

promoting gambling sweeps and trying to make a bit of money out of them, we should hand this country back to its original inhabitants. It is a blot on the fair island of Tasmania that its Government depend upon receiving so much from this vice of the public towards their annual revenue.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: The Federal Government have tried to stop Tattersall's and have not succeeded.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: The Federal Government have had an opportunity to put a stop to the sweeps.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: None of them could see any way to stop them except by extending the Constitution.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: These are the only points I intend to touch upon. I again repeat that I am in doubt as to why the committee were appointed. If it was in order to assist the Government to obtain a mass of valuable evidence, even though in some particulars the report might not be in accordance with their wishes, there is plenty of material on which to frame a new Bill. Ten years ago, however, a committee were appointed and brought in a number of valuable recommendations that have not been acted upon from that day to this. The report of the joint committee might share a similar fate, but I have this suggestion to offer, that the Government should apply the law of the land as it stands, and if they do so most of the trouble will quickly disappear. Betting by the book-makers on racecourses is illegal. Prosecutions have been instituted against book-makers, and I believe against the clubs that permitted them to operate. These cases were dismissed by the magistrate. I am not questioning the wisdom of his decision, but he said it was contrary to the policy to enforce the law, and I believe there was ample evidence that these prosecutions were malicious and were instituted by some man who had a grudge against the parties in question. Let it be the policy of the Government in the future, and particularly at the present crisis, to enforce this law—enforce it on every racecourse in the State—prohibit

bookmaking, and carry out the law as it stands, and also confine the use of the totalisator to bona fide amateur clubs in accordance with the law as it stands. If these two things are done, I am sure a great deal more would be accomplished than by giving effect to the detailed proposals contained in the report of this joint select committee.

On motion by Hon. J. F. Cullen debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 10.3 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Tuesday, 26th October, 1915.*

	PAGE
Papers presented	1923
Question: Timber, imported and local	1924
Papers: Trotting Association leave, Kalgoorlie	1924
Railway irregularities, case of Hugh McLeod	1924
Return: Public Library, Museum and Art Gallery	1924
Bills: Land Act Amendment, 3a.	1924
Weights and Measures, Council's amendments	1924
Mines Regulation Act Amendment, Council's Amendments	1925
Licensing Act Amendment Continuance, Council's amendments	1935
Annual Estimates, votes and items discussed	1942
Resolution: Venereal diseases, uniform legislation	1966

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

### PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Minister for Works: 1. Regulations under the Abattoirs Act, 1909. 2. Regulations under the Stock Diseases Act, 1895.

By the Premier: Agricultural Bank operations (ordered on motion by Mr. Harrison).

# QUESTION — TIMBER, IMPORTED VERSUS LOCAL.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS (for Mr. O'Loughlen) asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Is he aware that oregon timber is being used in connection with the Harvey irrigation works? 2, What explanation does the engineer offer for not using local hardwoods?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, Yes. 2, Local timber is being used largely and wherever possible. Oregon is only used where the local timber is unsuitable owing to its tendency to warp, as in the case of face boards for concrete.

# PAPERS—TROTTING ASSOCIATION LEASE, KALGOORLIE.

On motion by Hon. Frank WILSON ordered: That all papers in connection with the application for and granting of a special lease to the W.A. Trotting Association at Kalgoorlie, and all papers in connection with the application for and granting of a mining lease to Jas. Arthur Combe under the same ground and for ground adjoining, be placed upon the Table of the House.

# PAPERS—RAILWAY IRREGULARITIES, CASE OF HUGH McLEOD.

On motion by Mr. SMITH ordered: That all papers in connection with the Hugh McLeod case be laid on the Table of the House.

# RETURN — PUBLIC LIBRARY, MUSEUM AND ART GALLERY.

On motion by Mr. TAYLOR ordered: That a return be laid on the Table of the House showing: 1, List of offices held by employees of the Trustees of the Public Library, Museum, and Art Gallery, together with salaries and emoluments attaching to each office. 2, The terms of the engagements of such officers. 3, The commitments of the trustees referred to in the secretary's state-

ment published in the *West Australian* on 12th October, 1915. 4, What rights, if any, have any of the officers to engage in private practice. 5, How much was expended on books, papers, and periodicals for the year ending 30th June, 1915. 6, How much on art subjects and pictures during the same period.

# BILL—LAND ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

# BILL—WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

## *Council's Amendments.*

Schedule of four amendments made by the Council now considered.

## *In Committee.*

Mr. McDowall in the Chair; Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister) in charge of the Bill.

No. 1.—Clause 33, paragraph (d): strike out all the words after "such" in line 1 and insert "grain" in lieu:

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: I move—

*That the amendment be agreed to.*

Question passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 2.—Schedule D; in the definition of "wheat" strike out "seed":

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: I am of opinion that the word "seed" got in there by mistake. It is quite unnecessary. I move—

*That the amendment be agreed to.*

Question passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 3.—New clause: Add the following to stand as Clause 8:—Application of Act to Government Railways. The Commissioner of Police may, by arrangement with the Commissioner of Railways, from time to time examine and test any weighing instrument used on the Government Railways:

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: This new clause was requested by the deputy leader of the Opposition when the Bill was before this House. However, there

was some difficulty in respect to the drafting, so it was inserted in another place. But before we agree to this clause, I would like to amend its number, making it seven instead of eight, as proposed by the Council. If hon. members look at the Bill they will see that Clause 7 is the first clause in Part II. of the Bill. I want this new clause to come within Part I. Therefore I move an amendment on the Council's amendment—

*That "No. 8" be struck out and "No. 7" inserted in lieu.*

Amendment on the amendment passed; the Council's amendment, as amended, agreed to.

No. 4.—New clause: Add the following to stand as Clause 52:—"Regulations and By-laws.—52. (1.) Any regulation or by-law made or purporting to be made under or by virtue of this Act shall—(a) be published in the *Gazette*; (b) take effect from the date of publication or from a later date to be specified therein; and (c) be judicially noticed, and unless and until disallowed as hereinafter provided, or except in so far as in conflict with any express provision of this or any other Act, be conclusively deemed to be valid. (2.) Such regulations and by-laws shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament within fourteen days after publication if Parliament is in session, and if not, then within fourteen days after the commencement of the next session. (3.) If either House of Parliament pass a resolution at any time within one month after any such regulation or by-law has been laid before them disallowing such regulation or by-law, then the same shall thereupon cease to have effect, subject, however, to such and the like savings as apply in the case of the repeal of a statute":

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: I move—

*That the amendment be agreed to.*

The main portion of the amendment provides that either House might reject regulations.

Question passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

[*The Speaker resumed the Chair.*]

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a Message accordingly returned to the Council.

## BILL—MINES REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT.

*(Council's Amendments.)*

Schedule of six amendments made by the Council now considered.

*In Committee.*

Mr. McDowall in the Chair; the Minister for Mines in charge of the Bill.

No. 1.—Clause 6, paragraph (c.): Strike out the words "be elected by duly registered unions of mine workers in accordance with the regulations" and insert the words "in accordance with the regulations be elected by the majority of persons bona fide employed in the mines in the several mining districts":

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The Bill provided for the election of workmen's inspectors by duly registered unions of mine workers, and the amendment seeks to provide for their election by a majority of the persons employed in the mines. The question has already been debated, and I move—

*That the amendment be not agreed to.*

Hon. Frank Wilson: Why not? It is a reasonable amendment.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The clause was more reasonable than the amendment is. The properly constituted unions have been recognised in similar legislation, namely, the Arbitration Act, for many years and this measure is on all fours with that. An overwhelming majority of the men employed in the mines, and particularly of those working underground, are members of the miners' union, and it would be much easier for them than for the mine workers as a whole to elect workmen's inspectors.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: What percentage of the men employed in the mines are in the union?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: We have no statistics, but I believe it varies from 70 to 90 per cent. in the different districts. There is no district in the State where the majority of the men do not belong to some union. Therefore I see no reason why they should not elect the workmen's inspectors. This principle has been recognised in other countries and the demand for the appointment of workmen's inspectors has always emanated from the organised bodies.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: The non-unionist today is really outside the pale of all industrial laws.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Yes, he is a rat.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: There is no doubt most of our industrial legislation does not recognise the non-unionist. If it has been thought good to recognise the rights of organised bodies, and ignore the rights of unorganised men in connection with other similar legislation, there is no reason why the same should not be done in this case.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It was rather amusing to hear the interjection of the member for Subiaco. It is somewhat on a par with the Kaiser's desired system of domination in European matters. The hon. member endorses the statement made by the secretary of the Trades Hall some time ago that non-unionists were rats and ought to be made to live the lives of rats. I take exception to such expressions; it is time they were stopped.

Mr. Green: How would a lawyer be treated if he charged less than the registered fee?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Because some men do not agree with hon. members opposite and their trade unions, they think such men should not be able to earn a living. Members with an undoubted wish to be fair ought not to endorse such a thing.

The Premier: You have to endorse it because it is a fact.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I will not endorse it, and will do my best to persuade the Committee to agree to the amendment. The trade unions are attempting to treat people outside their

ranks in this unfair manner, and the Premier and his colleagues, under pressure from the Trades Hall, are trying to make life unbearable for anyone who disagrees with them. This will recoil on their own heads. One of these days they themselves will be anxious to shake off the shackles of the Trades Hall—I daresay they would like to do so now—and when that time comes, they will wish they had not been so pronounced in their advocacy of such proposals.

The Premier: I like that from you—dominated by the Employers' Federation of which you form a part.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I am not even a member of it. I am independent of the Employers' Federation and the Trades Hall, and I object to being stamped out of existence by either of them.

The Premier: Do not you work in combination with other coal owners?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: There is a coal owners' association.

The Premier: There you are.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: That has nothing to do with the Employers' Federation.

The Premier: They are a part of the Employers' Federation.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: They are not.

The Premier: What do you do with the coal owner at Collie if he stands outside your arrangements?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: What I would like to do with the Premier, wipe him out, put him outside the pale of the law for the time being and then, perhaps, the country would improve. Then all, including the Premier, if he gave a fair day's work for a fair day's pay, would have a chance to live. The Minister for Mines was remarkably modest; he thought the amendment required no debate. As a matter of fact he was on thin ice and, if he had done his duty to his own people and to the rest of the State, he would have accepted the amendment. The amendment amounts to this: it is desired that the inspectors shall be elected by the workers on the mines, and not by only one section of them. It is

possibly true that 70 to 90 per cent. of the men working on the goldfields belong to some union, and that there is anything from 10 to 30 per cent. who are not members of unions. We hear so much about protecting the lives of the workers, and yet from 10 to 30 per cent. of the workers who are not members of unions are to have no say in the appointment of these inspectors. Therefore, the lives of one section of the workers are of no consequence, while the lives of the other section are of the greatest consequence. Why should not non-unionists have as much right in this matter as the unionists themselves? The Government, however, say, "We have our trades union organisation; we have made it into a huge political machine which has got charge of the country, and we are going to bring all the pressure we can to bear upon anyone outside, so that his life shall be miserable until he joins our ranks." The amendment is a just one. The argument that it is not so convenient does not hold good. Is it not just as convenient to take a ballot on the mine as the men go off shift as to take a ballot at the Trades Hall? Why force all these acts of the workers into the Trades Hall, especially in view of the fact that 30 per cent. of the workers have no right of access to the Trades Hall? I hope the Committee will pass the amendment as requested.

The PREMIER: The hon. member himself believes in unionism, not the brand, of course, that means that the men employed in an industry can band together for the purpose of protecting their own interests, but the brand of unionism which would be at the will and whim of the Employers' Federation. This is the brand he desires to inaugurate in Western Australia.

Hon. Frank Wilson: This is a voluntary system. It is a different brand to the trades hall unionism.

The PREMIER: If industrial unionism does not suit the hon. member, it becomes some kind of terrorism which has to be put down at once. Let me remind him of the Packers' union. The leader of

the Opposition said on the public platform that he welcomed this union, which was formed by the employers' federation for the purpose of blackmailing, when they had an opportunity of doing so, all recognised unions throughout Australia.

Hon. Frank Wilson: That was not so.

The PREMIER: It was. There is evidence in *Hansard* which I produced, and which showed a statement made by the president of the Australian Employers' Federation in London, to the effect that they had formed a union and had established an employment bureau, and had laid it down as a rule that before a man could register in the bureau he had to join that union. They also subsidised the union. In this way the employers formed a union.

Hon. Frank Wilson: No.

The PREMIER: It is in *Hansard* and can be looked up. I brought to the Chamber a newspaper report of the utterances in London of the president of that organisation. The hon. member on the public platform in Western Australia said he welcomed that union into Western Australia.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I would welcome any independent union.

The PREMIER: The hon. member would welcome any organisation that would undermine the true and unadulterated form of unionism which has stood for generations past for the uplifting of the worker. We have a difference of opinion as to whether unionism should embrace every man, if he so desires, employed on a mine, for the selection of these check inspectors, or whether we should leave it open to anyone to prepare the roll for the purpose of conducting the election.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: Regulations are provided for.

The PREMIER: What do the regulations provide for? Someone must prepare the roll for the purpose of conducting the election. If the hon. member was on the Treasury benches he would

make regulations for the mine owners to prepare the roll. He would thus get behind this particular clause of the Bill. The leader of the Opposition suggested that the lives of 30 per cent. of the workers were to be disregarded because they did not belong to unions. Are 70 to 90 per cent. of the workers going to risk their own lives at the expense of the 30 per cent.? It is absurd to suggest that the union workers will appoint check inspectors in such a way as to do an injury to the non-unionists when in doing so they must do an injury to themselves. The method suggested is the only practical one by which the check inspectors can be appointed if their services are going to give satisfaction. In our Arbitration Courts only two parties to an industrial dispute are heard, one side being representative of the employers, and the other representative of the union. In such cases men who are not members of the unions are not represented or recognised, and why should they be recognised in this case which is of more vital importance than the question of a daily wage of 10s. or 12s.? There should be no objection to the clause as it originally passed this Chamber. The leader of the Opposition is only doing a little special pleading in order to make members believe that in the opinion of this side of the House men who do not belong to unions are outside the pale of the law. What the member for Subiaco said was that men who were not members of industrial unions were not recognised under our industrial laws. That is a statement of fact which cannot be denied by the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: The leader of the Opposition became indignant concerning the statement of fact which I put forward. Immediately upon the outbreak of war the British Government summoned into consultation representatives of all the organised labour in Great Britain, but not one representative of unorganised labour was invited to take part in the deliberations concerning the manufacture of necessities for the country during the period of war. Fur-

thermore, when the coal trouble occurred in South Wales, members of the British Cabinet invited representatives of the unions to confer with them in regard to it, but did not invite representatives of the workers who were not members of industrial unions.

Hon. Frank Wilson: How do you know?

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: Only representatives of industrial unions were consulted about bringing this dispute to an end.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: They are not political labour unions; they are trades unions.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: They are just as much political organisations as any unions in Western Australia. Take the action of the Chamber of Mines itself. When that organisation desired to draw up an industrial agreement they only invited members of unions to consider the matter. That is a strong argument against non-unionists being allowed to enter into this particular matter. There is also the question of the preparation of the roll, if we are to have non-unionists as well as unionists upon it.

