.

Mr. SAMPSON: If a double-pressed brick is required, why should not any make be accepted so long as the quality required by the Chief Architect is there? I do not know that there is any particular virtue about State bricks. I firmly believe that

the establishment of the State Brickworks has had the effect of discouraging private persons from embarking on the industry, since they could not but feel concerned as to the possibility of great extensions of the State enterprise bringing about such competition as they would not be able to stand up against. When the State Brickworks were started, it was claimed that bricks would, as a result, be made available at a considerably reduced price.

Mr. Thomson: At 35s. per thousand.

Mr. SAMPSON: I believe someone in an excess of enthusiasm said they would be produced at 25s. per thousand with the wonderful labour-saving machinery which was to be installed. The establishment of the State Brickworks seems to have had a bad effect on private enterprise. I have no hesitation in saying that I see no great virtue in establishing a State industry where a number of private persons are already engaged. Surely the function of Government is to govern, and not to enter into competition with people who are carrying on industries. If the principle of State industry is to be continued and extended, then no one engaged in any industry whatever can feel a great degree of confidence in the future. There must always be the fear that the Government will step in and compete. That state of things must prove disastrous from the standpoint of the Treasurer. One has only to examine the figures of the State trading concerns to realise that from their inception, taken by and large, they have shown deficits.

The CHAIRMAN: I will ask the hon. member to keep to the subject of the division.

Mr. SAMPSON: Speaking of State trading concerns, I suppose I can deal with the State Brickworks as an example.

Mr. Sleeman: You were in favour of State trading the other night.

Mr. SAMPSON: I do not wish to be drawn from the subject. Personally I think the less said about State trading concerns, the better. In my opinion it is a great pity that we have any State trading concerns at all. I may contemplate the manufacture of bricks by the State with some complacency, but if the Government entered into the industry with which I am concerned, I would feel as anxious as those who are now engaged in the brick-making industry or in the business of manufacturing implements. How-

ever, I do not intend to deal with that aspect further, Mr. Chairman. I repeat, there is no great virtue in having established State Brickworks or, for that matter, any other State trading concern. Another point to which reference has not yet been made is the statement, uncontradicted so far as I know, that the output of the State Brickworks passes through the hands of some other concern and is thus to a certain extent under control.

MR. THOMSON (Katanning) [6.7]: I have listened with much interest to the most eloquent defence put up by the member for Guildford (Hon. W. D. Johnson) on behalf of the State Brickworks. That hon. member would lead one to believe that the people of Western Australia had been in dire straits because of a brick combine which would not supply them with bricks. He even went so far as to say that one of the reasons why the State Brickworks were established was that the Government were large users of bricks and wanted them at a cheaper rate than that at which they were available to the average citizen desirous of putting up a home. What a wonderful argument to put up in favour of State trading! The ordinary citizen who wants to build his little cottage is to pay more than the Government!

Hon. J. Cunningham: The hon. member is not right. The private citizen does not pay any more than the State.

Mr. THOMSON: I am dealing with the remarks of the member for Guildford as to the reasons for the establishment of State Brickworks,

Mr. Mann: That is what the member for Guildford said.

Mr. THOMSON: The member for Guildford was a member of the Government that established the State Brickworks. I am positively amazed at such an argument being put forward by any supporter of State trading. On the one hand it is said that the public must be protected from a combine of private brickmakers who are out to exploit the public. But when the Government want to erect buildings, they, if you please, must be placed, as regards the supply of bricks, on a plane much more advantageous than that occupied by ordinary citizens. In season and out of season we have been told by the supporters of State trading that these concerns are established in the interests of the people. The cry is, "We are

out to protect the poor working man who wants to build a cottage; we want to see that he gets cheaper commodities." By way of comparison I propose to quote an instance of Government trading. I want to show the policy of these State trading concerns which have been brought into being to protect the public from the rapacity of private traders. I know of a State trading concern—

The CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. member's illustration deal with bricks?

Mr. THOMSON: It will deal with bricks. It is comparable. It is an example of what can happen as regards State bricks.

The CHAIRMAN: I want the hon. member to keep to the division.

Mr. THOMSON: I am dealing with State trading concerns.

The CHAIRMAN: The question before the Committee is State Brickworks, £32,844. I would like the hon. member to keep to that.

Mr. THOMSON: I hope, Sir, you will allow me the same latitude as was granted to other members.

The CHAIRMAN: I repeatedly called other members to order.

Mr. THOMSON: But the member for Guildford made his statements, and I think we should be allowed to reply to them. Throughout his speech that hon. member extolled the wonderful benefits which Western Australia has derived from the establishment of the State Brickworks. On the other hand, I wish to point out that the State Brickworks have been detrimental to Western Australia. I desire to give an illustration regarding a trading concern from which a gentleman had been at the trouble of obtaining a quotation. He received a written quotation from a Government department. Eventually he was notified that a tender he had put in was accepted, that his was the lowest tender. Fortunately for himself, before signing the contract, he placed his order with the State trading concern referred to. The State trading concern turned round and said they would not accept the order. I can verify that statement because my firm happened to be the one that received the quotation. The State trading concern absolutely repudiated their own quotation. No private firm would have done what the State trading concern did. And State trading concerns are brought into being for the purpose of protecting the interests of private citizens! I want to

be quite fair to the Honorary Minister in charge of this division. My illustration does not apply to the State Brickworks.

The CHAIRMAN: You certainly gave me to understand that it did.

Mr. THOMSON: I said it applied to a State trading concern, not that it applied to the State Brickworks. At a later stage I shall be able to supply definite information with full details.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member gave me to understand that he was going to connect his illustration with this particular division. I should like him to do so in future.

Mr. THOMSON: I was giving an illustration relating to State trading concerns which are brought into being, allegedly, to protect the interests of the public. We find them doing things which, if done by private concerns, would lead to considerable talk about "rapacious combines." I admit quite frankly that the State Brickworks are showing a profit. I do not know of any other business which is in so favourable a position as the State Brickworks. The Government are spending large sums of money in the construction of public buildings. I do not say that the principle adopted by the Government is wrong, but we do find that for the great majority of public buildings, irrespective of how far away they may be from Perth, State bricks are specified. Any private citizen enjoying the same opportunity as the State Brickworks to supply the enormous number of bricks required for the construction of buildings, could equally show a profit. I believe that if the business were thrown open to public competition, a number of new brickworks would be established here. I have discussed the matter with men actively interested in the industry, and they declare that they will not spend one penny more while there is danger of the Government stepping in and utilising the finances of the State in competition with them. The member for Guildford said that private enterprise could not possibly compete with the equipment of the Government. Of course it could not.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. THOMSON: Before tea I was dealing with the remarks made by a previous speaker, who said the establishment of the State Brickworks had been of great benefit

to the public. I have very grave doubts about that. In my opinion, instead of the establishment of those works being of benefit to the public it has resulted in private owners refusing to extend their works. To quote the statement made by the member for Guildford (Hon. W. D. Johnson), those owners do not feel themselves to be in a position to extend their works, believing that it is impossible to compete with a Government concern. The State Brickworks are peculiarly and favourably situated. The Government erect large buildings, including railway stations, all over the State.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member to keep to the question.

Mr. THOMSON: I am saying that when constructing a railway station the Government specify the use of State bricks, and will not have privately manufactured bricks, even though they be of excellent quality. Therefore the State Brickworks enjoy an assured market. If any private citizen, being in the same position, did not show a profit it would be only as a result of infernally bad management. The member for Guildford says that the machinery and facilities at the State Brickworks are right up to date. That being so, the bricks should be turned out at a lower cost than could be done at a private plant. The private manufacturer cannot borrow money as cheaply as can the Government. Moreover, he has to pay rates, and if he makes any profit he has to pay also income tax. And, these days, he has to pay land tax as well. It means that the State Brickworks are in a much happier position than is any private firm. The member for Guildford contends that splendid results have accrued from the establishment of the State Brickworks. I say it would have been better for the State if the money expended on the State Brickworks had been used to open up and develop agricultural lands. There would have been more private brickworks supplying the requirements of Perth but for the State Brickworks. Private enterprise is unable to profitably compete against the Government concern.

Hon. W. J. George: None of the private manufacturers has made much profit.

Mr. THOMSON: I am well aware of that. There was a proposal to purchase the Cardiff Brickworks and form a company, but when the promoters approached prospective shareholders the latter said, "Not

on your life; not while we have the State Brickworks to compete against." So the plant lay idle for a considerable time.

Hon. W. J. George: Also there was not then the same demand for bricks. That operated against the State Brickworks for a number of years.

Mr. THOMSON: The member for Guildford endeavoured to convey that the action of the then Government in establishing the State Brickworks had resulted in wonderful benefit to the community. He said there was at that time a combine preventing the poor working man from getting his bricks at a reasonable price, and that one of the chief reasons why the works were established was that the Government wanted a huge quantity of bricks at a price below that then obtaining.

Hon. W. J. George: I think they were misled as to the price at the start.

Mr. THOMSON: No doubt. The then Government thought that by establishing a State Brickworks they would reduce the price of bricks to about 25s. per thousand. If the establishment of the State Brickworks has resulted in any benefit at all, it has been a benefit to only the metropolitan area; for the price of the State bricks, by the time they have been transported to country towns, renders their use entirely unprofitable. As I say, the only benefit accruing from the State Brickworks has accrued to those living in the metropolitan area.

Hon. W. J. George: About half the population of the State is living in the metropolitan area.

Mr. THOMSON: But it is not the half producing the wealth of the State. All people resident in the metropolitan area are actually living on those producing wealth in the country districts.

Hon. W. J. George: They are mutually dependent, one on the other.

Mr. THOMSON: I do not know that those employed in city stores or in the State Brickworks are contributing much to the wealth of the State. The actual wealth being created—I refer now to the speech of the Minister for Lands and to the speech of the Treasurer when introducing his Budget; both alluded to the bountiful harvest.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member to get down to the question before the Chair. We do not want a discussion, either of the bountiful harvest or of the Budget.

Mr. THOMSON: I was about to use that, only by way of comparison. The establishment of the State Brickworks has not been beneficial to the State. However, I will not labour the question any more, for it is the policy of the Government to carry on those works, and so it is of no use kicking against pricks. Still I contend that the money spent in the establishment of those works—I am prepared to admit that they have supplied large quantities of first-class bricks to the public; it is the principle I am dealing with. If the State had not entered upon the manufacture of bricks, possibly some of the smaller yards that have since closed down would have continued in operation. The Government, by specifying State bricks in all their building contracts, narrowed the market for the private manufacturer. On both sides of the railway between Midland Junction and Bellevue there is a number of deserted brickworks. Some may say they were worked out, but judging by the appearance of the adjacent clay deposits it seems to me there was years of work ahead of those kilns. On one occasion I spoke to Mr. Kealy on the subject. He said, "It is simply because we cannot compete against the Government. It doesn't matter a damn to them whether they lose money or make money, they still carry on. I am in the industry to make money, and since I cannot do that I will get out of the business and leave it to the Government."

Hon. W. J. George: His works being close to Perth, he had all the advantage of cheap freights.

Mr. THOMSON: But there was also the freight to pay on his firewood coming in from a distance; and he had many other difficulties. As the member for Toodyav (Mr. Lindsay) has just pointed out, he also had to pay taxes, which the Government did not have to do.

Hon. W. J. George: If he had no income, he would not have to pay income tax.

