

Schedule—agreed to.

Preamble:

Mr. SCADDAN: How did the name of John Boileau come to be among those in whom the land had been vested?

Mr. McDOWALL: The hon. member was referring to a very old resident of Coolgardie. As the Minister had said, this reserve had been vested in trustees in the early days. Eventually the sum of £300 had been raised for the purpose of installing it with electric light and other improvements. However, the trustees could not pay up and the bank had threatened to foreclose, upon which the municipality had raised a loan and paid off the bank. It was now desired to vest the land in the municipality.

Preamble passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment; the report adopted.

BILL—AGRICULTURAL BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

Second reading.

Order of the Day read for resumption of debate on second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

FIRE BRIGADES BILL SELECT COMMITTEE.

Member to give evidence.

On motion by the Premier (without notice) the member for Murchison (Mr. Holman) was permitted to give evidence before the select committee of the Legislative Council on the Fire Brigades Bill.

House adjourned at 10.31 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 19th October, 1909.

	PAGE
Papers presented ...	1024
Questions: Railway Officers reclassification ...	1024
Commercial Agent at Rome ...	1024
Motion: Government Business, Precedence on alternate Wednesdays ...	1025
Notice Paper altered ...	1031
Bills: Coolgardie Recreation Reserve Revestment, 3a ...	1031
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, Com. ...	1032
Permanent Reserve Rededication, 2a, Com. ...	1037
Fisheries Act Amendment, Com. ...	1039

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

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Minister for Mines: Papers relating to a loan to R. Berteaux of the President Loubet Lease, Davyhurst (Return ordered on motion by Mr. Collier).

By the Premier: 1, Rules and regulations of the Fremantle Public Hospital. 2, Wharfage charges on wool at Derby, Broome, Port Hedland, Onslow, and Carnarvon.

QUESTION—RAILWAY OFFICERS RECLASSIFICATION.

Mr. HARDWICK asked the Premier: Seeing that the reorganisation of the Railway Department has been going on for two years, is it the intention of the Government to place a sum of money on this year's Estimates so that reclassification by the Commissioner of Railways shall take effect from the 1st July, 1909?

The PREMIER replied: Reclassification is now proceeding, and provision will be made for increases to take effect from the 1st July.

QUESTION—COMMERCIAL AGENT AT ROME.

Mr. JACOBY (without notice) asked the Premier: What are the conditions under which Signor Astengo will act as commercial agent at Rome for this State?

The PREMIER replied: This gentleman was appointed honorary commercial agent at Rome for Western Australia.

lia recently on the recommendation of the Agent General, and on that of Chevalier Zunini, who was for some time Italian Consul in Western Australia; the idea of the appointment being to encourage, as far as possible, trade relationships between the two countries. This gentleman is a member of the Legislature of Italy.

Mr. TROY: At what salary was the appointment made?

The PREMIER: Without remuneration.

MOTION — GOVERNMENT BUSINESS, PRECEDENCE ON ALTERNATE WEDNESDAYS.

The PREMIER (Hon. N. J. Moore) moved—

That on Wednesday, 20th October, and on every alternate Wednesday thereafter, Government business shall take precedence over all other notices and Orders of the Day, as well as on the days already provided.

As a rule this motion was made earlier in the session, and was generally assented to without discussion. The Government had still a considerable amount of business to bring down, and it would be necessary to devote a greater amount of time to Government business. During this session, so far, one day in three had been devoted to private members' business, and at the commencement of the session a certain portion of the time supposed to have been devoted to Government business had been allotted to members in charge of private measures. Among the measures yet to be brought down by the Government were those dealing with the amendment of the Constitution, re-purchased estates, the re-imposition of the land and income tax, several railway Bills, a Roads Bill, and other minor measures. Then there would be the Loan Bill as well, so it would be recognised that this motion was by no means unreasonable.

Mr. BATH (Brown Hill): Instead of attempting to take away private members' day every other week it would have been more reasonable to suggest

sitting an extra day in each week. Such extra day could be allotted to Government business, and private members' day would be observed as hitherto. The Premier had referred to certain measures the Government had on the stocks, but it was to be remembered that private members also had some important measures on the Notice Paper and, with one or two exceptions, had had very little opportunity of getting on with them. The bills of fare submitted by the Government was altogether too extensive for the short time elapsing between 1st September, when Parliament had met, and Christmas. If it was intended to prorogue by Christmas there was no hope whatever of dealing with the measures on the Notice Paper, let alone those still to be brought down. If it should be found inconvenient to sit an extra evening in the week, why should we not sit on Monday or Friday from 10 o'clock in the morning till 5 in the afternoon?

Mr. JOHNSON (Guildford): The suggestion made by the Leader of the Opposition should claim the serious attention of the Premier. Members had had a month's adjournment, and had probably made the most of it in the prosecution of their private business. Consequently it was only fair that we should now make up part of that time in the service of the State. The sitting of an extra day from this time forward would probably obviate the undue rush which always occurred at the end of a session. The measures referred to by the Premier were far too important to be dealt with in the hurry and scurry which almost invariably marked the close of a session. He had no desire to oppose the motion, because he did not want to sit after Christmas; nor did he want to see any measure being put through without proper consideration. Still, he would submit to the Premier that the sitting of an extra day would be a wiser expedient than the cutting out of private members' day.

Mr. TROY (Mt. Magnet): The House had only been sitting a little over a month, and but small opportunity had been given to members to ventilate their grievances, therefore he would oppose

the motion. If, during recess, members received greater courtesy from Ministers, and fuller opportunities of having their grievances redressed, there would not be that great necessity for private members' day; but such courtesy and such opportunities were denied members in recess, and, consequently, members were justified in demanding the retention of private members' day. True, no objection was raised to this motion in previous years, but in previous years Parliament had been sitting some time before the motion was introduced. Later, however, it had been the custom of Governments to delay the opening of Parliament until late in the year, and to wait until the hot months, and then when members were exhausted, to seek an early opportunity of getting into recess. The Premier surmised the House would rise before Christmas, but intimated the intention to bring down a host of Bills which experience showed there could be no opportunity of passing. What was the good of bringing down at the far end of the session a Bill for the alteration of the Constitution that would create a great deal of discussion and a great deal of criticism. But evidently it was intended to bring down the Bill merely to mislead the people into a belief of the sincerity of the Government in regard to the alteration of the franchise of another House, or the Government had no sincerity in regard to having the measure passed. In fact they had had four years in which to deal with the measure, and had shown no sincerity in regard to it. It was a Bill that should be brought down as soon as possible, but as it would embrace such a mass of contentious matters it would take weeks to get through the House.

The Premier: Will it take weeks to get the alteration to the Constitution through?

Mr. TROY: If it embraced an alteration of the franchise for the electors of another House it would create a great deal of argument: it was a big subject. But the Government could have no sincerity in regard to it. The Bill would be thrown out, and the Legislative Coun-

cil elections were to be held next May. Private members' day should be retained, because it was the only opportunity members had of ventilating their grievances. He could give personal experience as to the manner in which he had been treated, and would take every opportunity while in the House of conserving the privileges of members, and of enabling them to have their grievances discussed in the House if that opportunity were denied by Ministers during recess.

Mr. HOLMAN (Murchison): Members must protest against taking away private members' day so early in the session. In past sessions the debate on the Address-in-Reply took almost as many weeks as the House had sat this session, and practically every member gave away his right to speak on the Address-in-Reply in order to enable the Government to get on with the business, while the general debate on the Estimates was allowed to go through by members on the Opposition in order to enable the Government to get on with the business.

The Premier: It was very kind of you.

Mr. HOLMAN: The Premier could not point to any experience in previous years where the same thing had happened. But it appeared to be the desire of the Government merely to get into recess to carry on some of the same work Ministers had carried on in past years during recess. It was well known when the debate on the Address-in-Reply was allowed to lapse the Government had no business to bring forward.

The Premier: Legislation has never been so far advanced as during this session and the same can be said of the Estimates.

Mr. HOLMAN: And simply because things were well advanced private members were to have their only privilege taken away. If that was the treatment members were to receive for being kind to the Government, the best thing for members to do was to take up a firm stand and not allow so much progress to be made. Although the Government had some important measures on the Notice Paper, private members had also important mea-

asures on the Notice Paper dealing with the interests of the people of the State, with the protection of life and property, with the advancement of the mining industry, and with the payment of compensation to men injured in following their employment; and members should have an opportunity of having these matters dealt with; but it appeared the Government were only seeking to get into recess. It was only about eight weeks before Christmas, yet there was to be a Bill brought down for an amendment to the Constitution. A great deal of time would be spent dealing with it in this Chamber, and then it would be sent to the Legislative Council at the last moment and tossed out, like many other measures sent to that place; and the Government would be able to say they had passed through the Assembly a measure granting privileges to a certain section of the community, but it was tossed out by the other House. However, all knew that the Government were not sincere in this matter, and that the sole idea was to blind the electors to show what sort of good fellows Ministers were. Was the real idea to get into recess and allow the Premier to take up the position of Agent General?