Mr. Taylor: If a man has been a tradesman for 20 years, he still must resign from the union if he is not working in the industry.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: Yes. Every name on the union books must be that of a bona fide worker in the industry. When the secretary of the Independent Workers' Union was in Perth he had numerous consultations with the leader of the Opposition. Of course it was claimed that the consultations were only about the unemployed difficulty. At the same time, it is a strange coincidence that a meeting was called in Perth for the purpose of launching the Independent Workers' Union. Unorganised labour is not recognised to-day in any part of the world where industrial legislation exists. The non-recognition of the small percentage of non-unionists so far as the election of check inspectors is concerned the leader of the Opposition construes into disregard for the lives of the non-unionists. Rather should it be claimed that the non-

unionists show a disregard for the lives of unionists, and also for their own, by their preference for cringing to the employers instead of agitating to obtain safe conditions of working.

Mr. TAYLOR: I wish to point out to the leader of the Opposition that in adopting this amendment we should be departing from all the principles laid down here and in another Chamber when formulating industrial legislation. For the last 15 years we have recognised the principle that organised employers should treat with organised workers. That principle would have found expression in the present Bill, even if members now in Opposition had been on the Treasury bench.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The argument of the member for Mount Margaret is unsound. It is true that our industrial arbitration legislation provides that men must organise for the purpose of approaching the court. But any 21 workers can form themselves into a union and register for that purpose.

Mr. Foley: No.

Mr. Taylor: Try it.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I have always said that I would make the arbitration court as free as a court of small debts. The member for Subiaco has dragged in the Independent Workers' Union of Melbourne. I think that union is still in existence in Melbourne.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: We do not hear much of it.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The only public expression of opinion I ever gave with regard to that body was that I welcomed a free and independent union of workers, a non-political body. As regards the Premier's remarks concerning the Employers' Federation, I have to point out that the employers are not all of the same political faith, and that the object of their federation is to advance, not their politics, but their industry. The clause as it originally stood asks us to enact something that is incongruous and repugnant. There is no insurmountable difficulty in allowing non-unionists to have a say in this matter, because the workmen's inspectors could be elected

on the pay sheets. Would everybody voting on a Trades Hall roll be really qualified to vote? Certainly not. Many of them would not be workers at all. In reply to the remarks of the member for Subiaco, let me point out that Mr. Lloyd George in no way represented British capital in connection with the coal strike. Mr. Lloyd George is a true democrat, representing all classes, and more especially the working class. Naturally he consulted the leaders of the men who were kicking up the row. The proposal of the Government is just the same as if the Premier, in the event of the election of a representative from this Parliament to the Imperial Parliament, were to contend that members on the Opposition side should not be permitted to vote at all because they were not Labourites. The Government ought to accept the Council's amendment, which would be acceptable to a very fair proportion of the workers. It enables all the men on the mine, whether unionist or non-unionist, to elect the man who, in conjunction with the district inspector, is to be responsible for the proper inspection of the workings.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: Would you allow non-unionists to vote for a workers' representative on the arbitration court bench?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I did not either permit them to vote or prevent them from voting.

Mr. FOLEY: I trust the House will not agree to the amendment, which is unfair, not to the non-unionists, but to those who take an interest in the welfare of mine workers. Mining unionism is a different thing from city unionism, and is used for different purposes. In the Eastern States if there is any trouble in a mine, if there is an inrush of water or if the safety of the mine, not the men, is jeopardised, almost since the inception of unionism the union of employers has always gone to the employees' union and consulted with them as to the best means of effecting a remedy. On our goldfields before the advent of unionism, things were not too good and the conditions

under which the men worked were certainly not good. The conditions under which the employers had to work their mines were not as efficient as they are at the present time. The efficiency has been brought about by the good spirit existing between the union of employers and the union of employees. Where does the leader of the Opposition get his information from?

Hon. Frank Wilson: Where do you get yours?

Mr. FOLEY: I have got mine from a lifelong experience in an industry which the hon. gentleman knows nothing about.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I was working in a mine before you saw one.

Mr. FOLEY: The system of mining that the hon. member knows of is as dead as Julius Caesar. When this and other Bills of a similar nature were before this Chamber the whole of the data given to the leader of the Opposition came from one of the strongest unions in existence, namely the Chamber of Mines. The data which the leader of the Opposition is working upon at the present time is exactly similar to the data given to the Minister for Mines by Mr. Thomas Maughan. The union that the Premier spoke of was quoted in a speech by Mr. Blackwood of Melbourne. Mr. Blackwood was President of the Employers' Federation. Mr. Blackwood believes in unionism, like the leader of the Opposition and the member for Canning. Mr. Blackwood's remarks were these—

The next step taken by the employers as far as this union was concerned was to establish a Labour Bureau within the building which the employers were asked to patronise. This essential feature of employment has been the means of largely increasing the membership. The men seemed naturally to go where they could secure work. Those who turn up generally from 60 to 70 a day, are carefully scrutinised by the bureau's secretary when all obvious loafers are passed out.

They must have great powers of discernment if they can tell a loafer from the worker by merely looking at him.

The respectable men's names are entered in a register and employment found for them as soon as possible.

This is where their unionism comes in—Before taking up a job they must become members of the Independent Workers' Union by putting 1s. down and agreeing to pay 6d. a week subscription.

Is that not preference to a union of non-descripts, a union that never fought for anything in their lives? That is the kind of unionism that the leader of the Opposition sticks up for. The unionism which we wish to see recognised is the unionism that we know. In my district 97 per cent. of those engaged in the mining industry are members of unions and in the other districts I think the percentage of miners who belong to the unions is certainly not lower than 70 anywhere. The very small percentage who do not belong to the unions merely sit idly by and have no trouble or worry. They merely do their work. The men in the unions have fought the battles for the others and got for them all that it was possible to get, namely the conditions which they are enjoying at the present time.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Nothing of the sort. Take the Lumpers' Union. They will not admit them there.

Mr. FOLEY: There is not a man working in or about a mine who cannot get into a union of workers in the mining industry if he wants to do so.

Hon. J. Mitchell: What does he pay?

Mr. FOLEY: The large sum of 2s. and then a subscription of 1s. a week, which entitles him to be placed in the position of not asking for charity if he gets hurt.

Hon. Frank Wilson: What do you do with the 1s. a week? It goes into a political fund, a lot of it.

Mr. FOLEY: A political fund would not get very rich on 1s. a week. When we read the report of the Registrar of Friendly Societies we see a reference to the fact that the amount of accident pay



is creeping up until it takes up almost the whole of that 1s. a week. The unionist engaged in mining thus makes himself independent of charity, and the very first to whom our non-unionist friends apply are those whom he has traduced all the time. The unionist in the mining districts seldom, if ever, turns down an appeal for assistance. It is absolutely fair, considering that the unions year in and year out have done something to better their conditions and have done a good deal to put the mining industry on a better basis of working, that every member of Parliament should see that adequate recognition is given to unionism. So far as accidents on the goldfields are concerned, many of them have happened to non-unionists, and no hon. member can say that a unionist has refused to go to the assistance of his fellow man in the event of his being a non-unionist.

Hon. J. Mitchell: What has that to do with this amendment?

Mr. FOLEY: Nothing except that it puts the unionist in a true light. The leader of the Opposition said that there is discrimination where the life of a miner is concerned.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I said nothing of the sort.

Mr. FOLEY: At any rate I want to emphasise that there is no discrimination in mining where the safety of life is concerned. If the amendment is not agreed to the unions will have to provide the money for the machinery to carry out the election. Last session the Country party in another place definitely promised that when the miners required assistance they would furnish it; yet, in face of that, the division lists on this Bill in another place show that those members were not sincere in their promise. However, whether the amendment is agreed to or not, I believe the unionists will have sufficient numbers to elect their own representatives. One hon. member said that any 15 men could form a union. That may be so in some industries, but not in mining. In the debate on the Health Bill in another place all

members accepted the advice of the one medical man among their numbers; if it was a legal question, the opinions of the Attorney General and the member for Canning (Mr. Robinson) in this House would be accepted; why then should not the advice of mining representatives be accepted on a Bill of this nature? I trust the amendment will be negatived.

Mr. CHESSON: The Arbitration Act provides that only unionists shall vote in the preparation of a citation for the court. Following that direction I contend that none but unionists should have a say in the election of the workmen's inspectors. On the Murchison 95 per cent. of the miners are Britishers; the other five per cent, are foreigners, and should have no voice in the election of a workmen's inspector. Just now heavy calls are being made on the Britishers for war funds, and we are told that conscription is to come presently. When conscription arrives the Britishers will be called upon to go to the war, and those left in the mines will be principally foreigners, who, if the Council's amendment is agreed to, will then have all the say in the election of workmen's inspectors. A man appointed inspector by the unionists will have some ability, but the foreigners would vote for any man who happens to be popular with them. When a workers' representative is called upon to view the scene of an accident, and take up the case, he takes it up on behalf of non-unionists as well as unionists. If the mine-owners are to control the ballot, only the men on the pay-sheet will be allowed to vote, but if the ballot is taken on the union rolls men working in little shows will be entitled to vote for an inspector, who, in point of fact, will be elected to look after the interests of all the miners in the district.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	16
Noes	..	..	..	11
				—
Majority for	..			5
				--

## ATTS.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Collier	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Foley	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Green	Mr. Walker
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Willmott
Mr. Mullany	Mr. Bolton

(Teller).

## NOES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Connolly	Mr. Robinson
Mr. George	Mr. Varyard
Mr. Gilchrist	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Male
Mr. Lefroy	

(Teller).

Question thus passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 2.—Clause 9: Strike out the clause and insert the following:—"Workmen's inspectors shall be appointed for a term not to exceed two years, but they shall be eligible for re-appointment. A workman's inspector may be removed from his office by the Minister for any cause which the Minister may, in his discretion, deem sufficient."

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I move—

*That the amendment be agreed to.*

Question passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 3.—Clause 10: Strike out the word "an" in line one and insert the words "a district or special":

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I move—

*That the amendment be agreed to.*

Question passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 4.—Clause 10: Add at the end of the clause the following:—"A workmen's inspector shall have power to do all or any of the following things, namely—  
(a) To make examination and inquiry to ascertain whether the provisions of this Act affecting any mine are complied with;  
(b) To enter, inspect, and examine any mine and every part thereof at all times by day or night, with such assistants as he may deem necessary, but so as not unnecessarily to impede or obstruct the working of the mine;  
(c) To examine into and make inquiry respecting the state and condition of any mine or any

part thereof, and of all matters or things connected with or relating to the safety or well-being of the persons or animals employed therein or in any mine contiguous thereto, and for the purpose of such examination or inquiry the inspector may require the attendance of any mine official or employee, and such official or employee shall attend accordingly;  
(d) With the authority of a district inspector, but not otherwise, to initiate and conduct prosecutions against persons offending against the provisions of this Act;  
(e) Where a district inspector is not available, or with the authority of a district inspector, to obtain written statements from witnesses, and to appear at inquiries held respecting mining accidents, and at inquests, and to call and examine witnesses, and to cross-examine witnesses";

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I propose to amend this amendment. I agree to accept paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (d). In paragraph (e) the words inserted are, "Where a district inspector is not available or with the authority of a district inspector to obtain written statements from witnesses, etc." I will accept that also. I move—

*That the Council's amendment be amended by inserting at the end of the paragraphs, "(f) To exercise generally such other powers as are in his discretion necessary for carrying this Act into effect."*

This is only restoring some of the powers which it was proposed to confer upon workmen's inspectors in the first place. The amendment made by the Council strips workmen's inspectors of their powers in an important direction.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: Paragraph (f) would give them everything which is not contained in paragraphs (d) and (e).

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes. It would give them general power as regards the administration of the Act.

Mr. Robinson: What powers are they?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: They are powers to enforce the Act already in force. Only such powers as are conferred upon workmen's inspectors by the many provisions of the Mines Regulation Act are to be given.

Mr. Robinson: Would the Minister be willing to add the words "and such other powers given by this Act" to paragraph (f) in place of the words which give discretion to the inspector?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: There is no need for that. No inspector can go outside the powers conferred on him under the Act. The words suggested would be superfluous.

Hon. Frank Wilson: A workmen's inspector could shut down a section of a mine because he thought it dangerous without going to the district inspector.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Not without going to the district inspector. The district inspector himself has no power to close down absolutely and entirely a part of a mine. If it is necessary, however, these powers are conferred on the district inspector and the special inspector by the amendment. It is quite conceivable that the powers which might be necessary for a district inspector to exercise upon occasions may also be necessary on the side of the workmen's inspector. The workmen's inspectors will have to administer the Act in places where the district inspector is not available, or may not be likely to be visiting such places for two or three months. If it is necessary for a district inspector to have certain powers when visiting a remote goldfields centre once in three months, it is also essential that the workmen's inspectors should have those powers in the absence of the district inspector.

Mr. Robinson: Will this paragraph give them this power?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I think so.

Mr. Robinson: Will not other words have to be used in order to convey that meaning?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It has to be taken in conjunction with other powers which are also conferred. The only specific power which a workmen's inspector has is contained in these amendments. Outside Clause 10 the workmen's inspector will have no power whatever. The intention of the Bill is that he shall not be subjected to any

greater restrictions than those imposed upon a district inspector with regard to the safety of a mine or taking precautions in regard to dangerous places underground, in the circumstances that I have just related. It is necessary that the powers conferred under paragraph (f) should be given to the workmen's inspectors if they are going to fulfil the duties which are expected of them under this Bill.

Amendment put and passed.

Question as amended passed; the Council's amendment as amended agreed to.

No. 5.—New clause: Add the following to stand as No. 4:—"Section sixteen of the principal Act is hereby repealed":

The MINISTER FOR MINES: This amendment simply proposes to repeal Section 16 of the principal Act. That section deals with workmen's inspectors as they were appointed in the past. Now that we are agreeing to other methods there is really no further need for that section. I therefore move—

*That the amendment be agreed to.*

Question passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 6.—New clause: Add the following clause:—1. Any regulation or by-law made or purporting to be made under or by virtue of this Act shall—(a.) be published in the *Gazette*; (b.) take effect from the date of publication or from a later date to be specified therein; and (c.) be judicially noticed, and unless and until disallowed as hereinafter provided, or except in so far as in conflict with any express provision of this or any other Act, be conclusively deemed to be valid. 2. Such regulations and by-laws shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament within fourteen days after publication if Parliament is in session, and if not, then within fourteen days after the commencement of the next session. 3. If either House of Parliament pass a resolution at any time within one month after any such regulation or by-law has been laid before it disallowing such regulation or by-law, then the same shall thereupon cease to have effect, subject, however, to such and the like savings as

apply in the case of the repeal of a statute:

The MINISTER FOR MINES: This amendment deals with the question of making by-laws and regulations. I see no need whatever for altering the provision which exists at the present time and which has been in existence ever since the Act was first passed.

Hon. Frank Wilson: But the Government have just accepted a similar proposal from the Legislative Council in the Weights and Measures Bill.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The Weights and Measures Bill, however, is a new measure. In this case the Mines Regulation Act has been in existence for nine years and we have found no need to make any alteration in regard to the by-laws and regulations. There has never been a word of complaint in that time.

Mr. George: You surely do not stand in the way of improvements.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: If we have something which has served us well for nine years, and which our experience tells us there is no need to alter why seek to effect an alteration. I move—

*That the amendment be not agreed to.*

Mr. GEORGE: I see no reason why the proposal of the Legislative Council should not be passed. There is nothing wrong with any of the paragraphs of the proposed amendment. If the Minister does object to the proposal, why does he not tell us what his objections are?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Premier himself suggested that such an amendment should be inserted in every Act.