Mr. THOMSON: That is so, but if he sustained a loss on the manufacture of bricks year after year, whatever capital he had invested in the industry would soon disappear. On the other hand, if a State trading concern incurs a loss, the taxpayers have to make it good. That is the difference between private enterprise and State enterprise. If the State brickworks did not show a profit, no other State industry could do so, because Government contractors are in the position of being compelled to use State-made bricks.

We can only discuss the position of these enterprises; we cannot do more than enter a protest. One member has given his ideas of the beneficial results that have accrued to the people from the establishment of these works. My desire has been to show members that there is another side to the picture, and that State trading concerns are not in the interests of the country.

MR. MANN (Perth) [7.47]: I would not have spoken on these estimates had it not been for the extravagant and inconsistent statements made by the member for Guildford (Hon. W. D. Johnson). That gentleman opened his address by saying that State enterprise was not part of the policy of the Government in which he was a Minister, and that it was brought into operation only in extreme cases. He went on to say that State enterprise was a revolution in the commercial world just as was a strike in the industrial world. He patted himself on the back for having been the originator of the State brickworks, which he said were established to smash a combine that was exploiting the public. The facts, however, were just the reverse. The private manufacturers were selling their bricks to the small contractors at a certain price, and the Government stepped in and demanded that they should be supplied with bricks at a reduced price. It was the Government of which the member for Guildford was a member who wanted to be the exploiters. The Government of the day wanted to exploit the manufacturers, and because the manufacturers refused to give a special price to the Government, they, according to the member for Guildford, in the interests of the people were forced to establish State brickworks. The hon. member went on to say that State enterprises were started with a view to providing a better and more economical way of conducting business. It is known that for years the Armadale brickworks were only half finished, and not until the present Minister for Works took charge were they completed. Yet the member for Guildford patted himself on the back and claimed that he brought into operation a more economical enterprise that revolutionised brick manufacture.

Mr. Davy: And there has been a shortage of bricks ever since.

Mr. MANN: The member for Guildford said the Government stepped in only when private enterprise had failed.

Mr. Latham: There have been more failures since the Government stepped in.

Mr. MANN: The Minister for Works will be able to call to mind an occasion when one of his constituents had entered into a large contract for a brick structure. He had brought experts from overseas to undertake its erection, and they were standing idly by for weeks owing to a dearth of bricks. The Minister for Works had some force behind him, but even he was unable to get bricks from the State works. He saw me and I went with him to a private manufacturer, from whom the contractor was able to get the bricks he required. I mention this to show that the member for Guildford was wrong when he said that State enterprise was brought into operation only when private enterprise had failed. The member for Guildford argued that there was a combine who were exploiting the public. If there is one man in this State who is admittedly a fair employer and a fair trader, it is the largest manufacturer of bricks, Mr. Law. There is not a member of this House who does not hold that gentleman in respect. I refuse to accept the hon. member's statement that that gentleman was a party to exploiting the public. If the Government, when they started the State brickworks, did it to break down a combine that was exploiting the public, why did they not keep their price well below that of the private manufacturers? Did they offer bricks at a lower price? No. They joined up with the private manufacturers and became co-exploiters, part of the combine, and sold at the same price and exploited the same customers in the same market. The speeches of the member for Guildford are generally logical, but to-night he was illogical and inconsistent from beginning to end.

Mr. Lindsay: There is no doubt he was a bit out of sorts to-night.

Mr. MANN: I know that we cannot interfere with these Estimates and I probably should not have spoken but for the extravagant statements of the member for Guildford. He told us that there was no connection between the establishment of brickworks and the establishment of sawmills.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not discuss State sawmills.

Mr. MANN: We have always been led to believe that brickworks and other enterprises were established by the State to police industry and see that the public ob-

tained a fair deal. Can it be suggested that the public are getting a fair deal when precisely similar prices are being charged by the Government concerns?

Hon. G. Taylor: Prices are higher than ever.

Mr. MANN: Yes, prices have gone up year by year.

Mr. Lindsay: And still there is a shortage of bricks.

Hon. W. J. George: It was impossible to prevent wages from rising.

Mr. MANN: I do not suggest that it was possible.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: You would not have the Government run their enterprises at a loss, would you?

Mr. MANN: I wish to show that the State brickworks have been of no service whatever to the people.

Mr. Thomson: Hear, hear! That is the point.

Mr. MANN: They have never supplied bricks at 1s. per thousand less than have private manufacturers. Where, then, does assistance to the people of the State come in? If it is contended that the brickworks, as a State enterprise, help to swell the Treasury figures, there may be something to say for them, but when it is contended that they were established to police the industry and protect the people, and when the Government have raised their prices and sold under conditions exactly similar to the private manufacturers, it is patent that the State brickworks have not served the purpose that the hon. member claimed for them.

Mr. Davy: The State brickworks do not pay income tax or rates and taxes.

Mr. MANN: That is my concluding point. Private enterprise has to operate under the same arbitration award as do the State brickworks. It has to pay income tax or dividend tax; it has to pay land tax and, in fact, every form of taxation applicable to the industry, while the State works pay no taxation at all. Notwithstanding the fact that the State works pay no taxation, they do not sell bricks one penny cheaper than do private manufacturers. Wherein, then, lies the benefit that the member for Guildford claimed had resulted from the establishment of State brickworks by the Government in which he was Minister for Works? The hon. member claimed that the brickworks had been inaugurated to bring about more economical production. Yet

the brickworks were left unfinished for years.

Hon. W. J. George: They required another kiln.

Mr. MANN: Yes, the other kiln did make production more economical, but the hon. member who suggested that he was the beginning and end of excellence in organisation failed to do his job. If the member for Guildford is going to defend every State trading concern on the same grounds as he has adopted to-night, the Government would be quite justified in closing down all the State trading concerns at once or disposing of them, for the simple reason that they are not serving the purpose for which they were established.

MR. STUBBS (Wagin) [7.56]: To discuss intelligently the division now before us, it would be necessary to ascertain exactly how much capital is invested in the State brickworks.

Hon. G. Taylor: I think it is £38,000.

Hon. J. Cunningham: The amount is £40,080.

Mr. STUBBS: I do not intend to discuss the merits or demerits of State trading concerns, because I daresay that if I attempted to do so, I should be called to order. However, you, Mr. Chairman, have been kind enough to allow other members a certain amount of latitude, and I hope you will be equally kind to me. I do not care twopence which Government established the State trading concerns, or which Government continued them afterwards. Both were wrong and in my humble opinion did not do the right thing in the interests of the public. Although it may be charged against me that I sat behind a Government that continued to carry on State brickworks when there was an opportunity to dispose of them, I am deadly opposed to them, and I consider that the later government were equally to blame with the Government that established them.

Mr. Teesdale: Did they have a chance to sell them?

Mr. STUBBS: They did not try to sell them.

Hon. W. J. George: Go on!

Mr. STUBBS: If they did, they could not have tried very hard. Therefore it is of no use members on this side of the House slang-whanging the Government for continuing State trading concerns, and brick-

works in particular, because they had an opportunity to try to dispose of them and did not avail themselves of it. I decline to be a hypocrite. I supported a Government that continued State trading concerns when they should have sold them.

Mr. Teesdale: You would not have had the Government sell them for a song.

Mr. STUBBS: I would not care a button what they were sold for. It was not in the best interests of the State to continue them.

Mr. Teesdale: And would not we have heard of it if we had disposed of them for thirty bob apiece?

Mr. STUBBS: The Honorary Minister has been kind enough to tell us that £40,000 is invested in these works. The interest on fixed and working capital is £1,966. If a private individual had £40,000 invested in similar works, the rate of interest would be at least 7 per cent., which would amount to £2,800 annually. He would be a very foolish man who did not write five or 10 per cent. off the £40,000 every year for wear and tear on machinery. Any member who understands business will agree with that contention. Allowing £2,800 for interest and £4,000 for depreciation we have a total of £6,800, which is a considerably larger sum than the Government propose to write off. The estimated amount to be contributed to Consolidated Revenue is £6,000, which the management expect to obtain from the sale of £40,000 worth of bricks. Working expenses and salaries run into about £30,000. No private company could carry on business on those lines. If it did it would soon be in the bankruptcy court. If, as the member for Guildford stated, the brickworks were established for one definite purpose, and they have achieved that object, the time has come to consider whether they should not now be disposed of. Sometimes the establishment of industries carried on by the State is justified, just as in a case of emergency when war broke out, but to continue carrying them on year after year will have the effect later on of causing people with money to refrain from putting it into enterprises of this kind lest the Government should enter into competition with them. These brickworks have been in existence for 10 or 12 years. We are told by the member who has championed their cause, that they were established to provide a long-felt want. Can any fair-minded member say that we have not now sufficient private enterprise and fair-minded business people in the State

to supply all the bricks necessary for Western Australia at a reasonable rate and without robbing the people? If it is logical to carry on these brickworks now it would be equally logical to socialise every industry in Western Australia.

Mr. Thomson: That is what the Government are aiming at.

Mr. STUBBS: Everyone would then be working for the Government. I must say that on more than one occasion the present Government, when they found a certain trading concern was being carried on at a loss, closed it down.

Hon. G. Taylor: That was in the case of the fish shops.

Mr. STUBBS: I rose as a humble unit in Parliamentary life of this State to say that the time is now ripe to dispose of this trading concern. I also wish to say that the Government which established these concerns and that which carried them on were equally guilty. I do not care twopence who established them. The profits alleged to have been made this year are not commensurate with the amount of capital involved in the brickworks. I ask the Government to watch carefully the cost of production, and see whether they are justified in continuing to run their State brickworks in opposition to those of private enterprise.

MR. DAVY (West Perth) [8.5]: I am sorry the member for Guildford, who started a fight or controversy, should have then left the Chamber, for I should have liked to have a shot back at him.

Mr. A. Lambrough: He is not far away.

Mr. DAVY: I am not accusing him of running away, but I wish he were here. Even those of us who have been in Parliament but a short time realise what a sort of little Benjamin is represented in these brickworks in relation to the member for Guildford. He regards them as the piece-de-resistance of his political life, and does not miss any opportunity to impress upon us what a wonderful blow he struck for democracy in Western Australia when he established them.

Mr. Teesdale: He did not tell us that last month.

Mr. DAVY: But he told us to-night. I have always found it difficult to understand how the hon. member reconciles his various attitudes one with the other. He stands for State brickworks. He told us in his first speech that I ever heard him utter in the House that it was not a function of Govern-

ment to do for the people what they could do for themselves, but to do for them what they could not do for themselves. At the same time he is a stalwart supporter of the principle of co-operation.

Hon. G. Taylor: The standard bearer.

Mr. DAVY: Yes. To my mind, and I believe to the minds of others who have given any thought to economics, that is the antithesis of socialism. We find in him these three inconsistent attitudes. It is not worth while endeavouring to enter into a lengthy argument on the merits or demerits of State trading, because it is not relevant to the issue before us at the moment, and it has also been thrashed out over and over again. We know the arguments on both sides. We have reviewed them, and weighed them according to our political colour. I wish to make a remark or two with regard to the State brickworks. I am not making any accusation, and am not in a position to relate as a fact what I will now put forward as hearsay evidence placed before me. Had there been time I would have taken steps to confirm what I propose to say now, or to obtain refutation of it. It seems to me too important an accusation against the State Brickworks Department to leave unmentioned, even though I am not in a position to state these things as facts. Quite recently a builder of my acquaintance, whom I believe to be a straight man, told me he had a number of workers' homes contracts, and that part of the conditions of those contracts was that a certain number of bricks should be bought from the State Brickworks. That was the condition of his contract.