The Premier: Give notice of the question.

Mr. HOLMAN: If notice were given of the question it would enable the Premier to prepare an answer which might be different from what would be given straight away. It was believed this was the case, and one would not like to see the Ministers the Premier would leave behind with six or seven months of recess to carry on as they liked.

The Premier: They do not get rid of me so easily as that.

Mr. HOLMAN: In all probability the kindness the Premier had met with from the Opposition during the session would lead him to think that he should remain.

The Premier: Do not disabuse me.

Mr. HOLMAN: The Premier might be assured that if opportunity were not given to private members to bring forward their business a different stand would have to be taken by the Opposition. It was true, as the member for Mount Magnet said,

that during recess private members were not treated with the courtesy to which they were entitled. Members could always get smiles and kindly nods from Ministers while the House was sitting, and a great many requests totally ignored during recess received fair consideration when the House was sitting. There were some important matters he (Mr. Holman) wished to bring forward, and to have the opportunity of expressing his views on but if this motion were carried there would be no opportunity of doing so. It would be impossible for private members to bring anything forward because there was only an hour and a-half given on private members' day before the Orders of the Day were called on. It would be better to sit four days, or even five days a week, and do the business properly than to have the rights of private members frittered away and business carried through in a slipshod manner. The result of carrying on business in a slipshod manner would mean that we would be all next session dealing with amendments to the measures passed this session. Almost every session business was allowed to accumulate to the last few weeks and then rushed through hurry-scurry: members were practically forced to allow the business to go through in any manner the Government desired to push it on, and the next session brought down a crop of amending measures as a sort of patch-work for the measures of the previous session. The Premier should withdraw the motion and bring down another to make an extra sitting day in the week, and instead of bringing down fresh measures, as had already been promised, half the Orders on the Notice Paper should be taken away and the rest dealt with in a proper manner so that there would be no amendments required next session.

Mr. ANGWIN (East Fremantle): The Premier's motion should not be adopted. If the practice of the past was bad there was no reason why members should not get rid of it as soon as possible. It was necessary to have more than one day a fortnight to deal with measures already on the Notice Paper introduced by private members, so that the Premier's

motion might lie in abeyance for two or three months. It was not compulsory to close down at Christmas. We kept on last session till February, and if there was necessary business to be done there was no reason why we should close at Christmas. No doubt, private members who had given notice of the measures on the Notice Paper had done so with the idea of trying; if possible, to get them placed on the statute-book; and if they were afraid of the hot weather and had no intention of carrying into effect the matters of which they had given notice one could understand their support to the motion; but if members were earnest in their desire to amend various Acts of Parliament and grant the relief their measures, if passed, would apparently afford, there was no necessity for them to run away, even if we should have a little warm weather. Members should consider the business of the country before their own pleasures.

Mr. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret): The Premier, in submitting the motion, gave as a reason for taking away private members' day, that there was a deal of legislation on the Notice Paper, and that the Government intended to bring down many more Bills. Look at the magnitude of the measures now under discussion! After the Estimates, which had only just been started, there was the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Bill only in the Committee stage. With regard to this measure the Minister for Works would recognise that it would be a difficult task to mould it in accordance with the wishes of members. Following that, came the Licensing Bill, and assuredly the Attorney General would not treat that measure in anything approaching a light spirit. Then there was the Health Bill only in the second reading stage. The two last-named measures were sufficient in themselves to form the work of a session, that was providing there was an earnest desire on the part of the Government to put them on the statute-book before Parliament rose. The consideration of these Bills would take the House almost up to Christmas, without touching the Estimates or the oft-promised alteration of the Constitution Act. Instead of the

Premier loading the Notice Paper with fresh Bills he should get to work and clear off some of those now before members. The Government must recognise that during this session there had been a great desire on the part of members to get on with work. The Address-in-Reply had created no discussion, while the debate on the first line of the Estimates consisted of but two speeches. Such a thing as that had never happened before in the Parliament of Western Australia. Notwithstanding these facts the Government now desired to curtail the opportunities of private members. Of course the Government desired to get through business and into recess, but private members should not allow their privileges to be taken away in the manner suggested by the motion. The proposal made by the Leader of the Opposition was well worth consideration, as there was no reason why the House should not sit another day a week and allow private members to continue having Wednesdays for bringing forward motions and Bills. In that morning's paper he had read of a meeting at which supporters of the Government had questioned the right of a private member to bring down a Bill. That was ridiculous. Was a certain small section of the community to dictate to Parliament as to the privileges of private members? Not only that, but some small section of the community even went so far as to question the backbone of the Premier and his supporters, and abused them at a meeting of citizens held at the Palace Hotel. He intended to move an amendment whereby the Government would have three days a week for their business, and members would still retain Wednesday as private members' day. If we sat for four days a week then the business should be able to be completed within a week of Christmas. It was doubtful whether, if the Premier desired to fill the Notice Paper as was indicated, and Parliament sat only three days a week, we would rise before March. He moved an amendment—

That all the words after "on" in line 1 be struck out, and "Friday the 2nd October, and on every Friday

thereafter the House shall meet for the despatch of business at 4.30 p.m. and shall sit until 6.15 p.m., if necessary, and if required, from 7.30 p.m. onwards" be inserted in lieu.

Mr. SPEAKER: The amendment was not in order as the Sessional Order fixing the day on which the House should meet was not before members. The question now was whether on Wednesday the 20th of October, and on every alternate Wednesday thereafter, Government business should take precedence. The amendment needed altering slightly.

Mr. TAYLOR: The amendment suggested striking out the whole of the Premier's motion with the exception of the first two words, and did not seek to amend a Sessional Order already passed.

Mr. BATH: When the Premier asked, as he did, for an extra sitting he did not amend a previous Sessional Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The amendment suggested by the member for Mount Margaret was an amendment of a Sessional Order already passed this Session.

Mr. TAYLOR: The position would be met if he added certain words to his amendment. He would therefore withdraw the previous amendment and submit the following—

That all the words after "on" in line 1 be struck out, and "Friday the 22nd October, and on every Friday thereafter the House shall meet for the despatch of business at 4.30 p.m., and shall sit until 6.15 p.m., if necessary, and if required, from 7.30 p.m. onwards, in addition to the days already provided by Sessional Orders," be inserted in lieu.

Mr. SPEAKER: That would meet the case.

The PREMIER: The amendment altered the Sessional Orders: was it not necessary, therefore, that notice of motion should be given of any such proposed alteration?

Mr. SPEAKER: An amendment could be moved to the motion, provided that it was in order.

The PREMIER: In 1906 a motion was moved to the effect that for the remainder of the session the House should meet for the despatch of business on Tues-

days, Wednesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays from 3 o'clock until 6.30, and if requisite from 7.30 onwards. That motion was moved after due notice had been given.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member desired to move the amendment, he could give notice of it for the following day. In its present form it could not be accepted because it proposed to alter a Sessional Order which had already been passed.

Mr. TAYLOR: The last paragraph of the amendment it was proposed to move, would get over all difficulties.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member could give notice to move it in the form of a motion on the next day.

Mr. TAYLOR: What would be the position with reference to the motion before the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: If the amendment were passed it would interfere with the Sessional Orders that had already been agreed to by the House.

Mr. BATH: The motion which the Premier had moved also interfered with the Sessional Order.

The PREMIER: But notice of the motion had been given. The member for Mount Margaret could give notice of his intention to move on another day that the House should sit on Friday.

Mr. TAYLOR: Was it not competent when a motion had been moved for a member to rise in the ordinary way and propose an amendment to that motion?

Mr. SPEAKER: In connection with the matter under discussion there were two separate motions which were passed on the 30th July last relating to the sitting days and hours, and the member for Mount Margaret now proposed to amend one of those motions, which was not at present before the House.

Mr. TAYLOR: Was it understood that the Premier had given notice in a proper manner to amend a Sessional Order?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR: Would not an hon. member then be in order in moving an amendment to that motion?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member's amendment would not touch the Session-

al Order that the Premier was amending.

Mr. TAYLOR: The last paragraph added at Mr. Speaker's request would overcome the difficulty.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member's amendment was not strictly in order.

Mr. TAYLOR: There was no intention to touch any of the Standing Orders or the Sessional Orders in the amendment. He was endeavouring to move an amendment without having any cognisance of any Sessional Order in existence. The Premier had put forward a notice of motion in the same form, and no mention had been made of any Sessional Order. The object of the amendment was to add another sitting day.

Mr. Scaddan: The hon. member could give notice.