The Premier: It has never been discussed here.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: It surely cannot be argued that one House should extend laws when it takes two Houses to make them. The proposal of the Legislative Council is quite reasonable and should be accepted.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: The opposition of the Minister to this proposed new clause is surprising because the principle is not new and it was accepted by his

colleague, the Honorary Minister, in the Weights and Measures Bill only an hour ago. Nearly every Act which is passed is governed by regulations and it will tend to the smooth working of any Act to have wide powers in regard to regulations. If these powers are not given we will find ourselves having to effect amendments to laws every session. The Interpretation Act ought to be amended also to provide in the direction that this clause suggests. It is very important that the amendment should be made, especially when we remember the sweeping amendment which the Bill will make to the Mines Regulation Act, sweeping in that it introduces a new principle in regard to check inspectors. The check inspectors are given much wider powers than such inspectors are given by any Act in any other part of the world. Then the Executive can give them further powers by regulation.

The Minister for Mines: You cannot confer powers on inspectors by regulation.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: The methods by which they shall carry out their work is giving them power. I doubt if the Committee would have agreed to the amendment moved by the Minister for Mines if members had thought that this new clause would not be accepted. It is unreasonable when members have been so generous in giving such wide powers not to agree to this new clause.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: This question has been thrashed out on so many occasions that it is almost unnecessary to make any remark. I can quite understand those who believe the Legislative Council is an incubus and ought to be swept away supporting the attitude of the Minister, but those of us who believe in a two chamber Parliament believe that the clause is a right provision to have in the Bill. The Interpretation Act says that regulations must be approved by both Houses, but I have always held that this provision in the Interpretation Act should be amended. The Government initiates legislation and it takes both Houses to pass that legislation. The Government draw up regulations and by

those regulations the Government can extend the powers of an Act of Parliament and they do so on many occasions. It ought to take both Houses to approve of the regulations or if one House disapproves of them they should not have the force of law. The regulations cannot be objected to effectively in this Chamber, because the Government have a majority, but they can in another chamber. Whatever Government is in power must be in power by a majority, therefore their regulations cannot be effectively objected to in this House.

The Minister for Mines: Why is it that the Council have not asked for this provision before the last two or three years?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: This provision has been put into Bills times out of number within recent years and the Government have accepted the provision. This afternoon the Government accepted it in another Bill; why stand out on this measure? Do the Government think that the Upper House will object to the regulations which the Government will frame under this Bill? Let the Government be consistent. If the Government believe that this is a fair provision in regard to regulations, then let them stick to it in all cases. It is of vital importance that the provision should be inserted in this Bill.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	15
Noes	..	..	..	15
A tie	..	..	..	0

#### AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Collier	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Foley	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Green	Mr. Walker
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Bolton
Mr. Mullany	(Teller).

#### NOES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Connolly	Mr. Robinson
Mr. George	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Gilchrist	Mr. Veryard
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. Willmott
Mr. Harrison	Mr. F. Wiltson
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Male
Mr. Lefroy	(Teller.)

The CHAIRMAN: I give my casting vote with the ayes.

Question thus passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Resolutions reported, and the report adopted.

A committee consisting of Hon. Frank Wilson, Mr. Mullany and Hon. P. Collier drew up reasons for not agreeing to two of the Council's amendments.

Reasons adopted, and a Message accordingly returned to the Council.

#### BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT (CONTINUANCE).

*Council's amendments.*

Schedule of four amendments made by the Council now considered.

*In Committee.*

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

No. 1.—New clause: Add the following to stand as Clause 3:—Section 3 of The Licensing Act Amendment Act, 1914, is amended by adding the following proviso:—Providing that during the continuance of this Act, notwithstanding anything in The Licensing Act, 1911, whereby or pursuant to any provision of such Act or by any license or special permit heretofore or hereafter granted thereunder, a time before the hour of nine o'clock in the morning or after nine o'clock at night is prescribed as the earliest or latest time respectively at which liquor may be sold or disposed of in any licensed premises or club premises, the said and all other provisions of such Act and every such license or special permit shall be read and construed and given effect to as if for such earliest time there were substituted the said hour of nine o'clock and for such latest time the said hour of nine o'clock:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It is necessary to explain what has been done by the Council in regard to this measure in anticipation of considering another

measure. The Government introduced a local option Bill to give to the people the right to decide the hour when licensed premises should be open. The Council have anticipated that measure by proposing in the emergency amending Licensing Bill amendments to fix the trading hours for licensed premises between nine a.m. and nine p.m. These amendments, to a certain extent, infringe upon the other measure. It was proposed to leave it to the discretion of the Government to close public houses in any licensing district or in any prescribed portion of a licensing district, either altogether or for certain hours in the day. Full discretion was given to the Government to act in cases of emergency. Evidently the Council have considered the whole as one great emergency, and to a certain extent I agree with them. So much can I agree with them that I leave it entirely to the Committee to vote on this amendment. I would prefer that the Government should have a free hand, so that if the necessity arose hotels could be closed or the hours for trade limited as might be deemed necessary, but the Council have limited the discretion to act in that manner to the period between nine a.m. and nine p.m. Within these hours, the discretion is still preserved and the principle will still obtain, but this is a curtailment of the principle in some degree.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I cannot see that.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Certainly it is.

Hon. Frank Wilson: It is curtailed by the opening and closing hours now.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It was not curtailed under the local option Bill. The people would have been able to say whether the opening hour should be seven, eight, nine or ten o'clock. If this amendment is agreed to, the necessity for the local option measure will be removed. I have been wedded to the local option Bill, because the liquor traffic is *par excellence* one for the consideration of the people.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Yes, but is it in war time? This is an emergency measure.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: If the local option Bill is passed after we have

fixed the hours from nine a.m. to nine p.m., we shall have taken from the people the opportunity to fix the hours as they have a right to do. If this amendment is agreed to another place might consider the other measure unnecessary.

Mr. Taylor: It will be unnecessary for war purposes.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Undoubtedly. My only objection to this amendment is that it destroys the appeal to the people for which we were providing. We promised the temperance bodies that we would submit a local option measure, and if this amendment is agreed to that measure will be jeopardised. I cannot credit that another place would carry it if we agreed to this amendment. In fact it is understood the local option Bill has been postponed pending the fate of this amendment, and my objection to the amendment is that it will seal the fate of that Bill. As a believer in the appeal to the people, especially on a question which concerns them socially to a degree scarcely to be expressed, I have an objection to the acceptance of this amendment. At the same time I recognise that, if we cannot get local option, this is a step in the right direction. I move—

*That the amendment be not agreed to.*

Mr. ROBINSON: I think the Committee should adopt the amendment, because it gets over the entire difficulty which we have been debating. The view of those who some months ago waited on the Premier was that the Government had sufficient power under the then existing law to close hotels at any time and in any locality. The answer of the Government was that they would not take the responsibility of using that statute in war time for a war purpose when they had given their word to Parliament that the measure was only to be used in cases of emergency, of which war was not one—the principal contingency mentioned by the Attorney General was racial riots. The next move was that the Attorney General introduced a Bill to give power to take a local option poll. In the discussion of that measure an amendment

was moved similar to that which we have now before us from another place. If I mistake not, that amendment was then ruled out of order, the Attorney General taking the point that the amendment was foreign to the Bill. I observe that another place has got over the difficulty by making an addition to the title of this Bill.

The Attorney General: That does not cover it.

Mr. ROBINSON: I have only the amendment before me at the moment, and I am not prepared to argue whether the constitutional difficulty raised by the Attorney General is or is not got over.

The Attorney General: I do not think it is.

Mr. ROBINSON: If not, then it can no doubt be got over by a further amendment. If the cry of "Refer the question to the people" is to be raised on every Bill, there will never be any legislation at all. Let us leave party spirit aside in considering this measure. As a matter of fact, the Council has adopted this suggestion from us. Instead of the hours being 8 to 8, which some people thought drastic, they are now to be fixed practically at 9 to 9. That circumstance will save the Treasurer £3,000.

The Premier: No: £300.

Mr. ROBINSON: I commend the Council's amendment as offering a fair way out of the difficulty.

#### *Point of Order.*

The Attorney General: I do not like to interrupt the hon. member, but he has referred to my having previously objected to this amendment. I submit that the whole of these amendments are out of order.

Mr. Robinson: Does the Attorney General rise to a point of order on my address?

The Attorney General: No; on the whole debate. The whole debate is out of order.

Mr. Robinson: The Attorney General having opened the debate, I simply followed up the matters discussed. I understand that when a member is on his feet, another member cannot rise to a point

of order unless it is on something arising out of the speech of the member on his feet. Apparently the Attorney General wants to burke the whole discussion. Is the Attorney General in order?

The Chairman: I understand the Attorney General is raising the point of order that these amendments, according to the practice, are not in order at all; and I understand, further, that he is waiting for my decision on that point.

Mr. Robinson: Can the Attorney General do that when I am speaking?

The Chairman: A member can rise to a point of order at any time. If that were not so, a member could speak for an hour or two in a debate that is wholly out of order.

Mr. Robinson: Is the Attorney General in order in rising to a point of order on something antecedent to my address? I thought that when I was on my feet, replying to the Attorney General, I could not be ordered to sit down so long as I complied with the rules of debate.

The Chairman: The Attorney General made an explanation, and then the member for Canning rose to support the amendment. During his speech—whether as the result of an argument used by the member for Canning I do not know—it appeared to the Attorney General that the whole of the amendments were out of order. The Attorney General rose for the purpose of raising that point of order, and in doing so he certainly interrupted the speech of the member for Canning. I now ask the Attorney General to state his point, and I ask the member for Canning to be seated.

The Attorney General: The following appears in *May*, Tenth Edition, page 458—

In like manner, it is not within the scope of a Committee on an expiring laws continuance Bill to amend the provisions of the Acts proposed to be continued, or to abridge the duration of such provisions; nor can an amendment be moved whereby an Act still in force would be included among the provisions of a statute law revision Bill . . . .

and so on. The point is that we cannot make any amendment in an expiring laws continuance Bill or amend any of the provisions of the Act to be continued.

Mr. Taylor: This was done by the Council.

The Attorney General: It is not within our power to permit it to be done.

The Chairman: Standing Order 391 says—

It is an instruction to all Committees of the whole House to whom Bills may be committed, that they have power to make such Amendments therein as they shall think fit, provided they be relevant to the subject-matter of the Bill; but if any such amendments shall not be within the title of the Bill, they shall amend the title accordingly, and report the same specially to the House.

This Bill is a continuance Bill. It certainly has been through the House as a continuance Bill. It is before us as a continuance Bill at the present time. The fact that Standing Order 391 insists upon amendments being relevant to the subject matter of the Bill, certainly brings this Bill within that Standing Order. Further than that, *May*, as the Attorney General has quoted, says in dealing with a similar matter—

In like manner, it is not within the scope of a Committee on an expiring laws continuance Bill to amend the provisions of the Acts proposed to be continued.

This is an expiring laws continuance Bill. There is no getting away from that. Therefore, these amendments are certainly not relevant to the subject-matter of the Bill, inasmuch as they absolutely and entirely alter the scope and provisions of the Bill in almost every conceivable way. In actual fact they make it a different Bill altogether. I therefore rule that the Council's amendments are out of order.

*Dissent from Chairman's ruling.*

Mr. Robinson: I move—

*That the Chairman's ruling be disagreed with.*

I do so on the ground that as the amendments deal with the alteration of the title of the Bill, they thereupon become relevant to the Bill.

*[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]*

Mr. McDowall: I have to report that the member for Canning has moved to disagree with my ruling. The Attorney General raised a point of order that the Council's amendments are not in order because they are not relevant to the subject matter of the Bill. In accordance with our Standing Orders, and in accordance with the decision given on page 386 of *May*, 1911 edition, I ruled that the amendments were not in order. My ruling has been disputed.

Mr. Robinson: The title of the Bill as it stands is "An Act to continue the operation of the Licensing Act Amendment Act, 1914." The Bill as it came before us dealt solely with the continuation of that measure, and under the Standing Orders, if a Bill deals solely with the continuation of another measure, the ruling given by the Chairman (Mr. Holman) some weeks ago on this subject holds good to-day. But the subject matter before the Committee recently, on which the Chairman gave his decision, was entirely different from that which we are now considering. Standing Order 391 reads—

It is an instruction to all Committees of the whole House to whom Bills may be committed that they have power to make such amendments as they think fit, provided they relate to the subject matter of the Bill.

If it stopped there I should not have the power to continue to address you; but it proceeds—

But if any such amendments shall not be within the title of the Bill, they shall amend the title accordingly and report the same specially to the House. Showing that the meaning of it all is that the amendments to a Bill must be plainly within the title of the Bill. We must not have any other subject matter than that contemplated in the Bill. Let us apply that to these amendments. If they came forward from



another place purely as amendments, I think the motion of the Attorney General would be in order, following the ruling given recently by Mr. Holman. But those in another place who desire these amendments and sent them down for our consideration, realised the difficulty presented by Standing Order 391, and they made this amendment No. 4, adding to the title the words "To amend the same and to amend the Licensing Act, 1911." I submit that the Chairman of Committees, in considering the Standing Orders in question, did not take into consideration that it was proposed to amend the title of the Bill so as to bring the substantive amendments within the purview of the Bill. We therefore, in addressing ourselves to the amendments, would assume that they could only be before the Committee when the Bill was amended in the formal way, as provided by amendment No. 4. I submit that, taking the matter into your own consideration, you must assume that all the amendments are taken together and that the last one is made first, so that the title of the Bill is correctly amended; then, I submit, the remainder follows in order.

The Attorney General: It is not necessary to debate the subject at length, it is so perfectly clear. A Bill was sent up from this Chamber to another place with a distinct title and serving a distinct purpose, aiming at one thing and one thing only, except so far as other matters were relevant to the main issue. In another place amendments have been passed which are entirely irrelevant, which stand entirely upon another footing. Not only do they stand on another footing, but those amendments actually amend other laws, amend the Licensing Act of 1911, and amend the Licensing Act Amendment Act of 1914. All these are not only an extension of the scope given under the title, but they are actually irrelevant, and constitute new matters added to the title under which the measure left this Chamber. There is a distinction which the member for Canning has not pointed out between this measure and ordinary measures; This is a specific title to a Bill. In

ordinary measures, it is true, amendments, being relevant to the measure, can be made, and the title amended to cover them: but this is purely a laws continuance Bill and, being a continuance Bill, is safeguarded from amendments in an especial manner. It is not one of those we can play fast and loose with, the spirit of it being the continuance. The measure proposed to be continued is in operation at the present moment. The question submitted to this Chamber, and the question submitted to another Chamber was only "Shall that Act be continued?" Every amendment, therefore, can only be relative to continuance. There can be no alteration of the main measure, no amendment of the scope of the measure, no shortening or lengthening of its provisions or duration. The one point submitted is continuance, and therefore all other matters outside that scope are irrelevant to it. We cannot take a higher authority than *May*, and he is most explicit. There is no getting beyond what he says; there is no in-reading into the sentence any other conclusion than he points out. He states—

In like manner it is not within the scope of a Committee on an expiring laws continuance Bill to amend the provisions of the Act proposed to be continued.

Therefore, in these circumstances, this being a laws continuance Bill, it is not within the scope of this Committee, or any other committee of the Legislature, to pass amendments altering the character of the Bill.

