

first part of No. 4, dealing with Clause 8, and disagreed with the further amendment No. 6 for the reasons indicated in the schedule.

BILL — GOVERNMENT ELECTRIC WORKS.

Assembly's Message.

Message received from the Assembly notifying that it had agreed to make amendments Nos. 1 and 2 requested by the Legislative Council, but that it declined to make amendment No. 3.

House adjourned at 9.50 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 9th February, 1915.

	PAGE
Questions: Wheat Handling Charges ..	1321
Wongan Hills-Mullewa Railway resolution ..	1321
Loan Flotation, New South Wales ..	1322
Education Department, Promotions and Transfers ..	1324
Bills: Midland Junction Trades Hall, all stages ..	1322
Licensing Act Further Amendment, 2R. ..	1325
Lunacy Act Amendment, Council's message ..	1329
Government Electric Works, Council's amendments ..	1333
Control of Trade in War Time Amendment, Council's message ..	1360
Blackboy and Zamia Palm License, returned ..	1361
Paper presented ..	1322
Joint Select Committee, Money Bills Procedure ..	1325
Annual Estimates, general debate ..	1335

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

QUESTION—WHEAT HANDLING CHARGES.

Mr. JAMES GARDINER (without notice) asked the Premier: 1, Is he aware that the Acquisition Board have fixed the price for handling charges of wheat acquired from farmers at 4d. per bushel. 2, If so, how it is made up? 3, To whom is it to be given?

The PREMIER replied: 1, No. The charge of 4d. is not limited to handling but is made to cover the cost of acquiring, receiving, despatching, insurance, and other incidental charges. 2, Answered by No. 1. 3, To those employed in carrying out the duties enumerated in answer No. 1.

QUESTION—WONGAN HILLS-MULLEWA RAILWAY RESOLUTION.

As to debate.

Hon. FRANK WILSON (without notice) asked the Premier: Will he give the House an opportunity on the following day to discuss the motion received from the Legislative Council with reference to the transfer to the Working Railways of the Wongan Hills-Mullewa railway. At the last meeting of the House some doubt was expressed as to whether the Government would give an opportunity to members to discuss this motion, which was one of considerable interest.

The Minister for Works: Of what use will be the discussion? The railway will be taken over shortly.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The motion might be allowed to come on first, that is, if the Premier is agreeable.

The PREMIER: The arrangement of the Notice Paper for to-morrow is out of my hands. To-morrow will be private members' day and in that case I cannot give an answer to the hon. member's question. The matter is out of my control. Private members' business appears on the Notice Paper in the order in which it is received by the House.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Not necessarily. The Premier is quite mistaken. He is evidently raising an obstacle. It is not a question of preference. This can be done by arrangement as it has been done on many occasions previously. There are only two motions to be considered, and the Premier might agree to take the Council's Message first. The motion dealing with gold mining leases can follow.

The PREMIER: The hon. member is quite wrong. Private members' busi-

ness is placed on the Notice Paper by the Clerk without reference to anyone, in the order in which it is received by the House, and we never attempt to alter the Orders on private members' day.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You have done it yourself on many occasions.

The PREMIER: No, only in regard to formal third readings. By arrangement the House can alter the Notice Paper at any time. A member can move for the postponement of an order of the day until others have been disposed of.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The reason I asked the Premier to facilitate the consideration of that message from the Legislative Council is because of a reply the member for Northam (Hon. J. Mitchell) received from whoever was in charge of the House at the last sitting, a reply which was tantamount to the fact that the Government did not know or did not care.

The Minister for Mines: All I said was that I would make no promise.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I am asking the Premier now to promise to facilitate the consideration of this Message from the Council.

The PREMIER: I repeat it is entirely out of my hands. I am not able to do what the hon. member asks, and I am not prepared to undertake the responsibility of altering the Orders of the Day on private members' day. I have already explained that it will appear on the Notice Paper in its proper order, and if hon. members desire that it shall be discussed first they can do so by arrangement, that is, by postponing the other Orders of the day.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Will the Premier make a promise that he will give us an opportunity to discuss the message before we finally adjourn?

The PREMIER: Oh yes. We will not adjourn this week, do not worry.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the Minister for Lands: Report of the Department of Agriculture for the year ended 30th June, 1914.

QUESTION—LOAN FLOTATION, NEW SOUTH WALES.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN (without notice) asked the Premier: 1, Has his attention been drawn to the fact that New South Wales have placed a loan on the London market? 2, Is this not a breach of the agreement arrived at at the Premiers' conference?

The PREMIER replied: It is hardly correct to say that. The agreement arrived at between the Commonwealth and the States was that the States should not borrow for purposes other than renewal, and I understand from the cable message which appears in the local Press that this loan floated by New South Wales is for renewal purposes. That being the case, it is not a breach of the agreement arrived at at the conference.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Does the same apply to the money raised in Adelaide?

The PREMIER: I do not know anything about that.

BILL — MIDLAND JUNCTION TRADES HALL.

All Stages.

Introduced by the Minister for Lands and read a first time.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. W. D. Johnson—Guildford) [442] in moving the second reading said: Some considerable time ago the Labour bodies at Midland Junction, and principally the Midland railway employees, desired to secure a piece of land on which to erect a building for meeting purposes, etc. Their object was to avoid going to the hotels. At that time there were no meeting places at Midland Junction, and a number of the employees' meetings were perforce held in hotels, which was decidedly objectionable. The matter was brought under the notice of the Midland Railway Company by myself a few years ago, and the local manager pointed out that it was a matter they could not deal with in West Australia; it would have to be submitted to the company in London. That was done, but it took some time to carry out. The first request was

submitted to them some six or seven years ago. About six or eight months ago we received a notification from the London Office agreeing to a site being granted to the Labour people, provided the Government indemnified the company against any action that might be taken. The question was then submitted to the Crown Law authorities who pointed out that it was purely a matter for the company; if the company desired to grant the land, it was within their province to do so. After a closer investigation, however, it was found that a legal difficulty existed owing to a few words in the Act which gave the original contractor the power to acquire land. In the Guildford-Greenough Flats Railway Act of 1886, Section 6 empowered the contractor to acquire land at Perth, Fremantle and Geraldton, etc., for the purposes of this railway, and provided that compensation should be paid for the land so acquired, and that the land should vest in the contractor in fee simple, but the following words also appeared:—

And such lands shall be used for railway purposes and no other. According to the reading of those words, if the land is used for any other purpose, it would be competent for anyone to obtain an injunction against the Labour people to prevent the land being used for this purpose.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Is this within the strip of railway land?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes, the company have a good acreage within the town boundaries of Midland Junction and this is a portion of it. Anyone would be able to obtain an injunction against the Trades Hall people and possibly even against the company to prevent the land being used for the purpose of a trades hall. This would not be of any benefit to anyone, because the land could not revert to the original owner as it is held in fee simple, but it might have the effect of preventing the land from being used for the purpose of a trades hall. The Bill is designed to overcome this technicality and to place the parties concerned on the safe side.

The Bill has the concurrence of the company who wish to be assured that they will not be interfered with and that their action in this connection will not lead to any interference with the balance of their land at Midland Junction. The proposition is a good one. We have already expressed our appreciation of the action of the company in assisting us to enable employees and the Labour people to procure a place in order that they need not in future hold their meetings in an hotel. Owing to the delay they recently rented a building from the Railway Department but they have only a month to month tenancy because the land on which the building stands was purchased to provide for the extension of the railway yards at Midland Junction. At present the Trades Hall people have no security of tenure and do not know when they might be called upon to find another meeting place. This Bill will overcome the difficulty. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. FRANK WILSON (Sussex) [448]: I have no objection to the Midland Railway Company granting this block of land for the purpose of a trades hall. It is necessary that these institutions should be erected in order that the particular brand of politics represented by my friends on the Government side of the House should be kept fully before the public, and that other matters of interest to their supporters might also receive attention.

The Attorney General: In order that the bone and sinew of the community might have shelter.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: There is plenty of opportunity on the Esplanade to ventilate grievances. I hope that when this land is transferred, as I presume it will be, we shall not have a repetition of the experience in connection with the head office of the Trades Hall in Beaufort-street. I hope the Midland Junction Trades Hall people will not come to the Government with a request to be allowed to dip their hands into the Treasury for funds with which to erect a

building. I hope they already have the money or will raise it.

The Minister for Lands: They have the money in hand.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The transfer of the block of land is merely a matter between the Midland Railway Company and the Trades Hall authorities and we should not take any exception to it. I presume the object of inserting in our legislation the provision referred to by the Minister, was to prevent the company from cutting up any large portion of their land and selling it for town sites as they might otherwise have done. The land was granted specifically for railway purposes and therefore, it was wise that the words referred to were inserted in the Act by a previous Parliament.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etcetera.

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

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

QUESTION—EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, PROMOTIONS AND TRANSFERS.

Mr. HEITMANN asked the Minister for Education: 1, In making promotions and transfers how is each teacher's aggregate mark arrived at? 2, Since when have promotions and transfers been made on the present mark system? 3, Are there any exceptions to this rule; if so, what are they? 4, Apart from the exceptions have all other promotions and transfers been made in accordance with this rule since the date of its inception?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, The regulations dealing with the matter are as follows:—Reg. 28: Relative claims for promotion to vacant positions shall be determined by (a) efficiency and (b) seniority. (a.) Efficiency will be represented by a percentage mark, as prescribed in Regulation 21. Reg. 21: The efficiency of teachers will be judged on the basis of the reports of the inspec-

tors. The inspectors will take into consideration ability and effectiveness in teaching, skill in the management of a school or a class, interest in work, and diligence and tact in the discharge of duties. A mark denoting efficiency will be allotted to each teacher on a percentage basis, the standard varying according to the class and grade. A teacher whose efficiency mark is less than 50 per cent. for two consecutive years may have his classification reduced. The attainments of teachers will be judged on the basis of examinations, as prescribed in Regulations 15-19. Reg. 28—continued: (b.) Seniority will be represented by a number made up as follows:—One mark for every two years of service as teacher up to 20 years, and 1 mark for every year of service beyond 20 years. Every year of service in districts where extra living allowances are provided shall count as one year and a half. Years of service as pupil teacher or monitor shall count at one-half of the above rate, and years spent as student in the Training College at one-quarter of the above rate. Each year of service with the highest grade of classification that is under consideration in any case shall count as a year and a half. The maximum seniority mark shall be 20. Reg. 29: Priority of claims to a vacant position from positions carrying a lower salary shall be determined among teachers whose classification qualifies them for such position by the aggregate of the efficiency and seniority marks. The average efficiency mark of the last four years shall be taken. No teacher shall have any claim to be placed on the list for promotion to the headmastership of a large school until he has been in the service of the Department for six years. 2, The system was introduced towards the end of 1912. 3, Reg. 30 provides that if any vacant position is considered by the Director to require special qualifications, he may recommend to the Minister that the rules of priority be set aside, and that a teacher be appointed irrespective of such rules. This would apply, for instance, to posts in secondary schools and central schools, and to posts for teachers of special subjects. 4, Yes, so far as is

possible. Efficiency marks have not as yet been given on the regular basis for four years, and have had to be assigned as nearly as possible from reports and records for previous years.

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE, MONEY BILLS PROCEDURE.

Extension of Time.

Mr. ROBINSON (Canning) [4.58]: I wish to explain that the Committee have met on several occasions and that progress has been made in the direction of settlement, but as yet not sufficient progress has been made to enable me to submit a definite report to the House. I move—

That the time for bringing up the Joint Select Committee's report be extended to Tuesday 16th February.

Question passed.

BILL—LICENSING ACT FURTHER AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. T. Walker—Kanowna) [5.0] in moving the second reading said: This small Bill is scarcely one altogether on the lines I promised the leader of the Opposition, but the matters omitted from this measure are provided for in part by a measure introduced in another place. The first substantial amendment proposed by the Bill is to enable a licensing bench at its discretion under the proposed amendment of Section 45 of the Act, to substitute a publican's general license for a wine and beer license. Hon. members will be aware that perhaps the most objectionable form of license granted is the wine and beer license, and whilst we are aware that the matter of licenses is subject to a local option poll—that is to say, we cannot grant a new license in any district where a vote has been against increase—yet it has been thought that the substitution of a better form of license for an inferior form would not be increasing the number of licenses in the district. If we continue the wine and beer licenses we continue the worst form of license. Wine and beer licenses are not under the same police supervision, not governed by same rules

regarding accommodation for the public as are publicans' general licenses, and the whole surroundings are not as good as in the case of the publican's general license. It has been thought by some magistrates that it was at any rate the spirit of the legislation that it should be possible to substitute a publican's general license in lieu of a wine and beer license.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: Will all the other provisions of the Act still stand?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes; that is the reason why it is put in this form. This amendment amends Section 45 in a very simple manner; it adds a new proviso to the section. Therefore it destroys none of the section itself, and the only alteration is to put a proviso at the commencement of the subsection so that it shall read "provided always that." An amendment was made in this chamber, when the Licensing Act, 1911, was under consideration. Those words were not by that amendment excluded. They are necessary for the correct reading of the section. In taking the correction down to the printer those words were inadvertently crossed out; they were really not part of the original amendment. We restore them here, and by doing so remove a lot of difficulty in the interpretation of the section. There is substantially no alteration in the previous law in what I am now asking the chamber to grant—that the bench, at its discretion, may substitute a publican's general license in place of a wine and beer license.

Mr. Nairn: Are there many of these wine and beer licenses?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Not many; but it is desirable that the best form of license should be issued in lieu of them. Not only that, but the State will get more revenue.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: The substitution would be at the discretion of the licensing bench?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes. And every other provision of the Licensing Act still applies. We go further than that. We amend Section 67 by permitting to be lawfully done what is done now. Subject to the payment of a fine, we per-

mit the holder of a publican's general license who is behind in the payment of his licensing fee beyond the period authorised, fourteen days, to pay up, so that he shall not lose his license. That is at the discretion of the Minister controlling the Licensing Act. We do take the money now after the fourteen days have expired, the irregularity being amended by the Governor in Executive Council. We want now to do this on a lawful basis, and to enable the Treasurer to impose a fine on those who do not pay their license fees within the fourteen days allowed. A further amendment affects State hotels, and I sincerely trust there will not be another discussion such as we had the other night. What we propose is that all State hotels now in existence shall be deemed to have been duly and properly licensed until December next. Hon. members will know that previously the State has had to make application for licenses and renewals. The amendment now brings the law into line with what I asked for the other night, and at the same time validates what has been done in the past in that respect.

Mr. Robinson: Validates the one you missed the other night?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The one at Bruce Rock.