Mr. TAYLOR: There was no necessity to give notice. The Premier made no reference to any Sessional Orders when moving the motion, and the amendment was equally silent as far as the Sessional Orders passed in the earlier part of the session were concerned.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member would wait a few moments he would endeavour to have the amendment worded in such a form as would make it conform to the practice of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR: The point had been raised by Mr. Speaker that the amendment was not in order as it purported to amend a Sessional Order, and as no notice had been given of the amendment. In his (Mr. Taylor's) opinion, neither the Premier's motion nor the amendment indicated any connection with the Sessional Order referred to. The amendment was relevant. The Premier desired to take away private members' day while he (Mr. Taylor) desired to retain it, and in retaining it to give the Government an extra day in each week. Even if the amendment were out of order it was so relevant to the Premier's motion that it was competent for the House to accept it. To give notice of the amendment would be to lose the opportunity, which would pass with the

passing of the Premier's motion. He moved as an amendment—

"That all the words after 'That' be struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—"On Friday, 22nd October, and on every Friday thereafter the House shall meet for the despatch of business at 4.30 p.m. and shall sit until 6.15 p.m. if necessary, and if requisite from 7.30 p.m. onwards, in addition to the days already provided by Sessional Orders."

Mr. SPEAKER: The amendment could not be accepted inasmuch as it purposed to amend a Sessional Order, and no notice of such amendment had been given. On Friday, 30th July, on motion by the Premier, it had been ordered that the House should meet for the despatch of business on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays. Immediately afterwards, on motion by the Premier, it had been ordered that on Tuesdays and Thursdays Government business should take precedence of all motions and Orders of the Day. Now, in accordance with notice given, the Premier had moved to amend that latter Sessional Order. Consequently, the motion was entirely in order, whereas the amendment purposed to amend the earlier Sessional Order, which was not a subject before the House, and in respect of which no notice of amendment had been given.

Mr. Taylor: Then you rule the amendment out of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot do otherwise.

Mr. SCADDAN (Ivanhoe): To allow the member for Mount Margaret an opportunity of giving notice of the amendment, he moved—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and negatived.

The PREMIER (in reply): It was recognised that it would be necessary, later in the session, to meet on Fridays.

Mr. Bath: That will not give us private members' day.

The PREMIER: In 1906 the House had first met on Fridays on the 27th November. Hon. members would get due opportunity of bringing forward anything of an important character on the days allotted. For instance, the member for Dundas would, this week,

have an opportunity of discussing a matter in which he was very much interested.

Mr. JOHNSON: Will you treat us all alike?

The PREMIER: There were several matters which hon. members were just as anxious to see passed as were the Government, and he hoped that, later on, they would take occasion to give approval to a motion sent down from another place, providing that measures lapsing in one session might be taken up in the next at the stage at which they had been dropped. There had been no session, so far as he knew, in which Government measures had been brought down so early. Private members had had very good opportunities. Two or three of their measures had already received approval in the House. It was necessary now that further opportunity should be taken for discussing measures outlined by the Government. Some hon. members opposite would be the first to twit the Government if the Bill amending the Constitution were not brought down. He would be prepared to consider the proposal of the Leader of the Opposition later in the session.

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

Ayes	22
Noes	19

Majority for .. 3

AYES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Male
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. Monger
Mr. Daglish	Mr. N. J. Moore
Mr. Davies	Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. Draper	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Osborn
Mr. Gregory	Mr. J. Price
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Haywood	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Jacoby	(Teller).
Mr. Layman	

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. McDowall
Mr. Bath	Mr. O'Loughlen
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Collier	Mr. Swan
Mr. Gill	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Heilmann	Mr. Walker
Mr. Holman	Mr. Ware
Mr. Horan	Mr. A. A. Wilso-
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Troy
Mr. Johnson	(Teller).

Question thus passed.

BILL—COOLGARDIE RECREATION RESERVE REVESTMENT.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

NOTICE PAPER ALTERED.

Mr. HEITMANN: The Notice Paper laid before members was not the same as that exhibited in the corridor. It was usual for members to telephone during the morning to ascertain what was the business for the sitting, and when they came to the House they found that the Notice Paper was altogether different. There was, at least, one member who was absent to-day who would have been present had he known other business had been put forward to that which appeared on the Notice Paper exhibited in the corridor.

Mr. JOHNSON: Members made it a habit of ascertaining by means of the telephone during the morning the business for the day, and then made their necessary arrangements. According to the Notice Paper at first circulated one concluded that the House would not get past the Estimates at this sitting, but on coming to the House it was found that there was the Agricultural Bank Act Amendment Bill, with other business put before the Estimates. It was probably owing to a mistake, but it would be as well if the Notice Paper posted in the corridor, and from which members got the information, was the only one for the business of the day.

The PREMIER: If there was any fault in connection with the matter he was the culprit, through having left on the Friday without fixing up the Notice Paper. Being anxious to have several small Bills passed on to the Legislative Council as early as possible he had yesterday requested to alter the Notice Paper so that this might be done, and several small Bills were put in front of the Estimates. He had thought that the altered Notice Paper would have been printed before to-day.

BILL—AGRICULTURAL BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Mr. Daglish in the Chair; the Minister for Lands in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of No. 15 of 1906, Section 10:

Mr. ANGWIN: This clause proposed to increase the fees of the trustees from two guineas to three guineas per sitting, but the remuneration paid to some of the directors of banks doing far more work than the trustees of the Agricultural Bank were called upon to do averaged only two guineas. Members should vote against the clause and leave the fees paid to the trustees as they were at present.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The directors of banks received more than 150 guineas a year, the sum now proposed to be paid to the trustees of the Agricultural Bank, and they received the money whether they attended or not, whereas the trustees of the Agricultural Bank were to be paid only for attendance, and they were required to work longer hours than ordinary bank directors. In addition to this the trustees of the Agricultural Bank lived in the country, because it was an advantage to those doing business with the bank to have practical farmers as trustees. The present trustees were Mr. Cook of Northam, who lost two days every time he attended a meeting of the trustees, and Mr. Richardson of Serpentine, and their assistance in the control of the bank was most valuable. No bank directors did similar work, nor interested themselves in such small matters as the trustees were called upon to manage.

Mr. Scaddan: Are they provided with passes?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes.

Mr. Scaddan: And are their expenses paid?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No. They were expected to visit agricultural centres. Mr. Cook had visited most of the agricultural districts.

Mr. Scaddan: Does he get any expenses for that?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No: and no fees. The trustees had not asked for any increase. They were well calculated to do the right thing by the thousands of applications for assistance from the bank. They would have to personally inspect specimens of machinery to be submitted by agricultural implement makers. Their duties were more than simply attending board meetings once a week, and they were only paid when they actually attended.

Mr. BATH: We had also to consider whether the experiment of appointing trustees had been justified. Had it brought about any superior work than was performed by Mr. Paterson? If not, there was no justification for the increased expenditure.

Mr. JACOBY: If the full responsibility for the management of the bank were placed on the shoulders of the trustees, perhaps there would be some justification for an increase, but largely the bank was still under Ministerial control.

The Minister for Lands: No.

Mr. JACOBY: And what the Minister left undone was done entirely by Mr. Paterson, the present manager. We should put the bank absolutely under the trustees, and remove it from Ministerial control; but at present the powers of the trustees were considerably curtailed. The trustees were trustees only in name, and had not the same powers of management over the institution as were exercised by the directors of ordinary banks. The member for East Fremantle was probably nearer the mark in saying that the fees paid to the directors of banks averaged about two guineas a board meeting. The present time was inopportune for making any increase. Until we were prepared to give the necessary increments to all the civil servants we should not increase them to any particular persons serving the State.

Mr. TAYLOR: The proposal to increase the fees of the trustees from two guineas to three guineas was one which should never have emanated from the Government, seeing that Ministers were going about the country referring to the stringency of the finances, refusing local

requirements of all descriptions, denying to the people those services which they should receive, and preventing the lower paid portion of the civil servants from getting the salaries they deserved. The amendment was one which should receive the marked protest of every member, irrespective of party. The fee of two guineas a sitting which the trustees received at present was ample, considering the fact that they spent but a short time each week at their duties, and that there were other concessions granted. For instance, they received a free pass on the railways. He would like to know from the Minister whether under that pass the trustees could go all over the railway system, or was the privilege restricted to the railway line between their homes and the City?

The Minister for Lands: The trustees received a free pass over the railways that could be used at any time.

Mr. TAYLOR: The value of that concession was very considerable, and, in fact, seeing that the trustees had free passes over all railway lines, they would really be well paid for their work on behalf of the bank if they received a fee of one guinea a week instead of two guineas as at present, and three guineas as suggested. Probably the meetings of the trustees never lasted for longer than from two hours to five hours, and certainly never occupied as much as eight hours. These meetings could only be held once a week. However, the fee of two guineas for, say, three or four hours work was a very good remuneration. The local governing bodies were all being starved by the Government, the people were being harassed not only by direct taxation, but also by indirect taxation, due to the fact that the Government were now paying out of loan moneys for many works that should be carried out with revenue; yet, in view of these needs, an effort was now being made to increase the fees of the trustees. It was doubtful, after all, whether the bank had profited much by the institution of the trusteeships. It was due to the vigilance, the experience, and the great general knowledge of the present

manager of the bank that the operations of the institution had proved so successful in the past. And even at the present time the trustees were assuredly largely guided in all their duties by the wisdom of the manager. If the trustees were removed the bank would not perform its functions one iota less successfully than it did at present. It was really nothing more than cheek on the part of the Government to bring forward the proposal.