The Premier: There is only one point to which I desire to draw attention. At the moment we are, I think, deciding that the Committee of another place did not conform to the Standing Orders of another place. This Committee, however, has not attempted to make any amendment to the Bill against the Standing Orders of this House, and it seems to me, if we are not careful, that we shall be deciding a point of order which does not affect this Chamber. If any ruling is to be given, that ruling has to be given in the direction that we

cannot consider this message, because it does not conform to our Standing Orders. In that case, another place which have to decide whether their previous action in making amendments to the Bill, which did not conform to the Title, was rightly or wrongly taken. We can then decide whether to deal with the Message or not. If we decide not to deal with it, the Bill will be lost. We are not making any amendment, and, therefore, that question does not arise here. The Council can, of course, amend the Bill just as we can amend it here. This Bill has come down with the alterations which have been effected by another place. If we cannot agree to the amendments made by the Council we can only do so by stating that their amendments cannot be discussed. It is against our Standing Orders to discuss them.

Hon. Frank Wilson: What Standing Order is this against?

The Premier: I am merely raising the question as to how we are to deal with the matter. We can only deal with it on the basis that the amendments made by the Council do not conform to our Standing Orders, and a Message will have to be transmitted to that place notifying them accordingly.

Mr. Robinson: I would like, with your permission, Sir, to refer to another Bill.

Mr. Speaker: I do not think the hon. member can do so, having already spoken to the question.

Hon. Frank Wilson: It is usual for Mr. Speaker to listen to hon. members, unless he has made up his mind. The member for Canning has another Bill to which he desires to draw your attention. Have you made up your mind, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: I am prepared to listen to hon. members so that I may obtain all the views possible, but I would not be acting correctly by allowing one hon. member to rise from time to time to address the House and not permit other hon. members to do the same.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Only until your are satisfied.

Mr. Speaker: I want to give the hon. member every opportunity of presenting his views, but I would prefer that the leader of the Opposition should take this point.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I am not conversant with the point. It is usual that perhaps two prominent members of the House should argue a point of order across the House, and one or two others may come into the matter from time to time. This is done with the object of giving Mr. Speaker all possible information to enable him to make up his mind. It is all within your province, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is that the Chairman's ruling be disagreed with. I will leave it to the House to decide as to whether they desire further information. It is the pleasure of the House that the member for Canning be heard?

Leave given.

Mr. Robinson: The Bill to which I desire to draw your attention is the Roads Act Continuance Amendment Bill. I hope my object is made clear by the mere mention of the title of that Bill. The title of that Bill is precisely the same as the title proposed for the Bill now under consideration. That is a Bill to continue the operations of the Roads Act and to amend it. If you look at the Bill you will see that it comprises three sections, but that number 2 is divided into seven or eight sections. I also observe that the Statute or Bill comes within the purview of Standing Order 391. It is no use quoting *May* when it comes to a question of our Standing Orders, unless the Standing Orders of the British House of Commons are similar to our own. *May* is useful where we have no law on the subject. Where we have a precise law dealing with the question, as we have in Standing Order 391, I submit that you are bound, Sir, by this Standing Order, and need not look at *May* at all. If my arguments bring me within the purview of Standing Order 391 I submit that you will have no difficulty in ruling that the Bill is in order.

Mr. Speaker: The contention of the member for Canning is that the Chair-

man's ruling is not correct, and should be disagreed with on the ground that if the title of a Bill is altered, any amendment is admissible provided such amendment is within the Title. The hon. member has quoted Standing Order 391. This is an instruction to all committees of the whole House to whom Bills may be committed—

That they have power to make such amendments therein as they shall think fit, provided they be relevant to the subject-matter of the Bill.

I have now to ask myself would these amendments have been relevant to the subject-matter of the Bill when first introduced to this House? In my opinion they would not; they would be distinctly irrelevant. The hon. member for Can- ning now argues that since another Chamber has altered the title the amendments can, therefore, be admitted under the title so amended. Am I correctly stating the hon. member's views?

Mr. Robinson: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: On a previous occasion I gave a decision in this House respecting this very same principle. I desire again to emphasise the points then stressed, that it is permissible for any member to amend the title of a Bill, but that the amendment of the title does not permit the introduction of amendments which are irrelevant to the subject-matter of the Bill. In my opinion the amendments sent down by the other Chamber are distinctly irrelevant, and as such cannot be admitted. I feel it my duty to support the decision of the Chairman for the reasons given.

The Attorney General: Should I be in order in moving that a Message be transmitted to the Legislative Council?

Mr. Robinson: How do you rule, Sir, regarding the last three lines of Standing Order 391?

Mr. Speaker: I will quote them. They state—

But if any such amendments shall not be within the title of the Bill they shall amend the title accordingly and report the same specially to the House. This merely provides that if the amend-

ments submitted are relevant to the subject-matter of the Bill, and not within the title, then in such a case the title can be amended accordingly. The amendment of this title, however, does not permit of amendments which are irrelevant to the subject-matter of the Bill.

Hon. Frank Wilson: The subject-matter of the Bill was the closing of public houses.

The Premier: The only subject-matter of the Bill is that of continuance.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I hope hon. members will accept my decision without further question. The principle involved is not new to me. I gave it considerable attention in 1913, when the hon. member for Northam endeavoured to secure certain amendments to the Bill of Sales Act Amendment Bill. He consulted me on the matter and I went into it most thoroughly. The decision then given can be found in *Hansard*, and is similar to the one given by the Chairman this afternoon. As to the nature of the Message which will go to the Legislative Council in this matter, I will ask the House to allow the question to stand over until we meet after tea.

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

#### *Committee resumed.*

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: In order to expedite matters, I propose now to move in the direction of disagreeing with all the amendments made by the Council. I take this course in order that the matter may be reported to the House and a Committee appointed to draw up reasons for presentation to the Council. I move—

*That the amendments made by the Council be not agreed to.*

Mr. ROBINSON: Does that open up the matter for discussion again? When we send this Bill back to the Upper House, I suppose it simply explains to them that the matter could not be debated here except in a constitutional way.

The Attorney General: That is so.

Question passed; the Council's amendments not agreed to.

A committee consisting of Hon. Frank Wilson, Mr. Robinson, and Hon. T. Walker drew up reasons for not agreeing to the amendments made by the Council.

Reasons adopted and a Message accordingly returned to the Council.

## ANNUAL ESTIMATES. 1915-16.

### *In Committee of Supply.*

Resumed from the 21st October ; Mr. McDowall in the Chair.

Department of Works and Industries (Hon. W. C. Angwin, Minister).

*Vote—Public Works and Buildings, £93,102 :*

Mr. GEORGE (Murray-Wellington) [7-48]: The Minister for Works, in introducing his departmental Estimates, dealt with them very baldly, and I wish he had given us more information as it must be recognised that the request for the expenditure of £93,000 would have been reinforced had some indication been given as to how the officers, for whom salaries amounting to £7,000 are provided, will be employed during the forthcoming year. I do not assume that they will be idle ; no one will contend that, but some information regarding the work on which they will be engaged would have been acceptable. It has been usual to give a resumé of the work of the past year as well as an outline of the work for the year under discussion. This vote shows a decrease of nearly £10,000 on the expenditure for the year 1914-15 and there is a footnote reading " State Brick Works, implement works, quarries and sawmills have been transferred to trading concerns and business undertakings." I would like to have seen it clearly stated what the amount of the saving would be if the State Brick Works for instance had been left in these Estimates. Then we could have formed some idea as to whether there was any real economy being effected or whether it was merely a matter of transfer. Taking these four undertakings on the expenditure of last year, the total expenditure would be £568,432, a clear indication that we cannot by those

means get at anything like a fair idea as to how these Estimates are being dealt with. Take the sawmills, the expenditure upon them last year was £411,000.

The Minister for Works : They were not included last year.

Mr. GEORGE : Then why is this foot-note so prominently displayed on these Estimates ?

The Minister for Works : The brick works were on their own last year.

Mr. GEORGE : What was included in last year's Estimates and how does this decrease of £39,000 come about ? If we knock out the sawmills, that would leave about £100,000 which would swamp the Estimates of last year, so we have no indication on which we can form an opinion. If the implement works were left out, representing £142,000, a sum of £14,000 would be left for the brick works and quarries. This foot-note is absolutely misleading, and the actual decrease shown cannot be arrived at without a close analysis of the Estimates. We are entitled to more information than has been given on this important matter. When referring to the various officials I do not wish to be misunderstood. I realise that if the money for them to expend is not provided on these Estimates, they will probably be engaged on loan works ; still the information should have been given. I would like to refer to some of the works, but I cannot do so without anticipating the matter in connection with the Wyndham Freezing Works which should come on for discussion to-morrow. I think a certain amount of re-organisation in this particular department is desirable in the interests of the public and I hope I shall have an opportunity, at any rate before the session closes, to make some recommendations for the consideration of the Minister and the information of the House. For roads boards subsidies a sum of £27,000 is provided. A number of roads boards are finding it impossible to carry on with the means at their disposal and are entering the loan market, the same as municipalities, and considerable apprehension is being caused among people

in the various districts. I do not know how the question of loans by roads boards is dealt with by the Works Department or whether they have any power to borrow or whether each roads board can act on its own account. Perhaps the Minister will give us some information on this point.

Vote put and passed.

This completed the Estimates of the Department of Works and Industries.

Business undertakings and State trading concerns.

Vote—*Avondale and Harvey Estates*. £5,250 :

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Members have had an opportunity to peruse the report of the Avondale Estate for the year ended 30th June and the financial position has been clearly shown. The Avondale Estate has been farmed by the department and has been fairly successful during the past year or two. There is an increase in the estimated expenditure but this is provided in order to meet two years' interest on the estate, the payment of which was overlooked last year. To the 30th December of last year there was a profit of £642 and the interest was included in that amount but was not paid. The irrigation work is proceeding at the Harvey Estate and it is intended at an early date to settle this land. Consequently, for the present, it cannot be expected to be a paying proposition. There is a small orchard there which is showing a profit, but when it is remembered that we have to pay interest on the whole of the estate pending the completion of the irrigation works and subdivision for sale, it cannot be expected to pay. While the farming account last year showed a profit of about £404 14s. 4d. the total loss was £1,066 11s. 5d., which was due to meeting the interest Bill.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Why have not you sold the estate? That is the point.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: As soon as the irrigation work is finished we will.

Mr. WILLMOTT: I understand the Avondale Estate cost about £5 per

acre. When that estate was bought by the Government there were good fences and homesteads, water in every paddock, up to date shearing sheds, stables and so forth; moreover, the estate is adjacent to the railway. How is it that the property has not been sold?

Mr. E. B. Johnston: No one will take it up on the terms.

Mr. WILLMOTT: In the centre of the estate there is a large area of rocky country, and I understand the idea is that this rocky country must be sold at a price far and above its value in order that the State may get its money back. All land repurchased by the Government, I believe, has to be resold at an advance of 10 per cent. plus cost of subdivision. It seems to me useless to go on buying estates if the Government cannot get rid of those they have bought already, and I hope the Government will not continue to repurchase until they have disposed of the estates they now hold. I understand there is some idea of cutting up Yandanooka estate and farming it on the share system. In my opinion, the better course would be to cut up that estate into blocks of 1,000 acres and put on them settlers with some money.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: All the repurchased estates might have been shown under one heading. The Avondale Estate, I believe, has been run at a profit.

The Premier: We never could discover the object for which the Avondale estate was purchased.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Minister for Lands has had applications for every block of that estate.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Yes, and he would not sell.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The land is undoubtedly good. The rocky area was taken into consideration when the purchase price of the estate was agreed on. Avondale is in one of our best wheat growing areas. The estate cost as much to make it as we paid for it. However, the point is that the estate is not being sold. It was withdrawn from sale by the late Minister for Lands,

and is now being farmed. I believe the idea of the late Minister for Lands was to grow seed wheat on the estate. The estate should have been sold, and then a great deal more of it would have been under cultivation. On the whole of the repurchased estates there will be a profit.

Hon. Frank Wilson: The Avondale estate could have been sold at a profit.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Undoubtedly, the investment of the money for a period of 20 years at a higher rate of interest than that at which the State borrows returns a profit. The Harvey estate, I observe, is estimated to yield a return of £750 this year, while £250 is expected from Avondale; but, of course, when interest on the purchase price is allowed for, a considerable loss is shown.

Mr. WANSBROUGH: It is absolutely essential that the Government should take this matter in hand seriously. The Avondale estate is degenerating into a wilderness of young growth of all sorts and into a breeding ground for noxious weeds. I fear the Minister's estimate of revenue will prove far beyond the actual result. This year's crops on the Avondale estate are the worst that were ever on it, with the exception of last year's. This is not due to bad farming, but to lack of stocking the estate during the previous years. The crops are half weeds at the present time. The improvements are not being maintained as they should be, and the area cleared by the previous owner is going back to scrub. The 12,000 acres which the estate comprises is carrying only about 1,000 sheep, instead of the 4,000 or 5,000 it should carry in addition to the crop. These facts are retarding the development of the district. Irrespective of the loss which the Government may make on the deal of the previous Administration, the estate should be cut up and sold. Since its repurchase the estate has certainly not paid anything like interest and sinking fund on the purchase price. I notice the Government estimate from a 12,000 acre estate—

Mr. Bolton: It is not 12,000 acres, but 10,000.

Mr. WANSBROUGH: A revenue of £4,000 odd. If I could not produce £20,000 from an estate such as the Avondale, I would leave farming alone.

Hon. Frank Wilson: What profit do you say you would make from the estate?

Mr. WANSBROUGH: I say the Government ought to be doing a turnover of £15,000 or £20,000 from that estate.

Hon. Frank Wilson: But what profit do you estimate they should make?

Mr. WANSBROUGH: I have not gone into that question. No estate should have done better than Avondale. Another aspect: on the whole of that 12,000 acres immediately adjoining the township the roads board are not getting one penny of rates. I admit that at the time of its purchase the mayor and all the chief citizens were insistent upon the Government acquiring that estate; but it was the greatest mistake they ever made, because at the present time, instead of having eight or ten families on that estate, they have only one concern, and that being worked on a very small scale. The present Minister, and I understand the previous Minister, had in view the object of setting aside portion of it as an agricultural college. I wish to emphasise the point that if the Government should succeed in getting the estate off their hands, they should make provision for that very necessary institution. I have no doubt that this promise was made in good faith.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: There was no promise at all.

Mr. WANSBROUGH: I have taken it from my predecessor as a distinct promise made by the Minister.

Mr. Willmott: Of course it was a promise.

Mr. WANSBROUGH: I hope that when the Minister succeeds in getting it off his hands he will reserve the necessary land for the establishment of an agricultural college. The Southern, the Northern, and the Eastern districts have their experimental farms, and here is a splendid opportunity for acquiring

a suitable position in the Beverley district for the establishment of an agricultural college. It is one of the best wheat growing areas in the State, and it is only fair that this college should be established.

Mr. ROBINSON: I agree with the remarks of the last speaker. I know the Avondale estate very well, and I contend that as an ordinary commercial proposition a property such as Avondale, purchased at some £60,000, should return at least £6,000 a year profit. Instead of that, the Government expect to make, this year, £4,600, and that at a cost of £5,000. It would be far better to let the thing go back to the wilds, as they are doing with the end paddock near Beverley. For the last three years not a hand's turn has been done to that paddock. The scrub has been allowed to grow up as it would not be allowed to grow on any private paddock in the district. All the weeds of Western Australia can be found on the Avondale estate.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): This is a legacy we got from the last Government.