Hon. J. Mitchell: None of the State hotels are licensed now.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: One is licensed by special Act of Parliament. That there have been omissions in the past I frankly admit. I do not confess to it altogether as a fault. The fact is that the Government have taken the position that they are not bound by the law to make application; that the Government are the giver of licenses and therefore cannot admit that any body should be allowed to give them licenses. Since the House did not take that view of the question, it is now proposed that, so far as the past is concerned, State hotels shall be deemed to have complied with the law, but that henceforth we shall have to apply for renewals and for licenses for our managers to the licensing bench. I do not want a repetition of the discussion we had the other evening. There is another amend-

ment here, dealing with refreshment rooms, that those rooms on our railways shall be subject to the same inspection, by liquor inspectors, as are other licensed premises. Those comprise practically all the reforms proposed in this measure. We are altering subsection 3 of Section 44 of the principal Act, which reads as follows:—

Nothing in this Act contained shall affect the provisions of Section 59 of the Government Railways Act, 1904. We are repealing that, and compelling the vendors of liquors in refreshment rooms to submit to the same inspection as other licensees.

Mr. Smith: What about the premises?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I agree with the hon. member, there is room for improvement in some of them; but that is not what is proposed to be done here. "One thing at a time and that done well." I beg to move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: I move—

That the debate be adjourned till the next sitting.

Motion put and negatived.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: I think the Attorney General might have agreed to the adjournment as asked for by the leader of the Opposition, who has been called away from the chamber.

Hon. J. Mitchell: While the Government may be anxious to have the session closed down, I appeal to the Attorney General to allow this debate to be adjourned.

The Attorney General: Tell me what there is about the Bill which requires lengthy consideration.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Clause one is a very important matter indeed. I am willing to proceed, if the Attorney General insists.

The Attorney General: I think it is good policy to get through the work.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would remind hon. members that the question has been decided by the House; the motion for the adjournment was defeated.

Mr. ROBINSON (Canning) [5.14]: If a measure of this description says just what the Attorney General tells

us, it is probably a measure which should be supported by every member of the House; but I think it is right that we should examine the provisions of this Bill to see whether its standards comply with the conditions the Attorney General has given us. I had only reached the consideration of paragraph three when the Attorney General finished his speech. This Bill was placed in our hands only a few moments ago; and I venture to say that if it is passed now by the Government majority, it will be passed without debate, without due consideration, and without our being able to apply our minds to its provisions. On the other hand, if we are allowed time to consider the measure, it is probable that we might very well pass the Bill through. For instance, will the Attorney General answer me this question? What is the Section 119 of the principal Act referred to in Clause 3 of this Bill?

The Attorney General: That section enables the Governor-in-Council to amend the irregularities.

Mr. ROBINSON: Is that Section 119 of the principal Act of 1911?

Mr. Green: This is second reading, is it not?

Mr. ROBINSON: Certainly; but the Attorney General referred to that section, and perhaps he will answer me the question.

The Attorney General: That deals with aborigines, and provides that they are not to loiter about in any town.

Mr. ROBINSON: What has it to do with that section? I am only just mentioning this to show that here is a clause as to which the Attorney General himself has not a reply to make to me.

Mr. Thomson: And yet he expects us to understand the Bill.

Mr. ROBINSON: How can I understand the Bill, who never saw it until five minutes ago?

The Attorney General: There is nothing to misunderstand.

Mr. ROBINSON: Then, why does not the Attorney General answer me?

The Attorney General: I did answer. Why be so impertinent?

Mr. ROBINSON: I am the last person in this House who should be accused of impertinence. The Attorney General has thrown some heat into his reply to me. I endeavour to be courteous to everyone here, from the Speaker downwards. I ask the Attorney General to calm himself a little. I put to him a question, and he could not answer it in a moment; so how can he expect me or any other member of the House to answer such a question in a moment? I venture to say the Bill is probably all right; but the House wants a little time for consideration. If the Government propose to carry the measure through immediately, then I propose to close my Bill file and to have no more to say on this subject. Are we here as a deliberative House, or are we here as a sausage machine?

The Attorney General: So far as you are concerned, there seems to be a good deal of the sausage machine.

Mr. ROBINSON: In that case, I decline to have the Government turn the handle.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Perth) [5.19]: I think the Attorney General might well have consented to the adjournment of the debate. No delay to the measure would have been involved in the adoption of that course, and it is impossible to consider a Bill of this importance at a moment's notice. The truth of that proposition was clearly established a few minutes ago by the fact of the Attorney General's finding himself unable to answer the question put to him by the member for Canning (Mr. Robinson). This Bill, although a small one, amends a very lengthy and highly important Act, one of far reaching effects; and naturally I wish—

Mr. Green: Are you speaking to the adjournment or on the second reading?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: I am not speaking to the adjournment. That motion is disposed of.

The Attorney General: May I make a personal explanation? The apparent confusion is due to a misprint in the Bill.

Mr. Robinson: If I discovered that in five minutes, it shows that we should not have gone on.

The Attorney General: I have discovered it now. "Section 119" in Clause 3 should read "Section 199."

Mr. Robinson: Now I hope the Attorney General will withdraw the heated remark he made with reference to myself.

The Attorney General: I will not, unless the hon. member will withdraw his boiling remarks.

Mr. Robinson: I made no boiling remarks.

The Attorney General: Why waste time by adjourning?

Hon. Frank Wilson: We have heaps of work to do, apart from this Bill.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: The personal explanation made by the Attorney General fully bears out my contention that I had good and sufficient reason for moving the adjournment of the debate on this small but very important Bill. In amending a measure such as the Licensing Act, the powers of which are so far reaching, one does not know at the first glance what the effect of any proposed amendment may be. That has been amply proved by the remarks of the member for Canning (Mr. Robinson). We have not had time even to discover what now discloses itself as a printer's error in the Bill. The member for Canning was perfectly right in asking whether we are here as a deliberative Assembly, or simply to pass, without consideration, each measure as the Government send it along. The attitude of the Attorney General on this Bill is certainly not conducive towards a future disposition on the part of the House to suspend the Standing Orders in as ready a manner for the convenience of Ministers as hon. members have done in the past. The measure provides for, amongst other things, the conversion of any wine and beer license into a general publican's license. That is a very far reaching power. A wine and beer license may be transferred from one portion of a district to a totally different portion in a totally different form—namely, in the form of a general publican's license. That power is

given to the licensing bench, which therefore may move hotels over distances of hundreds of miles. Some licensing districts extend over many hundreds of square miles. We have not had time to consider such a point as this. Apparently, that is the effect; but we have not had time to discover what is the real effect of the provision. Apart from this aspect, I do not at present see any objection to the Bill, providing that all the powers of the principal Act are conserved with the exception I have mentioned, namely, that notwithstanding the local option provisions, there is power to convert a wine and beer license into a general publican's license. If the full powers of the principal Act are not conserved, then I see grave objection to this Bill.

The Attorney General: Those powers are fully conserved.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: The danger I see is that under this measure a publican's license in a town like Nannine or Lennonville—towns almost non-existent—may be transferred to centres like Meekatharra or Black Range in the same licensing district. I submit to hon. members that certainly the effect of this Bill would be to permit the transfer of a license from a defunct mining centre to another whose residents may not want a general publican's license granted in their midst.

Mr. Nairn: The transfer would have to be approved by the licensing bench.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: I know that; and the effect of this Bill will be to leave the matter to the sweet will of the licensing bench, although the residents of the town or centre to which the license is to be transferred may emphatically object to the transfer. To the principle stated by the Attorney General there could be no objection at all—namely, that of giving to the bench power to convert an inferior license into the better license. Again, as regards the last clause of the Bill I agree with the member for North Perth (Mr. Smith) that there is a great deal to be said; and I am indeed sorry that the Attorney General has not allowed more time for

the consideration of the Bill, because I should have liked to offer some suggestions in the same direction as indicated by the member for North Perth. Refreshment rooms at railway stations ought to be brought under the Licensing Act, and should be required to provide comfortable accommodation, which is not supplied by them at present. I wish to say, however, that I think the proprietors of railway refreshment rooms probably serve the public as well as they can in existing circumstances. The Railway Department does not afford those proprietors the opportunity of treating the public properly. The rents charged by the department are frequently exorbitant. As things are, the public are squeezed in anyhow when endeavouring to obtain refreshment on railway stations. I regret that the Bill does not empower licensing benches to insist on the provision of decent accommodation at railway stations.

Mr. Hudson: The licensing benches do not grant the licenses for railway refreshment rooms.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: I am aware of that; but by this Bill the Attorney General proposes to vest in licensing benches certain powers which they have not had hitherto. The Bill does not go far enough in that direction. It should give the power suggested by the member for North Perth (Mr. Smith) with regard to accommodation, and not only as regards liquors. I am speaking at five minutes' notice. Having only just seen the Bill, I am not prepared to enter fully into the details of the measure.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: If the Railway Department refused to enlarge railway refreshment premises, would you have the licensing bench abolish the license?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: Yes.

Hon. FRANK WILSON (Sussex) [5.27]: I wish to appeal to the Attorney General to grant the House an adjournment on this measure. For my part, I confess I cannot grasp the full purport of the Bill.

Mr. Green: Pass the second reading.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: No. We want to discuss the measure.

Mr. Green: It is a Committee Bill.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: No; it goes much further. I therefore ask the Attorney General to grant an adjournment. There is any amount of other work on the Notice Paper, and we can get on with that other work much more rapidly than with this Bill.

The Attorney General: I will consent to an adjournment.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion passed.

BILL—LUNACY ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Message.

A Message having been received from the Council agreeing to certain amendments made by the Assembly, but disagreeing with certain other amendments and giving reasons, the Message was now considered.

In Committee.

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

No. 1—Clause 4: Strike out this clause:

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: Another place disagrees with our striking out of Clause 4, which provided that, except in certain circumstances, it shall not be necessary for medical practitioners to attend personally before the court, that their written certificates shall be deemed sufficient evidence. I move—

That the Assembly's amendment be not insisted upon.

The clause will have an important bearing on any cases similar to that of the man Hein, who was released through an informality in the committal warrant. As I have said, it provides that in the ordinary course the court shall accept as evidence the certificates of two medical men without requiring their personal attendance before the court. It must be remembered that the medical men would be held responsible for giving a wrong certificate just as they would be for giving wrong evidence before the court. To

require the medical man giving a certificate to appear in court would be to impose a burden of something like £3,000 per annum on the State; that is, judging on last year's figures.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: How many admissions were there last year?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: Some 258. The doctor's certificate to-day costs a guinea, but if the doctor is compelled to attend at court he will require a fee of from three to five guineas, which, in the circumstances, is only reasonable. That will be one direct result of the striking out of the clause. A medical certificate of this sort is equally as good as medical testimony given on oath. Therefore it is unnecessary to put this expense upon the Government. Members have stated that many sane people are detained in our Government institutions and hospitals for the insane. What is the logical conclusion of such an assertion? I am sure that many persons have been released where, I am sure, the cure has not been absolute and this proves to me that our medical officer is not inclined to keep people in that institution who should be out of it.

Mr. Smith: I think the Honorary Minister is wrong.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: If the supposition is put forward that people are being kept in that institution who should be out of it, it amounts to this: that Dr. Montgomery and, to a lesser extent, Dr. Anderson are in collusion with some persons outside the asylum and are receiving monetary reward for detaining people in that hospital.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: You are going beyond the amendment.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: I am not going beyond the discussion which has taken place in Committee. It has been said that the striking out of the clause will be a precaution against putting people into the asylum. There is no gain whatever to the Government, and I think there is no gain to Dr. Montgomery or Dr. Anderson to keep people in that institution who are fit to be at large. The Government have no desire, and I think no Government have ever had any desire, to keep

people in that institution who should be at large. The clause is, therefore, perfectly safe for the community, and for those who have been charged with being insane. I think that the Committee will come to the conclusion that we should not go to this unnecessary expense. I hope the Committee will not insist on the amendment which means the striking out of Clause 4.

Mr. ROBINSON: I think it was my suggestion that this clause should be struck out when we were considering it on a former occasion. Since I moved in that direction I have had the opportunity of discussing the matter with some of the medical men who do honorary service at the Perth Public hospital. I have ascertained from these gentlemen that there is attached to the Perth Public Hospital an observation ward. If any man is brought in there and there is any doubt cast upon his mental capacity, he is placed in this observation ward and is under observation there by the honorary medical staff for 14 days. If they are satisfied, then, that he is insane, or not sufficiently sane to be at large, they sign the necessary certificate and take proceedings to have him sent down to the Hospital for the Insane. It appears that probably a very large percentage of the men and women, who are sent to the Hospital for the Insane, drift thither through that particular channel—I think somewhere about 75 per cent. I am, therefore, disposed to agree with the argument used by the Honorary Minister within the limits I have described. I think if a man has been under observation for 14 days by one of the honorary medical staff of the Perth Public Hospital, he is in a very different position to the man who has been examined once by a doctor from town "A" in the north, and once by a doctor from town "B" in the south. I think in these cases they should come before a justice of the peace and be examined. There is, of course, a great difference between cases of this sort and the cases dealt with in the Perth Public Hospital. I should be glad if the Honorary Minister would agree to an amendment to this effect, that in cases of men or women who have been

in the observation ward of the Perth Public Hospital, or any other hospital having similar accommodation, for a period of 14 days, the certificate of two medical officers from that hospital should be sufficient, and that in that case the provisions of Clause 4 should be followed out. In all other cases, however, I am still of opinion that the greatest possible difficulty should be placed in the way of a man entering the Hospital for the Insane, and that every possible means should be provided for him to get out. I understand there is a similar ward in Kalgoorlie that existing at the Perth Public Hospital, and that institution could, therefore, be added if it is conducted on the same lines as the Perth Public Hospital. If my amendment as suggested is accepted I shall be glad to draft it.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: I hope the Committee will not agree to the motion of the Honorary Minister and will insist on the amendment to strike out Clause 4. So far as the remarks of the Honorary Minister in connection with the Inspector and the Assistant Inspector General of the Insane are concerned, in my opinion these officers are very excellent officers. From the Inspector General down to the lowest attendant in the institution they are all worthy of their places. There is no doubt that if patients once get into their hands they will be treated rightly. It is an excellent institution and the inmates will always be discharged if they are not qualified to remain there. I do not think we can be too careful, however, before we allow the admission of anybody into that hospital. I agree that there is an erroneous impression in the minds of people in regard to the Hospital for the Insane, as we know it to-day. People have the idea once they are admitted into that institution—and this idea has a very harmful affect upon them—that they are in a lunatic asylum such as used to exist in the old days. I do not think we can be too careful to guard against the easy admission of patients into this hospital. As already stated, there is a reception ward in the Perth Public Hospital and also I think in the Kalgoorlie Hospital. There

is no question about doctors' certificates that are issued there. If the Minister could accept the amendment, that this shall not apply to a patient coming from the reception house of this institution it would largely meet with his wishes on the score of expenses. The minority of cases sent to the Hospital for the Insane come from outlying districts, and the greatest care should be taken as to the certificates granted by medical men who may have very little practical knowledge of such cases. I would point out that the honorary medical staff in the Perth Public Hospital get exactly the same fee as others doctors, that is, one guinea, for certificates of this sort. So far as the question of cost is concerned, I can scarcely follow the Honorary Minister, because, as I say, these honorary medical officers get the same fee as other medical officers. One guinea is a special price and it is a special price because there is a certain amount of risk attached to issuing these certificates. I daresay if a guinea extra were paid for attending court it would not take a medical man ten minutes to go through the business.