The Minister for Works: That is an objectionable term.

Mr. TAYLOR: If it were objectionable he would withdraw it. Evidently it was thought that a man who could prove himself to be very useful at election time on behalf of a member of the Government was well worth an extra guinea a week as trustee of the Savings Bank. Let this position be considered. If he were a struggling farmer in the Northam district, and a trustee of the bank, who would have the duty of justifying or denying an application for a loan made by him to the bank, were an active supporter of the Government candidate in an election for the district then he (Mr. Taylor) would take very good care not to impress his opinion upon the public in that district, should he consider that the opponent to the Minister was the man who should be elected. In political contests when feeling ran high, and a man was prepared to get a black eye for his candidate, that man would be quite prepared to report unfavourably on an application for a loan by one who was not a supporter of that candidate.

Mr. Moulton: That is hardly fair comment.

The CHAIRMAN: The member was transgressing somewhat as the question under consideration was Clause 2.

Mr. TAYLOR: The clause was a bad one and should not be agreed to. So strongly was he of that opinion that he intended to divide the House upon it. The question should be looked at from economic lines, and quite irrespective of party feeling.

(Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.)

Mr. ANGWIN: The Minister for Lands had stated that the amounts given as being the fees paid by private banking institutions were not correct. The information which had been given to the Committee had been supplied by a bank director in Perth. There was a possibility therefore of the Minister being wrong with regard to this question. The Minister had since told the Committee—a fact that members were not aware of before—that in addition to these fees of two guineas the trustees of the bank were also given a free pass over the railways. That in itself must be considered of some value to the trustees. Those passes would enable them to travel throughout the State when carrying on their own private business. Under such conditions therefore members would be protecting the best interests of the State if they allowed the Act to stand as it was as far as the fees were concerned. As a rule, however, he did not care about advocating under-payments, but when all the circumstances were realised the Minister was not justified in asking hon. members to increase the amount of the fees. It was surprising that the Minister should introduce this question of increase, more especially at the present juncture when he was economising in every direction. The member for Swan had pointed out that the responsibility which rested on the trustees was very small, and that the principal person we had to rely upon was the manager of the bank, Mr. Paterson, in whom every member had the utmost confidence. No doubt Mr. Paterson preferred to have trustees to assist him in the consideration of the various questions that were placed before him, yet, at the same time, the fee of two guineas together with a free pass over the railways should be sufficient recompense to those gentlemen who held the positions.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: With reference to the free passes given to the trustees of the bank, it was necessary that these gentlemen should have them in order that they might be able to attend to their work throughout the country. The Committee had been asked to consider the question of the increase, because it was believed to be right that the increase

should be given. Section 5 of the Act of 1906 stipulated that the Act should be administered by three trustees to be appointed from time to time. These trustees had the same responsibilities as directors of an ordinary bank, and with regard to the payments made to the latter the member for East Fremantle was right in the information he had given to the House. The trustees of the Agricultural Bank were called upon to administer an Act which provided for advances being given totalling £2,000,000, and when that fact was taken into consideration it would be admitted that the fees they were paid were not large. The sum of three guineas would be quite low enough. The duties took up a considerable amount of time, and so far all of the trustees had lost by the transaction.

Mr. Hudson: In the Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Bill it is provided that the fees shall be only two guineas per sitting, or £100 per annum.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The trustees of the Agricultural Bank, however, had to deal with the lending of money in small sums aggregating £2,000,000. Under the old system there were many delays and the whole matter rested with the present managing trustee, Mr. Paterson. The appointment of additional trustees had obviated all trouble. People who went to the bank now were satisfied with the treatment they received. The trustees gave up a considerable amount of time to the work of the bank, and it was necessary that they should travel all over the State. In doing this they allowed clients to interview them everywhere, and did a considerable amount of good. Hon. members should realise the serious responsibility cast upon these gentlemen and agree to the increased remuneration.

Mr. TROY: The proposal to raise the fees would not receive his support. It would be introducing a bad principle to increase the fees and encourage the system known elsewhere as "guinea pigs." If these people were depending upon the Agricultural Bank for their livelihood they should be paid a decent salary, but they were giving their services in an honorary capacity, and if we

paid them for those services, three guineas per sitting, that payment would be regarded as substantial remuneration. Members were told that the trustees dealt with loans aggregating £2,000,000, but members of Parliament were dealing with sums of money amounting to £10,000,000, and they did not ask three guineas a sitting, neither did they get it. If we were to believe that these trustees should be paid according to their responsibilities, we could compare them with others occupying similar positions, or positions of greater responsibility, and then see whether or not they were being paid a high fee. With regard to the Fremantle Harbour Trust, the members of that body who had duties thrust on them which were as onerous and responsible as those of the Agricultural Bank, received no greater fee than £2 2s. per sitting.

Mr. Collier: That is too much.

Mr. TROY: That might be the case, but the members of the trust devoted as much time to their work as the trustees of the Agricultural Bank did to their duties, and again the trustees of the Bank had the additional advantage over the members of the Fremantle Harbour Trust of having a free pass over the railways, and this free pass to people engaged in business on their own behalf was a substantial advantage indeed. There was no desire to discuss any of these gentlemen personally, but one could mention Mr. Cook, who was a large farmer, and no doubt a capable man, who was interested in business transactions, interested in market sales and so forth, and that pass he possessed gave him a tremendous advantage with regard to his business. Then again as a trustee of the Agricultural Bank he held a position of great importance in the farming community, and no matter how fair or honourable he might be, and members would believe that all the trustees were honourable men, that position would be bound to have a certain amount of influence with the people who carried on an occupation which demanded assistance from the Agricultural Bank. It would be foolish to deny this, because we had a knowledge of what the people outside

believed were the powers of a member of Parliament, and unfortunately they could not be relieved of that impression. Many advantages accrued to the position of trustee of the bank, and, taking into consideration the small amount of work these gentlemen had to do—merely agreeing to what Mr. Paterson advised—it had to be admitted that they were already well paid.

Mr. JOHNSON: If it could be consistently done, he would be pleased to support the amendment. There were hundreds of employees of the State who were not receiving the salaries they were entitled to, simply because the public finances would not permit of it; yet, in spite of this, the Minister had expressed a desire to increase the fees of the trustees of the Agricultural Bank, merely on the ground that the trustees were entitled to such increase. However, seeing that the directors of the Western Australian Bank received only two guineas per sitting, or £150 per annum, why should higher fees be paid to the gentlemen administering the Agricultural Bank Act? Surely it would not be urged that the responsibility was greater, or even as great as that in connection with an institution like the Western Australian Bank! As the Minister had stated, these trustees went around the country; but so did members of Parliament who had to do it on a totally inadequate remuneration. The trustees had not asked for the increase, nor were their private circumstances at all on a par with those of the hundreds of civil servants who were being paid less than they were entitled to.

Mr. GORDON: It was scarcely fair to compare the positions of the trustees of the Agricultural Bank with those of the directors of the Western Australian Bank, or similar institutions. To begin with, nearly all the directorships in the City were filled by men living in the City, whereas the trustees of the Agricultural Bank were of the agricultural community, and had to come, one from Northam and the other from near Pinjarra. Consequently, to attend a meeting meant, for them, practically three

days away from home. Moreover, a special knowledge was required of them to do the business of the bank. It had been urged that in these days of retrenchment the State could not afford to pay the extra guinea, but it was to be remembered that the extra money would not come out of the Treasury at all, but would be provided from the bank's funds.

Mr. Taylor: The Government are responsible for the money.

Mr. GORDON: But the bank would have to pay its way, and in the event of its failing to do this a higher rate of interest would be charged against borrowers. If the present trustees were to resign it would be difficult to fill their places with men of equal ability.