Mr. ROBINSON: You did not get any weeds; you have since acquired them. In the first place I object to the Government farming at all. I am democrat enough to say what the Government dare not say, because someone will not let them, that I would sooner see 100 farmers and their families on Yandanooka than see that splendid crop at present growing there, and I would rather see 20 families on Avondale than see merely the manager and his weeds. If, before engaging in farming operations, the Government had put the proposal to their own followers, they would have been told "Do not go in for farming, because you do not know anything about it." Not many farmers of this State are very successful; they are labouring under tremendous odds.

The Premier: Why all this stinking fish?

Mr. ROBINSON: There is no stinking fish. If trained farmers find it difficult at times to make their farms pay, is it any wonder that we should find weeds

on the Government farm? In view of his annually increasing deficit, the Treasurer would do well to turn that Avondale estate into cash, representing some £50,000 or £60,000.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): We will sell it to you for £50,000.

Mr. ROBINSON: I am not a buyer. But if I did buy that farming proposition I would be ashamed to show an expenditure of £5,000 and an anticipated profit of £4,600. I would want to know whose fault it was. I venture to say it is not the fault of the manager, because I know him to be a good man, with a thorough understanding of his business. It is the fault of the man above him, the fault of one who says "Do or do not do, certain things."

The Premier: Who is that?

Mr. ROBINSON: I do not know. Perhaps you could put your finger on him. Certainly somebody gives orders to the manager of Avondale. I venture to say that if that manager owned the property it would not be left in its present condition for two minutes. The farm is a positive disgrace. The Government should sell the farm for what it will fetch. If there is a loss, let them cut their loss. If the department do not understand cutting up the estate and dealing with it, let them get the advice of some reputable man who will do it for them. If the Government will not take this much advice, let them give their manager a free hand, as they do at Yandanooka, and let him produce the same results as is to be seen at Yandanooka. But I protest against the Government entering on farming operations at all. We see a desire on the part of the succeeding Governments to purchase these large estates with the object of cutting them up and placing a number of settlers on the land—closer settlement it was called. Instead of following that out, the Labour Government endeavour to put into operation a policy of monopolising the land, nationalisation of the State, owning everything and everybody, and preventing anybody else from adding to or acquiring a different status from that

of the working man. It is a policy of dispoiling everybody, casting an envious eye on the man who has a nice farm and taking it from him, and afterwards letting it go to wreck and ruin.

The Minister for Mines: We did not take the Avondale estate.

Mr. ROBINSON: However you have acquired it. If the Government cannot make it pay they should sell it.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): Why did not your Minister for Lands sell it?

Mr. ROBINSON: I do not know.

The Premier: Why did he buy it?

Mr. ROBINSON: For the purposes of closer settlement, at the request of the Beverley people. I venture to say that had the Beverley people thought for a moment that any succeeding Government would have held on to this estate for the purpose of growing weeds, they would have been the last to ask the Government to purchase it.

The Minister for Mines: Why did not the Liberal Government sell it?

Mr. ROBINSON: Because you turned them out.

The Minister for Mines: They first hawked it all over the country.

Mr. ROBINSON: I was not very much concerned in the politics of the country at that time, and so I cannot speak of my own knowledge. It was only when I found people who pose as democrats building up a large monopoly in farming that I determined it was time to enter my protest against this policy. The Harvey estate is a very large property, yet we are told that all the Government are going to make out of it is £750. The Minister for Mines laughs, presumably at the incongruity of the figures, to think that such a huge estate should produce only £750 for a year's operations. It would be far better for the Government to invest their money in things which they understand, brickworks for instance, and implement works. Why not take the money from the Harvey estate and spend it on the implement works? I hope the Government will treat very seriously the remarks made to-night, and that the Premier will see if the

Avondale estate cannot be placed on the market and offered for sale. If he then learns that there are no buyers, well and good; but I am informed that ever since this Government have been in power that estate has been withheld from sale. If that is so I think it is very wrong. Instead of a big revenue from this estate we find that there is little more than £400 a year being produced.

Mr. HARRISON: If this land is cut up at the price suggested it will need a capitalist to take up the land at all. I suggest that the Commissioner for the South-West should pay a visit to the Avondale Estate to see if dairying could be carried out there. I am of opinion that if we are going to develop the butter industry of the State quickly we must go into those areas which will not cost £30 an acre to prepare. We know that dairy properties are worth more per acre than ordinary farms. Another point I wish to mention is that the Avondale Estate pays nothing to the local authorities by way of rates in connection with the maintenance of roads. It is not right that the Government should escape the payment of these rates.

The Premier: We do pay them. We give them a subsidy every year.

Mr. HARRISON: Do the Government give them any extra amount for roads?

The Premier: No.

Mr. HARRISON: If the Government are carrying on any business they should take on the same liabilities that a private individual carrying on the same business would have to take on. The Government should be prepared to show that this estate can be worked profitably on the same lines as other men holding similar estates have been able to show.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: It is time we had a definite statement from the Government in regard to this estate. It was purchased on the recommendation of the Land Purchase Board.

The Premier: They did not recommend the purchase until someone moved in the direction.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: There was machinery provided for the repurchase of



estates. This legal machinery was put in motion in connection with the purchase of this estate.

The Minister for Works: The less you say about it the better.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: The more that is said about it the better. The estate was purchased in broad day light. There was no secret contract about it. The purchase was recommended by the Land Purchase Board a couple of years in succession. The land board specially impressed upon Sir Newton Moore the necessity for purchasing this estate at the price they recommended.

The Premier: Did you come down with a request for the special authority of Parliament?

Mr. O'Loughlen: Practical surveyors turned down the proposition on account of the granite.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: I know that the Land Purchase Board was composed of men whose opinions were second to none in the State in regard to agricultural lands.

Mr. O'Loughlen: There must have been some driving force behind them.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: That insinuation is unworthy of the member for Forrest.

Mr. O'Loughlen: The estate was never worth the money the previous Government paid for it. They hawked it all over the State and could never sell it.

Hon. J. Mitchell: That is not so.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: The opinion of the member for Forrest is beside the mark.

The Minister for Mines: Who composed the board?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: The late Surveyor General I think, and Mr. Paterson of the Agricultural Bank.

Mr. Bolton: You are wrong.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: I am not wrong.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: I do not think either of those gentlemen were on the board.

Mr. Willmott: Hon. E. M. Clarke was a member.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: Yes, I think so. The board strongly recommended the purchase of this estate. The pur-

chase was not completed long before the late Government left office, but they made all arrangements for the cutting up of the land. Sir Newton Moore showed his faith in the country by purchasing the first block for himself. Another block was also purchased running into many hundreds of acres. The late Government had buyers for the estate. If it had not been for the regulations issued by the late Minister for Lands (Hon. T. H. Bath) the estate should have been sold long ago, but owing to these regulations and in the intervention of the dry season the market went by for the time being.

The Premier: These regulations did not apply to this estate.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: They did.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You withdrew it from sale.

The Premier: We had to do something with it.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: I know that the Government could have sold every block.

The Premier: Why did not the late Government sell it?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: Why did not the Premier sell it? It was in order to try his land nationalisation policy that he withheld the estate from sale. It is high time the Government declared their policy in regard to this estate. If they had carried out some research work in the way of wheat culture there would have been some excuse for holding on to it. They are simply leaving it there and adding to the cost of the land. The cost of cultivation will, as a result of this neglect, be at least 10s. an acre more than it ought to be.

Mr. GEORGE: I should like to hear from the Minister what the Government propose to do in regard to the subdivision of the Harvey Estate. I do not think the Government will have any difficulty in finding buyers for this land if they put a fair price on it. At the present time the local authorities are not getting their rates from that estate. I understand it is intended to put 600 acres of it upon the market. The estate is so constituted that some of it is good grazing land and some of it good orchard country.

It could well be subdivided into 10-acre lots, because a man can make a good living on 10 acres in that particular part of the State. There is an irrigation scheme going on there and the people who are affected by it are more than nervous in connection with it. I introduced a deputation to the Premier recently on the subject, but no reply has yet been received. Under the scheme at present a provision is made for channels and those channels have either to be lined expensively or the seepage will be very big indeed. The people are desirous of getting a pipe scheme instead of the channel scheme so that they may get the water down with some amount of pressure. Under the gravitation scheme as at present they will practically have to regrade every orchard, which will mean a big expense.

Mr. O'Loghlen: There was nothing done in connection with irrigation there until this Government came into power.

Mr. GEORGE: When the present Government got into power they found the whole scheme in the pigeon holes of the other Government.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Yes, it would have remained there but for this Government.

Mr. GEORGE: What nonsense the hon. member is impudently talking; he does not know what he is saying. The people asked that the Government should provide the money and the people would undertake to repay it. That should have been done. Instead of that the matter has been fiddled with, and there are questions asked now as to whether oregon is being used in bridges down there. I hope the Minister will see that this estate is cut up and disposed of as quickly as possible. The people desire that as soon as possible the estate shall be handed over by sale to those who are prepared to work it and to show that the Harvey district can be a big lesson to everyone in regard to closer settlement.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: My remarks will be very brief. I want to take exception to the remarks of the member for Perth, who charged the present Government with being dilatory in the matter of the disposal of the Avondale estate. All

along I have held the opinion that a mistake was made by paying such a high price for that estate. I had the opportunity of looking through the papers some time ago and I noticed that one or two practical surveyors were asked to make a survey of the particular locality and they reported that there were something like 2,000 acres of granite ridges which, if put on the market to-morrow, would not realise 30s. an acre. I want the member for Perth to be a little more charitable and not accuse this Government of having deliberately thwarted any efforts put forward by settlers to secure that country.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Why was it withdrawn from sale?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Because of the absolute hopelessness of procuring buyers.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Why is it not put up for sale now?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The Honorary Minister has stated that the Government will take £50,000 for the property to-day.

Hon. Frank Wilson: He is talking through his neck. Why has it been closed down for four years?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The member for Perth was quite correct when he stated that owing to the dry seasons it would be waste of time to advertise it for sale. I would urge the Government to try and find a buyer for it. I believe it would pay the Government to show a loss of some thousands of pounds by disposing of the estate. There was a blunder made by giving too high a price for it.

Mr. Bolton: To a supporter.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I am supposed not to have much charity in my composition but I am prepared to let that go. It is idle for an hon. member to charge this Government with having made any efforts to dispose of that property because I believe they were absolutely discouraged by the failure of a previous Government when they put it on the market. The same thing applies to the Denmark estate. That estate was held up for nine months and people were anxious to invest.

Mr. Thomson: The prices were too high.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The member for Katanning must realise that we cannot buy estates at a high price and sell them at less than that amount. Such a thing is not a payable proposition for the State. After all, I do not know that it is a good thing to purchase big estates when we have so many millions of acres of Crown lands which are not settled. The member for Murray Wellington, as usual, is trying to get a halo around his head. He is the one man in this Chamber who poses for the gallery whenever it is possible for him to up-end himself. He pointed out in regard to the Harvey estate that the initiation of the irrigation scheme did not rest with the Government now in power but with the late Liberal Government. He pointed out that the late Government had plans prepared and had them in the pigeon-holes. What were those plans doing in the pigeon holes, and why was the dust allowed to accumulate on them?

Mr. George: They could have had the job finished while you were thinking about it.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: It remained for this Government, which is supposed to be out of sympathy with the rural settlers, to put an Irrigation Bill on the stocks and carry it through. I realise that the Harvey irrigation scheme has to be put on the same basis as various other departmental undertakings, but it is a matter of money, and possibly, if we had an overflowing Treasury that work would be much more advanced than it is to-day. But they are making fair progress down there and when the estate is subdivided and put on the market it will find many buyers.

Mr. George: That is what I said.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Yes, but I do not want the hon. member to put in all his time glorifying what his party have done. They had the opportunity and failed to take advantage of it. When the present Government go out of office, if they ever do, I hope it will be found that what promises they gave they made a decent attempt to redeem by putting the works in hand. I hope it will not be found on searching the pigeon-holes that there are

schemes locked up with the dust accumulating upon them.

The CHAIRMAN: I would remind the hon. member that he is very wide of the mark. I allowed the member for Murray-Wellington a lot of latitude and I am allowing the hon. member a lot of latitude.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I realise it is only a good heart which allowed you to overlook the offence of the member for Murray-Wellington. He deserves a lot of sympathy and I believe you give him a full portion of it. The Harvey estate is a magnificent property. It has been cleared with the traction engines and at a rate, I believe, much lower than any other land in the State.

Mr. George: The engines are bogged there now.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: That is testimony to the soil. There might be droughts in the Eastern areas, but droughts are unknown at Harvey. In regard to the Avondale estate the only advice I can give—and I suppose little notice will be taken of it—is that the Government should make a big effort to dispose of the property. They will have to incur a heavy loss because it is an estate which should not have been purchased at the price. Yandanooka is a good property in comparison with Avondale, not only as regards the price but the uniformity of the land. I am not in favour of the Government farming on a large scale. They have quite enough to occupy them in the various other activities connected with the Government departments. The Harvey estate has been cleared and a good deal of public money has been spent upon it and I hope competent surveyors will be employed to apportion the blocks in conformity with the quality of the land. In some parts blocks of 10 acres will be sufficient to maintain a family, but in others, blocks of 40 and 60 acres will be required. There is no doubt about the estate being a good one. It has been acquired by the present Government, who have launched big public works to make the occupation of the estate successful,

and I think the people of Harvey are grateful for it.

Mr. George: And they are anxious.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: No matter what the hon. member might claim was in the pigeon-holes of the department, it remained for the present Government to pave the way for the settlement and occupation of that estate by giving it an irrigation scheme which the other Government, though having the opportunity, failed to provide.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: When the Avondale estate was purchased everyone will concede that the price paid was the full value, but value was received by the State for the money. We cannot judge the price of land after we have passed through such a drought as that experienced last year and after the estate has been locked up for three or four years. I think we paid the full value for the estate but still I think we got fair value for the money. It was undoubtedly second to none in Western Australia. It joined the town and the Beverley people were most anxious that it should be purchased. The ex-member for Beverley, Mr. Broun, was most anxious in regard to this estate and whilst he occupied a seat in this House he asked the Government what they intended to do with it and whether it was open for sale. It has been said that we were to blame because we did not immediately sell it. The estate was purchased only 12 months or so before we went out of office and the transaction was completed before I took office as Premier perhaps 15 or 18 months, and in that time the estate had to be surveyed and cut up and priced, and the department does not do these things at express train speed. The result was, before we could get a start in earnest to sell the land, we went out of office.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: You had plenty of time. You sold a few blocks.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The estate was opened for sale as soon as the estate was subdivided and if it had remained open, all of it would have been sold. The ex-Premier, Sir Newton Moore, took up a block to start the thing going but, as soon as the present Government took

office, they closed on it within the first week or two of their occupation of the Treasury bench and even before Parliament had met. The ex-member for Beverley, Mr. Broun, on the 5th August, 1913, asked the then Minister for Lands, Mr. Bath, the following questions:—

- 1, How many applications were received by the department for blocks of land on the Avondale estate since October, 1911?
- 2, How many of these applications have been approved, and the area of same?

The Minister for Lands replied—

- 1, No applications were received, as all the unselected portion of the estate has been reserved. The reservation, however, is now being removed, and the blocks, with the exception of the homestead and blocks adjoining will be available for selection on the 6th inst.
- 2, Answered by reply to No. 1.