Hon. R. H. Underwood: It might take six hours.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: That would be quite the exception. In ordinary cases they would get through the whole thing in ten minutes and be able to pocket the extra guinea. If we can save people going into the institutions, we shall be saving the cost of their upkeep to the State.

Mr. ROBINSON: I have written out the amendment I desire to move, but I am not quite sure that I am in order in moving an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot move an amendment. The Committee must either insist or not insist on the amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON: Even if the Committee are in favour of my amendment there is no power?

The Minister for Mines: We are with you, but we have no power.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I shall appear to the Committee to be backing down, but I have given the matter some investigation since the House

last met, and whilst I yield to no man in the Chamber as to the necessity for safeguarding the liberties of the people and preventing them from being wrongfully placed in an institution, yet I think the reversion to the old clause is in itself some protection. Under the Principal Act a penalty is attached for any signature appended to a wilfully erroneous certificate whereby the liberty of a person is endangered. The Bill provides that there shall be two doctors' certificates. These certificates are equivalent to the sworn testimony of two independent medical practitioners. If those certificates are proved to be given for any motive than expressing a medical fact then the practitioner signing the document is amenable to the law.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: It is carelessness.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I thought it would be some advantage to the Committee if I took the practice which prevailed in England, and this is what Wood Renton says—

The examination must be a real one, i.e., an examination made personally and *bona fide* by the justice for the purpose of satisfying himself as to the sanity or insanity of the person examined. The time, and place, and manner, and character, and duration of the examination are one and all left to his discretion, and he will not be considered as having acted without jurisdiction by reason only of his having made a less full and complete examination than the Court may think he ought to have made.

And here is the point that I especially wish to draw attention to.

Nor is it necessary that the medical practitioner above referred to should be actually present when the justice sees and personally examines the alleged lunatic, or that the latter should be made aware of the object of the examination. "The language" of (the seceion) said Lindley, L. J., in *Reg. v. Whitfield*, does not point to anything like such an investigation as takes place under a *writ de lunatico inquirendo*. The object of the statute is not

to enable justices to adjudicate a person to be *non compos mentis*, but to enable them to place under proper care and control persons who they are satisfied are lunatics, and require to be so placed.

Not only is it necessary for two medical men independently to examine the patient as to his mental condition, but there is the justices' examination subsequently, and when the patient is taken to Claremont there are the medical officers who are supposed to have the patient under observation to ascertain if the person is sane or not; and if the person is sane they immediately release him. There are other safeguards. If the justices are not satisfied with the certificate and there are questions they would like to ask the doctor, or if they want further light thrown on the certificate, then the justices can send for the doctor who is bound to attend, and if the patient's representatives desire to have the doctor present for examination or cross-examination, a request that that shall be done will bring it about. The safety rests with the fact of the doctor being compelled under penalty to give a truthful certificate, and if a doctor will not give a truthful certificate, then he will not give truthful evidence. I would like to accept something like the suggestion of the members for Canning and Perth, but that would not altogether meet the case. There can be the placing of the patient under observation in the Perth hospital and that is done in many cases now, and then there is the observation in the Hospital for Insane. While I desire to place obstacles in the way of people being wrongfully placed in the Hospital for Insane, I do not want to place unnecessary obstacles in the way.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: If a medical man will give a false certificate he will give false evidence. By bringing him into court we are not saving a patient from going to the Hospital for Insane. Nothing is being accomplished. I can imagine one absolute criminal medical practitioner being obtained, but not two. It is scarcely likely that two scoundrels could be found to sign a cer-

tificate for a man to be placed in a Hospital for Insane, and they would be such poor scoundrels if they could not back up their criminality under the cross-examination of a lawyer. If a person who is charged with being insane has sufficient sense to call for a doctor, the Act provides that it shall be done, but we want to provide for the case where a person is obviously insane, so that we are saved the expense of calling in doctors to give evidence.

Question passed; the Council's amendment not insisted on.

No. 4—Clauses 8 and 10: Strike out these clauses:

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: Having thoroughly considered the question, and having obtained the opinion of others, it seems to me conclusive that Clause, 8 is not required. The clause is entirely covered by Clause 6, which is still retained in the Bill. Clause 6 effects all that we require to validate past actions and protect the State in the future. I move—

That the amendment be insisted on.

Question passed, the Council's amendment insisted on.

No. 4—Clause 10: Strike out this clause:

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: This clause is necessary for validating actions which have taken place in various courts, and I am of opinion after further consideration that it should be retained in the Bill. Therefore I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

Question passed, the Council's amendment not insisted on.

No. 6.—Insert a new clause to stand as Clause 7—"Section 94 of the principal Act is hereby amended by the substitution of the word "three" for the word "two" in the third line, and by inserting after the word "visitors" the words "one of whom shall be a female:"

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD: I might reasonably complain about the draftsmanship of the schedule of these amendments, and particularly this one,

which is not clear. Hon. members are not given a fair chance of following what is required by the Council. It is my opinion that it is up to the clerks to draft these amendments a little more clearly for the benefit of members. After considerable exploration I find that this clause refers to the amendment inserted at the instance of the member for North Perth, which provided that three inspectors should be appointed, one of them to be a woman. The amendment of the Legislative Council is that that woman shall be a medical practitioner. We find, however, that in this State there are only three women medical practitioners, namely Mrs. Jull, who is not likely to take the position, Mrs. Montgomery, who is a sister-in-law of the Inspector General of the Insane, and Dr. Gertrude Mead. I have no objection to Dr. Mead but we should not pass an Act of Parliament for one person. There may be others competent to become inspectors besides Dr. Mead, and if we are to have a woman inspector there should be some choice in regard to the appointment. Lunacy is a special study, and possibly 90 per cent. of medical students are not versed in it. In making an appointment of this description, the Governor in Council should have some choice. I therefore move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Question passed, the Council's amendment not agreed to.

Resolutions reported, and the report adopted.

A committee, consisting of the Attorney General (Hon. T. Walker), the Honorary Minister (Hon. R. H. Underwood) and Mr. Smith drew up reasons for not agreeing to two of the Council's amendments. Reasons adopted, and a Message accordingly returned to the Council.

BILL—GOVERNMENT ELECTRIC WORKS.

Council's Amendments.

Schedule of three amendments requested by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

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

No. 1.—Clause 5: After the word “proclamation,” in line three, insert the words “but subject to the consent of the local authority having control in any such area”:

The PREMIER: The clause provides for power to establish and maintain electric works and the Council desire that the local authority in any district not affected by the agreement ratified last year shall be consulted. I disagree with the proposal, but I see no particular reason for squabbling over it. I therefore—

That the amendment be made.

Question passed; the Council’s amendment made.

No. 2.—Clause 7: Add the following subclause to stand as No. 2: “Before the Commissioner proceeds to exercise any of the other powers conferred by paragraphs (i.) to (vi.) of the last preceding section, a like notice shall be given by the Commissioner to the local authority or the owner or occupier of the land or premises in respect of which such power is to be exercised.”

The PREMIER: This will merely give effect to the promise I made when the Bill was before this Chamber. I move—

That the amendment be made.

Question passed; the Council’s amendment made.

No. 3.—Clause 13: Add the following words:—“All by-laws so made—(a) should be published in the *Gazette*; (b) from the date of such publication, or from a later date fixed by the order making the same, shall be of the same effect as if they were contained in this Act; (c) shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament within fourteen days after such publication, if Parliament is in session, and if not, then within fourteen days after the commencement of the next session. Notwithstanding any publication thereof, no by-law shall continue to have any force or effect if the same is disapproved, either wholly or in part, by resolution of either House of Parliament within thirty days after such by-law has

been laid before Parliament, if Parliament is so long in session: Provided that if Parliament is not in session for thirty days after such by-law has been laid before Parliament, then such by-law shall not continue to have any force or effect if disapproved by either House of Parliament within thirty days after the commencement of the next session of Parliament”:

The PREMIER: This amendment is in accordance with the attitude of the Council regarding the disallowance of by-laws under other measures. We desire to keep the powers of the Commissioner under this measure in conformity with his powers under the Railways Act, and as that law provides that by-laws shall be disallowed only on a resolution by both Houses, I move—

That the amendment be not made.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: We have discussed this question on more than one occasion, and I think the Premier would be wise to accept the amendment. No good purpose will be served by reiterating the arguments previously advanced. When by-laws are framed they should become law only if both Houses agree to them. In other words, if either House passes a resolution disallowing them they should not receive the force of law.

The PREMIER: We desire that the powers of the Commissioner who is controlling the tramways, the electric works and the railway system shall be uniform on all matters regarding the disallowance of by-laws. The Interpretation Act stipulates the procedure to be adopted under the Railways Act, namely, that a resolution of both Houses shall be necessary to disallow regulations. If the amendment is made we will not have uniformity.

[Mr. Holman took the Chair.]

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

Ayes	22
Noes	17
				—
Majority for	5
				—

ATRS.	
Mr. Angwin	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Collier	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Foley	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Green	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Walker
Mr. Johnston	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. McDowall	Mr. Heitmann
(Teller).	

NOES.	
Mr. Allen	Mr. Smith
Mr. Connolly	Mr. S. Stubbs
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. Veryard
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Willmott
Mr. Mitchell	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Nairn	Mr. Male
Mr. Robinson	(Teller)

Question thus passed; the Council's amendment not made.

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

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1914-15.

In Committee of Supply.

Debate resumed from the 4th February on the Treasurer's financial statement and the Annual Estimates; Mr. Holman in the Chair.

Vote—His Excellency the Governor £1,750:

Mr. VERYARD (Leederville) [8.4]: By their remarks on the Estimates members have shown that they are in sympathy with the Government in their present financial difficulties. At the same time I do not think that the sympathy felt by members for the Government is so deep as it would have been had the Government shown an inclination to try and live within their income during their term of office.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You have hit the nail on the head.

Mr. VERYARD: The member for Bunbury stated that the verdict at the last election was clearly a direction to the Government to adjust the financial position, but I do not think anyone will contend that the Government has made

an effort to adjust the financial position, seeing that the deficit has increased during the past seven months by something like half a million. As a new member I may be pardoned for referring to past financial statements. According to the financial statement made in the last year of the term of the Liberal Government in 1911 the revenue for the three years had been £3,850,412, while the surplus was £155,992. During the last year of the Labour Government the revenue amounted to £5,205,344, and the deficit for the year was £135,406. In comparison with the results obtained by the Liberal Government in their last year the Labour Government, instead of having a deficit, should have had a surplus of £160,000 odd in place of a deficit of £135,000. That, to my mind, shows clearly the difference between inexperienced and experienced business men handling the State's financial affairs. Apart from the financial position, when the Liberal Government was in office business was good, and the worker had plenty of work; yet within six months after the advent of the Labour Government we had the spectacle of processions of unemployed in our streets, and unfortunately the unemployed have been with us ever since. The financial statement show that in their first year the Labour Government showed a considerable deficit; the following year it was increased by 100 per cent., and in their third year it had been again increased by something like 100 per cent. The deficit during the past seven months, as I have already said, has increased by nearly half a million. During the seven months just past, as compared with the same period of the last year of the Liberal administration, there has been an increased revenue of £82,864.

Mr. Heitmann: Where did you get your figures from?

Mr. VERYARD: In my opinion the people of the State have treated the Government handsomely. They have given them a sufficient income within which they should live comfortably. But they will not live within their means. Not

only has the expenditure been increased but they have got into difficulties.

The Minister for Mines: Are these figures as reliable as your statement with regard to the management of the State hotels?

Mr. VERYARD: Yes.

The Minister for Mines: Well then, you will have to apologise.

Mr. VERYARD: Despite an increased income during the past year the Government have increased their liabilities, and they have expended the public moneys so as to leave a deficit. It seems to me either that the Government have not the business knowledge, or are indifferent to their financial position; in either case the position is an unfortunate one for the State. The Government and their apologists attribute the deficit to various causes—the loss of the War Emergency Tax Bill; the war itself and the bad season. So far as the War Emergency Tax Bill is concerned I think the legislature was wise in throwing it out, seeing that the Government had not been called upon to provide any funds for war purposes. So far as the war itself is concerned I do not know that the Government has shown that it has been called upon to contribute anything in this direction.

Member: Do you mean to say the war has not cost this State money?

Mr. VERYARD: Practically nothing. So far as the other reason is concerned—the bad season—we had no bad season since the Labour Government took office until this year. I claim that it is not a bad season when you get an average of 11 bushels, and that has been the average taking the past three years. In 1912 the average was 10 bushels; in 1913, 11 bushels; in 1914, 12 bushels.

The Minister for Mines: What was it in 1911?

Mr. VERYARD: I am saying that the average for the past three years has been 11 bushels.

Mr. Munsie: These figures are just about as accurate as the others he has quoted.

Mr. VERYARD: These figures can easily be verified.

The Minister for Mines: And if they are not correct, you will apologise?

Mr. VERYARD: My contention is that the drought has not seriously affected the Government, except so far as the land rents are concerned.

Mr. Heitmann: What about railway traffic?

Mr. VERYARD: The railway traffic was not affected before January. Very little harvest is shifted by the railway before the end of December, so that the deficit would not be affected from that source until January. Therefore, I do not think the bad season has had any serious effect in bringing about the present financial position of the State. The Government seeks to meet the position which has arisen by cutting down the votes in certain directions. I would ask the Government to be careful in regard to the subsidies to roads boards and municipalities. These moneys are generally very well spent by the roads boards and municipalities, and, further, 75 per cent. of it goes to pay labour for work done.

Member: Rubbish.

Mr. VERYARD: By curtailing these subsidies you are inconveniencing the public generally and reducing the opportunities for labour. With regard to the reduced vote for charitable institutions; I think the Government should have given notice of their intention in order that the institutions might be prepared to meet the new position.

The Minister for Works: It is apparent you have not read the Estimates; that you are following what other people have said.

Mr. VERYARD: I know that the Government, through the Minister for Railways, have proposed to reduce the hours of the railway employees and thereby reduce the cost of railway wages. This last effort of the Government does not appear likely to work satisfactorily, more especially when it is borne in mind that a little time ago the wages of these men were increased by a shilling a day. Under the Government's proposal ninepence of that shilling would be taken back. No one, I think, will say that living is

cheaper now than it was three years ago, when the increase was given. With reference to the municipal subsidy for Leederville, I wish to point out that while this is based on 7s. 6d. in the pound, the Perth City Council, if paid at that rate, would be entitled to £116,660 per annum.

The Minister for Works: They are entitled to the lot, but they will not get it.

Mr. VERYARD: The maximum, however, has been fixed at £3,000. A peculiar feature of the matter is that even for the last half year the subsidy has not been paid.