Mr. FOULKES: Such positions as those under review involved the appointment of men who were not resident in the district in which the bank was situated. In other words, they were required to have a practical knowledge of agricultural pursuits, which of necessity implied a residence in country districts. Because of this, every time they had to come to Perth it would cost them, in personal expenses alone, something like £1 a day. The two gentlemen holding the positions at present were leaders of the agricultural industry; he referred more particularly to Mr. A. R. Richardson. It was quite certain that both gentlemen lost money by their positions as trustees every time they had to come to the City on the bank's business. It was probably the great interest Mr. Richardson took in the agricultural development of the State that induced him to accept the position of trustee. One could not understand the attitude of the member for Mount Margaret. When it was a question of paying £50 to each member of the useless board controlling the harbour works at Bunbury, the hon. member gave support to the Government; but that cost the State £300 a year, while this Bill merely proposed an increase of £100 a year. No doubt there was need for economy, and it was true that we were refraining from paying moneys due to civil servants, but if we passed this increase for the trustees of the Agricultural

Bank it would be an excellent argument to advance in urging the payment of increments in the public service. We should maintain the principle that employees of the State should be paid a fair and just remuneration.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: We might be inclined to be "penny wise and pound foolish" in a matter of this sort, because on any transaction it might easily happen that unless we had the best advice possible we might lose a sum of money many times greater than the small increased expenditure proposed by the clause. As pointed out, this increase meant no additional expenditure from revenue, because the Bank paid its own way, and no person running a bank would object to a small additional expenditure, if assured it gave additional security in dealing with the many advances sanctioned. The Agricultural Bank was a growing institution, and its transactions were on a much larger scale to-day than they were a few years ago. Certainly the usefulness of the bank had been increased by the appointment of these trustees. There was a time when in the northerly part of the South-Western Division there was a considerable amount of dissatisfaction at the bank. It was believed that the agriculturists in that part were not receiving the amount of assistance to which they were entitled. This was probably owing to the great bulk of the work having to fall on the one trustee, it being impossible for that gentleman to make himself sufficiently acquainted with the agricultural development in all parts of the division, but since the additional trustees had been appointed a good deal of the dissatisfaction in the North had disappeared, this being largely due to the fact that one of the trustees, some months ago, had spent a fortnight in making himself acquainted with the district at a considerable amount of trouble and, no doubt, expense to himself. When we had these trustees devoting themselves unstintingly to the services of the institution it was verging on parsimony to demand that they should not receive a maximum salary of 150 guineas a year. To pay them three guineas a sitting did not mean that the

maximum would be reached. At any rate the payment of three guineas a sitting did not work out at more than a guinea a day because of the considerable distance the trustees had to travel from their homes to Perth. The sacrifice of time was not merely that occupied in attending a meeting, as there was a good deal of work done in addition. The trustees frequently travelled about the country and did not hesitate, if occasion arose, to inspect properties on which advances were sought. Taking the whole of the work done by the trustees the payment was on the most moderate scale, and members should not allow themselves to be carried away by false analogies between the trustees and other persons who were, perhaps, not receiving what they should receive and what we would like them to receive. Members should not go beyond the trustees and the duties the trustees performed, and should not penalise the trustees because, in their opinion, other persons were not receiving as much reward as we would like them to get.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: In order to give time for the consideration of the arguments advanced by hon. members, he moved—

That progress be reported.

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

Ayes	21
Noes	20
Majority for	1

AYES.

Mr. Dutcher	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. Monger
Mr. Davies	Mr. N. J. Moore
Mr. Draper	Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Gordon	Mr. Osborn
Mr. Gregory	Mr. J. Price
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. Quinlan
Mr. Hayward	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Jacoby	Mr. Layman
Mr. Male	(Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. W. Price
Mr. Bath	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Swan
Mr. Collier	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Gill	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Heltmann	Mr. Walker
Mr. Holman	Mr. Ware
Mr. Hudson	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Troy
Mr. McDowall	(Teller)
Mr. O'Loghlen	

Motion thus passed.

Mr. HOLMAN: There were only 20 members voting for the "Ayes," would a recount be allowed.

The CHAIRMAN: No point of order had been raised by the hon. member. The division signed by the tellers had been handed in and must be accepted, unless the member could convince him he was wrong.

Mr. JOHNSON: On a point of order was Mr. Speaker voting in the division, and could he do so from the seat he occupied behind the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN: Any member sitting to the right or left of the Speaker or Chairman must be recorded as voting, so long as he was in the Chamber. That was all that was necessary.

Progress reported.

BILL—PERMANENT RESERVES REDEDICATION (No. 1).

Second Reading.

The PREMIER (Hon. N. J. Moore) in moving the second reading said: This is a Bill to enable the purpose of certain reserves to be changed. It has been introduced to allow room for the expansion of the Children's Hospital grounds in order to permit of infectious cases being dealt with there. At the present time a certain portion of a reserve is dedicated to the purposes of the Seventh Day Adventists. This land forms a triangle and was given to the religious body by Act of Parliament passed last year. It is now desired that the land should be transferred to the Children's Hospital committee, and the Seventh Day Adventists have intimated their willingness to make the transfer, provided that they are given sufficient land elsewhere to enable them to erect a church. The area granted is 1 rood in extent, having a frontage of 223 links to Thomas-street, and the area now proposed to be granted to the Seventh Day Adventists in lieu of the block they are transferring has a frontage of 80.3 links to Hay-street with a depth of 409.7 links. The arrangement as to the transfer was entered into between the Hospital commit-

tee and the Seventh Day Adventists, subject of course to Parliamentary approval. The members of the Adventists community considered that with a frontage of 53 feet they would be able to erect a place of worship with a certain right-of-way on one side. It is provided in the Bill that the Government should hand over to the Children's Hospital committee the triangular block originally held by the religious body. Should Parliament approve of the transfer, the Children's Hospital committee will be able to erect an infectious diseases ward at some distance from the existing building, while at the same time the religious body will be amply satisfied.

Mr. Taylor: Will the church be in the same area?

The PREMIER: Yes, the new grant they are getting is on Reserve 3078. There is a frontage of 329 links between the Seventh Day Adventists' land and the eastern boundary of the reserve. In making this proposal to members I can assure them that the Children's Hospital committee are well worthy of support. The institution is practically self-supporting, and the ladies and gentlemen associated with the movement have given every indication that they are a live body and are prepared to do all they possibly can to make the institution self-supporting.

Mr. Bath: What is the present purpose of Reserve 3078?

The PREMIER: Public buildings. It faces Thomas and Hay-streets.

Mr. Bath: Was not that set apart for the Technical School?

The PREMIER: No, the block set apart for that purpose was on the other side of Mueller-road. The plan which I will put on the Table for the benefit of members shows the various blocks and marks the portion which is to be transferred by the Seventh Day Adventists to the Children's Hospital committee. It will be seen clearly from the map that with the transfer convenient provision will be able to be made by the Children's Hospital committee for the infectious diseases ward.

Mr. Taylor: You are giving the Seventh Day Adventists a Hay-street

frontage in place of a Thomas-street frontage.

The PREMIER: Yes, the frontage to Hay-street will be 80.3 links as against a frontage of 220 links to Thomas-street.

Mr. Taylor: Are you giving them a larger area?

The PREMIER: Yes, 1 rood 12 perches as against 1 rood. The frontage of the new area is the more valuable of the two. Since the Children's Hospital has been started about 100 in-patients and 506 out-patients have been treated. The attendances and re-attendances numbered at the time the figures were given to me 1,700 children. I understand that the result of the treatment of the children has been a considerable relief to the Perth Hospital. I do not know that I can give members any further information, but if it is thought fit, the debate will be adjourned so that members can see the plan which I will table. I beg to move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. DAGLISH (Subiaco): In supporting the second reading of the Bill I would only like to say that the Seventh Day Adventists are not anxious for this change at all, and have agreed to it in order to enable the Children's Hospital committee more efficiently to carry out the work of that institution. That religious body agreed somewhat reluctantly to the exchange. Although the land proposed to be given to them in exchange is commercially more valuable than the site granted by Parliament they are being given no advantage by having the new site for church purposes as against the one previously conferred upon them. From the church point of view the old site would be even better than the present one. I merely point this out to show that the Bill does not aim to give something to this religious denomination which they do not possess.

Mr. Scaddan: Is it desirable that the church should be near the hospital?

Mr. DAGLISH: I do not think any annoyance will be caused. The Methodist building site is close to it. The member

need not be alarmed that the health of the attendants at the church will suffer from the proximity to the hospital. The provisions in the Bill are fairly reasonable, and will be advantageous. I know from personal knowledge, to the management of the Children's Hospital.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

Clauses 1 to 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Change of purposes of portion of Reserve A3078:

Mr. SCADDAN: It would be an advantage to all concerned if some other piece of land were found for the Seventh Day Adventists. Surely the Government could easily find an equally valuable block in place of the one suggested in the Bill. The possibility of church services being held close to the hospital could be removed. Quiet was one of the most important necessities in connection with the treatment of patients, and it was not advisable to have church services adjoining the Hospital. At a church there were choirs, singing, and organs playing, and a considerable amount of noise was made at times.

The PREMIER: The difficulty in meeting the suggestion of the hon. member was that the Government were unable to find an equally suitable piece of land for the Seventh Day Adventists. That religious body did not feel inclined to give way in the matter of the transfer unless they were given another site in that locality. At the present time there was a Wesley Church reserve alongside that proposed to be given to the Seventh Day Adventists. The building on this block would be close to the street, and would be four chains distant from any other building.

Mr. Scaddan: They camp out; they do not use buildings.

The PREMIER: They proposed in this case to erect a building in which to carry on their services.

Clause put and passed.

Schedules, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment; the report adopted.

BILL—FISHERIES ACT. AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Mr. Daglish in the Chair; the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

Clause 2—Amendment of 1905, No. 18, S. 30, Exclusive licenses:

Mr. JOHNSON moved an amendment—

"That in line 5 of Clause 2, after the word 'it' there be inserted, 'Provided always that such terms and conditions shall provide that only white labour shall be employed.'"

In granting a monopoly of this description, the Government should be given an assurance that the State would receive some advantage. The only return the State got from operations of this kind at the present time was the wages paid to the men engaged in it and if we gave the right for pearl shell fishing, or even in connection with any other industry, the only result obtained which could be considered an advantage to the State would be the wages earned by the people employed in it. Unless we took precautions in the Bill to protect the State against the employment of alien or coloured labour, it might be found that coloured labour exclusively would be employed. In that case what advantage would the State derive?