The Minister for Works: Your friend sitting next to you introduced that principle.

Mr. DAVY: I do not care whether he did or did not. That is not the point.

Hon. W. J. George: Occasionally I do the right thing.

Mr. DAVY: Sometimes even the Minister for Works does wrong things.

The Minister for Works: Very seldom.

Hon. G. Taylor: Not in your opinion.

Mr. DAVY: This man assures me—I cannot vouch for the accuracy of the information—that a large proportion of the output of the State Brickworks is in the hands of a couple of Perth firms, who are cartage contractors, but who apparently have bought up a large quantity of the output of the brickworks. This man informs me that in order to be supplied with bricks, which he must have to complete his contract, he is

obliged to go to those people and induce them to let him have a few bricks.

Mr. Thomson: As a favour.

Mr. DAVY: Yes. A condition which, according to him, is placed upon his getting these bricks, is that he shall buy his lime from the persons in question. I am not making that as a statement of fact. I have not yet been able to verify it, but I shall do so, or have it contradicted. I trust the Minister will treat my statement as a serious one. If he finds that my informant is wrong he must not blame me for having made an unfounded charge. I am not making a charge. I told the man in question to put his statement in writing and give me some information so that I might check it. I said if he would do this I would go into the matter. This question has come up earlier than I expected, but I do not wish to lose this opportunity to bring it up. I urge investigation of the matter. In the meantime I shall insist upon my informant producing evidence to show that these are facts. That is the chief reason why I rose to speak on this subject. I cannot, however, subscribe to the views expressed by the member for Wagin, when he says that the Government which carried on State enterprises is just as much to blame as the one which started them. We cannot close down State enterprises with a stroke of the pencil. If we did that we would cause a catastrophe. Suppose the party, of which we on this side are members, came into power after March.

Hon. W. J. George: As we shall do.

Mr. DAVY: That is irrelevant to the subject. We could not, because we disbelieve in the State Implement Works, close them down suddenly and throw hundreds of men out of employment.

Mr. Stubbs: Sell them.

Mr. DAVY: The State Implement Works cannot be sold in two minutes.

Mr. Thomson: Under present conditions it would be impossible to sell them.

Mr. DAVY: The negotiations for sale must be conducted, as the law stands now, in full public view. No binding contract for sale can be made without the consent of Parliament.

Mr. Thomson: Of both Houses.

Mr. DAVY: It is necessary to make a sort of tentative agreement for sale, which would not bind either party. This is then submitted to Parliament and everyone begins to talk about it. All the facts and figures are discussed.

Hon. G. Taylor: And the Government vilified.

Mr. DAVY: Everything is mixed up. When the subject has been discussed in this House it is taken to another place, and it is torn to pieces from other points of view. What chance would the Government have, with the law as it is, of disposing of State trading concerns? It would be extremely difficult to get rid of them. I cannot subscribe to the views expressed by the member for Wagin when he says that the continuer is as bad as the initiator. It is somewhat like the drug habit. Once a person acquires it, it is difficult for him to break himself of it. It is also like protection. We cannot wipe that out at once because the result would be too disastrous. The hon. member is unconsciously a little unfair, and a little erroneous in the statement he has made, that those who continue these things are as bad as those who initiate them. Although I am strongly opposed to this particular trading concern I do urge upon the Minister to look into the rumours to which I have referred.

MR. NORTH (Claremont) [8.14]: During the last two sessions I listened closely to Ministers dealing with various State enterprises and public utilities. I have noticed over and over again that there is a demand for an extension of some of the earlier enterprises, which are already starved for funds because the State as a whole is overloaded with debt. That must apply to the brickworks. So long as we have our eggs in so many baskets, we have set up the position of the Railway Department asking for four railways which they cannot have, although Ministers have told us repeatedly that they would willingly approve of the expenditure of many hundreds of thousands of pounds in other directions, provided these enterprises were not in existence. I think that is a reasonable argument to add to those already advanced. The State should limit its interest in these concerns to reasonable bounds, even if it meant that they retained one or two and made successes of them. I have heard references to the possibility of spending five or six million pounds in connection with some activities that would show a return of 10 per cent., and those remarks have been made concerning our railways and other activities. I trust the Government will look into this question and that the division under discussion will be

expunged from the Estimates, by means of an efficient sale.

MR. LINDSAY (Toodyay) [8.17]: I visited the State brickworks in company with the Minister on the occasion of the opening of the new kiln. I agree with the Minister's action in installing the additional kiln. The machinery could not turn out bricks to capacity because there was not kiln room for burning purposes. The Minister referred to the capital cost of the works, which he gave as £40,080. I notice that the interest on the working capital is given as £1,966. What interest is charged? If 5 per cent. is charged, which is less than the rate at which we can get money to-day, the amount for interest would be £2,000. It is evident, therefore, that the interest charge is less than 5 per cent.

The Premier: It would be based on the rate of interest at which the money was borrowed for the purpose of that expenditure.

Mr. Thomson: At which rate no private individual could borrow money?

Mr. LINDSAY: Sinking fund charges are represented by £106. In the operations of the State brickworks machinery is used, and there is a constant digging away of the bill for the purpose of securing clay and the getting rid of the material used for the bricks. In the circumstances, such a small provision for sinking fund struck me as peculiar, in view of the amount of capital involved.

Hon. W. J. George: There is a depreciation reserve of £14,000.

Mr. LINDSAY: That is not shown here.

Hon. W. J. George: It is shown in the Public Works Department's report.

Mr. LINDSAY: In view of the other charges that are indicated, it seems to me that if one were to run private brickworks, it would be necessary to provide for greater charges than the Government have disclosed in these details.

The Premier: Full depreciation is provided for in the balance sheet.

Mr. LINDSAY: But that is not disclosed here.

Hon. W. J. George: You will find those particulars in the departmental report.

Mr. LINDSAY: I was not aware of that. I thought from what I could see, more provision should have been made to pay back

the capital cost of the machinery, and of the clay that has been removed.

HON. J. CUNNINGHAM (Honorary Minister—Kalgoorlie) [8.20]: I do not intend to enter into a discussion as to whether a previous Government were right or wrong in establishing State brickworks, but to deal with the period under review. During the past financial year a new kiln has been added to the works. As the result of that provision, the output has been considerably increased. The new kiln was provided merely to meet the growing demands of the public. It was found that with the former plant, we could not fully employ the machinery. A large percentage of the original capital cost of the State brickworks was allowed to lie idle; hence the determination of the Government to get the utmost output with the capital expended on the brickworks. Despite the references to the operations this evening, during the past 12 months, and prior to that year, the works proved useful in the interests of the metropolitan area. A large percentage of the output from the brickworks has been used in connection with the erection of public buildings outside the metropolitan area. The name gained by the works is such that sales are made in different parts of the State because we produce high-class pressed bricks only.

Mr. Latham: As a matter of fact, you cannot cope with all the orders.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: We do not enter into competition with local firms regarding wire-cut bricks. At present our output is booked up for four months ahead.

Mr. Sampson: What is the significance of not entering into competition regarding wire-cuts?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: Daily I am in receipt of communications from both large and small contractors urging me to use my influence with the business manager of the brickworks to make available supplies necessary to carry on their undertakings. The primary object of the establishment of the works was to supply the Public Works Department with bricks for building construction purposes.

Mr. Davy: The member for Guildford did not say that.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: In addition to that, any surplus is made available to the public. We have no trouble in getting

orders, but our trouble is to cope with those we receive.

Hon. G. Taylor: There is a scarcity of bricks in the metropolitan area.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: Yes. The member for Swan asked why we did not enter into competition with firms producing wire-cut bricks.

Mr. Sampson: You forced a number of those previously engaged in that industry to cease operations, because they feared the Government would enter into competition.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: I know of no Hoffman mill in the State similar to that operating at the State mill. One kiln closed down for repairs and renovation, because the machinery had become worn out. I understand the kiln has re-started or is about to do so. It turns out pressed bricks. At present we have not the capacity to enable us to supply the demands of our clients.

Mr. Mann: You know that a new company will start shortly.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: There is room for a new company. The Government are not jealous, because we are confident we can hold our trade.

Hon. G. Taylor: You will bring them into the amalgamation.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: We can retain the clients who deal with us.

Mr. Davy: And many of your clients have to be clients by the compulsion of law.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: Not necessarily so. Regarding the statement by the member for Murray-Wellington that a large percentage of bricks were needed by the Public Works Department for the construction of buildings, the proviso he referred to was inserted in the contracts because it was necessary to have a first-class article, and the best bricks obtainable in the State are those turned out by the State brickworks.

The Minister for Works: That is quite right, too!

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: That is the simple explanation for the inclusion of that proviso in the contracts.

Mr. Davy: And as a result, the building of the homes of the people is held up.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: I do not dispute it. I have already stated that we are booked up with orders four months ahead.

The Minister for Works: Private enterprise cannot supply the demand.

Mr. Davy: Naturally, because private enterprise is being pushed out.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: Before the present Government took over the works, 150,000 bricks per week were being turned out; now the weekly output is over 306,000.

Mr. Mann: That was due to the additional plant.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: It was due to working the plant to its fullest capacity.

Mr. Stubbs: Do you suggest that if the State brickworks closed down to-morrow, the price of bricks would go up and the people would be exploited?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: There is no possibility of the State works closing down.

Mr. Teesdale: What about a better price for better bricks?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: The public require bricks and must have them.

Mr. Davy: Just as the opium fiend requires opium!

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: The member for Perth made a statement that the State brickworks had become fused in a combine for the production of bricks within the metropolitan area. Had I followed the advice of the member for Perth, that would have been the position. That hon. member introduced to me a gentleman who put a proposition forward, and if I had agreed to it, what the member for Perth says would have been true.

Hon. G. Taylor: Now we are getting the facts.

Mr. Mann: He offered to take over the works?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: The member for Perth introduced a deputation to me, consisting of one man. He was an interested party in connection with the production of bricks. I understand he was the secretary of the Producers' Association. He said, "When you erect the new kiln, will you give us a guarantee that the Government will not reduce the price of bricks?" Of course he could not get that guarantee. Yet the member for Perth, knowing these facts, is prepared to charge the State brickworks with linking up with the combine and increasing prices! When were prices increased?

Mr. Mann: You are not putting the case quite fairly. You are telling only half the story.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: I am not. The member for Perth made a definite statement.

Mr. Davy: Half the story is better than the whole!

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: I am telling the whole story and the member for Perth knows that is so. That hon. member said we had linked up with the combine and increased prices. As a matter of fact, prices have not been increased during the time the present Government have been in office.

Mr. Thomson: Have the prices been increased by others in the industry?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: The member for Perth is entirely wrong. He has not acted up to his ordinary standard and indulged in a little research work to make sure of the facts. He has misrepresented the position altogether, and no one knows it better than he. The gentleman I referred to asked for the guarantee that prices would not be reduced. I can show the member for Perth a report taken by a shorthand writer who was present at the time. If he desires to see it he may do so. The member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson) dealt with this position in a general way. It is not my intention to follow his example by entering into a discussion on the general phase of the question. The member for West Perth (Mr. Davy) referred to statements that had been circulated or made to him and he said that there were one or two persons who controlled the output from the brickworks. That statement is entirely wrong. There are people whom the Government appoint to act as agents.