The hon. member was not content with those replies and on the 14th August he asked the Minister—"When did he withdraw the Avondale estate from sale" and the reply was "In October, 1911." The present Government took office only on the 10th or 11th October, 1911, so that the estate was withdrawn immediately. The Minister was also asked—"Is he aware that persons desirous of putting in applications were refused that right" and his reply was—"Yes."

The Minister for Works: They wanted some town lots.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Anyhow, the ex-Minister said the applications were refused. Mr. Bath said distinctly that immediately they took office he closed down on this estate and up to the present time it has not been thrown open for genuine application. Supposing too much was paid for the estate, does that explain the action of the present Government in withholding the realisation of the property? Supposing the Advisory Board, who recommended the purchase of this estate, recommended a price which was too high, surely that does not account for the fact that the estate is in the deplorable condition it is to-day. It is illegal to have the estate closed up; the Act

states that when an estate is re-purchased it must be cut up and re-sold.

The Minister for Works: Not at any price that is going.

Mr. Willmott: Ten per cent. above the purchase price.

The Premier: We could not get it.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The ex-Minister said the Government had applications which were refused. The unsold portions of the estate were withdrawn and to-day the estate is in the same position. What is the explanation? I believe the ex-Minister, Mr. Bath, at that time had in mind the establishment of an agricultural college. I think he told me on one occasion, by interjection in this House, that he intended to make a model farm there for the training of students.

The Minister for Mines: We have one at Narrogin.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: But he thought so much of the Avondale Estate that he was of opinion it could better be used for the education of the would-be agriculturists, and I think he went further and announced his intention of establishing an agricultural college. Whether that was so or not, it was rendered unnecessary when the University was established, because we have a Chair of Agriculture and students can take their course at the University. Now we come back to the position that we have an estate which the ex-member for Beverley says if properly handled and managed could return £15,000 or £20,000 a year. I am satisfied that if it were properly managed the estate could return full interest, and I believe 10 per cent. in addition, but here we have Estimates showing that we are to expend £5,000 and to get back £4,500 for produce from the farm. There is no interest allowed in that and nothing for the hundred and one other charges; therefore the Government are estimating a loss which should not be the case. The balance sheet to which the Minister referred shows that last year on the small turnover there was a profit of £642. If this is right, surely we ought to look forward to getting a similar, if not better, return this year. I

hope the Minister will give us an explanation as to why the estate is withheld from sale. If the conditions under which it was first surveyed and put before the public are unsuitable and do not encourage sale, they should be altered. I do not think we should be so hide-bound as to hold hard and fast to any unsuitable conditions and the House would be agreeable, in fact the Government have the power to alter the conditions. The Government might have been justified for a short time in reserving the estate if it was their policy to establish an agricultural college there but, as soon as that proposal was abandoned, they should have attempted to realise on the estate. If the Government tried to realise on the estate to-day, they could not do so. There are hundreds of farms for sale and it is impossible to get a price for them.

The Minister for Works: You are answering your own question now.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: No, there is no reason why the estate should not be open for sale. The time has gone by when it should have been opened for sale, and it is idle to blame me for the 12 months I held it. Let us have an explanation why the estate is kept locked up all this time. If there is no explanation to make, let us rectify the error and throw the estate open for sale at prices that will bring the purchase money.

Mr. Thomas: You could not get a man fool enough to buy it.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Farms could be sold out of the estate. The stony ground is only fit for grazing purposes, but the bulk of the estate is first class land. I think the Committee should have a statement of the Government's policy in this connection.

The PREMIER: I do not think it is necessary for the Government to announce their policy with regard to Avondale or any other repurchased estate. The Act controls us. But the Act was never intended to compel an absurdity like that of throwing a repurchased estate on the market when there is no possibility of securing an adequate price. It is evident that the member for Sussex and the members of his Cabinet were not fully seized

of the position when they decided on the purchase of the Avondale estate. It is only a coincidence, of course, that this estate was owned by a member—

Hon. Frank Wilson: Do not be cadish.

The PREMIER: By a member then supporting the Liberal Government. It so happened that almost at that very moment the Federal Government had introduced a tax on large estates; and it was generally conceded by the public that to dispose of this estate to the State Government at the price obtained represented a very easy get-out to the owner of that property, in view of the heavy Federal land tax.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You are making a dirty insinuation, and you should not do it.

The PREMIER: I say it is a coincidence that the purchase took place just at the time the Federal land tax was imposed. It has been stated here times out of number.

Hon. Frank Wilson: That does not justify you in repeating it.

The PREMIER: Does the hon. member deny that the purchase took place just at the time—

Hon. Frank Wilson: I deny your inference. Why did you buy the Yanda-neoka estate?

The PREMIER: I am merely stating facts.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You are not stating facts.

[Mr. Carpenter took the Chair.]

The PREMIER: The present member for Geraldton, then member for Cue, made some remarks as to the price that was paid, and said something to the effect that about 2,000 acres of the estate was not suitable for cultivation. That hon. member also explained that that was known to the Minister, but he further said that he doubted whether it was known to Cabinet when they agreed to make the purchase, though eventually it was disclosed in a minute to Cabinet. In that minute the Minister had mentioned the fact that certain land was not cultivable, and was worth only £1 per acre. The words the Minister addressed to Cabinet were—

I reported on the 15th March, 1910, that there were in the estate 8,000 acres worth £6 per acre, 1,000 acres worth £2, and 807 acres worth £1.

Something like 1,000 acres of rocky land were valued at £2, and 807 acres of rocky land at £1. That should be a pretty decent price for the class of land.

Hon. Frank Wilson: It is grazing land.

The PREMIER: I do not know that grazing land is worth £1 per acre. The price paid for the estate was about £59,000.

The Minister for Mines: Five pounds five shillings per acre was the price.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Did the agricultural lands purchase board recommend the purchase?

The PREMIER: There is no need to worry about that, because the appointment of the board was in the hands of the Government. Only a few months previously the Government had brought down an amendment of the Agricultural Lands Purchase Act. The whole thing was in the melting pot then, but never a word about this purchase was mentioned when that Act was to be amended.

Mr. George: What is the inference?

Hon. Frank Wilson: Do you charge the Government with amending the Act so that they could buy this estate?

The PREMIER: I am only stating the absolute facts.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You are afraid to make the charge.

The PREMIER: I am not afraid to make a statement if I believe it to be true. I am only telling the Chamber what actually occurred.

Mr. George: Do you mean to say that the previous Government altered the Act in order to do a dishonest thing?

The PREMIER: Let the hon. member for Murray-Wellington give people credit for having a little more sense than he possesses. Just prior to the purchase a Bill came down for the purpose of amending the Agricultural Lands Purchase Act, and in connection with that Bill it was never mentioned that the object of amending the Act was to allow the purchase of the Avondale estate.

Mr. George: Was that likely to be the object? Was there any necessity for mentioning it? How do you connect the two?

The PREMIER: The hon. member may connect the two as best he can. I am stating the facts pure and simple. When that happened the Government had already had under consideration the question of repurchasing the Avondale estate. That has never been denied. The total price paid by the Government for the estate, plus survey fees, amounted in round figures to £60,000. Now we come to the question why the estate has not been sold. The member for Perth insists that the Government never made an attempt to sell the estate, and that they could have sold it if they had made the attempt.

Hon. Frank Wilson: The price paid for the estate was £51,400.

The PREMIER: The interest on the money has to be added to arrive at the cost to the Government. On the 31st January, 1911, Mr. Troy, on behalf of Mr. Collier, put the following questions to the then Minister for Lands, and received the following replies:—

Mr. Troy (for Mr. Collier) asked the Minister for Lands: 1, On what date were applications invited for selection of blocks on the lately purchased Avondale estate? 2, On what date did applications close? 3, How many blocks were offered? 4, How many applications were received? 5, What price per acre was paid by the Government for the estate? 6, What is the average price per acre at which the land is offered to the public? The Minister for Lands replied: 1, 2nd December, 1910 (date of first advertisement). 2, 21st December, 1910. 3, Nine under conditional purchase conditions and ten as working men's blocks. 4, One under conditional purchase conditions and one under working men's blocks on opening day, and one under conditional purchase and one under working men's blocks since. 5, £5 5s. 6, £5 16s. 2d.

There is the position, and yet hon. members ask why we have not sold the estate.

Just after the Liberal Government had obtained authority for the purchase of the estate, they put it on the market and obtained only two applications, one for a conditional purchase and one for a workmen's block. That was when there was a good demand for land. Now land values are down and we have passed through a series of bad years, and hon. members opposite want to know why we have not disposed of the estate.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Why did you withdraw it from sale?

The PREMIER: Just now I am only answering the member for Perth.

Hon. Frank Wilson: There were four offers.

The PREMIER: There were only two. The two others came too late.

Hon. Frank Wilson: At all events we sold some blocks, and you sold none.

The PREMIER: Undoubtedly a good deal of it is splendid land, and as soon as an opportunity presents itself the estate will be disposed of. But we are not going to sell this land so as to permit someone to get a large estate out of land bought with public money for closer settlement purposes. I will now read a statement made by Mr. Bath, when Minister for Lands, on the 9th July, 1912—

The hon. gentleman says that I am not selling the Avondale estate. As a matter of fact, I have reserved portion of it, because it may be possible that the University, when established, will desire to have a suitable area of land for an agricultural college, and while they may not decide that this is a suitable place. I have reserved it, and am awaiting their decision on the matter, because, if it is not utilised for the purpose, the Agricultural Department can utilise it to great advantage as a farm for the growth of pure seed wheat with which to supply farmers. In regard to the value of the land outside that particular park reserve, I have had an offer for it, but the request was for a big area. I understand that the area was resumed for closer settlement purposes, and it is certainly contrary to the principles of the Agricultural Lands Purchase Act.

and contrary to the interests of the estate, if, after resuming it, we allow it to go out into large areas again, and permit the same old order to continue.

Up to date there have been no genuine offers for land in the Avondale estate from persons desirous of obtaining it under closer settlement conditions. During recent years we have not pressed the sale for the reason pointed out by Mr. Bath, and also because it would be absolutely suicidal to place the estate on the market under conditions obtaining at present in Western Australia. Perhaps after this year the land will be saleable. While we are not hopeful that we shall be able to get a full cash return for the outlay, yet we ought to get a return in the fact that a number of families will be settled on an estate on which previously only one family resided. We are not going to be a party to granting this estate to anyone who comes along and makes an application for it. The estate must be disposed of in accordance with the terms of closer settlement legislation. Meantime the best use possible will be made of the estate by the Government. Let me tell hon. members who talk about the condition of the estate that prior to this year, at all events, the Avondale estate has been recognised by farmers for miles around as a farm upon which pure seed wheat was being produced.

Hon. J. Mitchell: And you made a reasonable profit.

The PREMIER: Yes, so from the point of view of the interest of the State we have lost nothing. Whether the conditions are such as the member for Beverley (Mr. Wansbrough) has stated tonight I am not in a position to affirm or deny, but I am doubtful if they are as bad as the hon. member claims. It must be remembered that throughout this State and practically all the Commonwealth, as the result of a very wet season following on a drought, we have had an exceptional growth of weeds. It is not confined to Avondale, but is common to every holding in the State. It invariably happens in such circumstances, and to condemn the Avondale estate because it

happens there as elsewhere, is unfair both to the manager and to the estate.

Hon. J. Mitchell: The fences are almost growing weeds this year in all the districts.

The PREMIER: I can assure the hon. member that I saw wheat crops in South Australia in which the wild poppies were higher than the wheat. When I asked the reason why, I was told it was in consequence of the abnormal conditions due to the wet season following upon a dry one.

Mr. Harrison: That would not apply to the timber undergrowth at Avondale.

The PREMIER: No. The hon. member may be correct in regard to that undergrowth, but I do not think it is so serious after all. In any case it can easily be disposed of. We are not desirous of holding on to the Avondale estate, except for the purpose of disposing of it in conformity with the terms of the Act.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Did not you hold it for stock purposes last year?

The PREMIER: No; Yandanooka was so held. Avondale was not held from that point of view exclusively.

Hon. J. Mitchell: It was very useful though.

The PREMIER: I am sure the member for Northam, who was largely responsible for the purchase, would not suggest that the present juncture is a suitable time to put that estate on the market. When the opportunity occurs for us to dispose of it satisfactorily we will dispose of it, because we want some of the cash back for the purpose of closer settlement.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I regret that hon. members opposite have wasted time in going into ancient history and so delaying the passing of the Estimates for something like an hour. If they had left the matter in the hands of the member for Northam (Hon. J. Mitchell) who knows something about it, instead of in the hands of the member for Canning (Mr. Robinson) who knows nothing about it, the Estimates would have gone through more quickly. The criticism of the member for Canning, in



regard to Avondale, reminds me of the old saying that the man who knows nothing about the matter can talk the longest on it. The member for Beverley (Mr. Wansbrough) stated that he did not anticipate we would get so much revenue from Avondale this year, that the crop is not looking as well as other crops in the district. I have here a minute under to-day's date from Mr. Robinson, the manager, as follows—

We have about 1,700 acres under crop this year and up to date the prospect is very encouraging.

It shows that the views of the officer in charge do not coincide with those of the member for Beverley. The hon. member also stated that to-day we have not 1,000 sheep on the holding. As a matter of fact we have 2,500 there—an evidence that the hon. member does not realise what the estate is being used for. Taking into consideration the seasons we have had to contend with, the Government during the last year or two have done very well in their endeavour to recoup some of the expenditure by way of payment of interest on this estate. A small profit has been shown for the last two years and, as the Premier stated, immediately land values rise to what they were when the estate was purchased, the Government will take the first opportunity of getting rid of the estate. The member for Murray-Wellington (Mr. George) commenced by asking what we were going to do with the Harvey estate. Later in his speech he explained that a little time ago the acting Premier, in answer to a question, stated that it was proposed to sell 600 acres of it as soon as the irrigation work was completed. Yet the hon. member wasted half an hour asking what we were going to do with it. When introducing the vote I pointed out that the interest of the last year had not been paid, and that in consequence we have this year to meet two years' interest, with the result that the expenditure is a little higher.

Item—Avondale estate, general expenses, including purchase of working plant, wages, working expenses, interest, etc.. £5,000:

Hon. J. MITCHELL: I notice in the balance sheet that the estate earned interest £1,098 in 1914 and, in addition provided a profit of £642. In view of the fact that but a very small portion of the estate was being cultivated, this return indicates the quality of the holding. The Premier was perfectly right in the contention that it is a good estate.

The Premier: You would not advise us to press the sale of it now?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: No, but it was a mistake to withdraw it in 1911. I understand that the Premier, speaking at Avondale, said the Act had been amended to enable us to purchase the estate. That statement was erroneous. The amendment of the Act in 1909 had no connection whatever with the purchase of the estate which was effected some time previously. It has become the custom to speak disparagingly of the Avondale estate, and in view of this it was the more pleasing to hear the Premier admit that it is a good proposition.

Mr. HARRISON: An estate such as this, with two watercourses and permanent buildings, would furnish an ideal place for the establishment of a dairy farm.

The Premier: It would be of no use having one isolated dairy farm there.

Mr. HARRISON: From Beverley to Toodyay we could get quicker settlement by dairying. If the Government could prove the possibility of dairying in this district they would be able to sell the land at a profit. It strikes me that this rock country cannot be worth £1 an acre if it cannot carry more sheep than it is stated it can carry. If dairying could be proved to be a profitable undertaking on this estate, I think it would be found to be a valuable property.

Vote put and passed.

Railway Department (Hon. J. Scaddan, Minister).