Mr. MALE: Where would they get it from?

Mr. JOHNSON: There seemed to be any amount of coloured labour along the North-West coast; at any rate that was his experience. It was not possible to get white labour unless one took it up there.

The Honorary Minister: What about the aborigines?

Mr. MALE: Would the hon. member inform the Committee what he proposed to include under the term "white labour"? Did he propose to restrict in his definition Greeks, Italians, and even Australian aborigines? The term "white labour" was too indefinite.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: To get over the difficulty the amendment could be made to read so that it should describe the people the member for Guildford wished to exclude, and we could exclude in the terms used in the Mining Act those people who

were prevented from engaging in that industry.

Mr. Male: That would be much better.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Members were under the impression that the Government intended to submit an amendment to the Bill, but there was no appearance of it on the Notice Paper.

Mr. MALE: It would be advisable for the member for Guildford to insert some provision to permit aboriginal labour being employed. We could hardly restrict aborigines from being employed in a local industry.

Mr. JOHNSON: There was no objection to the employment of aborigines providing these aborigines were paid, but when the Estimates were reached there would be a lot said with regard to the employment of natives. The position we were in to-day was that the people were taxed to a large extent in order to maintain the aborigines, and yet we found these aborigines working on the stations in the North-West.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member could not discuss that question at the present time.

Mr. JOHNSON: If the member for Kimberley could outline an amendment for the employment of aborigines, and for the wages to be paid to the Aborigines Department in their behalf, it would be accepted. The one object was to exclude Asiatic labour.

Mr. MALE: It might be advisable to allow the matter to stand over until the next sitting so that an amendment might be drafted. It seemed useless to put in an amendment such as the hon. member had moved, because it was too indefinite to carry out the objects stated.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Regarding the general principles connected with the employment of Asiatic labour, no objection would be offered to the amendment suggested, and he joined issue with the member for Guildford with regard to the question of the employment of aborigines. From a humane point of view it was distinctly advisable that employment should be found for these people. There were many instances where they had been kept out of mischief by being found work.

Mr. JOHNSON: But they should not be employed without pay.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Certainly not; but the value of the aboriginal labour was very small indeed. The hon. member took a rather exaggerated view of their work. For instance, if one took the prisoners in the northern gaols their labour was very difficult to let out at even 1s. 6d. a day.

Mr. Bath: No wonder when you load them up with chains.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The hon. member had not seen them. These men had been seen in chains, and they had been seen working, and the sight was not the awful thing we heard about. At all events hon. members opposite would not wish to see these people, who after all were the owners of this country whom we dispossessed, prevented from obtaining employment in connection with this industry. Hon. members in their passion for this white labour business sometimes were inclined to overlook the ordinary principles of justice, but as far as the aborigines were concerned they should be treated as considerably as possible, and where there was suitable occupation available members should consent to allow these people to be employed. We made no restriction in other parts of the State, and why should this one industry which we were called upon to establish be singled out for the restriction. The hon. member might allow his amendment to be restricted to Asiatics and Africans.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The member for Guildford could make the amendment read "That no person of Asiatic or African race should be employed." The aborigines of this State should be entitled to work where they could get it. There had been too much interference already with the employment of aborigines, and with regard to the question of payment for their services there would be a proper time to refer to that matter when the Committee were dealing with the Estimates. However, it could not be introduced with any success in the Bill, but should be done rather by regulation. The wording he would suggest would be that of the Mining Act

in respect to miners' rights, in which it was provided that no right should be issued to any Asiatic or African alien.

Mr. TROY: In the Federal Acts where reference was made to the races of Africa and Asia, natives of the islands of the Pacific were also included, but in this case it was not proposed to make provision for the races living on the islands between Australia and Asia.

The Attorney General: They would be Asiatics.

Mr. TROY: Javanese and Malays would not be called Asiatics.

The Attorney General: Yes.

Mr. TROY: These Javanese and Malays, the Malays in particular, were people who were always competing in the pearling trade.

Mr. Male: They are all Asiatics; legally, at all events.

Mr. TROY: The Malays and the Javanese, and the inhabitants of other islands in the Malay Archipelago should certainly be excluded from such labour. They were the most serious competitors of the white man in deep sea fisheries.

Mr. JOHNSON: By leave of the Committee he would withdraw his amendment, with the view of embodying the suggestion made by the member for Pilbara.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Mr. JOHNSON moved an amendment—

That after the word "fit" in line 3, the following words be inserted, "Provided always that such terms and conditions shall provide that no Asiatic or African alien, or any person of Asiatic or African race, claiming to be a British subject, shall be employed."

That was the exact wording in the Mining Act.

Amendment passed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: In such a case he would like to see provision made whereby no person would be prevented from taking turtles, or other fish, for the purpose of consumption on the spot. In addition to the 120 miles or so of foreshore there was a number of islands in these waters, and no person trading about these islands should be prevented from taking turtle for food for himself and crew.

The Premier: There will be no penalty for taking a turtle.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: If the exclusive right to the foreshore and these islands were given to one man, no other man could come along and take a turtle without rendering himself liable to prosecution.

The Premier: It would be an expensive undertaking.

Mr. SCADDAN: The spirit of the clause did not meet with his views at all. He would test the feeling of the Committee on the words, "to the exclusion of all other persons." He had heard no reason why a right should be given to any one man to exclusively collect turtle over 125 miles of foreshore. Admittedly, there were others gathering turtles in the locality at the present time, and if this concession were granted to one man the trade would be lost to the others, and the concessionaire would be converted into a monopolist.

The Honorary Minister: Why not say who are these other people gathering turtles?

Mr. SCADDAN: The file before the Minister would show it.

The Honorary Minister: There is nothing on the file to show it.

Mr. SCADDAN: Was there anything on the file to show that this particular syndicate could not make it pay unless an exclusive right was given? Was it necessary to have 125 miles of the shore to put up a factory? The member for East Fremantle supported the clause because it would enable the Government to grant a license to a certain individual to get sponges, but that was not the intention seeing that the Government had already the power to do that under the principal Act. No exclusive right should be given until it was shown that no one would be injured, or until it was shown that a monopoly was absolutely essential in order to bring the enterprise to a successful issue. Until that was shown he (Mr. Scaddan) would oppose the granting of an exclusive license, and he moved as an amendment—

That the words "to the exclusion of all other persons" be struck out.

The PREMIER: Perhaps the objection raised by the member for Pilbara might be met by the addition of the words "provided that such license shall not prohibit any person from catching any marine or animal life, the product of the sea, for his own personal consumption."

Mr. O'Loughlen: Supposing someone wanted to gather oysters to put on the market?

Mr. SCADDAN: The crux of the question was whether the Government were to be empowered to grant for all time an exclusive right to a few individuals to collect food fish. What was the nature of the application made by the particular syndicate for whom this Bill was brought in, and what part of the foreshore was it proposed to grant?

Mr. JOHNSON: It was a common practice for the people at Onslow to spend the week-end on the islands gathering turtles and turtle eggs, and shells and other things, yet they were to be excluded from these pleasure trips, and also from the profits attached to these trips. Unless the Government could bring in some proviso to protect these people the amendment should be supported.

Mr. OSBORN: Those who indulged in the week-end trips mentioned by the hon. member, in a large number of cases indulged in them for their own amusement and for what they called sport by destroying as many turtles and turtle eggs as they could get, and if the industry was to be preserved it was necessary that these people should be excluded. At the same time the clauses were rather too indefinite as to what the licensees were to get the exclusive right to. It would be better to define what they were to get, and leave the rest of the produce of the sea to those who wished to catch them. It was shown by the numerous amendments suggested that the Minister in charge of the Bill was not too well acquainted with the matter to grasp the situation right off.

The HONORARY MINISTER: During the discussion on the proposed amendment members had asked that further information be supplied to them

as to the agreement. No agreement had yet been made, although it had been proposed to the Government that if certain individuals were granted a concession they would be prepared to spend £5,000 at once in the construction of works.

Mr. Scaddan: They say they will spend it.

The HONORARY MINISTER: They would be under a bonded agreement. The proposal was that certain individuals should have exclusive rights to a portion of the foreshore for the purpose of catching turtles. Those persons were prepared to spend on works in the North at once £5,000 in the erection of a factory, although they were not willing to do that unless they had some security of tenure given, so as not to be under the disability of someone else coming on to the foreshore in the vicinity of their works and capturing the turtles they required.

Mr. Collier: In plain English, unless they have sole possession.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The member himself would not put up works of this description if he were liable to have every Tom, Dick, and Harry coming along and interfering with his business by catching turtles, and so preventing him from carrying on.