The Minister for Works: You are quite sure about that?

Mr. VERYARD: It has not been paid, unless the Government paid it today or yesterday. I hope, however, the Government will make the payment. Another point to which I wish to draw attention in connection with municipal subsidies is the amalgamation of Leederville and North Perth with the City of Perth. I trust that the maximum of £3,000 will not be maintained as against the amounts which should have been paid to the municipalities of Leederville and North Perth.

The Minister for Works: According to the Mayor of Perth, that is already settled and they are not going to do it.

Mr. VERYARD: I hope that the amounts which should have gone to the two municipalities of Leederville and North Perth will still go to the Perth City Council. Again, I hope the Committee in asking for assistance to the Government from the railway wages men will carry the principle further, and go right through the State service. Reduction, I consider, should be on a percentage basis.

Mr. Heitmann: And outside also.

Mr. VERYARD: The people outside are being taxed already. I believe in a graduated system on a percentage basis, so that the largest incomes may bear the greatest proportion of the reduction. My suggestion with regard to the percentage basis would be that State employees receiving up to £100 per annum should be free, and that those receiving from £100 to £200 per annum should pay five per

cent. Under this proposal, workers receiving 9s. per day—instead of contributing, as the Government propose, £11 14s. per annum—would contribute only £7. In my opinion, £7 a year is as much as those people are able to afford.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is not in order in dealing on the Estimates with a matter requiring legislation; he can deal only with administrative matters.

Mr. VERYARD: I am only dealing with what might be done.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is not right in dealing with that matter at the present time.

Mr. VERYARD: If a percentage basis were adopted, I am sure the Government would receive a considerable amount from their scheme of reduction. There are at present in the service hundreds of men who cannot be properly employed for their full time; not because they are unwilling to work, but because in existing circumstances there is not the work for them to perform. We cannot at this juncture afford to retrench any Government servants, as we have already too many unemployed; and therefore I consider that the salaried men, with the wages men, should come to the aid of the Government and help them to keep these people in employment.

Mr. Heitmann: What about the man outside earning a good salary?

Mr. VERYARD: He is being taxed pretty well already.

Mr. Heitmann: No more than the man inside.

Mr. VERYARD: Let additional, but reasonable, taxation be put on him, then.

The Minister for Works: We will give you a trial as to that.

Mr. VERYARD: Outside the Government service everyone at present is more or less affected. Large numbers of employees in the City of Perth are on short time. Everyone will admit that the business people of the State are suffering keenly, with very, very few exceptions. No one who has practical knowledge of the facts will deny that property owners also are suffering very keenly.

Mr. Munsie: There are a few exceptions around Perth, though, who are not suffering at the present time, who are not reducing rents.

Mr. VERYARD: If the hon. member knew as much about City property, he would not say that. The hon. member recently in referring to the Public Service asserted that the State was not receiving a fair return for what it was paying. To some extent I think that may be true. Apart from the fact that the whole of the men in Government employ cannot be profitably occupied, there is the fact that some of them do not want to be employed too much. Only this week I saw a departmental account issued which should have been issued a least six months ago. Only within the last few days did the department concerned issue that account. It seems to me that either the officers of that department must be too indifferent about their work, or else that they want more assistance. It is, however, a matter for complaint that the Government when short of money do not see that their accounts are rendered in good time. I have been informed on several occasions that the proper results are not being got from various departments owing to the fact that overseers and foremen are not able to press home on the men the necessity for their doing a fair day's work. The reason that has been assigned for this inability is that if men are dismissed or suspended, they, as a rule, are either sent back to the same work for re-employment or are given employment elsewhere.

The Minister for Works: Can you give some instances of that?

Mr. VERYARD: One railway inspector I know of has stated that; and such procedure is not in the best interests of discipline, nor does it tend to the obtaining of the best results.

The Minister for Works: I say the statement is incorrect.

Mr. VERYARD: It may be, so far as you know.

The Minister for Works: It is incorrect right through. No man is sent back when he is discharged from a job.

Mr. VERYARD: Then I have been wrongly informed, though I have heard it stated on many occasions.

The Minister for Works: The inspector who made that statement is a crawler, and ought to be out of the service.

Mr. VERYARD: I wish to make a further suggestion. I am not concerned as to how hon. members view it, but I do feel that in proposing to impose taxation upon other people we as representatives of the constituencies should be prepared to lay an extra burden on ourselves.

The Minister for Works: Hear, hear! I quite agree with you. But you fought against it.

Mr. VERYARD: I never fought against it.

Mr. Bolton: Let us take a bit off your income; not off your salary.

Mr. VERYARD: I think we have been too much inclined to tax the other fellow. In this case, at all events, I think we ought to start at home and so give confidence to the people at large. I suggest hon. members should contribute anything from 25 to 33 per cent.

Mr. Heitmann: Of their incomes?

Mr. VERYARD: Of their parliamentary salaries. I am speaking of hon. members just now as members of Parliament. Our private incomes are taxed already.

The Minister for Mines: Why does not the hon. member leave 20 per cent. of his salary in the Treasury? Nobody compels him to draw it.

Hon. J. Mitchell: The Minister promised to leave £300 of his salary in the Treasury.

The Minister for Mines: I did not. The hon. member knows I did not promise anything of the sort.

Mr. VERYARD: Ministers should contribute £300 a year each.

Mr. Thomas: Some hon. members would be dear at any price, but some would be cheap at a thousand a year.

Mr. VERYARD: That is right. Some time ago, when the Liberals were in power, salaries were increased all round. Hon. members of the Labour party thereupon went to the country boasting that they would reduce the salaries all round as soon as they were in power.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is not in order in dealing with those matters on the Estimates. It is out of order to introduce matters of a nature which cannot be dealt with on the Estimates.

The Minister for Mines: The hon. member is out of order, and he is quite incorrect.

Mr. VERYARD: I am sorry if I transgressed the rules of the House, Sir. I did not know I was doing that.

The Minister for Mines: The hon. member transgressed the truth.

Mr. VERYARD: I would advise, though I know the Labour party will not agree with the idea, that we dispose of various State enterprises into which the present Government have entered. That would be in the interests of the people at large. From that suggestion I would except tramways and railways. Public conveniences, such as railways and tramways, and other public services may advantageously be owned by the State.

The Minister for Mines: Except also State steamers, which are means of transit.

Mr. VERYARD: Apart from those exceptions, the Government would, in my opinion, do well to dispose of all these trading concerns. I am sure the money which would thereby be rendered available would prove of great benefit to the Government in many ways. Had this money been spent in the construction of railways and harbour works, it would have been far better for the people generally.

Mr. Bolton: You are breaking some new ground now.

Mr. VERYARD: Workers' homes represent a scheme which I myself have favoured; but the present time is not, I think, opportune for the expenditure of further money in that direction. I hope, at all events, that for the time being nothing will be spent on the building of homes that can possibly be avoided.

Mr. Taylor: The Government cannot spend any more now, because they have not got the money.

Mr. VERYARD: We have unemployed in large numbers; and, while many of

them are good men and willing to work, I still think the Government would do well to find the unemployed something to do just to cover the cost of meal and bed tickets.

Mr. A. A. Wilson: Can you suggest anything?

Mr. VERYARD: The Government could soon find such work as I have suggested, if they thought it worth while. For my part, I think it would be worth while. In my opinion, it would be better for the men who want to work, and it would get rid of some of the loafers living on the Government at the present time. There are some of the unemployed who were never in their lives better off than they are now, with two meals a day and bed at night. In 1911 the Government appointed a Public Service Appeal Board. Evidently they are not prepared to accept the verdicts of that board, because they have not paid the awards, but instead have thrown the onus on Parliament. The money having been awarded is proof that it has been earned, and it is only right that the Government should make the payments at the earliest possible date. If the award had been given against private employers they would have been called upon promptly to make good the award.

The Minister for Works: They generally go to a higher court.

Mr. VERYARD: A few weeks ago, in reply to a question put by me, the Premier said he was aware that the Asylum for the Insane was over-crowded, and would consider the question of providing further accommodation. Yet no provision has been made on the Estimates.

Mr. Foley: What would you suggest to reduce the number of lunatics in the State?

Mr. VERYARD: Make you supervisor over them. Since my election I paid a visit to this hospital in company with the Inspector General of the Insane and Dr. Anderson. In going through the building I saw rooms which, set apart for other purposes, were being used by the patients. Having regard to the way in which the institution is over-crowded it would be wise for the Government to

make a special effort to increase the accommodation. During last year there were 230 admissions and 28 re-admissions, or 258 in all. The patients in the hospital numbered 895, whereas in 1910 the number was 780, showing an increase last year of 115. This is pretty good evidence of the over-crowded state of the institution. With regard to the dairy at Claremont, I would like to congratulate the Minister in charge of the department. The appointments there are excellent in every particular; the cattle, the stalls, the milk-room and the appliances generally are everything that could be desired. The cost may have run into thousands of pounds, but I think the money has been well spent. Our police court records show that the general public do not always get pure milk, and I think it would be wise if some of our dairy owners were to combine together—the cost would be too great for a single individual—and erect dairies similar to that at Claremont. Most certainly the consumers generally would benefit by such an enterprise. The Minister controlling the Education Department is to be congratulated on the manner in which he is discharging his duties, the result being general satisfaction throughout the State. He has been following on the lines of the Liberal party right through, although, perhaps, he has allowed the administrative costs to go up rather higher than is desirable.

Mr. Foley: Some years ago you voted to charge the people of the State for education. That is in *Hansard*. You spoke against it, but voted for it.

Mr. VERYARD: It was on a no-confidence motion.

Mr. Bolton: It was nothing of the kind.

Mr. VERYARD: If the hon. member will look at *Hansard*, he will see it was on a question of no-confidence tabled by the then leader of the Opposition (Mr. Bath), and therefore I voted with the Government. Still, I have always been opposed to such a charge. I listened attentively the other evening to the members for Nelson (Mr. Willmott) and Forrest (Mr. O'Loughlen) on the subject of

the timber industry. Until that evening I had believed that the present and previous Governments had been doing something to protect this great industry; but when I find that the Government have spent only £72 in one year for the protection of the industry I think it would be just as well to let the thing alone. I hope that as a result of the remarks of the two members referred to the Minister controlling the department will do something in the near future to amend the situation. I am quite sure that we should jealously conserve this, one of our greatest industries. I am glad to know that we have now the West Australian Forest League, and I trust that the efforts of that organisation, with the assistance of the two members I have mentioned, will have some good effect. Most certainly the remarks of those two members on this subject should carry weight with the Government, especially seeing that one of them is a straight-out Government supporter, while the other is an ally of the Government. I hope the preservation of the timber industry and the work of reafforestation will be well looked after in the near future.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON (Williams-Narrogin) [8.40]: I entertain a high appreciation of the efforts the Government are making to carry on the country through the strenuous times we are experiencing. When we look at the combined effects of the war and the drought we must all realise that no Government have ever had in this State such a difficult task as that confronting the present Ministry.

Mr. Nairn: When the deficit arose they had neither the war nor the drought to contend with.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: We have had several very bad seasons, and even before the war and the present drought the payments due to the State from people not in a position to make them amounted to considerably more than half the deficit in, say, July last.

Mr. Nairn: Other Treasurers have had the same difficulties.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: The same deficits, without ever giving the same mea-

sure of consideration to settlers in the dry areas.

The Premier: The leader of the Opposition was Premier in the best season we ever had, and he had a deficit.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: May I add that the late Government went out leaving this Government £600,000 worth of short-dated Treasury bills to meet. In other words, the late Government financed so badly in their last year that they could not raise a loan, and so had to issue those short-dated bills in London which this Government had to meet. Any fair comparison made between the financial methods of the Labour party and of the previous administration must reflect favourably on the present Government. The chief duty the Government have to-day is to provide employment for workers who are being put off in different industries, and also to protect our settlers in the dry areas and keep them on their holdings, providing them with the necessary seed wheat, stores and manures so that they may carry on over the next harvest and probably bring the State back to greater prosperity than we have ever experienced. If the Government can see this task through on the lines they are at present following I am sure that at the end of that time the people of Western Australia will recognise that the Government have done very excellent work. In this task the Government are fairly entitled to the assistance of all parties and of every hon. member. I am glad to see that many of the new members in Opposition show a desire to help the Government, but I do not think the ex-Ministers of the Crown have shown the same feeling. I was surprised at the party bitterness that some hon. members displayed at a time of stress like this, when I did hope and believe, and the people of the State also thought, that political parties would be able to enter into a political truce and sink bitter party feeling, at any rate during the period of the war. The hon. member for Irwin (Mr. James Gardiner) the leader of the Farmers' and Settlers' Association in the House, certainly promised to assist the Government.

I could not help noticing, however, that several other hon. gentlemen on that side of the House hardly put forward what might be called helpful speeches, to the Government. May I instance in this connection the speech of the hon. member for Toodyay (Mr. Piesse)?

The Premier: He got in in the crush.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: That hon. gentleman urged that there should be no retrenchment in the civil service; that new agricultural lines should be built in his electorate; that new roads should be built by the State; and that roads boards subsidies should be increased.

Mr. Smith: You had a few lines built in your electorate.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I look with very pleasurable anticipation to the time when my electorate may have some more railways built, as soon as the country is in a position to construct the public works that this House has unanimously approved of during the past few weeks. Mr. Piesse also urged that more trains should be run on the existing railways in his electorate, and that in spite of the fact that his electorate is suffering, unfortunately, perhaps more than any other portion of the State from the drought this year. He also urged that an extra and new district allowance should be given to the school teachers in the country, and also said that no extra taxes should be placed upon the people. I am sure that every hon. member in this House would wish that the circumstances of the country were such that we could put forward speeches of that kind, and requests of that comprehensive nature, and expect the Government to fall in with our wishes, and, at the same time expect that no one would have to do anything extra for their accomplishment. I submit, in all sincerity, that as hon. members of this House charged with the responsibility of administering the affairs of the country, we cannot reasonably put forward requests of that nature, and expect the Government to supply the extra and new service to the people, without, at the same time, being prepared to fully pay for this new and extra service. In regard to the deficit, I wish to say

straight out that I find this deficit of a million pounds somewhat alarming. I hope that the Government will meet it by a sort of compromise between the two sources open to them. I hope they will try and bring in some sound measure of economy in administration, and also some fair measure of extra taxation upon the wealthier sections of the community. In putting forward this double-barrelled course, I recognise that if it were put into effect probably some unpopularity would be experienced by the Government, and by those hon. members who support the Government in the carrying out of their policy. I hope that the Government will proceed with such policy, and that all members of the House will give the Government fair support if they decide to do so. The question of a 44 hours working week for the workers, and also for the lower paid sections of the Government employees, has created a good deal of concern. During the last fortnight I have had an opportunity of discussing this matter both with the railway men and also with some of the workers engaged on the public works of the State—navvies and others. I find that amongst these lower paid workers there is a general desire to help the Government and that they are prepared to play their part in making sacrifices, providing that retrenchment, as far as it necessary, begins at the top, and that the higher paid State servants shall be the first affected and that retrenchment shall then take place downwards.