Mr. Davy: What are their names?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: Their names are Bradley and Jenkinson, of the State brickworks, and we have representatives in other centres.

Mr. Davy: Do not those people sell lime?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: I am not interested in what they sell. They can sell hair or horses if they like.

Mr. Davy: Suppose they make it a condition that the people buying bricks must also buy their lime?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: The provision laid down is that in the event of their reselling any of the State bricks that they shall not charge more than the price those bricks command at the works.

Mr. Davy: Would the selling of lime be an infringement of that?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: I am not interested in what business those people carry on. They can carry on any business they like provided they act honourably as

agents in the interests of the State Brick Works.

Mr. Davy: If what I have said is true would they be acting honourably?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: I do not know what the hon. member has said. He promised to go into certain phases of the question and advise me later. I can tell the hon. member that I have already looked into accusations similar to those made here and have found that they were without foundation. I do not know that it is necessary for me to go any further. I quite anticipate that when a debate such as this takes place an attack will be made, not only on the brickworks but on the principle of State trading generally.

Mr. Thomson: You were not disappointed.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: I was not, but I expected the vote to go through without discussion. Not one hon. member would agree to close the brickworks to-day. It is a known fact that previous Governments did not make a single effort to dispose of that branch of State trading.

Mr. Thomson: They knew that they could not; it was impossible.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: Everything was impossible, according to the hon. member.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is wandering away from the subject.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: It seems to me that members speak in this House with their tongues in their cheeks.

Mr. Thomson: Not on this side of the House.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is still getting away from the subject.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: The State brickworks during last year showed a profit of £4,805. The total accumulated profits since the inception of the works amount to £13,754. In addition to the payment of interest to the Treasury, £3,281 was paid to the credit of Consolidated Revenue, this being an appropriation of profits which makes the total paid to the Treasury towards general revenue to the 30th June, 1926, of £9,148.

Hon. G. Taylor: On a £40,000 capital expenditure.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: The capital cost of the works up to the present is £40,800, but I want the hon. member to remember that the cost of the additional

kiln was approximately £10,000. That was built a year or so ago. The total depreciation since 1914 amounts to £13,835. Of the profits £6,500 has been invested at the Treasury and with the interest on that investment there has now accumulated a fund of £7,442. In addition to the depreciation fund £774 has been provided as a sinking fund for the redemption of the loan. The output of bricks during last year was 11,301,708. It can thus be realised that the works are run in the interests of the State and the public. The works are rendering good service to the State and harmonious relations exist amongst all who are engaged there. Operations are being carried on without any friction. The feeling that exists there from the manager to the lads is one of giving the best possible service to the State. The only difficulty is that the works cannot cope with the demand made upon them. Notwithstanding what may be said to the contrary, there is ample opportunity for private enterprise to enter the field of brick production within the metropolitan area.

Mr. Davy: Then why don't they?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: The reason is that until recently the finances not only of Western Australia but of the world were so dislocated that business men were not in a position to put large sums of money into trading concerns such as brickworks.

Mr. Davy: Why into bricks and not into boots?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: Where has there been any additional large sums of money put into new boot works?

Mr. Davy: If I want to buy a pair of boots I get killed in the rush by the people who want to sell them to me.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: We also know that a representative of those people, who are desirous and are about to launch out in the manufacture of additional bricks, and a representative touring the old country and America with a view to his becoming familiar with the latest machinery for the production of bricks. We know what happened only a few years ago. The building trade fell off altogether in the metropolitan area and the State brickworks could not get rid of their production. One of the largest customers of the State brickworks to-day is a man who stuck to those works right through those bad days when it was difficult to dispose of the output of the State

brickworks. I commend the vote to the Committee.

[*Mr. Lambert took the Chair.*]

Mr. MANN rose to speak.

The Premier: You cannot speak again; you have already spoken.

Mr. MANN: The Minister did not submit the estimates. He merely replied.

The Premier: That does not matter. He has replied to the debate. You cannot speak twice on the division.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand the hon. member has already spoken.

Mr. MANN: The Minister said that I took a deputation to him—

The Premier: You cannot get around it in that way. You can only speak to an item.

Mr. MANN: I merely wish to say—

The CHAIRMAN: Do I understand that the hon. member is speaking to item No. 1, the Manager?

Mr. MANN: By way of personal explanation will you allow me to speak?

The CHAIRMAN: I am at a disadvantage as I have only just taken the chair, but I will listen to what the hon. member has to say.

Mr. MANN: Speaking a little earlier in the evening I said that the State brickworks were part of the combine.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not think the hon. member will be in order in discussing generally the brickworks. He must speak to an item.

Mr. MANN: The Minister said I took a deputation to him.

Hon. J. Cunningham: I said that had I followed the advice put up by the deputation that you presented—

Mr. MANN: We expect that at least the Minister when speaking will not endeavour to take advantage of his position by telling only half the story. We expect the Minister to be honourable and to tell the whole story.

Hon. J. Cunningham: If the hon. member is going to persist will I be permitted to reply to his remarks?

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Perth will appreciate the fact that he has already spoken and I must ask him not to continue.

Mr. MANN: My desire is merely to make a personal explanation.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Perth will appreciate the fact that if I allow him to make an explanation the Minister will also desire to make a further explanation, and so it will go on. I ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to item No. 1, the Manager.

Mr. THOMSON: Why is the manager's salary £704 for 1925-26 and £550 for the current financial year? His responsibilities have been increased by the installation of a kiln costing £10,000.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: The manager who was in control for a number of years has retired, and a new manager has been appointed. The new manager, for his first term of 12 months, receives a salary of £550. At the end of the year the salary will come up for review.

Hon. G. Taylor: Did the former manager receive £550 for his first year?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: Yes, or else £500.

Mr. Davy: Is this position under the Public Service Commissioner?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: No.

Mr. Davy: The salary seems very small.

Item, Salaries, Wages, and General Working Expenses, including repairs, etc., £30,000:

Mr. THOMSON: The Minister mentioned the names of various agents appointed to sell the bricks. What commission is being paid to those agents?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: I do not mind allowing the hon. member to know the commission paid, but we should have some regard for the business of the State brickworks, for the channels through which they operate, and for all the ramifications of the undertaking. It is not usual to proclaim publicly such details as rates of commission. I am prepared to let the hon. member have the information, but I consider his question unfair.

Mr. Teesdale: It is not usual to state publicly the result of a private deputation.

Mr. THOMSON: We are dealing with a matter of public expenditure involving £32,844. The Committee are entitled to know how the money is to be expended.

The Premier: That is not the question you asked. There has been no refusal to give information about the £32,000; that is a different matter.

Mr. THOMSON: If commission is being paid for sale of bricks, is it not included in the amount of £32,000?

The Premier: No.

Mr. THOMSON: It is usual to give such information. Surely we have nothing to hide. If the Government have appointed agents, we are entitled to know what commission is being paid to them.

Hon. G. Taylor: I do not think private firms give such information.

Mr. THOMSON: This is not a private firm.

Hon. G. Taylor: It is on the same lines.

Mr. THOMSON: We are dealing with public money. This is the first time since I have been a member of the Chamber that information has been refused me. Certainly I have no ulterior motive. The Minister's statement that agents had been appointed prompted me to note down a question as to the amount of commission paid. The Government publish the name of every officer employed in the Public Service, together with the salary paid him; and many civil servants object strongly to the publication of that information.

Mr. SAMPSON: The fullest information should be given to the Committee. How many times have gibes been uttered here as to private business arrangements and honourable understandings by means of which the public are exploited! If the information desired is not given, an impression may be created that a considerable sum is paid away in commissions. Therefore the utmost publicity is desirable in the interests of all concerned. At a meeting of shareholders the cards are laid on the table, and that should be done in this instance. We are all shareholders in the State brickworks, many of us against our will.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: All we can demand from the Minister is an assurance that he is selling the bricks on the same commercial lines as are adopted by other people. I do not know that private firms herald forth all the details of their business.

Mr. Davy: But companies tell all their shareholders, and all of us are shareholders.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: They tell their shareholders, but the chairman of directors gives to the Press merely what he thinks sufficient. Members of the Press are not permitted to attend shareholders' meetings, nor are "Hansard" reporters. If we are going to probe into the brickworks as is proposed, I fear they are not likely to pay. The Gov-

ernment must act on the same lines as private enterprise. Frequently we do not give Governments a fair chance from that aspect. The Minister should not be asked to lay all his cards on the table. If there were any question of rascality-----

Mr. THOMSON: There is no such question.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: If there were, I would be the first to open fire on the Government. However, from what I can gather the administration of the brickworks is being carried on exactly on the lines laid down by a Government I supported.

Mr. TEESDALE: I disagree with the previous speaker. It is extraordinary for him to charge members with a desire to probe into the business of the brickworks. I object to the reference to possible rascality as a result of our questions. The Minister stressed the honourable manner in which the clay-heaving business is conducted, and surely he can allay the excitement by saying so much per cent. commission is paid. Such information may be found in all balance sheets. There is nothing wrong in the questions which have been asked, and references to possible rascality are totally uncalled for. I hope the Minister will give the information desired. Although the State bricks are said to be the finest made here, they bring only the same price as other bricks.

Mr. DAVY: This is one of the most illuminating discussions I have heard in Parliament. It brings home one more of the vital defects in State trading concerns in competition with private enterprise. After all, the people of Western Australia are shareholders in this concern, and undoubtedly all the shareholders in any concern are entitled to know all the facts about that concern. On the other hand, I agree that in a company in which all the shareholders are also all the consumers, it might be unwise to let all the consumers into the secrets of the concern. So we have in effect the position that the directors of the company, who are the Government of the day, find it inexpedient to take into their confidence all the consumers, who are also all the shareholders. It is too ridiculous to expect a company that has to tell its shareholders and consumers alike all its private concerns, to compete effectually with companies that confide only in their shareholders.

Mr. THOMSON: Surely the Minister is going to supply the information asked for. The State Implement Works have nothing to hide, for in their balance sheet we find

that they pay by way of commission and discount £5,085.

Hon. G. Taylor: Perhaps the bricks are in that.

Mr. THOMSON: No, they are not. We are entitled to ask what commission the State Brickworks are paying. If the Minister finds difficulty in telling us the rate of the commission, perhaps he could tell us the aggregate amount, as is done in respect of the State Implement Works. Also I should like to know why one man should have a close reserve of the sale of State bricks.

Hon. J. Cunningham: Who told you that?

The CHAIRMAN: I understood the Minister to say he would make the information available to the hon. member if he desired it.

Mr. THOMSON: I certainly desire it. But surely the Minister will supply the information to the Committee! It cannot be that he has anything to hide. We are entitled to know what proportion of the £32,000 shown here as working expenses goes in commission.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: The hon. member is now on a different track. He asked first for the percentage we allow the agents, but now he will be satisfied if I tell him the lump sum. I have not the figure here.

The Premier: It would have no meaning if he got it.

Mr. THOMSON: If commission is being paid on the sale of bricks, and if it is not shown in the accounts, then a proper statement of accounts has not been rendered to the Committee.

The Premier: It will be in the balance sheet.

Mr. THOMSON: I have the balance sheet here, but the information is not given in it.