Mr. Collier: Where is your cry of private enterprise and competition?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Some members would stifle every industry in the State. This was the first proposal for the expenditure of any considerable amount of capital put before the Government, and when the opportunity arrived, what did we find? Instead of making an attempt to assist these people to start their enterprise and open up a new trade in the North-West, some members were ready to place every possible obstacle in the road. The promoters of the scheme would not put their money into it unless they had security of tenure for a reasonable amount of foreshore. At present there were no works established up there. The promoters were prepared to pay rent of £100 a year for the first seven years, and if they renewed the lease after that period, a rental of £500 a year. It was for members to say

whether they would be a party to assist a new industry in the State, or whether they would raise all sorts of quibbles and imaginary difficulties in order to stop its establishment.

Mr. Scaddan: What bond is the syndicate prepared to put up?

The HONORARY MINISTER: An amendment had been prepared limiting the amount of foreshore and making a proviso whereby any agreement for over a certain mileage should be submitted to the House. There were no personal interests in this matter, the only idea being to get another industry established in the State. No member of the Government cared personally whether the industry was started or not, but in the present case there was a foreshore, at present unutilised, where a profitable industry might be established, and thus bring added wealth to the State. Therefore, in putting the proposal forward, the Government looked for assistance from all members; but it appeared that from members like the member for Ivanhoe, there was no possibility of getting any help to further the most reasonable project. This was not a party question. It should be understood that the site proposed was not the only place where turtles could be found. The coast line was over 1,000 miles in length, and turtles could be found in the Lacepede and Montebello Islands.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Members desired to obtain information as to the future operations of the company. The State had in the past gained a bitter experience of the evil results of handing over concessions and more care should be exercised in the future. The chief difficulty in connection with the proposition was that we were asked to give an exclusive right for the exploitation of a certain amount of foreshore, and that it was to be made an unlawful act for any other company or person to collect the product of the sea on that particular area. It was defined in the Bill that the measure referred to all the products of the sea except those mentioned in the second schedule, which only referred to food fish. It might possibly happen that a company would wish to exploit oysters

along that foreshore, but would be prevented by the Bill. It would be well to report progress, and allow much needed amendments to be introduced.

Mr. W. PRICE: Ministers seemed to have a keen desire to hand over the primary products of the State to any exploiting syndicate that chose to come here and ask for them. The rent was to be £100 a year for seven years, and for that sum everything in the ocean along the foreshore for an indefinite distance was to be handed over to the syndicate. Were the members of this syndicate known to the Government? In the past syndicates had been established with the idea, it was said in the first instance, of proving of benefit to the State, and on this account were granted certain concessions; but all knew how those syndicates had bled the State on every possible occasion. Some of the most valuable assets of Western Australia had been handed over to syndicates. The Honorary Minister had suggested that certain members were attempting to block the establishment of industries. When a concession for a proposed new industry meant the granting of a monopoly to a syndicate or a company he would oppose it, as monopolies were always dangerous. Certainly the monopoly proposed in the Bill was a very dangerous one. The Bill provided that if anyone attempted to take the products of the sea from the foreshore over which an exclusive right was to be granted to this syndicate, they could be prosecuted.

Mr. ANGWIN: It was necessary for a person entering into an industry to have a certain amount of protection. If a man went to the goldfields and discovered a reef, members could not agree that the land should be thrown open to any person who wished to go there and take gold out of it. According to a statement made in another place the exclusive right was given under the Bill to obtain other products than turtles. The Bill had been brought forward more particularly in favour of a London company. It had to be admitted that Section 30 in the existing Act gave power to enter into the sponge industry, but the clause in the Bill would repeal that

section. Where was the necessity to consider London companies? There were syndicates already in Western Australia who were willing to put up the money for the express purpose of engaging in sponge fishing. Would not any member if he had the money be willing to invest it in connection with sponge fishing in Australia, and retain that large sum of money which at the present time was being sent to other parts of the world for sponges; but would they do so unless they had an exclusive right to a certain area? What was contained in the Bill was also in the present Act, except in relation to turtles; but the section in the Act would be repealed by the Bill. Therefore it would affect everything as well as turtles. There should be power given whereby the Ministry would have the opportunity of giving exclusive areas and the Ministry should certainly have jurisdiction over areas. Members knew that in certain seasons it was a matter of impossibility to work on every portion of the coast in Western Australia. In the North-West those engaged in operations had to relinquish their labours for a time, and if they had not areas along some other portions of the coast line it would be impossible for them to carry on their industry. Being those who believed that it was to the interests of the State that an industry should be opened up, members should do everything to try and encourage this particular one.

Mr. Scaddan: And grant a monopoly.

Mr. ANGWIN: There would be no need to grant a monopoly. The Bill provided that the Government could if they so desired give exclusive rights, but it did not say that the Government should give exclusive rights for the whole of the coast line. The hon. member could say that the Government might do so, but did the hon. member believe that the Ministry would really do so?

Mr. Collier: There is nothing to prevent them.

Mr. ANGWIN: But they had common sense. At the present time we were dealing with the Ministry in power, but there was a possibility of another Ministry being in power shortly, and they

would have to administer the law. As a matter of fact the Colonial Secretary had already refused on more than one occasion to grant certain areas for sponge fishing and had pointed out that the areas applied for had been too large. In this manner the interests of the State had been protected; members therefore should continue to trust the Government. It was to be hoped as far as the sponge industry was concerned that in the near future it would be established in Western Australia, and that the £100,000 which was sent away from Australia annually would be spent in Western Australia where, if one could rely on the samples of sponges obtained and from opinions expressed, and reports which had been received, the sponges were as good as those that came from other parts of the world. The Bill, as far as giving exclusive rights was concerned, would receive his support.

[*Mr. Taylor took the Chair.*]

Mr. UNDERWOOD: We had already given exclusive rights in connection with minerals, timber, and to pastoralists, and according to the information we had it was necessary to give exclusive rights to this fishing industry; but in all other instances where these rights had been given there had been regulations framed to protect the State, and if the Government brought down regulations controlling exclusive rights in this matter members would be prepared to accept them. It was understood that after the Bill passed the second reading the Government would bring down something more comprehensive and give members to understand what it was proposed to give away; but to say that we were going to give one man the whole of the coast of Western Australia was further than he was prepared to go. The area that one company could hold should be limited, and regulations should be framed restricting those people to what they were going to catch. There was only one other marine animal affected in this Bill besides the turtle, and that was the dugong, and members should know whether we were giving the right to all these things or to one or two of them. The

member for East Fremantle was prepared to trust the Government, but he (Mr. Underwood) would only trust them if he had them bound in the Bill. The Government should at that stage report progress, think the matter over, and ask the chief of the Fisheries Department to say whether he could bring down something more definite than was before members at the present time.

The PREMIER: With the exception of the member for Ivanhoe, all members appeared to realise that it was essential to give some exclusive right. What the House desired was that too large an area should not be granted. Only the other day the Government gave an exclusive right to the co-operative hewers, and no other man except a member of that society could go on the particular land.

Mr. O'Loghlen: But they could become members of the society.

The PREMIER: It was not open for any man to go along and get a square beam from that area. That was the difference between an exclusive right and an ordinary reserve. Hon. members knew that it was absolutely necessary that some exclusive right should be given, otherwise no man would go to the expense of providing boats, plant, and gear. In order to meet the objection of hon. members, a provision might be framed providing that before any license were granted in respect to any length of foreshore exceeding 100 miles, the draft of such license should be laid on the Table of the House for the information of hon. members.

Mr. Troy: What if Parliament is not sitting.

The PREMIER: In such a case no license could be granted.

Mr. Troy: It is a very long stretch.

The PREMIER: A long stretch of foreshore was necessary, owing to the fact that the turtles were not regular in their habits. At the present time Barrow Island, which was considered a favourite breeding ground for turtles, was a Class A reserve under flora and fauna: so there was at least one place debarred from exploitation by any individual. The suggested provision would

safeguard the interests of the State and at the same time allow the industry to be established.

Mr. JOHNSON: Progress ought to be reported to allow hon. members to get a thorough grip of the amendments proposed. Again, no reliable information had been furnished as to the opinion of the people of the locality, the people who knew something about the question. It would be an easy matter to get a telegraphic message from, say, the chairman or secretary of the roads board.

Mr. OSBORN: It was well known that the people of the locality were in the habit of occasionally going to the islands to kill turtles for sport. To obtain an expression of opinion from the chairman of the road board would be to get the opinion of only one man. No other member of the board was a resident of Onslow. As for the secretary, he was merely an employee of the board. No good purpose could be served by delaying the passage of the Bill. The clause as printed was a good one, and would only be impaired by alteration.

Mr. SWAN: In addition to the chairman of the roads board, other members of the board resided in Onslow, and were readily accessible by telegraph. Members of the Opposition had no desire to strangle any industry. However, he, personally, was prepared to strangle the Bill by supporting the amendment of the member for Ivanhoe. The Minister in charge of the Bill had not dealt fairly with hon. members. He had introduced the Bill in haphazard fashion, apparently thinking that hon. members were not alive to what it meant.

The Premier: What do you want?

Mr. SWAN: Hon. members desired that the Minister should give them a reasonable opportunity of having proper provision made in the Bill. It was not fair to ask hon. members to draft the Bill in Committee.