The Minister for Works: And outsiders as well.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Certainly I should like to see this carried further than State employees if possible. I hope the Minister will come down with a tangible proposal on the lines indicated by his interjection. I wish to add that some of these men I am speaking of appreciate the desire of the Government to keep the rate of wage per hour up for the period that they are actually working. They are, further, glad too that the Government do not propose to reduce the rates of pay per working hour.

Mr. Taylor: How can you justify that with the action of the Government in reducing the hours of their employees?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I do not attempt to justify it. If hon. members will have a little patience and wait till I have concluded my remarks they will be able to say what they please. I wish to say, before I sit down, that whatever taxation is found to be necessary at this time. I hope it will be imposed upon all sections of the community, and particularly upon those whose incomes are above £250 per annum, whether such people are civil servants or out of the service. All should in my opinion, contribute on a fair basis, and any vote I can give in this Chamber will be freely given. I wish to say, further, that I was pleased to hear the hon. member for Swan (Mr. Nairn) and some other hon. members on the other side of the House say they approve of the desire of the Government to keep up the rates of wages. It is a new and refreshing expression to hear from members of the Liberal side of the House.

Mr. Allen: We have never advocated low wages.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I have heard something about 6s. a day in this Chamber. I can remember something like that being the ruling rate of wage in this State.

Mr. Allen: You hear a lot of things outside; but they are not necessarily true.

Hon. J. Mitchell: It was paid by the Labour Government.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: No, it was not. I can well remember the railway men in this State going out on strike to get 7s. or 8s. a day under a Liberal Government. The point I wish to make clear is that if retrenchment is necessary I hope the Government will not start on the man they propose to bring under the 44 hours of work per week system, but will start at the very top; with the Governor who gets £5,000 a year; with the judges; with the Agent General; with the Public Service Commissioner, and with all people in the payment of the State, whether under special Acts or not, receiving over £250 per an-

num. Let us all contribute on a graduated basis; and contribute a larger amount as we ascend in the scale, and let it apply to the people outside the civil service as well as to the people who are receiving their salaries from the State. So far as I am concerned I am not prepared to support the policy of allowing the manual worker—the wage earner of the State—to suffer alone; neither do I desire that the civil servant should suffer alone, but that every one in the State should contribute to the Treasury at the present time on the basis of the income that they are fortunate enough to possess.

The Minister for Mines: Does the hon. member know that the reduction of hours is not to penalise the worker, but to prevent him from being penalised in the way that he would be dismissed?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I understand that the intentions of the Government are good. Surely it would be just as easy for the Minister to bring down a Bill providing that the people with the big incomes should first be started on; the mine managers of whom we heard something the other night; the pastoralists; the business managers, and people of that description.

Mr. Thomson: And members of Parliament.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Everyone who is getting over £250 per annum, and the more they get the higher they ought to be taxed, during this time of special stress.

The Minister for Mines: That would not create employment or give work. In the Railway Department if work has fallen off it has meant a reduction of hands. We would still have to reduce hours in order to spread the work over all.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: If the Government get this money out of the wealthier classes of the community they will be able to find work to give to the people who are out of employment.

The Minister for Mines: It would not increase the traffic on the railways.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: If the Government could find this extra money they would be able to provide extra work with it. I want the Government to get that

extra amount from the wealthier sections of the community who can best afford to pay.

The Minister for Mines: The Government are just as desirous as anyone else in the House to increase public works and increase employment.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: The hon. member for Bunbury (Mr. Thomas) referred to the Railway Department the other night, and advocated that the Government should increase fares and rates on the existing railways. As far as I am concerned, I am absolutely opposed to any increase in freights at the present time, and I think that other hon. members representing the goldfields, as well as others in this House, realise that an increase in our railway freights would be a bad thing for our primary industries; for the mining and agricultural industries.

Mr. Thomson: What about increasing the fares in the metropolitan and suburban areas?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I hope the Government will not increase freights because action of that sort at this time would result in putting a burden on the farmers, the miners, and the timber-workers—all people engaged in our primary industries in the interior of the State. They cannot stand any greater load at the present time, and, indeed, find the taxation they are labouring under to-day too heavy to bear. If this suggestion was carried into effect it would mean that the coastal people would be excluded from paying extra taxation. The rich owners of St. George's Terrace, and of city property, would not pay any more tax, whilst the poor small farmer in the interior who is cultivating his land, or the man who is working in the mine, would be taxed, if the freights were increased. I hope that if it is necessary to increase taxation, it will be more on the basis of the proposals of the labour platform, than on the suggestion of the hon. member for Bunbury. I hope too it will be on the basis of increasing the income tax, and perhaps increasing taxation on unimproved values, so that the wealthy owners of city properties in the State shall pay a land tax at the rate of a penny in the pound, in-

stead of a half-penny in the pound as they do to-day.

Mr. Robinson: You cannot tax the country into prosperity.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: We can tax it into an unlocking of the unimproved lands of the State. If that is done, and by that means we bring about a profitable holding of some of the lands of the State in small areas, the country would get into a state of prosperity through the effect of this taxation, and through the land being settled in small holdings and cultivated. It would have been a good thing for the farmer if we had in 1912 carried the increased land tax which was then desired by the Government instead of increasing the freights on fertilisers; but, instead of doing that, what the Government did, in spite of my protests, was to put up the rates on the freights for artificial manures. The recent drought shows more than ever before that that increase was inopportune, and that it is undesirable. It should be removed as early as possible. Artificial manures are only required by the man who goes on the land to properly work his holding, and he is the man we ought to assist, whereas a tax on unimproved values would be affecting the man who in some cases, unfortunately, is holding land that often is not being utilised.

Mr. McDowall: You cannot get the tax on.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I know the Government have had difficulties in the matter, and that an unfortunate blunder was made in increasing freights.

The Premier: It does not appear to be much use putting the tax on.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: The point I wish to emphasise is that whilst fertiliser freights affect the man who is working the land, the absentee entirely escapes. The tax on unimproved land values would affect the absentee, the person, I believe, that every hon. member in this House wishes to be affected as well as the holders of valuable city lands. I will oppose any increase in the railway freights on the lines suggested by the member for Banbury, because the primary industries cannot stand it.

Mr. McDowall: What about making the railways pay; they have not paid for years past?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: They have paid big sums into the revenue. In looking through the Estimates, I am sorry to see in some directions a measure of extravagance proposed on luxuries. I refer particularly to the estimates of the Agent General's office, and I was surprised to see there an item of £710 for the purchase of a new motor car for the use of the Agent General. It must be a magnificent motor car if it is to cost that sum of money in London. Then I notice there is a new item of £300 as an entertainment allowance for the Agent General.

Mr. Taylor: That is not half enough.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: In this time of war, when entertainments have been put aside in England, it is not necessary to give the Agent General a new sum of £300 as an entertainment allowance, especially as it has never been voted in times of peace. We pay the Agent General £1,500 a year, which is the largest salary I understand paid to any Australian Agent General. Last year he had a trip to this State at a cost of £800, and if we give him that motor car we shall have to add to it another £300 for the expenses of running it and the wages of a driver. I understand that the Agent General wishes to rival the High Commissioner of Australia himself. He desires to assume the style of an Oriental potentate at the expense of the State. I hope now when we are making reductions in necessary directions in this country, members will not approve of this proposed expenditure on the motor car and entertainments. Whilst roads board subsidies in my district are being cut down and whilst we are acquiescing in the direction of the reduction of the wages of workers from £2 14s. to £2 9s. 6d., I am not going to approve of this additional extravagance in the Agent General's office. I understand the present Agent General's term of office will expire next February and that it is very likely he will not be re-appointed.

The Premier: How do you know it is not very likely?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I do not know. I am not in the confidence of the Government on this point. But we cannot afford the increased extravagance of that office in the manner proposed. I wish to refer to the question of the moratorium. Some months ago the Government passed a Bill providing for the appointment of a Royal Commission, on whose recommendation a moratorium could be proclaimed, if necessary.

Mr. Taylor: There is no necessity for it.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I submit there has been necessity for it, but, so far as I know, the Government have made no move in the matter. The responsibility for the inaction of the Government lies on the members of the Farmers' and Settlers' Association in this Parliament, if the country Press in Western Australia are to be accepted as a reliable guide. I have here an extract from the *Geraldton Express* of recent date, and this is what it says—

Mr. E. B. Johnston, M.L.A., has been vigorously urging the Government to proclaim the Moratorium Act in the interests of farmers, who are said to be suffering from the onslaught of machinery agents, but, apart from the representations of the member for Williams-Narrogin, here has been no demand in either House for the establishment of even a partial moratorium. If the agricultural section of the community throughout the State are harassed to the degree they are said to be in the Williams-Narrogin electorate, one would think the Country Party could be relied upon to declare themselves with no uncertain sound on the question from their seats in the House. But the Country Party have not done so. They have carefully avoided the subject, and seem to be satisfied with things as they are. It could scarcely be expected, in such circumstances, that the Government would cheerfully undertake the responsibility involved in a compliance with Mr. Johnston's request.

That is in an article opposing the declaration of a moratorium. During a

number of years residence in farming districts, I have never known writs and summonses to fly about these districts with lawyers' letters to the extent that is the case to-day, and especially in my district, which it might be said is one of the most prosperous of the agricultural districts this year. It appears to me that the machinery firms and other sharks are pressing people there because they know they can get their money by doing so.

The Premier: Do not look this way when you refer to sharks.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I am looking in the direction of the Premier, because I want the Premier to go to the relief of these people. I want the Government to say that at any rate a partial moratorium is to be proclaimed at once as far as p.n.s. due by farmers are concerned. Thousands of p.n.s. were returned on the 4th February because settlers were unable to meet them, and so far we have had no move from the Farmers' and Settlers' Association in this matter.

Mr. Willmott: That assertion is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: It is the assertion of the *Geraldton Express*, and the editor of that paper must take the responsibility of it. I refuse to do so. I have heard the leader of the Country party speak, and I have listened to him with pleasure on both the Estimates and the Address-in-reply, and, so far as I know, he has preferred no request for even the establishment of a partial moratorium.

Mr. Griffiths: It is the last thing you want to resort to.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Is that the official view of the party? I have no desire to see any man who can afford to pay, escape his obligation to pay, through the protection of a moratorium, but I wish to remind hon. members that if a partial moratorium is proclaimed it will not enable people to escape paying the amounts due if they are in a position to do so, because the Act clearly sets out that if a man is in a position to pay his creditor, if the creditor proves that that man has the means of paying, the magis-

trate can make an order, notwithstanding the operation of the moratorium. At the present time settlers who are really in a good financial position are being forced to go to the expense of calling meetings of creditors simply because of the action of one cantankerous creditor, perhaps an oppressive machinery firm, who is determined to have its pound of flesh. I appeal to the Government to take some cognisance of the representations which have been made on this subject, and to afford protection to this section of the community.

Mr. Hickmott: If they apply for it they can get it put into force.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I have been applying to the Government on behalf of some of my electors, and, so far as I know, no action has yet been taken, no relief is yet obtainable under the Postponement of Debts Act. The member for Beverley made a suggestion the other evening that we should abolish the State trading concerns. I was surprised to hear it because the member and his colleagues in this House a few days before had very properly helped the Government to establish another big State trading concern, the monopoly over the whole of the wheat in Western Australia, and it seemed to me, in view of the action his party took in helping us to establish that State trading concern in wheat, somewhat inconsistent on his part to call out for the abolition of all State trading concerns. His time would have been better exercised if he had urged the Grain and Foodstuff Board, of which the President of his association is a shining member, to make some statement quickly so that the farmers of Western Australia might know where they were. At present they have not that knowledge, but the board has only been appointed a little while and I do not want to blame them at this stage. People in Western Australia, however, ought to know where they can deliver their wheat, what price they can get, and when they are going to get the cash. At the present time the farmers have not that knowledge. The member for Beverley surely would not wish the Government to dis-

pose of the Agricultural implement works or the workers' homes? For my own part, I only wish the Government would go on building more workers' homes, notwithstanding the financial stress. They are required in the town of Narrogin and other flourishing centres. It is true the railway revenue has suffered very much this year. We have built a lot of good lines into new districts, and in consequence of the unfortunate drought they are not carrying any traffic, but we have to pay interest and sinking fund to the British money lender on the cost of their construction. That is one important factor in the present position of affairs, and I would here point out that the drought and the war have had their effect on the State trading concerns just as they have on many private trading concerns and businesses in this country. We can honestly say that the drought and the war together have robbed the people of Western Australia of a good deal of the benefit they would have derived from the putting into operation of the Labour policy. I look for only a good season or two to enable members of the Ministry to say to our friends opposite in the historic words of Sir John Forrest, "Where are the croakers now"? With a couple of good seasons I venture to say we shall have hon. members in both the Opposition parties claiming credit for the establishment of many of these very State trading concerns which to-day they are anxious to jettison.

Mr. McDOWALL (Coolgardie) [9.17]: I think the Government are right in doing all they possibly can at the present juncture to assist the agricultural industry. but I advise members opposite not to applaud that statement too soon because I intend to show that in consequence of agriculture run mad in this country the State is in the parlous position that it now occupies. If it were not for the goldfields and for their steadying influence this country would be in a most chaotic condition indeed. This fact must be realised by everyone. Yet the goldfields go on with little or no encouragement, whereas everything is lavished upon agriculture.

Mr. Griffiths: The goldfields have had it all in the past.

Mr. McDOWALL: They have not, and the hon. member ought to know it. I have not time to go into statistics on the question at present. Some years ago when sectional railway returns were kept I took the trouble to carefully investigate this matter. I examined every railway report and balance sheet and proved conclusively that the Eastern goldfields railway had paid its capital value and had contributed to the consolidated revenue over one million pounds. Therefore, we on the goldfields have nothing to thank anyone for. We have paid handsomely, directly and indirectly.

Mr. Griffiths: What about the water scheme?

Mr. McDOWALL: The water scheme certainly has cost the consolidated revenue some contributions for sinking fund, but when the position during the last few years is analysed, it can be seen that a large proportion of the deficit is due to the agricultural areas. Speaking from memory the agricultural areas are not bearing their proportion of the cost of the main reservoir at Mundaring and I do not think they are bearing their fair share of the administrative expenses.

Mr. Griffiths: When a man holds a thousand-acre block and pays £25 a year holding fee surely it is a fair proportion.