Vote — Railways and Tramways, £1,654,579:

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan—Brown Hill-Ivanhoe) [9.46]: I have no intention of submitting these Estimates

in the form of departmental Estimates. The report of the Commissioner of Railways for this year has been before members for some time and will give the details of the operation of the railways for the previous year. I can add nothing to the report of the Commissioner. If hon. members require information as to last year's operations they will find it contained in that report.

Mr. Smith: What about next year?

The PREMIER: I will come to that. So far as the current financial year is concerned, it is not anticipated that there will be any alteration in the system at present operating either in regard to fares or freights, or in any other direction. All that can be said in regard to the present financial year is that the Estimates which are now submitted to members are based on the mileage that will be operated on for the year. In that direction the Railway Estimates are, generally speaking, more accurate than those for any other department, which is due to the fact that it is pretty well known when the Estimates are submitted what the cost per mile of operating the system will be, and what the earnings per mile, according to the then outlook of the season, will be. We anticipate a pretty good harvest, and so from that point of view are able to anticipate a fairly good financial result. At the same time we do not anticipate quite as good results from the harvest as we received for the year 1913-14. That is due in a large measure to the fact that a good deal of the timber trade and the carrying of timber over our railways will not be the same as it was in that year, and also that we shall not be carrying over the railway system so much material as was carried in that year. The falling-off, however, will be very largely counterbalanced by the increased harvest which we anticipate for this coming season. The Railway Estimates are, as I have said, based on the mileage. If the mileage increases very much the amount to be expended will also be increased. If we do not, on the other hand, operate on the same mileage as the Estimates are worked upon, there will be so much less

expenditure. The same thing occurs in regard to the earnings. They fluctuate up and down according to the mileage. Our mileage is, however, increasing. I have been nervous in regard to the position of our railways in some directions. We have one mile of railway for every 96 persons, including men, women and children, in the State.

Hon. J. Mitchell: What does that matter?

The PREMIER: It might not matter if the whole of the population was centred around our existing railway systems, but the trouble is that the population is scattered throughout the State. The result is that these 96 persons are not bringing revenue to our railway system. I am doubtful whether members would find any other place in the world where we have a similar mileage to the proportion of population in the State. As a matter of fact, everyone of the 96 persons in the State can claim to own one mile of our railways.

Mr. Smith: Why do you not reduce the cost by introducing motor trains, and oil-driven tramways?

The PREMIER: The hon. member might be prepared to take on an experiment of that kind, but I am not so prepared. I do not think our railway officers would be prepared to take on the experiment either. There are, of course, cases where such a mode of traction is of advantage, but this form of traction is not used for the general working of a railway system. It is not adopted anywhere in the world except in isolated cases, either for light passenger or small goods traffic. There are no railways working anywhere in the world entirely on the oil-engine system.

Mr. Smith: I only mean in regard to light agricultural extensions.

The PREMIER: It is not desirable at this stage to commence experimenting with our railway system when it is showing the excellent results that it is.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I wish the Premier would knock off some of his experiments in other directions, and refrain from experimenting at all.

The PREMIER: We are not experimenting; we are only taking up work that is essential and should be done in the way of encouraging the development of our various industries. We believe in home manufacture and in the encouragement of our own men in our own State, if that can be done. If it cannot be done, we believe in encouraging first of all the men in Australia. We also believe in expending our money so that it shall be circulated in the State, and so that everyone shall derive benefit from it. Though it might appear on the balance sheets that there has been a loss on our State enterprises, from the point of view of the community there has been a gain. So it is with our railway system. Our railways showed a loss for last year of £150,000 on the same basis as our other trading concerns. If we charged up interest and sinking fund on the capital, the cost of our railway system would have to be added to by the sum of £150,000. But surely no hon. member will assert that, because of this loss, our railway system is not of advantage to the people of the State.

Mr. Harrison: You could not expect anything else last year.

The PREMIER: I have never stated that I anticipated that there would be anything else but a loss on last year's operations. I want to make this remark, namely that it is a great wonder to me that the loss has not been heavier. I was assured by the Under Treasurer of Victoria (Mr. Minogue) when I was in Melbourne recently that Victoria, that compact little State, had also been suffering a very great loss on her railway system. What he said showed that Victoria had suffered even more than Western Australia was suffering. He stated that they were passing through exactly the same phase that we in Western Australia were passing through, in regard to the development of the agricultural industry, and in the loss incurred through pushing the railways out into the back blocks. He stated that through these extensions being made the railway system showed a loss to the State of £1,000 per day for

every day in the year. But the Government of Victoria are not worrying about this. They recognise that it had to happen. The same thing applies to our railway system in this State. While we are building railways throughout sparsely populated areas, which are in course of development, we must expect to have a loss on the railways. We have, however, lost considerably less in comparison with Victoria than we might have lost. I do not think we are justified in adding sinking fund to our railway system. It is just as much an asset and is kept up to just the same standard as it was at the outset, and a sinking fund is not necessary in an undertaking of that kind. There is no similar gauge in the world which has better provision for carrying freights and accommodating passenger traffic than the Western Australian railway system. It compares more than favourably with most of the better gauges which are provided in other parts of Australia. In connection with our trams, here is one of our State trading ventures and it is one which is showing a profit.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Not when you are providing for all the expenditure. You must charge interest on the power house.

The PREMIER: Surely the hon. member will be fair even in regard to a State trading concern.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Of course, you have not yet come to that.

The PREMIER: The hon. member is trying now to charge up the whole of the capital cost in connection with our new power house to the tramway system, when he ought to know that the new power house—

Hon. J. Mitchell: Which should have been finished in 1914.

The PREMIER: Which should have been finished at the end of 1914 but which, owing to the war, it was found impossible to finish, was built not merely for the purpose of providing current for the Perth tramway system but for the purpose of providing current for the whole of the metropolitan area.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: It ought to have been finished before the war broke out.

The PREMIER: No, that is not so. On the contract, the work should have been completed by the end of the year 1914. In the circumstances it is not fair to charge the full interest on the capital expenditure to the tramways. In any case the tramways are not yet getting the full benefit of the power house. Until they do so it is not fair to charge this up against them. We had to provide a new power house for the purpose of giving additional current, which was necessary to operate our tramways successfully. The reason we purchased the tramways was due to the fact that the tramway company were up against things from the point of view of current. They were not prepared to expend a large sum of money on putting up a new power house unless they could get authority from Parliament for the extension of their concession, but this authority was not forthcoming. We, therefore, stepped in and purchased the tramways in accordance with the desire, not only of the Government but of the opposite side of this Chamber. It can fairly be said, I think, that we have stolen this policy of the nationalisation of the tramway system from our friends opposite. This is one of the State trading concerns which our friends opposite advocated.

Mr. Thomson: What about the "Western Australia"?

The PREMIER: That is doing its part, at any rate. The hon. member will probably hear something about the "Western Australia" which will satisfy him. Last year the earnings on our tramway system amounted to £114,021 while the expenditure amounted to £65,237, which left us a surplus of £48,784.

Mr. Smith: After making provision for interest?

The PREMIER: No. We are providing in this for £10,000, which goes towards the belated repairs fund for the purpose of bringing the track up to the standard in several directions. We are also providing for the three per cent. to the municipalities, amounting to £3,386, and the interest which amounted to £23,931, which gives a net profit, after

paying interest, the 3 per cent. to the municipalities and the £10,000 towards the belated repairs fund, of £11,467.

Mr. Smith: By charging extortionate fares.

The PREMIER: The hon. member is stating what is not correct. We are not charging extortionate fares.

Hon. J. Mitchell: What about the sinking fund?

The PREMIER: The sinking fund is not chargeable yet. I think it will be chargeable next year. The member for North Perth has spoken often about fares charged on the tramways since he entered Parliament, but previous to that he was dumb on the subject. I am beginning to wonder why the hon. member has so suddenly changed the opinions he previously held on the matter. This must be caused by one or two things, either he is playing off to his constituents purely and simply and is not concerned about the interest of the State as a whole, or else he was, prior to becoming the member for North Perth, interested in seeing a foreign country taking money out of Western Australia.

Hon. J. Mitchell: That is not fair.

The PREMIER: I was going to say that the hon. member's newspaper is always one of the strongest supporters of the Government in entering into trading concerns if it thinks there is any possibility of a failure.

Mr. Smith: We were the strongest supporters of the Government purchasing the trams on the assumption that they were to charge penny fares afterwards.

The PREMIER: The hon. member desired that we should rush into the purchase of a tramway system to immediately reduce fares, so as to show a loss and so that, after showing a loss, he could in his newspaper turn round and, by means of glaring headlines, show to the public that here was another State trading concern which was showing a deficit. The one concern which we are operating in the interests of the people in the metropolitan area is showing us a very handsome pro-

fit because we have stuck to the prices which were charged by the private company which owned the concern. That only proves that if the Government chose to run all its concerns in the way that private enterprise did previously there would be no trouble in showing profits. We have proved that the Government can run the tramway system as the company did and show equally good results.

Mr. Thomson: You do not run your other concerns in the same way.

The PREMIER: The Government have stood behind the Commissioner of Railways and until we get additional power for the purpose of better meeting the public requirements we are not going to alter the existing system. We cannot provide penny sections when we have not got the cars to carry the people.

Mr. Smith: Are you building new cars?

The PREMIER: We have made provision on the loan Estimates for 10 bogey cars. There are 10 under-frames on order which will arrive during the financial year and 10 others will be ordered at a later stage. I think hon. members will agree that the tramway system is being well operated and well managed by the Commissioner and his staff.

Mr. HARRISON: I would like to ask the Minister for Railways whether, in view of the big traffic to Carrabin in consequence of the opening up of the Westonia goldfield, any provision has been made for a goods shed and for accommodation for passengers at that centre.

The CHAIRMAN: We are not yet on items.

Mr. THOMSON (Katanning) [10.7]: In discussing the railways last session I drew the attention of the House to the fact that 80 per cent. of the increases had been paid by the agricultural districts, and I also drew attention to the unfairness of the charges imposed in the country districts as compared with those in the metropolitan area. If we turn to page 7 of the last report of the Commissioner of Railways we will find there that holiday excursion fares were increased, but not in the metropolitan area.

The Minister for Mines: There are no holiday excursions in the metropolitan area.

Mr. THOMSON: A person can travel from Perth to Fremantle on certain days for 10d. I want to protest that when economies are to be effected they are always effected at the expense of the country, and when freights have to be increased the increases are always put on the country. The holiday excursion rates have been increased by 6d. first-class and 3d. second-class up to 25 miles and proportionately for longer distances, equivalent to 1s. 9d. first-class and 9d. second-class up to 100 miles and 2s. first-class and 1s. second-class for distances over 100 miles.

The Minister for Mines: So are the city season tickets increased.

The Minister for Works: Also the city daily tickets.

Mr. THOMSON: Pardon me, they are not. I am quoting from the Commissioner's report. The Commissioner says—

In my opinion, seeing it became necessary to raise these fares, a corresponding increase could with equity have been made in the case of ordinary suburban tickets.

The Premier: He says "ordinary" not "excursion."

The Minister for Mines: Ordinary tickets for the country were not touched.

Mr. THOMSON: If a man travels 12 miles in the country he has to pay 1s. 10d., and for the same privilege and in a more comfortable carriage in the metropolitan area he pays 1s. 2d. and on two days of the week he can travel for 10d. I want to emphasise what the Commissioner says. Evidently he was directed by the Government and the increases which were made were put on the country districts. He adds—

An additional 1d. on single and 2d. on return tickets would, in the aggregate, provide a substantial addition to the revenue without pressing unduly on the metropolitan residents, and the increase would not be felt by them any more than by the long distance passengers.

I wonder why the Government are so solicitous about the metropolitan people?

The Premier: The difference is that the great bulk of the tickets issued in the metropolitan area are issued to people going to and from their work. The excursion tickets are for people coming from the country for pleasure purposes.

Mr. THOMSON: I object to the preferential treatment. The same thing applies to the increases in freights. The suburban people ought to be made to pay more. On the Commissioner's own showing the traffic in the metropolitan area is run at an absolute loss. The same thing applies to the increase in the freights, and particularly the increases on the necessities of life. The Commissioner on this subject points out that on food-stuffs and on ordinary necessities of life, the increases range from one-fourteenth of a penny to one-tenth of a penny per lb., whilst on lines such as sugar, which is usually conveyed in 5-ton lots, the increase is one-thirty-third of a penny per lb. only, it cannot be contended that these increases are seriously felt. These increases in freights do not affect the metropolitan area at all but they do seriously affect the people living in the country. So far as the loss is concerned, the Commissioner points out that last year there was a decrease of £138,000 compared with 1913-14. The wheat yield of 2,624,190 bushels against 13,331,000 bushels for the previous year largely accounted for the discrepancy, the quantity of wheat transported last year being only 56,928 tons, whilst that handled during 1914 amounted to 299,143 tons. I am endeavouring to show that the working of the district railways may possibly have resulted in a small loss, and that the Commissioner declares the loss to be due largely to the bad harvest. There is only one way by which we can open up and develop the country, and that is by building railways. After all we are not in the position of some of the other States which have their rivers by which they can get their produce to the seaboard, and though in regard to our railways we may lose indirectly, we get from them a lasting benefit. There is no parallel between the

steamships and the Railways. The Railways have an absolute monopoly and are a law unto themselves.

The Minister for Mines: So are the shipping combine.

Mr. THOMSON: I am not defending them, but the Railways have made laws which are grossly unfair to the public. The State steamers in the North-West entered into direct competition with private enterprise. The people in the North already had means of getting their produce to the market. Moreover, the service has not been improved by the advent of Government steamers. But the Railways are an absolute law unto themselves. I know of a firm who delivered to the Railway Department at Albany 75 bags of cement. The Railways delivered at Katanning 71 bags of cement.

The Premier: They could have been sent at Commissioner's risk.

Mr. THOMSON: If a private individual had taken 75 bags and delivered 71—

Mr. Willmott: He would have been put in prison.

Mr. THOMSON: The Commissioner of Railways shelters himself behind regulations exempting him from liability for any loss, damage, injury, detention or delay in respect to any goods sent or carried at owner's risk, unless the damage is proved to have been occasioned by the wilful misconduct of the Commissioner or his servants. In the name of Heaven, how is a private individual to prove wilful misconduct on behalf of the Commissioner or his servants?

The Premier: It has been proved in numerous cases.

Mr. THOMSON: I maintain that it is wilful misconduct if they do not deliver what has been entrusted to them. These are the boasted railways which we own. I am satisfied that if the consignor went to law he would win.

The Premier: Let him go to law.

Mr. THOMSON: That is the attitude of the Commissioner. It is always "Let him go to law;" but if the individual wins the department immediately appeals. To

my mind the department is defrauding the people of the State.

The Premier: Say that outside.

Mr. THOMSON: No. I will adopt the frequent attitude of the Premier and say it here, instead. The department is absolutely defrauding the people of the State of thousands of pounds a year. In this case the cement in dispute is worth only about 35s. Who is going into a lawsuit with the Government over 35s.? That is the stand the Railway Department adopt. They know the people will not go to court, at least not over small sums.

The Premier: He could have sent it at the Commissioner's risk.

Mr. THOMSON: I maintain that if the Railways received 75 articles they should deliver 75.

The Premier: Nonsense.

Mr. THOMSON: If the Premier got short delivery occasionally he might change his views. To my mind it is grossly unfair that the Commissioner should adopt the attitude he does in regard to these regulations. Our boasted ownership of the railways is a mere myth. We have to comply with all the Commissioner's conditions and regulations. We say the railways are ours, but that is all we have from them.