The Premier: Is the balance sheet of the State Implement Works in the report of the Public Works Department?

Mr. THOMSON: Yes, but no mention is made of the commission paid on the sale of bricks. We are entitled to know the amount being paid. Also I want to know why one or two men are appointed agents for the State brickworks.

Hon. J. Cunningham: Who told you that?

Mr. THOMSON: I think the Minister said there was one in Perth and one in Bunbury. The attitude of the Government leads

to believe that they do not wish to supply the Committee with the information.

Hon. J. Cunningham: What do you want to know for?

Mr. THOMSON: Why should I not know?

Hon. J. Cunningham: Tell me what you want to know for.

Mr. THOMSON: I am entitled to know. The Minister will not give us the information. It is an astounding state of affairs. It leads one to believe the Government are doing something they do not wish to disclose.

The Premier: Go on, go on. Pursue that just a little further.

Mr. THOMSON: We can only come to that conclusion when they refuse to disclose simple information.

The Premier: There is no consultative council behind us.

Mr. THOMSON: We are dealing with the State Brickworks.

Mr. Corboy: You would deal with them all right, if you had your way.

Mr. THOMSON: I have asked respectfully for the information. I have not shifted my ground. I merely thought it would help the Minister out of a difficulty if we were satisfied with the same information as is supplied in the balance sheet of the State Implement Works.

Mr. TEESDALE: In my experience the Estimates have never before gone through so smoothly. There has been no obstruction. We have not worked in two-hour shifts, as we did in one memorable session. We have let the Estimates go through without being unreasonable, and this is not an unreasonable request. The Minister could tell us the result of a private conversation in his office.

Hon. J. Cunningham: It was not a private conversation.

Mr. Chesson: It was not private.

Mr. THOMSON: I must record my protest.

The Premier: The hon. member cannot carry on all night. There is a limit somewhere.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand the Minister has said he cannot give the hon. member the information here.

Mr. THOMSON: Very well. I move an amendment—

That the item be reduced by £1.

I regret having to take this action, but it is the only way we have of raising a protest against the Minister's refusal to supply the information asked for. I have no desire to hold up the Estimates or to embarrass the Government.

The Premier: For goodness sake don't worry about embarrassing the Government! You can do that as much as you like.

Mr. THOMSON: Why not answer the question?

The Premier: It won't be answered. That's all about it.

Mr. THOMSON: There is the position!

The CHAIRMAN: I should like the hon. member to put his amendment in writing.

Mr. THOMSON: That is not usual.

The CHAIRMAN: According to precedent it is not competent in the hon. member to move to reduce this Vote. It is not a matter of Supply, as the Revenue Estimates are. This is merely a statement of revenue and expenditure. According to a ruling given by a previous Speaker, it is not competent in the hon. member to move to reduce the amount.

Mr. THOMSON: Under what Standing Order is that?

The CHAIRMAN: It is according to a ruling by a previous Speaker. To put it in order, I rule that the hon. member is not in order in moving to reduce the Vote.

The Premier: This is only a statement of estimated expenditure.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: There can be no doubt about the soundness of your ruling on that point, Sir, for we are not in these Estimates asked to vote expenditure. It bears out my statement to the Speaker last night and again to-night. These Estimates really ought not to be under discussion. They are submitted to the House under an Act of Parliament, and years ago we drifted into a discussion of them because they were for State trading concerns. I was largely responsible for starting that discussion. Still, the hon. member is not in order in moving to reduce the item.

Mr. THOMSON: On the statement made by the member for Mt. Margaret, I disagree with your ruling, Sir. You gave as a reason for so ruling that a previous Speaker had ruled that we could not move to reduce these items. Now we have a statement by the member for Mt. Margaret, the ex-Speaker, that it has been the custom to discuss these Estimates. I maintain that by virtue of that custom we are entitled to

discuss this item and deal with it as we have done in years gone by.

Hon. G. Taylor: There is no vote to reduce.

The CHAIRMAN: There is a difference between discussing the Estimates and moving to reduce an amount.

Mr. SAMPSON: It will be within the recollection of members—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Does the member for Katanning desire to disagree with my ruling?

Mr. THOMSON: The Premier has stated that he will not supply the information, and according to your ruling we are not in a position to get it. Having asked the question and been refused, I can do no more, but if the position is that the Committee, considering the finances of the State and the huge expenditure involved in State trading concerns, cannot deal with the amounts, the sooner the practice is amended the better.

Mr. SAMPSON: I remind the Committee that during the discussion on State hotels in 1923—

The CHAIRMAN: On what item is the hon. member speaking?

Mr. SAMPSON: On Item No. 2, salaries, wages and general working expenses, including repairs, etc., £550. The Committee in 1923 considered the expenditure provided for State hotels, and after long discussion decided to reduce the amount.

Hon. G. Taylor: That was an amount from Consolidated Revenue.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall not allow the hon. member to proceed on those lines. He must confine his remarks to the item.

Mr. SAMPSON: The matter to which I refer was the salary of one of the inspectors, and because of that I consider I am justified in drawing a comparison between the two items.

The Premier: Are you disagreeing with the Chairman's ruling?

Mr. SAMPSON: No.

The Premier: Then you are discussing it.

Mr. SAMPSON: I am referring to salaries. A precedent was established in 1923. The document before us gives details of the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure, and I submit that unless the amounts are approved by us—

The CHAIRMAN: I shall not allow the hon. member to proceed on those lines. He must discuss the item.

Mr. SAMPSON: If in the opinion of the Minister it is unwise that the amounts should be disclosed, we should be given information to some extent.

Item, Interest on fixed and working capital, £1,966:

Mr. MANN: Prior to the expenditure of a considerable amount of capital for additions to the State brickworks, I took to the Honorary Minister a deputation consisting of the secretary of the Brickmakers' Association, who stated that if the Government would refrain from proceeding with the additions, the association would establish a company to produce the bricks that the Government desired should be made. He told the Minister that Mr. Law was visiting England and the Continent inquiring into the brick industry and the most economical method of producing bricks, and said it was hardly fair that private enterprise should be expending its capital when the Government were working in opposition. The Minister replied that the Government intended to proceed with their extensions. Then the Minister and the secretary chatted about the industry.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot allow the hon. member to proceed on those lines. He apparently is trying to bring up some past history of a deputation, and I cannot see that it has any bearing on the subject. I ask him to confine his remarks to the item. No good purpose would be served by reopening the general discussion.

Mr. MANN: I merely wished to show that the secretary was in a position to satisfy the Minister that private enterprise would have provided all the necessary bricks if the Government had refrained from making additions to their works.

Hon. G. Taylor: There would then have been less interest to pay.

Mr. MANN: Yes; the Government would have incurred less expenditure and would have had to find less interest, and would probably have obtained a similar return from the works. I mention those facts to show the reason for the deputation to the Honorary Minister.

Division put and passed.

Divisions—State Ferries, £9,463 State Hotels, £64,637—agreed to.

Division—State Implement and Engineering Works, £189,593:

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The Estimates show an increase of £2,388 over the expenditure of last year. We know nothing about last year's operations of a huge industry involving a tremendous expenditure of public money. Perhaps the Minister is in a position to give us an idea whether the works are being extended to meet the growing needs of the country. More land is being brought under cultivation, and there should be an increase in the output of the works. An increase of £2,388 does not indicate a great increase of output. What new machines are being made at the works, and how are they competing with private enterprise in the Eastern States or with the firms that are assembling machines in this State? The Minister should let us know how the works are meeting the requirements of farmers in the way of up-to-date machinery and labour-saving appliances.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The trouble with the State Implement Works has been that no new capital was provided to bring the plant up to date.

Hon. G. Taylor: They were started with bad old plant.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, plant that was quite obsolete. Last year we provided £10,000 for new plant, and a good deal of it is already working. Some of it could not be obtained from England owing to the coal strike. All we could do was to obtain quotes for delivery a certain period after the termination of the strike. Some of the new machines will reduce the cost of particular operations by 200 to 300 per cent.

Hon. G. Taylor: I am glad to hear that.

Mr. Sampson: The new machines could not reduce the cost by that percentage.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: There are moulding machines and steam hammers for heavy work of which we have not yet had delivery. The machines that will reduce costs greatly are the plumbing and woodwork machines. The blacksmiths and moulding shops will receive attention this year, when we hope to provide a similar amount to help bring the plant up to date. It is useless to expect the works to compete with the highly developed factories in the East unless modern plant is provided.

Mr. Sampson: Are you developing road-making plant or anything of that kind?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: I want the works to give attention to the manufacture of agricultural implements rather than general engineering. They were established with the idea of turning out machines locally instead of importing them from overseas. That was my idea when I engaged the new factory superintendent, Mr. Mellor, of the old firm of Mellor's, who has been engaged in manufacturing agricultural implements all his life.

Hon. G. Taylor: Is he showing results?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: He has not yet had time to show results, but he knows his work, and is well fitted for the job. His father was in the business before him, and he was in business with his brother.

Mr. Sampson: He comes from modern implement works.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: He was in charge of Shearers' works at Mannum, and should know what is required. To secure improvement, we must equip the works with up-to-date machinery so that they may turn out manufactures economically. We in this State have not the massed production that manufacturers in the Eastern States enjoy, and if the works are further handicapped by obsolete machinery, we cannot expect them to compete successfully. Those who know the manager, Mr. Shaw, are aware that he puts his heart and soul into the work, and does not spare himself.

Hon. G. Taylor: He is a very capable man.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: To expect him to make the works pay with the obsolete plant was to expect too much. We propose to change the power plant. An old steam plant consisting of engines and boilers has been used, and every time anything went wrong, the whole of the plant was held up. Electric current is now being introduced, and each machine will be run by separate batteries so that a small stoppage will not interfere with the whole of the plant. It is estimated that the new power plant will pay for itself in three years, and we shall have the proceeds from the sale of the old plant to the good. There is nothing wrong about that. The management estimate that the new plant will result in a saving of 33 1/3rd per cent. in power costs. It is estimated that the return from the old plant will be as much as has to be laid out in the new plant. The

manager thinks that with these improvements there should be a far better future in store for the works. These works have laboured under heavy difficulties, but I trust the expenditure of £20,000 on new plant will place them on a much better footing.

Mr. MANN: I wish to make a suggestion to the Minister.

Mr. Davy: To close down the works?

Mr. MANN: If we must have these works, let them be equipped and run to the best advantage. In other works of this kind the bonus system is instituted as a reward for ideas of originality. It has been found that this system tends to more economical working, for it encourages men to put forward suggestions for the betterment of the system, and to indicate valuable inventions concerning different parts of machinery. When I was in Melbourne last I visited Massey Harris's works, and I was led to understand that at McKay's works at Sunshine some extraordinarily useful ideas were put forward by the workmen as the result of the institution of this bonus system.

Mr. Teesdale: It has led to some men getting the sack.

Mr. MANN: Up-to-date managers are looking for ideas, and would not dream of dispensing with the services of those who put them forward.

Hon. G. Taylor: Mr. Shaw would not do that.

Mr. MANN: Instead of depending only upon the brains of the works manager and the general manager, the Minister should induce those who are engaged at the Implement Works to put forward their ideas, and give them a bonus according to the value of those ideas.