Mr. McDOWALL: The mains extended to assist many of the settlers are not paying. I have previously pointed out that the goldfields originally brought prosperity to Western Australia. They brought the farmers and settlers to cultivate the lands of this State, and now when the State is in a parlous position, the goldfields again have to come to the rescue and provide the stability for the State. The member for Leederville (Mr. Veryard) showed extreme anxiety for increased expenditure in and around Perth, but certainly not for increased taxation. It is most remarkable how glibly members talk about spending money in connection with this, that and the other thing. After all is said and done the money derived from taxation and from

outside sources is infinitesimal in the extreme. What does our taxation produce? The stamp duty which can scarcely be termed taxation, brings in £77,051, and probate duty £30,662. Our agricultural friends are fond of telling us what they are doing for the country and of saying that they are the backbone of the country and are contributing to the revenue more than any other section of the community. The land tax produces only £46,201, but if we dissect that amount we find that a large proportion of it is paid by city property, and not by the man on the land. The income tax amounts to £31,990 and the totalisator tax to £12,070, or a total of £140,261.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: What about land revenue.

Mr. McDOWALL: By no stretch of imagination can land revenue be called taxation; in fact some economists regard it as unfair to pay land receipts into revenue because they really represent a portion of an asset. If the hon. member desires I shall take an opportunity during the debate on the Lands Department to show that the money devoted to the development of agriculture, the Agricultural Department and the lands and surveys is far in excess of what is received from the sale of land.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: You cannot show that.

Mr. McDOWALL: I think I can. The dividend duty amounts to £92,566, and the goldfields of the State pay 48 per cent. of it, so that when it becomes a matter of revenue from taxation the goldfields once more have to come to the rescue of the State.

Hon. J. Mitchell: They are part of the State.

Mr. McDOWALL: I am glad that the hon. member admits it. I have been in the House for years and very few have acknowledged that fact. In times of prosperity we are of no consequence, but in times of adversity when we are able to study the markets and keep things going we are welcomed into the parental fold as brothers. The member for Leederville was cheered by the leader of the Opposition

when he spoke about making revenue and expenditure balance. I have been in this House for seven years and only once has there been a surplus at the end of the financial year, and that was only for a space of five minutes. It was created by the railway revenue reaching an abnormal amount during 1911.

Mr. Willmott: And it came from the farmers.

Mr. Nairn: How long will the million deficit last?

Mr. McDOWALL: I am not proud of the deficit, but from the remarks of some hon. members one would be apt to conclude that the State had never experienced a deficit until recently.

Mr. Nairn: It never before reached a million.

Mr. McDOWALL: But such adversities as those which prevail at present have never before been experienced. We have a yield of only $2\frac{1}{2}$ bushels per acre, and we have the effects of the greatest war in history to contend with.

Mr. Allen: The war has not affected the position.

Mr. McDOWALL: Our deficit at the end of June, 1914, was £446,000.

Mr. Nairn: There was no war at that time.

Mr. McDOWALL: No. In August, 1909, the Wilson Administration had a deficit of £396,086.

The Premier: And there was no war then.

Mr. McDOWALL: No. The Wilson Government wiped off their deficit by starving the railways and by various other means of that kind. I have listened to dreary debates on this question on many occasions.

Hon. J. Mitchell: We had two millions less revenue than the present Government.

Mr. McDOWALL: On the 30th June, 1911, the Wilson Government emerged from the usual state of being burdened with a deficit and showed a surplus of £13,298 15s. 6d.

The Premier: That was only on paper.

Mr. McDOWALL: It was created by an abnormal railway revenue, namely, a sum of £224,000, and the very next

month, not only was the surplus wiped out, but the Government went to the bad to the extent of £46,099. In the following month they went to the bad by £78,230, and in the month after that by another £28,994. When the Labour Government came into power there was not a surplus as the member for Canning (Mr. Robinson) stated. There was a surplus at the end of June, 1911, but in October, 1911, there was a deficiency. Throughout the State during the last elections it was said over and over again that the Wilson Government had left the Labour Government a surplus, and that the Labour Government had dissipated that surplus. That is not true.

Mr. Allen: Why did you put in the Governor's Speech at the opening of Parliament if it is not true?

Mr. McDOWALL: The hon. gentleman has apparently not been listening.

Mr. Allen: I could not help listening.

Mr. McDOWALL: I distinctly said there was a surplus at the end of June, 1911; but the Labour Government did not come into office until October, 1911, and by that time the surplus had disappeared. I hope I have made myself sufficiently clear to the hon. member for West Perth.

Mr. Allen: The trouble was I could not hear you.

Mr. McDOWALL: I am sorry indeed. I understand now why you did not understand; but now that I have made myself quite plain I hope the hon. member will have sufficient intelligence to understand. The other night speaking on this debate, we had many speakers from the opposite side of the House—the member for Canning (Mr. Robinson), the member for Wagin (Mr. S. Stubbs), and several others. The burden of their song was "Agriculture, agriculture, agriculture; spend every penny on the agricultural industry, never mind the goldfields."

Mr. Griffiths: Agriculture pays 28 per cent. of the railway revenue.

Mr. McDOWALL: And the railways are losing, so that the State is not very much indebted to you for that 28 per cent.

Mr. Griffiths: Last year the goldfields lines lost £5,000 more than the agricultural railways.

Mr. McDOWALL: I should like to know how the hon. member knows, considering that sectional returns have been done away with for many years, and the Commissioner for Railways himself even could not give the hon. member that information.

Mr. Griffiths: I have the information all right.

Mr. McDOWALL: When I make statements I have something to go upon, something behind me, not the mere *ex parte* statement of individuals.

Mr. Griffiths: There is no *ex parte* statement about it. I have the proof.

Mr. McDOWALL: Well, the hon. member, on the discussion on the vote for the Railway department will have his opportunity of proving it, and I shall also have an opportunity of criticising his figures. The hon. member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson) made reference to the resumption of special rates on spur lines, which he classed as an iniquitous charge—

The statement of the results of district railways.

This is an extract from the Railway Commissioner's report—

as contained in Appendix R, shows that the net loss on this class of line has been reduced from £47,878 in 1912-13 to £29,833 last year, an improvement of £18,045.

If the hon. member would not rush in, but would take a little time to get a knowledge of the various accounts of this country, it would perhaps be better for him, because he can easily get into a mess—

In considering this result, however, it must be borne in mind that £14,590 was derived from the reimposition on 26th January of the special charge of 1s. per ton on goods going on to and coming from such lines.

Mr. Thomson: They do not give credit for goods going on to the lines, only coming from.

Mr. McDOWALL: That is the result of the district railways in that particular year. £14,000 odd came in and still there was a loss of £29,000 on those particular

railways. If the railway report be referred to it will be found that on two lines in the hon. member's district there was a loss of £10,000—the Nyabing line and another, I forget for the moment its name. In the railway report it will be found that there has been a loss of £10,000 on those lines and yet the hon. member says we had no right to reimpose this charge.

Mr. Thomson: Yes, I say so still.

Mr. McDOWALL: There was this gigantic loss, and it is to be remembered that there were 13 million odd bushels of wheat to be transported last season on the railways; this year there is practically none. What then is going to be the loss on the agricultural lines for the year ending 30th June, 1915?

The Premier: Those two lines you mentioned lost £21,000.

Mr. McDOWALL: Kyabing £4,245, Tambellup-Ongerup £6,384. Those figures are quite sufficient to illustrate my argument. They show that last year, even with the reimposition of that charge there was a loss. What will be the loss this year without that charge? The great cry with some hon. members is "You must not make any extra charge on agriculture." Then the member for Swan (Mr. Nairn) comes along with this extraordinary statement—

Hitherto the railways have paid. It is only since the advent of this Government that they have not paid.

I would like to know where the hon. gentleman got his information from; it was certainly not from the public returns. In the *Statistical Abstract*—and let me remind the hon. member that when he looks up the figures he should endeavour to make sure that he has got all the figures. If the member looks up the *Abstract* he will find that it refers simply to the profit over expenses. In the *Abstract* everything over working costs is, according to the Railway Department, profit. Of course it is not profit in the true sense of the term. If there be shown—.23. .85. .77, .17. and so on, one must at once realise that there has been a loss, because the sinking fund is not included in the railway report and sinking fund of 1 per

cent, not being included it is apparent at once that there is a loss.

Mr. Nairn: It was in your year.

Mr. McDOWALL: I am not arguing in respect of any particular year. I do not care whether it was a Labour or a Liberal year. I am refuting the statement that it is only since the advent of the Labour Government that the railways have not paid. It is immaterial to me what they did under a Labour Government or what they are likely to do. I am not going to allow it to go on record that it is only since the advent of the Labour Government that the railways have not paid.

Mr. Smith: Let the dead past bury its dead.

Mr. McDOWALL: I wish the hon. member for North Perth would direct his writers on the *Sunday Times* to do the same thing. It might be better for him and for the country if that policy were adopted. I am not going to let the dead past bury its dead. The hon. member for Swan did not do that. It was a virtue when the hon. member for Swan produced his figures against the Labour Government, but apparently it is a crime when I reply. Even when one has got the railway report, and has got the sinking fund included, one is not even then absolutely correct, unless care is taken to quote from complete accounts. For instance, in the Estimates there is a tabulated statement, and it is the first time I have seen such a statement in the Estimates. It is a magnificent table, and a good thing for us to have placed before us. I desire to express my appreciation of the insertion of this allocation of interest and sinking fund.

Member: What page?

Mr. McDOWALL: Between pages 18 and 19. This is a point I want to stress. I am going to show that our railways have not really paid anything into Consolidated Revenue. They have apparently paid a little, but when the accounts are dissected the railways, pretty well for the past 10 years, have not been of any real service to the Consolidated Revenue of this State.

Hon. J. Mitchell interjected.

Mr. McDOWALL: I am averaging it. It will be seen from the *Abstract* that the interest account this year is set down at £556,843. According to the Statistical *Abstract* there was a profit of £128,160 on the railways. But if this statement of the allocation of sinking fund be referred to, it will be seen that there is a sum of £111,510 to be paid out of that £128,000. There is more than that, and this is the point I am driving at. A mistake is made if one takes that as being correct, because there are other railways in course of construction. The money has been borrowed for them, interest has to be paid, and sinking fund to be provided; so that if one takes £22,625 off that, or nearly £23,000, it will be found that the railway revenue is practically non-existent.

Mr. Nairn: What year are you quoting, 1899?

Mr. McDOWALL: 1914. I am giving you now last year because I want to quote from the public statements before the House and not to enter into a long discussion upon figures which are not before the House. If members will look at a report published in the time of Sir Newton Moore, and which was specially commended by the hon. member for Canning (Mr. Robinson), it will be found that in 1910 the interest on railways is given as £387,315; but if the proper allocation be taken, this charge, including railways in the course of construction, stands at £416,859 as interest and £110,541 as sinking fund, and the profit made on the working of the railways was £17,366. Those are the facts of the case when we get right down to bed-rock. But the ordinary man with no knowledge as to sinking fund and matters of that kind, looking at the figures, even if he takes into consideration the sinking fund, would arrive at the conclusion that in 1910 the sinking fund would be booked as £110,541, and he would deduct that from £153,111, leaving a profit of £42,570 as against the £17,366 shown in the proper analysis of expenditure of Sir Newton Moore's accounts. That is the position I am arriving at, and I have not in this table which I have prepared, and which I shall presently

read to the Committee, taken into consideration the extra interest. I am taking that into consideration in the argument alone. But if these charges are properly entered up against the railway system of this State, then it is evident that the railways have not paid for the last ten years. Anyhow, it is useless talking without quoting, and I shall quote exactly. The tabulated figures which I have prepared are as follows:—

Working Railways.

Year.	Profit as per Monthly Abstract Dec., 1914	'Sinking' Fund,	Profit.	Loss.
	£	£	£	£
30th June—				
1905	22,744	£83,700		60,956
1906	81,224	£84,000	224	
1907	45,692	£87,000		44,308
1908	128,009	87,802	40,207	
1909	156,683	110,897	546,083	
1910	153,111	110,541	£42,570	
1911	224,141	105,067	119,434	
1912	101,474	105,285		9,811
1913	25,928	109,800		84,472
1914	128,160	111,510	16,650	
		Bal.	Not. Pro	£71,621
	1,067,163	995,542	265,168	265,168

a. Approximate. b. Profit Sir Newton Moore's
Statements, 1909, £23,848; 1910, £17,366.

In 1905 the sinking fund was approximately £83,700. The profit was shown as £22,744; but I have to explain that £79,000 was expended out of revenue on charges which are usually spread over a number of years. No doubt, that was a Labour year, and the Labour party started well in endeavouring to spend out of revenue the money required for matters of that description. However, there was a loss for that year of £60,956 on the total sinking fund, leaving out of consideration the lines under construction. In the year 1906 the sinking fund was £84,000, and the profit was £224. For 1907 the sinking fund was £87,000, and the loss £44,308. In 1908 the sinking fund was £87,202, and the profit £40,207. In 1909 the two amounts were £110,897 and £46,683, respectively; or, really, according to Sir Newton Moore's estimate, the profit was £23,848. In 1910 there was, as I stated a few moments ago, a profit of £42,570. In 1911—the great year in which the Liberal Administration succeeded in reducing the deficit—the profit was £119,434. In the following year, 1912, the sinking fund was £105,285,

leaving a loss of £3,811; in 1913 £109,800, leaving a loss of £84,472. For 1914 it is £111,510, showing a profit of £16,650, which, as I have already explained, completely disappears when one takes into consideration the interest on the unopened lines. But all this means is, profits of £265,168 with losses of £193,547, or a net profit for the period of ten years of £71,621, which profit, as I have already explained, would be completely wiped out if the proper charges against the railways were taken into consideration. I trust, therefore, my friends realise that the railways of this State have not paid. Even putting the railways on their very best footing, taking only interest and sinking fund on the lines which have actually been handed over to the Commissioner of Railways, there is a profit for ten years of only £71,000 odd. And yet we hear the agricultural members over and over again telling us that we must reduce freights, that we must meet the agriculturist in every possible way. I desire to repeat, as I have already said, that in the present extraordinary state of public and commercial affairs it is necessary, even essential, that the farming industry should be fostered to the utmost possible extent; but I do say also that the fetish of agriculture is being worshipped altogether too much in Western Australia. Some three or four years ago, in speaking in this Chamber, I felt foul of some remarks made by Sir Walter James in the course of an election speech at Beverley. On that occasion Sir Walter James said that there were three great industries, mining, farming, and timber. I criticised his remarks as follows:—

It was declared by Sir Walter James that the life of the timber industry was, unhappily, short; and mining, he regretted to say, was showing signs of shrinking. The agricultural industry, however, was growing and expanding. Agriculture lay at the root of the State's prosperity, and mineral development was no good unless it helped to settle the lands of the State.

This is the point to which I wish to call attention particularly—

Mineral development was no good unless it helped to settle the lands of the State. If that is not agriculture run mad, I should like to know what it is. The goldfields are no good except they tend towards the settlement of the agricultural lands of the State.

Mr. Griffiths: Is that not the history of all countries?