The Premier: What do you want?

Mr. SWAN: Even the member for Kimberley had suggested that the limit ought to be set to the extent of the foreshore.

The Attorney General: We have the necessary amendment here.

Mr. SWAN: The exclusive right to 100 miles of coast line was too much.

Mr. Osborn: It is not half enough.

Mr. SWAN: Not five per cent. of the constituents of the hon. member knew anything about the Bill, and the hon. member would not dare to take up before his constituents the same attitude as he did to-night.

Mr. Osborn: I will ask that the hon. member withdraw that.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot ask the hon. member to withdraw that.

Mr. Osborn: Is it not a reflection?

The CHAIRMAN: No.

Mr. SWAN: The hon. member might be possessed of more backbone and pluck than one gave him credit for. The majority of members were not familiar with the area in question. The member for Roebourne was familiar with it, but did not possess sufficient judgment to give proper representation to the interests of his constituents in the matter. The islands which were practically innumerable along the coast were the home of the turtle, and if we gave to the Government the power proposed under this Bill we would place in their hands practically the right to alienate the whole of the turtle grounds along the coast.

The Honorary Minister: Quite wrong.

Mr. BUTCHER: It would be wise to definitely fix the area of any concession to be granted; but there was no reason for objecting to the exclusive license system. Nearly 30 years ago Shark Bay was a prosperous community, but as there were no regulations in connection with the gathering of shell, the result of the indiscriminate fishing was that the area became denuded of shells, and an Act of Parliament had to be passed. The bay was then closed for a period, and afterwards the exclusive license system was adopted, by which method Shark Bay had been restored to almost its previous condition. Licensees nursed their areas most cautiously. The same condition would apply in regard to the turtles. People were now indiscriminately destroying turtles and turtle eggs; it was easily done at certain periods of the year.

Mr. Seaddan: Can you not prevent it without having exclusive license?

Mr. BUTCHER: Certainly the turtle could be protected altogether, but why do that when we could continue the industry without sacrificing the turtles? If the area was limited the case would be met. Turtles existed all along the coast, and although the 120 miles spoken of might be the best home of the turtles, it was not the whole area over which they extended. The area to be granted would depend entirely on the coast line. If the turtles were plentiful 50 miles would be sufficient. A little more coastline might be required where the turtles were not so plentiful.

Mr. COLLIER: The arguments advanced in favour of giving an exclusive license were the old arguments advanced in regard to the granting of monopolies all over the State. What was the result of the granting of the pastoral monopolies? The population of Western Australia had been practically robbed by the pastoralists in regard to their meat supply.

Mr. Underwood: Not by the pastoralists.

Mr. COLLIER: Well, by somebody. It was simply because exclusive rights were given over large pastoral areas. Again, in mining, practically the whole of the goldfields, or at least a large portion of our auriferous areas, was locked up because gold mining companies had special rights. Even on the Golden Mile there were hundreds of acres locked up without any work being done on them. The same prevailed in the timber areas. We would do an injustice to the future residents of the State if we gave exclusive rights to any syndicate or company over these turtles. But if, as the member for Gaseoyne said, turtles extended right along the coast, there was nothing to prevent the syndicate starting the industry straight away without an exclusive license.

The Honorary Minister: They would not have their works on wheels to move anywhere.

Mr. COLLIER: Did the Minister think that another company would commence operations alongside the syndicate's factory? Would any company commence op-

erations in an area being worked by another company? Why had not the industry been started already seeing there were so many turtles, and why were these people afraid others would start? The Bill was loosely drafted, and there was no information before members to justify them in passing it. First of all, the area proposed to be granted to these people should be defined in the Bill.

The Attorney General: It is not a Bill giving a concession, it is merely to amend the existing Fisheries Act.

Mr. COLLIER: It would have been better had some provision been made in the Bill for the area to be granted.

The Attorney General: Certainly not.

Mr. COLLIER: Would it not be possible to define the area in the Bill?

The Attorney General: That is a matter to be dealt with when we make the agreement.

Mr. COLLIER: But power was given by this Bill to make the agreement without reference to Parliament.

The Attorney General: If you want the agreement laid on the Table I have no doubt it will be done.

Mr. COLLIER: Once the Government were permitted to make these agreements, it was no use having agreements laid on the Table after they were made.

The Attorney General: The Government have already the power to make these agreements under the principal Act.

Mr. COLLIER: With the exception of the exclusive right.

The Attorney General: No, we have that also.

Mr. COLLIER: Then, evidently there was not the power in the present Act to make an agreement suitable for this company. Information should be given as to whom the company consisted of and what guarantee there was that the sum of £5,000 would be spent.

Mr. Butcher: It will be in the agreement.

Mr. COLLIER: In the past the State had been "let in" time after time, pastoral and mineral lands and timber areas had been given away, and now it was proposed that the ocean should be handed over. Monopolies should not be given in

any direction. The Honorary Minister had put forward the idea that because members wished to block a monopoly they were trying to prevent the establishment of an industry. When members spoke about stepping in and establishing industries in opposition to private enterprise they were always told of the virtues of competition, but under the Bill it was proposed to shut out competition. The Minister had referred to a certain amendment proposed to be brought forward with regard to the area, but it had not been read.

The Honorary Minister: It has been read twice.

[Mr. Daglish resumed the Chair.]

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: There was a good deal of misconception with regard to the Bill. At the present time the Government had full power to grant an exclusive license in respect to every product of the sea except food fish. The Bill sought to extend that power in respect to turtles and dugongs. Members were not asked to make a great change in the law, and had they thought fit, the Government might have taken action, arguing that the turtle was not a fish, and that there was no necessity to bring the Bill forward. As it was, however, the Government desired that there should be no doubt on the question, but rather that members should be given an opportunity of hearing about the matter, and giving the proposed amendment the fullest consideration. If the Bill granting power to extend the exclusive rights to the turtle were passed it would then be a matter for negotiation as to whether an agreement should be entered into. There would be no objection, if members wished it, that before an agreement of that kind were sanctioned it should be laid on the Table. For members to talk as if the matter were cut and dried was to reveal an entire misconception. No agreement had been entered into. The matter had been discussed, but had not been proceeded with as it was held that turtles were food fish, and being so, it was necessary for the Government to have the Act amended, otherwise it would be useless to go on with the negotiations for

the establishment of the industry. It would be a pity if members made it impossible for the Government to negotiate with the company, considering that the latter were prepared to spend, immediately the agreement was entered into, at least £5,000, and up to £25,000 if the Government considered that amount should be spent. The company were prepared, moreover, to establish an industry for treating the turtles, not outside the State, but in Western Australia. The Government were prepared so to amend the Bill as to give all possible protection to people who might require the turtle for food for their own consumption in the localities covered by the license, and the Premier had read the clause which would meet that difficulty, and which would also meet the difficulty brought forward by the member for Ivanhoe. It would be well for that member to withdraw his amendment in favour of the proviso the Government were willing to introduce. There was a further proviso that no more than a certain amount of the foreshore should be included in one exclusive license. There would be no objection to reporting progress on the Bill, but it would be satisfactory that before doing so there should be a clear understanding as to what members wished. We had already agreed that only white labour should be employed in the industry, or rather, that there should be no Asiatic or African labour employed. Then the Government proposed that the largest extent of foreshore covered by one of these licenses should be 100 miles, or that if the extent exceeded that length, the agreement to be entered into should not receive sanction until the House had been given an opportunity of expressing an opinion upon it. Then there was a further provision that no person should be prohibited from catching turtle, or any food fish not excluded, within the licensed area provided that he caught them for his own consumption within the area. The Government were ready to meet members on those points. It might be well to report progress so that the proposed amendments could be placed on the Notice Paper.

Mr. Walker: Do not you think 100 miles too much?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It would be well to have the opinion of members on that point. The member for Gascoyne thought that 70 miles would be sufficient, but the member for Roebourne was of opinion that 100 miles would not be enough. It would be possible, probably, for the Committee to arrive at a modification and perhaps it would be thought that 70 miles would be sufficient.

Mr. Angwin: Would the provision apply also as to the area for sponge fishing?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: That was provided for in the Act.

Mr. Angwin: But that section would be repealed by this Bill?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The Bill would apply to sponges. The clause would not prevent the Government from giving a larger extent of water than 100 miles provided that if this were done the agreement should be placed before members. There were merits in the proposal of the member for Kanowna that it might be well to limit the area to less than 100 miles. It might even be fixed at 50 miles.

Mr. Angwin: It might occasion a delay of seven or eight months in that case.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Such a delay would not be of very great moment, for it would not enable anyone else to get ahead of the company now negotiating. There was no wish to force the Bill through the House at unnecessary speed. The Government would be prepared to meet the wishes of members as to the length of foreshore, but if it were contended that there should be no sort of exclusive right and that we should practically repeal Section 30 of the existing Fisheries Act to that extent, the Government could not agree as it would make it impossible to establish any of these industries along our coast. He moved—

That progress be reported.

Motion passed; progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.32 p.m.