Mr. TEESDALE: We have no machinery in my part of the State, but I took part in a conversation the other day concerning machinery. I was interested to hear that for two or three seasons great objection had been raised to the State Implement Works harvester. It was admitted that no better ploughs were turned out than those at North Fremantle, and other implements were also mentioned as being satisfactory. I wondered whether the deficiency that was spoken of in relation to the harvester was due to the inability of the management to use certain patents that are requisite for the successful working of such an implement. It appears that only in certain details is the harvester deficient. I am aware that num-

bers of farmers make a dead set against the State Implement harvester. It would be interesting to hear from the Minister if any attempt has been made this year to dispose of that objection, which seems to be detrimental to the acceptance of an implement which in other respects appears to be suitable.

Mr. THOMSON: I am going to be consistent.

Mr. Heron: We would not expect it of you.

Mr. THOMSON: I regret that the State Implement Works were ever brought into existence. No doubt they were established with the best of intentions, but had they not been established, I feel sure that two or three thriving private implement manufacturers would have established themselves in Western Australia. We know that Metters erected a large building, and then practically ceased operations in this direction. Can the Minister say whether any attempt has been made on the part of McKay's of Victoria to negotiate for the purchase of the State Implement Works? Unfortunately the State works have been run at a loss ever since their inception. I am not casting any reflection upon the management. I have not met Mr. Shaw, but I think he is doing his best with an obsolete plant. I am not reflecting upon anyone. The balance sheet shows that there has been written off a sum of practically £120,140. I do not know how this comes to be taken in also as an asset. Perhaps it is hoped by the introduction of up-to-date plant to recoup the works for this amount. Ever since these works were started they have been run at a loss to the State.

Mr. Chesson: Nothing else could be expected with the obsolete plant on which they were started.

Mr. THOMSON: I have said so. That does not remove my opposition to State trading concerns. But for these works we might have had a branch of McKay's or some other up-to-date machinery manufacturing firm established in Western Australia.

Mr. Sleeman: Do you think that would have happened?

Mr. THOMSON: Yes.

Mr. Sleeman: You are very optimistic.

Mr. THOMSON: I know it was the action of the hon. member and his union which materially helped to prevent the establishment of such works here.

Mr. Sleeman: You know nothing of the kind.

Mr. THOMSON: I do know it.

Mr. Sleeman: You know that it is a lie.

Mr. THOMSON: It is not a lie.

Mr. Sleeman: It is a lie.

Mr. THOMSON: It is perfectly true.

Mr. Sleeman: You know it is a lie.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Fremantle must desist from making these remarks.

Mr. THOMSON: The hon. member cannot put that sort of thing over me. I have too long been a member of this House to be browbeaten.

Mr. Sleeman: All your experience will not stand to you. It is a lie.

Mr. THOMSON: I do know—

Mr. Sleeman: You know a lot.

Mr. THOMSON: I know that the manager of McKay's Harvester Company came here, and entered into negotiations with the local unions.

The Premier: What has that to do with the State Implement Works?

Mr. THOMSON: It has a lot to do with them.

The Minister for Works: It has nothing to do with this vote.

Mr. THOMSON: If it had not been for the State Implement Works—

The Premier: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member has regaled the House on four occasions during the last two or three months with all this matter connected with McKay's and the local unions.

Mr. THOMSON: Do you not like to hear it?

The Premier: I have some regard for what is relevant to the matter before the Chair. If I wandered all over the place in the rambling fashion followed by the hon. member, I could talk interminably upon many questions. The matter of McKay's making an agreement with the local unions has nothing to do with the State Implement Works. The hon. member is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the vote.

Mr. THOMSON: I am dealing with the State Implement Works.

Mr. Sleeman: This vote has nothing to do with McKay's.

Mr. THOMSON: I have been too long a member to be prevented from saying what I intend to say. I am here to voice my opinions, in the same way that other members can do. I do not bar them from ex-

pressing their opinions. We are dealing with State enterprises, which since their inauguration have meant the loss of many thousands of pounds to the State. I am entitled to discuss this matter, and to draw comparisons in doing so. But for the establishment of this trading concern of a certainty we would have had established in the State several private manufacturers of implements. This would not have cost the State one penny; on the other hand the revenue of the State would have materially benefited as the result of the taxation paid by private enterprises. I, therefore, regret the extension of the principle of State trading. I do not say the Minister is not administering the department in the way he thinks right. I do not say he is not efficient in what he is doing. I am opposed to the principle. It is not in the interests of the State. It is unfortunate that we have not got—

Mr. Sleeman: It is a wonder you did not sell those trading concerns when you were on this side of the House.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not intend to allow any further discussion on the question as to whether the implement works could be sold or not, or as to whether McKay's could have come here or not. The hon. member must confine himself to the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure as submitted on these Estimates.

Mr. THOMSON: I am dealing with that matter.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think it is fair to discuss all these things.

Mr. THOMSON: When interjections are made, such as those made by the member for Fremantle, it is difficult to refrain from replying to them. If I do not reply, it is tantamount to acquiescing in the statement that I am neglecting my duty. I commend "Hansard" to the hon. member. If he will read it, he will learn what action I took in the endeavour to induce the Government to sell these State trading concerns. The jibes he throws at me are without foundation and unwarranted.

Mr. Sleeman: You did not carry much weight.

Mr. THOMSON: I have the courage of my convictions which is more than can be said of some members. I am not reflecting upon any particular individual. It is unfortunate that the Implement Works have meant such a loss to the State. That has not been the fault of the management, but

of the obsolete plant that was first installed. The works have never been in a position to pay their way. I must be consistent, and protest against this kind of thing. If I had not spoken upon this vote, some members would have said I had raised my voice on the State Brickworks, but had allowed the State Implement Works to pass unnoticed.

The Premier: We know well that you will not pass anything.

Mr. THOMSON: I stand solidly for my principles, and insist upon voicing my views. I wish to be consistent.

Hon. G. Taylor: You ought to move to strike out this item.

Mr. THOMSON: If I had my way, I would have no hesitation in striking out these items, but according to the ruling of the Chair we can only discuss them, and nothing more. It is contrary to the rules of the House for a private member to move to increase expenditure that will mean a levy upon the taxpayers. We are, therefore, hamstrung. According to the Constitution, a private member is not permitted to move for increased expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. THOMSON: I am finishing in a moment.

The Premier: Order! The Chair should be obeyed.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is not in order in proceeding along these lines.

Mr. THOMSON: I am endeavouring to place before the Committee the difficulty of our position. I merely desire to draw a comparison. We are placed in a difficult position. When dealing with the general Estimates we can move to reduce a vote or an item, but according to the ruling of the Chairman we are not able to do so upon any of these items. We are placed in a peculiar position. We are here occupying responsible places, and are regarded by the public as custodians of the State's purse.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Surely this is tedious repetition.

The Premier: This is the fourth time you have told us all this.

Mr. THOMSON: We are helpless in the matter. All we can do is to raise our voices in protest against this additional expenditure or against any particular item that is placed before us.

Item, Wages, Materials, Stores, Freights, and Working Expenses, etc., and expenses in connection with the undertaking generally, £169,958:

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The Auditor General's report states on page 12—

Trust fund. The balance is included in return No. 1 as "Trust Fund," total £20,854,306 0s. 5d., of which £2,496,292 13s. 4d. was uninvested. A perusal of the return shows the following debit balances:—Commonwealth Government, main roads, £20,987 16s.; Commonwealth Government, wire netting advances, £7,830 11s. 8d.; North-West, main road development, £5,420 19s. 9d.; State Implement and Engineering Works, £53,766 4s. 4d. . .

Does that amount of £53,000 odd represent the whole of the losses incurred since the inception of this State trading concern, or is it a loss for one year? What roused my curiosity was the Auditor General's footnote—

The first three are of a temporary nature. The other items (trading concerns) are perennial. The State Trading Concerns Act, 1916, provides that the money required shall be taken from the "Advance to Treasurer" or a Parliamentary appropriation. As regards two of the trading concerns (State Implement and Engineering Works and State Sawmills) the reason for the overdraft is that sufficient capital has not been provided. In the other cases, apart from any shortage of capital, the earnings have not been sufficient to meet working expenses, interest, etc.

As regards the trading concern under discussion, we learn that £189,593 is needed to carry on the business up to the 30th June next, the amount representing an increase of £2,388 over last year's expenditure. What I want to know is whether the amount of £53,000 odd referred to in the Auditor General's report represents the total losses since the inception of the concern, or last year's loss?

The PREMIER: That amount represents the whole of the loss, right from the inception.

Division put and passed.

Divisions—State Quarries £26,020, State Shipping Service £221,000, State Sawmills £923,705—agreed to.

Division—Wyndham Freezing, Canning, and Meat Export Works, £334,000:

Item, Advances to Kimberley cattle owners (including purchase of stud cattle and herd bulls), £10,000:

Mr. LATHAM: How is the amount of £10,000 made up?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: The Minister has made available certain stud bulls with a view to improving the herds in the North-

West. The bulls are made available to the pastoralists on easy terms.

Mr. Latham: But surely not £10,000 worth?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: No, not £10,000 worth. It is the policy of the department, upon delivery of cattle, to make an advance to the owner with a view to assisting him to carry on his operations. As a result, a recoup takes place out of cattle delivered to the Wyndham Meat Works. Accordingly a sum of money is made available for that purpose.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I find the value of having the Auditor General's report available while the Estimates are under consideration. Unfortunately the report was presented to the House only this afternoon, after the conclusion of the Revenue Estimates. On the same page of the report as I quoted from previously, I find the following—

Wyndham Freezing, Canning, and Meat Export Works, £238,569 14s. 9d.

Does that amount represent the loss from the inception of the works?

The Premier: Yes.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: That is the accumulated loss?

The Premier: Yes.

Division put and passed.

Resolutions reported and the report adopted.

BILL—PUBLIC EDUCATION ACTS AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 3rd November.

MR. DAVY (West Perth) [9.53]: After careful perusal of the Bill I cannot see any vital objection to it. The portion which deals with the tightening up of the enforcement of compulsory education seems to me necessary, and the portion dealing with the provision of an appeal board for teachers has precedent in several other departments and probably is a proper thing. One little subclause in the clause dealing with the appeal board seems to me unjustifiable, and I propose to say something about it in Committee. I refer to the prohibition against the teacher who is appealing to the board from employing a legal practitioner to represent him or her. It is astonishing

to me that in this somewhat highly specialised society in which we live, the one section of the community that is carefully trained for the representation of other people should be prohibited from acting where other people have grievances to expose or need to defend themselves.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: Why give that right to one section and not to another? It is not given to the industrial section of the community.

Mr. DAVY: I do not at all approve of the prohibition in that case either. I regard it as ridiculous. The most experienced union advocates in the Arbitration Court are generally agreed that the work in the Arbitration Court would be done better and more fairly by the trained professional man than by the half-trained lay advocate. I have heard union advocates say that they would rather have a lawyer appearing against them in that court than the very experienced but lay advocate. However, I will deal with that matter when the clause comes up. Otherwise I have no critical comment to offer upon the Bill. The measure seems necessary, fair, and properly drafted.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Lutey in the Chair; Hon. J. Cunningham (Honorary Minister) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—Amendment of Section 2 of Act No. 2 of 1907:

Mr. THOMSON: Why is it proposed to omit from Section 2 of the Act of 1907 the reference to a Government or efficient school being situated within six miles of the child's residence?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: When the Act of 1907 was passed, the usual mode of transport was by spring cart, or sulky, or other horse-drawn vehicle. To-day the motor car comes into use for the transport of children from the various districts to the school.