Mr. McDOWALL: I do not know the history of all countries, but the history of the world proves that no first rank nation has ever been raised on a purely agricultural basis. There is a statement direct and emphatic. The nearest approach to a front rank nation based purely on agriculture is undoubtedly France, and about 50 per cent. of the population of France are engaged in agriculture, but it is agriculture in the shape of gardens more than any other form.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): The mining industry is very handy to Western Australia to-day.

Mr. McDOWALL: Yes. Everybody admits that now. I admitted it while the Honorary Minister was outside the Chamber. Let us glance at the figures of the agricultural industry and timber. Turning to Budget sheet No. 9, hon. members will find that timber exported represents £1,142,280, and wool exported £907,363, while 13,331,350 bushels of wheat were exported. I do not intend to say that the whole of the value of the wheat produced is represented by the value of the wheat exported, but I do say that when comparing these figures with the results of the goldfields, we may realise how small a factor, relatively, agriculture has been in the development of the welfare of this State up to the present time. And agriculture has been in existence in Western Australia probably since 1829, and certainly since 1836. Again referring to Budget sheet No. 9, hon. members will see that the exports last year totalled £10,415,095, or, excluding gold, £5,429,954, leaving £4,985,141, or approximately 48 per cent. of all the exports of this State, for gold. When hon. mem-

bers realise that I have been sitting here for the last two months listening to speech after speech from the Opposition side of the House, they will understand that I began to feel that there was no such place as the goldfields in Western Australia at all. Notwithstanding one hears all the talk about agriculture, as soon as a little money is to be expended on the development of the goldfields, on fostering them and giving them some encouragement, it may be realised, in view of the figures I have quoted, that the goldfields deserve a great deal more. If hon. members bear in mind that the goldfields of this State have produced £120,117,888 worth of gold, and have paid £25,088,465 in dividends, they must acknowledge what a magnificent asset the goldfields are to the State. All this is admitted, no doubt, but I am speaking on the present occasion, not because it is not admitted, but because I desire not to allow certain members to forget that we have goldfields in Western Australia. Next let us look for a moment at the money lavished on agriculture. Let hon. members refer to Budget sheet No. 8, and they will see that there has been expended on the development of the goldfields, during the last three years, £92,345 in 1911-12, £78,143 in 1912-13, and £50,659 in 1913-14.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Look up the loan expenditure as well.

Mr. McDOWALL: It is loan expenditure I am looking at. Now let us see the figures referring to agriculture, just below. For 1911-12 they are £362,406, for 1912-13 £155,432, and for 1913-14 they are £156,752. The difference, it will be seen, is vast. But there is more yet. There is immigration in connection with the agricultural industry. Then there is working capital for the Agricultural Bank, £506,638. All these matters relate to the development and the fostering of the agricultural industry.

Hon. J. Mitchell: The farmer pays interest on all that, though.

Mr. McDOWALL: The farmer does not pay interest on all this expenditure. The people of the State, out of the Consolidated Revenue, pay interest on many of

these items. Many of them are not booked to the farmer as investments; and I am surprised to find an ex-Minister of the Crown, and one so thoroughly conversant with the facts, attempting to throw dust in the eyes of the Committee in that fashion. Next, let hon. members turn to Budget sheet No. 7, which refers to money out of loan, money expended on the development of agriculture. Interest is charged on the loans, of course, and the result is that the State as a whole has to pay the interest. Development of goldfields and mineral resources is debited with £1,248,321, and development of agriculture with £3,020,278 and immigration with £55,064. And so it goes on, right along the line, money being lavished on the fostering of the agricultural industry. I do not say that the money will never come back, or that the expenditure has not been beneficial to a certain extent; but I do desire to point out that the present state of this country's finances is due largely to the immense amounts of money which have been expended on agricultural railways, and upon which consequently interest and sinking fund have to be paid, and also to the amounts which have been lavished on other items pertaining to agriculture. Practically, the whole of the attention of Parliament has been devoted to agriculture for the last few years, and it is for that reason we are in our present financial position. When it is seen that the whole of the community pays a land tax of only £42,000, which amount, moreover, is derived principally from City lands, it must be recognised that the State is not getting a fair deal from the man on the land. That is what I have risen to say on the present occasion, and I do trust that it will be realised, and that we shall hear less of this talk about the agricultural industry being the backbone of the State in every respect.

Hon. J. Mitchell: So it is.

Mr. McDOWALL: I should like to know where we would be just now, were it not for the goldfields. Unquestionably the cry of the farmers calls to mind a

certain cartoon of the *Bulletin*. A gentleman shaven in the orthodox wows-er fashion was reading to a crowd of youngsters, all listening to him intently; and he read from the sacred word that it rained for 40 days and 40 nights. Then one little fellow jumped up and asked, "Mister, were the cockies satisfied then?" That is the way of it with the farmers. They are never satisfied, no matter what may be done for them. I explained a few minutes ago that no first-class country is a purely agricultural country. What I fear in this state is that this agricultural business is going to run us to such extent that we will be neglecting the goldfields and the industrial institutions and will simply grow wheat and be hewers of wood and drawers of water, like the cheap countries of Asia, in order to supply the English market. We should develop more industries in the State. Nothing has been done in this country for years past except in regard to agriculture. I will defy anyone to say that anything but agriculture has been seriously considered for some years past. According to *Pitman's Commercial Encyclopaedia*, Germany, in the census of 1905, had a population of 60,641,278.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: What will she have after the war?

Mr. McDOWALL: That is not pertinent to the question; the hon. member ought to be a little more dignified. Germany has engaged in agriculture, 9,732,472 persons and in mining 11,256,254. Even in Germany we find that mining takes a superior place to agriculture. Down to the middle of last century Germany was an agricultural country. It is a pity it did not remain so, for if it had it would have been so poor and weak, so much of a hewer of wood and drawer of water for the richer countries of Europe, that it could not have gone to war at all. Now there are more people in Germany engaged in industrial occupations than in any other, while large numbers are engaged in trade and commerce. That is what has made the wealth of Germany, what has made Germany the nation it is to-day. That is what makes America the

nation it and what has made Great Britain the most splendidly financial country in the world. Agriculture is still very important, however. Now let me give you this other extract—

Commerce.—The change of the condition of Germany from an almost purely agricultural State to one predominantly industrial has led to the trade with other countries closely resembling those of Britain, namely, the imports are largely food and raw material and the exports chiefly manufactured goods.”

Again I repeat that this State can never be a great country unless we foster every industry, and my remarks to-night are intended to direct attention to the necessity for introducing some check on the fostering of one industry at the expense of all the others. China is purely an agricultural country. Agriculture there is as great a fetish as we are making of it here. The farmer is looked up to by all. The members of the Opposition here want us to bow down and worship the farmers.

Mr. Nairn: And you want us to bow down and worship the golden calf.

Mr. McDOWALL: No, but to give it a little consideration. Now, take our exports. We have exported tin to the aggregate value of £1,164,543.

Mr. Willmott: Greenbushes alone has sent over £300,000 worth.

Mr. McDOWALL: You will find my figures are absolutely correct. I cannot understand the interjection. Greenbushes may have sent away nearly the whole of the £1,164,543.

Mr. Mitchell: Why did the goldfields fall off last year?

Mr. McDOWALL: There was a slight falling off last year, but it was infinitesimal. It will be a sorry day for the State when the goldfields fall off to any material degree. But to continue these exports: We have exported timber to the value of £13,983,042; hides and skins, £2,904,533; sandalwood, £2,443,241; mallet bark, £863,429; and wheat, £3,291,337. Since the inauguration of the State in 1829 right up to the 11th month of last year we have not exported from all other sources as much as our goldfields have

done in any one year during the last 20 years. I do not pretend to claim that the amount of wheat exported is the value of it, but I would remind hon. members that although they may have fed us with wheat we have still to take into consideration that the butter and bacon and ham and things of that kind imported into the State far exceed the value of the wheat used in the State. My friend interjects, “Open up the South-West.” I am with him in that. I say, open up every part of the country. I only hope to see the day when the holders of unused land along existing railways will be so taxed as to be compelled to make use of their property. If this were done we would save the construction of railways into new country, the capital expenditure, and the interest and sinking fund thereon, which is the bugbear of the State at the present time. But to return: we have exported flour to the value of £730,327, and pearls and pearl-shell to the value of £6,078,989. Then there is wool, £18,386,225, and we have a total of £49,845,866. This represents nearly the total products of the State since its inauguration. There may have been half a million for horses and a few other little things, but I have given practically the total trade of the country since 1829. And when we compare that amount of less than 50 millions with the mining figures—which show that mining has produced 120 millions and paid in dividends 25 millions—it must be realised that the mining industry should be fostered in every possible way. The member for Canning (Mr. Robinson) when speaking on the Address-in-reply said:

. In the year 1910, as reported in the *Parliamentary Debates*, Vol. 38, page 1155, a detailed statement of the various departments was presented by the then Treasurer in fact this schedule which I have before me now supplies what I call a profit and loss account.

And again—

Every business man knows that without analytical comparisons of his business and accounts it is impossible to successfully manage his business.

This was the initial effort of the hon. member in this Chamber. He delivers a lecture almost before he has felt his feet, and he grows quite patronising. We are all likely to make mistakes. But he returns to the charge on the Estimates. I interjected at the time that the statement he alluded to was really not a profit and loss statement, but simply an analysis of cash, and would not carry out the purpose he desired. But notwithstanding this, on the 28th January he returned with this further advice—

I have suggested that the Premier should continue that fine institution initiated by Sir Newton Moore, namely the submission of a balance sheet practically of each department, a long schedule containing the profit and loss of each one. A member is then able to run his eye over it and say "That department is not paying."

The statement alluded to is simply an analysis. It is not an accountant's schedule of profit and loss, nor a statement to be presented to the House in connection with our trading concerns. There would be a howl of derision if we came along with this analysis of cash and pretended that it showed the position of any trading concern. Members of the Opposition would laugh at it. It is simply what it purports to be. The hon. member gave us advice and returned to it. He did not really know that he was only talking about a cash statement instead of a complete statement.

Mr. Robinson: That deals with the departments then in existence, and not with any trading concerns at all.

Mr. McDOWALL: The hon. member argued that if the trading concerns had been in existence—

Mr. Robinson: No. I want that system followed in connection with all the departmental concerns, and in connection with trading concerns a complete profit and loss account and balance sheet.

Mr. McDOWALL: The hon. member's statement was as I have given it.

Mr. Robinson: Then you did not hear my statement.

Mr. McDOWALL: I admit that the printed statement was an excellent one,

and if similar statements were still prepared a lot of bother would be saved. But still that statement was not what the hon. member led us to believe it was. If it had shown nothing more than the true interest and sinking fund and profit on the railways, it would have been worth the labour involved in preparing it, and I am astonished that it has been discontinued. Why was it discontinued? The leader of the Opposition might have given us information on the point. This document was issued in 1909 and 1910, but in 1911 when the Liberal party succeeded in wiping out the deficit, and when the present leader of the Opposition was Treasurer, the statement was discontinued. I would like to know the reason why. The new statement in the Estimates, however, makes up for it, and gives us the requisite information.

Mr. Robinson: I drew attention to that very matter myself.

Mr. McDOWALL: It struck me that the hon. member was patronising us as a lot of dolts who could not make up figures.

Mr. Nairn: They can make up figures, but they do not.

Mr. McDOWALL: I think the Government do. There has been a great howl about the fact that the revenue now totals £5,200,000 compared with £3,850,000 in the last year of the Wilson Administration.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Is not that so?

Mr. McDOWALL: Certainly, but when members set out to deal with figures we do not expect them to talk nonsense. The magnitude of the figures is of no consequence. If I am turning over £1,000 a year and making £500 profit I am better off than I would be if I were turning over £2,000 and making only £200 profit. That is the position in regard to the revenue of the State. But members have drivelled about the constantly increasing revenue as if that were a matter of all importance. Judging from the remarks of some members one would think that the money had been thrown away.

Mr. Robinson: You throw lots of it away.

Mr. McDOWALL: It would take too long to analyse the whole of the statement showing how the revenue from licenses has increased by £68,310 and the revenue of the railways by £406,372. Thus the increases have progressed, but there is the expenditure for working costs to be considered on the other side. The table I have prepared shows the whole position completely. It shows how the money has been spent and it indicates the new works. The amount spent on tramways is shown as £116,736, on State implement works £43,385, on State hotels, which last year were included in miscellaneous services, £36,562, on State steamers £77,561 and on State ferries £23,649. I could give details of the expenditure, but what I wish to emphasise is that the increased revenue is a matter of no importance. The railway revenue was bound to increase, but the working expenses have also increased and interest and sinking fund have advanced on account of extra construction. There is no point in arguing about the magnitude of this increase of revenue unless one analyses the figures and indicates the essential features of expenditure on the other side. At the time of the last election, there was a tremendous uproar both in Parliament and outside about the state of the rolls. The leader of the Opposition was virtuous in his indignation regarding the inflation of the rolls. In another place it was discussed to the utmost limit. Outside of Parliament it was magnified and we were declared to be a disgraceful lot who were inflating the rolls in order to get votes for our party. The leader of the Opposition in an interview made use of the following words—

"By the way, has the Attorney General explained that roll business yet? I've been away and don't know." The general verdict is that he hasn't. "Of course he can't. How can he explain away the fact that there are 23,000 more voters on the rolls than there are adults in the State? It's the hottest thing I've ever heard of in roll-making. I thought he was in a corner about it when he resorted to abuse in replying to Mr. Colebatch. He blew

off a lot of froth, but there was nothing in the shape of refutation. I consider it an awful scandal that the integrity of the rolls should be endangered in this way. I can't recall anything like it in the history of the ballot in Australia, and the Government has put up a precedent that I hope will never be followed."

Mr. Griffiths: It was without doubt a horrible roll.

Mr. McDOWALL: I admit that, but it is not the first time in the history of the State that it has occurred. I would draw the hon. member's attention to the rolls of 1904.

Mr. Smith: You are digging up the graveyards all right.

The Minister for Mines: The leader of the Opposition said there had never been anything like it.

Mr. McDOWALL: The hon. member said it had never occurred before in Australia. Any stick was good enough with which to beat the Labour party, but when I now attempt to show that though two wrongs do not make a right, this was not the only occasion on which such a thing occurred—the other occasion having been when the Liberal Government were in power—the member for North Perth twists me with digging up graveyards. I have certainly done so this evening, but it was necessary, and I trust the hon. member will profit by it. The statements I have made were accurate and certainly it was essential that they should be made. The population in 1904 was 235,365, and on the 30th June there were 163,820 persons enrolled. If the hon. member will look up part 12 of the *Statistical Register* for 1911 he will be able to obtain all the figures. To quote them now would occupy too much time. The fact remains that when the population of the State was 235,000 or nearly 100,000 less than it is to-day, there were 163,820 names on the roll.

Mr. Griffiths: Were not there more names on the roll last year than there were adults in the State?

Mr. McDOWALL: Yes.

Mr. Allen: Two wrongs do not make a right.