The Premier: The goods could be insured under Commissioner's risk.

Mr. THOMSON: What real risk does the Commissioner take?

Mr. Willmott: The consignor would have to go to law then and fight it. I have been there myself.

Mr. THOMSON: I will just show of what value is the Commissioner's risk. In the case of a man sending plate glass under Commissioner's risk, the only risk the Commissioner takes is while the goods are in transit. Yet the only possible chance plate glass would have of being damaged would be while being loaded or unloaded. The moment it is unloaded in the railway shed the Commissioner's risk ceases. How much, then, is that risk worth? I maintain it is most unfair. Where is the return for the Commissioner's extra charge, if he takes no responsibility at all? It is grossly unfair for the

Railways to shelter themselves behind laws of their own making under which they are able to defraud the people. We have here a list of works which may possibly be undertaken this year. Judging by the balance-sheet submitted to the country, I do not think anybody has seen evidence of much money available for the undertaking of works. Railways have been authorised, and the Government cannot proceed with them through lack of funds. This is very evident in my district. The line from Nyabing was passed, and the settlers are in a very unfortunate position—

The Premier: That has nothing to do with these Estimates.

Mr. THOMSON: I am merely replying to the Premier's remark. I understand extensions and improvements to existing lines are provided for in these Estimates.

The Premier: No; they are on Loan Estimates.

Hon. Frank Wilson: The whole thing appears to be loan.

Mr. THOMSON: A considerable amount of money is being lost by the department through not providing water facilities. On the Great Southern line the department have been hauling water for miles from Lake Matilda.

The Premier: That is loan also.

Mr. THOMSON: Surely the water supplies for locomotives do not come out of loan. Thousands of pounds could be saved and the working expenses of the department reduced if adequate water supplies were provided for the locomotives. The Government were bringing water from Lake Matilda to Katanning, and also from Kwobrup, a matter of 20 to 25 miles, and water was also purchased from private individuals. I have nothing to say against the private individuals, but there seems to be a lack of good management that the department do not put down their own dams. The department were paying up to £80 and £90 a month for water. This capitalised for 12 months would provide a pretty large dam. I directed attention to this matter last session, and I do so again now in the hope that

the Minister will take note of it, because thousands of pounds could be saved in this direction alone.

The Premier: Your own people are responsible for nothing being done. The Katanning people turned down the proposal.

Mr. THOMSON: I am not speaking particularly of Katanning, but of the system as a whole along the Great Southern line. Whatever action the Katanning people might have taken as regards water supplies does not affect the Railway Department.

The Premier: That is the only place where we are purchasing water from private supplies.

Mr. THOMSON: No. The department are purchasing from other supplies, and there has been unnecessary haulage. There appears to have been a grave lack of management in providing water supplies for our railways.

The Premier: You do not know what a difficult task it is.

Mr. THOMSON: Possibly it might be, but when the department are purchasing water and dragging it for 60 to 70 miles, when there are plenty of running streams, one wonders why it is done.

The Minister for Mines: Not so many running streams.

Mr. THOMSON: Yes, there are.

The Minister for Works: Running last year?

Mr. THOMSON: This has been going on for years. The Great Southern has been in the hands of the Government for 17 years, and they have not provided facilities.

The Premier: There is a nice indictment against your own Governments.

Mr. THOMSON: But the present Government have done nothing.

The Premier: Give us 13 years of office, and I will promise you good water supplies.

Mr. THOMSON: God forbid that we should have 13 years under the present Government. We would all be in the Insolvency Court. The present Government have been in office for four years and have done nothing.

The Premier: That is not correct.

Mr. THOMSON: I do not excuse previous Governments, but the present Government can do it and I want them to do it. Railway stations in the metropolitan and suburban areas are provided with waiting rooms for ladies and gentlemen, but the poor unfortunate male in the country is supposed to be pretty hardy and no provision is made for him.

The Premier: They told us when we started to build these wheat railways that they did not want platforms or sheds.

Mr. THOMSON: I am dealing with stations on main lines. There are Narrogin, Wagin, Katanning, and other stations right down without waiting rooms for males.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: There are lots of more urgent requirements.

Mr. THOMSON: Perhaps so. There is one fair-sized station without a waiting room for ladies.

The Premier: I can point to places that are without railways.

The Minister for Works: Where can you find waiting rooms for males?

Mr. THOMSON: There is one at Subiaco and another at Cottesloe Beach.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: You are wrong.

The Minister for Mines: Let us build the railways and never mind about the waiting rooms.

Mr. THOMSON: If the Premier will undertake to immediately start the Nyabing extension, I will say no more. When the Government are increasing railway fares, they should remember that the residents in the country are part owners of the railways and should not be called upon to pay higher fares than those who are living in more favoured portions in the metropolitan area.

Hon. J. MITCHELL (Northam) [10.40]: A statement in the report of the Commissioner that strikes me as being peculiar is that, while the earnings on the railways decreased by £198,000, the expenses decreased by only £74,000.

The Premier: That is easily understood.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The interest is apart from that.



The Premier: When we increase our railway system as we have been doing, the cost for running the increased mileage is greater in proportion than earnings.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: I do not think so at all. The decrease in the revenue is altogether out of proportion to the decrease in the expenditure. When we come to take district railways we find that, notwithstanding that last year was a bad one, the earnings on the lines were not so much less than they were in the previous year. The total difference shown is only some £33,000 odd, apart from two isolated railways. When we remember that the decrease in freight on wheat last year was £112,000 we can see what these railways would have been to the State if we had had the wheat traffic. These district lines are paying handsomely if they get credit for all they are entitled to. The line from Coomalling to Wongan gets the credit for just its proportion of the freight charged from Wongan to Fremantle, which is not fair. The Premier is always referring to these lines as being the cause of all his trouble.

The Premier: I have not done so.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: This paltry £33,000 loss shown on the lines is said to be the cause of all his trouble. Every paying agricultural railway is taken out of the loss, but if they were all put together we should find there was a profit.

The Premier: What lines are you referring to?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: A great deal of the loss incurred has been made on the goldfields district railways.

The Premier: That is not so. The Kalgoorlie line is what saved us last year.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: I am talking about the district railways on the goldfields. What have the Government done to increase their earnings? They have increased the freight on fertilisers by £28,000 since 1912-13. This is all against the farmer.

The Premier: They are not paying as much as people pay for the carriage of their food supplies to the goldfields.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Why do we want cheap freights on fertilisers if not to increase the production of our lands?

The Premier: To assist development in its early stages.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: To assist the State and to assist the railways. I am not, of course, saying a word against the goldfields. We find that in 1912-13 393,000 tons of goods earned £476,000. In 1914-15 324,000 tons of goods earned £501,000. There were 75,000 tons less carried, but the Government made £25,000 more in freight.

The Premier: Cannot the hon. member understand that?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: No, I cannot understand it, except that freights have been increased. Fares and freights have been increased all along the line and it is time the House entered a protest against this sort of thing. Now we come to the question of parcels rates. Parcels are taken to people all over the State, to people on the goldfields, but more particularly to people in the agricultural areas. The freights on parcels have been considerably increased, in fact have been increased double the amount in many cases.

The Premier: That is not so.

[Mr. McDowall resumed the Chair.]

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Yes, I say they have been materially increased. This increase has meant a considerable reduction in the comfort for the people, particularly in the agricultural areas. They have been in the habit of getting small parcels in the shape of vegetables and other things of that sort sent over the railways. The rates now, however, are almost prohibitive. In one instance, I am told, there has been a 50 per cent. increase on the carriage of eggs from Dowerin to Perth.

The Premier: Only for electioneering purposes.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Premier ought to be smothered with them.

The Premier: Then I should be sweeter than you are.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Premier does not look like it. He jokes about

these increases. Why should a man have to pay fourpence for the carriage of his newspaper from Perth to Tambellup? Unless people live in town, where they can have their paper delivered to them, they cannot get one at all.

The Premier: The paper could be sent through the post for a halfpenny.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: It should be possible to send it over the railways. The Premier made a great boast about this increase on the freight of newspapers.

The Premier: No, I did not.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: People along the railway lines want to know how the war is getting on, what the wheat market is, and how the Government are managing the affairs of the country, but in order to prevent the people getting their newspapers the Government have put on this prohibitive rate.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: A *West Australian* costs twopence in Kalgoorlie.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: It is a retrograde step to deny the people their full comforts. When lower freights were charged under the Liberal Administration, a profit of £220,000 was made on our railways. The parcels rates were then half the present rates, and yet profits were higher. Are the Government going to keep the parcels rates up?

The Premier: Until conditions improve.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Minister had something to say about commercial travellers' tickets. I wonder whether the revenue lost or gained by the increase on season tickets.

The Premier: I think it gained.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Minister had an opportunity of making himself unpleasant to people who have used the railways for years and who, notwithstanding his statements concerning them, are quite fit to associate with the Minister. I want to know from the Minister what arrangements he has made for haulage of wheat, and for the storage of wheat at country sidings. It is of importance that that matter should be dealt with

promptly. I know it is useless to ask the Government to reduce the freight on wheat, but we may ask them to make arrangements for proper storage and speedy transport. I have no more to say, except to warn the Government that they cannot for ever go on increasing freights and fares and to warn them that the question of parcels rates must be taken into serious consideration. There have been numerous complaints from the people in the country on the score of the increased rates on small parcels coming into the City and going out to the people on the land. I think there is ample reason for reconsidering the position.

This concluded the general debate on the Estimates of the Railway Department; item discussed as follows:—

Item—Extensions, replacements, depreciation, etc., £10,100.

Mr. HARRISON: I want to know whether the Minister anticipates that the accommodation at Carabbin will be extended soon. Is it included in this item?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I cannot inform the hon. member on which item such expenditure is provided, but there is an item from which the money might be drawn if the department decide to undertake the work. As the hon. member knows, the matter has been receiving the attention of the railway authorities for some considerable time. Generally with regard to accommodation at sidings, in view of the strenuous financial times in which we are living I think it is not asking too much that people should put up with some little inconvenience as regards accommodation whilst so many urgent public works in the shape of railways, harbours, and so forth are needed to provide facilities for the carriage of produce. The same thing applies to the construction of platforms. I know that as regards Carabbin, dissatisfaction has been expressed by the Westonia people especially because both the up and the down train arrive at that station between 2 and 3 o'clock in the morning. After all, however, the rush to Westonia is over,

and that centre has settled down to the normal.

**Mr. HARRISON:** I wish to call the Minister's attention to the amount of traffic from Westonla.

The Minister for Mines: I know the traffic is very considerable.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—*Tourist resorts, cave houses, etc.*, £9,435—agreed to.

Vote—*Yandanooka estate*, £25,371:

Item—Clerk, £102.

**Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON:** Are the Government going to pay this clerk a living wage?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Both the manager and the clerk receive their keep on the farm, in addition to their salaries.

Item—Upkeep, stock, plant, interest, etc., £25,000.

**Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON:** A good many members have expressed the view that the Government ought not to continue farming, simply as farming, on the scale they are doing at the present time. What are their intentions in regard to Yandanooka?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: As hon. members are aware, this estate was purchased in 1912 and a portion of it was thrown open for selection. Owing to the bad season, however, the applications were not as numerous as it was anticipated they would be. It is hoped, however, in the near future that application for farms will be more numerous than they have been in the past. To enable the department to derive some revenue from the estate, they started to put cattle on it and the meat stalls were supplied with fattened stock. Last year was not a favourable one because of the season and consequently we did not get that revenue which we expected. It was considered advisable that an attempt should be made to improve a portion of the property and at the outset 100 men were sent there to do some clearing. We cleared about 7,000 acres at an average cost of 16s. 9d. per acre. Of that total 5,000 acres has been put under crop and it is hoped, during next year.

if by that time it has not been possible to get rid of the property, to put under crop something like 8,000 acres. The Government purchased this estate for closer settlement and the intention is, as soon as the seasons become more favourable, to see that closer settlement is brought about. We want settlers, not large estates.

**Hon. H. B. LEFROY:** I am glad to hear that it is the intention of the Government to dispose of the Yandanooka estate, because it is in the interests of the country that that should be done. Under the circumstances there is some justification for the Government having cultivated a portion of it. Still, I hope it is not their intention to continue farming operations, which do not constitute one of the functions of government.

**Mr. CARPENTER:** I was one of the interested parties who visited this estate a few days ago. I thought there might be a possibility of the Government putting into operation what has been frequently advocated by social reformers and those interested in schemes of land settlement, namely, that there should be some kind of co-operative settlement under the direction of Government expert advisers, and to some extent under Government control. I am well aware that experiments have been made in this way and that they have not proved successful. I remember some years ago in South Australia there was started a village settlement scheme, the chief feature of which was general management by a committee of the settlers, and the Government advanced up to £100 to each settler. The settlement was a failure to a large extent, but it was stated, after the experiment had been made, that there had been an oversight in allowing a man without sufficient experience to have the management of the land, whereas if it had been under the control of someone with expert knowledge, the experiment might have proved a success. I would like to see settlers get some of the advantages which accrue from living a community life. I know there are a number of people who

live in the country and who get accustomed to what is termed the isolation of farming life, and in time these people tell us that they prefer to live in that way. I know, however, that the average man who goes on the land does like to be somewhere near a neighbour. In an estate like that of Yandanooka we could have a scheme of closer settlement which would give the people who take up blocks an opportunity of living in groups, and having all the advantages which that group life confers. I was impressed by the success of the operations at the estate, due, in a large measure, to the unity of the workers. For instance, instead of having 20 or 30 men on separate plants, there was one manager with one plant. A similar thing would be possible under co-operative effort.

Vote put and passed.

[*The Speaker resumed the Chair.*]

Progress reported.

#### RESOLUTION—VENEREAL DISEASES, UNIFORM LEGISLATION.

Message received from the Legislative Council requesting the concurrence of the Assembly in the following resolution:—"That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that the Government should approach the Governments of the other States of the Commonwealth with the object of endeavouring to arrive at an agreement between all the States as to the methods to be adopted to stamp out venereal diseases, so that laws may be enacted in each State to deal with the evil."

*House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.*

## Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 27th October, 1915.

---

Leave of absence ...	1966
Bills: General Loan and Inscribed Stock Act Amendment, 3r. ...	1966
Vermis Boards Act Amendment, 3r. ...	1966
Health Act Amendment, report stage ...	1966
Land Act Amendment, 2r. ...	1966
Mines Regulation Act Amendment, message Licensing Act Amendment Continuance, message ...	1978
Weights and Measures, message ...	1984
Industries Assistance Act Amendment, message ...	1986
Select Committee, Retirement of C. F. Gale, to adopt report ...	1986
Joint Select Committee, Horse-racing control, to adopt report ...	1937
	1989

---

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

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. J. CORNELL (South) leave of absence for the remainder of the session granted to the Hon. J. E. Dodd on the ground of ill-health.

#### BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

1, General Loan and Inscribed Stock Act Amendment.

*Passed.*

2, Vermis Boards Act Amendment.

Returned to the Assembly with amendments.

#### BILL—HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

#### BILL—LAND ACT AMENDMENT.

*Second Reading.*

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.40] in moving the second reading said: This Bill is introduced in fulfilment of a definite policy announced some time ago by the Government of reclassifying, or repricing land in the less favoured areas selected since the general advancement in price of all Crown lands open for selection in 1910. I need not stress to this Chamber the im-