Mr. Thomson: The reference is to a consolidated school?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: Yes.

Mr. Thomson: What about those who have not got motor cars?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: This deals with motor transport provided by the Government.

Mr. LATHAM: The proviso to the clause sets out that subject to regulations a grant at the prescribed rate per day may be made to a parent or guardian of a child. At present the department require the production of a certificate from the Taxation Department setting out that the parent's gross income does not exceed £400, and the greatest difficulty is often experienced in procuring the driving allowance. Previously a declaration was deemed sufficient. What is the reason for demanding a certificate from the Taxation authorities, seeing that the information disclosed is such as should be regarded as secret?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: The Government must be satisfied that the gross income of a parent does not exceed £400. While not desiring to cast any reflection upon parents of children, it has been found necessary at times to verify statements that have been made to the department, and the best information available is essential.

Mr. THOMSON: The Minister's explanation shows the inconsistency of the Government regarding regulations. For the convenience of the department, consolidated schools are provided in the country and that avoids the necessity for a number of small schools. The Government provide motor transport to take the children to those schools, at no charge to the parents.

The Premier: That is done in the interests of the higher education of the children, rather than in the interests of the department.

Mr. THOMSON: I am in favour of consolidated schools, but wish to point out the inconsistency of these regulations. Although the transport facilities are provided free in respect of the consolidated schools, and free railway transport is granted under the provisions of the Act, the regulations set out that when a man furnishes his own conveyance to enable his children to attend a country school, he cannot receive the driving allowance if his gross income exceeds £400, and unless he has a certificate from the Taxation Department to support his statement.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: I saw a form to-day and it referred to "actual income."

Mr. THOMSON: I appeal to the Government to amend the regulations, for the present system is not fair. No question is

asked regarding the parent's salary where transport to consolidated schools is concerned, but the man who has to provide the conveyance and feed and shoe a horse, has to provide a certificate showing that his gross income does not exceed £400. That is not fair, and I protest against such a provision.

Mr. C. P. WANSBROUGH: In consolidated school areas served by charabancs many of the children are not within reasonable distance of the charabanc route. Yet the parents beyond reasonable distance from those routes are just as much entitled to their driving allowance to take the children to the charabanc as they were to have their children driven to the school displaced by the consolidated school. As to the income limitation, it is quite possible for a man with a gross income of £400 to have no real income at all. I readily admit that many such men have had consideration from the Minister, but to get this they had to go to considerable trouble to secure the necessary certificate from the Taxation Department.

Mr. A. WANSBROUGH: I have a little grievance from my own electorate. For the past 12 months children on the King River route have been brought in to the Albany school by motor car. However, that car has discontinued running and the parents have been forced to provide other conveyances for their children. The parents of two boys, who were just within the school age and were finishing their schooling, purchased bicycles for the boys, instead of a horse and trap. Because they purchased bicycles they were not permitted to get the driving allowance that they could have claimed had they purchased a horse and trap. I hope the Minister will look into that case with a view to remedying it.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: There is good sense in what the member for Beverley said. A little time ago a man reputed to have a gross income of over £400 found that it panned out at £120 taxable income. I agree with what the member for Katanning said as to the inconsistency in asking no questions about the financial position of parents whose children are driven to the consolidated school, but insisting on going into his income taxation before granting a driving allowance to a parent who provides his own conveyance for the purpose.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I am struck with the objections raised to our education system.

I do not know what more assistance the people require in educating their children. To say that a special driving allowance should be granted to parents who can buy bicycles for each of their sons to ride to school, is asking a little too much. In Queensland I have seen fine boys walking five or six miles to school. Many of those boys, now equally fine men, are in this State, distributed over our goldfields and agricultural areas. We should be grateful for what we have, when we remember what the pioneers had to put up with. It is appalling to think of a man buying bicycles for each of his sons and then making a grievance of being denied a driving allowance.

Mr. Thomson: What do you know about it? You could not ride a bicycle.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: You do not know what I can ride. The whole grievance appears to be that the Government have been generous to some people in driving their children to school, and have not provided exactly the same facilities for all. Just consider the increasing cost of our education system!

Hon. J. Cunningham: The Vote has been doubled within the past 10 years.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: And still there is discontent. That story of the bicycles is just too much for me.

Mr. A. WANSBROUGH: It is all very well for the hon. member to criticise, but I say that all parents should be treated alike. Before the motor car was taken off the run those parents had an allowance for sending their children to school, and I contend that the allowance should have been continued.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 6--Teachers' Appeal Board:

Mr. DAVY: I have an amendment to move. Paragraph (d) of Subclause 5 provides that the teacher may conduct his case in person, or by an agent, but that no legal practitioner shall appear on behalf either of the appellant or of the department. I realise that the unfortunate legal practitioner is distrusted by certain sections of the community, particularly by any section with revolutionary tendencies. I am not putting up a plea for the legal practitioner, for I can imagine that what a man of feeling would be likely to gain if permitted to appear before the Teachers' Appeal Board would be extremely small. But there can be

no reason to justify the depriving of a teacher suffering under a real grievance and a very serious punishment of having the best mouthpiece that he or she can obtain to represent his or her case. This is an appeal board for persons who have suffered punishment in the shape of fine, transfer at their own expense, reduction to a lower class or grade, reduction to a position carrying a lower salary, or dismissal. The Minister is now providing a tribunal to which the teacher may appeal, but the teacher is not to have the best representative available to present his case.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: The teacher would not have counsel appearing against him, either.

Mr. DAVY: No, but the department would probably be represented by one of its highly experienced advocates, perhaps Mr. Hussey who, by the time the public appeal board sessions are finished, would have represented the Government in something like 300 or 400 cases.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Mr. Stevens, of the Public Service Association, is being educated in a like manner.

Mr. DAVY: Perhaps he is.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Why not leave it to him?

Mr. DAVY: Why should we?

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Why not?

Mr. DAVY: Who is to say Mr. Stevens will be available? He might die to-morrow; whereas the Government would have plenty of other people to call to their aid.

The Minister for Justice: The Crown Law Department might retain a K.C.

Mr. DAVY: What has that to do with it?

Hon. G. Taylor: That would not matter.

Mr. DAVY: This is a case in which a citizen suffers a serious punishment, perhaps dismissal for a serious offence that might blast his character.

The Minister for Justice: He could take action at common law afterwards.

Mr. DAVY: What sort of action could he take and what good would it be if he lost his position?

The Minister for Justice: Action for wrongful dismissal.

Mr. DAVY: It is not a question of wrongful dismissal. The Minister suggests that the board is to be a farce, that a person who is dismissed shall not be permitted to be represented properly and might be defeated on his appeal. Then he may go to the common law courts and bring an action for

wrongful dismissal. Why make two bites at a cherry because of some extraordinary prejudice against the legal profession? It is most unjust. I can begin to understand the motives that actuated those persons—not members of the Government party—who originally provided that a legal practitioner should not appear in the Arbitration Court when sitting to deal with awards. The idea was that anything in the nature of a legal dispute should be avoided and that the proceedings should be conducted on the lines of a round-table conference. It was thought that the importation of legal practitioners, who spend their lives in somewhat strenuous and bitter fights in the common law courts might affect the proceedings in the Arbitration Court. The idea has been completely abortive, because in no court do we find more bitterness exhibited than between the highly experienced advocates who appear respectively for the unions and the employers in the Arbitration Court. The appeal board will really be a court of criminal appeal, and why should any Government suggest that a person with a sense of grievance should not avail himself of any representation that he can get? How can it be justified? Before the Public Service Appeal Board any person who thinks he can get better value by employing a lawyer may do so, and I do not know that the proceedings have been delayed in consequence. Some lawyers perhaps are longwinded, but so also are some laymen. I suggest that this provision has slipped in by accident.

The Minister for Justice: Not at all.

Mr. DAVY: If not, it has probably been dictated by the department.

The Minister for Justice: by useful and long experience?

Mr. DAVY: Whose long and useful experience?

The Minister for Justice: Twenty years experience in the Railway Department has shown that this practice is the best.

Mr. DAVY: Did the Railway Appeal Board recommend that lawyers should be excluded? Of course not. Are not they the best judges?

The Minister for Justice: No.

Mr. DAVY: Are not the members of the board who see both sides, the best judges, or does the Minister consider that the departmental advocates are the best judges?

The Minister for Justice: No, an appellant is the best judge. He knows where he gets a fair deal.

Mr. DAVY: If it is in the appellant's interest to deprive him of the right to choose an advocate, why not leave it to him to decide for himself? I move an amendment—

That in line 2 of paragraph (d) of Sub-clause 5 the words "but no" be struck out and the word "or" inserted in lieu.

If that amendment be agreed to, I shall move to delete the words "shall appear on behalf of the appellant or the department."

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: I oppose the amendment. I made it clear during my remarks on the second reading that this provision had been inserted as a result of conferences between the Minister for Education and the representatives of the teachers. The teachers are the people most concerned and they have agreed to a board of appeal constituted on the lines set out in paragraph (d) precluding the appearance of lawyers. We have the railway and police appeal boards where lawyers are precluded from appearing.

Mr. Davy: Very improperly.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: No doubt the teachers, in coming to this determination, were influenced by the fact that the Education Department is a Government department, and that the Minister for Education would have unlimited means at his disposal to brief the best counsel obtainable to represent him, whereas the individual teacher, apart from any help he might receive from the organisation of which he may be a member, would have to rely upon his own resources.

Mr. Davy: Then forego the right of the department.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: This piece of legislation has been agreed upon between the teachers and the Minister for Education, and therefore I am justified in asking the Committee to reject the amendment.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I do not see why legal practitioners should not be permitted to defend teachers before an appeal board. In the department there are highly trained officials who will be most skilful in the handling of cases on behalf of the department, and the teachers will therefore be seriously handicapped in substantiating the claims they may personally put forward on their own behalf.

Mr. Chesson: The teachers will engage their own agents to act for them.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I have been an advocate myself in the Arbitration Court, and I know what is entailed in the task.

The Premier: You do not say that the people for whom you acted suffered as a result of your representation?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: No, I was successful owing to the justice of the case I had to put up. Teachers should have the right if they so desire to employ counsel to plead their cause. We know that employees have had to agree to things because they have thought they could not do any better.

Hon. J. Cunningham: The teachers were not compelled to agree to this.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: They may have thought that, as this Bill would take them a long way further than they were before, they should accept it as it is. If they knew they had a choice in this matter they might prefer to have the assistance of counsel. I would not be a party to preventing any section of the community from employing the best legal advice obtainable in a matter of this kind.

Hon. J. Cunningham: The teachers have asked for this Bill.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: It is because I realise the injustice of this clause that I support the amendment.

The Minister for Justice: They will have the secretary of their union to appear for them.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The same privilege should be extended to teachers in this matter as is extended to other people.

Mr. MANN: Recently the president of the Arbitration Court, and another member of the court, reproved the secretary of the Tramway Union for the inadequacy of his experience and for the manner in which he drafted his case.

The Minister for Justice: There are some inexperienced lawyers who do not make a good job of their cases.

Mr. MANN: The court said this official had not fully looked after the interests of his union.

The Premier: That does not prove anything. Judges often reprove lawyers for not putting up a better case.

Mr. Davy: You are confining the teachers to one person.

Hon. J. Cunningham: Their agent.