Mr. McDOWALL: I have with painful reiteration asserted that, but if two wrongs do not make a right it is as well to dissipate the statements circulated during the last election that the rolls were inflated by us, and that such a thing had never been done by any one else.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Who was in power in 1904?

Mr. McDOWALL: Sir Walter James was Premier. On the 30th September, 1905, when the population had increased to 250,294 there were only 121,722 persons on the roll.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: But in 1904 plural voting was in force.

The Minister for Mines: No.

Mr. McDOWALL: It was not.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: What part of 1904 are you referring to?

Mr. McDOWALL: There was an election in June, 1904, and the Labour party were returned in very strong numbers. There was then a famous shuffle of seats with Mr. Rason. Mr. Rason got a dissolution and on the 27th October, 1905, when the dissolution election took place, there were only 121,722 persons on the roll. If the former roll was not inflated what could be said of it? The population had increased by 14,000 and the roll was 42,000 less than in the previous year.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: Plural voting made the difference.

Mr. McDOWALL: There was no plural voting in 1905.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: Between 1904 and 1905 there was.

Mr. McDOWALL: Apart from that, what was the cause of the inflation of the rolls at the last election? It was due to the care exercised not to disfranchise any elector. In consequence of lifting names from the Federal roll duplications occurred, but these duplications did not make any difference to the voting strength I do not know why hon. members should take this so unkindly. I am only serving back a little of what they have given us, and a little of what we have put up with during the last election. In 1904, 69½ per cent. of the population was enrolled. In 1914, taking our population at 325,000,

65 per cent. of our population was enrolled. Consequently, there was a greater enrolment in proportion to the population than there was in 1914.

Hon. J. Connolly: What are you quoting from?

Mr. McDOWALL: I am endeavouring to tell the hon. member. The *Statistical Register* I am quoting from is for 1911, Part 12, page 23.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: It is the 1904 figures I am speaking of.

Mr. McDOWALL: I tell you that I would not quote from this paper because it is too troublesome, but in order that the hon. member may see it, I will quote the paper.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: What are you quoting from for the 1904 figures?

Mr. McDOWALL: I am quoting from the *Statistical Register* for 1911, Part 12, page 23. That Register gives the roll for 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907, 1908, 1909, 1910, and 1911. I hope the hon. member understands that. Having satisfactorily answered that question I will proceed. The population of the State according to the census of 31st March, 1901, was 119,705 and on 30th June, 1905, it was 235,365, and the population on 31st March, 1901, was 181,124, showing an increase for the period of 51,241. On the basis of the calculations of the Registrar General we have a position something like this: that after allowing 60 per cent. of this increase of population and deducting three and two-thirds per cent. for foreigners, etc., not qualified to vote, there were 163,826 persons on the roll, or 23,710 more adults on the roll than there were adults in the State.

Mr. Griffiths: In my electorate in one district there were 351 more persons on the roll than there ought to have been.

Mr. McDOWALL: I wish to point out--

Mr. Allen: What is the point?

Member: How will this reduce the deficit or affect the State?

Mr. McDOWALL: How will it affect the State? It is not going to affect the financial position of the State in any way whatever, but it is going to show the people of the State, who have been constantly talking about this matter, that it is just

as well for the Liberal party to take the beam out of their eye before putting it into ours.

Mr. Allen: Who do you think will read all this?

Mr. McDOWALL: I do not think the hon. member for West Perth will read it.

Mr. Allen: I certainly will not.

Mr. McDOWALL: I am honestly of opinion that the hon. member has not sufficient application to put himself to anything that is of importance or for the country's good. The hon. member will come along here and rattle off parrot-like something that has been given to him to say. When he has done that he thinks he has done his duty to the State, and when I, and others who are endeavouring to bring forward something that is of real interest to the State, he becomes insulting in his interjections. If he wishes to come out on top he had better leave me alone. I will give back a great deal more than the hon. member sends if he tries too much of this game on me.

Mr. Allen: That does not answer my question.

Mr. McDOWALL: Is the hon. member's question worthy of an answer? Is it worthy of the marvellous brain power that appears to lie at the back of the head of the hon. member. I am never insulting unless anybody insults me. The moment people become insulting to me I become insulting to them. I venture to say that hon. members who have sat here with me for the last seven years will say that in debate I have always treated them properly, and that I have not descended to petty personalities unless someone has interfered with me, as the hon. member for West Perth has done.

Mr. Nairn: You were pretty hard on me.

Mr. McDOWALL: I was not insulting. I endeavoured to show that the hon. member was making a mistake in connection with his railway figures, and I say he was. To go back to where I was before this crossfire occurred—and I do not mind it, in fact, I rather like it—I will now refer to the particular points I desired to make. I have indeed allowed myself fuller sway than I had intended. My friends on the

other side must not think that the sun rises and sets only in the agricultural areas, but must believe that there are great goldfields in the State that require developing; that the secondary industries should be encouraged and fostered in every way; that there is a great area in the South-West, which is fertile enough and vast enough to contain the State of Victoria, to be developed, too, that our copper and coal reserves should be developed, and that if we are going to improve the country all our industries, which are so inter-dependent, should be attended to, for if they are neglected and if they are not fostered, we are sure to feel the effects sooner or later. I hope I have drawn the attention of the House to the fact that we have one of the finest goldfields in the world in Western Australia and that it must not be neglected, and that a little fostering will enrich it and make it even greater than it is at present. In this vast country of nearly a million square miles it is absurd to say that all the gold in the State is in the Golden Mile or even in Coolgardie. It is in other parts of the State as well, and there is every chance of finding it. Some gold may be found even in the Leonora constituency. There are ample opportunities by a little expenditure of money of developing the mining industry, so that it will steady this country in times of adversity and will help to make the State more prosperous, as it did in the years 1892, 1904, and upwards to 1915. Having expressed myself in this fashion I hope that hon. members will not think that I have been too severe on their industries, or that I do not believe in other industries in the State, besides the gold-mining industry. If I did succeed in impressing them to that extent I am satisfied.

Mr. HARRISON (Avon) [10.40]: In speaking on the Estimates I, as a new member of the House, may possibly stray a little, and I trust that you, Mr. Chairman, will bear with me. The member for Coolgardie (Mr. McDowall) was eloquent on the item of gold production, but he erred in seeking to represent the Country party as being in favour of one industry, and

one industry only. I wish to remind the hon. member that the Country party stand for primary production in all directions. Gold as a primary product is first on the list of Western Australia. For last year we have a gold return of 1,232,977 fine ounces, which I am given to understand represents a total value of nearly £5,000,000. As regards the agricultural industry, the last has been the worst season Western Australia has known, and the figures given represent an average of $2\frac{1}{2}$ bushels to the acre. I question, however, if even that average would be realised. The year before last our export of wheat amounted to 13,000,000 bushels. If that average had been maintained this year and the mean price of 5s. per bushel for wheat had been realised, it would have meant that the export of wheat would represent over £3,000,000 of money. Moreover, the agricultural industry will be of more and more value to the State as the years go by. The Western Australian agricultural industry is at present really in its developmental stage. A number of agricultural railways have recently been built; and, as the production of the districts which they serve increases, the traffic from the agricultural lines will raise the railway revenue to a very different position from that in which it is to-day. A good deal has been said about the deficit, and the dimensions to which it has attained. A good deal of criticism has been directed towards that deficit from all sides of the House. What are we to do? The main object of every member of the House should be to reduce the deficit, and in my opinion there is only one way to do it. I think that one way is to increase production. That will meet the case, and therefore I wish to see production increased from every possible source, from the goldfields and from every other industry, and from every walk of life. Barriers hemming production are bad for the State. Any secondary enterprise which will promote production is of advantage to the community. A good deal has been laid to the charge of the agriculturist as being mainly responsible for the increased deficit. The amount out-

standing for rents is £210,000; Agricultural Bank arrears represent £70,000 and water supply arrears £15,000; making in round figures a total of £300,000. Other amounts raise the grand total chargeable against the agriculturist to £400,000. Those amounts are placed to the debit of the farmer, and if we have a decent season we shall be able to wipe off those amounts and reduce the deficit to that extent. The amounts I refer to do not, however, represent gifts to the farmer. The Government, in view of climatic conditions, have come to the assistance of the farmer; and we are very glad that the Government have adopted that course. I trust that another place will not be long in dealing with the last Bill sent up, and that we shall soon be able to overcome the trouble, because seed time is close upon us and if we miss the seed time it will be of serious moment to the State. We must get to work at once, so that the largest possible area may be put under crop; the larger the area, the better it will be for the people of Western Australia generally. Mr. Speaker very lucidly pointed out that the State trading concerns could not be looked upon as being the sole source of the increased deficit. I propose to speak of one trading concern of which I claim to know something. In connection with that concern we have the expenditure for the last financial year and also the revenue for that year. I refer to the State implement works. If that were a concern carried on by private enterprise, it would bring into its balance sheets not only the amounts shown in the return for revenue but also the amounts for machinery outstanding and the moneys not yet collected. All the bills due and payable would be shown, and all the stock in hand. Further, the value of patterns would be shown. In an engineering works, and especially in one newly established, patterns represent a very large amount as compared with the cost of the first implements made to those patterns. A private concern would show all those assets, and if that had been done in the case of the implement works the position would have appeared very differently. Again,

the implement works is not only making agricultural machinery, but is supplying the Fremantle Harbour Trust and other Government departments with various requirements. I should like to see a certain amount of money placed to the credit of all trading concerns, and I think that might be done in the same manner as limited liability companies set aside a certain amount of capital to make calls upon it, as required, for development, for building premises, and so forth. If a certain amount of capital were allocated to each of the State trading enterprises, to be called upon as needed, those concerns would be able to produce balance sheets exactly on the lines of private enterprise, and we would at once see from those balance sheets exactly how they stood. The result would be information very different from that which appears on the Estimates. The member for Coolgardie (Mr. McDowall) referred to the position agriculture occupies as against gold mining. I wish to remind the hon. member that no industry suffers more than the agricultural industry does from adverse climatic conditions. If mining were affected in the same way as agriculture by unfavourable climatic conditions, the returns from the goldfields would be very much less than shown for last year. Fortunately, however, climate makes only the smallest difference to mining. True, a good season gives water, and so enables prospectors to travel outlying districts. If to-day we can assist the prospector to go out into virgin country and so bring other mines into production, it will be one of the best means that can possibly be adopted for reducing the deficit.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: But you will not let the prospector join your association; he cannot get full membership of your association.

Mr. HARRISON: That does not matter.

Mr. Willmott: Can any man join the Timber Workers' Union if he wants to?

The Minister for Works: We will let any man join the Labour party.

Mr. HARRISON: With regard to the finances, to me it is not a matter of much consequence what has happened in the past, except in so far as the past affords a guide for the future. If collectively we can reduce the deficit and increase the prosperity of the country, it is our bounden duty to do so. We are placed here to-day in conditions never previously experienced. The past season has been the worst the State has ever known. The war will make it more difficult than ever before to raise loans: and if we can produce £3,000,000 from the soil, from the mines, and from the timber industry, that will be as good to us as £5,000,000 of borrowed money. Moreover, the £5,000,000 would carry interest and sinking fund and would have to be redeemed. As we have an ex-treasurer as leader of the Opposition and an ex-treasurer as leader of the Country party, I trust that they with the Premier will do as it was stated at the opening of Parliament they would endeavour to do, namely, their utmost to raise the State to a sound financial position. I hope also that during the period of depression, when all the departments are likely to be comparatively slack except those which will be administering the legislation which we have already passed to assist the agricultural industry, an attempt will be made to modernise those departments. I am against the appointment of a great number of royal commissions, but if it needs the appointment of a royal commission to bring our departments up to date, then I shall be in favour of appointing one. With regard to the implement works my experience of engineering enables me to say whether the employees are working on the mark-time system or whether they are working honestly, and on the occasion of a recent visit to the State works it is only fair to say that I found everything as it should be. I sincerely trust that before long the State will again be raised to a sound financial position and in spite of the war in Europe, Australia, by primary development will become one of the leading nations of the world.

Progress reported.

BILL—CONTROL OF TRADE IN WAR TIME AMENDMENT.

Council's Message.

Bill returned from the Legislative Council with an amendment, which was now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. McDowall in the Chair, the Premier in charge of the Bill.

The PREMIER: The amendment proposed by the Legislative Council is that a new clause be added to the Bill to stand as Clause 5 as follows:—"Section 3 of the principal Act is amended by adding the words, 'and shall continue in force until 30th September, 1915.'" As Parliament will meet again before that date, we might accept the amendment. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed, the Council's amendment agreed to.

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

BILL—BLACKBOY AND ZAMIA PALM LICENSE.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

House adjourned at 10.58 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 10th February, 1915.

Questions:	Page
Railway Department and Customs Duties, State Sawmills and State Brickworks	1361
Bills: Industries Assistance, Council's pressed requests	1361
Lunacy Act Amendment, Assembly's Message	1367
Coal Mines Regulation Act Amendment, 2 nd Com.	1369
State Children Act Amendment, 2 nd Com.	1370
Vernin Boards Act Amendment, Com.	1371
Dividend Duties Act Amendment, Com.	1377

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

QUESTION — RAILWAY DEPART- MENTS AND CUSTOMS DUTIES.

Hon. A. SANDERSON asked the Colonial Secretary: What is the total amount of cash paid by the Western Australian Government Railway Department to the Federal Customs from 1st January, 1901, to 31st January, 1914?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: £306,847 Os. 8d.

QUESTION—STATE SAWMILLS AND STATE BRICKWORKS, EXPEN- DITURE.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Of the sum of £281,903 appearing in the Revenue and Expenditure returns for the six months ended 31st December, 1914, as expenditure on "Public Works and Buildings," what amount represents the expenditure on (a) State sawmills, (b) State brickworks? 2, Of the sum of £56,794 appearing on the Revenue and Expenditure returns for the month of January, 1915, as expenditure on "Public Works and Buildings," what amount represents the expenditure on (a) State sawmills, (b) State brickworks?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, Expenditure on sawmills to 31st December, 1914, £162,191; expenditure on brickworks to 31st December, 1914, £387. 2, Expenditure on sawmills for January, 1915, £39,774; expenditure on brickworks for January, 1915, £55.

BILL — INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE. *Assembly's Message.*

Consideration resumed from the previous day of the Message from the Assembly notifying that it had agreed to make amendments Nos. 5 and 7, requested by the Council, had agreed to make amendment No. 10 subject to a modification, but had declined to make amendments Nos. 1 to 4, 6, 8, 9, and 11, now considered.

In Committee.

Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair; the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

No. 2—Clause 9, strike out paragraph (c):

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move—

That the amendment be not pressed.

The object of the measure is to place the relief to farmers on business lines, and to end the entirely free and easy method adopted in the past. Hence, this is regarded by the Government as a vital provision of the Bill. During the last three years the Lands Department have been practically over-riding Section 36 of the Lands Act, 1898, which requires forfeiture for non-payment of rent within 90