Mr. Davy: Where will they get him?

Hon. J. Cunningham: The agent will be chosen by the teacher.

Mr. MANN: The only person the teacher can look to is the secretary of the union.

The Minister for Justice: Or any other teacher.

Hon. J. Cunningham: Or any other secretary.

Mr. MANN: The advocate must be someone who is au fait with the regulations and the technicalities of the department. Sometimes a good cause has been spoilt by the inexperience of the advocates. Teachers may find themselves in that position.

The PREMIER: The point made by the hon. member proves nothing. Every day in the court lawyers lose cases, and clients suffer through their incompetence. Judges frequently reprove lawyers for their conduct of cases. The appellant is not confined to a union secretary in this case. He can select anyone he likes.

Mr. Davy: Anyone bar a lawyer.

The PREMIER: Very well, bar a lawyer. I have no prejudice at all against lawyers. For my part I would not care whether they appeared before these boards or not. But let me remind hon. members that there are many appeal boards in this State, and that the Public Service Appeal Board is the only one before which lawyers may appear. The member for Perth and other members have argued that lawyers should be permitted to appear before the Teachers' Appeal Board in the interests of the appellants, the teachers. But the teachers themselves do not want lawyers in this instance. They have agreed to the clause. Therefore the men and women for whom members opposite are pleading do not know their own best interests, apparently. Hon. members talk about technicalities. It is because of those very technicalities that before appeal boards men who are not trained lawyers are often able to do better than many a trained lawyer.

Mr. Davy: The lay advocate is more technical than the lawyer.

The PREMIER: It is a question of knowledge of the practical side of the case. The lawyer knows nothing about that. It is not a matter of interpreting difficult laws in these cases; it is a question of fact.

Hon. G. Taylor: There is the interpretation of regulations.

The PREMIER: That is a simple matter. Cannot educated men such as teachers argue regulations affecting their own interests? The youngest member of the Public Service knows as much about all the regulations affecting his salary, promotion, superannuation and so forth as all the members of the legal profession put together. I do not know

whether members of the Public Service study these matters up in their evenings or during their spare time in the office, but no member of the legal profession has anything on a public servant in that respect. That is because of the first-hand practical knowledge the public servant has, which he must first of all pump into the legal practitioner, who never gets as close a grip of it as the public servant himself. It is by agreement between the Government and the teachers that the clause appears as printed. However, there has been no demand from the Railways Appeal Board, for instance, that lawyers should be permitted to appear. Another reason why it is in the interests of the teachers not to permit lawyers to appear is that the case is one of the Crown on one side against an individual on the other, and that the Crown could obtain the services of the best trained lawyer in the city, irrespective of cost. So an impecunious teacher, who otherwise would not engage a lawyer, might be compelled to brief counsel also. If it comes to a question of feeing lawyers, the Crown Law Department are probably in a position to obtain a more eminent lawyer than the school teacher. At present the case is one of layman against layman. Under the amendment it would be a case of lawyer against lawyer, with the advantage to the Crown of being able to secure the most expensive lawyer. That is the view taken with many persons who have to deal with appeal boards, and that is the reason why in this instance it is proposed to exclude lawyers.

Mr. DAVY: I will answer the Premier's last argument first. He says that if the appellant is permitted to have a lawyer, the department must also be permitted to have a lawyer, and that the department will win because they can pay more for a better lawyer. Precisely the same argument applies to the case of a man charged in the Criminal Court. If the Premier's argument is good, the Crown ought not to be allowed to have a lawyer to prosecute, and the accused ought not to be allowed to have a lawyer to defend him.

The Premier: Nothing of the kind.

Mr. DAVY: That seems to me an irresistible inference from the Premier's argument. The cost of lawyers in this town is practically the same, whoever may be the lawyer engaged. One can brief any counsel

to appear in appeals such as these for about the same fee. If the Crown wanted to brief the most eminent King's Counsel, they might in such cases as these pay a guinea or two extra on five or six guineas.

The Premier: I think in most cases the fee of a King's Counsel would be four or five times as much. It is not a question of the case, but of the man.

Mr. DAVY: No. The Taxing Master allows a little more to a King's Counsel than to a junior.

The Minister for Justice: But the fee marked on the brief is not taxed.

Mr. DAVY: It is taxed by the Taxing Master.

The Minister for Justice: Nothing of the kind.

Mr. DAVY: I admit the hon. gentleman is Minister for Justice, but I regret to suggest that I perhaps know a little more about this matter than he does. Of course the fee on brief is taxed every week by the Taxing Master.

The Minister for Justice: The fee under the agreement made between solicitor and client for taking up the case is not taxed.

Mr. DAVY: No.

The Minister for Justice: That is what I am talking about.

Mr. DAVY: But I am talking about taxation. The whole thing is governed by taxation. In my experience I have not known of any case in which a King's Counsel was paid more than was recovered on taxation from the other side.

The Premier: Are there not cases in which the fees of the King's Counsel are not taxed at all? If I desired to secure a King's Counsel, he could stipulate for a fixed fee.

Mr. DAVY: He might, but there is very little of that done in Western Australia.

The Minister for Justice: It has been done lately.

The Premier: It is done by the Crown.

Mr. DAVY: The Minister for Justice is probably thinking of criminal cases, which are different from ordinary cases. Even with its unlimited power, the Crown could gain no advantage over the appellant in this type of case. The next argument, and in fact the only argument, put up in favour of the clause is that the teachers agreed to the exclusion of lawyers. I say they did not agree; and that is not giving the lie direct to Ministers. The teachers' organisation

agreed. The trouble is that Ministers and members opposite visualise the whole community as divided into two sections—on the one side the employers' organisation or the Government departments, and on the other side the employees' organisation or the unions.

The Premier: Surely we are entitled to assume that the executive of the teachers' union know the opinions of the teachers.

Mr. DAVY: I do not think the Premier is entitled to assume that, at least not when it is proposed to deprive an individual of what is generally regarded as an absolute right; that is, to be represented by the best mouthpiece he can get, when in court or before a board.

The Premier: Would the executive not know the feelings of the teachers?

Mr. DAVY: The executive would not know the feelings of teachers who were not members of the union.

The Premier: They are practically all members of the union. Once a year their conference is held and these matters are dealt with.

Mr. DAVY: There are some teachers who are not members of the union.

Member: More shame to them!

Mr. DAVY: That is the attitude adopted by some people! Because a man is not in the union, he can be trampled upon and his opinion respecting any subject ignored accordingly. There are some teachers who are not in the union.

The Premier: But not many.

Mr. DAVY: And we know that such teachers cannot get any promotion; they are blocked every time.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: Quite right, too.

Mr. DAVY: That is the union point of view. The teacher cannot get promotion unless he is in the organisation.

The Premier: That is not correct, in the way you put it.

Mr. DAVY: That is how I have heard it.

The Premier: You hear all sorts of things in the street.

Mr. DAVY: Apparently it is nearly correct.

The Premier: It is not.

Mr. DAVY: At any rate, it is not necessary for that statement to be correct or otherwise for the purposes of my argument. There are some who do not belong to the Teachers' Union and no person who does not represent such teachers, has any right to agree to deprive them of the right to secure someone to represent them.

The Minister for Justice: If there were no Teachers' Union, there would be no request for an appeal board.

Mr. DAVY: Perhaps not, but what does that mean? Some unfortunate teacher may be dismissed and find herself confronted with the necessity to appear before an appeal board.

Hon. J. Cunningham: She can appoint an agent.

Mr. DAVY: Where can she make her appointment, if she is not a member of the union?

Hon. J. Cunningham: She can appoint someone of her own selection.

Mr. DAVY: Where can she look for someone, if she is deprived of her right to secure the services of a lawyer?

The Premier: She can get her best boy!

Mr. DAVY: And he may perhaps put more love and affection into the work, than skill. I am sure the Minister will not think I am raising this point to harass him and to delay the consideration of the clause. I believe this is an unjust provision that should not appear in the Bill, and I contest it on that ground. Not only is it unjust, but it is grossly illogical and senseless. In our society we set up a division of labour. One section we train to represent other people. They are called lawyers. The Premier talks about lawyers as though they were people who expounded the law. In 99 cases out of a hundred, there is no law in it. In most instances the job of a lawyer is to present the facts.

The Premier: As they affect his client.

Mr. DAVY: Yes, quite irrespective of the law. He has to absorb the case of his client and act as his mouthpiece.

The Premier: It is better to have it first hand than when absorbed in that way.

Mr. DAVY: Yes, if it could be produced first hand, but 999 people out of a thousand would, if confronted with such strange circumstances, be absolutely speechless. The Premier recollects the first occasion he stood up to make a speech. His knees knocked together and he found himself unable to give expression to his thoughts.

The Premier: But teachers would not select an agent of that description.

Mr. DAVY: The trouble is that no one else will be available. It is not an easy thing to get someone to give the necessary attention to an individual's case for nothing. Even the union secretary might not be avail-

able, because the teacher concerned might not be a member of the union. The unfortunate person would be ignorant of how evidence should be presented. Perhaps dismissed wrongfully, the young teacher might have to face an ordeal upon which his whole future depended. He would be unable to secure expert assistance because the Teachers' Union had agreed with the Education Department to bar lawyers. Unconsciously, I believe, the provision is included in the Bill, but it will tend seriously to detract from the value of the measure.

Mr. MANN: I can visualise the Premier in arguing the case we are putting before members this evening.

The Minister for Works: Let us see you do it.

Mr. MANN: I am not as capable to undertake that task as the Premier, or the Minister for Works who has spent half a lifetime in different courts. The chairman must be a police or resident magistrate, a man possessing a trained mind, who will view a question from the strictly official point of view. Then the Director of Education will be represented by someone who will not be the biggest noodle procurable. Suppose the teacher desiring to appeal was a resident of Broome or some other North-West port, and the resident magistrate presided and the clerk of courts, not the sympathetic Minister himself, represented the Director of Education. How could such an unfortunate teacher get somebody to represent him in Broome?

The Premier: I am surprised that these unfortunate teachers have agreed to such a provision!

Mr. MANN: The union agreed to it, but if we can point out a weakness we should do so.

The Premier: The teachers do not see a weakness in it.

Mr. MANN: Frequently persons interested have failed to see weaknesses until it was too late.

The Minister for Works: Why was this fought for in the Arbitration Court?

Mr. MANN: I think the Minister would change his mind if he had an opportunity to redraft this clause.

The Minister for Works: Not at all.

Mr. MANN: I pointed out one instance last week.

The Premier: That was only one. It could happen with a lawyer.

Mr. MANN: I repeat that I am sure the Minister has been arguing against his own personal inclinations.

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

Ayes	11
Noes	17

Majority against .. 6

AYES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Davy	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Denton	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. C. P. Wansbrough
Mr. Mann	Mr. Latham
Mr. North	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Chesson	Mr. Millington
Mr. Collier	Mr. Munle
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Pantou
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Troy
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Heron	Mr. Willcock
Miss Holman	Mr. Withers
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Wilson
Mr. McCallum	(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Sir James Mitchell	Mr. Angwin
Mr. Maley	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Richardson	Mr. Clydesdale
Mr. J. H. Smith	Mr. W. D. Johnson
Mr. George	Mr. Lambert

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 7—Agreed to.

Title—Agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE PREMIER (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till 4.30 p.m. on Tuesday next.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 11.7 p.m.